

MEMORANDUM

JULY 18, 2012

RECEIVED-FPSC

12 JUL 18 PM 2:57

COMMISSION  
CLERK

TO: OFFICE OF COMMISSION CLERK  
FROM: *ML* MICHAEL LAWSON, SENIOR ATTORNEY  
RE: DOCKET NO. 120009-EI - NUCLEAR COST RECOVERY CLAUSE

---

Please find attached the original and six copies of the Supplemental Testimony of Bety Maitre, appearing on behalf of the staff of the Florida Public Service Commission, to be filed in the above-reference Docket.

MTL/th  
Attachment

COM 5  
AFD \_\_\_\_\_  
APA \_\_\_\_\_  
ECO \_\_\_\_\_  
ENG \_\_\_\_\_  
GCL \_\_\_\_\_  
IDM \_\_\_\_\_  
TEL \_\_\_\_\_  
CLK CFR-1

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04794 JUL 18 2012

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Nuclear cost recovery clause.

DOCKET NO. 120009-EI

DATED: JULY 18, 2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the Supplemental Testimony of Bety Maitre, appearing on behalf of the staff of the Florida Public Service Commission, has been served by U.S. Mail, on this 18<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012, to the following:

Florida Power & Light Company  
Kenneth Hoffman  
215 S. Monroe St., Suite 810  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1858

Florida Power & Light Company  
Bryan S. Anderson / Jessica A. Cano  
700 Universe Boulevard  
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Progress Energy Service Company, LLC  
John T. Burnett / D. Triplett / R. Alexander Glenn  
P.O. Box 14042  
St. Petersburg, FL 33733-4042

Progress Energy Florida, Inc.  
Mr. Paul Lewis, Jr.  
106 East College Avenue, Suite 800  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-7740

Carlton Fields Law Firm  
Matthew R. Bernier  
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 500  
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1866

Carlton Fields Law Firm  
J. Michael Walls / Blaise N. Gamba  
P.O. Box 3239  
Tampa, FL 33601-3239

Office of the Public Counsel  
J. R. Kelly / Charles Rehwinkel /  
Joseph McGlothlin / Erik Sayler  
c/o The Florida Legislature  
111 W. Madison Street, Room 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Moyle Law Firm, P.A.  
Vicki G. Kaufman / Jon C. Moyle, Jr.  
The Perkins House  
118 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

White Springs Agricultural Chemicals, Inc.  
Randy B. Miller  
Post Office Box 300  
White Springs, FL 32096

Brickfield Law Firm  
James W. Brew/F. Alvin Taylor  
Eighth Floor, West Tower  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20007

Gardner, Bist, Wiener, Wadsworth, Bowden, Bush,  
Dee, LaVia & Wright, P.A.  
Robert Scheffel Wright/John T. LaVia, III  
1300 Thomaswood Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308

Gary A. Davis & Associates  
James S. Whitlock/Gary A. Davis  
Post Office Box 649  
Hot Springs, NC 28743

Federal Executive Agencies  
Captain Samuel Miller  
USAF/AFLOA/JACL/ULFSC  
139 Barnes Drive, Suite 1  
Tyndall AFB, FL 32403-5319



---

MICHAEL T. LAWSON  
Senior Attorney, Office of the General Counsel

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850  
(850) 413-6199

Docket No. 120009-EI: Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause.

Florida Power & Light Company

Nuclear Power Uprate

Witness: **Supplemental Testimony of BETY MAITRE**, Appearing on  
behalf of the staff of the Florida Public Service Commission

Date Filed: July 18, 2012

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04794 JUL 18 2012

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

1                   **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2                                   **COMMISSION STAFF**

3                                   **SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF BETY MAITRE**

4                                   **DOCKET NO. 120009-EI**

5                                   **JULY 18, 2012**

6   **Q.     Please state your name and business address.**

7   **A.     My name is Bety Maitre and my business address is 3625 N.W. 82nd Ave., Suite**  
8 **400, Miami, Florida, 33166.**

9   **Q.     Are you the same Bety Maitre who presented direct testimony on behalf of**  
10 **the Florida Public Service Commission in Docket No. 120009-EI, Nuclear Cost**  
11 **Recovery Clause (NCRC)?**

12 **A.     Yes. I prefiled testimony and exhibit BM-1 on June 19, 2012, in this docket.**

13 **Q.     What is the purpose of your testimony today?**

14 **A.     The purpose of my testimony is to correct the staff audit report of Florida Power**  
15 **& Light Company (FPL or Utility).**

16 **Q.     What is the correction?**

17 **A.     I removed Audit Finding 1.**

18 **Q.     What did Audit Finding 1 originally find?**

19 **A.     Audit Finding 1 found that the Utility included a duplicate credit adjustment to its**  
20 **filing that resulted in an understatement of the construction carrying costs. In my audit**  
21 **finding, I recommended that the Utility increase its expenses by increasing Construction**  
22 **Carrying Costs by \$3,511.**

23 **Q.     What is the result of removing Audit Finding 1?**

24 **A.     It decreases the expenses for Construction Carrying Costs by \$3,511.**

25 **Q.     Why did you determine that Audit Finding 1 needed to be removed?**

1 A. Upon additional review of FPL's reconciliation between the filing and the general  
2 ledger, my supervisor and I discovered that FPL had made the proper adjustments and the  
3 filing costs were not understated.

4 **Q. How did you determine there was an error in the audit?**

5 A. FPL notified the audit supervisor that it believed there was an error in the audit,  
6 and Audit Finding 1 duplicated Audit Finding 4. Kathy Welch, my supervisor, and I did a  
7 thorough review of the audit and audit findings. While we did not find that Audit Finding  
8 1 duplicated Audit Finding 4, we did find through a review of our workpapers that Audit  
9 Finding 1 was in error.

10 **Q. Upon determining that the audit finding was incorrect, what did you do?**

11 A. We issued a revised audit report in this docket for the nuclear uprate projects on July  
12 13, 2012. This revised audit report is filed with my testimony and is identified as Exhibit  
13 BM-2.

14 **Q. Does that conclude your testimony?**

15 A. Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

State of Florida



**Public Service Commission**

Office of Auditing and Performance Analysis  
Bureau of Auditing  
Miami District Office

**Auditor's Report**

Florida Power & Light Company  
Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause  
Nuclear Extended Power Uprate

**Twelve Months Ended December 31, 2011**

Docket No. 120009-EI  
Audit Control No. 12-010-4-2  
**May 31, 2012**  
**Revised July 12, 2012**

Bety Maitre  
Audit Manager

Gabriela M. Leon  
Audit Staff

Debra Dobiac  
Audit Staff

Kathy Welch  
Reviewer

Table of Contents

Purpose..... 1

Objectives and Procedures..... 2

Audit Findings

    1: Adjustments to Construction Additions (REVISED July 12, 2012)..... 5

    2: Miscalculation of Schedule T-3 ..... 6

    3: Removal of Participation Credits..... 7

    4: Miscellaneous Adjustments ..... 8

Exhibit

    1: True-Up..... 9



Purpose

To: Florida Public Service Commission

We have performed the procedures described later in this report to meet the agreed-upon objectives set forth by the Division of Economic Regulation in its audit service request dated January 12, 2012. We have applied these procedures to the attached summary exhibit and to several related schedules prepared by Florida Power & Light Company in support of its filing for the Nuclear Extended Power Uprate in Docket No. 120009-EI.

This audit was performed following General Standards and Fieldwork Standards found in the AICPA Statements on Standards for Attestation Engagements. Our report is based on agreed-upon procedures. The report is intended only for internal Commission use.

## Objectives and Procedures

### **General**

#### Definitions

Utility refers to Florida Power & Light Company  
NCRC refers to the Nuclear Cost Recovery Clause  
EPU refers to the Extended Power Uprate

### **Capital Investments**

#### Rate Base

**Objectives:** The objective was to reconcile any transfer of construction work in progress to plant based on Commission Order No.'s PSC-10-0207-PAA-EI, PSC-11-0078-PAA-EI, and PSC-11-0575-PAA-EI. In addition, our objective was to verify Accumulated Depreciation based on the amount of plant transferred.

**Procedures:** We reconciled the amounts for Plant in Service from the orders to FPL's books and the Utility's filing, Appendix A. Depreciation is not recorded on the asset level and does not reconcile to the general ledger. Therefore, we recalculated the Accumulated Depreciation and Depreciation Expense estimates on a test basis using Commission approved rates from Docket No. 080677-EI. Plant in Service, Accumulated Depreciation, and Depreciation Expense were compared to Commission Order No.'s PSC-10-0207-PAA-EI, PSC-11-0078-PAA-EI, PSC-11-0575-PAA-EI. No exceptions were noted.

#### Construction Work in Progress (CWIP)

**Objectives:** The objectives were to verify that Construction Costs listed on the Utility's Schedule T-6 filing were supported by adequate documentation and that the capital additions were appropriately recoverable through the NCRC and in compliance with Section 366.93, F.S. and Rule 25-6.043, F.A.C.

**Procedures:** We traced CWIP additions in Schedule T-6 to the general ledger and judgmentally selected a sample for testing. We verified that additions had appropriate supporting documentation, were related to the EPU project, and were charged to the correct accounts.

### **Revenue**

#### Operating Revenue

**Objectives:** The objectives were to determine the actual Kilowatt Hours (KWH) sold for the period January 1, 2011, through December 31, 2011 and whether the Utility applied the Commission approved cost recovery factor to actual KWH sales that were included in the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause (CCRC). The NCRC costs are recovered as apart of the CCRC rate.

**Procedures:** We verified the NCRC amount approved in Order PSC-11-0547-FOF-EI to the Capacity Cost Recovery Clause. In that audit, we reconciled revenues to the ledger and the Utility's "Revenue and Rate" reports. We also selected a random sample of bills for the month of April and September 2011 and recalculated each to verify use of the correct tariff rate. No exceptions were noted.

## **Expense**

### Operation and Maintenance Expense

**Objectives:** The objectives were to verify that Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Expenses listed on the Utility's Schedule T-4 of the NCRC filing was supported by adequate documentation and that the expenses are appropriately recoverable through the NCRC clause.

**Procedures:** We traced expenses in the filing to the general ledger. We judgmentally selected a sample of 2011 O&M Expenses for testing. The source documentation for selected items was reviewed to ensure the expense was related to the EPU project and that the expense was charged to the correct accounts. No exceptions were noted.

## **Other Issues**

### Separate and Apart Process

**Objectives:** The objectives were to review and document FPL's separate and apart process for identifying and applying the adjustments necessary to ensure costs recovered thru the NCRC are limited to the EPU.

**Procedures:** We read FPL's testimony and procedures related to the separate and apart process. We reviewed the Recoverable Cost Justification Forms prepared by FPL and reconciled them to the sample items when applicable. No exceptions were noted.

## **True-up**

**Objectives:** The objective was to determine if the True-Up and Interest Provision as filed on Schedule T-1 filing was properly calculated.

**Procedures:** We traced the revenue requirements for Carrying Costs on Construction and Deferred Tax Adjustment, O&M, and Base Rate to supporting calculation schedules. We recalculated the True-Up amounts as of December 31, 2011 using the Commission approved beginning balance as of December 31, 2010, Debt and Equity Components, the Financial Commercial Paper rates, and the 2011 EPU costs. We traced all adjustments to source documents. Findings 1, 2, 3, and 4 discuss the adjustments to Construction Carrying Cost. Finding 4 also discusses the adjustments to Deferred Tax Carrying Cost.

## **Analytical Review**

**Objectives:** The objective was to perform an analytical review of the Utility's EPU Cost to determine if there were any material changes or inconsistencies from the prior year.

**Procedures:** We compared 2011 to 2010 costs and used the information to judgmentally select the sample. No exceptions were noted.

Audit Findings

**Finding 1: Adjustments to Construction Additions (REVISED July 12, 2012)**

**This finding has been deleted.**

**Finding 2: Miscalculation of Schedule T-3**

**Audit Analysis:** We tested the mathematical accuracy of Schedule T-3. In the July calculation of average Construction Work In Progress (CWIP) on line 6, the Utility did not use the correct June CWIP balance to compute the average. The calculation of the difference follows:

**Difference in Average by Staff**

Description	Amount
Beg. Balance used by Utility from pg. 1 of Sch. T-3	\$ 708,271,655
July's CWIP Balance from pg. 2 of Sch. T-3	\$ 768,386,894
July's Average CWIP from pg. 2 of Sch. T-3	\$ 738,329,274
Actual average of June and July Amount	\$ 737,015,503
Difference	\$ 1,313,771

The Utility acknowledged the miscalculation and plans to include a correction in the Errata to be filed. There were no differences between Staff's recalculation and the Schedule T-3 filing for the months of January thru June. Because the Utility's schedule had included adjustments in its calculations, the following schedule was created using the Utility's schedule which included those adjustments, along with the corrected average CWIP balance shown above, and calculates the effect on the Construction Carrying Costs.

**Construction Carrying Cost Adjustment by Staff**

Line No.	Description	Jun-11	Jul-11	Aug-11	Sep-11	Oct-11	Nov-11	Dec-11	12 Mo. Total
1	Nuclear CWIP Additions (T-6 Ln73)	\$ 37,415,487	\$ 58,674,245	\$ 39,214,123	\$ 66,036,578	\$ 62,159,515	\$ 60,863,627	\$ 92,234,545	\$ 621,137,017
2	Transfers to Plant	\$ -	\$ 14,634	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 66,610	\$ -	\$ 12,181,480	\$ 127,290,440
3	Eligible Unamtz. Carrying Charges	\$ (11,128,672)	\$ (9,673,043)	\$ (8,217,414)	\$ (6,761,785)	\$ (5,306,156)	\$ (3,850,527)	\$ (2,394,898)	
4	Amtz. of Carrying Charge	\$ (1,455,629)	\$ (1,455,629)	\$ (1,455,629)	\$ (1,455,629)	\$ (1,455,629)	\$ (1,455,629)	\$ (1,455,629)	\$ (17,467,548)
5	CWIP Base Eligible for Return	\$ 705,644,112	\$ 768,386,894	\$ 811,925,975	\$ 882,470,629	\$ 949,238,768	\$ 1,014,978,486	\$ 1,100,009,064	\$ 9,572,599,877
6	Average CWIP	\$ 685,229,675	\$ 737,015,503	\$ 790,156,434	\$ 847,198,302	\$ 915,854,698	\$ 982,108,627	\$ 1,057,493,775	\$ 9,304,288,822
7 a	Equity Component	\$ 3,131,107	\$ 3,367,755	\$ 3,610,562	\$ 3,871,210	\$ 4,184,987	\$ 4,487,673	\$ 4,834,393	\$ 42,369,499
7 b	Equity Component (gross tax)	\$ 5,097,447	\$ 5,482,710	\$ 5,878,001	\$ 6,302,337	\$ 6,813,165	\$ 7,305,939	\$ 7,870,399	\$ 68,977,614
7 c	Debt Component	\$ 908,510	\$ 977,175	\$ 1,047,627	\$ 1,123,255	\$ 1,214,299	\$ 1,302,126	\$ 1,402,728	\$ 12,293,766
8	Total Return Requirement	\$ 6,005,957	\$ 6,459,885	\$ 6,925,627	\$ 7,425,592	\$ 8,027,464	\$ 8,608,065	\$ 9,273,127	\$ 81,271,047
9	Total Return Requirement (Projected)	\$ 3,378,414	\$ 3,590,556	\$ 3,873,180	\$ 4,205,988	\$ 4,607,002	\$ 5,086,182	\$ 4,142,194	\$ 50,832,130
10	Difference	\$ 2,627,543	\$ 2,869,329	\$ 3,052,447	\$ 3,219,604	\$ 3,420,462	\$ 3,521,883	\$ 5,130,933	\$ 30,438,917
11	Actual / Estimated	\$ 5,245,972	\$ 5,648,313	\$ 6,024,859	\$ 6,455,269	\$ 6,928,273	\$ 7,414,006	\$ 7,949,847	\$ 73,321,291
12	Final True-up (Per Staff)	\$ 759,984	\$ 811,572	\$ 900,768	\$ 970,323	\$ 1,099,191	\$ 1,194,059	\$ 1,323,280	\$ 7,949,756
12	Final True-up (Per Filing)	\$ 759,984	\$ 823,087	\$ 900,819	\$ 970,424	\$ 1,099,293	\$ 1,194,162	\$ 1,323,384	\$ 7,961,731
	Difference	\$ (0)	\$ (11,515)	\$ (50)	\$ (101)	\$ (102)	\$ (103)	\$ (104)	\$ (11,975)

**Effect on the General Ledger:** There is no effect on the ledger.

**Effect on the Filing:** Construction Carrying Cost should be decreased by \$11,975.

**Finding 3: Removal of Participation Credits**

**Audit Analysis:** Appendix A, of the NCRC filing, shows jurisdictional CWIP that was transferred to Plant in Service, net of adjustments. St. Lucie Unit 2 is jointly owned and the clause is credited for participation credits. There were two participation credits that were not booked or billed but were recorded in the filing. Rule 25-6.0423 requires the filing to be based on actual costs. Therefore, these credits should be removed from the filing.

**Adjustments to Plant in Service**

Month	Description of Asset Transferred	Plant Transferred (Appendix A)	Participant Credit (Appendix A)	Adjusted Plant Transferred
October	EPU PSL Fabric Building E Roof	\$ 49,250	\$ 3,963	\$ 53,213
	Jursidictional Factor	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
	Jursidictional Total	\$ 48,668	\$ 3,916	\$ 52,584
December	EPU PSL Simulator	\$ 365,884	\$ 64,039	\$ 429,923
	Jursidictional Factor	0.98818187	0.98818187	0.98818187
	Jursidictional Total	\$ 361,560	\$ 63,282	\$ 424,842

The Utility plans to include this adjustment in its Errata filing. Plant in service is deducted in the calculation of Construction Carrying Cost. The schedule below shows the effect on Construction Carrying Cost.

**Construction Carrying Cost Effect of Increasing Transfers to Plant in Service**

Description	Rates	October	December	Total
Participation Credit Eligible for Return		\$ 3,916	\$ 63,282	
Equity Component(gross tax)	0.00743903	\$ 29	\$ 471	
Debt Component	0.00132585	\$ 5	\$ 84	
Total Return Requirement		\$ 34	\$ 555	
No. of Months		2.50	0.50	
Total		\$ 85	\$ 277	\$ 362

**Effect on the General Ledger:** There is no effect on the general ledger.

**Effect on the Filing:** Construction Carrying Cost should be decreased by \$362.

**Finding 4: Miscellaneous Adjustments**

**Audit Analysis:** There were several small miscalculations found during the NCRC audit. In the schedule below, we list some of the miscalculations and the effect on the filing.

No.	Description of Miscalculation	Effect on Construction Carrying Cost	Effect on Deferred Tax Carrying Cost
1	Pension and Welfare and Business Meals credits reflected on Line 5 Other Adjustment of Schedule T-3B is overstated by \$6,388.		\$ (5)
2	The calculation of January to December's CWIP balance on Line 6 of Schedule T-3B excludes the Pension & Welfare and Business Meals credits reflected on Line 5.		\$ 11
3	The CWIP additions on Line 1 of Schedule T-3 double counted a prior period jurisdictionalized adjustment of \$3,011.	\$ 331	
4	The calculation of the CWIP beginning balance on Schedule T-3B was increased by the the Pension & Welfare and Business Meals credits reflected on Line 5 as \$(2,173). It should have been deducted. CWIP beginning balance eligible for CPI is overstated by \$4,345.		\$ 5
	Total	\$ 331	\$ 11

Additional minor errors were found. Due to time constraints, we were unable to obtain sufficient data to properly compute the effect on the filing. However, the Utility plans to include corrections to the filing in its upcoming Errata filing.

**Effect on the General Ledger:** There is no effect on the general ledger.

**Effect on the Filing:** Carrying Cost on Construction and Deferred Taxes should be increased by \$331 and \$11.



## Exhibit

### Exhibit 1: True-Up

**St. Lucie and Turkey Point Uprate Project  
Construction Costs and Carrying Costs on Construction Cost Balance  
True-up Filing: Retail Revenue Requirements Summary**

[Section (5)(c)1.b.]

Schedule T-1 (True-up)

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
COMPANY: FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
DOCKET NO.: 120009-EI

EXPLANATION: Provide the calculation of the actual true-up of total retail revenue requirements based on actual expenditures for the prior year and the previously filed expenditures.

For the Year Ended 12/31/2011

Witness: Winnie Powers

Line No.	(A) Actual January	(B) Actual February	(C) Actual March	(D) Actual April	(E) Actual May	(F) Actual June	(G) 6 Month Total
	Jurisdictional Dollars						
1. Pre-Construction Revenue Requirements	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2. Construction Carrying Cost Revenue Requirements (Schedule T-3, line 9)	\$5,116,387	\$5,459,178	\$5,828,757	\$6,264,134	\$5,876,873	\$6,005,957	\$34,551,286
3. Recoverable O&M Revenue Requirements (Schedule T-4, line 38)	\$305,715	\$361,468	\$1,281,838	\$1,778,542	\$1,778,894	\$819,862	\$6,326,318
4. DTA(DTL) Carrying Cost (Schedule T-3A, line 8)	(\$296,265)	(\$296,789)	(\$296,691)	(\$296,269)	(\$300,626)	(\$306,201)	(\$1,792,841)
5. Other Adjustments (a)	\$0	\$0	(\$3,190)	(\$12,044)	\$922,817	\$1,226,582	\$2,134,165
6. Total Period Revenue Requirements (Lines 1 through 5)	<u>\$5,125,837</u>	<u>\$5,523,857</u>	<u>\$6,810,713</u>	<u>\$7,734,363</u>	<u>\$8,277,959</u>	<u>\$7,746,200</u>	<u>\$41,218,928</u>
7. Projected Revenue Requirements for the period (Order No. PSC 11-0095-FOF-EI)	\$4,548,058	\$5,017,875	\$5,897,267	\$6,451,653	\$6,455,729	\$6,463,809	\$34,834,391
8. Difference (Line 6 - Line 7)	<u>\$577,779</u>	<u>\$505,982</u>	<u>\$913,446</u>	<u>\$1,282,710</u>	<u>\$1,822,230</u>	<u>\$1,282,391</u>	<u>\$6,384,538</u>
9. Actual / Estimated Revenue Requirements for the period	\$4,988,911	\$5,391,941	\$7,974,489	\$6,657,429	\$7,541,780	\$7,406,511	\$39,961,060
10. Final True-up Amount for the Period (Line 6 - Line 9)	<u>\$136,926</u>	<u>\$131,916</u>	<u>(\$1,163,776)</u>	<u>\$1,076,934</u>	<u>\$736,178</u>	<u>\$339,689</u>	<u>\$1,257,868</u>

\* Totals may not add due to rounding

(a) Other Adjustments Line 5 represents Base Rate Revenue Requirements for 2010 and carrying costs on over/under recoveries. Refer to Appendix C Line 8.  
(b) Includes prior period adjustment of (\$333) as shown on T-3, line 8.

Docket No. 120009-EI  
Exhibit BM-2  
Page 11 of 12

**St. Lucie and Turkey Point Uprate Project**  
**Construction Costs and Carrying Costs on Construction Cost Balance**  
**True-up Filing: Retail Revenue Requirements Summary**

[Section (5)(c)1.b.]

Schedule T-1 (True-up)

Line No.	(H) Actual July	(I) Actual August	(J) Actual September	(K) Actual October	(L) Actual November	(M) Actual December	(N) 12 Month Total
	Jurisdictional Dollars						
1.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.	\$6,471,400	\$6,925,678	\$7,425,693	\$8,027,566	\$8,608,168	\$9,273,231	\$81,283,022 (b)
3.	\$180,679	\$98,254	\$1,358,166	\$432,542	\$1,219,480	\$1,969,004	\$11,584,442
4.	(\$308,202)	(\$310,187)	(\$317,410)	(\$323,890)	(\$323,538)	(\$320,770)	(\$3,696,838)
5.	\$1,207,637	\$1,188,578	\$1,169,331	\$1,150,278	\$1,131,100	\$1,157,714	\$9,138,802
6.	<u>\$7,551,513</u>	<u>\$7,902,323</u>	<u>\$9,635,779</u>	<u>\$9,286,496</u>	<u>\$10,635,210</u>	<u>\$12,079,179</u>	<u>\$98,309,428</u>
7.	\$6,672,675	\$6,972,602	\$7,303,896	\$7,901,387	\$8,379,822	\$9,252,560	\$81,317,333
8.	<u>\$878,839</u>	<u>\$929,720</u>	<u>\$2,331,884</u>	<u>\$1,385,109</u>	<u>\$2,255,388</u>	<u>\$2,826,618</u>	<u>\$16,992,096</u>
9.	\$7,445,469	\$7,807,426	\$8,257,517	\$10,931,134	\$11,417,060	\$12,885,043	\$98,704,710
10.	<u>(\$14,996,983)</u>	<u>(\$15,709,749)</u>	<u>(\$17,893,297)</u>	<u>(\$20,217,630)</u>	<u>(\$22,052,270)</u>	<u>(\$24,964,222)</u>	<u>(\$395,281)</u>

\* Totals may not add due to rounding

(a) Other Adjustments Line 5 represents Base Rate Revenue Requirements for 2010 and carrying costs on over/under recoveries. Refer to Appendix C Line 8.  
(b) Includes prior period adjustment of (\$333) as shown on T-3, line 8.