

CONFIDENTIAL
DECLASSIFIED

041414-EI

PRM 10-28-06

1 Q. What made the difference between the Cypress and the Bahamas-based
2 alternative?

3 A. From a strategic perspective, we considered geographic diversity of supply and
4 relative certainty in meeting Hines 4's commercial in-service date to be the key
5 factors. While each of the two finalists had attractive aspects, we ultimately
6 concluded that the amount of our supply need alone would not be sufficient to anchor
7 a new Bahamas-based LNG facility and associated pipeline. In addition, we made the
8 judgment that there was not a sufficient degree of certainty that the Bahamas-based
9 project could meet Hines 4's in-service date.

10 We continue to believe that ultimately a Bahamas-based LNG project is likely to
11 come to fruition and will be a good resource for the State of Florida. We certainly
12 intend to give full consideration to potential Bahamas-based LNG sources when
13 evaluating our future supply needs. The availability of a Bahamas-based LNG facility
14 and related pipeline would further enhance the geographic diversity of PEF's and the
15 State of Florida's natural gas supply. We concluded only that a purchase from a
16 Bahamas project was not the best choice for our next planned generating unit at this
17 time.

18
19 Q. Please describe the economic difference between the Cypress and the Bahamas-
20 based alternative.

21 A. Over the twenty-year contract term, the price difference between the alternatives was
22 not significant enough to dictate that factor alone as the basis for decision. The price
23 spread between the alternatives on a comparable volume basis of 80,000 MMBtu in
24 the summer and 40,000 MMBtu in the winter, as reflected in Exhibit _____ (PRM –
25 5), amounted to a difference of approximately \$59 million (NPV), which is about 6%

1 of the total cost difference over the life of the contract. Exhibit ____ (PRM-5)
2 reflects quantities and timing based on the responses to the RFP issued by the
3 Company as well as the present value amounts to reflect discounting to December 1,
4 2004. However, since our analysis of the most cost-effective alternative weighed
5 both price and non-price strategic factors, the strategic benefits and the greater
6 certainty of timely completion of the BG/Cypress/FGT proposal made it the clear
7 winner.

8 In addition, we also evaluated the economics of the Cypress project versus the
9 current gas market in a comparable time period, as reflected in Exhibit ____ (PRM
10 - 6). A Gulf of Mexico alternative is the market proxy in Exhibit ____ (PRM-6),
11 using a term of twenty years beginning in May 2007 with the actual contracted
12 volumes previously stated. Based on this analysis, the Cypress project is slightly
13 lower in price than the Gulf of Mexico alternative.

14

15 **Q. How does the pricing under these supply and transportation contracts compare**
16 **with the costs assumed for these items in the Company's analysis of the Hines 4**
17 **RFP?**

18 A. The pricing for these contracts is slightly less than that assumed in the RFP analysis
19 of the Hines 4 self-build option. The self-build option assumed a firm transportation
20 annual cost of \$14.8 million, while the firm transportation costs in the Cypress/FGT
21 contracts is \$12.8 million. The commodity costs in the Hines 4 RFP analysis was
22 assumed to be the same for all of the alternatives evaluated.

23

24

25

DECLASSIFIED
CONFIDENTIAL

PRM-5

MAY 2008 THROUGH APRIL 2028

	COST			QUANTITIES - DT/Day (e)		
	<u>GOM Based</u>	<u>Cypress</u>	<u>Bahamas Based</u> (a)		<u>May 2008 through April 2009</u>	<u>May 2009 through April 2028</u>
Transportation	394,214,711 (b)	419,772,341 (c)	285,644,581	Summer	60,000	80,000
Supply (d)	2,286,316,217	2,264,237,861	2,243,819,861	Winter	25,000	40,000
Capital Investment	7,030,000	1,160,000	1,350,000			
Total	<u>2,687,560,927</u>	<u>2,685,170,202</u>	<u>2,530,814,442</u>			
PV (to 12/1/04)	\$994,581,968	\$993,326,982	\$934,595,516			

(a) Alternative did not provide a certainty regarding meeting the in-service date for Hines 4.

(b) Based on a annual FT cost proposed by Gulfstream of \$17.5 million for 80,000 Dt/day.

(c) Reflects SNG's negotiated rate of \$10.79/Dt and FGT rates of \$23.39/Dt (Summer) and \$3.04/Dt (Winter).

(d) Based on forward curve for HH as of 8/5/04. Cypress includes \$0.05 / DT. GOM includes forward curve of Transco Zone 4 basis.

(e) Consistent with RFP's issued by PEF

DECLASSIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL

PRM-6

MAY 2007 THROUGH APRIL 2027

COST				QUANTITIES - DT /Day			
				May 2007 through April 2008	May 2008 through April 2009	May 2009 through April 2027	
	<u>Cypress</u>		<u>Market Proxy</u> (a)				
Transportation	514,941,729 (b)		483,661,847 (c)	Summer	60,000	80,000	100,000
Supply (d)	2,754,528,591		2,779,711,650	Winter	25,000	40,000	50,000
Capital Investment	1,160,000		7,030,000				
Total	<u>3,270,630,320</u>		<u>3,270,403,497</u>				
NPV (to 12/1/04)	\$1,293,336,098		\$1,293,175,998				

(a) GOM based alternative assumed as the Market Proxy.

(b) Reflects SNG's negotiated rate of \$10.79/DT and FGT rates of \$23.39/Dt (Summer) and \$3.04/DT (Winter).

(c) Based on a annual FT cost proposed by Gulfstream of \$17.5 million for 80,000 Dt/day.

(d) Based on forward curve for HH as of 8/5/04. Cypress includes \$0.05 / DT. Market Proxy includes forward curve of Transco Zone 4 basis.

DECLASSIFIED

CONFIDENTIAL