BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 130001-EI
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

MAY 13, 2013

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR PERFORMANCE RESULTS FOR

JANUARY 2012 THROUGH DECEMBER 2012

TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS OF:

J. CARINE BULLOCK

COM 5
AFD 6
APA
ECO 1
ENG 1
GCL 1
IDM
TEL
CLK 1-Ctf Rec

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

TESTIMONY OF J. CARINE BULLOCK

DOCKET NO. 130001-EI

MAY 13, 2013

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is J. Carine Bullock, and my business address is 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

Q. By whom are you currently employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company ("FPL") and I am the Vice President of Production Assurance and Business Services in the Power Generation Division of FPL, where I am responsible for providing production process standardization and commercial support for FPL's fossil generating assets.

Q. Have you previously testified in predecessors to this docket?

A. Yes, I have.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to report actual 2012 performance for Equivalent Availability Factor (EAF) and Average Net Operating Heat Rate (ANOHR) for the ten generating units used to determine the Generating Performance Incentive Factor (GPIF). In addition, I will explain adjustments that FPL proposes to the heat rate, net output factor (NOF) and Forced Outage

Factor (FOF) of St. Lucie 1 (PSL1), St. Lucie 2 (PSL2) and Turkey Point 3 (PTN3) to address the impact on their operation resulting from the Extended Power Uprates (EPU). I have compared the performance of each unit to the targets approved in Commission Order No. PSC-11-0579-FOF-EI issued December 16, 2011, for the period January through December 2012, and performed the reward/penalty calculations prescribed by the GPIF Manual. My testimony presents the result of these calculations: $46,363,302 of fuel savings to FPL's customers as a result of the availability and efficiency of FPL's GPIF generating units, and a GPIF reward of $20,679,970 that reflects FPL's proposed adjustment to PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 heat rates, NOFs and FOFs.

Q. **Have you prepared, or caused to have prepared under your direction, supervision, or control any exhibits in this proceeding?**

A. Yes. Exhibit JCB-1 shows the reward/penalty calculations. Page 1 of Exhibit JCB-1 is an index to the contents of the exhibit.

Q. Please explain how the total GPIF reward/penalty amount was calculated in general terms.

A. The steps involved in making this calculation are provided in Exhibit JCB-1. Page 2 provides the GPIF Reward/Penalty Table (Actual), which shows an overall GPIF performance point value of +4.46, $46,363,302 in fuel savings and an adjusted GPIF reward of $20,679,970. Page 3 provides the calculation of the maximum allowed incentive dollars. The calculation of the system actual GPIF performance points is shown on page 4. This page lists each

GPIF unit, the unit's performance indicators (EAF and ANOHR), the weighting factors, and the associated GPIF points.

Page 5 is the actual EAF and adjustments summary. This page, in columns 1 through 5, lists each of the ten GPIF units, the actual outage factors and the actual EAF for the fossil units and Turkey Point 4 (PTN4) and the proposed adjustment to actual FOF for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 that is explained later in my testimony. Column 6 is the adjustment for planned outage variation. Column 7 is the adjusted actual EAF, which is calculated on page 6. Column 8 is the target EAF. Column 9 contains the Generating Performance Incentive Points for availability as determined by interpolating from the tables shown on pages 8 through 17. These tables are based on the targets and target ranges submitted to, and approved by, the Commission.

Continuing with Exhibit JCB-1, Page 7 shows the adjustments to ANOHR. For each of the ten units, it shows, in columns 2 through 4, the target heat rate formula, the actual NOF and ANOHR for the fossil units and Turkey Point 4 and the proposed modification to actual NOF and ANOHR for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 that is explained later in my testimony. Since heat rate varies with NOF, it is necessary to determine both the target and actual heat rates at the same NOF. This adjustment provides a common basis for comparison purposes and is shown numerically for each GPIF unit in columns 5 through 8. Column 9 contains the Generating Performance Incentive Points as

determined by interpolating from the tables shown on pages 8 through 17. These tables are based on the targets and target ranges submitted to, and approved by, the Commission.

Q. Please explain the primary reason or reasons why FPL will receive a reward under the GPIF for the January through December 2012 period.

A. The primary reason that FPL will receive a reward for the period was that adjusted actual EAFs for St. Lucie 1 and 2, Turkey Point 3 and 4, and five of the fossil units were each better than target.

Q. Please summarize each nuclear unit's performance as it relates to the EAF of the units.

A. St. Lucie Unit 1 operated at an adjusted actual EAF of 72.5%, compared to its target of 68.7%. This results in a +10.0 point reward, which corresponds to a GPIF reward of $4,420,026.

St. Lucie Unit 2 operated at an adjusted actual EAF of 66.9%, compared to its target of 60.1%. This results in a +10.0 point reward, which corresponds to a GPIF reward of $2,467,423.

Turkey Point Unit 3 operated at an adjusted actual EAF of 55.0% compared to its target of 49.9%. This results in a +10.0 point reward, which corresponds to a GPIF reward of $2,796,722.

Turkey Point Unit 4 operated at an adjusted actual EAF of 84.4% compared to its target of 78.0%. This results in a +10.0 point reward, which corresponds to a GPIF reward of $3,506,337.

In total, the combined nuclear units' EAF performance results in a net GPIF reward of $13,190,508.

Q. Please summarize each nuclear unit performance as it relates to the ANOHR of the units.

A. By utilizing the three-year average for ANOHR and NOF that is explained later in my testimony, the St. Lucie Unit 1 adjusted actual ANOHR results in 10,705 Btu/kWh compared to its target of 10,771 Btu/kWh. This ANOHR is within the ±75 Btu/kWh dead band around the projected target; therefore, there is no GPIF reward or penalty.

By utilizing the three-year average for ANOHR and NOF, the St. Lucie Unit 2 adjusted actual ANOHR results in 10,643 Btu/kWh compared to its target of 10,724 Btu/kWh. This results in a +1.32 point reward, which corresponds to a GPIF reward of $120,588.

By utilizing the three-year average for ANOHR and NOF, the Turkey Point Unit 3 adjusted actual ANOHR results in 10,797 Btu/kWh compared to its target of 10,875 Btu/kWh. This results in a +0.46 point reward, which corresponds to a GPIF reward of $53,801.

The Turkey Point Unit 4 adjusted actual ANOHR is 11,304 Btu/kWh compared to its target of 11,263 Btu/kWh. This ANOHR is within the ±75 Btu/kWh dead band around the projected target; therefore, there is no GPIF reward or penalty.

In total, the combined nuclear units' heat rate performance results in a GPIF reward of $174,389 when FPL's proposed modification to reflect the three-year average for ANOHR and NOF is used.

Q. What is the total GPIF reward for FPL's nuclear units?

A. $13,364,897.

Q. Please summarize the performance of FPL's fossil units.

A. Regarding EAF performance, five of the six fossil generating units performed better than their availability targets resulting in a reward of $6,527,075 while the remaining unit performed worse than its availability target resulting in a penalty of $264,367. Thus, the combined fossil units' availability performance results in a net GPIF reward of $6,262,708.

Regarding ANOHR, one out of the six fossil units (Martin 8) operated with an ANOHR that was below the ±75 Btu/kWh dead band, resulting in a reward. However, the low actual ANOHR is due in part to the energy input from Martin Solar. In contrast, the ANOHR target is based on three years of Martin 8 operations before the solar energy input was as substantial as it was in 2012

and is today. Accordingly, FPL has adjusted the Martin 8 ANOHR to exclude the effect of Martin Solar energy input, so that it is more directly comparable to the operations during the target-setting period. With this adjustment, the Martin 8 reward is $1,052,365, reflecting a reduction of more than $2.2 million. Once there have been three years of Martin 8 operations with substantial solar input, this type of adjustment will no longer be needed. The remaining five fossil units operated with ANOHRs that were within the ±75 Btu/kWh dead band and so received no incentive reward or penalty. Thus, the combined fossil units' heat rate performance results in a net GPIF reward of $1,052,365.

Q. What is the total GPIF reward/penalty for FPL's fossil units?

A. The net GPIF availability performance reward of $6,262,708 plus the net GPIF heat rate performance reward of $1,052,365 results in a total GPIF reward for FPL's fossil units of $7,315,073.

Q. To recap, what is the total GPIF result for the period January through December 2012?

A. The total GPIF result for the period January through December 2012 is $46,363,302 of fuel savings to FPL's customers as a result of the availability and efficiency of FPL's GPIF generating units, and a GPIF reward of $20,679,970.

Q. Is FPL proposing an adjustment to the reward/penalty calculations for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3?

A. Yes. FPL believes that this adjustment is reasonable and appropriate in order to address a statistical anomaly that I will discuss below. The effect of the adjustment is to lower the 2012 GPIF heat rate reward for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3.

Q. Please explain the reason for FPL's proposed adjustment.

A. In order to explain the adjustment, it will be useful first to briefly describe how achieved heat rates are compared to target heat rates for the purpose of determining GPIF rewards or penalties.

Because the achievable heat rate for a generating unit is dependent in part on the NOF at which the unit is operating (i.e., generally, operation at full load is more efficient than operation at partial load), the GPIF methodology provides for adjustments to the ANOHR of the GPIF units once the actual heat rate and net output factor are known at the end of the projection period. (Page 4.214, Paragraph 2.3.7 of the GPIF manual). This adjustment is made based on a curve that correlates expected ANOHR with NOF based on regression analysis. While the details of the calculation are complex, the effect of the adjustment is to express the actual ANOHR and the target ANOHR at the same NOF, so that the reward/penalty determination will properly reflect the utility's success in operating the units efficiently rather than simply the differences in efficiency due to the actual NOF being different than what was projected at the time the targets were set.

Normally, regression analysis is an appropriate and effective basis for developing the correlation curves between ANOHR and NOF, because the actual NOF falls within or at least very close to the range of NOF values from which the regression equations are determined. However, due to the number and duration of periods when PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 were operated at partial load for testing purposes as a result of the EPUs, the 2012 actual NOFs were considerably lower than normal for those three units. These NOFs fall well outside the range of the NOFs from which the regression equations were calculated and consequently do not provide a statistically valid basis for adjusting the actual ANOHR as prescribed by the GPIF methodology. The Turkey Point 4 (PTN4) ANOHR and NOF were not significantly affected by the EPU since this outage did not start until late in the year and the unit stayed off-line for EPU work for the remainder of 2012. Hence, the unit did not operate at a reduced NOF for testing purposes in 2012 as was the case for the other three nuclear units, and therefore no adjustment was necessary to the ANOHR and NOF of this unit.

Q. How does FPL propose to perform the GPIF ANOHR reward/penalty calculations for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 in the absence of statistically valid correlation curves?

A. FPL calculated the three-year average (2009-2011) for ANOHR and NOF for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 and used those values as a proxy to represent their 2012 performance. A three-year time frame was chosen since it is consistent with the time frame used in developing GPIF heat rate targets. FPL believes

this is a reasonable approach in the absence of a reliable basis for performing the calculation using actual 2012 performance.

Q. What is the impact on the total reward amount of using the three-year actual ANOHR and NOF performance for these nuclear units?

A. FPL's proposed adjustment reduces the 2012 GPIF reward by $2.9 million.

Q. Did FPL also make an adjustment to the availability (EAF) reward/penalty calculations for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 to reflect the impact of the EPUs?

A. Yes. The GPIF reward/penalty calculation for availability does not have a direct counterpart to the need to correlate ANOHR and NOF in the GPIF reward/penalty calculation for heat rate. Therefore, there is no regression equation and no concern about statistical validity. Nonetheless, FPL closely scrutinized the manner in which EAF is calculated to determine whether any form of adjustment for the impact of the EPU outages would be warranted. FPL focused on whether the forced outage factors (FOFs) and maintenance outage factors (MOFs) that are used in determining EAF for the nuclear units might be unrepresentatively low as a result of the EPU outages, which would tend to increase the calculated reward. The reason for this focus is that FOF and MOF reflect, respectively, the number of forced outage hours and maintenance outage hours during the year, divided by the total number of hours in the year (8,784 hours in 2012). Because PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 were out of service for extended periods in 2012 due to the EPUs and would have had no opportunity for either forced or maintenance outages during those

periods, FPL was concerned that using the full 8,784 hours as the denominator might result in calculated FOFs and MOFs that were lower than what one would reasonably expect if the units had operated throughout the year. As noted earlier, PTN4 was offline for its EPU outage during only a small portion of 2012 and hence the denominators in the FOF and MOF calculations would not be significantly affected.

FPL recalculated the FOFs for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 using the actual number of hours that each unit was available to be in service (i.e., net of the EPU outage hours). This re-calculation resulted in modest increases in the FOFs for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3. The MOFs for these units were zero, so they were unaffected by the re-calculation (i.e., because the numerators were zero, reducing the denominators could not affect the resulting factors). I should point out that the FOF and MOF for PTN4 were both zero and likewise would have been unaffected by an adjustment to their denominators.

The increased FOFs for PSL1, PSL2 and PTN3 did not affect the reward calculation, because each of those nuclear units received the maximum allowed EAF reward with or without the increases. Rather, what this exercise confirmed was that the nuclear units had excellent reliability performance in 2012 before and after the EPUs. It is very common that the initial period of operation following extensive modifications to a nuclear unit (or any piece of complex equipment) will entail a series of minor outages to address "infant

mortality" issues on the new equipment. Such outages would increase the FOF and/or MOF for the unit. Instead, the performance of these nuclear units in 2012 after they returned from the EPU outages was strong, notwithstanding the extensive, unprecedented scope of the EPU work that was performed. Under these circumstances, the GPIF reward for nuclear unit availability is well deserved.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR

JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

JCB-1
DOCKET NO. 130001-EI
FPL Witness: J. Carine Bullock
Exhibit No.: _____
Pages 1 - 18
May 13, 2013

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR

REWARD/PENALTY TABLE (ACTUAL)

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

GENERATNG PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS (GPIF)		FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)		GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR ($000)	
+ 10		91,083		46,380	
+ 9		81,975		41,742	
+ 8		72,866		37,104	
+ 7		63,758		32,466	
+ 6		54,650		27,828	
+ 5	<——— 4.46	45,542	<——— 46,363.302	23,190	<——— 20,679.970
+ 4		36,433		18,552	
+ 3		27,325		13,914	
+ 2		18,217		9,276	
+ 1		9,108		4,638	
0		0		0	
- 1		(9,108)		(4,638)	
- 2		(18,217)		(9,276)	
- 3		(27,325)		(13,914)	
- 4		(36,433)		(18,552)	
- 5		(45,542)		(23,190)	
- 6		(54,650)		(27,828)	
- 7		(63,758)		(32,466)	
- 8		(72,866)		(37,104)	
- 9		(81,975)		(41,742)	
- 10		(91,083)		(46,380)	

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FACTOR

CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM ALLOWED INCENTIVE DOLLARS

ACTUAL

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

LINE 1	BEGINNING OF PERIOD BALANCE OF COMMON EQUITY END OF MONTH BALANCE OF COMMON EQUITY			$ 10,849,749,770
LINE 2	MONTH OF	January	2012	$ 10,983,930,940
LINE 3	MONTH OF	February	2012	$ 11,043,325,330
LINE 4	MONTH OF	March	2012	$ 11,128,965,610
LINE 5	MONTH OF	April	2012	$ 11,196,334,650
LINE 6	MONTH OF	May	2012	$ 11,333,068,500
LINE 7	MONTH OF	June	2012	$ 11,681,736,330
LINE 8	MONTH OF	July	2012	$ 11,828,681,570
LINE 9	MONTH OF	August	2012	$ 11,987,094,020
LINE 10	MONTH OF	September	2012	$ 12,073,906,876
LINE 11	MONTH OF	October	2012	$ 12,172,856,430
LINE 12	MONTH OF	November	2012	$ 12,463,562,700
LINE 13	MONTH OF	December	2012	$ 12,530,193,155
LINE 14	AVERAGE COMMON EQUITY FOR THE PERIOD (SUMMATION OF LINE1 THROUGH LINE 13 DIVIDED BY 13)			$ 11,636,415,837
LINE 15	25 BASIS POINTS			0.0025
LINE 16	REVENUE EXPANSION FACTOR			61.3808%
LINE 17	MAXIMUM ALLOWED INCENTIVE DOLLARS (LINE 14 TIMES LINE 15 DIVIDED BY LINE 16)			$ 47,394,364
LINE 18	JURISDICTIONAL SALES			102,225,549,000 KWH
LINE 19	TOTAL SALES			104,462,720,986 KWH
LINE 20	JURISDICTIONAL SEPARATION FACTOR (LINE 18 DIVIDED BY LINE 19)			97.86%
LINE 21	MAXIMUM ALLOWED JURISDICTIONAL INCENTIVE DOLLARS (LINE 17 TIMES LINE 20)			$ 46,380,125

JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

DERIVATION OF SYSTEM ACTUAL GPIF POINTS

PLANT/UNIT	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	WEIGHTING FACTOR %	UNIT POINTS	WEIGHTED UNIT POINTS
Ft. Myers 2	EAF	6.90	5.60	.3864
Ft. Myers 2	ANOHR	3.51	0.00	.0000
Martin 8	EAF	5.86	3.20	.1875
Martin 8	ANOHR	7.18	3.16	.2269
Manatee 3	EAF	5.84	6.00	.3504
Manatee 3	ANOHR	6.42	0.00	.0000
Sanford 4	EAF	3.80	-1.50	-.0570
Sanford 4	ANOHR	3.19	0.00	.0000
Scherer 4	EAF	4.38	10.00	.4380
Scherer 4	ANOHR	2.17	0.00	.0000
St. Lucie 1	EAF	9.53	10.00	.9530
St. Lucie 1	ANOHR	2.19	0.00	.0000
St. Lucie 2	EAF	5.32	10.00	.5320
St. Lucie 2	ANOHR	1.97	1.32	.0260
Turkey Point 3	EAF	6.03	10.00	.6030
Turkey Point 3	ANOHR	2.53	0.46	.0116
Turkey Point 4	EAF	7.56	10.00	.7560
Turkey Point 4	ANOHR	4.50	0.00	.0000
Turkey Point 5	EAF	5.62	0.80	.0450
Turkey Point 5	ANOHR	5.50	0.00	.0000
GPIF System Total:		100		4.46

ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY AND ADJUSTMENTS

JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9			
	ACTUAL				PLANNED OUTAGE ADJ TO	ADJUSTED ACTUAL		POINTS FROM	ORIGINAL PLANNED OUTAGE	ACTUAL OUTAGE	ACTUAL FUEL SAVINGS/ (LOSS)
UNIT	FOF	MOF	POF	EAF	EAF [1]	EAF	TARGET EAF	TABLES	DATES	DATES	($000)
Ft. Myers 2	0.3	4.8	1.9	93.0	0.0	93.0	91.6	5.60	02/04/12 - 02/10/12; 02/11/12 - 02/17/12 02/12/12 - 02/18/12; 02/19/12 - 02/25/12	10/21/12-10/28/12; 10/20/12-10/27/12 12/10/12-12/16/12; 12/11/12-12/17/12 10/29/12-11/05/12; 10/28/12-11/04/12	3,519.0
Martin 8	1.5	4.4	2.5	91.6	0.6	92.2	91.4	3.20	11/26/12 - 12/23/12	9/22/12-9/29/12; 10/22/12-11/21/12	1,706.9
Manatee 3	0.0	3.6	2.1	94.3	1.1	95.4	93.9	6.00	11/03/12 - 11/09/12; 11/10/12 - 11/16/12	11/9/12-11/28/12; 11/28/12-12/11/12	3,192.0
Sanford 4	0.3	3.8	2.6	93.3	-1.1	92.2	92.5	-1.50	02/18/12 - 02/24/12; 05/26/12 - 06/20/12 06/21/12 - 06/27/12; 11/26/12 - 12/09/12	11/28/12-12/14/12; 10/9/12-11/3/12	(519.2)
Scherer 4	0.9	1.2	18.8	79.1	-4.6	74.5	72.5	10.00	03/02/12 - 05/26/12	3/2/12/-5/9/12	3,987.0
St. Lucie 1	2.1	0.0	39.1	58.8	13.7	72.5	68.7	10.00	01/01/12 - 04/01/12	1/1/12-4/21/12	8,679.0
St. Lucie 2	2.2	0.0	31.3	66.5	0.4	66.9	60.1	10.00	07/09/12 - 10/30/12	8/5/12-11/23/12	4,849.0
Turkey Point 3	0.9	0.0	63.2	35.9	19.1	55.0	49.9	10.00	01/30/12 - 07/08/12	2/26/12-9/5/12	5,488.0
Turkey Point 4	0.0	0.0	16.0	84.0	0.4	84.4	78.0	10.00	11/05/12 - 12/31/12	11/5/12-12/31/12	6,889.0
Turkey Point 5	0.1	5.1	0.9	93.9	-1.1	92.8	92.6	0.80	03/17/12 - 03/23/12; 03/24/12 - 03/30/12 03/24/12 - 03/30/12; 06/01/12 - 06/10/12	11/26/12-12/12/12	409.8
											38,200.610

(1) EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY ADJUSTMENT DUE TO PLANNED OUTAGE ACTUAL DURATION VERSUS TARGET DURATION
SEE 6.203.006 FOR FORMULAS AND CALCULATION DATA

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY ADJUSTMENTS
JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

	ACTUAL				TARGETS		ADJUSTED ACTUAL
PLANT / UNIT	PH	EFOH	EMOH	EPOH	POF%	EPOH	EAF%
Ft. Myers 2	8784	27.2	417.9	165.5	1.9	168.0	93.0
Martin 8	8784	132.8	383.0	220.5	1.9	168.0	92.2
Manatee 3	8784	3.9	312.8	187.8	1.0	84.0	95.4
Sanford 4	8784	25.8	335.4	228.8	3.7	324.0	92.2
Scherer 4	8784	79.8	106.5	1649.6	23.5	2064.0	74.5
St. Lucie 1	8784	188.0	0.0	3432.5	24.9	2184.0	72.5
St. Lucie 2	8784	191.5	0.0	2753.3	30.9	2712.0	66.9
Turkey Point 3	8784	74.7	0.0	5553.7	43.7	3840.0	55.0
Turkey Point 4	8784	0.0	0.0	1404.7	15.6	1368.0	84.4
Turkey Point 5	8784	6.9	449.4	80.7	2.1	186.0	92.8

$$\text{ADJ. ACTUAL EAF\%} = 100\% - POF_T - \frac{(EFOH_A + EMOH_A) \times \frac{PH - EPOH_T}{PH - EPOH_A}}{PH} \times 100\%$$

ADJUSTMENTS TO AVERAGE NET OPERATING HEAT RATES & ADJUSTMENTS SUMMARY

JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

1	2					3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
						ACTUAL		TARGET [2]	ADJUST.[3]		ADJUST.[5]	GPIF[6]	ACTUAL
UNIT	HEAT RATE [1] FORMULA					NOF %	ANOHR BTU/KWH	ANOHR AT ACTUAL NOF BTU/KWH	TO ANOHR BTU/KWH	TARGET [4] ANOHR BTU/KWH	ACTUAL ANOHR BTU/KWH	POINTS FROM TABLE	FUEL SAV./(LOSS) $000
Ft. Myers 2	ANOHR=	-9.31 x	NOF +	8,001		79.4	7,258	7,262	-4	7,105	7,101	0.00	0.0
Martin 8	ANOHR=	-5.78 x	NOF +	7,573		77.4	7,021	7,126	-105	7,025	6,920	3.16	2065.7
Manatee 3	ANOHR=	-2.46 x	NOF +	7,162		78.0	6,964	6,970	-6	6,930	6,924	0.00	0.0
Sanford 4	ANOHR=	-7.12 x	NOF +	7,928		73.1	7,404	7,408	-4	7,252	7,248	0.00	0.0
Scherer 4	ANOHR=	-16.22 x	NOF +	11,497		78.3	10,290	10,227	63	9,948	10,011	0.00	0.0
St. Lucie 1	ANOHR=	-34.86 x	NOF +	14,285		97.4	10,824	10,890	-66	10,771	10,705	0.00	1997.0
St. Lucie 2	ANOHR=	-21.94 x	NOF +	12,940		101.5	10,632	10,713	-81	10,724	10,643	1.32	1793.0
Turkey Point 3	ANOHR=	-93.86 x	NOF +	20,627		101.7	11,003	11,081	-78	10,875	10,797	0.46	2307.0
Turkey Point 4	ANOHR=	-76.05 x	NOF +	18,754		101.9	11,046	11,005	41	11,263	11,304	0.00	0.0
Turkey Point 5	ANOHR=	-11.56 x	NOF +	7,987		75.9	7,116	7,110	6	6,936	6,942	0.00	0.0

8,162.692

1) THESE FORMULAS ARE AS APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION IN THE PROJECTION FILING AND ARE BASED ON MONTHLY ACTUAL DATA
2) CALCULATED FROM ANOHR FORMULA IN COLUMN 2 USING ACTUAL NOF IN COLUMN 3
3) ADJUSTMENT TO ANOHR=ACTUAL ANOHR - TARGET ANOHR AT ACTUAL NOF (COLUMN 6 = COLUMN 4 - COLUMN 5).
4) AT TARGET NOF AS APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION IN PROJECTED DATA.
5) AT TARGET NOF, ADJUSTED ACTUAL ANOHR = TARGET ANOHR + ADJUSTMENTS (COLUMN 8 = COLUMN 7 + COLUMN 6).
6) OBTAINED FROM THE GPIF POINT TABLES USING THE COMMISSION APPROVED TARGETS.
7) ST. LUCIE 1, ST. LUCIE 2 AND TURKEY POINT 3 FUEL SAVINGS REPRESENT THE SAVINGS FROM ACTUAL, UNADJUSTED HEAT RATE PERFORMANCE

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Ft. Myers 2

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	6,284.00	94.1	+10	3200.00	7016
+9	5,655.60	93.9	+9	2880.00	7017
+8	5,027.20	93.6	+8	2560.00	7019
+7	4,398.80	93.4	+7	2240.00	7020
+6	3,770.40	93.1	+6	1920.00	7022
+5	3,142.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 3,519.0	92.9 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 93.0	+5	1600.00	7023
+4	2,513.60	92.6	+4	1280.00	7024
+3	1,885.20	92.4	+3	960.00	7026
+2	1,256.80	92.1	+2	640.00	7027
+1	628.40	91.9	+1	320.00	7029
				0.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 0	7030 <- Adj. Act. HR=7101
0	0.00	91.6	0	0.00	7105
				(0.00)	7180
-1	(-628.40)	91.4	-1	(-320.00)	7181
-2	(-1,256.80)	91.1	-2	(-640.00)	7183
-3	(-1,885.20)	90.9	-3	(-960.00)	7184
-4	(-2,513.60)	90.6	-4	(-1280.00)	7186
-5	(-3,142.00)	90.4	-5	(-1600.00)	7187
-6	(-3,770.40)	90.1	-6	(-1920.00)	7188
-7	(-4,398.80)	89.9	-7	(-2240.00)	7190
-8	(-5,027.20)	89.6	-8	(-2560.00)	7191
-9	(-5,655.60)	89.4	-9	(-2880.00)	7193
-10	(-6,284.00)	89.1	-10	(-3200.00)	7194
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	6.90		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	3.51

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Martin 8

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)		ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY		AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)		ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES	
+10	5,334.00		93.9		+10	6537.00		6855	
+9	4,800.60		93.7		+9	5883.30		6865	
+8	4,267.20		93.4		+8	5229.60		6874	
+7	3,733.80		93.2		+7	4575.90		6884	
+6	3,200.40		92.9		+6	3922.20		6893	
+5	2,667.00		92.7		+5	3268.50		6903	
+4	2,133.60		92.4		+4	2614.80	<- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 2,065.7	6912	<- Adj. Act. HR=6920
+3	1,600.20	<- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 1,706.9	92.2	<- Adj. Act. EAF= 92.2	+3	1961.10		6922	
+2	1,066.80		91.9		+2	1307.40		6931	
+1	533.40		91.7		+1	653.70		6941	
						0.00		6950	
0	0.00		91.4		0	0.00		7025	
						(0.00)		7100	
-1	(-533.40)		91.2		-1	(-653.70)		7110	
-2	(-1,066.80)		90.9		-2	(-1307.40)		7119	
-3	(-1,600.20)		90.7		-3	(-1961.10)		7129	
-4	(-2,133.60)		90.4		-4	(-2614.80)		7138	
-5	(-2,667.00)		90.2		-5	(-3268.50)		7148	
-6	(-3,200.40)		89.9		-6	(-3922.20)		7157	
-7	(-3,733.80)		89.7		-7	(-4575.90)		7167	
-8	(-4,267.20)		89.4		-8	(-5229.60)		7176	
-9	(-4,800.60)		89.2		-9	(-5883.30)		7186	
-10	(-5,334.00)		88.9		-10	(-6537.00)		7195	
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =		5.86			WEIGHTING FACTOR =		7.18	

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Manatee 3

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	5,320.00	96.4	+10	5843.00	6774
+9	4,788.00	96.2	+9	5258.70	6782
+8	4,256.00	95.9	+8	4674.40	6790
+7	3,724.00	95.7	+7	4090.10	6798
+6	3,192.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 3,192.0	95.4 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 95.4	+6	3505.80	6806
+5	2,660.00	95.2	+5	2921.50	6815
+4	2,128.00	94.9	+4	2337.20	6823
+3	1,596.00	94.7	+3	1752.90	6831
+2	1,064.00	94.4	+2	1168.60	6839
+1	532.00	94.2	+1	584.30	6847
				0.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 0	6855 <- Adj. Act. HR=6924
0	0.00	93.9	0	0.00	6930
				(0.00)	7005
-1	(-532.00)	93.7	-1	(-584.30)	7013
-2	(-1,064.00)	93.4	-2	(-1168.60)	7021
-3	(-1,596.00)	93.2	-3	(-1752.90)	7029
-4	(-2,128.00)	92.9	-4	(-2337.20)	7037
-5	(-2,660.00)	92.7	-5	(-2921.50)	7046
-6	(-3,192.00)	92.4	-6	(-3505.80)	7054
-7	(-3,724.00)	92.2	-7	(-4090.10)	7062
-8	(-4,256.00)	91.9	-8	(-4674.40)	7070
-9	(-4,788.00)	91.7	-9	(-5258.70)	7078
-10	(-5,320.00)	91.4	-10	(-5843.00)	7086
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	5.84		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	6.42

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Sanford 4

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	3,461.00	94.5	+10	2907.00	7140
+9	3,114.90	94.3	+9	2616.30	7144
+8	2,768.80	94.1	+8	2325.60	7147
+7	2,422.70	93.9	+7	2034.90	7151
+6	2,076.60	93.7	+6	1744.20	7155
+5	1,730.50	93.5	+5	1453.50	7159
+4	1,384.40	93.3	+4	1162.80	7162
+3	1,038.30	93.1	+3	872.10	7166
+2	692.20	92.9	+2	581.40	7170
+1	346.10	92.7	+1	290.70	7173
				0.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 0	7177 <- Adj. Act. HR=7248
0	0.00	92.5	0	0.00	7252
				(0.00)	7327
-1	(-346.10)	92.3	-1	(-290.70)	7331
-2	(-692.20) <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) (519.2)	92.1 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 92.2	-2	(-581.40)	7334
-3	(-1,038.30)	91.9	-3	(-872.10)	7338
-4	(-1,384.40)	91.7	-4	(-1162.80)	7342
-5	(-1,730.50)	91.5	-5	(-1453.50)	7346
-6	(-2,076.60)	91.3	-6	(-1744.20)	7349
-7	(-2,422.70)	91.1	-7	(-2034.90)	7353
-8	(-2,768.80)	90.9	-8	(-2325.60)	7357
-9	(-3,114.90)	90.7	-9	(-2616.30)	7360
-10	(-3,461.00)	90.5	-10	(-2907.00)	7364
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	3.80		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	3.19

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Scherer 4

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	3,987.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 3,987.0	74.5 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 74.5	+10	1979.00	9754
+9	3,588.30	74.3	+9	1781.10	9766
+8	3,189.60	74.1	+8	1583.20	9778
+7	2,790.90	73.9	+7	1385.30	9790
+6	2,392.20	73.7	+6	1187.40	9802
+5	1,993.50	73.5	+5	989.50	9814
+4	1,594.80	73.3	+4	791.60	9825
+3	1,196.10	73.1	+3	593.70	9837
+2	797.40	72.9	+2	395.80	9849
+1	398.70	72.7	+1	197.90	9861
				0.00	9873
0	0.00	72.5	0	0.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 0	9948 <- Adj. Act. HR=10011
				(0.00)	10023
-1	(-398.70)	72.3	-1	(-197.90)	10035
-2	(-797.40)	72.1	-2	(-395.80)	10047
-3	(-1,196.10)	71.9	-3	(-593.70)	10059
-4	(-1,594.80)	71.7	-4	(-791.60)	10071
-5	(-1,993.50)	71.5	-5	(-989.50)	10083
-6	(-2,392.20)	71.3	-6	(-1187.40)	10094
-7	(-2,790.90)	71.1	-7	(-1385.30)	10106
-8	(-3,189.60)	70.9	-8	(-1583.20)	10118
-9	(-3,588.30)	70.7	-9	(-1781.10)	10130
-10	(-3,987.00)	70.5	-10	(-1979.00)	10142
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	4.38		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	2.17

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: St. Lucie 1

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	8,679.0 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 8,679.0	71.7 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 72.5	+10	1997.0 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 1,997.0	10695
+9	7,811.1	71.4	+9	1797.3	10695
+8	6,943.2	71.1	+8	1597.6	10695
+7	6,075.3	70.8	+7	1397.9	10695
+6	5,207.4	70.5	+6	1198.2	10695
+5	4,339.5	70.2	+5	998.5	10696
+4	3,471.6	69.9	+4	798.8	10696
+3	2,603.7	69.6	+3	599.1	10696
+2	1,735.8	69.3	+2	399.4	10696
+1	867.9	69.0	+1	199.7	10696
				0.0	10696 <- Adj. Act. HR=10705
0	0.0	68.7	0	0.0	10771
				(0.0)	10846
-1	(-867.9)	68.4	-1	(-199.7)	10846
-2	(-1,735.8)	68.1	-2	(-399.4)	10846
-3	(-2,603.7)	67.8	-3	(-599.1)	10846
-4	(-3,471.6)	67.5	-4	(-798.8)	10846
-5	(-4,339.5)	67.2	-5	(-998.5)	10847
-6	(-5,207.4)	66.9	-6	(-1198.2)	10847
-7	(-6,075.3)	66.6	-7	(-1397.9)	10847
-8	(-6,943.2)	66.3	-8	(-1597.6)	10847
-9	(-7,811.1)	66.0	-9	(-1797.3)	10847
-10	(-8,679.0)	65.7	-10	(-1997.0)	10847
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	9.53		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	2.19

St. Lucie 1 heat rate fuel savings represent the savings from actual, unadjusted heat rate performance.

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: St. Lucie 2

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	4,849.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 4,849.0	63.1 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 66.9	+10	1793.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 1,793.0	10527
+9	4,364.10	62.8	+9	1613.70	10539
+8	3,879.20	62.5	+8	1434.40	10551
+7	3,394.30	62.2	+7	1255.10	10564
+6	2,909.40	61.9	+6	1075.80	10576
+5	2,424.50	61.6	+5	896.50	10588
+4	1,939.60	61.3	+4	717.20	10600
+3	1,454.70	61.0	+3	537.90	10612
+2	969.80	60.7	+2	358.60	10625
+1	484.90	60.4	+1	179.30	10637 <- Adj. Act. HR=10643
				0.00	10649
0	0.00	60.1	0	0.00	10724
				(0.00)	10799
-1	(-484.90)	59.8	-1	(-179.30)	10811
-2	(-969.80)	59.5	-2	(-358.60)	10823
-3	(-1,454.70)	59.2	-3	(-537.90)	10836
-4	(-1,939.60)	58.9	-4	(-717.20)	10848
-5	(-2,424.50)	58.6	-5	(-896.50)	10860
-6	(-2,909.40)	58.3	-6	(-1075.80)	10872
-7	(-3,394.30)	58.0	-7	(-1255.10)	10884
-8	(-3,879.20)	57.7	-8	(-1434.40)	10897
-9	(-4,364.10)	57.4	-9	(-1613.70)	10909
-10	(-4,849.00)	57.1	-10	(-1793.00)	10921
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	5.32		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	1.97

St. Lucie 2 heat rate fuel savings represent the savings from actual, unadjusted heat rate performance.

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Turkey Point 3

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)		ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY		AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)		ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES	
+10	5,488.00	<- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 5,488.0	52.9	<- Adj. Act. EAF= 55.0	+10	2307.00	<- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 2,307.0	10732	
+9	4,939.20		52.6		+9	2076.30		10739	
+8	4,390.40		52.3		+8	1845.60		10746	
+7	3,841.60		52.0		+7	1614.90		10752	
+6	3,292.80		51.7		+6	1384.20		10759	
+5	2,744.00		51.4		+5	1153.50		10766	
+4	2,195.20		51.1		+4	922.80		10773	
+3	1,646.40		50.8		+3	692.10		10780	
+2	1,097.60		50.5		+2	461.40		10786	
+1	548.80		50.2		+1	230.70		10793	<- Adj. Act. HR=10797
						0.00		10800	
0	0.00		49.9		0	0.00		10875	
						(0.00)		10950	
-1	(-548.80)		49.6		-1	(-230.70)		10957	
-2	(-1,097.60)		49.3		-2	(-461.40)		10964	
-3	(-1,646.40)		49.0		-3	(-692.10)		10970	
-4	(-2,195.20)		48.7		-4	(-922.80)		10977	
-5	(-2,744.00)		48.4		-5	(-1153.50)		10984	
-6	(-3,292.80)		48.1		-6	(-1384.20)		10991	
-7	(-3,841.60)		47.8		-7	(-1614.90)		10998	
-8	(-4,390.40)		47.5		-8	(-1845.60)		11004	
-9	(-4,939.20)		47.2		-9	(-2076.30)		11011	
-10	(-5,488.00)		46.9		-10	(-2307.00)		11018	
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =		6.03			WEIGHTING FACTOR =		2.53	

Turkey Point 3 heat rate fuel savings represent the savings from actual, unadjusted heat rate performance.

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Turkey Point 4

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	6,889.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 6,889.0	81.0 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 84.4	+10	4094.00	11061
+9	6,200.10	80.7	+9	3684.60	11074
+8	5,511.20	80.4	+8	3275.20	11086
+7	4,822.30	80.1	+7	2865.80	11099
+6	4,133.40	79.8	+6	2456.40	11112
+5	3,444.50	79.5	+5	2047.00	11125
+4	2,755.60	79.2	+4	1637.60	11137
+3	2,066.70	78.9	+3	1228.20	11150
+2	1,377.80	78.6	+2	818.80	11163
+1	688.90	78.3	+1	409.40	11175
				0.00	11188
0	0.00	78.0	0	0.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 0	11263 <- Adj. Act. HR=11304
				(0.00)	11338
-1	(-688.90)	77.7	-1	(-409.40)	11351
-2	(-1,377.80)	77.4	-2	(-818.80)	11363
-3	(-2,066.70)	77.1	-3	(-1228.20)	11376
-4	(-2,755.60)	76.8	-4	(-1637.60)	11389
-5	(-3,444.50)	76.5	-5	(-2047.00)	11402
-6	(-4,133.40)	76.2	-6	(-2456.40)	11414
-7	(-4,822.30)	75.9	-7	(-2865.80)	11427
-8	(-5,511.20)	75.6	-8	(-3275.20)	11440
-9	(-6,200.10)	75.3	-9	(-3684.60)	11452
-10	(-6,889.00)	75.0	-10	(-4094.00)	11465
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	7.56		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	4.50

GENERATING PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE POINTS TABLES
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
PERIOD OF JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

UNIT: Turkey Point 5

EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY POINTS	FUEL SAVINGS/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL EQUIVALENT AVAILABILITY	AVERAGE HEAT RATE POINTS	FUEL SAVING/(LOSS) ($000)	ADJUSTED ACTUAL AVG. HEAT RATES
+10	5,123.00	95.1	+10	5012.00	6791
+9	4,610.70	94.9	+9	4510.80	6798
+8	4,098.40	94.6	+8	4009.60	6805
+7	3,586.10	94.4	+7	3508.40	6812
+6	3,073.80	94.1	+6	3007.20	6819
+5	2,561.50	93.9	+5	2506.00	6826
+4	2,049.20	93.6	+4	2004.80	6833
+3	1,536.90	93.4	+3	1503.60	6840
+2	1,024.60	93.1	+2	1002.40	6847
+1	512.30	92.9	+1	501.20	6854
				0.00	6861
0	0.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 409.8	92.6 <- Adj. Act. EAF= 92.8	0	0.00 <- Fuel Sav/(Loss) 0	6936 <- Adj. Act. HR=6942
				(0.00)	7011
-1	(-512.30	92.4	-1	(-501.20)	7018
-2	(-1,024.60)	92.1	-2	(-1002.40)	7025
-3	(-1,536.90)	91.9	-3	(-1503.60)	7032
-4	(-2,049.20)	91.6	-4	(-2004.80)	7039
-5	(-2,561.50)	91.4	-5	(-2506.00)	7046
-6	(-3,073.80)	91.1	-6	(-3007.20)	7053
-7	(-3,586.10)	90.9	-7	(-3508.40)	7060
-8	(-4,098.40)	90.6	-8	(-4009.60)	7067
-9	(-4,610.70)	90.4	-9	(-4510.80)	7074
-10	(-5,123.00)	90.1	-10	(-5012.00)	7081
	WEIGHTING FACTOR =	5.62		WEIGHTING FACTOR =	5.50

ACTUAL PLANNED OUTAGES

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

JANUARY THROUGH DECEMBER, 2012

PLANT/UNIT	ACTUAL PLANNED OUTAGE DATE	REASON FOR OUTAGE
Ft. Myers 2	10/21/12-10/28/12; 10/20/12-10/27/12	CT-2A HRSG outage; CT-2B HRSG outage
	12/10/12-12/16/12; 12/11/12-12/17/12	CT-2C HRSG outage; CT-2D HRSG outage
	10/29/12-11/05/12; 10/28/12-11/04/12	CT-2E HRSG outage; CT-2F HRSG outage
Martin 8	9/22/12-9/29/12; 10/22/12-11/21/12	CT-8A HRSG outage; CT-8B upgrade
Manatee 3	11/9/12-11/28/12; 11/28/12-12/11/12	CT-3C Main steam to cold reheat valve replacement; CT-3D HRSG outage
Sanford 4	11/28/12-12/14/12; 10/9/12-11/3/12	CT-4A planned outage; CT-4B Major overhaul
Scherer 4	3/2/12/-5/9/12	Boiler outage
St. Lucie 1	1/1/12-4/21/12	Refueling outage and EPU modifications
St. Lucie 2	8/5/12-11/23/12	Refueling outage and EPU modifications
Turkey Point 3	2/26/12-9/5/12	Refueling outage and EPU modifications
Turkey Point 4	11/5/12-12/31/12	Refueling outage and EPU modifications
Turkey Point 5	11/26/12-12/12/12	CT-5C Rainbow hardware removal / HRSG inspection