BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 080007-EI FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

AUGUST 29, 2008

ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY

PROJECTIONS
JANUARY 2009 THROUGH DECEMBER 2009

TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS OF:

K. M. DUBIN R. R. LABAUVE E. SILAGY

CP ____ SC ___ GA ___ DM ___ (1)

OM

07990 AUG 298

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
3		TESTIMONY OF KOREL M. DUBIN
4		DOCKET NO. 080007-EI
5		AUGUST 29, 2008
6		
7		•
8	Q.	Please state your name and address.
9	A.	My name is Korel M. Dubin and my business address is 9250 West
10		Flagler Street, Miami, Florida, 33174.
11	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
12	A.	I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) as Senior
13		Manager of Purchased Power in the Resource Assessment and Planning
14		Department.
15	Q.	Have you previously testified in this docket?
16	A.	Yes, I have.
17	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
18	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to present for Commission review FPL's
19		Environmental Cost Recovery Clause (ECRC) projections for the January
20		2009 through December 2009 period.

1	Q.	Is this filing by FPL in compliance with Order No. PSC-93-1580-FOF
---	----	--

2 El, issued in Docket No. 930661-El?

Α.

- 3 A. Yes. The costs being submitted for the projected period are consistent with that order.
- Q. Have you prepared or caused to be prepared under your direction,
 supervision or control an exhibit in this proceeding?
 - A. Yes. KMD-3 consists of seven documents, PSC Forms 42-1P through 42-7P provided in Appendix I. Form 42-1P summarizes the costs being presented at this time. Form 42-2P reflects the total jurisdictional costs for O&M activities. Form 42-3P reflects the total jurisdictional costs for capital investment projects. Form 42-4P consists of the calculation of depreciation expense and return on capital investment for each project. Form 42-5P gives the description and progress of environmental compliance activities and projects for the projected period. Form 42-6P reflects the calculation of the energy and demand allocation percentages by rate class. Form 42-7P reflects the calculation of the ECRC factors.

Q. Please describe Form 42-1P.

Form 42-1P (Appendix I, Page 2) provides a summary of projected environmental costs being presented for the period January 2009 through December 2009. Total environmental costs, adjusted for revenue taxes, amount to \$93,698,955 (Appendix I, Page 2, Line 5) and include \$91,077,343 of environmental project costs (Appendix I, Page 2, Line 1c) increased by the revised estimated/actual true-up under-recovery of \$5,728,576 for the January 2008 - December 2008 period (Appendix I,

2		\$3,174,379 for the January 2007 - December 2007 period (Appendix I
3		Page 2, Line 3).
4	Q.	Please describe Forms 42-2P and 42-3P.
5	A.	Form 42-2P (Appendix I, Pages 3 and 4) presents the environmenta
6		project O&M costs for the projected period along with the calculation of
7		total jurisdictional costs for these projects, classified by energy and
8		demand. Form 42-3P (Appendix I, Pages 5 and 6) presents the
9		environmental project capital investment costs for the projected period
10		Form 42-3P also provides the calculation of total jurisdictional costs for
11		these projects, classified by energy and demand.
12		
13		The method of classifying costs presented in Forms 42-2P and 42-3P is
14		consistent with Order No. PSC-94-0393-FOF-El for all projects.
15	Q.	Please describe Form 42-4P.
16	A.	Form 42-4P (Appendix I, Pages 7 through 60) presents the calculation of
17		depreciation expense and return on capital investment for each project for
18		the projected period.
19	Q.	Please describe Form 42-5P.
20	A.	Form 42-5P (Appendix I, Pages 61 through 107) provides the description
21		and progress of environmental projects included in the projected period.
22		
23	Q.	Please describe Form 42-6P.
24	A.	Form 42-6P (Appendix I, Page 108) calculates the allocation factors for
		•

Page 2, Line 2), and decreased by the final true-up over-recovery of

- demand and energy at generation. The demand allocation factors are calculated by determining the percentage each rate class contributes to the monthly system peaks. The energy allocators are calculated by determining the percentage each rate contributes to total kWh sales, as adjusted for losses, for each rate class.
- 6 Q. Please describe Form 42-7P.
- 7 A. Form 42-7P (Appendix I, Page 109) presents the calculation of the proposed ECRC factors by rate class.
- 9 Q. Are all costs listed in Forms 42-1P through 42-7P attributable to

 10 Environmental Compliance projects previously approved by the

 11 Commission?
- 12 A. Yes, with the exception of the Electric Utility Greenhouse Gas Reduction
 13 Program, which is discussed and supported in the testimony of Randall R.
 14 LaBauve.
- 15 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 16 A. Yes, it does.

1		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
3		TESTIMONY OF RANDALL R. LABAUVE
4		DOCKET NO. 080007-EI
5		AUGUST 29, 2008
6		
7		
8	Q.	Please state your name and address.
9	A.	My name is Randall R. LaBauve and my business address is 700
10		Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.
11	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
12	A.	I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) as Vice
13		President of Environmental Services.
14	Q.	Have you previously testified in this docket?
15	A.	Yes, I have.
16	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
17	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to present for Commission review and
18		approval a new environmental project - the Greenhouse Gas (GHG)
19		Reduction Program. Additionally, my testimony discusses the current
20		status of FPL's approved CAIR/CAMR/CAVR projects resulting in light of
21		the vacatur of the United States Environmental Protection Agency's
22		(EPA's) CAIR and CAMR rules.

1	Q.	Have you prepared, or caused to be prepared under your direction,
2		supervision, or control, any exhibits in this proceeding?
3	Α.	Yes, I am sponsoring Exhibit RRL-2 – Executive Order 07-127 and Exhibit
4		RRL-3 – HB 7135: The Florida Climate Protection Act.
5		
6		GHG REDUCTION PROGRAM
7	Q.	Please describe the law or regulation requiring the Greenhouse Gas
8		Reduction Program.
9	A.	On July 13, 2007 Florida Governor Charlie Crist signed Executive Order
10		07-127 establishing immediate actions to reduce GHG emissions within
11		Florida. The Governor's order requires the Florida Department of
12		Environmental Protection (FDEP) to establish maximum allowable GHG
13		emissions for electric utilities within the state. HB 7135 provides for a
14		regulatory and legislative process to implement the Governor's Executive
15		Order 07-127. The FDEP has begun rulemaking under Chapter 403 of
16		the Florida Statutes, as amended by HB 7135, to implement the
17		reductions in GHG emissions from electric utilities needed to achieve
18		those GHG limits. EPA has also received appropriations to begin
19		rulemaking for the mandatory reporting of GHG emissions from sources.
20		A proposed rule is anticipated from EPA by September of 2008 with a final
21		rule promulgated by June of 2009.
22	Q.	Does HB 7135 have any other impacts on FPL?
23	A.	Yes. HB 7135 requires major emitters, including electric utilities, to report

GHG emissions to the nonprofit partnership "The Climate Registry"

providing historical and current GHG emission data to establish the baseline emissions and targets for the required compliance reductions to meet the 2017, 2025 and 2050 goals established in Executive Order 07-127. Reporting GHG emissions to the registry requires an annual membership fee, use of specific reporting protocols for the calculation and reporting of GHG emissions in an electronic reporting system, and third party verification of reported emissions to provide accreditation for the reporting entity's emissions.

As I mentioned earlier, HB 7135 also requires that FDEP initiate rulemaking to establish a Florida GHG cap-and-trade program no earlier than January 1, 2010 and submit the rule to the legislature for ratification. Details of that program have not yet been established and it is unknown at this time whether allowances will be allocated to sources in whole or in part, or will be available only at auction. Regardless of whether the allowances are allocated or auctioned, however, the need for CO2 allowances will become part of the fossil generation costs. FPL has included CO2 emission allowance market price projections in its evaluation of proposed generation expansion projects including its proposed Nuclear Uprate projects, Turkey Point Nuclear Unit 6 & 7 expansion, West County Energy Center Unit 3 and the proposed Conversion Projects at Riviera and Cape Canaveral Plants. Future CO2 allowance and program management costs would be included in FPL's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program.

- 1 Q. Please describe the activities FPL will initiate as a result of this 2 project.
- A. FPL plans to comply with Florida reporting requirements for its GHG
 emissions through participation in The Climate Registry reporting
 program. FPL will begin GHG reporting activities in 2009 during its initial
 implementation of the FPL Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program. FPL is
 proposing to recover the costs associated with joining the registry, the
 preparation of the initial GHG report, and the electronic data reporting
 required by the registry.

10 Q. What are the compliance dates for this project?

- 11 A. The FDEP has indicated that it will complete its rulemaking by June of
 12 2009 requiring mandatory GHG reporting to The Climate Registry by all
 13 electric utilities within the state. FPL anticipates that FDEP will complete
 14 additional rulemaking to adopt a GHG cap-and-trade program within
 15 Florida by January 2010 to address those requirements of HB 7135 for
 16 the electric utility sector.
- 17 Q. Has FPL estimated the cost of its Greenhouse Gas Reduction
 18 Program?
- The ultimate cost of the Project will depend on the rules developed by the
 FDEP to implement Executive Order 07-127 and HB 7135. To comply with
 the reporting requirements FPL will initiate required activities in 2009 to
 join The Climate Registry and report baseline data. Subsequent to the
 data reporting in 2009, FPL is required to engage the services of a
 Registry-approved Third Party Verification consultant. Costs for

verification of reported GHG emissions are dependant on the protocol used in reporting data and the complexity of the GHG emissions reported. FPL has not included a projection of these costs at this time and anticipates verification to occur in 2010. FPL will provide estimates of these costs once the appropriate reporting protocol has been identified for FPL.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

FPL's nuclear, renewable and conversion generation projects along with our energy efficiency program will further reduce greenhouse GHG, which will help to achieve compliance with the Cap and Trade rule being developed by FDEP. To achieve the future reduction goals established by Executive Order 07-127, which will be included in FDEP's Cap and Trade rule, FPL anticipates that additional reductions in its GHG emissions will be required beyond the currently planned projects. The additional reductions will likely require a combination of the implementation of carbon sequestration and storage technology, further implementation of cost-effective zero and low GHG emitting renewable generation. expansion of Demand Side Management (DSM) and Energy Efficiency (EE) programs, and the use of verified carbon offset projects. Costs associated with the implementation of controls and storage technologies for GHG emission reductions, and prudently incurred costs for required offsets for mitigation of GHG emissions to comply with regulations would also be included in FPL's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program. Costs associated with the expansion of DSM and EE programs would not be

recovered as an FPL ECRC project, although FPL likely will seek recovery of those costs through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery (ECCR) Clause.

Α.

FPL believes that it is premature to identify specific reduction strategies beyond the Non-GHG emitting and Low-GHG emitting generation expansion projects needed to meet future capacity needs that will provide substantial reductions in FPL System GHG emissions. GHG emission controls for fossil fuel fired Electric Generating Units (EGUs) are not yet commercially available nor have they yet been demonstrated as cost-effective technology. Similarly Carbon Capture and Storage is still under development and has not yet been demonstrated as commercially available for fossil fuel-fired EGUs nor has risks associated with the transportation and storage of CO2 been mitigated. FPL does anticipate that further advances in these technologies are likely to occur over the coming years prior to the 2025 and 2050 deadlines established in the Governor's order.

18 Q. Has FPL

Has FPL estimated how much will be spent on the Project in 2009? Yes, FPL expects to begin incurring such costs following publication of registry guidance and rulemaking by the FDEP, which is anticipated to occur prior to the June 2009 date for the final federal mandatory GHG emissions reporting rule. FPL's preliminary estimate of \$50,000 in 2009 O&M expenses for the project includes the projected registration and consultant fees for the first year of Climate Registry participation.

1		Specifically, FPL anticipates the following required activities in 2009 for
2		The Climate Registry:
3		1. Annual Membership Fee for joining The Climate Registry: \$15,000
4		(annual fee is \$10,000 and includes additional one-time fee of
5		\$5,000 for reporting prior year baseline emissions)
6		2. Preparation of GHG Baseline Emission Inventory for FPL: \$20,000
7		(includes contractor labor costs for identification of emission source
8		data, selection and application of registry approved methods, and
9		quantification of baseline GHG emission data)
10		3. Preparation, formatting, and data entry of FPL emissions data for
11		submittal to the Climate Registry Information System (CRIS):
12		\$15,000 (includes contractor labor costs associated with data entry
13		for: a) creation of corporate/entity profile inputs; b) creation of
14		facility accounts with location specific information; c) populating
15		entities with baseline GHG emission inventory data into on-line
16		reporting system).
17	Q.	How will FPL ensure that the costs incurred are prudent and
18		reasonable?
19	A.	Consistent with our standard practice for all contractor services
20		procurements, FPL will competitively bid the contractor selection for the
21		GHG reporting activities. FPL has a working knowledge of the
22		appropriate costs that should be incurred for this task. We will ensure
23		that the contractor utilizes practices adopted by The Climate Registry for
24		completing the inventory and reporting activities of the project and

- 1 provides a reasonable cost estimate before initiating the project.
- 2 Q. Is FPL recovering through any other mechanism the costs for the
- 3 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program for which it is seeking ECRC
- 4 recovery?
- 5 A. No.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A.

CAIR/CAMR/CAVR STATUS UPDATE

Q. What is the current status of CAIR?

The CAIR vacatur is not yet final. EPA has received a 30 day extension of the deadline for seeking rehearing of the vacatur order before the D.C. Circuit, with the deadline now being September 24, 2008. Until rehearing is complete and there either is resolution of further appeals to the US Supreme Court or the time for such appeals has expired, there is no way of knowing whether CAIR ultimately will be vacated, or will remain in effect either in its current or modified form. Furthermore, assuming the Court's order vacating CAIR is ultimately finalized, that order directed EPA to adopt a replacement rule consistent with the Court's decision. While the Court agreed with some of the arguments FPL made in its challenge to CAIR, it rejected the argument by FPL and other Florida utilities that Florida should be excluded from the CAIR region. And the Court also criticized EPA for spreading out the CAIR emission reductions over two phases (2009/2010 and 2015), holding that EPA needed to impose the full requirements by 2010. Therefore, if CAIR is vacated, EPA will be under pressure to devise alternative emission reduction rules in a very short time period to address the Ozone and PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality

Standards (NAAQS) impacts of upwind sources on downwind non
attainment areas. It is reasonable to expect that those rules will apply to

utilities in Florida.

5 Q. Should FPL continue its CAIR Compliance Projects?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes. FPL believes that continuing with construction of its CAIR
 Compliance projects that are currently underway is clearly in the best
 interests of our customers. FPL has considered several factors in support
 of the decision to continue with the projects at this time, including the
 following:
 - Until the vacatur of CAIR has been finalized through court action by the D.C. Circuit and/or the Supreme Court, we must continue to comply with CAIR.
 - Should CAIR be vacated, the EPA will have to act quickly, consistent with the Court's ruling, to ensure that non-attainment areas for ozone and PM2.5 are addressed in further rulemaking by 2010.
 - 3. States with non-attainment areas retain the ability under Section 126 of the Clean Air Act to require EPA to consider contributions from upwind sources (which had been identified in part through CAIR modeling that resulted in Florida being included in CAIR for Ozone and PM2.5 impacts).
 - The Scherer CAIR Project controls must be installed and operated in order to comply with the Georgia Multi-Pollutant Rule.
 - 5. The SCR controls at SJRPP are nearing completion, with the SCR

construction having been completed for Unit 2 and approximately 60% complete for Unit 1. If CAIR is vacated, FPL fully expects that SCRs will be required at SJRPP in the near future in order to comply with EPA's and/or FDEP's replacement for CAIR, in response to Clean Air Act Section 126 petitions objecting to SJRPP's contribution to downwind non-attainment (its location in extreme north Florida makes it vulnerable to such petitions), or to comply with other environmental requirements. For example, while SJRPP is upwind of existing Ozone and PM2.5 designated non-attainment areas in Florida, the SJRPP Units are likely to be required to reduce emissions of NOx to address designation of Duval County as non-attainment of the 2007 revised Ozone NAAQS which was set to 75 ppb.

SJRPP has estimated significant capital costs associated with delay of construction of one year or longer through demobilization and remobilization of equipment and labor, and through materials cost increases in addition to anticipated delays in catalyst availability through forfeiture of contract. If construction of the Unit 1 SCR were delayed, by even one year, it would result in a cost increase of \$7.6 million to complete construction and would impose an 18 month delay in completion of the SCR because we would lose our spot in the queue for acquiring the catalyst necessary to operate the SCR. FPL's share of the additional cost for the delay by only one year

would be in excess of \$1.5 million. FPL does not believe it would be consistent with the best interests of its customers to put those SJRPP SCR project on hold with the high likelihood that the SCRs will be required in the near future even without CAIR and the substantial additional costs that would result if the project were put on hold.

Α.

6. The 800 MW Cycling project for Manatee Units 1 and 2, and Martin Units 1 and 2 ,in addition to providing annual and ozone season reductions in NOx emissions, also provide substantial fuel savings by allowing these large units to cycle off-line more frequently when not needed for system load. Projected fuel savings associated with the 800 MW Cycling Project are \$2.9 billion over the life of the project.

Q. Should FPL continue to recover Capital and O&M costs associated with its CAIR Compliance Projects?

Yes. FPL must continue with the construction of these projects to meet CAIR requirements that remain in effect until there is a final decision, in the case of the Scherer project, in order to meet the requirements of the Georgia Multi-Pollutant rule. Moreover, as discussed above, it would not be in the economic interests of our customers to defer or discontinue either the SJRPP SCR project or the 800 MW Cycling Project FPL also plans to recover O&M costs associated with the operation of the controls required for CAIR compliance, or compliance with other requirements including the Georgia Multi-Pollutant rule. Should regulatory requirements

change and operation of the controls not be required on an annual or seasonal basis, FPL will make appropriate adjustments through the ECRC True-Up process to ensure savings are returned to customers.

A.

I would like to point out that increases in steel costs and labor during 2008 have increased the project cost for the SJRPP SCRs from the original projection of \$227 million to a revised total cost of \$239 million for the total project with FPL's share of the total cost now at \$47.8 million.

Q. What is the status of FPL's CAMR Compliance Project in light of the vacatur of CAMR?

The CAMR was vacated by the US Court of Appeals on February 8, 2008 and remanded back to the EPA for reconsideration with the court immediately issuing its mandate finalizing the fate of CAMR. I should point out that the vacatur of CAMR was coupled with rejection of EPA's delisting of coal fired EGUs from the list of emission sources that are subject to regulation under section 112 of the Clean Air Act. Therefore, EPA must begin rulemaking to define Maximum Available Control Technology (MACT) for control of mercury (Hg) emission on coal fired EGUs. In 2005, prior to CAMR, EPA had established several MACT categories for coal fired EGUs requiring specific Hg emission standards.

FPL's installation of Hg Controls on Unit 4 at Plant Scherer must continue as planned, in spite of the vacatur of CAMR, in order to comply with the Georgia Multi-Pollutant rule. FPL also believes that the Hg controls being

installed at Plant Scherer represent Maximum Available Control Technology for Hg emissions and will meet any subsequent MACT standard developed by EPA to address coal fired EGU Hg emissions. FPL and JEA intended to comply with CAMR by achieving co-benefits from the operation of the SCRs that are being installed to comply with CAIR, so there are no separate Hg controls at SJRPP that would be affected by the CAMR vacatur. CAMR did impose distinct monitoring requirements, however, and FPL has planned to comply with those monitoring requirements at SJRPP by installing Hg Continuous Emission Monitoring System (HgCEMS). The system had already been procured and was being installed prior to the vacatur of CAMR. Installation of monitors has already been completed on SJRPP Units 1 and 2. The remand of the Hg monitoring rules under CAMR temporarily removes the requirement for the HgCEMS to complete certification requirements and begin continuous operation. Until required by regulation or rule, FPL does not intend to operate the HgCEMS and has not included HgCEMS O&M in the ECRC for the CAMR Project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Α.

Q. What is the status of FPL's BART Project as it relates to the vacatur of CAIR?

Should the vacatur of CAIR become final, the "BART equals CAIR" exemption adopted by the Clean Air Visibility Rule (CAVR) would also be nullified, thus requiring the FDEP to address BART at all applicable units within the state. FPL had begun negotiations with FDEP concerning Turkey Point Fossil Units 1 & 2 having made substantial progress until the

- 1 vacatur of CAIR. While FDEP was seeking guidance from EPA regarding
- the affect of the CAIR vacatur on BART and CAVR, until the fate of CAIR
- 3 is known FPL believes that the CAIR exemption remains.
- 4 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 5 A. Yes, it does.

1		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
3		TESTIMONY OF ERIC SILAGY
4		DOCKET NO. 080007-Ei
5		August 29, 2008
6		
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
8	A.	My name is Eric Silagy. My business address is Florida Power & Light
9		Company, 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida, 33408.
10	Q.	By who are you employed and what position do you hold?
11	A.	I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL" or the
12		"Company") as Vice President and Chief Development Officer.
13	Q.	Please describe your duties and responsibilities in that position.
14	A.	I lead FPL's efforts to develop new electric generation, including the
15		development of clean, zero greenhouse gas emitting renewable
16		electric generation.
17	Q.	Have you previously testified in this proceeding?
18	A.	Yes I have.
19		
20		PURPOSE AND SUMMARY
21		
22	Q.	What is the purpose of this testimony?
23	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to present for Commission review and
24		approval under the projected 2009 Environmental Cost Recovery
		1

Clause ("ECRC") recoverable costs for the Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center ("Martin Solar"), DeSoto Next Generation Solar Energy Center ("DeSoto Solar") and the Space Coast Next Generation Solar Energy Center ("Space Coast Solar").

Q. Would you please summarize your testimony?

In Order Number PSC-08-0491-PAA-EI, issued in Docket Number 080281-EI on August 4, 2008, the Commission found that the Martin Solar, DeSoto Solar and Space Coast Solar projects are eligible for recovery through the ECRC pursuant to House Bill 7135 (the "Energy Bill"). On August 4, 2008, I filed testimony in this proceeding that provided overviews of the Energy Bill and each of these three projects, as well as presenting the reasonable actual and estimated costs for each project through the end of 2008. In this testimony, I discuss the activities planned for each project in 2009 and present FPL's projection of the reasonable costs to be incurred in 2009. Those costs should be recovered through the ECRC.

A.

MARTIN SOLAR PROJECT

Α.

Q. What are the 2009 major project milestones for Martin Solar?

The major project milestone in 2009 for Martin Solar is the commencement of construction in the first quarter of 2009, with the possible commissioning of a portion of the solar field in December 2009. The Martin Solar project is currently in the process of design

1		and optimization of the layout and configuration. Once completed later
2		this year, then an estimate of the amount of generation that could be
3		placed into service by the end of 2009 can be established.
4	Q.	What costs for the Martin Solar project do you expect to incur in
5		2009 for which you are requesting recovery under ECRC?
6	Α.	FPL expects to incur capital costs for 2009 of \$210,005,000.
7	Q.	Please describe the activities for which these costs are projected
8		to be incurred in 2009.
9	A.	The projected 2009 costs are primarily split between material and
10		equipment costs of approximately \$90 million and construction costs of
11		approximately \$120 million. Included in the equipment and material
12		category are costs related to solar mirrors, heat collection tubes,
13		support structures, heat transfer fluid, and the solar field heat
14		exchanger/steam generator. Included in the construction category are
15		costs related to site clearing and grading, stormwater system
16		installation, transmission line relocation, solar field construction,
17		balance of plant construction, and owner project management costs.
18	Q.	What is the current projected total capital cost for the Martin
19		Solar project?

The current projected total capital cost for the Martin Solar Project is

20

21

A.

\$476.3 million.

Q. What steps is FPL taking to ensure that the 2009 costs for this project are prudent and reasonable?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

As discussed in the testimony I filed on August 4, 2008, FPL is using Α. trained and qualified employees with extensive experience in designing, procuring, and constructing utility facilities in Florida to develop the Martin Solar project. Through the leveraging of shared resources, FPL is also calling on the experience and expertise of its sister company, FPL Energy, which owns and operates the world's largest solar thermal facility, the 310 MW Solar Electric Generating System ("SEGS") in California that has produced reliable renewable solar power for about 20 years. FPL Energy has performed a global assessment of solar equipment providers for upgrade work performed at SEGS and for ongoing development efforts for other large solar thermal plants in California and internationally. These assessments have revealed that globally there are a limited number of solar equipment suppliers and all have manufacturing capacity constraints. Additionally, there are a limited number of companies with recent experience in the engineering and construction, including on-site assembly and erection, of solar thermal fields. As a result, competitive bidding of all aspects for the Martin project may not be feasible or necessary, however, FPL expects to achieve design, procurement, and construction efficiencies for the benefit of its customers by having its own highly qualified employees leverage the expertise, international

1		relationships and experience gained by its sister company FPL
2		Energy.
3		
4		DESOTO SOLAR PROJECT
5		
6	Q.	What are the major 2009 project milestones for DeSoto Solar?
7	A.	The major project milestones in 2009 for DeSoto Solar are the
8		commencement of construction in the first quarter of 2009, with project
9		completion expected in December. The solar field is expected to be
10		commissioned in 5 MW stages beginning in July and continuing until
11		the end of December, at which time FPL expects the entire 25 MW to
12		be in service.
13	Q.	What costs for the DeSoto Solar project do you expect to incur in
14		2009 for which you are requesting recovery under ECRC?
15	A.	The expected costs for 2009 are \$166,429,700. Of this total,
16		\$467,475 is for operation and maintenance ("O&M") expenses with the
17		remainder being capital costs.
18	Q.	Please describe the activities for which these costs are projected
19		to be incurred in 2009.
20	A.	The capital costs will be associated with site grading and preparation,
21		civil, mechanical and electrical construction of the PV solar field and
22		equipment, testing, start-up and commissioning, and electrical
23		interconnection, all of which FPL expects will be completed in 2009. In
24		parallel, FPL will incur O&M expenses as phased turnover and

1	commissioning of sections of the PV solar field commence, beginning
2	in the third quarter of the year.

- Q. What is the current projected total capital cost for the DeSoto Solar project?
- 5 A. The current projected total capital cost for the DeSoto Solar project is \$173.5 million.
- Q. What steps is FPL taking to ensure that these costs are prudent and reasonable?

A. As discussed in the testimony I filed on August 4, 2008, FPL has entered into a turnkey EPC contract with a highly qualified supplier and contractor experienced in utility-scale projects. As part of the process, FPL followed a well-defined request for information ("RFI") process which was initially conducted in 2007 with responses from 26 international and domestic companies involved in the development, manufacturing, and construction of utility-scale PV systems and projects. In February of 2008 a request for proposal ("RFP") was issued which resulted in responses from eight companies of which four provided conforming proposals to the RFP. The four responses were short listed down to two proposals after obtaining bid clarifications and conducting an initial screening evaluation. A detailed bid evaluation along with initial negotiations with the two companies was conducted which resulted in a final selection.

The contract for the engineering, procurement and construction of the

DeSoto Solar project is with SunPower of San Jose California. In addition to other large scale PV projects, SunPower built the largest-operating solar PV power plant in North America, a 14 MW installation located at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada.

SPACE COAST SOLAR PROJECT

- Q. What are the major 2009 project milestones for Space Coast Solar?
- A. The major project milestones in 2009 for Space Coast Solar are the receipt of all necessary permits and approvals during the first quarter of 2009 in order to support the commencement of construction in September, 2009. The solar field is expected to be commissioned in 2 MW stages beginning in May, 2010 and continuing until the end of July, 2010, at which time FPL expects the entire 10 MW to be in service.
 - Q. What costs for the Space Coast Solar project do you expect to incur in 2009 for which you are requesting recovery under ECRC?
- 19 A. The expected costs for 2009 are \$27,030,686. Of this total \$20,000 is
 20 for O&M expenses associated with the property lease from the federal
 21 government.
- Q. Please describe the activities for which these costs are projected to incur in 2009.
- 24 A. Costs for 2009 will be inclusive of site engineering, design,

1		procurement of key components, extensive ground preparation and
2		site work, civil construction activities and transmission interconnect
3		work. Additionally there will be O&M costs associated with the
4		property lease from the federal government.
5	Q.	What is the current projected total capital cost for the Space
6		Coast Solar project?
7	A.	The current projected total capital cost for the Space Coast Solar
8		project is \$78.9 million, which includes the net present value of the
9		land lease for the property. This projected total capital cost has been
10		reduced by \$1.1 million from the cost provided in the testimony I filed
11		on August 4, 2008. The reduction is a result of cost savings recently
12		identified due to more defined scope.
13	Q.	What steps is FPL taking to ensure that these costs are prudent
14		and reasonable?
15	A.	The Space Coast Solar project is being handled as a turnkey EPC
16		contract with SunPower, in the same manner as the DeSoto Solar
17		project. My previous comments on the steps FPL is taking to ensure
18		that the costs for the DeSoto Solar project are reasonable and prudent
19		apply equally here.
20		
21		TOTAL PROJECT COSTS
22		
23	Q.	ls FPL recovering through any other mechanism the 2009
24		projected costs for the Martin Solar, DeSoto Solar or Space Coast

1		Solar projects for which it is seeking ECRC recovery?
2	A.	No. FPL will apply ECRC incremental cost principles to its cost
3		recovery requests for the solar projects. This will ensure that only the
4		correct incremental costs of the solar projects are included for ECRC
5		recovery.
6	Q.	In your August 4, 2008 testimony, you stated that FPL estimates
7		the total costs of the three projects to be about \$729.8 million.
8		Has FPL's estimate of the total project costs changed?
9	Α.	Yes, for reason discussed in my testimony for the Space Coast Solar
10		project, the total costs of the three projects have been reduced to
11		\$728.7 million.
12	Q.	Your August 4, 2008 testimony discussed the uncertainties with
13		respect to project costs and what FPL is doing to mitigate those
14		uncertainties. Has your assessment of the uncertainties or FPL's
15		response to the uncertainties changed?
16	Α.	No.
17	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?
18	A.	Yes.

APPENDIX I

ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY

COMMISSION FORMS 42-1P THROUGH 42-7P JANUARY 2009 – DECEMBER 2009

KMD-3
DOCKET NO. 080007-EI
FPL WITNESS: K.M. DUBIN
EXHIBIT
PAGES 1-109

Florida Power & Light Company

Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Total Jurisdictional Amount to Be Recovered

For the Projected Period January 2009 to December 2009

	Line No.	Energy (\$)	CP Demand (\$)	GCP Demand (\$)	Total (\$)
	1 Total Jurisdictional Rev. Req. for the projected period				
	a Projected O&M Activities (FORM 42-2P, Page 2 of 2, Lines 7 through 9)	7,551,764	6,226,789	2,413,172	16,191,725
	b Projected Capital Projects (FORM 42-3P, Page 2 of 2, Lines 7 through 9)	21,605,195	53,280,423	<u>0</u>	<u>74,885,618</u>
	c Total Jurisdictional Rev. Req. for the projected period (Lines 1a + 1b)	29,156,959	59,507,212	2,413,172	91,077,343
N					
	2 True-up for Estimated Over/(Under) Recovery for the current period January 2008 - December 2008				
	(FORM 42-1E, Line 4, filed on August 4, 2008)	(2,994,900)	(2,572,131)	(161,546)	(5,728,576)
	3 Final True-up Over/(Under) for the period January 2007 - December 2007				
	(FORM 42-1A, Line 7, filed on April 2, 2008)	<u>1,833,204</u>	<u>1,283,719</u>	<u>57,456</u>	<u>3,174,379</u>
	4 Total Jurisdictional Amount to be Recovered/(Refunded) in the projection period January 2009 - December 2009				
	(Line 1 - Line 2 - Line 3)	<u>30,318,655</u>	60,795,624	<u>2.517.262</u>	93,631,540
	5 Total Projected Jurisdictional Amount Adjusted for Taxes (Line 4 x Revenue Tax Multiplier 1.00072)	30,340,484	60,839,397	2,519,074	93,698,955

Notes:

Allocation to energy and demand in each period are in proportion to the respective period split of costs.

True-up costs are split in proportion to the split of actual demand-related and energy-related costs from respective true-up periods.

Totals may not add due to rounding.

O&M Activities (In Dollars)

Line# Project#	Projected JAN	Projected FEB	Projected MAR	Projected APR	Projected MAY	Projected JUN	6-Month Sub-Total
1 Description of O&M Activities							
1 Air Operating Permit Fees-O&M	\$163,175	\$ 163,175	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$979,050
3a Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems-Q&M	160,902	80,609	130,609	80,609	36,609	56,609	545,947
5a Maintenance of Stationary Above Ground Fuel	100,502	39,500	120,000	272,500	148,072	125,000	705,072
Storage Tanks-O&M	U	39,500	120,000	272,000	140,072	125,000	705,072
8a Oil Spill Cleanup/Response Equipment-O&M	15,150	15,150	30,150	15,150	25 450	40.150	140,900
13 RCRA Corrective Action-O&M	4,167	4,167	4,167	4,167	25,150 4,167	40,150	25,002
14 NPDES Permit Fees-O&M	124,900	4,107	4,167	4,167	4,167	4,167	124,900
17a Disposal of Noncontainerized Liquid Waste-O&M	32,500	32.500	30.000	30,000	30,000	30,000	185,000
19a Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention &	223,524	223,524		223,524			
Removal - Distribution - O&M	223,524	223,524	223,524	223,524	223,524	223,524	1,341,144
	50.000						
19b Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention &	59,809	59,809	59,809	59.809	59,809	59,809	358.854
Removal - Transmission - O&M	(40.000)						
19c Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention &	(46,686)	(46,686)	(46,686)	(46,686)	(46,686)	(46,686)	(280,116)
Removal - Costs Included in Base Rates		_	_	_		_	_
20 Wastewater Discharge Elimination & Reuse	(40.600)	0	(45.000)	0	0	0	0
NA Amortization of Gains on Sales of Emissions Allowances 21 St. Lucie Turtie Net	(18,608)	(18,608)	(806,81)	(18,608)	(281,499)	(89,611)	(445,542)
	0	0	0	0	0	0	
22 Pipeline Integrity Management	07.500	0	40,000	0	0	0	40.000
23 SPCC - Spill Prevention, Control & Countermeasures	37,500	104,166	114,166	104,168	37,500	45,500	443,000
24 Manatee Rebum	41,667	41,667	41,667	41,667	41,667	41.667	250,002
25 Pt. Everglades ESP Technology	189,693	189,693	189,693	189,693	189,693	189,693	1,138,158
26 UST Replacement/Removal	0	0	٥	0	D	0	0
27 Lowest Quality Water Source	21,539	21,539	21,539	21,539	21,539	21,539	129,234
28 CWA 316(b) Phase II Rule	43,917	43,917	43,917	43,917	43,917	43,917	263.502
29 SCR Consumables	29,166	29,166	29,166	29,166	29,166	29,166	174,996
30 НВМР	3,333	3,333	3,333	3.333	3,333	3,333	19,998
31 CAIR Compliance	76,026	76,026	180.334	242,334	76,334	76,334	727.388
32 BART	0	0	0	0	0	0	o
34 St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspection & Maintenance	15,000	15,000	500,000	520,000	750,000	0	1,800,000
35 Martin Plant Drinking Water System Complance	0	0	0	0	0	C	O
36 Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage	83,333	83,333	83,333	83,333	83,333	83,333	500,000
37 DeSoto Next Generation Solar Energy Center	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0
38 Space Coast Next Generation Solar Energy Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
39 Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center	0	0	0	0	0	٥	0
40 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program			15,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	30,000
2 Total of O&M Activities	\$1,260,008	\$1,160,981	\$ 1,958,289	\$ 2,067,791	\$ 1,643,803	\$1,105,619	\$ 9,196,489
3 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	\$ 716,643	\$ 636,350	\$ 818,158	\$ 805,158	\$ 342,267	\$ 569,155	\$ 3,887,730
4a Recoverable Costs Allocated to CP Demand	\$ 343,184	\$ 324,450	\$ 939,950	\$ 1,062,452	\$ 1,101,356	\$ 336,284	\$ 4,107.674
4b Recoverable Costs Allocated to GCP Demand	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 1,201.086
5 Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	98,69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	
6a Retail CP Demand Jurisdictional Factor	98,76729%		98.76729%	98.76729%			
6b Retail GCP Demand Jurisdictional Factor		100,00000%	100.00000%	100.00000%	98.76729%	98.76729% 100.00000%	
OD REIGH COF Definal of Suits dictional Pacifol	100,00000%	100.00000%	100.0000076	100.00000%	100.0000076	100.00000%	
7 Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A)	\$ 707,274	\$ 628,030	\$ 807,461	\$ 794,631	\$ 337,792	\$ 561,714	\$ 3,836,902
8a Jurisdictional CP Demand Recoverable Costs (B)	\$ 338,953	\$ 320,450	\$ 928,363	\$ 1,049,355	\$ 1,087,779	\$ 332,138	\$ 4,057,038
8b Jurisdictional GCP Demand Recoverable Costs (C)	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 1,201,086
9 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for O&M Activities (Lines 7 + 8)	\$1,246,408	<u>\$1.148.661</u>	\$ 1.936.005	\$ 2,044.167	<u>\$ 1.625.752</u>	\$1,094.033	\$ 9.095.026
•							

Notes:

w

(A) Line 3 x Line 5 (B) Line 4a x Line 6a (C) Line 4b x Line 6b

Totals may not add due to rounding.

O&M Activities (in Dollars)

Line # Project #	Projected	Projected AUG	Projected SEP	Projected OCT	Projected NOV	Projected DEC	6-Month Sub-Total	12-Month Total		d of Classification	
	300	703	JLF	001	1404	UEC	Sub-Total	TOTAL	OF Demand	OUT Deliking	Energy
1 Description of O&M Activities											
1 Air Operating Permit Fees-O&M	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$163,175	\$979,050	\$1,958,100			\$1,958,100
3a Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems-O&M	160,902	36,609	36,609	102,609	80,609	36,609	453,947	999,894			999,894
5a Maintenance of Stationary Above Ground Fuel	130,500	0	8,000	224,000	0	0	362,500	1,067,572	1.067.572		
Storage Tanks-O&M											
8a Oil Spill Cleanup/Response Equipment-O&M	16,150	25,150	15,150	15,150	15,150	15,150	100,900	241.800			241,800
13 RCRA Corrective Action-O&M	4,167	4 167	4.167	4.167	4,167	4,163	24.998	50,000	50,000		
14 NPDES Permit Fees-O&M	0	0	٥	0	0	. 0	0	124,900	124,900		
17a Disposal of Noncontainerized Liquid Waste-O&M	18,000	18,000	18,000	48,000	18,000	18,000	138,000	323,000			323,000
19a Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention &	223,524	223,524	226,274	226,274	226,274	226,274	1,352,144	2,693,288		2,693,288	
Removal - Distribution - O&M							.,	_,			
19b Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention & .	59,809	59,809	62,559	62,559	62,559	62,563	369,858	728,712	672,657		56,055
Removal - Transmission - O&M											
19c Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention & Removal - Costs Included in Base Rates	(46,686)	(46,686)	(46,686)	(46,686)	(46.686)	(46,686)	(280,116)	(560,232)	(258,569)	(280,116)	(21,547)
20 Wastewater Discharge Elimination & Reuse	٥	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NA Amortization of Gains on Sales of Emissions Allowances	(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(537,667)	(983,208)			(983,208)
21 St. Lucie Turtle Net	٥	0	0	0	0	o	o o	o	0		
22 Pipeline Integrity Management	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40,000	40.000		
23 SPCC - Spill Prevention, Control & Countermeasures	37,500	37,500	47,500	37,500	37,500	47.500	245,000	688,000	688,000		
24 Manatee Rebum	41,567	41,667	41,667	41,667	41,667	41,663	249,998	500,000			500,000
25 Pt. Everglades ESP Technology	189,693	189,693	189,693	189,693	189,693	189,690	1,138,155	2,276,313			2,276,313
26 UST Replacement/Removal	٥	o	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
27 Lowest Quality Water Source	21,539	21,539	21,539	21,539	21,539	21,542	129,237	258,471	258,471		
28 CWA 316(b) Phase II Rule	43,917	43,917	123,917	43,917	43,917	43,913	343,498	607,000	607,000		
29 SCR Consumables	29,166	29,156	29,166	29,166	29,166	29,174	175,004	350,000			350,000
30 HBMP	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,337	20,002	40,000	40,000		
31 CAIR Compliance	76,334	248,334	80,334	101,334	103,334	274,338	884,008	1,611,396			1.611,396
32 BART	٥	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0
34 St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspection & Maintenance	0	o	٥	0	0	0	0	1,800,000	1,800,000		
35 Martin Plant Drinking Water System Compliance	0	10,000	7,000	0	0	0	17,000	17,000	17,000		
36 Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage	83,333	83,333	83,333	83,333	83,333	83,333	500,000	1,000,000	710,000		290,000
37 DeSoto Next Generation Solar Energy Center	0	31,165	62,330	93,495	124,660	155,825	467,475	467,475	467,475		
38 Space Coast Next Generation Solar Energy Center	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,333	3,333	20,000	20,000	20,000		
39 Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center	٥	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
40 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	0	20,000	50,000			50,000
2 Total of O&M Activities	\$1,173,746	\$1,142,118	\$1,095,783	\$1,362,948	\$1,115,113	\$1,283,286	\$7,172,991	\$16,369,481	\$ 6,304,506	\$ 2.413.172	\$7,651,803
3 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	\$ 636,448	\$ 694,155	\$ 516.366	\$ 633,366	\$ 578.366	S 705 374	\$ 3,764,072	¢ 7,651,902			
4a Recoverable Costs Allocated to CP Demand		\$ 247,782			\$ 333,815		\$ 2.196.833				
4b Recoverable Costs Allocated to GCP Demand		\$ 200,181						\$ 2.413.172			
5 Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98,69261%					
6a Retail CP Demand Jurisdictional Factor	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%					
6b Retail GCP Demand Jurisdictional Factor	100.00000%	100.00000%	100.00000%	100.00000%	100.00000%	100.00000%					
7 Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (A)		\$ 685,079			\$ 570,805			\$ 7,551,764			
8a Jurisdictional CP Demand Recoverable Costs (B)							\$ 2,169,751				
8b Jurisdictional GCP Demand Recoverable Costs (C)	\$ 200,181	\$ 200,181	\$ 202,931	\$ 202,931	\$ 202,931	\$ 202,931	\$ 1,212,086	\$ 2,413,172			
9 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for O&M - Activities (Lines 7 + 8)	\$1.161.269	\$1.129.987	\$1.084.390	\$1.348.175	\$1.103.436	\$1.269.442	\$ 7.096.699	\$16.191.725			

Notes:

(A) Line 3 x Line 5

(B) Line 4a x Line 6a (C) Line 4b x Line 6b

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Capital Investment Projects-Recoverable Costs (in Dollars)

Line	# Project#	P	rojected JAN		jected EB		ojected MAR	P	rojected APR	Proj • M	ected IAY	-F	Projected JUN	-	3-Month ub-Total
	1 Description of Investment Projects (A)														
	2 Low NOx Burner Technology-Capital	\$	67,941	\$	67,527	\$	67,113	\$	66,699	\$	66,285	\$	65,871	\$	401,436
	3b Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems-Capital		87,218		86,902		86,586		86,271	1	85,955		85,640		518,572
	4b Clean Closure Equivalency-Capital		313		312		311		310		309		308		1,865
	5b Maintenance of Stationary Above Ground Fuel Storage Tanks-Capital		139,659	1	39,251		138,843		138,435	1:	38,027		137,619		831,834
	7 Relocate Turbine Lube Oil Underground Piping to Above Ground-Capital		128		128		127		127		127		127		764
	8b Oil Spill Cleanup/Response Equipment-Capital		8,580		8,528		9,067		9,603		9,545		9,486		54,810
	10 Relocate Storm Water Runoff-Capital		788		787		786		785		783		782		4,711
	NA SO2 Allowances-Negative Return on Investment		(21,474)		(21,523)		(21,351)		(21,179)	(23,954)		(26,562)		(136,044)
	12 Scherer Discharge Pipeline-Capital		5,165		5,154		5,144		5,133	-	5 122		5,112		30,830
	17b Disposal of Noncontainerized Liquid Waste-Capital		0		0		0		0		0		0		0
	20 Wastewater Discharge Elimination &Reuse		19,861		19,827		19,794		19,760		19,726		19,692		118,660
	21 St. Lucie Turtle Net		11,488		11,483		11,478		11,472		11,467		11,462		68,850
	22 Pipeline Integrity Management		0		0		0		0		0		0		0
Ų	23 SPCC - Spill Prevention, Control & Countermeasures		212,234	2	211,855		211,477		211,098	2	10,719		210,340		1,267,723
	24 Manatee Reburn		390,300	3	89,184		388,067		386,951	3	85,834		384,718		2,325,055
	25 Pt. Everglades ESP Technology		948,551	ç	45,951		943,555		941,159	9:	39,061		936,961		5,655,238
	26 UST Removal / Replacement		5,514		5,503		5,493		5,483		5,473		5,462		32,929
	31 CAIR Compliance	1	,363,600	1,4	21,137	1,	505,804	1	,612,566	1,7	43,784		1,888,732		9,535,623
	33 CAMR Compliance		378,086	3	87,711		406,859		425,682	4	43,772		458,084		2,500,194
	34 St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspection & Maintenance		0		0		0		0		0		0		0
	35 Martin Plant Drinking Water System Compliance		2,333		2,330		2,327		2,324		2,321		2,318		13,952
	36 Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage		75 000		0		0		0		0		0		0
	37 DeSoto Next Generation Solar Energy Center 38 Space Coast Next Generation Solar Energy Center		75,808 14,325		32,224 21,046		207,099 34,493		307,826 54,335		39,792 69,785		586,551 84,511		1,749,300 278,495
	39 Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center		201,848	•	259,903		321,065		426,937		98,031		797,267		2,605,051
	2 Total Investment Projects - Recoverable Costs		3,912,266		95,220		344,137	4	,691,778		51,966		5,664,481		7,859,848
	3 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	S 1	,660,208	\$ 1,6	670,131	\$ 1,	685,522	\$ 1	,708,507	\$ 1.7	37,703	\$	1,771,077	\$ 1	0,233,148
	4 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand	\$ 2	2,252,058	\$ 2,4	125,090	\$2,	658,615	\$2	,983,271	\$ 3,4	14,263	\$	3,893,404		7,626,701
		_													
	5 Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	-	8.69261%		69261%		.69261%		8.69261%		9261%		8.69261%		
	6 Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor	9	8.76729%	98.	76729%	98	.76729%	91	3.76729%	98.7	6729%	9	8.76729%		
	7 Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (B)	\$ -	1,638,502	\$ 1,6	348,296	\$ 1,	663,486	\$ 1	,686,170	\$ 1,7	14,985	\$	1,747,923	\$ 1	0,099,362
	8 Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs (C)	\$ 2	2,224,297	\$ 2,3	395,196	\$ 2,	625,842	\$ 2	,946,496	\$ 3,3	72,175	\$	3,845,410	\$1	7,409,416
	9 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for	<u>\$:</u>	3,862,799	\$ 4,0	3,492	<u>\$4,</u>	289,328	<u>\$ 4</u>	,632,666	\$ 5,0	87,160	\$!	5,593,333	\$2	7,508,778
	Investment Projects (Lines 7 + 8)														

(A) Each project's Total System Recoverable Expenses on Form 42-4P, Line 9 (B) Line 3 x Line 5 (C) Line 4 x Line 6

Capital Investment Projects-Recoverable Costs (in Dollars)

			Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	Projected	6-Month	12-Month	Method of Classification		
Line	# Project #	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	Sub-Total	Total	Demand	Energy	
	1 Description of Investment Projects (A)				•	•			4			
	2 Low NOx Burner Technology-Capital	\$ 65,458					•		\$787,974		\$ 787,974	
	3b Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems-Capital	85,324	85,008	84,693	84,377	84,061	83,908	507,371	\$1,025,943		1,025,943	
	4b Clean Closure Equivalency-Capital	307	306	305	304	303	302	1,828	\$3,692	3,408	284	
	5b Maintenance of Stationary Above Ground Fuel Storage Tanks-Capital	137,211	136,802	136,394	135,986	135,578	135,170	817,142	\$1,648,976	1,522,132	126,844	
	 Relocate Turbine Lube Oil Underground Piping to Above Ground-Capital 	126	126	126	125	125	125	754	\$1,517	1,401	116	
	8b Oil Spill Cleanup/Response Equipment-Capital	9,397	9,307	9,167	9,028	8,972	10,815	56,685	\$111,495	102,919	8,576	
	10 Relocate Storm Water Runoff-Capital	781	779	778	777	776	774	4,666	\$9,377	8,656	721	
	NA SO2 Allowances-Negative Return on Investment	(25,896)	(25,067)	(24,238)	(23,409)	(22,581)	(21,752)	(142,943)	(\$278,987)	•	(278,987)	
	12 Scherer Discharge Pipeline-Capital	5,101	5,091	5,080	5,070	5,059	5,049	30,451	\$61,280	56,566	4,714	
	17b Disposal of Noncontainerized Liquid Waste-Capital 20 Wastewater Discharge Elimination & Reuse	0 19,659	0 19,625	0 19,591	0 19,557	0 19,524	0 19,490	0 117,446	\$0 \$236,106	0 217,944	0 18,162	
	21 St. Lucie Turtle Net	11,457	11,452	11,447	11,442	11,437	11,828	69,064	\$137,914	127,306	10,608	
	22 Pipeline Integrity Management	0	0	0	0	0	6,395	6,395	\$6,395	5,903	492	
0	23 SPCC - Spill Prevention, Control & Countermeasures	209,961	209,581	209,202	208,822	208,442	211,358	1,257,367	\$2,525,090	2,330,852	194,238	
	24 Manatee Reburn	383,602	382,485	381,369	380,252	379,136	378,019	2,284,862	\$4,609,917	–	4,609,917	
	25 Pt. Everglades ESP Technology	936,716	936,464	933,846	931,831	929,815	927,193	5,595,864	\$11,251,101		11,251,101	
	26 UST Removal / Replacement	5,452	5,442	5,432	5,421	5,411	5,401	32,559	\$65,488	60,450	5,038	
-	31 CAIR Compliance	1,997,471	2,091,915	2,199,053	2,298,745	2,386,652	2,594,077	13,567,914	\$23,103,538	21,326,343	1,777,195	
	33 CAMR Compliance	479,047	511,647	541,419	566,828	603,485	731,402	3,433,827	\$5,934,022	5,477,558	456,464	
	34 St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspection & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	19,518	19,518	\$19,518	18,016	1,502	
	35 Martin Plant Drinking Water System Compliance	2,315	2,312	2,310	2,307	2,304	2,301	13,848	\$27,801	25,662	2,139	
	36 Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage	0	0	0	0	0	27,338	27,338	\$27,338	25,235	2,103	
	37 DeSoto Next Generation Solar Energy Center	751,431	1,157,852	1,633,839	1,885,098	2,005,444	2,041,381	9,475,044	\$11,224,344	10,360,933	863,411	
	38 Space Coast Next Generation Solar Energy Center	99,370	158,412	218,380	234,728	251,027	267,710	1,229,628	\$1,508,123	1,392,114	116,009	
	39 Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center	1,008,243	1,223,649	1,434,717	1,647,506	1,844,985	2,024,698	9,183,798	\$11,788,849	10,882,015	906,834	
	2 Total Investment Projects - Recoverable Costs	6,182,531	6,988,234	7,867,540	8,469,013	8,923,757	9,545,889	47,976,963	75,836,811	53,945,413	21,891,398	
	3 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy	\$1,809,613	\$1,870,418	\$1,934,702	\$1,978,170	\$2.010,350	\$2,054,998	\$11,658,252	\$21.891.398			
	4 Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		\$5,117,816			\$6,913,406		\$36,318,711				
						* -,	**********	*	¥ , ,			
	5 Retail Energy Jurisdictional Factor	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%	98.69261%					
	6 Retail Demand Jurisdictional Factor	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%	98.76729%					
	7 Jurisdictional Energy Recoverable Costs (B)	\$1,785,954	\$1,845,965	\$1,909,408	\$1,952,308	\$1,984,067	\$2,028,131	\$11,505,833	\$21,605,195			
	8 Jurisdictional Demand Recoverable Costs (C)							\$35,871,007				
	9 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs for Investment Projects (Lines 7 + 8)	\$6,104,967	\$6,900,693	<u>\$7,769,111</u>	\$ 8,363,137	\$8,812,251	\$9,426,681	\$47,376,840	\$74,885,618			

Notes

(A) Each project's Total System Recoverable Expenses on Form 42-4P, Line 9

(B) Line 3 x Line 5

(C) Line 4 x Line 6

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Low NOx Burner Technology (Project No. 2)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments								
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$ 0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$17,462,051	17,462,061	17,462,051	17,462,051	17,482,051	17,462,051	17,462,051	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$14,932,069	14,976,819	15,021,569	15,066,319	15,111,069	15,155,820	15,200,570	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$2,529,982	\$2,485,232	\$2,440,482	\$2,395,731	\$2,350,981	\$2,306,231	\$2,261,481	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		2,507,607	2,462,857	2,418,107	2,373,356	2,328,606	2,283,856	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for laxes (D)		19,269	18,925	18,581	18,237	17,893	17,550	\$110,455
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		3,922	3,852	3,782	3,712	3,642	3,572	\$22,480
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		44,750	44,750	44,750	44,750	44,750	44,750	\$268,501
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$67,941	\$67,527	\$ 67,113	\$66,699	\$66,285	\$65,871	\$401,436

Notes: -

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Totals may not add due to rounding.

00

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Low NOx Burner Technology (Project No. 2) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments								
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Ptant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$17,462,051	17,462,051	17,482,051	17,462,051	17,462,051	17,462,051	17,462,051	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$15,200,570	15,245,320	15,290,070	15,334,820	15,379,570	15,424,320	15,469,071	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	Q	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$2,261,481	\$2,216,731	\$2,171,981	\$2,127,231	\$2,082,480	\$2,037,730	\$1,992,980	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		2,239,106	2,194,356	2,149,606	2,104,856	2,060,105	2,015,355	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		17,206	16,862	16,518	16,174	15,830	15,486	\$208,531
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		3,502	3,432	3,362	3,292	3,222	3,152	\$ 42,441
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		44,750	44,750	44,750	44,750	44,750	44,750	\$537,002
	b. Amortization (F)								4444,444
	c. Dismantlement								
	 d. Property Expenses 								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$65,458	\$65,044	\$64,630	\$64,216	\$63,802	\$63,388	\$787,974

Notes

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for laxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11,75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Totals may not add due to rounding.

9

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Continuous Emissions Monitoring (Project No. 3b) (in Dollars)

<u>Lin</u>		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)		•-		•-			•	-
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$6,683,345	6,717,475	6,751,605	6,785,735	6,819,864	6,853,994	6,888,124	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$5,757,482	\$5,723,352	\$5,689,222	\$5,655,092	\$5,620,962	\$5,586,632	\$5,552,702	n/a
8.	Average Net Investment		5,740,417	5,706,287	5,672,157	5,638,027	5,603,897	5,569,767	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		44,110	43,848	43,586	43,324	43,061	42,799	\$260,728
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		8,977	8,924	6,871	8,817	8,764	8,711	\$53,064
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		34,130	34,130	34,130	34,130	34,130	34,130	\$204,780
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)								
	Total Courts or Decourable Communication (Course 7.9.0)	_	P 07 040	200,000	Par Ent	Poc ata	POE OEE	POT 040	\$5.40 F30
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$87,218	\$86,902	\$86,586	\$86,271	\$85,955	\$85,640	\$ 518,572

Notes

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project Continuous Emissions Monitoring (Project No. 3b) (in Dollars)

<u>Line</u> 1.		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$25,000
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,440,827	12,465,827	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$6,688,124	6,922,254	6,956,384	6,990,514	7,024,644	7,058,774	7,092,951	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0_	0	n/a
5.	Net investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$5,552,702	\$5,518,572	\$5,484,442	\$ 5,450,312	\$5,416,183	\$5,382,053	\$5,372,875	n√a
6.	Average Net Investment		5,535,637	5,501,507	5,467,377	5,433,247	5,399,118	5,377,464	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		42,537	42,275	42,012	41,750	41,488	41,321	\$512,111
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		8,657	8,604	8,550	8,497	8,444	8,410	\$104,226
8.	•								
	a. Depreciation (E)		34,130	34,130	34,130	34,130	34,130	34,177	\$409,606
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantiement								
	d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)								
9,	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)		\$ 85,324	\$85,008	\$84,693	\$84,377	\$84,061	\$83,908	\$1,025,943

Notes

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Clean Closure Equivalency (Project No. 4b) (in Dollars)

<u>Lin</u>	nvestments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other (A)	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated \$0 \$0	February Estimated \$0 \$0	March Estimated \$0 \$0	April Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	May Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	June Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	Six Month Amount \$0 \$0 \$0
2. 3. 4.	, , , ,	58,866 36,910 \$0	58,866 37,021 0	58,866 37,132 0	58,866 37,243 0	58,866 37,354 0	58,866 37,464 0	58,866 37,575 0	n/a n/a n/a
5.	Net investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$21,955	\$21,845	\$21,734	\$ 21,623	\$ 21,512	\$21,401	\$ 21,291	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		21,900	21,789	21,678	21,568	21,457	21,346	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		168 34	167 34	167 34	1 8 6 34	165 34	164 33	\$997 \$203
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantlement d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)		111	111	111	111	111	111	\$665
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	-	\$313	\$312	\$311	\$ 310	\$309	\$308	\$ 1,865

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Clean Closure Equivalency (Project No. 4b)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.						•			
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$ 0
	c. Retirements d. Other (A)		30	30	3 ∪	3 0	3 U	30	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (8)	\$58,866	58,866	58,866	58,866	58,866	56,666	58,866	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$37,575	37,686	37,797	37,908	38,018	38,129	38,240	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0_	. n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$ 21, 2 91	\$21,180	\$21,069	\$20,958	\$20,847	\$20,737	\$20,626	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		21,235	21,124	21,014	20,903	20,792	20,681	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		163	162	161	161	160	159	\$1,963
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		33	33	33	33	33	32	\$400
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		111	111	111	111	111	111	\$1,330
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantiement								
	d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	=	\$307	\$306	\$305	\$304	\$303	\$302	\$3,692

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Maintenance of Above Ground Storage Tanks (Project No. 5b) (in Dollars)

Line	<u>.</u>	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments								
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$ D	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	n√a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$3,258,649	3,302,781	3,346,912	3,391,044	3,435,175	3,479,307	3,523,438	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	r/a
5.	Net investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$10,351,568	\$10,307,437	\$10,263,305	\$10,219,174	\$10,175,042	\$10,130,911	\$10,086,779	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		10,329,502	10,285,371	10,241,239	10,197,108	10,152,977	10,108,845	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		79,374	79,035	78,695	78,356	78,017	77,678	\$471,155
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		16,154	16,085	16,016	15,947	15,878	15,809	\$95,891
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		44,131	44,131	44,131	44,131	44,131	44,131	\$264,789
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)		\$139,659	\$139,251	\$138,843	\$138,435	\$138,027	\$137,619	\$831,834

Notes

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.8840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Maintenance of Above Ground Storage Tanks (Project No. 5b) (in Dollars)

Lirx	<u>.</u>	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.			_						
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$ 0	\$ 0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	13,610,217	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$3,523,438	3,567,570	3,611,701	3,655,833	3,699,964	3,744,095	3,788,227	n⁄a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0		· 0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$10,086,779	\$10,042,648	\$9,998,516	\$9,954,385	\$9,910,253	\$9,886,122	\$9,821,991	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		10,064,714	10,020,582	9,976,451	9,932,319	9,868,188	9,844,056	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		77,339	77,000	76,661	76,322	75,982	75,843	\$930,102
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		15,740	15,671	15,602	15,533	15,464	15,395	\$189,297
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		44,131	44,131	44,131	44,131	44,131	44,131	\$529,578
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
_	Total States Community European / ing 7 P 9	_	\$137,211	\$136,802	\$136,394	\$135,986	\$135,578	\$135,170	\$1,648,976
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	=	\$137 ₁ Z11	\$130,6UZ	a130,394	⊕ 135,860	\$133,37B	\$130,17U	#1,048,976

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Relocate Turbine Oil Underground Piping (Project No. 7) (in Dollars)

Line 1	investments .	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
•	d. Other (A)								•
2. (Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	n/a
3. 1	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$20,526	20,557	20,588	20,619	20,650	20,682	20,713	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	0	. 0	0	0	0	. 0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$10,504	\$10,473	\$10,442	\$10,411	\$10,380	\$10,349	\$10,317	n/a
6.	Avarage Net Investment		10,488	10,457	10,426	10,395	10,364	10,333	n/a
	Return on Average Net Investment								
	Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		81	80	80	80	80	79	\$480
1	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		16	16	16	16	16	16	\$98
8, 1	Investment Expenses								
:	a. Deprectation (E)		31	31	31	31	31	31	\$186
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses a. Other (G)								
	• •								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)		\$128	\$128	\$127	\$ 127	\$127	\$127	\$764

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Relocate Turbine Oil Underground Piping (Project No. 7) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$ 0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$ 0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)		-	-	•	•	•	↓ a	~ 2
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	31,030	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$20,713	20,744	20,775	20,806	20,837	20,868	20,899	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	O	0	O	00	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$10,317	\$10,286	\$10,255	\$10,224	\$10,193	\$10,162	\$10,131	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		10,302	10,271	10,240	10,209	10,178	10,147	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		79	79	79	78	78	78	\$951
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		16	16	16	15	16	16	\$194
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		31	31	31	31	31	31	\$372
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
Q	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$126	\$126	\$126	\$125	\$125	\$125	\$1,517
0.	roun ogotom records and approved (area rea o)	_	9120	¥120	\$120	412 0	\$120	₹12 0	را تاران

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Protect: Oil Soill Cleanup/Response Equipment (Project No. 8b) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments						4-		
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$58,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$56,000
	c. Retirements		(\$53,550)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	(\$53,550)
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$536,885	483,335	483,335	539,335	539,335	539,335	539,335	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$214,164	166,236	171,858	177,813	184,102	190,391	196,679	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	<u>\$0</u>	0	0		0	0	Ð	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$322,720	\$317,098	\$311,476	\$361, 521	\$ 355,233	\$348 ,944	\$342,656	r/a
6.	Average Net Investment		319,909	314,287	336,499	358,377	352,088	345,800	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		2,458	2,415	2,586	2,754	2,706	2,657	\$15,576
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.6767% x 1/12)		500	492	526	560	551	541	\$3,170
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		5,622	5,622	5,955	6,289	6,289	6,289	\$36,065
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 6)	_	\$8,580	\$8,528	\$9,067	\$9,603	\$9,545	\$9,486	\$54,810

Notes:

- (6) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

18

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Oil Soill Cleanup/Response Equipment (Project No. 8b) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$147,000	\$203,000
	c. Retirements		\$0	(\$5.368)	\$0	(\$13,357)	\$0	\$0	(\$72,278)
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$539,335	539,335	533,966	533,966	520,609	520,609	667,609	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$196,679	202,936	203,792	209,934	202,636	208,695	215,979	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$342,656	\$336,399	\$330,175	\$324,033	\$317,973	\$311,914	\$451,630	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		339,527	333,287	327,104	321,003	314,944	381,772	r v a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		2,609	2,561	2,514	2,467	2,420	2,934	\$31,079
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		531	521	512	502	493	597	\$6,325
8.	Investment Expenses		-						
	a. Depreciation (E)		6,257	6,225	6,142	6,059	6,059	7,284	\$74,090
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	<u>-</u>	\$9,397	\$9,307	\$9,167	\$9,028	\$8,972	\$10,815	\$111,495

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Relocate Storm Water Runoff (Project No. 10) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.									
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0
	b. Cleanings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$47,336	47,474	47,611	47,749	47,886	48,024	48,161	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$ 0	0	0	0	0	.0	0	r√a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$70,457	\$70,320	\$70,183	\$70,045	\$69,908	\$69,770	\$69,633	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		70,389	70,251	70,114	69,976	69,839	69,702	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		541	540	539	538	537	536	\$3,229
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		110	110	110	109	109	109	\$657
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		137	137	137	137	137	137	\$825
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
a	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$788	\$787	\$786	\$78 5	\$783	\$782	\$4,711

Notes:

- (A) N
- (8) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.81425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Relocate Storm Water Runoff (Project No. 10)</u> (in Dollars)

<u>Lin</u>		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	. Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		•0	\$ 0	\$0	•	••	••	**
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 50
	c. Retirements		\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0
	d. Other (A)		•	••	40	•0	40	30	3 0
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	117,794	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$48,161	48,298	48,436	48,573	48,711	48,848	48,986	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Searing	\$ 0	0	0	. 0	0	.0	0_	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$69,633	\$69,495	\$69,358	\$69,221	\$69,083	\$68,946	\$68,808	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		69,564	69,427	69,289	69,152	69,014	68,877	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		535	533	532	531	530	529	\$6,421
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		109	109	108	108	108	108	\$1,307
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		137	137	137	137	137	137	\$1,649
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$ 781	\$7 79	\$778	\$777	\$778	\$774	\$9,377

Notes

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Scherer Discharge Pipeline (Project No. 12)</u> (in Dollars)

Line	-	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$428,372	429,510	430,649	431,788	432,927	434,065	435,204	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	. 0	0	00	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$435,889	\$434,750	\$433,611	\$432,473	\$431,334	\$430,196	\$429,056	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		435,319	434,181	433,042	431,903	430,764	429,626	r√a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		3,345	3,336	3,328	3,319	3,310	3,301	\$19,939
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.6767% x 1/12)		681	679	677	675	674	672	\$4,058
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	\$6,833
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$5,165	\$5,154	\$5,144	\$5,133	\$5,122	\$5,112	\$30,830

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- C\ N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Scherer Discharge Pipeline (Project No. 12)</u> (in Dollars)

Line	_	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month
1.							_	_	
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (8)	\$864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	864,260	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$435,204	436,343	437,482	438,620	439,759	440,898	442,037	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$429,056	\$427, 918	\$426,779	\$425,640	\$424,501	\$423,363	\$422,224	r/a
6.	Average Net Investment		428,487	427,348	426,209	425,071	423,932	422,793	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		3,293	3,284	3,275	3,266	3,258	3,249	\$39,563
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		670	668	667	665	663	681	\$8,052
8,	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	1,139	\$13,665
	b. Amortization (F)		••••					.,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	c. Dismantiement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
_									
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	==	\$ 5,101	\$5,091	\$5,080	\$5,070	\$5,059	\$5,049	\$61,280

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for laxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Non-Containerized Liouid Wastes (Project No. 17) (in Dollars)

Line 1.	investments	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Cleanings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	σ	0	o	0	0	0	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing		0	0	0	0		<u> </u>	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	u/a
€.	Average Net Investment		-	٥	0	0	0	0	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Debt Component (Line 8 x 1,8787% x 1/12)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$0	\$0	\$0.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Non-Containerized Liquid Wastes (Project No. 17) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments			••					
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$ 0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	a U	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing			0	0	0		0	n/a
5.	Net investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		•	O	0	0	0	0	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
6.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
_		_							
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	. \$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Wasterwater/Stormwater Reuse (Project No. 20) (in Dollars)

Line 1.		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
•-	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	* \$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)							-	-
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$606,781	610,430	614,079	617,727	621,376	625,025	626,673	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$1,754,881	\$1,751,232	\$1,747,583	\$1,743,935	\$1,740,286	\$1,736,637	\$1,732,988	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		1,753,056	1,749,408	1,745,759	1,742,110	1,738,461	1,734,813	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		13,471	13,443	13,415	13,387	13,359	13,331	\$80,404
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		2,742	2,736	2,730	2,724	2,719	2,713	\$16,364
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		3,649	3,649	3,649	3,649	3,649	3,649	\$21,892
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	-	\$19,661	\$19,827	\$19,794	\$19,760	\$19,726	\$19,692	\$118,660

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.81425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Wasterwater/Stormwater Reuse (Project No. 20)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Perlod Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	•0	••	**	**		
	a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)		•	•	••	30	4 0	\$0	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	2,361,662	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$628,673	632,322	635,971	639,620	643,268	646,917	650,568	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$ 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$1,732,988	\$1,729,340	\$1,725,691	\$1,722,042	\$1,718,393	\$1,714,745	\$1,711,098	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		1,731,164	1,727,515	1,723,867	1,720,218	1,716,569	1,712,920	n/a
7.									
	Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		13,303	13,275	13,248	13,218	13,190	13,162	\$159,799
	b. Debt Component (Line 8 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		2,707	2,702	2,696	2,690	2,685	2,679	\$32,523
8.	Investment Expenses	•							
	a. Depreciation (E)		3,649	3,649	3,649	3,649	3,649	3,649	\$43,785
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	<u>-</u>	\$19,659	\$19,625	\$19,591	\$19,557	\$19,524	\$19,490	\$236,106

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Turtle Nets (Project No. 21)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimaled	Six Month Amount
1.	investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	so	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0 \$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	50	\$0
	d. Other (A)						-	-	4 -2
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$468,938	468,938	468,938	468,938	468,938	468,938	468,938	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	(\$714,347)	(713,800)	(713,253)	(712,706)	(712,159)	(711,612)	(711,065)	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	00	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$1,183,285	\$1,182,738	\$1,182,191	\$1,181,644	\$1,181,097	\$1,180,550	\$1,180,003	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		1,183,012	1,182,485	1,181,918	1,181,371	1,180,823	1,180,276	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		9,090	9,086	9,082	9,078	9,074	9,069	\$54,480
	b. Debt Component (Line 8 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		1,850	1,849	1,848	1,848	1,847	1,846	\$11,080
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		547	547	547	547	547	547	\$3,283
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expanses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$11,488	\$11,483	\$11,478	\$11,472	\$11,467	\$11,462	\$68,850

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (8) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Turtle Nets (Project Ng. 21) (in Dollars)

Line	-	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month
1.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		t o	•••	**				_
	a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$76,149	\$76,149
	d. Other (A)		4 5	₩.	4 0	30	\$ 0	\$0	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$468,938	468,938	468,938	468,938	468,938	468,938	545,087	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	(\$711,085)	(710,518)	(709,971)	(709,423)	(708,876)	(708,329)	(707,738)	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	<u> </u>	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$1,180,003	\$1,179,456	\$1,178,909	\$1,178,362	\$1,177,814	\$1,177,267	\$ 1,252,825	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		1,179,729	1,179,182	1,178,635	1,178,088	1,177,541	1,215,046	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		9,065	9,061	9,057	9,053	9,048	9,337	\$109,100
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		1,845	1,844	1,843	1,842	1,842	1,900	\$22,204
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		547	547	547	547	547	592	\$6,610
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$11,457	\$11,452	\$11,447	\$11,442	\$11,437	\$11,828	\$137,914

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for laxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Pipeline Integrity Management (Project No. 22)</u> (in Dolfars)

Line 1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	February Estimated \$0 \$0	March Estimated \$0	April Estimated \$0	May Estimated \$0 \$0	June Estimated \$0	Six Month Amount \$0 \$0
	c. Retirements d. Other (A)		3 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
3.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B) Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C) CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0 \$0 \$0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0	0 0	Q 0 0	0 0 0	n/a n/a n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	. \$0	\$0	n/a
	Average Net investment	***************************************	-	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	\$0 \$0
6.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantiement d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)		o	. 0	o	0	0	0	\$0
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	-	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%, the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project; Pipeline Integrity Management (Project No. 22) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	ėn.	**
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$1,200,000	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000 \$0
	d. Other (A)		* U	••	₩0	. 40	₩0	\$0	\$0
	u. Olia (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	1,200,000	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	850	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	. 0	0	0		0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,199,150	r/a
6.	Average Net Investment		-	0	O	0	0	599,575	r/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		0	0	0	0	0	4,607	\$4,607
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		0	0	0	0	. 0	938	\$938
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	850	\$850
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	-	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,395	\$6,395

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project; Split Prevention (Project No. 23)</u> (in Dollars)

Line	-	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$8,333	\$8,333	\$8,333	\$8,333	\$8,333	\$8,333	\$49,998
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	19,503,628	19,511,961	19,520,294	19,528,627	19,536,960	19,545,293	19,553,626	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	2,066,853	2,118,028	2,169,221	2,220,433	2,271,662	2,322,908	2,374,173	n/a
4,	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	· -	0	. 0	0_	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$17,436,775	\$17,393,932	\$17,351,072	\$17,308,194	\$17,265,298	\$17,222,384	\$17,179,452	rv/a
6.	Average Net Investment		17,415,354	17,372,502	17,329,633	17,286,746	17,243,841	17,200,918	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		133,822	133,493	133,164	132,834	132,505	132,175	\$797.993
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		27,236	27,169	27,102	27,035	26,968	26,901	\$162,409
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		51,175	51,193	51,211	51,229	51,247	51,265	\$307,320
	b. Amortization (F)							·	
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$212,234	\$211,855	_\$211,477	\$211,098	\$210,719	\$210,340	\$1,267,723

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Protect: Splft Prevention (Project No. 23) (in Dollars)

Line	•	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other (A)		\$0 \$8,333 \$0	\$0 \$8,333 \$0	\$0 \$8,333 \$0	\$0 \$8,333 \$0	\$0 \$8,333 \$0	\$0 \$626,879 \$0	\$0 \$718,542 \$0
2. 3. 4.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B) Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C) CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$19,553,626 \$2,374,173 \$0	19,561,959 2,425,456 0	19,570,292 2,476,756 0	19,578,625 2,528,075 0	19,586,958 2,579,411 0	19,595,291 2,630,765 0	20,222,170 2,682,575 0	n√a n√a n√a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$17,179,452	\$17,136,503	\$17,093,535	\$17,050,550	\$17,007,546	\$16,964,525	\$17,539,594	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		17,157,978	17,115,019	17,072,042	17,029,048	16,986,036	17,252,060	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		131,845 26,833	131,515 26,7 6 6	131,184 26,699	130,854 26,632	130,524 26,564	132,568 26,980	\$1,586,482 \$322,885
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantlement d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)		61,283	51,301	51,318	51,336	51,354	51,810	\$615,723
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_ =	\$209,981	\$209,581	\$20 9,202	\$208,822	\$208,442	\$211,358	\$2,525,090

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (8) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Manates Reburn (Project No. 24)</u> (in Dollars)

Line	investments	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								•-
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$3,652,607	3,773,330	3,894,053	4,014,776	4,135,498	4,256,221	4,376,944	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$29,209,961	\$29,089,238	\$28,968,515	\$28,847,793	\$28,727,070	\$28,606,347	\$28,485,624	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		29,149,600	29,028,877	28,908,154	28,787,431	26,666,708	28,545,986	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		223,990	223,063	222,135	221,207	220,280	219,352	\$1,330,028
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		45,587	45,398	45,209	45,021	44,832	44,643	\$270,690
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		120,723	120,723	120,723	120,723	120,723	120,723	\$724,337
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$390,300	\$389,184	\$388,067	\$386,951	\$385,834	\$384,718	\$2,325,055

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Manatee Reburn (Project No. 24)</u> (in Dofars)

Line 1.	2_ Investments e. Excenditures/Additions	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated\$0	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount So
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0
	c. Retirements d. Other (A)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	32,862,568	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$4,376,944	4,497,667	4,618,389	4,739,112	4,859,835	4,980,558	5,101,281	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0		0	r/a
5.	Net trivestment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$28,485,624	\$28,384,902	\$28,244,179	\$28,123,456	\$28,002,733	\$27,882,011	\$27,761,288	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		28,425,263	28,304,540	28,183,817	26,063,095	27,942,372	27,821,649	n⁄a
7.									
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		218,424	217,497	216,569	215,642	214,714	213,786	\$2,626,660
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		44,454	44,265	44,077	43,888	43,699	43,510	\$ 534,584
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E)		120,723	120,723	120,723	120,723	120,723		** ***
	a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F)		120,723	120,123	120,723	120,723	120,723	120,723	\$1,448,673
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$383,602	\$382,485	\$381,389	\$380,252	\$379,136	\$378,019	\$4,609,917

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Protect: Port Everglades ESP (Protect No. 25) (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$36,000	\$0	\$80,000	\$0	\$116,000
	c. Retirements d. Other (A)		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$81,439,708	81,439,708	81,439,708	81,475,708	81,475,708	81,555,708	81,555,708	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$9,139,236	9,420,447	9,701,659	9,982,910	10,264,200	10,545,623	10,827,180	n√a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing		0	0	0	0	0		n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$72,300,472	\$72,019,280	\$71,738,049	\$71,492,798	\$ 71,211,508	\$71,010,085	\$70,728,528	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		72,159,86 6	71,878,655	71,615,423	71,352,153	71,110,796	70,869,306	ıva
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		554,488.51	552,328	550,306	548,282	546,427	544,572	\$3,296,402
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		112,851	112,411	111,999	111,588	111,210	110,833	\$870,892
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		281,212	281,212	281,251	281,290	281,423	281,557	\$1,687,944
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantiement								
	d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$948,551	\$945,951	\$943,555	\$941,159	\$939,061	\$936,961	\$5,655,238

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Port Everglades ESP (Project No. 25) (in Dollars)

Line 1.	-	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	•••
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$350,000	\$0	\$0	\$84,284	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$550, 284
	c. Retirements		:\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0.00,204
	d. Other (A)			-	•	•	•	•	40
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$81,555,708	81,905,708	81,905,708	61,905,708	81,989,992	81,989,992	81,989,992	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$10,827,180	11,109,480	11,392,524	11,675,568	11,958,826	12,242,299	12,525,771	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	r/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$70,728,528	\$70,796,228	\$70,513,184	\$70,230,140	\$70,031,166	\$69,747,693	\$69,464,221	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		70,762,378	70,654,706	70,371,662	70,130,653	69,889,429	69,605,957	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		543,750	542,923	540,748	538,896	537,042	534,864	\$6,534,624
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		110, 66 5	110,497	110,054	109,677	109,300	108,857	\$1,329,942
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		282,300	283,044	283,044	283,258	283,472	283,472	\$3,386,536
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantiement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$936,716	\$936,464	\$933,846	\$931,831	\$929,815	\$927,193	\$11,251,101

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) NVA
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project; UST Removal / Replacement (Project No. 26)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	Aprii Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.						_			
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	492,916	492,916	492,916	492,916	492,916	492,916	492,916	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	16,061	17,190	16,299	19,409	20,518	21,627	22,736	r/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing		0	0	0	0	0		n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$476,835	\$475,726	\$474,617	\$473,508	\$472,399	\$471,290	\$470,181	n/a
€.	Average Net Investment		476,281	475,171	474,062	472,953	471,844	470,735	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		3,660	3,651	3,643	3,634	3,626	3,617	\$21,831
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		745	743	741	740	738	736	\$4,443
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	\$6,654
	b. Amortization (F)								• •
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
		_							
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	=	\$ 5,514	\$5,503	\$5,49 3	\$ 5,483	\$ 5,473	\$ 5,462	\$32,929

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project, UST Removal / Replacement (Project No. 26)</u> (in Dollars)

<u>. Line</u> 1.	-	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	August Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	September Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	October Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	November Estimated \$0 \$0	December Estimated \$0 \$0 \$0	Twelve Month Amount \$0 \$0 \$0
	d. Other (A)		40	4 0	* 0	•	₩.	4 0	\$0
2. 3. 4.		\$492,916 \$22,736 \$0	492,916 23,845 0	492,916 24,954 0	492,916 26,063 0	492,916 27,172 0	492,916 28,281 0	492,916 29,390 0	n/a n∕a n∕a
5.	Net investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$470,181	\$469,072	\$487,963	\$466,854	\$465,744	\$464,635	\$463,526	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		469,628	468,517	467,406	466,299	465,190	484,081	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		3,609 734	3,600 733	3,592 731	3,583 729	3,575 728	3,5 6 6 726	\$43,355 \$8,824
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantlement d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)		1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	1,109	\$13,309
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_ =	\$5,452	\$5,442	\$5,432	\$5,421	\$5,411	\$ 5,401	\$65,488

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project, CAIR Compliance (Project No. 31) (in Dollars)

Line	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Ptant c. Retirements d. Other (A)		\$6,526,827 \$0 \$0	\$6,072,577 \$0 \$0	\$7,864,942 \$22,951,452 \$0	\$9,550,464 \$4,559,403 \$0	\$14,665,535 \$9,242,148 \$0	\$8,125,453 \$18,715,612 \$0	\$52,805,798 \$55,468,615 \$0
Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B) Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C) CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$47,002,484 \$246,124 \$89,013,965	47,002,464 324,292 95,540,792	47,002,464 402,461 101,613,368	69,953,916 501,668 66,526,858	74,513,318 628,152 91,517,920	83,755,487 775,143 96,941,306	102,471,079 963,245 86,351,147	n/a n/a n/a
5. Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$135,770,305	\$142,218,963	\$148,213,372	\$155,979,106	\$165,403,086	\$179,921,630	\$187,858,981	n/a
Average Net Investment		138,994,634	145,216,167	152,096,239	160,691,096	172,662,358	183,890,306	n/a
 Relium on Average Net Investment Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12) 		1,068,058 217,374	1,115,865 227,104	1,168,733 237,863	1,234,777 251,305	1,326,767 270,027	1,413,044 287,586	\$7,327,244 \$1,491,258
8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantlement d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)		78,168	78,168	99,207	126,484	146,991	188,102	\$ 717,121
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	 	\$1,363,600	\$1,421,137	\$1,505,804	\$1,612,566	\$1,743,784	\$1,888,732	\$9,835,823

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for laxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%, the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-64
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: CAIR Compliance (Project No. 31)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other (A)		\$9,974,003 \$74,997 \$0	\$10,960,952 \$24,179 \$0	\$12,731,258 \$16,000 \$0	\$9,252,219 \$16,000 \$0	\$9,358,720 \$9,113,630 \$0	\$32,840,296 \$17,783,004 \$0	\$137,823,246 \$82,496,426 \$0
2. 3. 4.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$102,471,079 \$963,245 \$86,351,147	102,546,076 1,178,256 96,250,153	102,570,255 1,393,362 107,086,926	102,586,255 1,608,502 119,802,184	102,602,255 1,823,672 129,038,403	111,715,885 2,042,699 129,283,493	129,498,890 2,276,113 144,340,785	n/a n/a n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$167,858,981	\$197,817,972	\$208,263,820	\$220,779,937	\$229,816,956	\$238,958,679	\$271,563,561	п/а
6.	Average Net Investment		192,738,476	202,940,896	214,521,878	225,298,461	234,386,833	255,260,120	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		1,481,035 301,424	1,559,432 317,379	1,848,422 335,491	1,731,231 352,344	1,801,068 366,558	1,961,462 3 9 9,201	\$17,509,893 \$3,563,655
8.	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantlement d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)		215,013	215,104	215,141	215,170	219,027	233,414	\$2,029,989
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	-	\$1,997,471	\$2,091,915	\$2,199,053	\$2,298,745	\$2,386,652	\$2,594,077	\$23,103,538

Modes

- (A) N/
- (a) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: CAMR Compliance (Project No. 33) (in Dollars)

<u>Lin</u>		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
١.	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$2,081,588	\$2,059,304	\$2,011,504	\$1,900,669	\$4 AD4 ADD	ên naz saz
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,011,004	\$1,800,008	\$1,194,482	\$9,247,547
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0
	d. Other (A)		~	•	•	40	₩u	ąu	\$ 0
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	O	o	0	o	0	o	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	ō	ő	ō	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$40,882,673	40,882,673	42,964,261	45,023,565	47,035,069	48,935,738	50,130,220	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$40,882,673	\$40,882,673	\$42,964,261	\$45,023,565	\$47,035,069	\$48,935,738	\$50,130,220	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		40,882,673	41,923,467	43,993,913	46,029,317	47,985,404	49,532,979	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		314,149	322,147	338,057	353,697	368,728	380,620	\$2,077,397
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		63,936	65,564	68,802	71,985	75,044	77,465	\$422,797
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Amortization (F)								*-
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$378,086	\$387,711	\$406,859	\$425,682	\$44 3,772	\$458,084	\$2,500,194

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%, the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: CAMR Compliance (Project No. 33)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements		\$3,338,850 \$0 \$0	\$3,711,375 \$0 \$0	\$2,727,046 \$0 \$0	\$2,768,038 \$0 \$0	\$5,159,385 \$0 \$0	\$22,504,216 \$0 \$0	\$49,456,457 \$0 \$0
	c. Retirements d. Other (A)		φ.	•	•••	4 0	•0	***	₩
	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	r√a
	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C) CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0 \$50,130,220	0 53,489,070	0 57,180,445	0 59,907,491	62,675,529	67,834,914	90,339,130	n/a n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$50,130,220	\$53,469,070	\$57,180,445	\$59,907,491	\$62,675,529	\$67,834,914	\$90,339,130	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		51,799,645	55,324,758	58,543,968	61,291,510	65,255,222	79,087,022	n/a
	Return on Average Net Investment		398,037	425,125	449,862	470,974	501,432	507.740	* + 070 F + F
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		81,009	86,5 <u>22</u>	91,557	95,854	102,053	607,718 123,684	\$4,930,545 \$1,003,476
	Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantiement		O	٥	O	0	O	0	· \$0
	d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)			•					
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)		\$479,047	\$511,647	\$541,419	\$566,828	\$603,485	\$731,402	\$5,934,022

Notes

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspect & Maintenance (Project No. 34) (in Dotars)

Line	-	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments		_						
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	o	o	o	0	0	O	r/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
4,	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	. 0	0	o	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	n/a
6.	Average Net investment		-	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		0	0	0	0	0	O	\$0
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Amortization (F)			-	_	_	•	•	••
	c. Dismanifement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
	**************************************	· 							
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 61-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspect & Maintenance (Project No. 34)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	investments								
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (8)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	3,750,000	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	2,188	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0 _	0	0	0	0	0_	<u></u>	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0_	\$3,747,813	n/a
€.	Average Net Investment		-	0	0	0	0	1,873,906	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		0	0	0	0	0	14,399	\$14,399
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		0	0	0	0	O	2,931	\$2,931
8	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	· a	0	0	0	2,188	\$2,168
	b. Amortization (F)						•		
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
۵	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	-	50	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$19,518	\$19,518
9.	Total System Lectives and Exhauses (Thes Lot o)	=		#V			40	918,010	319,516

Notes

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project:Martin Water Comp (Project No. 35) (in Dollars)

Line	-	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments								
	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$1,323	1,634	1,946	2,258	2,569	2,881	3,193	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0_	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$218,677	\$218,366	\$218,054	\$217,742	\$217,431	\$217,119	\$216,807	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		218,521	218,210	217,898	217,586	217,275	216,963	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		1,679	1,677	1,674	1,672	1,670	1,667	\$10,039
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		342	341	341	340	340	339	\$2,043
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		312	312	312	312	312	312	\$1,870
	b. Amortization (F)			0.2	4.2	012	312	312	\$1,070
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)		\$2,333	\$2,330	\$2,327	\$2,324	\$2,321	\$2,318	\$13,952

Notes:

- (A) N/A
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.8640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project:Martin Water Comp (Project No. 35) (in Dollars)

Line	-	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.			*0	•••		**		••	
	a. Expenditures/Additions b. Cleanings to Plant		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0
	d. Other (A)		•	••	•••	4 0	30	\$ 0	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$3,193	3,504	3,816	4,128	4,439	4,751	5,063	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	s o _	0	0	0	O	. 0	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$216,807	\$216,496	\$216,184	\$215,872	\$215,561	\$215,249	\$214,937	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		216,651	216,340	216,028	215,716	215,405	215,093	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		1,665	1,662	1,660	1,658	1,655	1,653	\$19,992
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		339	338	338	337	337	336	\$4,069
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		312	312	312	312	312	312	\$3,740
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	=	\$2,315	\$2,312	\$2,310	\$2,307	\$2,304	\$2,301	\$27,801

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Low Level Rad Waste - LLW (Project No. 36) (in Dollars)

Line	investments	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	P O	P 0
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 *0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0
	d. Other (A)		••	40	•••	***	₩.	3 0	3 0
	L. Corci (A)								
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$ 0	0	0	0	0	0		n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		•	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		0	0	O	0	O	0	\$0
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$ 0
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0

Notes:

- (A) N
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Low Level Rad Waste - LLW (Project No. 38)</u> (in Dollars)

Line	_	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$5,288,004 \$0	\$5,288,004 \$0
	d. Other (A)		40	••	•	•••	40	•	40
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (8)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	5,288,004	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	2,900	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$ 0 _	0	. 0	0	0	00	0	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,285,104	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		-	0	o	0	0	2,642,552	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		0	0	0	0	0	20,306	\$20,306
	 Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12) 		0	0	O	0	0	4,133	\$ 4,133
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	2,900	\$2,900
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	-	\$0	\$0	, \$0	\$0	\$0	\$27,338	\$27,338

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for laxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6840% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power 5. Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project; Solar - Desoto (Project, No. 37) (in Dollars)

Line	e investments	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
١.	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$3,801,571	\$8,399,014	\$7,793,704	\$13,989,560	\$14,549,682	\$17,188,564	\$65,722,095
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)								•
2.	Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	0	0	o	0	0	0	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$6,296,363	10,097,934	18,496,948	26,290,652	40,280,212	54,829,894	72,018,458	n/a
6.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$6,296,363	\$10,097,934	\$18,496,948	\$26,290,652	\$40,280,212	\$54,829,894	\$72,018,458	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		8,197,149	14,297,441	22,393,800	33,285,432	47,565,053	63,424,176	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		62,988	109,864	172,078	255,771	365,421	487,362	\$1,453,484
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		12,820	22,360	35,022	52,055	74,371	99,189	\$295,816
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
-	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$75,808	\$132,224	\$207,099	\$307,826	\$439,792	\$586,551	\$1,749,300

Notes:

- (A) N²
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Solar - Desoto (Project No. 37) (in Dollars)

<u>Line</u>	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
investments a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant c. Retirements d. Other (A)		\$18,468,496 \$0 \$0	\$32,647,623 \$123,134,577 \$0	\$0 \$26,068,352 \$0	\$0 \$16,354,354 \$0	\$0 \$4,358,778 \$0	\$0 \$2,342,527 \$0	\$116,838,214 \$172,258,588 \$0
Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Base (B) Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C) CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$0 \$0 \$72,018,458	0 0 90,496,954	123,134,577 170,849 0	149,202,929 548,718 0	165,557,283 985,447 0	169,916,061 1,450,917 0	172,258,588 1,925,684 0	n/a n/a n/a
5. Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$72,018,458	\$90,486,954	\$122,963,728	\$148,654,211	\$164,571,836	\$168,465,144	\$170,332,904	n√a
6. Average Net Investment 7. Return on Average Net Investment a. Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		624,359 127,071	106,725,341 620,095 166,908	135,808,970 1,043,579 212,392	156,613,024 1,203,441 244,927	166,518,490 1,279,556 260,418	169,399,024 1,301,691 264,923	n/a \$7,728,205 \$1,572,455
8. Investment Expenses a. Depreciation (E) b. Amortization (F) c. Dismantlement d. Property Expenses e. Other (G)		o	170,849	377,868	436,730	465,469	474,767	\$1,925,684
9. Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_ =	\$751,431	\$ 1,157,852	\$1,633,839	\$1,885,098	\$2,005,444	\$2,041,381	\$11,224,344

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Solar - Space Coast (Project No. 38) (in Dollars)

Line 1. Investments	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
a. Expenditures/Additions		\$1,073,371	\$380,146	\$2,527,892	\$1,763,238	\$1,577,913	\$1,606,737	\$8,929,297
b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,757	\$0,525,257
c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
d. Other (A)		-	-	•	•	•	40	4 0
Plant-in-Service/Depreciation Bas	e (B) \$0	0	O	o	0	0	o	n/a
3. Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C) \$0	0	0	O	0	0	0	n/a
4. CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$1,012,286	2,085,657	2,465,803	4,993,695	6,756,933	8,334,846	9,941,583	n/a
5. Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$1,012,286	\$2,085,657	\$2,465,803	\$4,993,695	\$6,756,933	\$8,334,846	\$9,941,583	n/a
6. Average Net Investment		1,548,972	2,275,730	3,729,749	5,875,314	7,545,890	9,138,215	n/a
7. Return on Average Net Investmen								
 Equity Component grossed t 	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	11,903	17,487	28,660	45,147	57,984	70,220	\$231,400
 b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1. 	.8767% x 1/12)	2,422	3,559	5,833	9,188	11,801	14,291	\$47,095
8. Investment Expenses								
 Depreciation (E) 		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
 b. Amortization (F) 								
 Dismantlement 								
d. Property Expenses								
e. Other (G)								
Total System Recoverable Expens	ses (Lines 7 & 8)	\$14, 325	\$21,046	\$34,493	\$ 54,335	\$69,785	\$84,511	\$278,495

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power 8. Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Solar - Space Coast (Project No. 38)</u> (in Dollars)

Line		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
1.			** ***	40.000.007	*******		******		
	a. Expenditures/Additions b. Clearings to Plant		\$1,606,736	\$9,260,637	\$1,824,584	\$1,746,244	\$1,813,844	\$1,829,344	\$27,010,686
	•		\$0 \$0	\$6,359,026	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,359,026
	c. Retirements d. Other (A)		3 -U	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	0	6,359,026	6,359,026	6,359,026	6,359,026	6,359,026	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	6,832	26,496	44,160	61,824	79,488	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$9,941,583	11,548,319	14,449,930	16,274,514	18,020,758	19,634,602	21,663,946	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$9,941,583	\$11,548,319	\$20,800,124	\$22,607,044	\$24,335,624	\$26,131,804	\$27,943,484	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		10,744,951	16,174,222	21,703,584	23,471,334	25,233,714	27,037,644	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		82,566	124,285	166,774	180,358	193,900	207,762	\$1,187,045
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		16,804	25,295	33,942	36,707	39,463	42,284	\$241,590
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	8,832	17,664	17,684	17,664	17,664	\$79,488
	b. Amortization (F)								
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$99,370	\$158,412	\$218,380	\$234,728	\$251,027	\$267,710	\$1,508,123

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes For Project: Solar - Martin (Project No. 39) (in Dollars)

<u>Lin</u>		Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1.	Investments a. Expenditures/Additions		\$8,232,000	\$4,323,000	\$8,904,000	\$13,992,000	\$23,009,000	£00.070.000	****
	b. Clearings to Plant		\$0	\$4,323,000 \$0	\$0,504,000	\$13,992,000		\$20,078,000	\$78,538,000
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0
	d. Other (A)		•	40	40	4 0	30	\$0	\$0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (8)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	o	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	Ô	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$17,710,000	25,942,000	30,265,000	39,169,000	53,161,000	76,170,000	96,248,000	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$17,710,000	\$25,942,000	\$30,265,000	\$39,169,000	\$53,161,000	\$76,170,000	\$96,248,000	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		21,826,000	28,103,500	34,717,000	46,165,000	64,665,500	86,209,000	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D)		167,715	215,952	266,771	354,740	496,901	662,444	\$2,164,522
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.6767% x 1/12)		34,134	43,951	54,294	72,197	101,130	134,822	\$440,529
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Amortization (F)								*-
	c. Dismantlement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	=	\$201,848	\$259,903	\$321,065	\$426,937	\$598,031	\$797,267	\$2,605,051

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>For Project: Solar - Martin (Project No. 39)</u> (in Dollars)

Line 1		Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimaled	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
١.	a. Expenditures/Additions		\$25,548,000	\$21,036,000	\$24,610,000	\$21,408,000	\$21,299,000	\$17,566,000	\$210,005,000
	b. Cleanings to Plant		\$0	\$ 0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$210,003,000
	c. Retirements		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0 \$0
	d. Other (A)					•-		•	4 0
2.	Plant-In-Service/Depreciation Base (B)	\$0	О	0	0	o	0	0	n/a
3.	Less: Accumulated Depreciation (C)	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
4.	CWIP - Non Interest Bearing	\$96,248,000	121,796,000	142,832,000	167,442,000	188,850,000	210,149,000	227,715,000	n/a
5.	Net Investment (Lines 2 - 3 + 4)	\$96,248,000	\$121,796,000	\$142,832,000	\$167,442,000	\$188,850,000	\$210,149,000	\$227,715,000	n/a
6.	Average Net Investment		109,022,000	132,314,000	155,137,000	178,146,000	199,499,500	218,932,000	n/a
7.	Return on Average Net Investment								
	 Equity Component grossed up for taxes (D) 		837,743	1,016,723	1,192,099	1,368,904	1,532,988	1,682,310	\$9,795,289
	b. Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.8767% x 1/12)		170,500	206,926	242,619	278,603	311,997	342,388	\$1,993,560
8.	Investment Expenses								
	a. Depreciation (E)		0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
	b. Amortization (F)								••
	c. Dismanttement								
	d. Property Expenses								
	e. Other (G)								
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$1,008,243	\$1,223,649	\$1,434,717	\$1.647.506	\$1 844 985	\$2,024,808	\$11,788,849
9.	Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 7 & 8)	_	\$1,008,243	\$1,223,649	\$1,434,717	\$1,647,506	\$1,844,985	\$2,024,698	\$11,78

Notes:

- (A) N/
- (B) Applicable beginning of period and end of period depreciable base by production plant name(s), unit(s), or plant account(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (C) N/A
- (D) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 5.6640% reflects an 11.75% return on equity.
- (E) Applicable depreciation rate or rates. See Form 42-4P, pages 51-54
- (F) Applicable amortization period(s). See Form 42-4P pages 51-54
- (G) N/A

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period January through June 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>Deferred Gain on Sales of Emission Allowances</u> (in Dollars)

Line	Beginning of Period Amount	January Estimated	February Estimated	March Estimated	April Estimated	May Estimated	June Estimated	Six Month Amount
1 Working Capital Dr (Cr)								
a 158.100 Allowance Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
b 158.200 Allowances Withheld	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c 182.300 Other Regulatory Assets-Losses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d 254.900 Other Regulatory Liabilities-Gains	(2,307,251)	(2,336,640)	(2,318,032)	(2,299,424)	(2,280,816)	(2,899,518)	(2,844,918)	
2 Total Working Capital	(\$2,307,251)	(\$2,336,640)	(\$2.318.032)	(\$2,299,424)	_(\$2,280,816)	(\$2,899,518)	(\$2,844,918)	·
3 Average Net Working Capital Balance		(2,321,945)	(2,327,336)	(2,308,728)	(2,290,120)	(2,590,167)	(2,872,218)	
4 Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance								
a Equity Component grossed up for laxes (A)		(17,842)	(17,884)	(17,741)	(17,598)	(19,903)	(22,071)	(113,038)
b Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.6698% x 1/12)	_	(3,631)	(3,640)	(3,611)	(3,582)	(4,051)	(4,492)	(23,006)
5 Total Return Component	_	(521,474)	(\$21,523)	(\$21,351)	(\$21,179)	(\$23,954)	(\$26,562)	(\$136,044) (D)
6 Expense Dr (Cr)								
 a 411.800 Gains from Dispositions of Allowances 		(18,608)	(18,608)	(18,608)	(18,608)	(281,499)	(89,611)	(445,542)
 b 411,900 Losses from Dispositions of Allowances 		0	0	0	0	0	0	
c 509.000 Allowance Expense		0	. 0	0	0	Ō	Ö	-
7 Net Expense (Lines 6a+6b+6c)	=	(\$18,608)	(\$18,608)	(\$18,608)	(\$18,608)	(\$281,499)	(\$89,611)	(\$445,542) (E)
8 Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5+7) a Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		(40,081) (40,081)	(40,131) (40,131)	(39,959) (39,959)	(39,787) (39,787)	(305,453) (305,453)	(116,174) (116,174)	
b Recoverable Costs Allocated to Demand		0	0	Ó	Ó	O	ó	
9 Energy Jurisdictional Factor 10 Demand Jurisdictional Factor		98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	98,58121 % 98,76048 %	98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	
11 Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (B)		(39,513)	(39,562)	(39,392)	(39,223)	(301,119)	(114,525)	(573,334)
12 Retail Dernand-Related Recoverable Costs (C)		Ó	Ó	o	ő	0	0	(0,3,334)
13 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines11+12)	=	(\$39,513)	(\$39,562)	(\$39,392)	(\$39,223)	(\$301,119)	(\$114,625)	(\$573,334)

Notes

- (A) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 6.2013% reflects an 11% return on equity.
- (B) Line 8a times Line 9
- (C) Line 8b times Line 10
- (D) Line 5 is reported on Capital Schedule
- (E) Line 7 is reported on O&M Schedule

In accordance with FPSC Order No. PSC-94-0393-FOF-EI, FPL has recorded the gains on sales of emissions allowances as a regulatory liability.

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause For the Period July through December 2009

Return on Capital Investments, Depreciation and Taxes <u>Deferred Gain on Sales of Emission Allowances</u> (in Dollars)

<u>Line</u>	Beginning of Period Amount	July Estimated	August Estimated	September Estimated	October Estimated	November Estimated	December Estimated	Twelve Month Amount
Working Capital Dr (Cr)								
a 158,100 Allowance Inventory	\$0	\$0	\$0_	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
b 158,200 Allowances Withheld	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
c 182.300 Other Regulatory Assets-Losses	\$0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
d 254,900 Other Regulatory Liabilities-Gains	(\$2,844,918)	(2,755,307)	(2,665,695)	(2,576,084)	(2,486,473)	(2,396,862)	(2,307,251)	
2 Total Working Capital	(\$2,844,918)	(\$2,755,307)	(\$2,665,695)	(\$2,576,084)	(\$2,486,473)	(\$2,396,862)	(\$2,307,251)	
3 Average Net Working Capital Balance		(2,800,112)	(2,710,501)	(2,620,890)	(2,531,279)	(2,441,668)	(2,352,056)	
Return on Average Net Working Capital Balance Equity Component grossed up for taxes (A)		(21,517)	(20,828)	(20,139)	(19,451)	(18,762)	(18,074)	(231,808)
b Debt Component (Line 6 x 1.6698% x 1/12)		(4,379)	(4,239)	(4,099)	(3,959)	(3,819)	(3,678)	(231,606) (47,178)
5 Total Return Component	_	(\$25,096)	(\$25,067)	(\$24.238)	(\$23,409)	(\$22,581)	(\$21,752)	(\$2 <u>76</u> ,987) (D)
6 Expense Dr (Cr)	_			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
a 411.800 Gains from Dispositions of Allowances		(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(89,611)	(963,206)
 b 411,900 Losses from Dispositions of Allowances 		0	0	0	0	0	0	
c 509,000 Allowance Expense	_	0	0		0	0	0	
7 Net Expense (Lines 6a+6b+6c)	=	(\$89,611)	(\$89,811)	(\$89,611)	(\$89,611)	(\$89,611)	(\$89,611)	(\$9 <mark>63,208)</mark> (E)
8 Total System Recoverable Expenses (Lines 5+7) a Recoverable Costs Allocated to Energy		(115,507) (115,507)	(114,878) (114, 8 78)	(113,849) (113,849)	(113,021) (113,021)	(112,192) (112,192)	(111,363) (111,363)	
b Recoverable Costs Allocated to Dernand		U	U	U	0	U	0	
9 Energy Jurisdictional Factor 10 Demand Jurisdictional Factor		98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	98.58121% 98.76048%	
11 Retail Energy-Related Recoverable Costs (B) 12 Retail Demand-Related Recoverable Costs (C)		(113,868) 0	(113,051) 0	(112,234) 0	(111,417) 0	(110,600) 0	(109,783) 0	(1,244,287)
13 Total Jurisdictional Recoverable Costs (Lines11+12)	-	(\$113,868)	(\$113,051)	(\$112,234)	(\$111,417)	(\$110,600)	(\$109,783)	(\$1,244,287)

Notes

- (A) The Gross-up factor for taxes uses 0.61425, which reflects the Federal Income Tax Rate of 35%; the monthly Equity Component of 6.2013% reflects an 11% return on equity.
- (B) Line 8a times Line 9
- (C) Line 6b times Line 10
- (D) Line 5 is reported on Capital Schedule
- (E) Line 7 is reported on O&M Schedule

In accordance with FPSC Order No. PSC-94-0393-FOF-EI, FPL has recorded the gains on sales of emissions allowances as a regulatory liability.

Project	Function	Site/Unit	Account	Depreciation Rate / Amortization Period	Actual Balance 12/31/08	Estimated Balance 12/31/2009
a I NOV D				1.01100		 -
15 - FOM NOY RO	rner Technology 02 - Steam Generation Plant	D45				
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades U1 PtEverglades U2	31200	6.70%	2,689,232.57	2,689,232.5
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera U3	31200 31200	6.10%	2,368,972.27	2,368,972.2
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera U4	31200	1.70%	3,815,802.70	3,815,802.7
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt U1	31200	1.40% 2.00%	3,246,925.80	3,246,925.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt U2	31200	1.80%	2,925,027.84 2,416,089.59	2,925,027.8
2 - Low NOX Bu	rner Technology Total	, a, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	51200	1.00%	17,462,050.77	2,416,089.5 17,482,050.7
3 - Continuous E	Emission Monitoring					
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	CapeCanaveral Comm	31100	1.70%	59,227,10	59,227.1
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	CapeCanaveral Comm	31200	1.30%	37,385.86	37,385.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	CapeCanaveral U1	31200	1.40%	407,386.53	408,386.5
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	CapeCanaveral U2	31200	1.10%	347,150.58	348,150.5
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Cutler Comm	31100	0.00%	64,883.87	64,883.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Cutler Comm	31200	0.50%	36,276.52	36,276.5
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Cutler U5	31200	0.20%	310,454.41	310,454.4
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Cutier U6	31200	1.00%	311,861.95	311,861.9
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee Comm	31200	14.10%	31,859.00	31,859.0
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U1	31100	4.10%	56,430.25	56,430.2
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U1	31200	4.80%	477,896.88	477,896.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U2	31100	4.10%	56,332.75	56,332.7
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U2	31200	4.00%	508,551.98	508,551.9
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin Comm	31200	4.10%	31,631.74	31,631.7
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U1	31100	1.50%	36,810.86	36,810.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U1	31200	1.80%	531,413.18	533,413.1
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U2	31100	1.50%	36,845.37	36,845.3
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U2	31200	1.50%	527,263.77	529,263.7
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades Comm	31100	2.70%	127,911.34	127,911.3
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades Comm	31200	2.20%	67,787.69	67,787.6
	02 - Steam Generation Plant 02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades U1	31200	6.70%	458,612.69	458,612.6
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades U2	31200	6.10%	480,873.50	480,873.5
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades U3 PtEverglades U4	31200 31200	4.00% 3.60%	508,210.30 517,303.41	508,210,3
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera Comm	31100	1.90%	60,973.18	517,303.4 60,973.1
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera Comm	31200	0.40%	11,495.25	11,495.2
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera U3	31200	1,70%	453,591.19	453,591.1
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera U4	31200	1.40%	437,621.87	437,621.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Sanford U3	31100	4.00%	54,282.08	54,282.0
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Sanford U3	31200	3.60%	434,357.43	435,357.4
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Scherer U4	31200	1.90%	515,653.32	515,653.3
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	SJRPP - Comm	31100	3.10%	43,193.33	43,193.3
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	SJRPP U1	31200	2.20%	220,702.83	220,702.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	SJRPP U2	31200	2.30%	216,142.08	216.142.0
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt Comm Fsil	31100	2.30%	59,056.19	59,056.1
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt Comm Fsil	31200	2.10%	37,954.50	37,954.5
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt U1	31200	2.00%	545,683.81	545,683.8
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt U2	31200	1.80%	504,788.03	504,788.0
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtLauderdale Comm	34100	4.10%	58,859.79	58,859.7
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtLauderdale Comm	34500	4.10%	34,502.21	34,502.2
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtLauderdale U4	34300	5.00%	463,054.20	463,054,2
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtLauderdale U5	34300	3.70%	474,559.99	474,559.9
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtMyers U2 CC	34300	5.50%	21,625,54	26,625.5
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Martin U3	34300	5.80%	413,342.64	415,342.6
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Martin U4	34300	5.70%	405,944.43	407,944.4
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Martin U8	34300	5.50%	4,688.46	4,688.4
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Putnam Comm	34100	4.10%	82,857.82	82,857.8
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Putnam Comm	34300	6.30%	3,138.97	3,138.9
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Putnam U1	34300	5.20%	332,065.69	333,065.6
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Putnam U2	34300	5.40%	365,469.22	366,469 2
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Sanford U4	34300	5.60%	98,339.95	101,839.9
		Sanford U5				

Project	Function	Site/Unit	Account	Depreciation Rate / Amortization	Actual Balance 12/31/08	Estimated Balance 12/31/2009
4 - Clean Closure	Equivalency Demonstration	<u> </u>		Period		_
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	CapeCanaveral Comm	31100	1.70%	17,254.20	47.054.04
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades Comm	31100	2.70%	19,812.30	17,254.20 19,812.30
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt Comm Fsil	31100	2.30%	21,799.28	
4 - Clean Closure	Equivalency Demonstration Total	ruikey r t commit an	31100	2.30%	58,865.78	21,799.21 58,865.71
5 - Maintenance r	of Above Ground Fuel Tanks					
o - maniformanios (02 - Steam Generation Plant	CapeCanaveral Comm	31100	1.70%	901,636.88	901.636.88
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee Comm	31100	4.90%	3,111,263.35	3,111,263.35
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee Comm	31200	14.10%	174,543.23	174,543.23
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U1	31200	4.80%	104,845,35	104,845,35
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U2	31200	4.00%	127,429.19	127,429.19
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin Comm	31100	1.70%	1,170,450.32	1,170,450,32
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U1	31100	1.50%	176,338.83	176,338.83
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades Comm	31100	2.70%	1,132,078.22	1,132,078.22
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera Comm	31100	1.90%	1,081,354.77	1,081,354.77
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Sanford U3	31100	4.00%	796,754.11	796,754.11
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	SJRPP - Comm	31100	3.10%	42,091.24	42,091.24
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	SJRPP - Comm	31200	2.00%	2,292.39	2,292.39
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt Comm Fsil	31100	2.30%	87,560.23	87,560.23
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt U2	31100	2.10%	42,158.96	42,158.96
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtLauderdale Comm	34200	4.40%	898,110.65	898,110.65
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtLauderdale GTs	34200	4.50%	584,290.23	584,290.23
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtMyers GTs	34200	5.00%	68,893.65	68,893.65
	05 - Other Generation Plant	PtEverglades GTs	34200	5.10%	2,359,099.94	2,359,099,94
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Putnam Comm	34200	3.70%	749,025.94	749,025.94
5 - Maintenance c	of Above Ground Fuel Tanks Total			_	13,610,217.48	13,610,217.48
7 - Relocate Turb	ine Lube Oil Piping					
	03 - Nuclear Generation Plant	StLucie U1	32300	1.20%	31,030.00	31,030.00
7 - Relocate Turb	ine Lube Oil Piping Total			_	31,030.00	31,030.00
8 - Oil Spill Clean	-up/Response Equipment					
•	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Amortizable	31670	7-Year	456,862.61	440,587.11
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin Comm	31600	3.20%	23,107.32	23,107.32
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Amortizable	34650	5-Year	9,271.59	156,271.59
	05 - Other Generation Plant	Amortizable	34670	7-Year	45,699.54	45,699.54
	08 - General Plant	Amortizable	39190	3-Year	1,943.47	1,943.47
3 - Oil Spill Clean	-up/Response Equipment Total				536,884.53	667,609.03
0 - Reroute Storm	n Water Runoff					
	03 - Nuclear Generation Plant	StLucie Comm	32100	1.40%	117,793.83	117,793.83
- Reroute Storm	n Water Runoff Total				117,793.83	117,793.83
2 - Scherer Disch						
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Scherer Comm	31000	0.00%	9,936.72	9,936.72
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Scherer Comm	31100	1.60%	524,872.97	524,872.97
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Scherer Comm	31200	1.60%	328,761.62	328,761.62
	02 - Steam Generation Plant arge Pipline Total	Scherer Comm	31400	1.00%	689.11 864,260.42	689.11 864,260.42
					•	,
	tormwater Discharge Elimination 02 - Steam Generation Plant	CapeCanaveral Comm	31100	1.70%	706,500.94	706,500.94
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U1	31200	1.80%	380,994.77	380,994,77
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U2	31200	1.50%	416,671.92	416,671.92
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	PtEverglades Comm	31100	2.70%	296,707.34	296,707.34
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Riviera Comm	31100	1.90%	560,786.81	560,786.8
	tormwater Discharge Elimination Total			_	2,361,661.78	2,361,661.78
l - St. Lucie Turti	e Nets					
	03 - Nuclear Generation Plant	StLucie Comm	32100	1.40% _	468,938.12	545,087.12
1 - St. Lucie Turti	e Nets Total				488,938.12	545,087.12
2 - Pipeline Integ					- -	4 000 000 0
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin Comm	31100	1.70% _	0.00	1,200,000.00 1,200,000.00
	rity Total					

Project Function SitsUst Account Depreciation Actual Balance Estimated Balance 120 1000 120							
23 - Spill Prevention Clean-Up & Countermeasurers 23 - Spill Prevention Clean-Up & Countermeasurers 23 - Spill Prevention Clean-Up & Countermeasurers 23 - Spill Prevention Part 25							
23 - Spill Prevalutor Clear Ly & Countermeasure CareClaraweral Corm 31100 170% 965,077.38 965,077	Project	Function	Site/Unit	Account			
23- Spill Prevellor Clean-U.p. & Countemmeasures 0.2 - Steam Generation Part 0.3 - Steam Generation Part 0.2 - Steam Generation Part 0.3 - Steam Generation Part 0.3 - Steam Generation Part 0.4 - Steam Generation Part 0.5 - Steam Generation Part 0.5 - Steam Generation Part 0.6 - Steam Generation Part 0.7 - Ste					1	12/31/08	12/31/2009
C2 - Steam Generation Plant	23 - Spill Prevent						<u> </u>
02 - Steam Generation Plant CapeCanaveral U1 3100 1,95% 13,450.30 30,444.00 30							665,907.33
C2 - Steam Generation Plant CapeCanaverell U							
22 - Steam Generation Plant Capic Canaverse U2 31100 13.0% 30,444.00 12,226.00			•				
22-Steam Generation Plant Culter Comm 31400 0.00% 12,238.00 13,386		02 - Steam Generation Plant	•				
22 - Steam Generation Plant Manateles Comm 31100 4.00% 711,583.43 711,583.43 62 - Steam Generation Plant Manateles Comm 31500 3.70% 5,000.00 5,000.00 6,000.00							
22 - Steam Generation Plant Manates Comm 31500 37.0% 5,000,00 10,955.00 10,9							
02 - Steam Generation Plant Manateb U1 31500 3.00% 10,035.00 10,035.00 10,035.00 10,035.00 10.03						•	
02 Steam Generation Plant Manutes U2 31500 3.0% 10.985.00 10.985.00 02 Steam Generation Plant Martin Comm 31100 1.70% 43.930.00 43.933.00 02 Steam Generation Plant Martin U1 31100 1.50% 182.607.50 182.50							·
02 - Sheam Generation Plant Muritin Corum 31100 1.70% 142,935.00 45,933.00 45,933.00 0 2.5 sheam Generation Plant Muritin UT 31100 1.00% 182,267.50 182,26		02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U2			•	
Q2 - Steam Generation Plant						45,303.00	
22 - Steam Generation Plant Pit-Verglades Comm 31100 2.70%, 1.885,476.00 1.885,476.00 32,500.00						•	·
02 - Sheam Generation Plant PiEverglades U3 31100 2.00% 32,500.00 32,500.00 32,500.00 02 - Sheam Generation Plant Rivers U3 31100 1.90% 206,914.03 206,014							·
02 - Sheam Generation Plant PiEverglades U4 31100 2.65% 32,500.00 32,500.00 2			_				
02 - Shasm Generation Plant Riviera Cum		02 - Steam Generation Plant	_				•
02 - Sleam Generation Plant						•	, .
02 - Slama Generation Plant Sanford U3 31100 4.00% 859,887.21 658,887.21 02 - Slama Generation Plant Sanford U3 31200 3.80% 211,727.2 211,727.20							
02 - Sham Generation Plant	•						
02 - Sleam Generation Plant Turkey Pt Comm Fall 31500 2 : 10% 13,559,000 12,500.00 02 - Sleam Generation Plant Turkey Pt U1 31100 2 : 10% 12,500.00 12,500.00 02 - Sleam Generation Plant Turkey Pt U2 31100 2 : 10% 12,500.00 12,500.00 03 - Nuclear Generation Plant Stucie U1 32,000 12,00% 40,454.00 40,454.00 40,454.00 03 - Nuclear Generation Plant Stucie U1 32,000 17,00% 437,645.30 1,006,457.32 03 - Nuclear Generation Plant Stucie U1 32,000 1,00% 437,645.30 1,006,457.32 03 - Nuclear Generation Plant Stucie U2 32,000 1,00% 437,645.30 1,006,457.33 05 - Clhar Generation Plant Full Stucie U2 32,000 1,00% 437,645.30 1,006,457.32 05 - Clhar Generation Plant Full Stucie U2 32,000 1,00% 437,645.30 1,006,457.32 05 - Clhar Generation Plant Full Stucie U2 32,000 1,00% 436,779.37 36,779.37						1	
02 - Steam Generation Plant		02 - Steam Generation Plant	Turkey Pt Comm Fsil				
03 - Nuclear Ceneration Plant SiLucie U1 32200 1.20% 494,540.02 404,540.02 03 - Nuclear Ceneration Plant SiLucie U1 32400 1.70% 437,945.38 1.058,487.39 03 - Nuclear Ceneration Plant SiLucie U2 32300 1.90% 398,779.37 398,779.37 05 - Other Generation Plant Amortizable 34670 7.70es. 7.065.10 7.0							12,500.00
03 - Nuclear Ceneration Plant SiLucie U1 32400 1,70% 437,945,38 1,056,487-38 0.5							
03 - Nudear Generation Plant							
05 - Other Generation Plant Amortizable 34670 7-Year 7.065.10 7.055.10							
05 - Other Generation Plant Fil.auderdale Comm 34200 4,40% 1,480,189.48 1,480,189.48 6.60 6.5 - Other Generation Plant Fil.auderdale Comm 34300 1,80% 28,250,00 28,2250.00 05 - Other Generation Plant Fil.auderdale GTs 34100 2,20% 82,250.01 22,728.74 02,728.74 05 - Other Generation Plant Fil.auderdale GTs 34100 2,10% 89,714.92 88,714.92 88,714.92 05 - Other Generation Plant Fil.Myers GTs 34100 2,10% 89,714.92 88,714.92 05 - Other Generation Plant FilMyers GTs 34200 5,00% 623,983.29 623,983.29 63,983		05 - Other Generation Plant	Amortizable				
05 - Chher Generation Plant Fil. auderdale Comm 34900 0 1, 90% 0 22, 250 0 0 28, 250 0 0 0 60 - Chher Generation Plant Fil. auderdale GTs 34200 4, 50% 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 13, 250 0 7 5 14, 300 1 2, 430 0 1 5 12, 430							
05 - Other Generation Plant							
05 - Other Generation Plant Fil.auderdale GTs 34200 4.50% 513,250.07 513,250.07 63,749.2 05 - Other Generation Plant FilMyers GTs 34200 5.00% 629,983.20 629,983.20 05 - Other Generation Plant FilMyers GTs 34500 2.90% 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant FilMyers GTs 34500 2.90% 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant FilMyers GTs 34500 4.80% 12,430.00 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant FilMyers U3 CC 34500 4.80% 12,430.00 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant Martin Comm 34100 3.40% 61,215.95 61,215.95 05 - Other Generation Plant Martin U8 34300 5.50% 74,555.00 74							
05 - Other Generation Plant FIMyers GTs 34100 2.10% 98,714.92 98,714.92 05 - Other Generation Plant FIMyers GTs 34200 2.90% 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant FIMyers GTs 34500 2.90% 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant FIMyers U2 CC 34300 4.80% 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant FIMyers U3 CC 34500 4.80% 12,430.00 12,430.00 12,430.00 05 - Other Generation Plant FIMyers U3 CC 34500 4.80% 12,430.00 12,430.00 12,430.00 12,430.00 15 - Other Generation Plant Martin Cormm 34100 3.40% 51,215.95 51,215.95 51,215.95 50 - Other Generation Plant Pleverglades GTs 34100 1.50% 454,080.86 454,080.86 454,080.86 65 - Other Generation Plant Pleverglades GTs 34100 1.50% 454,080.86 454,080.86 65 - Other Generation Plant Plumar Cormm 34100 4.10% 148,511.20 1							
05 - Other Generation Plant							·
05 - Other Generation Plant							
05 - Other Generation Plant			•			•	
05 - Other Generation Plant Martin Comm 34100 3,40% 61,215,95 61,215,95 05 - Other Generation Plant Martin UB 34300 5,50% 74,555,00 74,555,00 74,555,00 05 - Other Generation Plant PIEverglades GTs 34100 1,55% 454,080,88 454,080,88 05 - Other Generation Plant PIEverglades GTs 34200 5,10% 1,703,810,61 1,703,810,61 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,910,91 1,703,91 1,7							
Discrimination Disc						•	·
O5 - Other Generation Plant PtEverglades GTs 34200 5,10% 1,703,810,61 1,703,810,61 1,703,810,61 05 - Other Generation Plant Putnam Comm 34200 3,70% 1,713,191,94 1,713,191,94 05 - Other Generation Plant Putnam Comm 34200 3,70% 1,713,191,94 1,713,191,94 05 - Other Generation Plant Putnam Comm 34500 4,20% 60,746,93 60							
O5 - Other Generation Plant						•	
05 - Other Generation Plant Putnam Comm 34200 3,70% 1,713,191.94 1,713,191.94 05 - Other Generation Plant Putnam Comm 34500 4,20% 60,746.93							
Second Part Putnam Comm 34500 4,20% 60,746.93 60,746							
177,981.88 177,981.88 177,981.88 177,981.88 07 - Distribution Plant - Electric 36100 2.60% 2.60% 2.862,093.44 2,937,093.44 2,937,093.44 2,937,093.44 2,937,093.44 2,937,093.44 2,937,093.44 2,937,093.45 2,243.35 12,843.35		05 - Other Generation Plant	Putnam Comm				
O7 - Distribution Plant - Electric 08 - General Plant 09 - General O9 - Genera							
08 - General Plant 3900 2.70% 12,843.35 12,843.35 23 - Spill Prevention Clean-Up & Countermeasures Total 19,503,627.52 20,222,169.52							·
23 - Spill Prevention Clean-Up & Countermeasures Total 19,503,627.52 20,222,169.52							
24 - Manatee Reburn 02 - Steam Generation Plant Manatee U1 31200 4.80% 16,771,308.37 16,771,308.37 02 - Steam Generation Plant Manatee U2 31200 4.00% 16,091,259.94 16,091,259.94 24 - Manatee Reburn Total 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 25 - PPE ESP Technology 25 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31100 2.60% 298,709.93 307,709.93 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31500 6.70% 10,404,603.15 10,492,103.15 10,292,103.15	23 - Spill Preventi			•			
O2 - Steam Generation Plant O3 - O4 - O5 O4 - O5 O5 - O5 -							. ·
O2 - Steam Generation Plant Manatee U2 31200 4.00% 16,091,259.94 10,091,259.94 24 - Manatee Reburn Total 32,862,568.31 32,86	24 - Manatee Reb		Manager I M	04555	4 8004	40 774 000 07	46 554 664 65
24 - Manatee Reburn Total 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 32,862,568.31 25 - PPE ESP Technology 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31100 2.60% 10,402,603,15 10,492,103,15 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1.00% 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30 307,032,30							
25 - PPE ESP Technology 02 - Steam Generation Plant 03 - Steam Generation Plant 04 - Steam Generation Plant 05 - Steam Generation Plant 06 - Steam Generation Plant 07 - Steam Generation Plant 08 - Steam Generation Plant 09 - Steam Generation Plant 00 -	24 - Manatee Reb		manacos UZ	31200	50 /a _		
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31100 2.60% 298,709.93 307,709.93 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31200 6.70% 10,404,603.15 10,492,103.15 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31500 2.00% 2,500,248.85 2,500,248.85 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31600 1.00% 307,032.30 307,032.30 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31100 2.60% 184,084.01 193,084.01 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31200 6.10% 11,978,735.29 12,151,519.28 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31500 2.10% 3,954,581.63 3,954,581.63 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1.70% 324,086.94 324,086.94 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2.60% 4,855,902.04 4,867,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4,00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02						, ,	• •
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31200 6.70% 10,494,603.15 10,492,103.15 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31500 2.00% 2,500,248.85 2,500,248.85 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31600 1.00% 307,032.30 307,032.30 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31100 2.60% 184,084.01 193,084.01 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31200 6.10% 11,979,735.29 12,151,519.29 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31500 2.10% 3,954,581.63 3,954,581.63 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1.70% 324,086.94 324,086.94 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2.60% 4,858,902.04 4,867,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4,00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 <td< td=""><td>25 - PPE ESP Tec</td><td></td><td>S.E. 1.1.111</td><td></td><td>n nn**</td><td>ACA TOO 5</td><td>A</td></td<>	25 - PPE ESP Tec		S.E. 1.1.111		n nn**	ACA TOO 5	A
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31500 2.00% 2,500,248.85 2,500,248.85 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31600 1.00% 307,032.30 307,032.30 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31100 2.60% 184,084.01 193,084.01 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31200 6.10% 11,979,735.29 12,151,519.29 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31500 2.10% 3,954,581.63 3,954,581.63 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1,70% 324,086.94 324,086.94 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2,60% 4,858,902.04 4,867,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4,00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2,20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2,60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Ge							
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U1 31600 1.00% 307,032.30 307,032.30 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31100 2.60% 184,084.01 193,084.01 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31200 6.10% 11,979,735.29 12,151,912.92 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31500 2.10% 3,954,581.63 3,954,581.63 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1.70% 324,086.94 324,086.94 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2.60% 4,858,902.04 4,867,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4,00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2.60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3,60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam							
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31100 2.50% 184,084.01 193,084.01 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31200 6.10% 11,979,735.29 12,151,519.28 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31500 2.10% 3,954,581.63 3,954,581.63 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1.70% 324,086.94 324,086.94 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2.60% 4,858,902.04 4,857,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4.00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2.60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3,60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3,60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 -							-,
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31500 2.10% 3,954,581.63 3,954,581.63 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1.70% 324,086.94 324,086.94 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2.60% 4,855,902.04 4,867,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4.00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2.60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3,60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31500 2,10% 2,882,565.18 2,882,565.18				31100	2.60%	184,084.01	193,084.01
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U2 31600 1.70% 324,086.94 324,086.94 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2.60% 4,858,902.04 4,867,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4,00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2.60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3,60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31500 2.10% 2,882,565.18 2,882,565.18							
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31100 2.50% 4,858,902.04 4,867,902.04 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4,00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2.60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3,60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31500 2.10% 2,882,565.18 2,882,565.18							
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31200 4.00% 16,194,431.96 16,361,931.96 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2.60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3.60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31500 2.10% 2,882,565.18 2,882,565.18	•						· ·
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U3 31500 2.20% 2,427,316.36 2,427,316.36 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31100 2.60% 0.00 9,000.00 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3.60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31500 2.10% 2,882,565.18 2,882,565.18						. ,	
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31200 3.60% 25,123,410.25 25,210,910.25 02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31500 2.10% 2,882,565.18 2,882,565.18			PtEverglades U3	31500	2.20%	2,427,316.36	2,427,316.38
02 - Steam Generation Plant PtEverglades U4 31500 2.10% <u>2,882,585.18</u> 2,882,565.18							
	25 - PPE ESP Tec			3.000			

Project	Function	Site/Unit	Account	Depreciation Rate / Amortization Period	Actual Balance 12/31/08	Estimated Balance 12/31/2009
26 - UST Remove/	/Replace			•		
	08 - General Plant		39000	2.70%	492,916,42	492,916.42
26 - UST Remove	Replace Total				492,916.42	492,916.42
11 - Ciean Air inte	erstate Rule (CAIR)					
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U1	31400	3.70%	275,727,81	275,727,81
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U2	31200	4.00%	0.00	19,618,970,10
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Manatee U2	31400	3.00%	0.00	8,482,193,14
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U1	31200	1.80%	11,784,716,57	11,784,716.57
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U1	31400	1.30%	8,864,406,30	8,964,406,30
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U2	31200	1.50%	0.00	18,516,096.73
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin U2	31400	0.80%	0.00	8,280,537,95
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	SJRPP U1	31200	2.20%	4,189,46	27,502,817.42
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	SJRPP U2	31200	2.30%	25,797,452.64	25,797,452.64
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtLauderdale GTs	34300	2.20%	110,241,49	110.241.49
	05 - Other Generation Plant	FtMvers GTs	34300	3,10%	57,855.15	57,855,15
	05 - Other Generation Plant	PtEverglades GTs	34300	2.60%	107,874.32	107,874,32
1 - Clean Air Inte	rstate Rule (CAIR) Total	r teverglades GTs	34300	2.00%	47,002,463.74	129,498,889.62
4 - St Lucie Cool	ing Water System Inspect. & Mainte					
	03 - Nuclear Generation Plant	StLucie Comm	32100	1.40% _	0.00	3,750,000.00
4 - St Lucie Cool	ing Water System Inspect. & Mainte	enance lotal			0.00	3,750,000.00
5 - Martin Drinkir	ng Water System					
	02 - Steam Generation Plant	Martin Comm	31100	1.70%	220,000.00	220,000.00
5 - Martin Drinkir	ng Water System Total				220,000.00	220,000.00
6 - Low Level Wa	este Storage					
	03 - Nuclear Generation Plant	StLucie Comm	32100	1.40%	0.00	3,807,997.00
	03 - Nuclear Generation Plant	TurkeyPt Comm	32100	1.10%	0.00	1,480,007.00
6 - Low Level Wa	ste Storage Total	·			0.00	5,288,004.00
7 - DeSoto Solar	Energy Center					
	05 - Other Generation Plant	DeSoto Solar Energy Center	34300	3.33%	0.00	172,258,588.00
7 - DeSoto Solar	Energy Center Total			_	0.00	172,258,588.00
B - Snacecoast S	iolar Energy Center					
	01 - Intangible Plant	Kennedy Space Center	30300	30-Year	0.00	6,359,026,00
8 - Spacecoast S	iolar Energy Center Total	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	*****		0.00	6,359,026.00
				-	200 470 040 47	ran 200 Fra 55
Grand Total					229,473,813.17	502,328,556.55

Project Title: Air Operating Permit Fees - O & M

Project No. 1

Project Description:

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101-549, and Florida Statutes 403.0872, require each major source of air pollution to pay an annual license fee. The amount of the fee is based on each source's previous year's emissions. It is calculated by multiplying the applicable annual operation license fee factor (\$25 per ton for both Florida and Georgia) by the tons of each air pollutant emitted by the unit during the previous year and regulated in each unit's air operating permit, up to a total of 4,000 tons per pollutant. The major regulated pollutants at the present time are sulfur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter. The fee covers units in FPL's service area, as well as Unit 4 of Plant Scherer located in Juliette, Georgia, within the Georgia Power Company service area. Scherer Unit 4's annual air operating permit fee is approximately \$100,000. FPL's share of ownership of that unit is 76.36%. The fees for FPL's units are paid to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) generally in February of each year, whereas FPL pays its share of the fees for Scherer Unit 4 to Georgia Power Company on a monthly basis.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The monthly fees for 2007 emissions at Scherer have been paid and continue to be paid in 2008. 2007 air operating permit fees for the Florida facilities were calculated in January 2008 utilizing 2007 operating information. They were paid to the FDEP in February, 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$324,282 (16.5%) lower than originally projected. This variance is primarily due to higher usage of natural gas as a fuel across the FPL fleet due to the higher costs of residual oil. Permit fees are based on emissions, which are proportionate to the type of fuel used at each Florida facility. Utilizing natural gas in lieu of residual oil significantly reduces SO2, Particulate Matter (PM) and NOx emissions.

Project Progress Summary:

The monthly fees for 2007 emissions at Scherer have been paid and continue to be paid in 2008. 2007 air operating permit fees for the Florida facilities were calculated in January 2008 utilizing 2007 operating information. They were paid to the FDEP in February 2008.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$1,958,100.

Project Title: Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems (CEMS) - O & M

Project No. 3a

Project Description:

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101-549, established requirements for the monitoring, record keeping, and reporting of SO2, NOx, CO, Carbon Dioxide (CO2/O2) emissions, as well as opacity data from affected air pollution sources. FPL has 57 units which are affected and which have installed CEMS to comply with these requirements.

40 CFR Part 75 includes the general requirements for the installation, certification, operation and maintenance of CEMS and specific requirements for the monitoring of pollutants and opacity. These Systems continuously extract and analyze gaseous samples for each power plant stack and have automated data acquisition and reporting capability. Operation and maintenance of these systems in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR Part 75 is an ongoing activity which follow the Title IV CEMS Quality Assurance Program Manual.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to June 1, 2008)

Relative Accuracy Tests and Linearity Tests continue to be performed as scheduled. QA/QC maintenance continues to be performed on the analyzers per the requirements of the Title IV CEM Quality Assurance Program Manual. Calibration span gases and CEMS required parts continue to be purchased. In addition, analysis of fuel oil for sulfur content, heat of combustion and carbon continues to be performed per the requirements of 40 CFR Part 75, Appendix D. CEMS 24/7 Software Support contract with General Electric (CEMS NETDAHS) continues to be maintained to ensure integrity of the CEMS Systems and to ensure compliance with EPA and State Agencies. Additionally said software has been upgraded to comply with the new EPA reporting requirements.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$205,903 (27.4%) higher than originally projected. The increased estimate was due largely to the additional cost of the CEMS software upgrade. This upgrade was needed to meet the EPA's mandate of reporting in XML format starting 1/1/2009. Additionally the higher cost of replacement parts for the new model analyzers installed at the end of 2007 and in the first half of 2008 is reflected.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

This is an ongoing project. Each reporting period will include the cost of quality assurance activities, training, spare parts, calibration gas, and software support.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$999,894.

Project Title: Maintenance of Stationary Above Ground Fuel Storage Tanks - O&M

Project No. 5a

Project Description:

Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) Chapter 62-761, previously 17-762, which became effective on March 12, 1991, provides standards for the maintenance of stationary above ground fuel storage tank systems. These standards impose various implementation schedules for inspections/repairs and upgrades to fuel storage tanks.

PMT Tanks 1371/A (with the capacity 500,000 BBLS), TPE Tank 808 (capacity 200,000 BBLS), PFL Light Oil Tank #5 (capacity 80,000 BBLS) and TPE Light oil Tank # 901 are due for API in-service inspections. All inspections except TPE tank 901 were performed by TEAM in April, 2008. No discrepancies were reported and all fuel storage tanks appear to be suitable for continued services. The next due dates for external inspection was determined by API certified inspector after 5 years. TPE Tank 901 is due in July, 2008.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Work continued on miscellaneous maintenance of above ground fuel storage tanks and piping systems. All required API 653 external inspections & API 570 will be completed for this year and all 2008 tank registration fees have been paid.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$836,100 (123.5%) higher than originally projected. The following project activities were identified after the filing of the original estimates for 2008:

- 1) Turkey Point Unit 1 Metering Tank Roof Replacement and Bottom Plate Projection Repairs project. The cross-tie valve between the two units' metering tanks was not functional and replacement and repairs took longer than expected to complete.
- 2) External coating of Port Everglades Terminal above grade piping. The scope of this activity was increased due to additional piping and the move from epoxy coating to silicon coating which has a longer life.
- 3) Performing API 570 inspections on bulk light oil piping at Ft. Lauderdale and Port Everglades power plants.
- 4) Martin Plant Units 1 &2 Metering Tanks painting.
- 5) Port Everglades Terminal Tank 805 API out-of- service inspection.
- 6) Painting of Fort Myers Plant Units 1&2 Tanks. The initial plan was to paint entire roof of tank No.1 and touchup the roof of Tank No.2. The entire roofs of both tanks were painted.
- 7) Fort Myers Plant Tank No. 2 visual and settlement survey. Due to a leak discovered on one of the leak detection ports, a visual and settlement survey was implemented on the tank.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

This is an ongoing project. Each reporting period will include ongoing maintenance of above ground fuel storage tanks in accordance with F.A.C. Chapter 62-761. We have replaced the roof of PCC 1& PTF 1 Metering Tanks which were out of compliance due to the holes in the roof and for this purpose we had to evacuate, clean, and gas free the tank in order to be able to perform hot work on the roof of the tank. Decision was made to conduct the API 653 internal inspection and tank strapping at the same time so we don't need to take the tank out of service a few years later, and clean and gas freeing it just because of API internal inspection. Both projects have been successfully completed, PCC on March, and PTF on May, 2008. TPE tank 805 was due for API out-of-service inspection in April, 2008. The tank was taken out from service, evacuated, cleaned and gas freed for this inspection. There are some code required repairs which is in progress.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$1,067,572.

Project Title: Oil Spill Cleanup/Response Equipment - O&M

Project No. 8a

Project Description:

The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA '90) mandates that all liable parties in the petroleum handling industry file plans by August 18, 1993. In these plans, a liable party must identify (among other items) its spill management team, organization, resources and training. Within this project, FPL developed the plans for ten power plants, five fuel oil terminals, three pipelines, and one corporate plan. Additionally, FPL purchased the mandated response resources and provided for mobilization to a worst case discharge at each site.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Plan updates have continued to be performed and filed for all sites as required. The Corporate Oil Spill Response Plan has been updated to include the new NIMS ICS requirements. Routine maintenance of all oil spill equipment has continued throughout the year as well as the performance of spill management drills including a corporate team drill and deployment drills throughout the system. There has also been training for some new team members. Finally, a boat lift was installed at the Riviera Plant to allow for quicker deployment time. During the third and fourth quarters boat lifts will also be installed at the Turkey Point and Cape Canaveral sites.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) The variance is expected to be \$456, or -0.2%.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

This is an ongoing project. Each reporting period will include ongoing maintenance of all oil spill equipment in accordance with OPA 90. Additionally, following a formal assessment of the oil spill program, FPL retained a contractor to perform the mandated OSRO (oil spill removal organization) function. This contractor will also perform maintenance (required) on the oil spill equipment at all of the power plants as well as perform an annual (required) equipment deployment drill at these facilities. We will be installing boat lifts at Cape Canaveral and Turkey Point Plants during the third and fourth quarter.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$241,800. In addition to the ongoing operation described in the 2008 summary, FPL has 1) retained a spill management company to assist in corporate-level responses, 2) improved/enhanced the Fleet's ability to mobilize spill equipment (specifically boats), and 3) continue to certify all oil spill response members in the NIMS mandated incident Command System (ICS).

Project Title: RCRA Corrective Action - O & M

Project No. 13

Project Description:

Under the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984 (amending the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, or RCRA), the U.S. EPA has the authority to require hazardous waste treatment facilities to investigate whether there have been releases of hazardous waste or constituents from non-regulated units on the facility site. If contamination is found to be present at levels that represent a threat to human health or the environment, the facility operator can be required to undertake "corrective action" to remediate the contamination. In April 1994, the U.S. EPA advised FPL that it intended to initiate RCRA Facility Assessments (RFAs) at FPL's nine former hazardous waste treatment facility sites. The RFA is the first step in the RCRA Corrective Action process. At a minimum, FPL will be responding to the agency's requests for information concerning the operation of these power plants, their waste streams, their former hazardous waste treatment facilities, and their non-regulated Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs). FPL may also conduct assessments of human health risks resulting from possible releases from the SWMU's in order to demonstrate that any residual contamination does not represent an undue threat to human health or the environment. Other response actions could include a voluntary clean-up or compliance with the agency's imposition of the full gamut of RCRA Corrective Action requirements, including RCRA Facility Investigation, Corrective Measures Study, and Corrective Measures Implementation.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

EPA and the FDEP have agreed that no further action is required at the Fort Myers, Cape Canaveral, and Martin Power Plants. EPA and the FDEP agree that no further action is required at the Putnam Power Plant, except for the petroleum clean-up that is going forward under the FDEP District Office waste clean-up oversight. The EPA withdrew the 2007 order. In January, 2005, FPL entered into a bilateral Agreement with the FDEP to complete the assessments at the Sanford, Manatee, Saint Lucie, and Turkey Point Plants. During 2005, FPL prepared documents for the Sanford Plant that were submitted to the FDEP. In March 2007, a draft Facility Evaluation Report was received and reviewed by FPL. The draft report was returned to FDEP and a final report was received in the second quarter of 2007, awarding No Further Action for the Sanford Power Plant. Document preparation for the Manatee Plant was completed during third quarter 2007 and submitted to FDEP. A Facility Evaluation took place in the third quarter of 2007 and the site received the final report from the Department granting No Further Action. Site preparation activities were completed at Turkey Point Plant during the third & fourth quarter of 2007. A Facility Evaluation took place in the fourth quarter of 2007 and the site received the draft report from the Department granting No Further Action. The final report from the Department for the Turkey Point Plant is expected to be received shortly.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$57,022 (46.7%) lower than originally projected. Estimates were included in 2008 for further action that might be required by FDEP at Turkey Point or Manatee Plant after 2007. However, FPL completed all work associated with RCRA at the Manatee and Turkey Point Fossil sites in 2007. The FDEP has granted final "No Further Action" for the Manatee Plant. The FDEP is finalizing the draft report approved by FPL for the Turkey Point Plant. This draft report recommended No Further Action for the site.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The Power Generation Division completed all work associated with RCRA at the Manatee and Turkey Point Fossil sites in 2007. The FDEP has granted final No Further Action for the Manatee Plant. The FDEP is finalizing the draft report approved by FPL for the Turkey Point Plant. This draft report recommended No Further Action for the site. No additional work was recommended by the Department in order to reach a No Further Action agreement. No other activities are scheduled for 2008. The final report from the Department granting No Further Action for the Turkey Point Plant is expected to be received shortly.

Project Projection:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009) Projections for 2009 are \$50,000.

Project Title: NPDES Permit Fees - O & M

Project No. 14

Project Description:

In compliance with State of Florida Rule 62-4.052, FPL is required to pay annual regulatory program and surveillance fees for any permits it requires to discharge wastewater to surface waters under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System. These fees effect the Florida legislature's intent that the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's (FDEP) costs for administering the NPDES program be borne by the regulated parties, as applicable. The fees for each permit type are as set forth in the rule, with an effective date of May 1, 1995, for their implementation.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The NPDES permit fees were paid to FDEP for Power Generation Operating Plants.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in project expenditures is estimated to be \$30,505 less than (19.7% lower) the original estimate. This reflects inadvertently budgeting the permit renewal application fees as ECRC expenditures. Permit renewal application fees are not classified as ECRC recoverable and thus have been removed from the ECRC true-up calculation.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The NPDES annual regulatory program and surveillance fees were paid to FDEP for Power Generation Operating Plants.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project expenditures for the annual regulatory program and surveillance fees for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$124,900. The regulatory program and surveillance fees will be due in January, 2009.

Project Title: Disposal of Noncontainerized Liquid Waste - O&M

Project 17a

Project Description:

FPL manages ash from heavy oil fired power plants using a wet ash system. Ash from the dust collector and economizer is sluiced to surface ash basins. The ash sludge is then pH adjusted to precipitate metals. In order to comply with Florida Administrative Code 62-701.300 (10), the ash is then de-watered using a plate/frame filter-press in order to dispose of it in a Class I landfill or ship by railcar to a processing facility for beneficial reuse.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Ash work is complete at Manatee, and Turkey Point. Port Everglades will be complete in July. Remaining on the schedule for 2008 are Cape Canaveral, Sanford and Martin. Approximately \$25,000 will be spent on Maintenance Costs to replace worn hoses, filter cloths and a pump.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$32,803 (11.0%) higher than originally projected. The variance is primarily due to greater than anticipated ash accumulation in the storage basins at the Turkey Point site. As a result of the increase in ash material to be handled for removal, the site incurred extra expenses due to the use of additional moving equipment to support the job. Also, the time associated with the contractor completing the job contributed to the increases in manpower hours.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

This is an ongoing project. The frequency of basin clean out is a function of basin capacity and rate of sludge/ash generation. Typically, FPL generates 5,000 tons (@ 50% solids) of sludge per year.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are now estimated at \$323,000.

Project Title: Substation Pollutant Discharge Prevention & Removal - O&M

Project No. 19a, 19b, 19c

Project Description:

Florida Statute Chapter 376 Pollutant Discharge Prevention and Removal requires that any person discharging a pollutant, defined as any commodity made from oil or gas, shall immediately undertake to contain, remove and abate the discharge to the satisfaction of the department. Florida Statute Chapter 403 holds it is prohibited to cause pollution so as to harm or injure human health or welfare, animal, plant, or aquatic life or property. This project includes the prevention and removal of pollutant discharges at FPL substations and will prevent further environmental degradation. Additionally, remediation activities will be conducted in Dade and Broward counties which adhere to county regulations as defined in municipal codes.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

We have repaired leaks and/or regasketed 37 distribution transformers and 6 transmission transformers using 3 vendors. However, obtaining equipment clearances to make the necessary repairs has slowed this work down a bit. It is anticipated that this work will increase toward the end of the year once the cooler weather arrives and equipment clearances can be more easily obtained. In addition, we have also conducted minor oil spill clean-ups as a result of equipment leaks at 31 units. There is no equipment encapsulation work scheduled from this year. However, encapsulation work will continue for the remaining units in 2009. Environmental remediation work continues in Miami-Dade County at 7 substations due to various degrees of lead and arsenic contamination.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be:

- > 19a The variance in project expenditures is estimated to be \$665,806 or 68.8% higher than projected. Three vendors are being used to conduct equipment leak repairs, as opposed to the previous use of only one vendor; therefore, significantly more repairs are expected to be completed this year.
- > 19b The variance in project expenditures is estimated to be \$14,110 or 4.0% lower than projected.
- > 19c No variance is anticipated.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The equipment leak repair and regasketing work continues. We are in the progress of developing a complex data base to provide greater efficiency in managing this work. We are currently using 3 leak repair vendors to provide faster leak repairs. However, obtaining equipment clearances during the summer peak season has slowed this work down a bit. But it is anticipated that this work will increase during the fall once cooler weather arrives. The arsenic in soils and groundwater is being addressed at 7 substation locations in Miami-Dade County. The closure of 2 of the substations is anticipated in 2009.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be:

- > 19a \$2,693,288
- ➤ 19b 728,712
- > 19c (\$560,232)

Project Title: Wastewater/Stormwater Discharge Elimination & Reuse - O&M

Project No. 20

Project Description:

Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. Section 1342 and 40 CFR 122, FPL is required to obtain NPDES permits for each power plant facility. The last permits issued contain requirements to develop and implement a Best Management Practice Pollution Prevention Plan (BMP3 Plan) to minimize or eliminate, whenever feasible, the discharge of regulated pollutants, including fuel oil and ash, to surface waters. In addition, the 1997 Federal Ambient Water Quality Criteria requires FPL to meet surface water standards for any wastewater discharges to groundwater at all plants, and the Dade County DERM requires Turkey Point and Cutler Plant wastewater discharges into canals to meet county water quality standards found in Section 24-11, Code of Metropolitan Dade County.

In order to address these requirements, FPL has undertaken a multifaceted project which includes activities such as ash basin lining, installation of retention tanks, tank coating, sump construction, installation of pumps, motor, and piping, boiler blowdown recovery, site preparation, separation of stormwater and ashwater systems, separation of potable and service water systems, and the associated engineering and design work to implement these projects.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)
The project is on hold due to the Pt. Everglades ESP Project.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) Project expenditures are estimated to be \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)
The project is on hold due to the Pt. Everglades ESP Project.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$0.

Project Title:

St. Lucie Turtle Net - O&M

Project No. 21

Project Description:

The Turtle Net project says that FPL is limited in the number of lethal turtle takings permitted at its St. Lucie Power Plant by the Incidental Take Statement contained in the Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion, issued to FPL on May 4, 2001 by the National Marine Fisheries Service ("NMFS"). The number of lethal takings permitted in a given year is calculated by taking one percent of the total number of loggerhead and green turtles captured in that year. (The Incidental Take Statement separately limits the number of lethal takings of Kemp's Ridley turtles to two per year over the next ten years, and the number of lethal takings of either hawksbill or leatherback turtles to one of those species every two years over the next ten years). Based on the number of captured turtles in 2001, the lethal take limit for loggerhead and green turtles in that year was six (references; Nuclear Regulatory Commission letter dated May 18, 2001 included as Exhibit 1, Document No. 1, Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion Incidental Take Statement dated May 4, 2001 included as Exhibit 1, Document No. 2, Appendix B To Facility Operating License No. NPF-16 St. Lucie Unit 2, Environmental Protection Plan, Non-Radiological, Amendment No. 103 included as Exhibit 1, Document No. 3). In 2001, FPL experienced six lethal takings of loggerhead and green turtles at the St. Lucie Power Plant, indicating that its existing measures to limit such takings were performing marginally.

The existing net is in need of maintenance. To facilitate this work, a temporary net will be situated to allow removal of the existing net. The new net having been properly coated for UV protection and anti-fouling will be installed replacing the existing net. The existing net will be repaired and maintained as a spare to allow rotation of the nets for future maintenance.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The original estimate was related to the cost to re-coat the net once removed. When the net was being removed, a significant amount of sea grass was found to be tangled in the net which needed to be removed and required the net to be cut. The cost to repair the net as well as re-coat it is greater than the cost to purchase a new net; therefore a new net will be purchased. The cost of the new net is considered a capital expenditure, whereas the re-coating would have been an O&M expense.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 – December 31, 2008) Project expenditures are estimated to be \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The existing turtle net will be removed to be recoated and the new net will be installed in the interim. The new net will serve as a backup.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are \$0.

Project Title: Pipeline Integrity Management (PIM) - O&M

Project No. 22

Project Description:

FPL is required to develop a written pipeline integrity management program for its hazardous liquid / gas pipelines. This program must include the following elements: (1) a process for identifying which pipeline segments could affect a high consequence area; (2) a baseline assessment plan; (3) an information analysis that integrates all available information about the integrity of the entire pipeline and the consequences of a failure; (4) the criteria for determining remedial actions to address integrity issues raised by the assessments and information analysis; (5) a continual process of assessment and evaluation of pipeline integrity; (6) the identification of preventive and mitigative measures to protect the high consequence area; (7) the methods to measure the program's effectiveness; (8) a process for review of assessment results and information analysis by a person qualified to evaluate the results and information; and, (9) record keeping.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The baseline assessments were undertaken for the corporate hazardous liquid / gas pipelines and associated evaluations has been completed. One additional dig on Martin 30" pipeline has been conducted by Southern Cathodic Protection Company earlier this year and another one is planned for later this year. Martin Terminal 18" pipeline is scheduled for smart pig this year to determine the corrosion rate by comparing the tool's data to previous run dated 2003 for future appropriate countermeasures.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$154,465 (59.4%) higher than originally projected. The following additional project activities were identified after the original 2008 projections were filed:

- 1) An area with insufficient cover was identified along the Martin Terminal 30" pipeline with the length of 270 feet, which needs to be addressed to stay in compliance with DOT regulations.
- 2) One dig was performed on January 31, 2008 on the Martin Terminal 30" pipeline and another dig is scheduled for later this year after the peak season.
- 3) Corroded pipe-shoes on the Martin Terminal 30" above grade DOT piping were replaced. Thirty pipe-shoes were ordered to install, saddle and replace bad pipe-shoes.
- 4) The 2" supply and return lines to the Martin Terminal boilers were corroded badly and multiple holes were identified. Since the boilers are running with mineral oil and not with bunker C, a decision was made to remove the lines instead of replacing / repairing them.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

This is an ongoing project. Martin 18" dual (gas/oil) pipeline is due for in-line-inspection in December this year. Two assessment and evaluation digs, will be conducted following the in-line inspection (smart pig) as required. (As a DOT requirement after each in-line-inspection – smart pig – the data regarding the anomalies, dents, need to be validated by performing two, three and maybe even more as necessary confirmatory digs and conducting the direct assessment and inspection on the location of the detected anomalies). UTMs and magnetic particle testing is a part of these direct assessment. Since the inspection on Martin 18" pipeline will be implemented late November this year, the DOT confirmatory digs will be conducted in 2009.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$40,000.

Project Title: SPCC (Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures) - O&M

Project No. 23

Project Description:

The EPA first established the SPCC Program in 1973 when the agency issued the Oil Pollution Prevention Regulation (i.e., SPCC rule) to address the oil spill prevention provisions contained in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 (later amended as the Clean Water Act). The purpose of the regulation was to prevent discharges of oil from reaching the navigable waters of the U.S. or adjoining shorelines and to prepare facility personnel to respond to oil spills. The SPCC regulation requires certain facilities to prepare and implement SPCC Plans and address oil spill prevention requirements including the establishment of procedures, methods, equipment, and other requirements to prevent discharges of oil as described above. Specifically, the rule applies to any owner or operator of a non-transportation related facility that:

- has a combined aboveground oil storage capacity of more than 1320 gallons, or a total underground oil storage capacity exceeding 42,000 gallons (Note: the underground storage capacity does not apply to those tanks subject to all of the technical requirements of the federal underground storage tank rule found in 40 CFR 280 or a State approved program); and
- which due to its location, could be reasonably expected to discharge oil in quantities that may be harmful into or upon
 the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines.

In January 1988, a large storage tank owned by Ashland Oil Company at a site in western Pennsylvania collapsed, releasing approximately 750,000 gallons of diesel fuel to the Monongahela River. Following calls for new tank legislation, an EPA task force recommended expanded regulation of aboveground tanks within the framework of existing legislative authority. The result was EPA's SPCC rulemaking package, the first phase of which was proposed in 1991. Due to a series of agency delays primarily resulting from the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill that required EPA to issue the Facility Response Plan rule under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the final SPCC Rule was not published until July of 2002.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

As of January 1, 2008, the responsibility of managing the SPCC plans for all substations has been transferred from the Distribution Environmental Group to the Transmission Environmental Group. The revisions to approximately 625 SPCC plans are currently being conducted, and the plans are being rechecked for accuracy. Due to the transition of responsibilities, there were no oil diversionary structures installed at any substation from January to August, and none are expected to be installed for the remaining of 2008. However, diversionary structures are scheduled to be installed at certain substations in 2009. In addition, SPCC-required quarterly inspections of all substations are being performed.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$367,325 (94.9%) higher than originally projected, primarily due to expenditures for additional required facility upgrades that were identified during development of the SPCC plans. The additional upgrades include nitrogen blanketing systems for corrosion protection of double wall piping at Cape Canaveral, Putnam and Lauderdale Plants. These upgrades were not anticipated at the time FPL filed its original projections for 2008. In addition, work for new secondary containment for a transformer at Port Everglades was switched from Capital to O&M.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Due to the large amount of quarterly substation inspections reports that are being generated, we are in the process of developing a complex data base to manage all the inspection information. This will provide us better efficiencies in managing this data. This data will link up with the data base currently being developed for the equipment leak repair program.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$688,000, which includes required updates to the Facility Response Plans.

Project Title: Manatee Reburn - O&M

Project No. 24

Project Description:

This project involves installation of reburn technology in Manatee Units 1 and 2. Reburn is an advanced nitrogen oxides (NOx) control technology that has been developed for, and applied successfully in, commercial applications to utility and large industrial boilers. The process is a proven advanced technology, with applications of a reburn-like flue gas incineration technique dating back to the late 1960s, and developments for applications to large coal fired power plants in the United States dating back to the early to mid 1980s.

Reburn is an in-furnace NOx control technology that employs fuel staging in a configuration where a portion of the fuel is injected downstream of the main combustion zone to create a second combustion zone, called the reburning zone. The reburning zone is operated under conditions where NOx from the main combustion zone is converted to elemental nitrogen (which makes up 79% of the atmosphere). The basic front wall-fired boiler reburning process divides the furnace into three zones.

In the 1996-97 time period, FPL invested a considerable effort evaluating the Manatee Units for the application of reburn technology. FPL has recently reviewed the reburn system designs previously proposed for the Manatee units, and concluded that a design for either oil or gas reburn would require very similar characteristics. This will require reburn fuel injectors to be located at the elevation of the present top row of burners, with reburn injectors on the boiler front and rear walls. For the present application the injectors will be required to have a dual fuel (oil and gas) capability. In order to provide adequate residence time for the reburn process, it is proposed to locate the reburn overfire air (OFA) ports between the boiler wing walls and to angle them slightly to provide better mixing with the boiler flow. Because of the complexity of the boiler flow field and the port location, it was determined that OFA booster fans would be required to assist the air-fuel mixing and complete the burnout process. Installation of reburn technology for Manatee Units 1 and 2 offers the potential to reduce NOx emissions through a "pollution prevention" approach that does not require the use of reagents, catalysts, and pollution reduction or removal equipment. FDEP and FPL agree that reburn technology is the most cost-effective alternative to achieve significant reductions in NOx emissions from Manatee Units 1 and 2.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Installation of the Unit 1 & 2 reburn equipment is complete. The units are operating reliably and have completed the process of optimization. The new systems have achieved significant NOx emission reductions. The PMT Reburn O&M ECRC dollars cover all on-going burner and equipment maintenance costs associated with the project.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Estimated project expenditures for the period January 2008 through December 2008 are expected to be \$499,997. No variance estimated.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 2008 - December 2008)

Unit 1 & Unit 2 are operating as referenced above. Final report is being compiled to present to DEP. We then agree on new permit limits for Nox. Once new limit is established, project is complete and expenditures will be based on runtime and available maintenance time. No variance forecasted.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$500,000.

Project Title: Pt. Everglades ESP Technology - O&M

Project No. 25

Project Description:

The requirements of the Clean Air Act direct the EPA to develop health-based standards for certain "criteria pollutants". i.e. ozone (O3), sulfur dioxide (SO2), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen oxides (NOx), an lead (Pb). EPA developed standards for the criteria pollutants and regulates the emissions of those pollutants from major sources by way of the Title V permit program. Florida has been granted authority from the EPA to administer its own Title V program which is at least as stringent as the EPA requirements. Florida is able to issue, renew and enforce Title V air operating permits for sources within the state via 403.061 Florida Statutes and Chapter 62-213 F.A.C., which is administered by the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP"). The Title V program addresses the six criteria pollutants mentioned earlier, and includes hazardous air pollutants (HAP). The EPA sets the limits of emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants through the Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT). The original Port Everglades Title V permit, issued in 1998, expired in 2003. The renewal permit issued January 1, 2004 is now expiring December 31, 2008. A renewal permit application has been submitted and is pending DEP review. The DEP's Title V permit for FPL Port Everglades plant requires FPL to install and maintain Electrostatic Precipitators at all four Port Everglades units to address local concerns and to insure compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Stands and the EPA MACT Standards.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The ESP engineering design for Units 1–4 was completed in 2004. All four Units' ESPs were completed between 2005 and 2007 and are operational (O&M activities started in April 2005 for this project).

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$360,685 (15.3%) lower than originally projected. Fuel economics to date have dictated that the units at the Port Everglades Plant be run on gas due to fuel oil's rising costs. Consequently, fuel oil chemical additives usage has decreased and the ESPs have not had to be operated as much as was originally projected for 2008, which reduced the equipment deterioration and generated significantly less ash for disposal.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 2008 - December 2008)

Construction on all four electrostatic precipitators was completed and all four units ESPS are operational.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$2,276,313.

Project Title: UST Replacement/Removal - O&M

Project No. 26

Project Description:

The Florida Administrative Code (FAC) Chapter 62-761.500, dated July 13, 1998, requires the removal or replacement of existing Category-A and Category-B storage tank systems with systems meeting the standards of Category-C storage tank systems by December 31, 2009. UST Category-A tanks are single-walled tanks or underground single-walled piping with no secondary containment that was installed before June 30, 1992.

UST Category-B tanks are tanks containing pollutants after June 30, 1992 or a hazardous substance after January 1, 1994 that shall have a secondary containment. Small diameter piping that comes in contact with the soil that is connected to a UST that shall have secondary containment if installed after December 10, 1990.

UST and AST Category-C tanks under F.A.C. 62-761.500 are tanks that shall have some or all of the following; a double wall, be made of fiberglass, have exterior coatings that protect the tank from external corrosion, secondary containment (e.g., concrete walls and floor) for the tank and the piping, and overfill protection.

FPL has six Category-A and two Category-B Storage Tank Systems that must be removed or replaced in order to meet the performance standards of Rule 61-761.500. In 2004 FPL will replace the two single-walled USTs located at the Turkey Point Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 with ASTs providing secondary containment (concrete walls and floor) surrounding the tanks. Also in 2004, FPL will remove one single-walled UST located at the Ft. Lauderdale Plant and will not replace the tank. In 2005-2006 FPL will replace the single-walled USTs located at the Area Office Broward (one UST in 2005), Customer Service East Office (one UST in 2006), Juno Beach Office (one UST in 2005), and General Office (2 USTs in 2005), with double-walled tanks providing electronic leak detection. Additionally, the AST to be installed at the Area Broward Office will be concrete vaulted.

The removal and replacement of the USTs will be performed by outside contractors. Additionally, closure assessments will be performed in accordance with 62-761.800 and closure assessment reports will be submitted to local Counties, and the Department of Environmental Services (DEP).

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) There were no activities in 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) Project expenditures are for 2008 are \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) Initial review of the scope of work has been completed.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009) There are no activities planned for 2009.

Project Title: Lowest Quality Water Source (LQWS) - O&M

Project No. 27

Project Description:

Project Description:

Section 366.8255 of the Florida Statutes provides for the recovery through the ECRC of "environmental compliance costs" which are costs incurred in complying with "environmental rules or regulations." The LQWS Project is required in order to comply with permit conditions in the Consumptive Use Permits (CUPs) issued by the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD or the District)) for the Sanford Plant. Those permit conditions are intended to preserve Florida's groundwater, which is an important environmental resource. The permit conditions therefore "apply to electric utilities and are designed to protect the environment" as contemplated by section 366.8255. The SJRWMD adopted a policy in 2000 that, upon permit renewal, a user of the District's water is required to use the lowest quality of water that is technically, environmentally and economically feasible for its needs. This policy was implemented for the Sanford Plant in their current CUPs. For the Sanford facility, Condition 15 of CUP No. 9202, issued in June 2000, requires the lowest quality of water to be used that is feasible to meet the needs of the facility. The LQWS project at Sanford Plant is currently operational.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The project at the Sanford Plant is currently operational.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in project expenditures is \$54,797 or 18.2% lower than originally budgeted. Unplanned maintenance and repairs were performed, which required having the system out of service.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 2008 - December 2008)

The project at the Sanford Plant is currently operational.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$258,471 for the Sanford Plant.

PROJECT TITLE: 316b PROJECT No: 28

Project Description:

The Phase II Rule implements section 316 (b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) for certain existing power plants that employ a cooling water intake structure and that withdraw 50 million gallons per day (MGD) or more of water from rivers, streams, lakes, reservoirs, estuaries, oceans or other waters of the United States (WUS) for cooling purposes. The Phase II Rule establishes national requirements applicable to, and that reflect the best technology available (BTA) for, the location, design, construction and capacity of existing cooling water intake structures (CWIS) to minimize adverse environmental impact. The Phase II Rule has implications at the following FPL facilities: Cape Canaveral, Cutler, Fort Myers, Lauderdale, Port Everglades, Riviera, Sanford, Martin, Manatee and St. Lucie Power Plants.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

One-year biological sampling programs have been completed at Cape Canaveral, Cutler, Fort Myers, Port Everglades, Riviera, and St. Lucie Power Plants. The data collected during these studies have been analyzed and reported on and are being used to develop compliance strategies for each plant. The Proposal for Information Collection (PIC) for each plant were previously submitted the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the US EPA. The second set of 316(b) submittals - CWA 316(b) Supporting Information Documents - were submitted in 2008 for Lauderdale and Port Everglades Plants. The CWA 316(b) Supporting Information Documents for Riviera and Ft. Myers will be submitted later in 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to Dec 30, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$1,048,591 (73.1%) lower than projected. This variance is primarily due to economies of scale achieved through developing the database and report formats for one plant and using them across all plants. Additional economies of scale were achieved by combining meetings. The remanding of the 316(b) Phase II Rule by the Second Circuit Court also resulted in the development of more streamlined reports and significantly reduced the meeting requirements projected in 2008. Finally, per Order No. PSC-04-0987-PAA-EI issued on October 11, 2004, \$129,000 of 2007 expenses were credited to the 316(b) project for the netting of environmentally-related study costs assumed to be in base rates. This amount could not be determined until actual expenses for 2007 were available in early 2008.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 30, 2008)

One-year biological sampling programs were completed at Cape Canaveral, Cutler, Fort Myers, Port Everglades, Riviera, and St. Lucie Power Plants. The second set of 316(b) submittals - CWA 316(b) Supporting Information Documents - were submitted in 2008 for Lauderdale and Port Everglades Plants to the FDEP.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$607,000.

Project Title: SCR Consumables - O&M

Project No. 29

Project Description:

The Manatee Unit 3 and Martin Unit 8 Expansion Project Final Orders of Certification under the Florida Power Plant Siting Act and the PSD Air Construction Permit require the installation of SCRs on each of the plants' four Heat Recovery System Generators (HRSG) for the control of nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) made the determination that the SCR system is considered Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for these types of units, with concurrence from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The operation of the SCR will cause FPL to incur O&M costs for certain products that are consumed in the SCRs. These include anhydrous ammonia, calibration gases, and equipment wear parts requiring periodic replacement such as controllers, ammonia detectors, heaters, pressure relief valves, dilution air blower components, NOX control analyzers and components.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The SCR systems are operational on both Manatee Unit 3 and Martin Unit 8. The SCR Systems are not anticipated to become operational until 2009 at the SJRPP site.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in project expenditures is estimated to be \$493,270 or 57.7% lower than projected. Estimates related to ammonia consumption by the SCRs at SJRPP related to CAIR compliance were inadvertently included in the original estimates for this project.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 2008- December 2008)

The SCR systems are operating reliably on both Manatee Unit 3 and Martin Unit 8. Our costs for 2008 will be more than originally estimated, due to the higher cost of the anhydrous ammonia.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$350,000 for PMR/PMT.

Project Title:

Hydrobiological Monitoring Program (HBMP) - O&M

Project No. 30

Project Description:

The Hydrobiological Monitoring Program is required by the Water Management District in the Conditions of Certification for the new Manatee Unit 3. The program involves the data collection of river chemistry, flow and vegetation conditions to demonstrate that the plant's withdrawals do not impact the environment in and along the river. The Hydrobiological Monitoring Program is a 10 year study which started in 2003 during the construction phase of Unit 3 and will be completed in 2013.

Project Accomplishments:

(January, 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Continue with river monitoring, calibration, maintenance and data collection. Vegetative mapping, aerial photography and mapping was conducted in October 2007. Additional studies are being conducted during summer due to drought conditions and use of Emergency Diversion Schedule.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$20,401 (50.5%) lower than projected. The variance is primarily due to lower than projected costs for monitoring and reporting requirements.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

This is an ongoing project. Interpretive report due in 2009.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Project estimates for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$40,000.

Project Title:

CAIR - O&M

Project No. 31

Project Description:

The CAIR Project was initiated to implement strategies to comply with CAIR Annual and Ozone Season NOx emissions requirements. The CAIR project to date has included the Black & Veatch (B&V) study of FPL's control and allowance management options, an engineering study conducted by Aptech for the reliable cycling of the 800 MW units, the costs for the operation of SCR's under construction on SJRPP Units 1 and 2, costs for the operation of the Scrubber and SCR being installed on Scherer Unit 4, and the installation of CEMS for the peaking gas turbine units. The 800 MW Cycling Project was added to CAIR after 2006 submittal. Aptech Engineering provided engineering services for the first phase of a multiphase scope of work that will assure that the operating reliability is maintained in the new operating mode. FPL anticipates changing the operating mode of its four 800 MW units at Martin and Manatee Plants. The "study cost" so far to Aptech Engineering have been paid. They have identified several countermeasures that are being prioritized and scheduled for implementation in 2008 – 2011. The update to the Gas Turbine Peaking Unit are likely to change as a result of contractual guarantees related to necessary overhaul schedules, component and materials costs and labor estimates.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

All planned testing for 2008 has been scheduled. The testing at the Fort Myers site has been completed. The testing for the Port Everglades and the Fort Lauderdale GT power parks has been scheduled and will be completed by the third quarter of 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$552,892 (30.8%) lower than projected. Installation of the Boiler and Main Steam Drains at the Martin and Manatee Plants associated with the 800 MW Unit Cycling Project was listed as an O&M expense in the original projections and was subsequently re-classified as a Capital expenditure.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The 800 MW Cycling Project identified countermeasures to assist with assuring operating reliability are currently inprogress with Project scope, Outage planning, and implementation for 2008 including; Condenser Tube replacements, Steam Turbine projects, Boiler projects, and Balance of Plant projects. The projected schedule to begin cycling is; PMR 2 in December 2009, PMR 1 in December 2010, with PMT 1 and PMT 2 scheduled for June 2010. The Power Generation Division is scheduled to complete the required testing at the Port Everglades, Fort Lauderdale & Fort Myers GT power parks by the third quarter of 2008. Additional required testing will occur in a five year cycle per the rule. FPL projects operation and maintenance costs for the SCR on SJRPP to begin in the first quarter of 2009 as construction is completed and the controls are put into service. O&M costs associated with the Scrubber and SCR's at plant Scherer will occur starting in 2012 when the construction is completed.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Total estimated 2009 O&M costs are \$1,611,396.

Project Title:

BART Project - O&M

Project No. 32

Project Description:

Conduct air dispersion modeling to determine the visibility impacts to Federally Mandated Class 1 Areas (National Parks, National Wilderness Areas, etc.) from FPL's BART-Eligible units. The Regional Haze Rule, renamed the Clean Air Visibility Rule, (CAVR) mandates that certain vintage electric generating units (ca. 1962-1977) install Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) if it is shown, via modeling that a unit causes or contributes to visibility impairment in any Class 1 Area.

Project Accomplishments:

(January, 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

- Compile Emissions Inventory of BART-Eligible sources Complete May 2006
- Perform modeling First round complete June 2006
- Conduct BART Control Technology Analysis Pending
- Prepare BART Application Packages Fall 2006

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$1,355, whereas FPL did not anticipate any 2008 expenditures for this project originally. During negotiations with the Florida DEP regarding FPL's proposed compliance plan for BART at the Turkey Point Fossil plant in the first quarter of 2008, the Department requested additional information and analyses. To provide the requested information FPL needed to engage an air modeling consultant to analyze the visibility improvements related to FPL's plan.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

BART Application for exempt facilities (PCC, PMR, PMT, PPE, PRV) submitted to FDEP 1/31/07. BART Determination for PTF submitted to FDEP 1/31/07. FDEP requested additional information on PTF 2/26/07 which necessitated additional Golder support. Response to FDEP additional information submitted to FDEP 5/3/07.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Project estimates for Jan 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be zero. No additional modeling expenses are anticipated for 2009, PGD may incur engineering expenses regarding the installation of new cyclone separators for PTF 1&2 BART Determination. This will be determined at a later date.

Project Title:

St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspection and Maintenance - O&M

Project No. 34

Project Description:

The purpose of the proposed St. Lucie Plant Cooling Water System Inspection and Maintenance Project (the "Project") is to inspect and, as necessary, maintain the cooling water system at FPL's St. Lucie nuclear plant (the "Cooling System") such that it minimizes injuries and/or deaths of endangered species and thus helps FPL to remain in compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. Section 1531, et seq. (the "ESA") The St. Lucie Plant is an electric generating station on Hutchinson Island in St. Lucie County, Florida. The plant consists of two nuclear-fueled 850 net MWe units, both of which use the Atlantic Ocean as a source of water for once-through condenser cooling. This cooling water is supplied to the units via the Cooling System. The St. Lucie Plant cannot operate without the Cooling System. Compliance with the ESA is a condition to the operation of the St. Lucie Plant. Inspection and cleaning of the intake pipes is an "environmental compliance cost" under section 366.8255, Florida Statutes. The specific "environmental law or regulation" requiring inspection and cleaning of the intake pipes are terms and conditions that will be imposed pursuant to a Biological Opinion ("BO") that is to be issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA") pursuant to section 7 of the ESA. NOAA will finalize the BO in 2007. NOAA sent the Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") a letter dated December 19, 2006, confirming its intent to issue the BO and stating the requirements that will be imposed pursuant to the BO with respect to inspection and cleaning of the intake pipes.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 8, 2008 thru December 31, 2008)

Inspections have been completed on all intake and discharge lines. Currently we are reviewing bids for the cleaning of the intake lines for SL2 fall 2007. We expect the cleaning to be completed prior to the end of the year. Should the cleaning not be completed in 2007 we will be continuing in the SL1 outage.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 8, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$4,554,865 or 1030.5% higher than originally projected. This variance is primarily due to weather delays, whereby some scope of work has been carried over into 2008 instead of substantially completed in 2007 as originally projected. In addition, the level of effort required to remove concrete debris was greater than anticipated.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 8, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The inspections of the ocean intakes and discharges were completed during the SL1 Spring 2007 outage in April and May. Cleaning of select areas of the three ocean intake pipes and velocity caps is scheduled for the SL2 outage planned for the Fall 2007, October 1- Dec 25.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Project estimates for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$1,800,000. This projection is an estimate in anticipation of delays that may occur due to bad weather. Project work can only be performed during planned outages. Any weather delays that occur during the outage beginning in October 20, 2008, could prohibit the completion of work and would be deferred to the next outage, occurring in April 2009.

Project Title:

Martin Plant Water System - O&M

Project No. 35

Project Description:

The Martin Drinking Water System is required to comply with the requirements the Florida Department of Environmental regulations rules for drinking water systems. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) determined the system must be brought into compliance with newly imposed drinking water rules for TTHM (trihalomethanes) and HAA5 (Haleo Acetic Acid). The upgrades to the potable water system will cause FPL to incur Capital costs for major component upgrades to the system in order to comply with the new requirements. These include Nano filtration, air stripping, carbon and multimedia filtration. The operation of the Potable system will cause FPL to incur O&M costs for certain products that are consumed during the water treatment process. These include carbon and multimedia bed media and nano filtration media.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The project was delayed pending meeting with the agency on proposed design. No O&M dollars for 2008. Contract has been awarded. Permit applications have been submitted. The agency is The increased estimate was due largely to the additional cost of the CEMS software upgrade. This upgrade was needed to meet the EPAs mandate of reporting in XML format starting 1/1/2009. Additionally the higher cost of replacement parts for the new model analyzers installed end of last year (2007) and first half of this year (2008) was factored in.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Zero Dollars estimated Project expenditures are estimated to be \$0 versus an original projection of \$17,000. The Florida DEP requested a meeting to discuss the proposed design and implementation plan, which has delayed the work schedule. Preliminary approval was given based on the proposed concept of treatment. Construction applications and fees have been submitted to the FDEP. Permit issuance is expected in July 2008.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Zero Dollars estimated for 2008. The project was delayed pending meeting with the agency on proposed design.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

The 2009 estimate remains at the current estimate of \$17,000 for projected replacement used media beds.

Project Title:

Low Level Radioactive Waste - O&M

Project No. 36

Project Description: The Barnwell, South Carolina radioactive waste disposal facility is the only site of its kind presently available to FPL for disposal of Low Level Waste (LLW) such as radioactive spent resins, filters, activated metals, and other highly contaminated materials. The Barnwell facility ceased accepting LLW from FPL June 30th, 2008. This project will construct a LLW storage facility for class B and C radioactive waste at the St. Lucie Plant (PSL). Turkey Point (PTN) will be implementing a similar project; however the PTN project will start later than the PSL project since PTN has some limited existing LLW storage capacity. Where practical, this project will be implemented as part of a fleet approach. The objective at PSL and PTN is to ensure construction of a LLW storage facility with sufficient capacity to store all LLW B and C class waste generated at each plant site over a 5 year period. This will allow continued uninterrupted operation of the PSL and PTN nuclear units until an alternate solution becomes available. The LLW on site storage facilities at PSL and PTN will also provide a "buffer" storage capacity for LLW even if an alternate solution becomes feasible, should the alternate solution be delayed or interrupted at a later date.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Field work has been performed at PSL and PTN to determine the potential location for each site's LLW storage facility. Project planning is going forward. Conceptual designs for LLW storage facilities are being developed and evaluated by Engineering and Nuclear Projects. The Nuclear Projects Department has worked with each site's Radiation Protection Department to develop several measures to ensure LLW storage capability exists at PSL and PTN until the LLW storage facilities can be completed at PSL and PTN. For PSL this consists of the purchase of a LS3 portable Ground Shield, two rain covers and additional insertable cylindrical shielding for existing concrete Ground Shields to meet RP surface dose rate restrictions for the storage casks. For Turkey Point the interim measures being considered to ensure LLW storage capacity is available until a facility is constructed includes purchasing new rigging to allow safely moving existing ground shields so that they can be used to store LLW.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Project expenditures are estimated to be \$120,271, versus an original estimate of \$0. The original estimate assumed all costs were capital. The \$120,271 represents estimated costs for compressing waste to smaller volume.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The project for PSL and PTN is on schedule. Initial scoping work is progressing and conceptual designs for LLW storage facilities are under development and evaluation to choose the optimal solution for each site. Interim measures to provide limited LLW storage capacity have been implemented to allow LLW storage until LLW storage facilities are completed at the sites. The PTN facility is still in the early stages of scope development due to the fact that the need for a LLW storage facility is not as urgent as PSL.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Project estimates for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$1,000,000.

Project Title:

Low NOx Burner Technology - Capital

Project No. 2

Project Description:

Under Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101-349, utilities with units located in areas designated as "non-attainment" for ozone will be required to reduce NO_x emissions. The Dade, Broward and Palm Beach county areas were classified as "moderate non-attainment" by the EPA. FPL has six units in this affected area.

LNBT meets the requirement to reduce NO_x emissions by delaying the mixing of the fuel and air at the burner, creating a staged combustion process along the length of the flame. NO_x formation is reduced because peak flame temperatures and availability of oxygen for combustion is reduced in the initial stages.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All six units are in service and operational.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in depreciation and return is \$399 or 0.05% lower than projected.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties have now been re-designated as "attainment" for ozone with air quality maintenance plans. This re-designation still requires that all controls, such as LNBT, placed in effect during the "non-attainment" be maintained.

The LNBT burners are installed at all of the six units and design enhancements are complete.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$787,974.

Project Title:

Continuous Emission Monitoring System (CEMS) - Capital

Project No. 3b

Project Description:

The Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, Public Law 101-549, established requirements for the monitoring, record keeping and reporting of SO2, NOx and carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, as well as volumetric flow, heat input, and opacity data from affected air pollution sources. FPL has 57 units which are affected and which have installed CEMS to comply with these requirements.

40 CFR Part 75 includes the general requirements for the installation, certification, operation and maintenance of CEMS and specific requirements for the monitoring of pollutants, opacity, heat input, and volumetric flow. These regulations are very comprehensive and specific as to the requirements for CEMS, and in essence, they define the components needed and their configuration. Periodically, these systems extract and analyze gaseous samples for each power plant stack and have automated data acquisition and reporting capability.

Project Accomplishments (January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The 2006 Continuous Emission Monitoring System Capital Project necessary to replace the CEMS CO2 emission analyzers at FPL generating units have been installed and successfully recertified at all facilities with only Martin units 3 & 4 remaining. All of the applicable SO2 analyzers were successfully replaced by the 2 Qtr 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures: (January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in depreciation and return is \$35,059 or 3.4% higher than projected. This variance is primarily due to the procurement of a much lower cost per unit pricing from the vendor (California Analytical). In addition, several installations and in-service dates shifted from 2007 to 2008 due to equipment availability delays and schedule changes.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

All of the analyzers have been installed and successfully recertified with only Martin units 3 & 4 remaining. These are scheduled for the third quarter of 2008.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$1,025,943.

Project Title:

Clean Closure Equivalency - Capital

Project No. 4b

Project Description:

In compliance with 40 CFR 270.1(c)(5) and (6), FPL developed CCEDs for nine FPL power plants to demonstrate to the U.S. EPA that no hazardous waste or hazardous constituents remain in the soil or water beneath the basins which had been used in the past to treat corrosive hazardous waste. The basins, which are still operational as part of the wastewater treatment systems at these plants, are no longer used to treat hazardous waste.

To demonstrate clean closure, soil sampling and ground water monitoring plans, implementation schedules, and related reports must be submitted to the EPA. Capital costs are for the installation of monitoring wells (typically four per site) necessary to collect ground water samples for analysis.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) The variance in depreciation and return is \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$3,692.

Project Title:

Maintenance of Stationary Above Ground Fuel Storage Tanks - Capital

Project No.5b

Project Description:

Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) Chapter 17-762, which became effective on March 12, 1991, provides standards for the maintenance of stationary above ground fuel storage tank systems. These standards impose various implementation schedules for inspections/repairs and upgrades to fuel storage tanks.

The capital project associated with complying with the new standards includes the installation of items for each tank such as liners, cathodic projection systems and tank high-level alarms.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Installation of new radar level detector on PMR 1 & 2 metering tank will be installed in the 4th quarter. Abandoned 8" and 12" underground fuel oil piping in the Port of Palm Beach was removed and the project completed.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in depreciation and return is \$2,872, or 0.2% higher than projected.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Installation of new radar level detector on PMR 1 & 2 metering tank will be installed in the 4th quarter. Abandoned 8" and 12" underground fuel oil piping in the Port of Palm Beach was removed and the project completed.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

No new expenditures for 2009. Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$1,648,976.

Project Title: Relocate Turbine Lube Oil Underground Piping to Above Ground – Capital

Project No. 7

Project Description:

In accordance with criteria contained in Chapter 62-762 of the Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) for storage of pollutants, FPL initiated the replacement of underground Turbine Lube Oil piping to above ground installations at the St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) The variance in depreciation and return is \$2.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) This project is complete.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 is \$1,517.

Project Title: Oil Spill Cleanup/Response Equipment - Capital

Project No. 8b

Project Description:

The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA '90) mandates that all liable parties in the petroleum handling industry file plans by August 18, 1993. In these plans, a liable party must identify (among other items) its spill management team, organization, resources and training. Within this project, FPL developed the plans for ten power plants, five fuel oil terminals, three pipelines, and one corporate plan. Additionally, FPL purchased the mandated response resources and provided for mobilization to a worst case discharge at each site.

Project Accomplishments (January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

All equipment is being maintained and replaced as necessary to maintain compliance with regulatory guidelines for response readiness.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in depreciation and return is \$5,408, or 6.4% higher than projected.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

All deadlines, both state and federal, have been met. Ongoing costs will be annual in nature and will consist of equipment upgrades/replacements. In 2008, PGD will have purchased the following: (1) boom reel, (2) Conex boxes, (1) 18-ft flatbed trailer, (1) oil mop skimmer, and other equipment to be determined. PGD continues to assess our oil spill readiness at all applicable Florida facilities and are is taking action based on these assessments.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$111,495.

Project Title:

Relocate Storm Water Runoff - Capital

Project No. 10

Project Description:

The new National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, Permit No. FL0002206, for the St. Lucie Plant, issued by the United States Environmental Protection Agency contains new effluent discharge limitations for industrial-related storm water from the paint and land utilization building areas. The new requirements become effective on January 1, 1994. As a result of these new requirements, the effected areas will be surveyed, graded, excavated and paved as necessary to clean and redirect the storm water runoff. The storm water runoff will be collected and discharged to existing water catch basins on site.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) The variance in depreciation and return is \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$9,377.

Project Title:

Disposal of Non-Contaminated Liquid Waste - Capital

Project No.17b

Project Description:

FPL manages ash from heavy oil fired power plants using a wet ash system. Ash from the dust collector and economizer is sluiced to surface ash basins. The ash sludge is then pH adjusted to precipitate metals. In order to comply with Florida Administrative Code 62-701.300 (10), the ash is then de-watered using a plate/frame filter-press in order to dispose of it in a Class I landfill or ship by railcar to a processing facility for beneficial reuse.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) Project expenditures are estimated to be \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are \$0.

Project Title:

Wastewater Discharge Elimination & Reuse - Capital

Project No.20

Project Description:

Pursuant to 33 U.S.C. Section 1342 and 40 CFR 122, FPL is required to obtain NPDES permits for each power plant facility. The last permits issued contain requirements to develop and implement a Best Management Practice Pollution Prevention Plan (BMP3 Plan) to minimize or eliminate, whenever feasible, the discharge of regulated pollutants, including fuel oil and ash, to surface waters. In addition, the 1997 Federal Ambient Water Quality Criteria requires FPL to meet surface water standards for any wastewater discharges to groundwater at all plants and the Dade County DERM requires Turkey Point and Cutter Plant wastewater discharges into canals to meet county water quality standards found in Section 24-11, Code of Metropolitan Dade County.

In order to address these requirements, FPL has undertaken a multifaceted project which includes activities such as ash basin lining, installation of retention tanks, tank coating, sump construction, installation of pumps, motor, and plping, boiler blowdown recovery, site preparation, separation of stormwater and ashwater systems, separation of potable and service water systems, and the associated engineering and design work to implement these projects.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)
The variance in depreciation and return is estimated to be \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) All activities are complete.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$236,106.

Project Title:

St. Lucie Turtle Net - Capital

Project No. 21

Project Description:

The Turtle Net project says that FPL is limited in the number of lethal turtle takings permitted at its St. Lucie Power Plant by the Incidental Take Statement contained in the Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion, issued to FPL on May 4, 2001 by the National Marine Fisheries Service ("NMFS"). The number of lethal takings permitted in a given year is calculated by taking one percent of the total number of loggerhead and green turtles captured in that year. (The Incidental Take Statement separately limits the number of lethal takings of Kemp's Ridley turtles to two per year over the next ten years, and the number of lethal takings of either hawksbill or leatherback turtles to one of those species every two years over the next ten years). Based on the number of captured turtles in 2001, the lethal take limit for loggerhead and green turtles in that year was six (references; Nuclear Regulatory Commission letter dated May 18, 2001 included as Exhibit 1, Document No. 1, Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion Incidental Take Statement dated May 4, 2001 included as Exhibit 1, Document No. 2, Appendix B To Facility Operating License No. NPF-16 St. Lucie Unit 2, Environmental Protection Plan, Non-Radiological, Amendment No. 103 included as Exhibit 1, Document No. 3). In 2001, FPL experienced six lethal takings of loggerhead and green turtles at the St. Lucie Power Plant, indicating that its existing measures to limit such takings were performing marginally.

The existing net is in need of maintenance. To facilitate this work, a temporary net will be situated to allow removal of the existing net. The new net having been properly coated for UV protection and anti-fouling will be installed replacing the existing net. The existing net will be repaired and maintained as a spare to allow rotation of the nets for future maintenance.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The original estimate was related to the cost to re-coat the net once removed. When the net was being removed, a significant amount of sea grass was found to be tangled in the net which needed to be removed and required the net to be cut. The cost to repair the net as well as re-coat it is greater than the cost to purchase a new net; therefore a new net will be purchased.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 - December 31, 2008)

The variance is estimated to be \$1,107, or 0.9% higher than originally anticipated due to a new net is required since the existing net was cut during removal.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The original estimate was related to the cost to re-coat the net once removed. When the net was being removed, a lot of sea grass was tangled in the net and the net needed to be cut to remove. The cost to re-coat and repair the net is greater than the cost to purchase a new net. The new net is considered a capital cost.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$137,914.

Project Title: Pipeline Integrity Management (PIM) - Capital

Project No.22

Project Description:

FPL is required to develop a written pipeline integrity management program for its hazardous liquid pipelines. This program must include the following elements: (1) a process for identifying which pipeline segments could affect a high consequence area; (2) a baseline assessment plan; (3) an information analysis that integrates all available information about the integrity of the entire pipeline and the consequences of a failure; (4) the criteria for determining remedial actions to address integrity issues raised by the assessments and information analysis; (5) a continual process of assessment and evaluation of pipeline integrity; (6) the identification of preventive and mitigative measures to protect the high consequence area; (7) the methods to measure the program's effectiveness; (8) a process for review of assessment results and information analysis by a person qualified to evaluate the results and information; and, (9) record keeping.

Project Accomplishments: (January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) No projects for 2008 cycle.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in depreciation and return is estimated to be \$14,717, or 100% lower than projected. The installation of leak detection devices at the Martin 30" pipeline has been postponed. Further analysis is being conducted on other technology options.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) No projects for 2008 cycle.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$6,395.

Project Title:

SPCC (Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures) - Capital

Project No.23

Project Description:

The EPA first established the SPCC Program in 1973 when the agency issued the Oil Pollution Prevention Regulation (i.e., SPCC rule) to address the oil spill prevention provisions contained in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 (later amended as the Clean Water Act). The purpose of the regulation was to prevent discharges of oil from reaching the navigable waters of the U.S. or adjoining shorelines and to prepare facility personnel to respond to oil spills. The SPCC regulation requires certain facilities to prepare and implement SPCC Plans and address oil spill prevention requirements including the establishment of procedures, methods, equipment, and other requirements to prevent discharges of oil as described above. Specifically, the rule applies to any owner or operator of a non-transportation related facility that:

- ☐ Has a combined aboveground oil storage capacity of more than 1320 gallons, or a total underground oil storage capacity exceeding 42,000 gallons (Note: the underground storage capacity does not apply to those tanks subject to all of the technical requirements of the federal underground storage tank rule found in 40 CFR 280 or a State approved program); and
- Which due to its location, could be reasonably expected to discharge oil in quantities that may be harmful into or upon the navigable waters of the United States or adjoining shorelines.

In January 1988, a large storage tank owned by Ashland Oil Company at a site in western Pennsylvania collapsed, releasing approximately 750,000 gallons of diesel fuel to the Monongahela River. Following calls for new tank legislation, an EPA task force recommended expanded regulation of aboveground tanks within the framework of existing legislative authority. The result was EPA's SPCC rulemaking package, the first phase of which was proposed in 1991. Due to a series of agency delays primarily resulting from the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill that required EPA to issue the Facility Response Plan rule under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, the final SPCC Rule was not published until July of 2002.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Required facility upgrades have been identified, and contracts have been awarded to provide the engineering, procurement, and construction for the capital upgrades. The upgrades are scheduled to be completed by the end of 2008. Capital upgrades will be executed at the following facilities: Sanford Plant, Martin Plant, Martin Terminal, Port Everglades Plant, Manatee Plant, Manatee Terminal, Turkey Point Plant, and Cape Canaveral Plant.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in depreciation and return is \$22,485 or 1.0% lower than projected.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

By the end of 2008, we plan to have all required facility upgrades completed. It should be noted that the current EPA compliance deadline for implementation of the SPCC plans is July 1, 2009.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$2,525,090.

Project Title:

Manatee Reburn - Capital

Project No.24

Project Description:

This project involves installation of reburn technology in Manatee Units 1 and 2. Reburn is an advanced nitrogen oxides (NOx) control technology that has been developed for, and applied successfully in, commercial applications to utility and large industrial boilers. The process is a proven advanced technology, with applications of a reburn-like flue gas incineration technique dating back to the late 1960s, and developments for applications to large coal fired power plants in the United States dating back to the early to mid 1980s.

Reburn is an in-furnace NOx control technology that employs fuel staging in a configuration where a portion of the fuel is injected downstream of the main combustion zone to create a second combustion zone, called the reburning zone. The reburning zone is operated under conditions where NOx from the main combustion zone is converted to elemental nitrogen (which makes up 79% of the atmosphere). The basic front wall-fired boiler reburning process is shown conceptually in Figure 1 (see below), and divides the furnace into three zones.

In the 1996-97 time period, FPL invested a considerable effort evaluating the Manatee Units for the application of reburn technology. FPL has recently reviewed the reburn system designs previously proposed for the Manatee units, and concluded that a design for either oil or gas reburn would require very similar characteristics. This will require reburn fuel injectors to be located at the elevation of the present top row of burners, with reburn injectors on the boiler front and rear walls. For the present application the injectors will be required to have a dual fuel (oil and gas) capability. In order to provide adequate residence time for the reburn process, it is proposed to locate the reburn overfire air (OFA) ports between the boiler wing walls and to angle them slightly to provide better mixing with the boiler flow. Because of the complexity of the boiler flow field and the port location, it was determined that OFA booster fans would be required to assist the air-fuel mixing and complete the burnout process. Installation of reburn technology for Manatee Units 1 and 2 offers the potential to reduce NOx emissions through a "pollution prevention" approach that does not require the use of reagents, catalysts, pollution reduction or removal equipment. FDEP and FPL agree that reburn technology is the most cost-effective alternative to achieve significant reductions in NOx emissions from Manatee Units 1 and 2.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Installation of the Unit 1 and Unit 2 equipment is complete, started up and completed process optimization of the new systems to ensure minimal emissions. Unit 1 is out of warranty. Unit 2 is still under warranty.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in depreciation and return is \$253,766, or 5.1% lower than projected.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Unit 1 and 2 both completed.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$4,609,917.

Project Title:

Pt. Everglades ESP Technology - Capital

Project No.25

Project Description:

The requirements of the Clean Air Act direct the EPA to develop health-based standards for certain "criteria pollutants". i.e. ozone (O₃), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen oxides (NOx), an lead (Pb). EPA developed standards for the criteria pollutants and regulates the emissions of those pollutants from major sources by way of the Title V permit program. Florida has been granted authority from the EPA to administer its own Title V program which is at least as stringent as the EPA requirements. Florida is able to, issue, renew and enforce Title V air operating permits for sources within the state via 403.061 Florida Statutes and Chapter 62-213 F.A.C., which is administered by the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP"). The Title V program addresses the six criteria pollutants mentioned earlier, and includes hazardous air pollutants (HAP). The EPA sets the limits of emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants through the Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT). The original Port Everglades Title V permit, issued in 1998, expires on December 31, 2003 and must be renewed. The DEP's Final Title V permit for FPL Port Everglades plant requires FPL to install Electrostatic Precipitators at all four Port Everglades units to address local concerns and to insure compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Stands and the EPA MACT Standards.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

During June, all major mechanical and electrical work was completed. All contractor punchlist items for the ESP were completed. Restoration of the plant property and grounds started during June. A Project Punchlist has been formalized with the plant and is being pursued.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Estimated depreciation and return is \$333,754 or 2.8% lower than projected. Combinations of factors have led to the projected decrease in fiscal expenditures. Taking into account the supply of electricity, as compared to customer demand throughout the fleet, unit efficiency has usually demanded these units run less than anticipated. In addition, fuel economics to-date have also demanded the consumption of the least expensive fuel source, primarily natural gas, requiring less operation from the ESP's as initially predicted for 2007. This combination of unit efficiency and fuel economics has further lead to reduced equipment deterioration, with less generation of ash for disposal, requiring less overall maintenance activities.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 2008 - December 2008)

Construction on the Unit 3 electrostatic precipitator was completed in spring 2007 as the Unit went operational in May 2007. Therefore, at this time, all four ESP's (Units 1 through 4) have construction activities completed and are operational. The Units 1, 2 and 4 precipitators met all performance guarantees and permit requirements. Preliminary results of Unit 3 performance test exceeded all performance guarantees. The Unit 1, 2 and 4 stack emissions were well below the new Title V permit requirements of .03 lb/mmbtu particulate and 20% opacity. Enclosure of ash truck loading bay is planned to contain fugitive airborne ash during truck loadings. The Ash Enclosure design, material and erection contract will be turned over to the plant for implementation (scheduled for Fall 2007).

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$11,251,101.

Project Title:

UST Replacement/Removal - Capital

Project No. 26

Project Description:

The Florida Administrative Code (FAC) Chapter 62-761.500, dated July 13, 1998, requires the removal or replacement of existing Category-A and Category-B storage tank systems with systems meeting the standards of Category-C storage tank systems by December 31, 2009. UST Category-A tanks are single-walled tanks or underground single-walled piping with no secondary containment that was installed before June 30, 1992.

UST Category-B tanks are tanks containing pollutants after June 30, 1992 or a hazardous substance after January 1, 1994 that shall have a secondary containment. Small diameter piping that comes in contact with the soil that is connected to a UST that shall have secondary containment if installed after December 10, 1990.

UST and AST Category-C tanks under F.A.C. 62-761.500 are tanks that shall have some or all of the following; a double wall, be made of fiberglass, have exterior coatings that protect the tank from external corrosion, secondary containment (e.g., concrete walls and floor) for the tank and the piping, and overfill protection.

FPL has six Category-A and two Category-B Storage Tank Systems that must be removed or replaced in order to meet the performance standards of Rule 61-761.500. In 2004 FPL will replace the two single-walled USTs located at the Turkey Point Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2 with ASTs providing secondary containment (concrete walls and floor) surrounding the tanks. Also in 2004, FPL will remove one single-walled UST located at the Ft. Lauderdale Plant and will not replace the tank. In 2005-2006 FPL will replace the single-walled USTs located at the Area Office Broward (one UST in 2005), Customer Service East Office (one UST in 2006), Juno Beach Office (one UST in 2005), and General Office (2 USTs in 2005), with double-walled tanks providing electronic leak detection. Additionally, the AST to be installed at the Area Broward Office will be concrete vaulted.

The removal and replacement of the USTs will be performed by outside contractors. Additionally, closure assessments will be performed in accordance with 62-761.800 and closure assessment reports will be submitted to local Counties, and the Department of Environmental Services (DEP).

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008) There were no activities in 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Depreciation and return is estimated to be \$66,966, versus an original estimate of \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 2008 - December 2008)

Initial review of the scope of work has been completed.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$65,488.

Project Title:

CAIR Compliance - Capital

Project No. 31

Project Description:

The CAIR Project was initiated to implement strategies to comply with CAIR Annual and Ozone Season NOx emissions requirements. The CAIR project to date has included the Black & Veatch (B&V) study of FPL's control and allowance management options, an engineering study conducted by Aptech for the reliable cycling of the 800 MW units, the installation of SCR's on SJRPP Units 1 and 2, installation of a Scrubber and SCR on Scherer Unit 4, and the installation of CEMS for the peaking gas turbine units. The 800 MW Cycling Project was added to CAIR after 2006 submittal. Aptech Engineering provided engineering services for the first phase of a multiphase scope of work that will assure that the operating reliability is maintained in the new operating mode. FPL anticipates changing the operating mode of its four 800 MW units at Martin and Manatee Plants. The "study cost" so far to Aptech Engineering have been paid. They have identified several countermeasures that are being prioritized and scheduled for implementation in 2008 - 2011, Project completion is scheduled for the first quarter of 2009. The Scrubber and SCR installation on Scherer Unit 4 are projected to be completed in the first quarter of 2012. The update to the Gas Turbine Peaking Unit CEMS requirements identified the need to implement a revised CEMS monitoring program for those units which will now require CEMS under the CAIR program requirements. FPL has determined that the implementation of the Low Mass Emissions option under 40 CFR Part 75 as the preferred option. The CEMS installations will require emissions testing of representative units and the procurement and installation of a Continuous Emissions Monitor at the Port Everglades GTs, Lauderdale GTs and Fort Myers GTs.

Project Accomplishments:

(January, 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

- Completed B & V study of CAIR compliance options
- Completed 800 MW Cycling Engineering Study

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The variance in the return on CWIP is estimated to be \$2,200,113 or 37.3% higher than projected. The variance is primarily due to higher than projected material costs for structural steel and higher than projected labor costs for the SCR installation on Units 1 and 2 at SJRPP.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The 800 MW Cycling Project identified countermeasures to assist with assuring operating reliability are currently inprogress with Project scope, Outage planning, and implementation for 2008 including; Condenser Tube replacements, Steam Turbine projects, Boiler projects, and Balance of Plant projects. The projected schedule to begin cycling is; PMR 2 in December 2009, PMR 1 in December 2010, with PMT 1 and PMT 2 scheduled for June 2010.

Installation of the SCR on SJRPP Unit 2 is complete with the installation of the SCR on Unit 1 approximately 60% complete. Installation of the Scrubber and SCR on Scherer Unit 4 will be completed in 2012, foundation work for the controls has begun and construction of common plant equipment for the CAIR controls is also underway.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$23,103,538.

Project Title:

CAMR Compliance - Capital

Project No. 33

Project Description:

The Clean Air Mercury Rule (CAMR) was promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on March 15, 2005, imposing nation-wide standards of performance for mercury (Hg) emissions from existing and new coal-fired electric utility steam generating units. In addition to the CAMR, the Georgia Environmental Protection Division (EPD) adopted state specific rules as part of its Multi-Pollutant Rules requiring the installation of mercury controls on coal fired electric generating units within Georgia including all four units at Plant Scherer. The CAMR, and the Georgia Multi-Pollutant rule, are designed to reduce emissions of Hg through implementation of coal-fired generating unit Hg controls. In addition, CAMR requires the installation of Hg Continuous Emission Monitoring Systems (HgCEMS) to monitor compliance with the emission requirements. The State of Florida has begun the implementation of the requirements for reduction of Hg through rule making process. Plant St. John's River Power Park (SJRPP) Units 1 & 2, in which FPL has 20% ownership shares, are affected units under this rule and will require the installation of HgCEMS. Similarly the State of Georgia, in addition to the adoption of their state specific mercury reduction requirements under the Multi-Pollutant rule, has also begun their rule making process to implement the federal rule which will affect FPL's ownership share of Plant Scherer Unit 4 requiring the installation of HgCEMS and Hg controls.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

FPL completed the evaluation of mercury control options for Plant Scherer and approved the co-owner plan to proceed with the installation of a baghouse/sorbant-injection system on its ownership share of Plant Scherer. In June 2007 FPL issued a limited notice to proceed to the controls contractor BE&K. Contracts with engineering firm, Advatech, has been signed.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Estimated depreciation and return are \$2,524,933, or 61.7% lower than projected. The variance is primarily a result of changes in project schedule for the baghouse and sorbent injection installation on Scherer Unit 4, which delayed equipment procurement and certain construction activities to future years.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The FPL CAMR project at Plant Scherer includes FPL's costs from the installation of a Baghouse, a mercury sorbant injection system with associated controls and material handling equipment, and capital additions to Plant Scherer common areas to accommodate sorbant delivery and storage and spent sorbant disposal. Mercury controls at Plant Scherer are being installed on all 4 units at the plant to comply with the Georgia Multi-Pollutant Rule. Installation of controls requires a specific sequence for the construction of the controls and material handling systems. To date engineering and design work for the baghouses and sorbant handling equipment was initiated in April of 2007 with design work completed in 2008. Installation of the mercury controls has begun on all four units at Plant Scherer including foundation work presently underway for Unit 4 controls. Foundation piles are being installed for Unit 4 controls while construction of common facility components of controls has also begun. Installation of the mercury monitor is projected to be completed by December 2008 with the baghouse on Unit 4 projected to be completed in early 2010. The FPL CAMR project at SJRPP includes FPL's costs from the installation of HgCEMS which have been completed on Units 1 and 2.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 - December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for the period January 2009 through December 2009 are projected to be \$5,934,022.

Project Title: St. Lucie Cooling Water System Inspection and Maintenance – Capital

Project No. 34

Project Description:

The purpose of the proposed St. Lucie Plant Cooling Water System Inspection and Maintenance Project (the "Project") is to inspect and, as necessary, maintain the cooling water system at FPL's St. Lucie nuclear plant (the "Cooling System") such that it minimizes injuries and/or deaths of endangered species and thus helps FPL to remain in compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. Section 1531, et seq. (the "ESA") The St. Lucie Plant is an electric generating station on Hutchinson Island in St. Lucie County, Florida. The plant consists of two nuclear-fueled 850 net MWe units, both of which use the Atlantic Ocean as a source of water for once-through condenser cooling. This cooling water is supplied to the units via the Cooling System. The St. Lucie Plant cannot operate without the Cooling System. Compliance with the ESA is a condition to the operation of the St. Lucie Plant. Inspection and cleaning of the intake pipes is an "environmental compliance cost" under section 366.8255, Florida Statutes. The specific "environmental law or regulation" requiring inspection and cleaning of the intake pipes are terms and conditions that will be imposed pursuant to a Biological Opinion ("BO") that is to be issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA") pursuant to section 7 of the ESA. NOAA will finalize the BO in 2007. NOAA sent the Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") a letter dated December 19, 2006, confirming its intent to issue the BO and stating the requirements that will be imposed pursuant to the BO with respect to inspection and cleaning of the intake pipes.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 8, 2008 thru December 31, 2008)

Inspections have been completed on all intake and discharge lines. Currently we are reviewing bids for the cleaning of the intake lines for SL2 fall 2007. We expect the cleaning to be completed prior to the end of the year. Should the cleaning not be completed in 2007 we will be continuing in the SL1 outage.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 8, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Depreciation and return are estimated to be \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 8, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The inspections of the ocean intakes and discharges were completed during the SL1 Spring 2007 outage in April and May. Cleaning of select areas of the three ocean intake pipes and velocity caps is scheduled for the SL2 outage planned for the Fall 2007, October 1- Dec 25.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$19,518.

Project Title:

Martin Plant Drinking Water System Compliance - Capital

Project No. 35

Project Description:

The Martin Drinking Water System is required to comply with the requirements the Florida Department of Environmental regulations rules for drinking water systems. The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) determined the system must be brought into compliance with newly imposed drinking water rules for TTHM (trihalomethanes) and HAA5 (Haleo Acetic Acid). The upgrades to the potable water system will cause FPL to incur Capital costs for major component upgrades to the system in order to comply with the new requirements. These include Nano filtration, air stripping, carbon and multimedia filtration. The operation of the Potable system will cause FPL to incur O&M costs for certain products that are consumed during the water treatment process. These include carbon and multimedia bed media and nano filtration media.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The Florida DEP requested a meeting to discuss the proposed design and implementation plan, which has delayed the work schedule. Preliminary approval was given based on the proposed concept of treatment. Construction applications and fees have been submitted to the FDEP. On 08/20/2008 FDEP South East District has requested additional information prior to granting permits for construction, project will be delayed until permitting is approved. Permit issuance is expected in September 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Depreciation and return are estimated to be \$4,574, or 31.5% lower than projected. The project approval delays have resulted in delay in implementation.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The project is awaiting the final construction approval by FDEP.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$27,801.

Project Title:

Low Level Radioactive Waste - Capital

Project No. 36

Project Description:

The Barnwell, South Carolina radioactive waste disposal facility is the only site of its kind presently available to FPL for disposal of Low Level Waste (LLW) such as radioactive spent resins, filters, activated metals, and other highly contaminated materials. The Barnwell facility ceased accepting LLW from FPL June 30th, 2008. This project will construct a LLW storage facility for class B and C radioactive waste at the St. Lucie Plant (PSL). Turkey Point (PTN) will be implementing a similar project; however the PTN project will start later than the PSL project since PTN has some limited existing LLW storage capacity. Where practical, this project will be implemented as part of a fleet approach. The objective at PSL and PTN is to ensure construction of a LLW storage facility with sufficient capacity to store all LLW B and C class waste generated at each plant site over a 5 year period. This will allow continued uninterrupted operation of the PSL and PTN nuclear units until an alternate solution becomes available. The LLW on site storage facilities at PSL and PTN will also provide a "buffer" storage capacity for LLW even if an alternate solution becomes feasible, should the alternate solution be delayed or interrupted at a later date.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Field work has been performed at PSL and PTN to determine the potential location for each site's LLW storage facility. Project planning is going forward. Conceptual designs for LLW storage facilities are being developed and evaluated by Engineering and Nuclear Projects. The Nuclear Projects Department has worked with each site's Radiation Protection Department to develop several measures to ensure LLW storage capability exists at PSL and PTN until the LLW storage facilities can be completed at PSL and PTN. For PSL this consists of the purchase of a LS3 portable Ground Shield, two rain covers and additional insertable cylindrical shielding for existing concrete Ground Shields to meet RP surface dose rate restrictions for the storage casks. For Turkey Point the interim measures being considered to ensure LLW storage capacity is available until a facility is constructed includes purchasing new rigging to allow safely moving existing ground shields so that they can be used to store LLW.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Depreciation and return are estimated to be \$0.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The project for PSL and PTN is on schedule. Initial scoping work is progressing and conceptual designs for LLW storage facilities are under development and evaluation to choose the optimal solution for each site. Interim measures to provide limited LLW storage capacity have been implemented to allow LLW storage until LLW storage facilities are completed at the sites. The PTN facility is still in the early stages of scope development due to the fact that the need for a LLW storage facility is not as urgent as PSL.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (depreciation and return) for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$27,338.

Project Title:

DeSoto Next generation Solar Energy Center - Capital

Project No. 37

Project Description:

The DeSoto Next Generation Solar Energy Center ("DeSoto Solar") project is a zero greenhouse gas emitting renewable generation project which on August 4, 2008, the Commission found in Order Number PSC-08-0491-PAA-EI, to be eligible for recovery through the ECRC pursuant to House Bill 7135. The DeSoto Solar project is a 25 MW solar photovoltaic generating facility which will convert sunlight directly into electric power. The facility will utilize a tracking array that is designed to follow the sun as it traverses through the sky. In addition to the tracking array this facility will utilize cutting edge solar panel technology. The project will involve the installation of the solar PV panels and tracking system and electrical equipment necessary to convert the power from direct current to alternating current and to connect the system to the FPL grid.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

In May 2008, FPL received County zoning approval (through a special exception) to build the solar facility. An Environmental Resource Permit application was filed in June 2008. In June 2008, FPL retained an Engineering Procurement and Construction (EPC) Contractor to design and construct the facility.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Return on CWIP is estimated to be \$29,115. The costs incurred through the end of June 2008 are \$257,739. The expected costs for the remainder of 2008 are \$6,038,824.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The ERP permit is expected to be issued by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection in November 2008. Engineering design is underway with site construction expected to commence in January 2009.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (return on CWIP) for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$11,224,044. Projected costs for January 2009 through December 2009 are \$166,429,700.

Project Title: Space Coast Next generation Solar Energy Center - Capital

Project No. 38

Project Description:

The Space Coast Next Generation Solar Energy Center ("Space Coast Solar") project is a zero greenhouse gas emitting renewable generation project which on August 4, 2008, the Commission found in Order Number PSC-08-0491-PAA-EI, to be eligible for recovery through the ECRC pursuant to House Bill 7135. The Space Coast Solar project is a 10 MW solar photovoltaic (PV) generating facility which will convert sunlight directly into electric power. The facility will utilize a fixed PV array oriented to capture the maximum amount of electricity from the sun over the entire year. The project will involve the installation of the solar PV panels and support structures and electrical equipment necessary to convert the power from direct current to alternating current and to connect the system to the FPL grid.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

In June 2008, FPL entered into a long term lease with NASA for use of the land to build the solar facility. In July 2008, an Environmental Resource Permit application was filed with the Water Management District, and an Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permit application was filed. In July 2008, FPL retained an Engineering Procurement and Construction (EPC) Contractor to design and construct the facility.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Return on CWIP is estimated to be \$4,681. The costs incurred through the end of June 2008 are \$269,960, including approximately \$37,000 expended in late 2007. The remaining costs for 2008 are expected to be \$742,326.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The ERP and AOCE permits expected to be issued in January 2009. Engineering design is underway with site construction expected to commence in September 2009.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (return on CWIP) for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$1,508,123. Projected costs for January 2009 through December 2009 are \$27,030,686.

Project Title:

Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center - Capital

Project No. 39

Project Description:

The Martin Next Generation Solar Energy Center ("Martin Solar") project is a zero greenhouse gas emitting renewable generation project which on August 4, 2008, the Commission found in Order Number PSC-08-0491-PAA-EI, to be eligible for recovery through the ECRC pursuant to House Bill 7135. The Martin Solar project is a 75 MW solar thermal steam generating facility which will be integrated into the existing steam cycle for the Martin Unit 8 natural gas-fired combined cycle power plant. The steam to be supplied by Martin Solar will be used to supplement the steam currently generated by the heat recovery steam generators. The project will involve the installation of parabolic trough solar collectors that concentrate solar radiation. The collectors will track the sun to maintain the optimum angle to collect solar radiation. The collectors will concentrate the sun's energy on heat collection elements located in the focal line of the parabolic reflectors. These heat collection elements contain a heat transfer fluid which is heated by the concentrated solar radiation to approximately 750 degrees Fahrenheit. The heat transfer fluid is then circulated to heat exchangers that will produce up to 75 MW of steam that will be routed to the existing natural gas-fired combined cycle Unit 8 heat recovery steam generators.

Project Accomplishments:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The project filed for the necessary permit modifications, the Site Certification Conditions of Certification and the Army Corp or Engineers Fill permit in May of 2008. The modification to the Fill permit was issued on July 28, 2008. The modified Conditions of Certification are expected to be issued by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection on August 21, 2008. The project commenced initial engineering in July, 2008.

Project Fiscal Expenditures:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

Return on CWIP is estimated to be \$81,892. The costs incurred through the end of June, 2008 are \$766,731, which includes \$68,000 which was incurred in late 2007.

Project Progress Summary:

(January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2008)

The project has received its modified Fill permit from the Army Corps of Engineers and is expected to receive the modified conditions of certification shortly. Engineering has commenced along with procurement activities for the major equipment. All contracts are expected to be in place to support a construction start in January, 2009.

Project Projections:

(January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009)

Estimated project fiscal expenditures (return on CWIP) for January 2009 through December 2009 are expected to be \$11,788,849. Projected costs for January 2009 through December 2009 are \$210,005,000.

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of the Energy & Demand Allocation % By Rate Class January 2009 to December 2009

	(1) Avg 12 CP Load Factor	(2) GCP Load Factor	(3) Projected Sales	(4) Projected Avg 12 CP	(5) Projected GCP	(6) Demand Loss	(7) Energy Loss	(8) Projected Sales at	(9) Projected Avg 12 CP	(10) Projected GCP Demand	(11) Percentage of KWH Sales	(12) Percentage of 12 CP Demand	(13) Percentage of GCP Demand
	at Meter	at Meter	at Meter	at Meter	at Meter	Expansion	Expansion	Generation	at Generation	at Generation	at Generation	at Generation	at Generation
Rate Class	(%)	<u>(%)</u>	<u>(KWH)</u>	(KW)	(KW)	Factor	Factor	(KWH)	<u>{kW}</u>	<u>(kW)</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>(%)</u>	<u>(%)</u>
RS1/RST1	65.077%	61.696%	55,403,306,419	9,718,567	10,251,197	1.08663620	1.06901375	59,226,896,463	10,560,547	11,139,322	52.33820%	56.97040%	54.82339%
G\$1/GST1MIES1	64.480%	56.897%	6,219,248,803	1,101,055	1,247,798	1.08663620	1.06901375	6,648,462,497	1,196,446	1,355,902	5.87518%	6.45440%	6.67322%
GSD1/GSDT1/HLFT1 (21-499 kW)	76.435%	67.509%	24,942,068,687	3,725,073	4,217,613	1.08655195	1.06894858	26,661,788,803	4,047,485	4,582,656	23.56075%	21.83474%	22.55404%
OS2	95.627%	19.389%	18,498,130	2,208	10,891	1.05506701	1.04443473	19,320,090	2,330	11,491	0.01707%	0.01257%	0.05655%
GSLD1/GSLDT1/CS1/CST1/HLFT2 (500-1,999 kW)	81.083%	71.599%	11,220,287,833	1,579,680	1,788,928	1.08535318	1.06805030	11,983,831,786	1,714,511	1,941,619	10,58999%	9.24918%	9.55589%
GSLD2/GSLDT2/CS2/CST2/HLFT3 (2,000+ kW)	89,478%	80.072%	2,133,689,890	272,215	304,191	1.07696203	1.06151341	2,264,940,431	293,165	327,602	2.00150%	1.58152%	1.61233%
GSLD3/GSLDT3/CS3/CST3	93.476%	70.237%	261,545,665	31,941	42,509	1.02836156	1.02355239	267,705,691	32,847	43,715	0.23657%	0.17720%	0.21515%
ISST1D	111.786%	43.812%	0	0	0	1.05506701	1,04443473	0	0	0	0.00000%	0.00000%	0.00000%
ISST1T	111.422%	25.703%	0	0	0	1.02836156	1.02355239	0	0	0	0.00000%	0.00000%	0.00000%
SST1T	111.422%	25.703%	87,048,226	8,918	38,661	1.02836156	1.02355239	89,098,420	9,171	39,757	0.07874%	0.04947%	0.19567%
\$\$T1D1/\$\$T1D2/\$\$T1D3	111.786%	43.812%	5,382,413	550	1,402	1.05506701	1.04443473	5,621,580	580	1,479	0.00497%	0.00313%	0.00728%
CILC D/CILC G	92.489%	85.912%	3,419,610,773	422,070	454,380	1.07580614	1.06089603	3,627,851,508	454,065	488,825	3.20589%	2.44952%	2.40581%
CILC T	93.565%	84.459%	1,493,300,492	182,193	201,835	1.02836156	1.02355239	1,528,471,292	187,360	207,559	1.35069%	1.01074%	1.02152%
MET	72.366%	60.064%	91,941,054	14,503	17,474	1.05506701	1.04443473	96,026,431	15,302	18,436	0.08486%	0.08255%	0.09073%
OL1/\$L1/PL1	653.334%	48.943%	584,472,455	10,212	136,323	1.08663620	1,06901375	624,809,092	11,097	148,134	0.55214%	0.05986%	0.72906%
SL2, GSCU1	113.244%	112.649%	109,513,160	11,039	11,098	1.08663620	1.06901375	117,071,074	11,995	12,059	0.10345%	0.06471%	0.05935%
TOTAL			105,989,914,000	17,080,224	18,724,300			113,161,895,157	18,536,901	20,318,556	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

108

- Notes:
 (1) AVG 12 CP load factor based on actual load research data
 (2) GCP load factor based on actual load research data
 (3) Projected KWH sales for the period January 2009 through December 2009
 (4) Calculated: (Col 3)/8,760 ° Col 1)
 (5) Calculated: (Col 3)/8,760 ° Col 2)
 (6) Based on 2007 demand losses
 (7) Based on 2007 energy losses
 (8) Col 3 ° Col 7
 (9) Col 1 ° Col 6
 (10) Col 2 ° Col 6
 (11) Col 8 / total for Col 8
 (12) Col 9 / total for Col 9
 (13) Col 10 / total for Col 10

Florida Power & Light Company Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Calculation of Environmental Cost Recovery Clause Factors January 2009 to December 2009

Rate Class	(1) Percentage of KWH Sales at Generation (%)	(2) Percentage of 12 CP Demand at Generation (%)	(3) Percentage of GCP Demand at Generation (%)	(4) Energy Related Cost (\$)	(5) CP Demand Related Cost (<u>\$)</u>	(6) GCP Demand Related Cost (\$)	(7) Total Environmental Costs (\$)	(8) Projected Sales at Meter (KWH)	(9) Environmental Cost Recovery Factor (\$/KWH)
RSI/RST1 QS1/GST1 QSD1/GSDT1/HLTF(21-499 kW) QS2 QSLD1/GSLDT1/CS1/CST1/HLTF(500-1,999 kW) QSLD2/GSLDT2/CS2/CST2/HLTF(2,000+ kW) QSLD3/GSLDT3/CS3/CST3 ISST1D ISST1T SST1T SST1D1/SST1D2/SST1D3 CILC D/CILC G CILC T MET QL1/SL1/PL1 SL2, GSCU1 TOTAL	52.33820% 5.87518% 23.55075% 0.01707% 10.5899% 2.00150% 0.0000% 0.0000% 0.07874% 0.00497% 3.20589% 1.35069% 0.08486% 0.55214% 0.10345%	56.97040% 6.45440% 21.83474% 0.01257% 9.24918% 1.58152% 0.17720% 0.0000% 0.004947% 0.00313% 2.44952% 1.01074% 0.08255% 0.05986% 0.06471%	54.82339% 6.6732292 22.55404% 0.05655% 9.55589% 1.61233% 0.21515% 0.00000% 0.00000% 0.00728% 2.40581 1.02152% 0.09073% 0.72906% 0.05935%	\$1,782,557 \$7,148,445 \$5,180 \$3,213,054 \$607,266 \$71,776 \$0 \$23,889 \$1,507 \$972,684 \$409,807 \$25,746 \$167,521 \$31,389	\$34,685,789 \$3,929,690 \$13,293,839 \$7,653 \$5,631,258 \$962,831 \$107,885 \$0 \$0 \$30,122 \$1,905 \$1,491,362 \$615,378 \$50,259 \$36,448 \$39,397	\$1,381,042 \$168,103 \$568,153 \$1,425 \$240,720 \$40,616 \$5,420 \$0 \$0 \$4,929 \$183 \$60,604 \$25,733 \$2,286 \$18,366 \$1,495	\$51,946,494 \$5,880,350 \$21,010,437 \$21,010,437 \$1,610,773 \$185,081 \$0 \$0 \$58,940 \$3,596 \$2,524,650 \$1,050,918 \$78,291 \$222,335 \$72,281	55,403,306,419 6,219,248,803 24,942,068,687 18,498,130 11,220,287,833 2,133,689,890 261,545,665 0 87,048,226 5,382,413 3,419,610,773 1,493,300,492 91,941,054 584,472,455 109,513,160	0.00094 0.00095 0.00084 0.00077 0.00081 0.00075 0.00071 0.00068 0.00068 0.00068 0.00067 0.00074 0.00070 0.00085 0.00088
TOTAL				\$30,340,484	\$60,883,876	\$2,519,074	\$93,743,432	105,989,914,000	0.00088

Note: There are currently no customers taking service on Schedules ISST1(D) or ISST1(T). Should any customer begin taking service on these schedules during the period, they will be billed using the applicable SST1 Factor.

- (1) From Form 42-6P, Col 11
 (2) From Form 42-6P, Col 12
 (3) From Form 42-6P, Col 13
 (4) Total Energy \$ from Form 42-1P, Line 5b x Col 1
 (5) Total CP Demand \$ from Form 42-1P, Line 5b x Col 2
 (6) Total GCP Demand \$ from Form 42-1P, Line 5b x Col 3
 (7) Col 4 + Col 5 + Col 6
 (8) Projected KWH sales for the period January 2009 through December 2009
 (9) Col 7 / Col 8 x 100

APPENDIX II

ENVIRONMENTAL COST RECOVERY

EXHIBITS OF RANDALL R. LABAUVE

RRL-2 Executive Order 07-127

RRL-3 HB 7135

Executive Order 07-127

STATE OF FLORIDA OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR EXECUTIVE ORDER NUMBER 07-127

Establishing Immediate Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions within Florida

WHEREAS, with nearly 1,350 miles of coastline and a majority of citizens living near that coastline, Florida is more vulnerable to rising ocean levels and violent weather than any other state; and

WHEREAS, global climate change is one of the most important issues facing the State of Florida this century; and

WHEREAS, Florida is the second fastest growing state in the union with respect to the annual increase of new greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS, immediate actions are available and required to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases within Florida; and

WHEREAS, efforts are underway at the national level to begin addressing greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS, Florida has committed to becoming a leader in reducing emissions of greenhouse gases which are causing changing Earth's climate; and

WHEREAS, Florida, together with international leaders and experts, is hosting the Serve to Conserve Climate Change Summit on July 12 and 13,2007 in Miami, Florida;

NOW, THEREFORE., I, CHARLIE CRIST,

as Governor of Florida, in obedience to my solemn constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the State of Florida, do hereby promulgate the following Executive Order, to take immediate effect:

Section 1. I hereby establish greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the State of Florida as follows: by 2017, reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 levels; by 2025, reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels; by 2050, reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% of 1990 levels.

Section 2. I hereby direct the following actions by members of my Administration in order to produce immediate reductions in greenhouse gas emissions within Florida;

- 1. The Secretary of Environmental Protection shall immediately develop rules as authorized under Chapter 403, Florida Statutes, to achieve the following:
 - o Adoption of a maximum allowable emissions level of greenhouse gases for electric utilities in the State of Florida. The standard will require at minimum, three reduction milestones as follows: by 2017, emissions not greater than Year 2000 utility sector emissions; by 2025, emissions not greater than Year 1990 utility sector emissions; by 2050, emissions not greater than 20% of Year 1990 utility sector emissions (i.e., 80% reduction of 1990 emissions by 2050); Adoption of the California motor vehicle emission standards in Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations, effective January 1,2005, upon approval by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency of the pending waiver, which includes emission standards for greenhouse gases, submitted by the California Air Resources Board; and Adoption of a statewide diesel engine idle reduction standard.
- 2. The Secretary of Community Affairs shall immediately:
 - Convene the Florida Building Commission for the purpose of revising the Florida Energy Code for Building Construction to increase the energy performance of new construction in Florida by at least 15% from the 2007 Energy Code. The Commission should consider incorporating standards for appliances and standard lighting in the Florida Energy Code. Target implementation date for the revised Florida Energy Code for Building Construction is January 1, 2009;
 - o Initiate rulemaking of the Florida Energy Conservation Standards, Chapter 9B-44, Florida Administrative Code, with an objective to increase the efficiency of applicable consumer products authorized under s. 553.957, Florida Statutes, by 15% from current standards for implementation by July 1,2009.

Section 3. I hereby request the Florida Public Service Commission to take the following actions for the electric utility sector in order to open the market to clean, renewable energy technologies, thus avoiding future greenhouse gas emissions:

- Not later than September 1,2007, initiate rulemaking to require that utilities produce at least 20% of their electricity from renewable sources (Renewable Portfolio Standard) with a strong focus on solar and wind energy;
- Not later than September 1, 2007, initiate rulemaking to reduce the cost of connecting solar and other renewable energy technologies to Florida's power grid by adopting the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) Standard 1547 for Interconnecting Distributed Resources with Electric Power Systems as the uniform statewide interconnection standard for all utilities; and

Docket No. 080007-EI Executive Order 07-127 Exhibit RRL-2, Page 3 of 3

• Not later than September 1,2007, initiate rulemaking to authorize a uniform, statewide method to enable residential and commercial customers who generate electricity from on-site renewable technologies of up to 1 megawatt in capacity to offset their consumption over a billing period by allowing their electric meters to tum backwards when they generate electricity (net metering).

Section 4. All state agencies departments under the direction of the Governor are hereby directed, and all other state agencies are hereby requested, to assist those carrying out the directions in this Executive Order.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and have caused the Great Seal of the State of Florida to be affixed at Tallahassee, The Capitol, this 13th day of July,

Governor: Charlie Crist

ATTEST:

Secretary of State: Kurt S. Browning

CHAPTER 2008-227

HOUSE BILL NO. 7135

An act relating to energy; amending s. 74.051, F.S.; providing that it is the intent of the Legislature for a court, when practicable, to conduct a hearing and issue an order on a petition for a taking within a specified time; amending s. 110.171, F.S.; requiring each state agency to complete a telecommuting program by a specified date which includes a listing of the job classifications and positions that the state agency considers appropriate for telecommuting; providing requirements for the telecommuting program; requiring each state agency to post the telecommuting program on its Internet website; amending s. 163.04, F.S.; clarifying that condominium declarations may not prohibit renewable energy devices; removes three-story height restriction for installation of solar collectors on condominiums; amending s. 186,007. F.S.; authorizing the Executive Office of the Governor to include in the state comprehensive plan goals, objectives, and policies related to energy and global climate change; amending s. 187.201, F.S.; expanding the air quality, energy, and land use goals of the State Comprehensive Plan to include the development of low-carbon-emitting electric power plants, the reduction of atmospheric carbon dioxide, the promotion of the use and development of renewable energy resources, and provide for the siting of low carbon emitting electric power plants, including nuclear plants; amending ss. 196.012 and 196.175, F.S.; deleting outdated, obsolete language; removing the expiration date of the property tax exemption for real property on which a renewable energy source device is installed and revising the options for calculating the amount of the exemption; amending s. 206.43, F.S.; requiring each terminal supplier, importer, blender, and wholesaler to provide in a report to the Department of Revenue the number of gallons of blended and unblended gasoline sold; amending s. 212.08, F.S.; revising the definition of "ethanol"; specifying eligible items as limited to one refund; requiring a person who receives a refund to notify a subsequent purchaser of such refund; transferring certain duties and responsibilities from the Department of Environmental Protection to the Florida Energy and Climate Commission; requiring the Florida Energy and Climate Commission to adopt, by rule, an application form for claiming a tax exemption; amending s. 220.191, F.S.; providing that certain qualifying projects are eligible to transfer capital investment tax credits to other businesses under certain circumstances; providing limitations on the use of such transferred credits; specifying requirements for such transfers; amending s. 220.192, F.S.; defining terms related to a tax credit; allowing the tax credit to be transferred for a specified period; providing procedures and requirements; requiring the Department of Revenue to adopt rules for implementation and administration of the program; transferring certain duties and responsibilities from the Department of Environmental Protection to the Florida Energy and Climate Commission; amending s. 220.193, F.S.; defining the terms "sale" or "sold"; defining the term "taxpayer"; providing for retroactivity; providing that

1

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

the use of the renewable energy production credit does not reduce the alternative minimum tax credit; amending s. 253.02, F.S.; authorizing the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund to delegate authority to grant easements across lands owned by the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund to the Secretary of Environmental Protection under certain conditions; amending s. 255.249, F.S.; requiring state agencies to annually provide telecommuting plans to the Department of Management Services; amending s. 255.251, F.S.; creating the "Florida Energy Conservation and Sustainable Buildings Act"; amending s. 255.252,

F.S.; providing findings and legislative intent; providing that it is the policy of the state that buildings constructed and financed by the state be designed to meet the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system, the Green Building Initiative's Green Globes rating system, the Florida Green Building Coalition standards, or a nationally recognized green building rating system as approved by the department; requiring each state agency occupying space owned or managed by the department to identify and compile a list of projects suitable for a guaranteed energy, water, and wastewater performance savings contract; amending s. 255.253, F.S.; defining terms relating to energy conservation for buildings; amending s. 255.254, F.S.; prohibiting a state agency from leasing or constructing a facility without having secured from the department a proper evaluation of lifecycle costs for the building; amending s. 255.255, F.S.; requiring the department to use sustainable building ratings for conducting a life-cycle cost analysis; amending s. 255.257, F.S.; requiring all state agencies to adopt an energy efficiency rating system as approved by the department for all new buildings and renovations to existing buildings; requiring all county, municipal, school district, water management district, state university, community college, and Florida state court buildings to meet certain energy efficiency standards for construction; providing applicability; creating a sustainable building training certification program within St. Petersburg College; specifying program components; creating s. 286.29, F.S.; requiring the Department of Management Services to develop the Florida Climate-Friendly Preferred Products List; requiring state agencies to consult the list and purchase products from the list if the price is comparable; requiring state agencies to contract for meeting and conference space with facilities having the "Green Lodging" designation; authorizing the Department of Environmental Protection to adopt rules; requiring the department to establish voluntary technical assistance programs for various businesses; requiring state agencies, state universities, community colleges, and local governments that purchase vehicles under a state purchasing plan to maintain vehicles according to minimum standards and follow certain procedures when procuring new vehicles; requiring state agencies to use ethanol and biodiesel-blended fuels when available; amending s. 287.063, F.S.; prohibiting the payment term for equipment from exceeding the useful life of the equipment unless the contract provides for the replacement or the extension of the useful

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

2

life of the equipment during the term of the loan; amending s. 287.064, F.S.; authorizing an extension of the master equipment financing agreement for energy conservation equipment; requiring the guaranteed energy, water, and wastewater savings contractor to provide for the replacement or the extension of the useful life of the energy conservation equipment during the term of the contract; amending s. 287.16, F.S.; requiring the Department of Management Services to analyze specified fuel usage by the Department of Transportation; amending s. 288.1089, F.S.; defining the term "alternative and renewable energy"; revising provisions relating to innovation incentive awards to include alternative and renewable energy projects; specifying eligibility requirements for such projects; requiring Enterprise Florida, Inc., to solicit comments and recommendations from the Florida Energy and Climate Commission in evaluating such projects; amending s. 316.0741, F.S.; requiring all hybrid and other low-emission and energy-efficient vehicles that do not meet the minimum occupancy requirement and are driven in a highoccupancy-vehicle lane to comply with federally mandated minimum fuel economy standards; authorizing specified vehicles to use certain high-occupancy-vehicle lanes without payment of tolls; amending s. 337.401, F.S.; requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to adopt rules relating to the placement of and access to aerial and underground electric transmission lines having certain specifications; defining the term "base-load generating facilities"; amending s. 339.175, F.S.; requiring each metropolitan planning organization to develop a long-range transportation plan and an annual project priority list that, among other considerations, provide for sustainable growth and reduce greenhouse gas emissions; amending

s. 350.01, F.S.; conforming the beginning of a Public Service Commission member's term as chair with the beginning of terms of commissioners; correcting cross-references; amending s. 350.012. F.S.; renaming the Committee on Public Service Commission Oversight, a standing joint committee of the Legislature, as the "Committee on Public Counsel Oversight"; deleting the committee's authority to recommend to the Governor nominees to fill vacancies on the Public Service Commission; amending s. 350.03, F.S.; clarifying the power of the Governor to remove and fill commission vacancies as set forth in the State Constitution; amending s. 350.031, F.S.: increasing the number of members on the council; requiring the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a chair and vice chair to the council in alternating years; removing spending authority for the council to advertise vacancies; requiring the council to submit recommendations for vacancies on the Public Service Commission to the Governor; requiring the council to nominate a minimum of three persons for each vacancy; revising the date that recommendations for vacancies must be submitted; providing that a successor Governor may remove an appointee only as provided; providing for the council to fill a vacancy on the commission if the Governor fails to do so; authorizing a successor governor to recall an unconfirmed appointee under certain circumstances; amending ss. 350.061 and 350.0614, F.S., relating to the appoint

3

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

ment, oversight, and compensation of the Public Counsel; conforming provisions to changes made by the act; amending s. 366.04, F.S.; requiring an affected municipal electric utility to conduct a referendum election of all its retail electric customers to determine whether to require the municipal electric utility to provide a proposed charter transferring the operations of the utility to an electric utility authority; amending s. 366.81, F.S.; providing legislative intent; amending s. 366.82, F.S.; defining the term "demand-side renewable energy"; requiring the Public Service Commission to adopt goals for increasing the development of demand-side renewable energy systems energy resources; providing for cost-effectiveness tests; requiring the Florida Energy and Climate Commission to be a party in the proceedings to adopt goals; providing for an appropriations; providing for cost recovery; authorizing the commission to provide financial rewards and penalties; authorizing the commission to allow an investor-owned utility to earn an additional return on equity for exceeding energy efficiency and conservation goals; amending s. 366.8255, F.S.; redefining the term "environmental compliance costs" to include costs or expenses prudently incurred for scientific research and geological assessments of carbon capture and storage for the purpose of reducing an electric utility's greenhouse gas emissions; amending s. 366.91, F.S.; clarifying the definition of "biomass" to include waste and byproducts; requiring each public utility, and each municipal electric utility and rural electric utility cooperative that sells electricity at retail, to develop a standardized interconnection and net metering program for customer-owned renewable generation; authorizing net metering to be available when a utility purchases power generated from biogas produced by anaerobic digestion under certain conditions; amending s. 366.92, F.S.; directing the Public Service Commission to adopt a renewable portfolio standard; providing definitions; providing for renewable energy credits; providing for cost recovery; prohibiting the renewable portfolio standard rule from taking effect until ratified by the Legislature; amending s. 366.93, F.S.; revising the definitions of "cost" and "preconstruction"; requiring the Public Service Commission to establish rules relating to cost recovery for the construction of new, expanded, or relocated electrical transmission lines and facilities for a nuclear power plant; amending s. 377.601, F.S.; revising legislative intent with respect to the need to implement alternative energy technologies; providing for the transfer of the Florida Energy Commission in the Office of Legislative Services to the Florida Energy and Climate Commission in the Executive Office of the Governor; creating s. 377.6015, F.S.; providing for the membership, meetings, duties, and responsibilities of the Florida Energy and Climate Commission; providing rulemaking authority; amending s. 377.602, F.S.; revising the definition of "energy resources"; providing for conforming changes; providing for the type two transfer of the state energy program in the Department of Environmental Protection to the Florida Energy and Climate Commission in the Executive Office of the Governor; amending ss. 377.603, 377.604, 377.605, 377.606, 377.608, 377.701, 377.703, and 377.705, F.S.; providing for conforming changes;

4

CODING: Words etricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

amending s. 377.801, F.S.; providing a short title; amending s. 377.802, F.S.; providing the purpose of the Florida Energy and Climate Protection Act; amending s. 377.803, F.S.; revising definitions; clarifying the definition of "renewable energy" to include biomass, as defined in s. 366.91, F.S.; amending s. 377.804, F.S., relating to the Renewable Energy and Energy-Efficient Technologies Grants Program; providing for the program to include matching grants for technologies that increase the energy efficiency of vehicles and commercial buildings; providing for the solicitation of expertise of other entities; providing application requirements; amending s. 377.806, F.S.; conforming provisions relating to the Solar Energy System Incentives Program, to changes made by this act; requiring all eligible systems under the program to comply with the Florida Building Code; revising rebate eligibility requirements for solar thermal systems to include the installation of certain products by roofing contractors; creating s. 377.808, F.S.; establishing the "Florida Green Government Grants Act"; providing for grants to be awarded to local governments in the development of programs that achieve green standards; amending ss. 380.23 and 403.031, F.S.; conforming cross-references; creating s. 403.44, F.S.; creating the Florida Climate Protection Act; defining terms; requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to establish the methodologies, reporting periods, and reporting systems that must be used when major emitters report to The Climate Registry; authorizing the department to adopt rules for a cap-and-trade regulatory program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from major emitters; providing for the content of the rule; prohibiting the rules from being adopted until after January 1, 2010, and from becoming effective until ratified by the Legislature; amending s. 403.502, F.S.; providing legislative intent; amending s. 403.503, F.S.; defining the term "alternate corridor" and redefining the term "corridor" for purposes of the Florida Electrical Power Plant Siting Act; amending s. 403.504, F.S.; requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to determine whether a proposed alternate corridor is acceptable; amending s. 403.506, F.S.; exempting an electric utility from obtaining certification under the Florida Electrical Power Plant Siting Act before constructing facilities for a power plant using nuclear materials as fuel; providing that a utility may obtain separate licenses, permits, and approvals for such construction under certain circumstances; exempting such provisions from review under ch. 120, F.S.; amending s. 403.5064, F.S.; requiring an applicant to submit a statement to the department if such applicant opts for consideration of alternate corridors; amending s. 403.5065, F.S.; providing for conforming changes; amending

s. 403.50663, F.S.; providing for notice of meeting to the general public; amending s. 403.50665, F.S.; requiring an application to include a statement on the consistency of directly associated facilities constituting a "development"; requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to address at the certification hearing the issue of compliance with land use plans and zoning ordinances for a proposed substation located in or along an alternate corridor; amending

s. 403.507, F.S.; providing for reports to be submitted to the department no later than 100 days after certification application has been

5

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions. determined complete; amending s. 403.508, F.S.; providing for land use and certification hearings; amending s. 403.509, F.S.; requiring the Governor and Cabinet sitting as the siting board to certify the corridor having the least adverse impact; authorizing the board to deny certification or allow a party to amend its proposal; amending

s. 403.511, F.S.; providing for conforming changes; amending s. 403.5112, F.S.; providing for filing of notice; amending s. 403.5113, F.S.; providing for postcertification amendments and postcertification review; amending s. 403.5115, F.S.; requiring the applicant proposing the alternate corridor to publish all notices relating to the application; requiring that such notices comply with certain requirements; requiring that notices be published at least 45 days before the rescheduled certification hearing; requiring applicants to make specified efforts to provide notice to certain landowners and to file a list of such notification with the Department of Environmental Protection's Siting Coordination Office; amending ss. 403.516, 403.517, and 403.5175, F.S.; providing conforming changes and cross-references; amending s. 403.518, F.S.; authorizing the Department of Environmental Protection to charge an application fee for an alternate corridor; amending ss. 403.519, 403.5252, 403.526, 403.527, 403.5271, 403.5272, 403.5312, 403.5363, 403.5365, and 403.814, F.S., relating to determinations of need, public notice requirements, and general permits; conforming provisions to changes made by the act; creating s. 403.7055, F.S.; encouraging counties in the state to form regional solutions to the capture and reuse or sale of methane gas from landfills and wastewater treatment facilities; requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to provide guidelines and assistance; amending s. 489.145, F.S.; creating s. 403.7032, F.S.; providing legislative findings regarding recycling; providing for a longterm goal of reducing the amount of solid waste disposed of in the state by a certain percentage; requiring the Department of Environmental Protection to develop a comprehensive recycling program and submit such program to the Legislature by a specified date; requiring the Legislature's approval before implementing such program; requiring that such program be developed in coordination with other state and local entities, private businesses, and the public; requiring that the program contain certain components; creating s. 403.7033, F.S., requiring a departmental analysis of particular recyclable materials; requiring a submission of a report; amending s. 403.706, F.S., requiring every county to implement a composting plan to attain certain goals by a date certain; provides for goal modifications upon demonstrated need to the department; amending s. 489.145, F.S.; revising provisions of the Guaranteed Energy, Water, and Wastewater Performance Savings Contracting Act; requiring that each proposed contract or lease contain certain agreements concerning operational cost-saving measures; requiring the Office of the Chief Financial Officer to review contract proposals; redefining terms; requiring that certain baseline information, supporting information, and documentation be included in contracts; requiring the Office of the Chief Financial Officer to review contract proposals; providing audit requirements; requiring contract approval by the Chief Financial Officer; amending

6

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

s. 526.06, F.S.; revising provisions for the sale of gasoline blended with ethanol; providing specifications for transitioning to ethanol-blended fuels; creating s. 526.201, F.S.; creating the "Florida Renewable Fuel Standard Act"; creating s. 526.202, F.S.; establishing legislative findings for the act; creating s. 526.203, F.S.; providing definitions, fuel standard, exemptions, and reporting; creating s. 526.204, F.S.; providing for waivers; providing for suspension of standard requirement during declared emergencies; creating s. 526.205, F.S.; providing for enforcement of the act; providing for extensions; creating s. 526.206, F.S.; providing for rulemaking authority by the Department of Revenue and the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; creating s. 526.207, F.S.; requiring studies and reports by the Florida Energy and Climate Commission; amending s. 553.73, F.S.; requiring that the Florida Building Commission select the most recent International Energy Conservation Code as a foundation code; providing for modification of the International Energy Conservation Code by the commission under certain circumstances; creating s. 553.9061, F.S.; requiring the Florida Building Commission to establish a schedule of increases in the energy performance of buildings subject to the Florida Energy Efficiency Code for Building Construction; providing energy-efficiency performance options and elements for achieving performance goals; requiring the commission to adopt rules and implement a cost-effectiveness

test; amending s. 553.909, F.S.; requiring the Florida Energy Efficiency Code for Building Construction to set minimum requirements for certain commercial or residential appliances; requiring the Agency for Enterprise Information Technology to define specified objective standards and conduct evaluations relating to energy efficiency; requiring the agency to submit a report; providing report requirements; requiring the agency to submit specified recommendations; providing for the inclusion of specifications in certain plans and processes; creating s. 1004.648, F.S.: establishing the Florida Energy Systems Consortium consisting of all the state universities; providing for membership and duties of the consortium; providing for a director, an oversight board, and a steering committee; requiring the consortium to submit an annual report; requiring an economic impact analysis on the effects of granting financial incentives to energy producers who use woody biomass as fuel; providing that certain vehicle emission standards are subject to ratification by the Legislature prior to implementation or modification by the Department of Environmental Protection; requiring the Department of Education and the Department of Environmental Protection to develop an awards or recognition program for outstanding efforts in conservation, energy and water use reduction, environmental enhancement, and conservationrelated educational curriculum development; encouraging the departments to seek private sector funding for the program; repealing s. 377.901, F.S., relating to the Florida Energy Commission; requiring the Public Service Commission to provide a report to the Governor and the Legislature on utility revenue decoupling; providing effective dates.

7

CODING: Words etricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

10. Permits required for the taking of marine mammals under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended, 16 U.S.C. s. 1374.

Section 64. Subsection (20) of section 403.031, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

403.031 Definitions.—In construing this chapter, or rules and regulations adopted pursuant hereto, the following words, phrases, or terms, unless the context otherwise indicates, have the following meanings:

(20) "Electrical power plant" means, for purposes of this part of this chapter, any electrical generating facility that uses any process or fuel and that is owned or operated by an electric utility, as defined in s. 403.503(14)(13), and includes any associated facility that directly supports the operation of the electrical power plant.

Section 65. Section 403.44, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

- 403.44 Florida Climate Protection Act.—
- (1) The Legislature finds it is in the best interest of the state to document, to the greatest extent practicable, greenhouse gas emissions and to pursue a market-based emissions abatement program, such as cap and trade, to address greenhouse gas emissions reductions.
 - (2) As used in this section, the term:
- (a) "Allowance" means a credit issued by the department through allotments or auction which represents an authorization to emit specific amounts of greenhouse gases, as further defined in department rule.
- (b) "Cap and trade" or "emissions trading" means an administrative approach used to control pollution by providing a limit on total allowable emissions, providing for allowances to emit pollutants, and providing for the transfer of the allowances among pollutant sources as a means of compliance with emission limits.

- (c) "Greenhouse gas" or "GHG" means carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases such as hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride.
- (d) "Leakage" means the offset of emission abatement that is achieved in one location subject to emission control regulation by increased emissions in unregulated locations.
 - (e) "Major emitter" means an electric utility regulated under this chapter.
- (3) A major emitter shall be required to use The Climate Registry for purposes of emission registration and reporting.
- (4) The department shall establish the methodologies, reporting periods, and reporting systems that shall be used when major emitters report to The Climate Registry. The department may require the use of quality-assured data from continuous emissions monitoring systems.

76

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

- (5) The department may adopt rules for a cap-and-trade regulatory program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from major emitters. When developing the rules, the department shall consult with the Florida Energy and Climate Commission and the Florida Public Service Commission and may consult with the Governor's Action Team for Energy and Climate Change. The department shall not adopt rules until after January 1, 2010. The rules shall not become effective until ratified by the Legislature.
 - (6) The rules of the cap-and-trade regulatory program shall include, but are not limited to:
 - (a) A statewide limit or cap on the amount of greenhouse gases emitted by major emitters.
 - (b) Methods, requirements, and conditions for allocating the cap among major emitters.
- (c) Methods, requirements, and conditions for emissions allowances and the process for issuing emissions allowances.
- (d) The relationship between allowances and the specific amounts of greenhouse gas emissions they represent.
- (e) The length of allowance periods and the time over which entities must account for emissions and surrender allowances equal to emissions.
 - (f) The timeline of allowances from the initiation of the program through to 2050.
- (g) A process for the trade of allowances between major emitters, including a registry, tracking, or accounting system for such trades.
- (h) Cost containment mechanisms to reduce price and cost risks associated with the electric generation market in this state. Cost containment mechanisms to be considered for inclusion in the rules include, but are not limited to:
- 1 Allowing major emitters to borrow allowances from future time periods to meet their greenhouse gas emission limits.
- 2 Allowing major emitters to bank greenhouse gas emission reductions in the current year to be used to meet emission limits in future years.
- Allowing major emitters to purchase emissions offsets from other entities that produce verifiable reductions in unregulated greenhouse gas emissions or that produce verifiable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions through voluntary practices that capture and store greenhouse gases that otherwise would be released into the atmosphere. In considering this cost containment mechanism, the department shall identify sectors and activities outside of the capped sectors, including other state, federal, or international activities, and the conditions under which reductions there can be credited against emissions of capped entities in place of allowances issued by the department. The department shall also consider potential methods and their effectiveness to avoid double-incentivizing such activities.

77

CODING: Words etricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.

4. Providing a safety valve mechanism to ensure that the market prices for allowances or offsets do not surpass a predetermined level compatible with the affordability of electric utility rates and

the well-being of the state's economy. In considering this cost containment mechanism, the department shall evaluate different price levels for the safety valve and methods to change the price level over time to reflect changing state, federal, and international markets, regulatory environments, and technological advancements.

In considering cost containment mechanisms for inclusion in the rules, the department shall evaluate the anticipated overall effect of each mechanism on the abatement of greenhouse gas emissions and on electricity ratepayers and the benefits and costs of each to the state's economy, and shall also consider the interrelationships between the mechanisms under consideration.

	(i) A process to allow the department to exercise its authority to discourage leakage of
GHG e	missions to neighboring states attributable to the implementation of this program.
	(j) Provisions for a trial period on the trading of allowances before full implementation of a
<u>tradin</u>	g system.
	(7) In recommending and evaluating proposed features of the cap-andtrade system, the
<u>followi</u>	ng factors shall be considered:
	(a) The overall cost-effectiveness of the cap-and-trade system in combination with other
<u>policie</u>	s and measures in meeting statewide targets.
	(b) Minimizing the administrative burden to the state of implementing, monitoring, and
<u>enforci</u>	ng the program.
	(c) Minimizing the administrative burden on entities covered under the cap.
	(d) The impacts on electricity prices for consumers.
	(e) The specific benefits to the state's economy for early adoption of a cap-and-trade
<u>system</u>	for greenhouse gases in the context of federal climate change legislation and the
<u>develo</u>	pment of new international compacts.
	(f) The specific benefits to the state's economy associated with the creation and sale of
<u>emissi</u>	ons offsets from economic sectors outside of the emissions cap.
	(g) The potential effects on leakage if economic activity relocates out of the state.
	(h) The effectiveness of the combination of measures in meeting identified targets.
	(i) The implications for near-term periods of long-term targets specified in the overall
policy.	-
	78
	CODING: Words etricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.
	(j) The overall costs and benefits of a cap-and-trade system to the state economy.
	(k) How to moderate impacts on low-income consumers that result from energy price
increas	
	(1) Consistency of the program with other state and possible federal efforts.
	(m) The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of extending the program scope as broadly as
<u>possibl</u>	e among emitting activities and sinks in Florida.
	(n) Evaluation of the conditions under which Florida should consider linking its trading
	to the systems of other states or other countries and how that might be affected by the
<u>potent</u>	ial inclusion in the rule of a safety valve.
	(8) Recognizing that the international, national, and neighboring state policies and the
	of climate change will evolve, prior to submitting the proposed rules to the Legislature for
	eration, the department shall submit the proposed rules to the Florida Energy and Climate
Comm	ission, which shall review the proposed rules and submit a report to the Governor, the
	ent of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the department. The
_	shall address:
	(a) The overall cost-effectiveness of the proposed cap-and-trade system in combination
	ther policies and measures in meeting statewide targets.
	(b) The administrative burden to the state of implementing, monitoring, and enforcing the

program.

Docket No. 080007-EI Chapter 2008-227, House Bill No. 7135 Exhibit RRL-3, Page 9 of 10

	(c) The administrative burden on entities covered under the cap.
	(d) The impacts on electricity prices for consumers.
	(e) The specific benefits to the state's economy for early adoption of a cap-and-trade
<u>system</u>	for greenhouse gases in the context of federal climate change legislation and the
develop	ement of new international compacts.
	(f) The specific benefits to the state's economy associated with the creation and sale of
emissic	ons offsets from economic sectors outside of the emissions cap.
	(g) The potential effects on leakage if economic activity relocates out of the state.
	(h) The effectiveness of the combination of measures in meeting identified targets.
	(i) The economic implications for near-term periods of short-term and long-term targets
specifie	ed in the overall policy.
	(j) The overall costs and benefits of a cap-and-trade system to the economy of the state.
	79
	CODING: Words etricken are deletions; words underlined are additions.
	(k) The impacts on low-income consumers that result from energy price increases.
	(1) The consistency of the program with other state and possible federal efforts.
	(m) The evaluation of the conditions under which the state should consider linking its
	system to the systems of other states or other countries and how that might be affected by
the pote	ential inclusion in the rule of a safety valve.
	(n) The timing and changes in the external environment, such as proposals by other states
or impl	ementation of a federal program that would spur reevaluation of the Florida program.
	(o) The conditions and options for eliminating the Florida program if a federal program
were to	supplant it.
	(p) The need for a regular reevaluation of the progress of other emitting regions of the
country	and of the world, and whether other regions are abating emissions in a commensurate
manner	<u>r.</u>
	(q) The desirability of and possibilities of broadening the scope of the state's cap-and-trade
system	at a later date to include more emitting activities as well as sinks in Florida, the
condition	ons that would need to be met to do so, and how the program would encourage these
condition	ons to be met, including developing monitoring and measuring techniques for land use
emissio	ons and sinks, regulating sources upstream, and other considerations.

Section 66. Section 403.502, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

403.502 Legislative intent.—The Legislature finds that the present and predicted growth in electric power demands in this state requires the development of a procedure for the selection and utilization of sites for electrical generating facilities and the identification of a state position with respect to each proposed site and its associated facilities. The Legislature recognizes that the selection of sites and the routing of associated facilities, including transmission lines, will have a significant impact upon the welfare of the population, the location and growth of industry, and the use of the natural resources of the state. The Legislature finds that the efficiency of the permit application and review process at both the state and local level would be improved with the implementation of a process whereby a permit application would be centrally coordinated and all permit decisions could be reviewed on the basis of standards and recommendations of the deciding agencies. It is the policy of this state that, while recognizing the pressing need for increased power generation facilities, the state shall ensure through available and reasonable methods that the location and operation of electrical power plants will produce minimal adverse effects on human health, the environment, the ecology of the land and its wildlife, and the ecology of state waters and their aquatic life and will not unduly conflict with the goals established by the applicable local comprehensive plans. It is the intent to seek courses of action that will fully balance the increasing

80

CODING: Words stricken are deletions; words <u>underlined</u> are additions.