

ROGER E. GLAYTON

DIRECT TESTIMONY & EXHIBIT OF:

IN RE: FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY'S PETITION TO DETERMINE NEED FOR PLANTY ENERGY CENTER UNITS 1 AND 2 PLECTRICAL POWER PLANT

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

LINBRIC REKAICE COMMISSION BELOKE LHE LTOKIDV

SCANNED

		060225-E1
1		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
3		DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ROGER E. CLAYTON
4		DOCKET NOEI
5		MARCH 13, 2006
6		
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
8	А.	My name is Roger E. Clayton and my business address is 3055 Ennis Road,
9		Pattersonville, NY 12137.
10		
11	Q.	By whom are you employed and what is your position?
12	А.	I am the sole proprietor of Electric Power Resources, LLC. EPR is organized
13		in the State of New York as an independent consulting firm providing
14		engineering services to the electric power business.
15		
16	Q.	For what purposes have you been engaged by Florida Power & Light
17		Company ("FPL")?
18	А.	I have been engaged to work for FPL on transmission impact issues, including
19		the supervision and oversight of FPL's analysis and development of:
20		transmission integration and system reinforcement requirements; transmission
21		losses; and Southeast Florida interface limits, as they relate to the resource
22		needs identified in FPL's 2005 Generation Capacity Request for Proposals for
23		2009 – 2011 ("RFP").

1	Q.	Please state your educational background and professional association
2		experiences.
3	A.	I have Master of Science in Power System Engineering and Bachelor of
4		Science Honors degrees from Aston University in Birmingham, UK. I also
5		graduated from a student apprentice program with the Midlands Electricity
6		Board in the UK.
7		
8		I am a Professional Engineer in the State of New York and a Senior Engineer
9		of the IEEE. I have published numerous technical articles and papers on the
10		subjects of transmission planning and transmission line design.
11		
12		I presently Chair the New York State Reliability Council Reliability Rules
13		Subcommittee.
14		
15	Q.	Please state your business experience.
16	A.	I have more than thirty five years of experience in the electric utility
17		consulting business in the Americas. I have worked for some of the leading
18		consultants in the United States as a technical specialist, as a developer of
19		software tools and methods, and as a manager of professional engineers
20		engaged in power system planning and economic analyses.
21		
22		I founded Electric Power Resources, LLC in 2005 to provide engineering
23		support services to the electric power industry. I was Senior Vice President at

1 Conjunction LLC from 2003 through 2004 with responsibility for all electrical 2 engineering aspects of the 2,000 MW HVDC Empire Connection Project. I 3 worked for PG&E NEG from 1998 through 2003 where I was heavily 4 involved in project development of merchant generation and market 5 assessment activities such as fundamental forecasting, congestion analyses 6 and due diligence studies. I worked at GE from 1994 through 1998 and, as 7 Manager of GE's T&D Consulting Group, I led a twenty strong team that 8 provided consulting services internally to GE Power Systems and GE Capital, 9 and externally to the utility industry.

10

I co-founded Electric Power Consultants, Inc. in 1986 and led its consulting services in IPP interconnection and wheeling analyses. I was also involved in the development of its software products: Positive Sequence Load Flow (PSLF); Symmetrical Components Short Circuit (SCSC); Positive Sequence Dynamic Simulation (PSDS); Overhead Line Constants (OLC); and EMF (EBFANRI) programs. I managed the company's operations and successfully negotiated the company's sale to GE Power Systems in 1994.

18

19I work for Power Technologies Incorporated from 1972 through 1986 where20my responsibilities included transmission line design studies involving21economic optimization, electrical performance and EMF analysis. I taught22PTI's courses on transmission line theory and insulation coordination to utility23engineers. I was Project Engineer for major transmission system planning

studies in Mexico, Venezuela, Argentina and Peru. These studies involved the
 analysis of power flow, short circuit and stability performance for various
 system expansion options. I also had a two-year assignment with EDELCA in
 Venezuela leading their transmission planning studies for the GURI 11,000
 MW generation project.

My initial work experience was at GE where I was engaged in studies of
power system transients and transmission line design. I taught GE's courses
on insulation coordination, transmission line design, and utility practice. I
was liaison engineer with GE's protective equipment department with special
interest in station arrester application.

12

6

13

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to describe the overall evaluation process and
the results of transmission system related cost studies for various portfolios of
capacity options, as defined by the FPL Resource Assessment and Planning
department ("RAP"). The portfolios are comprised of various combinations
of the following resource proposals:

FPL's proposed generation plan of two new combined cycle units at West
 County Energy Center in Palm Beach County, one each in 2009 and 2010,
 to satisfy the 2009-2011 need requirements. Each new West County
 combined cycle unit would add approximately 1,219 MW (summer)
 capacity.

1		• Proposal 1 (P1), a proposed generation plan for one new combined cycle
2		unit of 1050 MW (summer) in St. Lucie county. The PPA is proposed to
3		start in 2010 with a 25 year term.
4		• Proposal 4 (P4), a proposed PPA of 50 MW from existing generation for
5		5 years from 2009 through 2013.
6		
7	Q.	Are you sponsoring an exhibit in this case?
8	А.	Yes. I am sponsoring an exhibit which consists of the following documents:
9		Document REC-1, Summary of the Performance of all Portfolios for:
10		• FPL System - Integration Impact, Interconnection Costs, Peak
11		and Average Losses and SE Florida import limits
12		• Non-FPL System - Integration Impact
13		Document REC-2, Transmission Loss Estimates
14		
15	Q.	Are you sponsoring any sections in the Need Study document?
16	А.	Yes, I sponsor the portions of Section III addressing transmission integration
17		and co-sponsor portions of Section VI.B.5 addressing the economic evaluation
18		of the various portfolios. In addition, I sponsor Appendix L of the Need Study
19		document.
20		
21		

1	Evalu	ation Process for Determining FPL Transmission System Related Costs
2	Q.	Please describe FPL's process for determining the transmission system
3		related costs for the various portfolios.
4	A .	FPL, in its evaluation of resource proposals, considers five categories of cost
5		that arise from the proposed delivery of additional power over FPL's
6		transmission system. These categories are described in detail in FPL's RFP,
7		Appendix E-1 Evaluation Methodology and Appendix E-2, Transmission
8		Integration and Losses, under the headings of:
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		 transmission interconnection costs; third party transmission service costs (as applicable); transmission integration costs; costs of transmission system losses; and impact on costs of operating existing FPL generation units in Southeast Florida to maintain reliability. Each of these categories of cost was evaluated for four portfolios of capacity options as defined by RAP. I worked with and supervised FPL's transmission engineers in the evaluation of the first three categories, while providing transmission loss data and Southeast Florida import limits to RAP for categories 4 and 5. These five categories of cost can be summarized as
21		follows:
22		
23		Transmission Interconnection Costs
24		Transmission interconnection costs are those costs incurred by new generation
25		just to interconnect to the system. They typically include generator step-up
26		transformer and substation costs at the point of interconnection. FPL's

Į

ł

1	substation and transmission engineers prepared interconnection cost estimates
2	for the capacity additions proposed by FPL.
3	
4	Third Party Transmission Service Costs
5	Proposers of new capacity that require third-party transmission service costs
6	include those costs in the Guaranteed Capacity Payment. It is noted that none
7	of the proposed Portfolios incurred Third Party Transmission Service Costs.
8	
9	Transmission Integration Costs
10	Transmission integration costs include the cost of system upgrades of existing
11	transmission facilities and the cost of new facilities required for reliable
12	operation of the generation capacity additions included in each Portfolio as an
13	FPL Network Resource. It is noted that none of the proposed Portfolios
14	incurred transmission integration costs.
15	
16	Cost of Transmission Losses
17	Each of the proposed Portfolios contains capacity additions at specific
18	locations in relation to the FPL transmission system and each will have a
19	unique impact on losses with respect to the FPL transmission system. The
20	cost of incremental losses for each Portfolio, as calculated by RAP, has two
21	components: the cost of generation capacity required to compensate for the
22	additional losses during peak load conditions; and the cost of energy losses
23	throughout the year.

Impact on Costs of Operating Existing FPL Generation Units in Southeast Florida to Maintain Reliability

The Southeast Florida import limit is the amount of power that can be 3 imported into Southeast Florida in a reliable manner under high load 4 conditions or during planned or forced outages of generation. In this context, 5 Southeast Florida is generally defined as the portion of the eastern FPL system 6 located south and east of and including FPL's Corbett Substation. During 7 those periods where no additional power can be imported into Southeast 8 Florida, there is a need to operate more expensive generation in Southeast 9 Florida when less expensive generation is available outside of Southeast 10 Florida. Such occurrences result in increased operating cost. FPL's RAP 11 12 department utilized the Southeast Florida import limits calculated for each 13 proposed Portfolio in its P-MAREA production cost model to determine incremental operating costs. Dr. Sim presents the results for each Portfolio, 14 including the production cost resulting from the P-MAREA analysis. 15

16

1

2

Q. Please describe your participation in FPL's process for determining the transmission system related costs for the various portfolios.

A. I worked with FPL's transmission planning engineers prior to the issuance of the RFP to define study criteria, methodologies and procedures to be used in estimating transmission related costs. I had several meetings and conference calls with FPL personnel to discuss and understand FPL's design practices,

planning and operating criteria, equipment cost basis, loss evaluation and simulation procedures.

2 3

1

4 RAP defined the set of portfolios for which transmission related costs were to 5 be evaluated after the capacity proposals had been received by FPL. I 6 received the portfolio definitions from RAP, worked with FPL's transmission 7 planning engineers to evaluate the transmission related costs and transmitted 8 the results of the analysis to RAP. These results included transmission 9 integration costs, transmission loss components to be used by RAP to estimate 10 the cost of additional capacity required to compensate for losses as well as the 11 cost of energy losses, and estimates of the impact on the Southeast Florida 12 import limit for each portfolio.

13

Q. What is your opinion of FPL's design practices, planning criteria and procedures?

A. FPL's design practices and FPL's planning criteria and procedures conform to
 FRCC, NERC and industry practice. Utilities vary in their application of
 NERC general criteria based on local conditions and experience. FPL's
 particular design practices, planning criteria and procedures are reasonable
 and have been applied in a consistent manner to the analysis of all portfolios.

- 21
- 22
- 23

Q. Please describe the set of portfolios that FPL's Resource and Planning

department provided for your analysis

- A. The set of portfolios is described in the table below:

Addition in 2009	Addition in 2010	Addition in 2011
WCEC1 & P4	WCEC2	
WCEC1	WCEC2	
WCEC1 & P4	P1	_
WCEC1	P1	
	Addition in 2009 WCEC1 & P4 WCEC1 WCEC1 & P4 WCEC1	Addition in 2009Addition in 2010WCEC1 & P4WCEC2WCEC1WCEC2WCEC1 & P4P1WCEC1P1

- KEY:
- WCEC1 = 1219 MW West County from 6/1/2009 through 2037
- WCEC2 = 1219 MW West County from 6/1/2010 through 2037
 - **P**1 =1050 MW CC Unit, 25 year PPA from 6/1/2010 through 5/31/2035
 - P4 = 50 MW 5 year PE PPA from 1/1/2009 through 12/31/2013

I.

Transmission Interconnection Costs

2

3

4

5

Q. Please describe your work and the conclusions you reached based upon your review of the transmission interconnection costs incurred by the

proposed portfolios

A. The transmission interconnection costs for all portfolios are summarized in
 Document REC-1, Summary of Performance of all Portfolios. Those costs
 included all material and installation costs for interconnection of portfolios 1,
 2, 4 and 5.

10

11 The cost estimates for FPL's West County portfolios 1 and 2 were prepared 12 by FPL's Transmission Engineering Department. They are budget grade 13 estimates (+/-10%) based upon on unit costs and current experience. They 14 include:

• Collector yard costs (WCEC1 @ 230 kV, WCEC2 @ 500kV)

- Substation and feeder costs (WCEC1 @ 230 kV, WCEC2 @ 500kV)
- Circuit breaker and overhead ground wire upgrades required for short circuit duty
- 19

20

21

22

15

16

17

18

Cost estimates for P1 based portfolios 4 and 5 include:

- Collector yard costs (P1 @ 500kV)
 - Substation and feeder costs (P1 @ 500kV)

1		• Circuit breaker and overhead ground wire upgrades required for short
2		circuit duty
3		
4		Note that the costs of the generator step-up transformers for all portfolios were
5		assumed to be included in the generator capacity costs provided in the
6		proposals, in accordance with the RFP instructions.
7		
8		I reviewed the engineering design and equipment specifications of the
9		proposed interconnections for compliance with FPL's standards and practice
10		as well as industry standards and practice. I met with and had conference
11		calls with FPL's Engineering Department where we discussed design,
12		equipment specifications and cost factors for the various portfolios.
13		
14		The results of my review are summarized in Document REC-1, Summary of
15		Performance of all Portfolios. These cost estimates are based upon prudent
16		engineering design, current and local experience in performing similar work,
17		and were developed in a consistent manner for all portfolios.
18		
19	II.	Third Party Transmission Service Costs
20	Q.	Please describe the third party transmission service costs incurred by any
21		portfolio.
22	А.	Portfolios 1 and 2 involve new generation at the West County site at Corbett.
23		Portfolios 4 and 5 involve new generation at the proposed P1 site on the 500

1		kV transmission line between Midway and Martin. All of the proposed
2		portfolios are located within or directly connected to the FPL service territory
3		and, therefore, none of the proposed Portfolios incurred Third Party
4		Transmission Service Costs.
5		
6	III.	Transmission Integration Costs
7		
8	Q.	Please describe FPL's transmission integration evaluation process.
9	А.	The integration evaluation process can be summarized as:
10		1. Power flow studies.
11		2. Cost estimates for new and/or upgraded system facilities.
12		3. Developing cash flow estimates for new and/or upgraded system
13		facilities.
14		
15		The first step was to perform power flow studies to identify any new system
16		facilities and upgrades that may be needed to integrate the capacity resources
17		in each portfolio into the transmission system as a network resource for FPL
18		while meeting reliability criteria. I worked with FPL transmission planning
19		engineers to develop the methodology that was used to perform these power
20		flow studies and I was in constant communication with them as they
21		performed the studies. In parallel with the system studies performed by FPL
22		personnel, I personally performed power flow studies to better understand
23		system requirements and review the need for transmission upgrades and new

facility additions. Finally, I reviewed and approved the results of the FPL power flow studies and reviewed the need for new facilities and facility upgrades required to integrate the capacity resources in each portfolio into the transmission system as a network resource for FPL.

5

4

1

2

3

6 My review determined that no new system facilities or facility upgrades were 7 required to integrate any of the portfolios. Therefore, it was not necessary to 8 either develop cost estimates for new and upgraded transmission facilities or 9 develop summary sheets of transmission integration costs and cash flow 10 projections for any of the portfolios. Document REC-1 summarizes the 11 performance of all of the portfolios and indicates that none of them required 12 any transmission system integration costs.

13

14 Q. Please describe the power flow analyses performed.

A. It is noted that the power flow simulation programs used by FPL and myself perform the same function but were developed by different suppliers. FPL used Siemens' PSS/E power flow program while I used GE's PSLF power flow program. Thus, not only were the results confirmed independently by FPL and myself but also through the use of independent analytical techniques.

20

Four portfolios were analyzed; Portfolios 1, 2, 4, and 5 for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011. First contingency, Alternating Current ("AC") power flow 23 studies were performed for each portfolio for each year to assess the need for

1 transmission system upgrades. All studies were performed using the 2005 2 Florida Reliability Coordinating Council's 2009, 2010 and 2011 power flow 3 cases representing summer peak load conditions. The cases were updated to 4 include the most up-to-date information on the FPL system. These studies 5 performed simulations to identify the facilities that may become overloaded 6 because of the integration of the capacity options in each portfolio, as well as 7 the incremental transmission facilities required to mitigate such overload(s). 8 An AC solution technique was used to also check the voltage performance of 9 the system against reliability criteria.

10

11 All portfolios and all years of analysis were subjected to a first contingency 12 screening for loss of transmission elements or generators out of service, one at 13 a time, in accordance with reliability criteria. This resulted in approximately 14 1,600 power flow calculations being performed for each portfolio and each 15 year of service. All of the Peninsular Florida interconnected system was 16 monitored in this process for thermal or voltage violations for system 17 elements at voltages of 69 kV and above. Violation of reliability criteria on 18 any FPL or other Peninsular Florida system element indicated the potential 19 need for transmission reinforcements.

20

21

22

A few apparent criteria violations were identified by the analysis but it was determined that all could be resolved with an existing operating action

1		involving a switching action immediately after the contingency has occurred
2		or with a planned system upgrade.
3		
4		My analysis confirmed that of the FPL planning personnel in determining that
5		no transmission reinforcements were needed for any portfolio, for any year of
6		analysis.
7		
8	Q.	Do you have a general observation regarding the results of the analysis?
9	Α.	Yes. The ability of the system to accommodate the various portfolios without
10		transmission reinforcements is not surprising given that a majority of the
11		proposed resources are within or close to the Southeast Florida load centers of
12		FPL.
13		
14		It is understood, and later analysis confirmed, that there is a limited amount of
15		transmission capability for the transfer of power from the west coast of
16		Florida and from the north into Southeast Florida. Therefore, transmission
17		reinforcements are likely to be required if the majority of a new resource
18		capacity is located to the west or north of Southeast Florida.
19		
20		
21		
22		

.

IV.

Costs Associated with Transmission Losses

2

3

4

5

Q. Please describe how transmission loss effects were included in the economic comparison of portfolios and how the loss calculations were performed.

- The transmission loss impact of each of the portfolios is a function of its 6 A. 7 resource location in the FPL system and system loading conditions. The 8 economic impact of transmission losses for each portfolio was determined as 9 the net present value (NPV) of the estimated cost of transmission loss impacts 10 for 2009 through 2037. Losses were calculated for each portfolio and for each 11 year to support the estimation of two cost components: a capacity component reflecting the cost of new generation capacity required to compensate for the 12 13 additional losses during peak load conditions and the cost of energy losses 14 throughout the year. The necessary loss calculations for each portfolio were 15 performed by FPL transmission planning engineers under my direction. I 16 confirmed FPL's calculations through independent analysis. The loss results 17 were then used to calculate cost differentials between portfolios by applying 18 appropriate capacity and energy costs to the loss values provided.
- 19
- Q. Please describe the methodology applied in the evaluation of transmission
 loss costs.
 - A. Appendix E-2, Transmission Integration and Losses of FPL's 2005
 Generation Capacity RFP describes the loss methodology in detail. It is the

same methodology that was applied in FPL's most recent RFP. I will summarize that methodology.

- Transmission losses are incurred by current (I) flowing through transmission elements that have resistance (R). Losses are calculated as I²R and occur in each transmission element as the current flows from generator to load. The further the generator is from the load, the larger the value of resistance and the higher the losses. Obviously, there are multiple generators, transmission elements and loads distributed in the system and losses, therefore, vary as a function of generator dispatch and load level.
- 11

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Power flows and the losses in the transmission system will be impacted whenever a new generating resource is dispatched. Therefore, the impact on losses of a capacity addition and, more generally, a portfolio of capacity additions, will depend both on where the new capacity resources are located and the characteristics of the resources. While low cost resources may operate and impact transmission losses most of the time, more expensive resources tend to operate and impact losses only at higher load levels.

19

The impact of losses can be evaluated by power flow calculations assuming that generation resources will be dispatched economically. This evaluation can be performed with reasonable precision for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011. However, for 2012 and beyond, increasing load will require additional capacity resources, the location and composition of which are unknown at this time. The expansion of the transmission system beyond 2011 is also uncertain. Therefore, the impact of a particular portfolio on losses becomes progressively more uncertain with time.

6 To deal with this uncertainty in a consistent fashion, it was assumed that the loss impacts for the year 2012 and beyond would be identical to the loss 7 8 impacts calculated for the year 2011. For portfolios where a capacity option 9 terminated prior to the end of the study period in 2037, that capacity was 10 presumed replaced by a combined cycle plant located such that the 11 incremental loss impact of this plant would equal the average year-round 12 losses on the FPL transmission system. A combined cycle plant was used as a 13 replacement for a terminating capacity option whether the terminating option 14 was base load generation or peaking capacity so as not to bias the results 15 toward a particular type of capacity option.

16

1

2

3

4

5

While the accuracy of the losses applied in this analysis can only be ascertained in retrospect after the actual resource and transmission system expansions over the 29 year period is known, I believe that the methodology developed is reasonable and that it produces a fair assessment of the differences in the cost of transmission losses between portfolios. In this context it is important to note that the contribution to the present value of the

cost of the loss impacts is greatest for the initial years when the uncertainties in future capacity resource and transmission expansion are the lowest.

3

4

5

2

Q. Please describe how the power flow analysis was applied to calculate losses.

- 6 A. Transmission losses were calculated for each portfolio for the years 2009. 7 2010 and 2011. Losses were recalculated for portfolios with one or more 8 capacity options terminating prior to 2037 assuming that the terminated 9 capacity options were replaced by a generic combined cycle plant of equal 10 capacity. Losses were calculated for summer peak load conditions and for 11 average system load conditions. Losses calculated for summer peak load 12 conditions were used to estimate the cost of additional capacity required each 13 year to compensate for transmission losses. Energy losses for each year were 14 calculated as 10% of the summer peak losses plus 90% of the losses at a load 15 level representing FPL's average load.
- 16

Peak load losses for the year 2009, 2010 and 2011 were determined using the same power flow representation applied in the transmission integration studies. Also, all FPL resources, other firm resources and the capacity options in the portfolio were assumed to be dispatched economically. The losses calculated under this methodology reflected the transmission losses only on FPL transmission facilities.

Peak losses for a future year after a capacity option is terminated used the
same 2011 power flow model but with dispatches adjusted to reflect the
replacement of the terminated capacity option with a generic combined cycle
unit, as discussed earlier.
Losses for average load conditions used the same system model as for peak
load conditions but with resources dispatched economically to the lower load
level.
This procedure was consistently applied to all portfolios for all years and
allowed efficient calculation of key loss parameters. The results fairly capture
the basic differences in transmission loss impacts between portfolios. Also,
the level of precision is appropriate considering the uncertainties associated
with expansion of capacity resources and the transmission system over a 29-
year period.
Please indicate in general terms how the portfolios compare in terms of
transmission losses.
Document REC-1 lists the peak load level losses and average load level losses
for all portfolios and all years of analysis. In general, the West County
Portfolios 1 and 2 have lower peak and average losses than the P1-based
Portfolios 4 and 5. For example, 2010 peak losses for Portfolio 2 were
estimated at 536 MW and 2010 peak losses for Portfolio 5 were estimated at

1		560 MW, an increase of 24 MW. This difference is explicable by virtue of the
2		location of P1 approximately 50 miles to the north of the West County site
3		and, therefore, 50 miles further away from the FPL load center in Southeast
4		Florida.
5		
6		Document REC-2 utilizes the peak and average losses reported in Document
7		REC-1 for each Portfolio and extrapolates them over the 29 year study period,
8		as discussed above. Tables E-1 (2009), E-1 (2010) and E-1 (2011-2037) show
9		the peak losses for each year. Tables E-2 (2009), E-2 (2010) and E-2 (2011-
10		2037) show the average losses for each year. These tables were utilized by
11		RAP to calculate the incremental capacity and energy costs for each Portfolio
12		relative to a reference Portfolio.
13		
14	V.	Costs Associated with Increased Operation of Generating Units in
15		Southeast Florida
16		
17	Q.	What was the rationale for including the operating costs arising from the
18		uneconomic dispatch of generating units in Southeast Florida as a
19		transmission related cost?
20	A.	The Southeast Florida import limit is the amount of power that can be
21		imported into Southeast Florida in a reliable manner under high load
22		conditions or during planned or forced outages of generation. In this context,
23		Southeast Florida is generally defined as the portion of the eastern FPL system

1 located south and east of and including FPL's Corbett Substation. During 2 those periods where no additional power can be imported into Southeast 3 Florida, there is a need to operate more expensive generation in Southeast 4 Florida at times when less expensive generation is available outside of this 5 area. Such occurrences result in increased operating cost. RAP utilized the 6 Southeast Florida import limits calculated for each proposed Portfolio in its P-7 MAREA production cost model to determine incremental operating costs, Dr. 8 Sim presents the results for each Portfolio, including the production cost 9 resulting from the P-MAREA analysis.

10

Q. Please describe the methodology and results obtained from the calculation of the Southeast Florida import limits.

13 A. Document REC-1 shows the Southeast Florida import limit for each portfolio 14 and for each year of analysis. The limit is measured as the sum of the flows 15 on the transmission lines connecting the Southeast Florida load center to the rest of the Florida system to the west and north. A power flow analysis was 16 17 performed by gradually increasing the interface flows and applying a critical 18 contingency until a valid solution could not be obtained. In all cases, the 19 limiting condition was the requirement to avoid voltage collapse in Southeast 20 Florida for a sudden outage of one of the Turkey Point nuclear units. These 21 import limits may be reduced as a function of planned operational outages of 22 transmission facilities in Southeast Florida. Conforming to operating

1		experience, this reduction in import limit may also vary with the amount of
2		generation on planned outages and other generation maintenance outages.
3		
4		The tables in Document REC-1 show little difference in the performance of
5		the various portfolios with respect to the Southeast Florida import limit. The
6		difference in import limit varies from zero to 3.5%, depending upon the year
7		of analysis. For example, in 2009, the limit for both Portfolios 2 and 5 is 8204
8		MW. In 2010, the limit for Portfolio 2 is 9083 MW and is 9401 MW for
9		Portfolio 5.
10		
11	Q.	Do you have an opinion as to whether each and every one of these
	-	
12	-	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic
12 13		analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources?
12 13 14	А.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the
12 13 14 15	A.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the real transmission-related costs arising from each portfolio and that all such
12 13 14 15 16	A.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the real transmission-related costs arising from each portfolio and that all such costs should be captured in performing an economic evaluation of competing
12 13 14 15 16 17	A.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the real transmission-related costs arising from each portfolio and that all such costs should be captured in performing an economic evaluation of competing capacity options under the RFP. These analyses and costs should be relied
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the real transmission-related costs arising from each portfolio and that all such costs should be captured in performing an economic evaluation of competing capacity options under the RFP. These analyses and costs should be relied upon by the Commission, as they were by FPL and the independent evaluator,
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the real transmission-related costs arising from each portfolio and that all such costs should be captured in performing an economic evaluation of competing capacity options under the RFP. These analyses and costs should be relied upon by the Commission, as they were by FPL and the independent evaluator, Sedway Consulting, in the analysis and comparison of which portfolio
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the real transmission-related costs arising from each portfolio and that all such costs should be captured in performing an economic evaluation of competing capacity options under the RFP. These analyses and costs should be relied upon by the Commission, as they were by FPL and the independent evaluator, Sedway Consulting, in the analysis and comparison of which portfolio provides the most cost-effective alternative to meet FPL's 2009, 2010 and
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A.	analyses is necessary and appropriate in performing an economic evaluation of the transmission-related costs for competing resources? Yes. It is my opinion that these analyses provide reasonable estimates of the real transmission-related costs arising from each portfolio and that all such costs should be captured in performing an economic evaluation of competing capacity options under the RFP. These analyses and costs should be relied upon by the Commission, as they were by FPL and the independent evaluator, Sedway Consulting, in the analysis and comparison of which portfolio provides the most cost-effective alternative to meet FPL's 2009, 2010 and 2011 generation need requirement.

Q. Please summarize your testimony.

2	Α.	My testimony provides a description of the evaluation of transmission related
3		costs associated with four portfolios of capacity options defined by RAP. The
4		following five aspects of transmission-related costs were evaluated:
5		• The transmission interconnection costs required to interconnect each
6		portfolio to the system
7		• Third party transmission service costs
8		• The cost of new transmission facilities and upgrades of existing
9		transmission facilities required to integrate the capacity options in each
10		portfolio into the FPL system
11		• Transmission losses during peak load and average load conditions
12		considering the transmission improvements required for each portfolio
13		and the operating characteristics of the capacity options within the
14		portfolio (cost impact calculated by FPL's RAP Department)
15		• Southeast Florida import limits (cost impact calculated by FPL's RAP
16		Department).
17		Each of these transmission related cost impacts were included in the economic
18		comparison of proposed capacity options. Inclusion of these costs is
19		necessary and appropriate to capture a reasonable estimate of the
20		transmission-related costs arising from the competing capacity options.
21		
22		I compared the transmission related costs of Portfolios 1 and 2, which are
23		based on the West County units #1 and #2 1219 MW combined cycle plants

1		proposed by FPL, to Portfolios 4 and 5 which are based on the West County
2		unit #1 plus P1, a 1050 MW combined cycle plant. The distinguishing
3		performance characteristic of Portfolios 1 and 2 is that they have significantly
4		lower transmission losses than Portfolios 4 and 5. None of the portfolios
5		considered required system integration reinforcements in the FPL or non-FPL
6		transmission systems nor incurred third party transmission service costs. All
7		portfolios have similar Southeast Florida import limits.
8		
9		Portfolios 1 and 2 have virtually identical performance with respect to
10		transmission losses and both have lower transmission losses than Portfolios 4
11		and 5. The increment in peak transmission losses in favor of Portfolios 1 and
12		2 is approximately 25 MW from 2010 onwards.
13		
14	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?
15	А.	Yes.
16		

PORTFOLIO 1				2(009				2	2010		2011				
Description		West (230)	County U kV & a 50 12/31/201	nit #1 (IMW Sy 3) from	Somb Cyc /stem Pur 1 Progres	: (1219MW) @ rchase (thru s Energy	West	County	Unit #: @	2 Comb 500kV	Cyc (1219MW)	2011 Existing Required Cost Estim mva amps mva amps \$,000 None Cost Estima None Cost Estima MW 568 248				
FPL Transmission Facility	Voltage	Existin	ig Rating	Re	quired	Cost Estimate	Exis Rat	ting	Rer Ri	quired ating	Cost Estimate	Exi Ra	sting iting	Rer Ri	quired ating	Cost Estimate
	(///	mva	amps	mva	amps	\$,000	mva	amps	mva	amps	\$,000	mva	amps	mva	amps	\$,000
none	\$,000															
FPL TOTAL \$,000																
		West County #1 Comb Cyc			mb Cyc	Cost Estimate	West	County	#2 Co	mb Cyc	Cost Estimate		Nr	one		Cost Estimate
	ERATION	Con	nected to 230kV S	FPL's Corbett Substation		\$11,240	Conne 5	cted to	FPL's (ubstati	Corbett on	\$19,510		<u></u>	<u></u>		
TOTAL \$,000		1-		\$11	.240	<u>I</u>	t		\$1'	9.510						±
LOSSES				N	W		MW				MW					
FPL System Losses (MW) @ /	Peak		<u></u>	5	54			<u>8 - 11 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 1</u>	<u></u>	537			<u></u>	<u></u> 	568	and the second
FPL System Losses (MW) @ 60% /	Peak Load	 		2	54		╂────		;	245					248	
SE Fla Import		10007			The second se				-			here in the second seco			-10	Parate I. P. 1989 - A.
SE Florida Import Limit (M)	N)	line and the second		81	183			<u>(* -1)- 100 86466</u>	9	1080		<u> 22</u>		9	015	<u>/- 1100403_2_20063_2_</u>
TOTAL COST (\$,000)		t					<u> </u>	<u> </u>				┝───				
NON-FPL TRANSMISSION FACILIT and above) that ratings are exceed	IES (230kV led and are	Existing Rating			led by %	Exis	sting ting		ded by %	Exi	sting		Overlor	ided by %		
materially impacted (i.e. > :	J%)	mva.	amps				mva	amps				mva	amps		~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Mud by /
														-		

Notes on West County Unit #1

1. West County #1 Collector Yard estimate does not include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers at an estimated cost of \$11.5 million; M\$11.50

2. Estimates include escalation & stores charges.

3. West County #1 Collector Yard site to be filled within six inches of final grade by generation EPC contractor and is NOT included in total project cost.

 4. Assumes that four 230 kV breakers will be replaced by another generator prior to West County Unit #1 being placed in service. If the other generator defers in service later than West County Unit #1 or drops out of the queue then the following costs will need to be added: Replace four 230 kV breakers K\$320.00 Four 230 kV,2 cycle,3000 amp,3-pole brkrs K\$20.00 K\$840.00

Notes on West County Unit #2

 West County #2 Collector Yard estimate does not include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers at an estimated cost of \$14.12 million: M\$14.12
 Estimates include escalation & stores charges.
 West County #2 Collector Yard site to be filled within six inches of final grade by generation EPC contractor and is NOT included in total project cost.

% Aq (pəpeoj	Төү	sdwe Bu Buj	isixa Beg Bym	% Xq I	opeope	NO ₁	sdwe Buj Bug	six3 IbA BVM	% Áq (ehoaded	۸Ö	sdwe Bupey i	Existing BYM	sid are	ا 10 AL COST (2,000) NON-FPL TRANSMISSION FACILITIE: and above) that ratings are exceeded and above) that ratings are exceeded 3%	
		9106				8	806					\$ 028				(WM) timiL Import Limit Elorida Import Limit	
	Carrier St		1275			.		14,024	ki. Fris	di dina				1	12 3	toqmi si 32 👋 👘 👘	
		546					543					563			ак гоза	FPL System Losses (WW) @ 60% Pes	
		295		_			929					224			эк	FPL System Losses (WW) @ Pe	
24		MIN	k in and	·· · · ///	UR T. AV		MN.	See. wet	en e	AC 200		MM	32 X 4	Negative and		SESSO SE	
						10	9'61\$				0	2'11\$			000, \$ JATOT		
					013,912	orbett Corbett	FPL's C	Cteq to I	anno) B	\$11'540	n orbett	bstation	S30kA 2n ecteq to L	nnoJ			
Estimate		'' Əl	ION		Settmate Estimate	nb Cyc	#s cou	Aunoo	180W	Jao Estimate	p che	noj ri	t Qunoo 1	SƏM	NUITA		
																600, \$ JATOT J93	
	Bachart Property															DONE	
Jeo temite \$_000	saue Bi pej	upeA liteA	Bui Bui	eixa iteA evm	feo0 Estimate 5.000	sawe Bup pénni	рөЯ 6Я 6Vm	sawe Bup Gup	eix3 FeA	jzoQ 916mije∃ 000, 2	beniu Bniu Briu	sym_ sym_	gaine gaine	evm evm			
	Ţ				ip Cye	@ 200FA	(WMe	nuoð jæ Irst)	θM	(MW6121)	۲۷ Smb Cyc	@ 530 #1 C	un Auno	West C	Descublion		
5010 5011					5008				PORTFOLIO 2								

Notes on West County Unit #2 1. West County #2 Collector Yard estimate does not include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers at an estimated cost of \$14.12 million. M\$14.12 2. Estimates include escalation & stores charges. 3. West County #2 Collector Yard site to be filled within six inches of final grade by generation EPC contractor and is NOT included in total project cost.

K\$840.00 Eonr 230 kV,2 cycle,3000 amp,3-pole brkrs K\$520.00 Replace four 230 kV breakers K\$350.00 the queue then the following costs will need to be added: service later than West County Unit #1 or drops out of placed in service. If the other generator defers in another generator prior to West County Unit #1 being 4. Assumes that four 230 kV breakers will be replaced by and is NOT included in total project cost. six inches of final grade by generation EPC contractor 3. West County #1 Collector Yard site to be filled within 2. Estimates include escalation & stores charges. 05.11\$M inoillim 3.11\$ to teop betamitee na ta include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers 1. West County #1 Collector Yard estimate does not Notes on West County Unit #1

% Âq (verloadec	0	sdwe 6u 8up	exis NeA Evm	% Åq p	absoh	٥٨Q	sdwe Buj	eix∃ JsA svm	% Aq I	pepeol1(MO	sdwe Bujiey I	gniteix3 svm	ала ага (230кV	NON-FPL TRANSMISSION FACILITIES and above) that ratings are exceeded a more materially impacted (i.e. > 3%)
<u></u>	25	626					L076			<u> </u>		2818			WH we	SE FIORIDA IMPORTERMIN (INVV)
					all the second s			\$		College -			all contain			
	1	52					247		_			524	······································		реод х	FPL System Losses (MW) @ 60% Peal
	3	69					195					224			А	FPL System Losses (MW) @ Pea
	Ň	<u>NM</u>			A. 280 - 40	<u>Alla ha</u>	<u>ww</u>					MM	1. AM	and the second	A and	FISSOT
			_			0	\$51'64				0	\$11,24				000, \$ JATOT
					016'22\$	e iqway -	oka rin Pris Mi	F of bet: 108 nifie	oenne0 M	\$11'540	ttett	FPL's Co	S30kA 2r	nnoJ		
Cost etemite3	Cost Estima		. 1	Site Unit #1 Site Cost			U eneO :	SPC	Cost Estimate	o chc	ພ໐ງ ເ#	(tuno)	səm	NOILV	INTERCONNECTION OF NEW GENER	
				1												FPL TOTAL \$,000
0005\$	edme	eaw	sdure	enu	000' \$	sdure	елщ	sduie	evm	000'\$	sduute	BVM	sqme	€¥Ŵ	1401	
Jao Defimate	beniup Bulite	원 9 님	60) 800	eix3 theA	teoJ etsmite∃	ing berlu	ipeA JeA	6u) 8u)	eixa Bag	1800 Otemite	beniu Bni	peA Raf	gauss (pnüelxa	egetiov (V4)	FPL Transmission Facility
					ene <u>ð</u> Og	i2 moti I:	# 1140 ROMAN	101 0 851	Purch	a Energy urchase (1219MW)	Progres Progres Progres	3) from 50MW 5 60MW 5	102/16/21 0kA & a (0nu(A Mu	(tµun) © 53 M ^{68t} C		noùqhased .
and the second second	5011		5040				5008					PORTFOLIO 4				

Notes on SPC CANA Unit #1 1. SPC's CANA Collector Yard estimate does not include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers. 3. Second Streep CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers.

K\$840.00 Eon: 230 kV/S c/cle/3000 smb/3-bole pikus K220/00 K\$350.00 Replace four 230 kV breakers the queue then the following costs will need to be added: service later than West County Unit #1 or drops out of placed in service. If the other generator defers in another generator prior to West County Unit #1 being 4. Assumes that four 230 kV breakers will be replaced by sind is NOT included in total project cost. six inches of final grade by generation EPC contractor 3. West County #1 Collector Yard site to be filled within 2. Estimates include escalation & stores charges. 09.11**\$**M :noillim 3.112 to teop betamitee na ta include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers 1. West County #1 Collector Yard estimate does not 14 JinU vinuo Jase Vounty Unit #1

% kq (\elloadec	vo	sdwe Buj Buj	eix∃ Rat Frat	%	ebsohe	>^Q	sdwe Buj Bujj	exis Exis	% Áq	papaoli	evQ	sdwa Guyey I	evm Briteling	overpt. TRANSMISSION FACILITIES (230kV) of above) that ratings are exceeded and are materially impacted (i.e. > 3%)		
		070														TOTAL COST (\$,000)	
	4	035	E in containit	Managari			1076	A. 49 (100-100)			the second second second	8204	A			(WM) timit Import Limit (WM)	
		19Z					549					£9Z	<u> </u>	<i></i>	פא רספס		
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	269					099					199	·		ye;	PPL System Losses (MW) @ Pe	
	- <u></u>	AW	genege i	•17. <del>74</del> . <del>1</del> 7		917 LOCA	MW	254				- MW	en 14.	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		SESSO	
						01	6'12\$					211,240			000, <b>\$</b> JATOT		
	016		016'22\$	Connected to FPL's Midway - \$27,910 Martin 500kV Line				Connected to FPL's Corbett \$11,240 230kV Substation									
teoJ etemite∃		eu	oN		cost Estimate	etil	r# Jint	Cana L	୦ଏଟ	feoStimate Estimate	Cyc	dmoʻ) M	Aunog	189W	NUITA		
						······		r			F					FPL TOTAL \$ ,000	
Estimate 5,000	sdwe Bupe	BVM BVM	sduue Buj	16A EVM	Estimate 000, \$	sdwe Buji	RVM BVM	equie sqme	teA evm	etembea 000, \$	sdwe Bu	itteA evm	sdwe	eau Buineixa	(KA)	Villos noiselmaner 197	
teoo	peniup	Red	Buŋ	elx3	1800	beriu	peЯ >	<b>6</b> 00	six3	າະວາ	beil	upeA 👔	Called .	and teal will	andiov		
			7.42		Briso Oc	ri 12 mot	# NUN MWOS	0), <del>9</del> 88(	Purci	(WM0121)	/ up رکد	© 530k/    #1 Cou	un Auno	West C		Desciption	
	۱. E	501					5010		27 A 377	600Z			117 (j. 1	FORTFOLIO 5			

Notes on SPC CANA Unit #1 1. SPC's CANA Collector Yard estimate does not

include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers.

Т

Т

K2840.00 Eonr 230 kV/S cycle, 3000 smp, 3-pole brkrs K\$520.00 K\$320.00 Replace four 230 kV breakers the queue then the following costs will need to be added: service later than West County Unit #1 or drops out of placed in service. If the other generator defers in another generator prior to West County Unit #1 being 4. Assumes that four 230 kV breakers will be replaced by Jeos toelot in total project cost six inches of final grade by generation EPC contractor 3. West County #1 Collector Yard site to be filled within 2. Estimates include escalation & stores charges. 09'L ISW :noillim 2.11\$ to teop betemitee na te include three CT GSU plus one ST GSU transformers 1. West County #1 Collector Yard estimate does not Votes on West County Unit #1

### Table E - 1 (2009)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Усыт	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Progress Energy System Purchase (50 MW thru 12/31/2013)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Component s (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	=(3)*(4) Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	=(5)+(6) FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	- (?) - (8) Difference in FPL Transmission System Lesses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MW)
2009	1219	50	0	2.19%	0	554	554.00	554	0.00

### Table E - 1 (2010)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
						-(4)*(5)		=(6)+(7)		<b>~ (8) - (9)</b>
Үеат	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Progress Energy System Purchase (50 MW thru 12/31/2013)	West County Generation #2 500kV (1219 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Componen ts (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Commonents (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Difference in PPL Transmission System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (AcW)
2010	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	0	537	537.00	536	1.00

### Table E - 1 (2011)

### Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
						=(4)*(5)		=(6)+(7)		~ (8) + (9)
				Filler Capacity				FPL Transmission		
				Needed to				System Losses		Difference in FPL
				Replace				with Portfolio's		Transmission System
	West County	Progress Energy	West County	Portfolio's	Filler		FPL Transmission	Remaining	FPL Transmission	Losses between
	Generation #1	System Purchase	Generation #2	Expired	Capacity		System Losses with	Components +	System Losses with	Portfolio in question
	230kV (1219	(50 MW thru	230kV (1219	Componen	Losses	Filler Capacity	Portfolio's Remaining	Filler Capacity	the Reference	and Reference
Year	MW)	12/31/2013)	MW)	ts (MW)	(%)	Losses (MW)	Components (MW)	Losses (MW)	Portfolio (MW)	Portfolio (MW)
2011	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	568	568.00	567	1.00
2012	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	568	568.00	567	1.00
2013	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	568	568.00	567	1.00
2014	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2015	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2016	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2017	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568,10	567	1.10
2018	_ 1219		1219	50 _	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	. 567	1.10
2019	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2020	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2021	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2022	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2023	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2024	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2025	- 1219		1219	50 _	2.19%	1.10	. 567 .	568.10	567	1.10
2026	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2027	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2028	1219		1219	50 -	2.19%	1.10	. 567	568.10	567	1.10
2029	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2030	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2031	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2032	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2033	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2034	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2035	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2036	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10
2037	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	567	568.10	567	1.10

### Table E - 2 (2009)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					=(3)*(4)		=(5)+(6) FFL		<b>≈ (7) + (8)</b>
						FPL Tiosi	Transmission	FPL T	Difference in PPL
						System Losses	System Losses with Portfolio's	System Losses	System Losses
	West County Generation #1	Progress Energy System Purchase	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace			with Portfolio's Remaining	Remaining	with the	between Portfulio
	230kV (1219	(50 MW thru	Portfolio's Expired	Filler Capacity	Filler Capacity	Components	Filler Capacity	Portfolio	Rothmace
Year	MW)	12/31/2013)	Components (MW)	Losses (%)	Losses (MW)	(MW)	Losses (MW)	(MW)	Portfulia (MW)
2009	1219	50	0	2.19%	0	254	254.00	253	1.00

### Table E - 2 (2010)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Progress Energy System Purchase (50 MW thru 12/31/2013)	West County Generation #2 500kV (1219 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	=(4)*(5) Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	=(6)+(7) FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	= (8) + (9) Difference in FPL Transmission System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MW)
2010	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	O	245	245.00	243	2.00

### Table E - 2 (2011)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
						-(4)*(5)		=(6)+(7) FPL		= (8) + (9)
	West County	Progress Energy	West County	Filler Capacity			FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's	Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining	FPL Transmission System Losses with the	Difference in FPL Transmission System Losses between Pottfolio
	Generation #1	System Purchase	Generation #2	Needed to Replace			Remaining	Components +	Reference	in question and
	230kV (1219	(50 MW thru	230kV (1219	Portfolio's Expired	Filler Capacity	Filler Capacity	Components	Filler Capacity	Portfolio	Reference Portfolia
Year	<u>MW)</u>	12/31/2013)	MW)	Components (MW)	Losses (%)	Losses (MW)	(MW)	Losses (MW)	(MW)	<u>(MW)</u>
2011	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	748	248.00	246	200
2012	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	248	248.00	246	3.00
2013	1219	50	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	248	248.00	246	2.00
2014	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2015	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2016	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2017	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2018	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2019	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2020	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	<b>247</b> .10	246	1.10
2021	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2022	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2023	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2024	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2025	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2026	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1,10
2027	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	<b>I.10</b>
2028	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2029	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	<b>247</b> .10	246	1,10
2030	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2031	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2032	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2033	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2034	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2035	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	I.10
2036	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	1.10
2037	1219		1219	50	2.19%	1.10	246	247.10	246	t.10

Exhibit No. Document No. REC-2 Portfolio 2 Page 1 of 6

Table E - 1 (2009)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

(8)	= (6) • (7) Difference m l'FI	Transmission	System Lossus	between Portfollo m	duestion and	Reference Portfolio	(MW)	0.00		
(1)	Тдн	Transmission	System Losses	with the	Reference	Portfolio	(MM)	554		
(9)	=(4)+(5)	FPL Transmission	System Losses with	Portfolio's Remaining	Components + Filler	Capacity Losses	(MM)	554.00		
(2)	НL	Transmission	System Losses	with Portfolio's	Remaining	Components	(MM)	554		
(4)	=(2)*(3)			Filler	Capacity	Losses	(MM)	0		
(3)				Filler	Capacity	Losses	(%)	2.19%		
(2)				Filler Capacity	Needed to Replace	Portfolio's Expired	Components (MW)	0		
Ξ				West County	Generation #1	230kV (1219	(MM)	1219		
							Year	2009		

# Table E - 1 (2010)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	West County Generation #2 500kV (1219 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	=(5)+(6) FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	- (7) - (8) Difference in Fr1. Transmission System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MW)
2010	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0	536	536.00	536	0.00

# Table E - 1 (2011)

### Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					=(3)*(4)		=(5)+(6)		~ (7) + (8) Difference m FPL
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	West County Generation #2 230kV (1219 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Transmission System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MW)
2011	1210	1210	0	2 1094	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2011	1219	1219	0	2.1970	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2012	1219	1219	0	7 10%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2013	1219	1219	0	2.1270	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2014	1219	1219	Õ	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2016	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2017	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	6.00
2018	1219	1219	õ	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2019	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	- 567	567.00	- 567	0.00
2020	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2021	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2022	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2023	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2024	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0,00
2025	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	<b>0.00</b>
2026	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	- 567	0.00
2027	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2028	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2029	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0,00
2030	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2031	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2032	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2033	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2034	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2035	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00
2036	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567,00	567	0.00
2037	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	567	567.00	567	0.00

Exhibit No. Document No. REC-2 Portfolio 2 Page 4 of 6

Í

I

Table E - 2 (2009) Average Load Losses Calculation for:

(8) ••••••	Difference in 1973. Transmere Syntheticsen Perfibilion Reference Reference	000
£	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	253
(6) =(4)+(5)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remainfolio's Remainte Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	253.00
(5)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	253
(4) =(2)*(3)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	0
(3)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	2.19%
3	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	0
E	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	1219
	Year	2009

### Table E - 2 (2010)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					=(3)*(4)		=(5)+(6)		÷ (7) + (8)
							FPL		Difference in FPL
			Filler Capacity Needed to				Transmission System Losses	FPL Transmission	Transmission
			Replace			FPL Transmission	with Portfolio's	System Losses	hetween
	West County	West County	Portfolio's			System Losses with	Remaining	with the	Portfulio m
	Generation #1	Generation #2	Expired			Portfolio's	Components +	Reference	quastion and
	230kV (1219	500kV (1219	Components	Filler Capacity Losses	Filler Capacity	Remaining	Filler Capacity	Portfolio	Reference
Year	<u>MW)</u>	<u>MW)</u>	(MW)	(%)	Losses (MW)	Components (MW)	Losses (MW)	(MW)	Portfolio (MW)
2010	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0	243	243.00	243	0.00

### Table E - 2 (2011)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					=(3)*(4)		=(5)+(6)		×(7)+(8)
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	West County Generation #2 500kV (1219 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPI. Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Difference in FPL Transmission System Losses between Pontolius in question and Reference Pontfolio (MW)
2011	1219	1219	0	2 19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2012	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2013	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2014	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2015	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2016	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2017	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2018	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0,00
2019	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2020	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2021	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2022	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2023	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2024	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2025	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2026	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2027	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2028	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2029	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2030	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0 00
2031	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2032	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2033	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2034	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0,00
2035	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2036	1219	1219	0	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	0.00
2037	1219	1219	U	2.19%	0.00	246	246.00	246	<b>Q.00</b>

### Table E - 1 (2009)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

Portfolio #4: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option and Bid P4, a 50 MW system purchase from Progress Energy (term - 5 yrs); For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011 no option

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					=(3)*(4)		=(5)+(6)		~(7) - (8)
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Progress Energy System Purchase (50 MW thru 12/31/2013)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replacc Portfolio's Expired Component s (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Difference in FPL Transmission System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MW)
2009	1219	50	0	2.19%	0	554	554.00	554	0.00
								<u>.</u>	

### Table E - 1 (2010)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

# Portfolio #4: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option and Bid P4, a 50 MW system purchase from Progress Energy (term - 5 yrs); For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011 no option

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
						=(4)*(5)		=(6)+(7)		= (8) - (9)
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Progress Energy System Purchase (50 MW thru 12/31/2013)	SPC Cana option (1050 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Componen ts (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components 4 Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Difference in FPL Transmission System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MW)
2010	1219	50	1050	0	2.19%	0	561	561.00	536	25.00

#### Table E - 1 (2011)

#### Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

# Portfolio #4: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option and Bid P4, a 50 MW system purchase from Progress Energy (term - 5 yrs); For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011 no option

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
						=(4)*(5)		=(6)+(7)		<b>≈(8)+(9)</b>	
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Progress Energy System Purchase (50 MW thru 12/31/2013)	SPC Cana option (1050 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Componen ts (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Difference in FPL Transmission System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MW)	n:
2011	1219	50	1050	0	2 10%	0.00	602	602.00	6/7	<b>NF 66</b>	8
2012	1219	50	1050	0	2.1970	0.00	595	593.00 <b>6</b> 03.00	567	20.00	ě.
2013	1219	50	1050	ő	2.19%	0.00	593	503.00	567	20.00 76 nn	8
2014	1219	20	1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594 10	567	27 10	Š.
2015	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	Å.
2016	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2017	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27 10	ě.
2018	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	8 8
2019	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	Ê.
2020	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2021	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27,10	
2022	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2023	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2024	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	ž.
2025	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2026	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2027	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	ž.
2028	- 1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	6 2
2029	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27,10	8
2030	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2031	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
20.32	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	Š.
2033	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27,10	
2034	1219		1050	50	2.19%	1.10	593	594.10	567	27.10	
2035	1219		437.5	662.5	2.19%	14.51	564	<b>57</b> 8.93	567	11.93	note (1)
2036	1219			1100	2.19%	24.09	544	568.09	567	1.09	ŝ
2037	1219			1100	2.19%	24.09	544	568.09	567	1.09	

note (1): The losses for 2035 have been adjusted to account for the Portfolio Option ending on 5/31/2035.

#### Table E - 2 (2009)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

# Portfolio #4: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option and Bid P4, a 50 MW system purchase from Progress Energy (term - 5 yrs); For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011 no option

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Progress Energy System Purchase (50 MW thru 12/31/2013)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	=(3)*(4) Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	=(5)+(6) H'L Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	- (7) - (8) Difference in FPL Transmission System Losses between Portfalio in quisition and Refirmes Portfalia (MW)
2009	1219	50	0	2.19%	0	254	254.00	253	3.00

Exhibit No. Document No. REC-2 Portfolio 4 Page 5 of 6

Table E - 2 (2010)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

Portfolio #4: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option and Bid P4, a 50 MW system purchase from Progress Energy (term - 5 yrs); For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011 no option

(10)	= (8) • (9)	Difference in 1711 1711 1711 1711 1711 1711 1711 17	4 64 7	
(6)		FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	243	
(8)	=(9)+(2)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MWV)	247.00	
(J)		FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	247	
(9)	=(4)*(5)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	0	
(2)		Filler Capacity Losses (%)	2.19%	
(4)		Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	o	
(3)		SPC Cana option (1050 MW)	1050	
(2)		Progress Encrgy System Purchase (50 MW thru 1231/2013)	50	
Ð		West County Generation #1 : 230kV (1219 MW)	1219	
		Ycar	2010	

Exhibit No. Poctument No REC-2 Potfolio 4 9 of 6 of 6

#### Table E - 2 (2011)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

# Portfolio #4: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option and Bid P4, a 50 MW system purchase from Progress Energy (term -

5 yrs); For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011 no option

(01)	(6)	(8)	ω	(9)	(5)	(†)	(£)	(7)	(1)	
(6) + (8) -		7.1.1 (८)+(9)=		(ς) _≢ (ፇ)≕						
199 m sonradii	L L L	noissimenenT	EPL							
noessiment	orisen I material	System Losses	noissimansiT							
offolia Portion	with the	Remaining Remaining	solution Portfolio's			Filler Capacity		Progress Energy	West County	
pus tionsimb en	Reference	Components +	Remaining			Needed to Replace	SPC Cana	System Purchase	Ceneration #1	
orici no 9 parteria	Portfolio #	Filler Capacity	Components	Filler Capacity	Filler Capacity	Portfolio's Expired	0201) noitgo	undi WM 02)	5121) ANOEZ	<b>A</b>
(MM)	(MIN)	(MW) \$3550T	(MM)	(MM) SOESOT	(%) 5955071	Components (MW)	(MW	(107/15/71	(MW	Y CAU
00 11	549	00.722	LSZ	00.0	%617	0	0\$01	05	6121	1102
00 (1	546	00 [.] 722	LSZ	0.00	5.19%	0	0\$01	0\$	6171	2102
0011	<b>5</b> 46	257.00	LSZ	00.0	5 19%	0	0\$01	0\$	6121	2013
01.51	546	01.822	LSZ	01.10	%61 7	05	0\$01		6121	2014
01/21	546	01.822	LSZ	01.1	\$617	05	0\$01		6121	5102
01 21	549	528.10	LSZ	01.1	5.19%	0\$	0\$01		1516	9107
0171	546	258.10	LSZ	011	519%	05	0\$01		6121	L102
01/21	546	528.10		01.1	\$61.2	- 05	0\$01		6121	8102
01 21	546	528'10	LSZ	01.1	5.19%	05	0501		6171	5102
01 Z1	546	01'852	LSZ	01.1	%61 7	0\$	0501		6121	2020
01 71	549	528.10	LSZ	01'1	8617	05	0\$01		6121	1202
01'71	942	528.10	<i>L</i> \$7	01.1	%61 7	0\$	0\$01		6171	ZZ0Z
01 21	546	528'10	LSZ	01.1	%61 7	0\$	0501		6121	£2023
01 21	546	528'10	LSZ	017	%617	05	0\$01		6171	\$20Z
01 71	549	01'857	- LSZ -	01.1	\$61.2	- 05	0\$01		6171	\$202
01'21	549	01.822	LSZ	01.1	%61 Z	05	0501		6171	9202
01 21	3 <del>4</del> 6	528.10	LSZ	01.1	%61.2	05	0\$01		6171	LZ0Z
01 21	549	528.10	- <i>LSZ</i> -	01.1	%61'7	- 05	0\$01		6171 -	8202
0171	947	01 852	LSZ	01'1	%61.2	05	0501		6121	6Z0Z
01 21	546	01.822	LST	01.1	%6172	05	0501		6121	0502
01 21	977	01.852	LSZ	01.1	%61.2	05	0501		6121	1502
01 21	546	01.852	LSZ	01.1	%61.2	05	0501		6171	7507
01:21	546	01.852	LST	01'1	%617	05	0501		6121	EEOZ
01.21	546	01.822	157	011	5168	05	0501		6171	#E0Z
ou 81.6	546	81.552	177	15.41	%61.2	\$7299	5.7E4		6171	SEOC
607	9177	60.522	677	60.42	%617	1100			6171	0507
601	S 9 <del>17</del>	60'967	677	60'#7	%617	0011			6171	1607

note (1): The losses for 2035 have been adjusted to account for the Portfolio Option ending on 5/31/2035.

Exhibit No. Document No. REC-2 Portfolio 5 Page 1 of 6

Table E - 1 (2009)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

Portfolio #5: For 2009 a 1219 MW W<del>c</del>st County #1 option; For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011, no option

(8)	<ul> <li>- (6) - (7)</li> <li>- (1) - (17)</li> <li>Littlarance in 171.</li> <li>Transmission</li> <li>System Losses</li> <li>System Losses</li> <li>System Losses</li> <li>System Losses</li> <li>System Losses</li> <li>Maximum Portibilo in</li> <li>question and</li> <li>Refinance Portibilo</li> <li>(MW)</li> </ul>	000	
(L)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	554	
(9)	=(4)+(5) FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	554.00	
(5)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	554	
(4)	=(2)*(3) Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	o	
(3)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	2.19%	
(2)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	C	
(1)	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	1219	
	Үсат	2009	

Exhibit No. Document No. REC-2 Portfolio 5 Page 2 of 6

I

Table E - 1 (2010)

Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

Portfolio #5: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option; For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011, no option

(6)	-(7) - (8) Lutterance in FPL Transmission System Loases betwoon Portfolio in question and Reference Portfolio (MMV)	24.00	
(8)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	536	
(1)	=(5)+(6) FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	560.00	
(9)	HPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	260	
(2)	=(3)*(4) Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	0	
(4)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	2.19%	
(3)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	0	
(2)	SPC Cana option (1050 MW)	1050	
(1)	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	1219	
	Year	2010	

### Table E - 1 (2011)

#### Peak Load Losses Calculation for:

# Portfolio #5: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option; For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011, no option

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
					=(3)*(4)		=(5)+(6)		=(7) + (8) Uniference in FP).	*
Ycat	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	SPC Cana option (1050 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Transmission System Losses between Portfolio is question and Reference Portfolio (MW)	D.
2011	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ž.
2012	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ž.
2013	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ž.
2014	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ŝ
2015	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ŝ.
2016	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ě.
2017	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	8
2018	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ě.
2019	1219	1050	0 -	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	<b>Š</b>
2020	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	
2021	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25,00	Č.
2022	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	\$
2023	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	Å.
2024	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ě.
2025	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25,00	8 8
2026	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	<b>~</b>
2027	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	
2028	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	2 A
2029	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25,00	
2030	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	2
2031	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	
2032	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	ž.
2033	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25,00	2 2
2034	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	592	592.00	567	25.00	
2035	1219	437.5	612.5	2.19%	13.41	566	579.75	567	12.75	note (1)
2036	1219		1050	2.19%	23.00	548	571.00	567	4.00	
2037	1219		1050	2.19%	23.00	548	571.00	567	4.00	ž.

note (1): The losses for 2035 have been adjusted to account for the Portfolio Option ending on 5/31/2035.

### Table E - 2 (2009)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

Portfolio #5: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option; For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011, no option

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
				=(2)*(3)		=(4)+(5)		~{6)-(7)
Үсыг	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Difference in FPL Transmission System Lasses between Portfolio in mission and Reference Portfolio (MW)
2009	1219	0	2.19%	0	253	253.00	253	0.00

Exhibit No. Document No. REC-2 Portfolio 5 Page 5 of 6

Table E - 2 (2010)Average Load Losses Calculation for:

Portfolio #5: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option; For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011, no option

(6)	- () - () Piterer a Synta Lower Pathor Pathor Pathor Pathor	8	
(8)	FPL Transmissi on System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (AWV)	243	
ε	=(5)+(6) FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MWV)	246.00	
(9)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	246	
(5)	=(3)*(4) =(3)*(4) =(3)*(4) =(3)*(4) =(3)*(4)	0	
(4)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	2.19%	
(3)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	c	
(2)	SPC Cana option (1050) MW)	1050	
(1)	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	1219	
	Vear	2010	

Table E - 2 (2011)

Average Load Losses Calculation for:

# Portfolio #5: For 2009 a 1219 MW West County #1 option; For 2010, Bid P1, a 1050 MW SPC Cana option (term - 25 yrs); and For 2011, no option

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
					=(3)*(4)		-(5)+(6)		× (7) - (8)	
Year	West County Generation #1 230kV (1219 MW)	SPC Cana option (1050 MW)	Filler Capacity Needed to Replace Portfolio's Expired Components (MW)	Filler Capacity Losses (%)	Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with Portfolio's Remaining Components + Filler Capacity Losses (MW)	FPL Transmission System Losses with the Reference Portfolio (MW)	Difference in SPI. Drammesten System Losses between Portfolio in question and Reference Patticles (MW	L
2011	1210	1050	0	2 104/	0.00	267	357.00	246	13.05	÷
2011	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	240	11.00	
2012	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	240	11.00	2
2013	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	8
2015	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.05	2 2
2016	1219	1050	0 0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.05	
2017	1219	1050	ů	2 19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.00	
2018	1219	1050	ů 0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.00	
2019	1219	1050	ů 0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.00	ŝ
2020	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.05	ě.
2021	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.00	
2022	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2023	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2024	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2025	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2026	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2027	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2028	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2029	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2030	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	20 20
2031	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,05	
2032	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11,00	
2033	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.00	
2034	1219	1050	0	2.19%	0.00	257	257.00	246	11.00	
2035	1219	437.5	612.5	2.19%	13.41	241	254.08	246	<b>8</b> 0 <b>8</b>	note (1)
2036	1219		1050	2.19%	23.00	229	252.00	246	6.00	
2037	1219		1050	2.19%	23.00	229	252.00	246	6.00	ž.

note (1): The losses for 2035 have been adjusted to account for the Portfolio Option ending on 5/31/2035.