

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**DOCKET NO. 010001-EI  
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

**NOVEMBER 5, 2001**

**IN RE: LEVELIZED FUEL COST RECOVERY  
AND CAPACITY COST RECOVERY**

**PROJECTIONS  
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2002**

**TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS OF:**

**L. E. GREEN  
J. R. HARTZOG  
K. M. DUBIN**

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

13973 NOV-5 01

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**DOCKET NO. 010001-EI  
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

**NOVEMBER 5, 2001**

**IN RE: LEVELIZED FUEL COST RECOVERY  
AND CAPACITY COST RECOVERY**

**PROJECTIONS  
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2002**

**TESTIMONY & EXHIBITS OF:**

**L. E. GREEN  
J. R. HARTZOG  
K. M. DUBIN**

1                   **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2                   **FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

3                   **TESTIMONY OF L. E. GREEN**

4                   **DOCKET NOS. 010001-EI, 010002-EI**

5                   **NOVEMBER 5, 2001**

6

7

8   **Q.    Please state your name and address.**

9    A.    My name is Leonardo E. Green. My business address is 9250 West Flagler  
10         Street, Miami, Florida 33174.

11

12 **Q.    By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

13    A.    I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) as a Load Forecast  
14         Manager, in the Resource Assessment and Planning Business Unit.

15

16 **Q.    Have you previously testified in this docket?**

17    A.    No, I have not.

18

19 **Q.    Please state your education and business experience.**

20    A.    I received a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Economics from the University of  
21         Missouri-Columbia, Missouri, in 1983. I joined FPL in April of 1986 and in July  
22         of 1991, I became Manager of Load Forecasting within the Resource Assessment  
23         and Planning Business Unit. I am responsible for coordinating the entire

1 economics and load forecasting effort for FPL. Prior to joining FPL, I worked  
2 for Seminole Electric Cooperative as the Load Forecasting Supervisor in the  
3 Rates and Corporate Planning Department. I have held several Assistant  
4 Professorships of Economics and Statistics research and teaching positions with  
5 the University of Missouri, Florida International University, NOVA University,  
6 and the University of South Florida.

7  
8 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

9 **A.** The purpose of my testimony is to present and explain revisions to FPL's load  
10 forecasts due to the events of September 11, 2001. The revised load forecast was  
11 an input to POWERSYM, a model used to calculate the fuel budget for the period  
12 January 2002 through December 2002.

13  
14 **Q. Have you prepared an exhibit in this proceeding?**

15 **A.** Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (LEG-1) which consists of four documents  
16 included in Appendix I.

17  
18 **Q. What is the outlook for the national economy for the rest of 2001 and for  
19 2002?**

20 **A.** At the beginning of October, Data Resources Inc. of Standard and Poors (DRI-  
21 WEFA) stated that prior to September 11, 2001 the national economy was already  
22 in a downward slide, but the terrorist attack will probably cause the tumble to  
23 accelerate, likely pushing the U.S. economy into a recession. In its most recent

1 U.S. Economic Review of October 2001, DRI-WEFA pronounced, "It no longer  
2 seems possible for the U.S. economy to escape a recession...the question of  
3 whether the U.S. economy escapes a recession appears to have been settled by the  
4 September 11 terrorist attacks." DRI-WEFA now expects both the third and  
5 fourth quarters of 2001 to register declines in Gross Domestic Product (GDP), a  
6 measure of total domestic output, and they project only a 1% real overall growth  
7 for the entire year. Their forecast of a decline in third quarter GDP has recently  
8 been proved correct with the announcement of a 0.4% decline for the quarter.  
9 Their outlook for year 2002 has the economy growing at a real rate of 1.3 %,  
10 starting out weak and then picking up strength in the latter part of the year in  
11 response primarily to federal programs stimulus. Prior to September 11, 2001 the  
12 forecasted real growth in GDP for 2001 was 1.6 % and 2.6 % for 2002.

13

14 **Q. Will Florida's economy be impacted by the national economy?**

15 A. Yes. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 strike at the heart of the state's  
16 economy. The combined effects of the slowing US economy and the perceived  
17 risks of air travel will adversely affect Florida's economy. DRI-WEFA expects  
18 international visitation to Florida from September to December of this year to be  
19 50% lower than the same period last year, a result of the weakening global  
20 economy and security fears. Domestic travel is also forecasted to be 30% less  
21 than the same period last year, as fewer Americans will be willing to travel in the  
22 coming months, both because of anxiety about flying and because of concern  
23 about employment security and declining income.

1 The revision to the forecast for Florida made by DRI-WEFA shows that the  
2 annual nominal growth rate in gross state product (GSP), the total output of the  
3 state, will be lower in 2002 by approximately \$3.8 billion, or a loss of about 0.5%  
4 of the total GSP.

5  
6 Florida state revenue forecasters apparently share this view of Florida's economy  
7 in 2002. They have estimated that the state's tax revenue will be \$1.3 billion less  
8 than the originally estimated \$50 billion. Announced job cuts, the number of lay-  
9 offs, the rise in the number of unemployment claims, low hotel occupancy rates,  
10 and the reduced number of flights and tourist visitors are further evidence of the  
11 contraction in the Florida's economy.

12  
13 **Q. Will FPL's service territory experience a similar downturn in economy as the**  
14 **rest of the state?**

15 A. In all probability, it will be more severe than the state's downturn. It has been  
16 observed historically that the three largest counties in FPL service territory have  
17 experienced a larger impact of economic slowdowns relative to other major  
18 counties in the state. For example, in past recessions unemployment rates have  
19 been higher in Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties compared to  
20 Duval, Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties, as shown in Appendix I, Page 1 of 4.  
21 In addition, per capita income, another key economic indicator, has also declined  
22 significantly during recessions in the counties served by FPL relative to other  
23 Florida counties as shown in Appendix I, Page 2 of 4. Therefore, I believe that

1 this recent slowdown will have a greater impact on FPL's service territory relative  
2 to non- FPL service areas.

3

4 **Q. Is the projected economic slowdown the basis for the revision to the FPL**  
5 **sales forecast?**

6 A. Yes. The expected and actual effects of the attacks of September 11, 2001 are  
7 compelling enough to warrant a revision to the near term outlook of the state's  
8 economy and the corresponding impact on the demand for electricity. The  
9 original sales forecast used for the fuel, capacity and conservation clause filings in  
10 August and September of 2001 was produced under the assumption that Florida's  
11 economy was experiencing a mild slowdown in the year 2001, but then it would  
12 rebound with good economic growth in the year 2002. Prior to September 11,  
13 Florida had been spared the worst of the national economic slowdown. Its lesser  
14 reliance on manufacturing, higher reliance on tourism and a somewhat greater  
15 reliance on international markets cushioned the effects of a weakening U.S.  
16 economy. Even though Florida's employment growth had slowed, it was still  
17 fairly strong compared to the rest of the nation, and Florida boasted of a low  
18 unemployment rate of 4.2%.

19

20 The economic outlook has changed significantly since September 11, 2001. From  
21 an auspicious position, Florida's economy has become more vulnerable because  
22 the most impacted industries are relatively more vital to the Florida economy than  
23 most other states. These heavily impacted industries are tourism, air travel,

1 merchandise trade, airline services, and the cruise industry. Of course, the  
2 downturn in these industries will have spillover employment and income effects  
3 on the rest of sectors that encompass the Florida economy.

4

5 **Q. How does an economic recession affect the usage of electricity?**

6 **A.** The growth in usage of electricity comes from the overall growth in per capita use  
7 of electricity by all customers and the growth in the number of new customers.  
8 Both per capita usage of electricity and growth of new customers are linked  
9 directly to the performance of the local and national economy. When the  
10 economy is booming, usage of electricity is up in all sectors: residential,  
11 commercial, industrial and others. Furthermore, if the economy is strong there  
12 will be new jobs that attract new customers, new households develop, and retirees  
13 coming from other states increase in numbers. The reverse also holds, if the  
14 economy is performing poorly, customers are more apprehensive as to how their  
15 reduced income is spent, restricting their level of consumption of goods and  
16 services. Electricity demand and sales begin to slacken when income falls. Job  
17 contractions reduce the number of new customers coming to the state seeking  
18 employment opportunities. New household formations are postponed.

19

20 Appendix I, Page 3 of 4 shows the effect of the last three national recessions on  
21 Florida's Per Capita Income, the customer growth in FPL's service territory, and  
22 the changes in electricity use per customer. The recession years are highlighted  
23 and they correspond to the years of 1974-1975, 1982, and 1990-1992. In all three

1 recessions, Florida's Real Per Capita Income growth and growth in electricity use  
2 per customer in FPL's service area are negative. This data supports my earlier  
3 observation that as customers' personal incomes decline, the use of electricity per  
4 customer also declines. This does not imply that growth in total use of electricity  
5 will decline, since there is still growth in customers, even in recession years. In  
6 Appendix I, Page 3 of 4, it can also be seen that with each recession year, the  
7 absolute growth in the number of customers drops significantly from the year  
8 prior to the recession to the year following the recession. The smaller growth in  
9 the number of customers results in a lower growth in sales of electricity than  
10 would be expected if there was no contraction in the economy.

11  
12 **Q. What is the impact of a recession on FPL's outlook on electricity sales?**

13 A. Appendix I, Page 4 of 4 shows FPL's revisions in the level of projected sales and  
14 customers for 2001 and 2002. FPL produced a new outlook for energy sales by  
15 changing the economic assumptions utilized in its forecasting models. FPL made  
16 use of the more recent economic outlook for the State of Florida produced by  
17 DRI-WEFA that incorporated the revision resulting from the events of September  
18 11. The new projected use of electricity per customer was slightly higher than the  
19 2001 estimated value, but it was 2.5 % lower than the forecast produced with  
20 economic assumptions prior to September 11. So even DRI-WEFA's economic  
21 forecast resulting in slightly higher per customer usage appears conservative  
22 given the actual declines in usage experienced in prior recessions.

23

1 Customer growth outlook has changed from 85,643 to 65,000 new customers in  
2 2002. The recession outlook has resulted in a reduction in forecasted growth of  
3 approximately 20,000 less new customers in 2002. In order to forecast customer  
4 growth, FPL models depend on population projections obtained from the Bureau  
5 of Economic and Business Research of the University of Florida (BEBR).  
6 However, BEBR has not updated the population projections as a result of the  
7 terrorist attacks of September 11. Therefore, FPL's projection of customer  
8 growth is based upon growth in customers during prior recessions.

9  
10 The decline in the growth of the number of customers from the year prior to a  
11 recession to the year following a recession can be seen on Appendix I, Page 3 of  
12 4. In the three recessions since 1972, FPL has seen a significant decline in the  
13 growth of customers from the year prior to the recession to the year following the  
14 recession. In the 1974/75 recession, FPL experienced a decline in the growth of  
15 customers of almost 64 thousand (1973 versus 1976). In the 1982 recession, FPL  
16 experienced a decline in the growth of customers of roughly 29 thousand (1981  
17 versus 1983). In the 1990/91/92 recession, FPL experienced a decline in the  
18 growth of customers of approximately 36 thousand (1989 versus 1993). A simple  
19 average of the decline in growth from those three prior recessions would suggest  
20 that FPL might anticipate a reduction in the growth of customers due to recession  
21 of 43 thousand. However, two of those three recessions were longer term, and  
22 this recession is forecast to be relatively shorter. In addition, assuming a  
23 customer growth reduction of 43,000 would have reduced FPL's customer growth

1 to 49,000, a lower level than FPL has experienced in any year since 1972,  
2 including the low year of growth in 1992 following Hurricane Andrew. So, it was  
3 considered prudent to take a more conservative approach. FPL projected that it  
4 would lose approximately 27,000 customers from the year prior to the recession  
5 (2000) to the year following the recession (2002). This is close to but lower than  
6 the decline in customer growth experienced during the 1982 recession, and it  
7 leaves 2002 customer growth at 65,000 customers, which is about the average  
8 new customer growth seen for most of the decade of the 1990s.

9  
10 The combination of the revised use per customer multiplied by the new projection  
11 of customers results in a projected level of sales of 100,158 gWh in 2002, a 1.7 %  
12 growth over 2001 as shown on Page 4 of Appendix I. This level of sales is 2.9%  
13 lower than the forecast used in the fuel, capacity, and conservation clause filings  
14 in August and September of 2001.

15  
16 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

17 A. The change in Florida's economic look for 2002, brought on by the events of  
18 September 11, 2001, warrants a revision to FPL's sales forecast. The  
19 performance of Florida's economy determines electricity usage per customer and  
20 the level of customer growth. The growth of both of these factors is forecast to  
21 decline from the levels forecast prior to September 11, 2001, resulting in lower  
22 forecast electricity sales in FPL's service territory. The revision in the sales and  
23 customer forecast is in line with but more conservative than the observed

1 outcomes from previous recessions. FPL's revised sales forecast is well founded  
2 and reasonable. Furthermore, it is consistent with the most recent projections by  
3 the State of Florida legislative revenue estimating conference.

4

5 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

6 A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF J. R. HARTZOG

DOCKET NO. 010001 - EI

NOVEMBER 5, 2001

1 Q. Please state your name and address.

2 A. My name is John R. Hartzog. My business address is  
3 700 Universe Boulevard, Juno Beach, Florida 33408.

4

5 Q. By whom are you employed and what is your  
6 position?

7 A. I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company  
8 (FPL) as Manager, Nuclear Financial & Information  
9 Services in the Nuclear Business Unit.

10

11 Q. Have you previously filed testimony in this  
12 docket?

13 A. Yes.

14

15 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

16 A. The purpose of my testimony is to present and  
17 explain FPL's incremental security costs

1 associated with the events of September 11, 2001  
2 to be included in the proposed fuel cost recovery  
3 factors. The recovery of these costs is discussed  
4 in the supplemental Testimony of FPL witness K. M.  
5 Dubin.

6

7 **Q. What is the basis for the additional security**  
8 **costs?**

9 A. FPL's nuclear plants rely on a "defense in depth"  
10 approach to security. Essentially, multiple  
11 barriers of increasing restrictions for access to  
12 plant components and systems are utilized.  
13 Historically, FPL has had a highly effective  
14 security program as demonstrated by Nuclear  
15 Regulatory Commission "force on force" inspections  
16 utilizing military Special Forces as mock  
17 adversaries. Both Turkey Point and St. Lucie  
18 successfully passed such inspections within the  
19 last few years. As a result of the September 11<sup>th</sup>  
20 events, FPL has deepened the security defense in  
21 depth, requiring additional manpower. This is  
22 consistent with new expectations regarding nuclear  
23 plant security and NRC Advisories. FPL is in

1 frequent contact with the NRC, and NRC  
2 recommendations are implemented as made. The  
3 incremental cost of this additional manpower is  
4 being captured in accounts established for that  
5 purpose. In the past, FPL's fossil units have had  
6 security based on fences, gates and limited  
7 personnel access. In light of the events of  
8 September 11, 2001 especially at Turkey Point and  
9 its close proximity to the nuclear units, FPL has  
10 also enhanced the security at selected fossil  
11 units.

12

13 **Q. How much are the incremental security costs in**  
14 **response to the September 11, 2001 events?**

15 A. FPL expects to expend approximately \$1.5 Million  
16 for additional security at its nuclear facilities,  
17 and \$300,000 at its fossil facilities in 2002.  
18 There are significant uncertainties in these  
19 costs, since it is vital that FPL respond to  
20 changing threat levels in a proactive manner. In  
21 addition, various assistance levels from  
22 governmental organizations will be required,  
23 including, as a minimum, local law enforcement and

1           the Florida National Guard. FPL anticipates that  
2           some of these governmental organizations will seek  
3           reimbursement of associated costs for providing  
4           assistance.

5

6   **Q.   Does this conclude your testimony?**

7   **A.   Yes, it does.**

1                   **BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

2                                   **FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

3                                   **SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF KOREL M. DUBIN**

4                                   **DOCKET NO. 010001-EI**

5                                   **November 5, 2001**

6

7    **Q.     Please state your name and address.**

8    A.     My name is Korel M. Dubin and my business address is 9250 West  
9           Flagler Street, Miami, Florida 33174.

10

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

12   A.     I am employed by Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) as Manager  
13           of Regulatory Issues in the Regulatory Affairs Department.

14

15   **Q.     Have you previously testified in this docket?**

16   A.     Yes, I have.

17

18   **Q.     What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?**

19   A.     The purpose of my supplemental testimony is to present for  
20           Commission review and approval revised fuel cost recovery factors  
21           (FCR) and revised capacity cost recovery factors (CCR) for FPL's  
22           rate schedules for the period January 2002 through December 2002.

23           This revision is due to a reduced sales forecast, from 94,729,311  
24           retail MWH to 91,929,691 retail MWH as discussed in the testimony

1 of FPL Witness Leo Green, and incremental costs for increased  
2 security at FPL's plants as discussed in the testimony of FPL Witness  
3 John Hartzog.

4

5 **Q. Have you prepared or caused to be prepared under your**  
6 **direction, supervision or control an exhibit in this proceeding?**

7 A. Yes, I have. It consists of various schedules included in Appendices  
8 II and III. Appendix II contains the FCR related schedules and  
9 Appendix III contains the CCR related schedules.

10

11

12

### **FUEL COST RECOVERY CLAUSE**

13

14 **Q. What is the proposed revised levelized fuel factor for which the**  
15 **Company requests approval?**

16 A. 2.860¢ per kWh. Schedule EI, Page 1 of Appendix II shows the  
17 calculation of this revised twelve-month levelized fuel factor. As  
18 shown on Line 30, the Total Jurisdictional Fuel Cost is  
19 \$2,578,571,684, a reduction of \$106,970,864 from the August 31,  
20 2001 filing due to the decrease in Net Energy for Load. Schedule E2,  
21 Pages 4 and 5 of Appendix II indicates the revised monthly fuel  
22 factors for January 2002 through December 2002 and also the  
23 revised twelve-month levelized fuel factor for the period. The fuel  
24 factor has been revised from the August 31, 2001 filing to reflect the

1 reduction in the sales forecast as described in the testimony of FPL  
2 Witness Leo Green. Additionally, the fuel factor has been revised to  
3 include the additional plant security costs as described in the  
4 testimony of FPL Witness John Hartzog.

5

6 **Q. Has the Company developed a revised twelve-month levelized**  
7 **fuel factor for its Time of Use rates?**

8 A. Yes. Schedule E1-D, Page 2 of Appendix II, provides a revised  
9 twelve-month levelized fuel factor of 3.138¢ per kWh on-peak and  
10 2.735¢ per kWh off-peak for our Time of Use rate schedules.

11

12 **Q. Were these calculations made in accordance with the**  
13 **procedures previously approved in this Docket?**

14 A. Yes, they were.

15

16 **Q. Is FPL proposing to include any additional costs in the**  
17 **calculation of the revised fuel cost recovery factors?**

18 A. Yes. FPL requests that it be allowed to recover incremental costs for  
19 increased security at FPL's plants as a result of the events of  
20 September 11, 2001, as described in the testimony of FPL Witness  
21 John Hartzog. For 2002 these costs are projected to be \$1,860,000  
22 and are reflected on Schedule E1, Page 1, Line 3a of Appendix II.

23

24 FPL is requesting recovery of these incremental security costs

1 through the FCR consistent with the Federal Energy Regulatory  
2 Commission's (FERC) Statement of Policy issued on September 14,  
3 2001 which states:

4 "In light of tragic events that have taken place in our country  
5 this week and the high state of alert the country is now  
6 experiencing, the Commission believes it is appropriate to  
7 provide regulatory guidance on certain energy infrastructure  
8 reliability and security matters that may be affected by this  
9 Commission's rate jurisdiction. The Commission understands  
10 that electric, gas, and oil companies may need to adopt new  
11 procedures, update existing procedures, and install facilities  
12 to further safeguard their electric power transmission grid and  
13 gas and oil pipeline systems. The Commission is aware that  
14 there may be uncertainty about companies' ability to recover  
15 the expenses necessary to further safeguard our energy  
16 infrastructure, especially if they are operating under frozen or  
17 indexed rates. In order to alleviate this uncertainty, the  
18 Commission wants to assure the companies we regulate that  
19 we will approve applications to recover prudently incurred  
20 costs necessary to further safeguard the reliability and  
21 security of our energy supply infrastructure in response to the  
22 heightened state of alert. Companies may propose a  
23 separate rate recovery mechanism, such as a surcharge to  
24 currently existing rates or some other cost recovery method.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

The Commission will give its highest priority to processing any filing made for the recovery of extraordinary expenditures to safeguard the reliability of our energy transportation systems and energy supply infrastructure. The Commission views the reliability of our Nation's energy transportation systems and energy supply infrastructure as critical to meeting the energy requirements essential to the American people. The Commission calls for the cooperation of the energy industry, customers, and state and local governments to provide any additional safeguards necessary to protect the country's vital energy transportation systems and energy supply infrastructure."

Additionally, NARUC will be introducing a resolution on "Supporting Recovery in State Regulated Rates of Extraordinary Expenditures Necessary to Safeguard National Energy Suppliers" at the Electricity and Gas Committees on November 12, 2001. The resolution states:

"Resolved, that States should approve applications by gas and electric companies subject to their jurisdiction to recover prudently incurred costs necessary to further safeguard the reliability and security of our energy supply infrastructure and should allow companies to propose separate rate recovery mechanisms, such as a surcharge to existing rates or

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

deferred accounting treatment."

FPL believes it is essential to increase security to protect and maintain its fuel supply so that we can continue to provide economical nuclear and fossil generation. Clearly, the inability to operate one or more of our generating units, particularly our nuclear generating units, will have a significant adverse impact on our fuel costs. Additionally, FPL believes it is appropriate to recover the incremental security costs through the fuel cost recovery clause. There are significant uncertainties in these costs. Moreover, it is vital that FPL respond to changing threat levels in a proactive manner. For example, as described in the testimony of FPL Witness John Hartzog, these costs may include the cost of additional security from the national guard. For these reasons FPL believes it is appropriate to bring this issue to the Commission for their consideration and approval. Even if the Commission is concerned about whether the use of the fuel clause is the most appropriate continuing method of recovery, FPL suggests that the clause should be used as an interim recovery method.

**CAPACITY PAYMENT RECOVERY CLAUSE**

- Q. Please describe the revisions made to the CCR.**
- A. Projected retail sales for 2002 were revised downward from 94,729,311 MWH to 91,929,691 MWH as discussed in the testimony

1 of FPL Witness Leo Green. Page 2 of Appendix III presents the  
2 calculation of the revised Capacity Payment Recovery Clause (CCR)  
3 factors by rate class due to this decreased sales forecast.

4

5 **Q. What effective date is FPL requesting for the new factors?**

6 A. FPL is requesting that the revised FCR and CCR factors become  
7 effective with customer bills for January 2002 through December  
8 2002. This will provide for 12 months of billing on the FCR and CCR  
9 factors for all our customers.

10

11 **Q. What will be the revised charge for a Residential customer using  
12 1,000 kWh effective January 2002?**

13 A. The total residential bill, excluding taxes and franchise fees, for 1,000  
14 kWh will be \$81.63. The base bill for 1,000 Residential kWh is  
15 \$43.26. The fuel cost recovery charge for a residential customer is  
16 \$28.66, a reduction of \$0.30 from the fuel charge filed on August 31,  
17 2001 and a reduction of \$1.75 from the current fuel charge. The  
18 conservation charge is \$1.87, an increase of \$0.06 from the  
19 conservation charge filed on September 20, 2001. The Capacity  
20 Cost Recovery charge is \$7.01, an increase of \$0.21 from the  
21 capacity charge filed on August 31, 2001 and an increase of \$1.74  
22 from the current capacity charge. The environmental cost recovery  
23 charge is \$0.00 and the Gross Receipts Tax is \$0.83. A 1,000 kWh  
24 residential bill comparing this revision to the originally filed charges

1           and a comparison to current charges is presented in Schedule E10,  
2           Page 14 of Appendix II.

3

4   **Q.   Does this conclude your testimony.**

5   **A.   Yes, it does.**

**APPENDIX I  
FUEL COST RECOVERY  
FORECAST ASSUMPTIONS**

LEG-1  
DOCKET NO. 010001-EI  
EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_  
PAGES 1-4  
NOVEMBER 5, 2001

## Unemployment Rates

### State of Florida and Selected Florida Counties

Year	Florida	County										
		Brevard	Broward	Collier	Duval	Hills- borough	Lee	Miami- Dade	Orange	Palm Beach	Pinellas	Volusia
1980	5.9	5.4	4.1	6.3	4.7	5.0	4.7	8.0	5.4	4.9	4.7	5.6
1981	6.8	6.5	4.8	8.4	5.8	5.8	5.3	9.4	6.3	5.8	5.0	6.2
1982	8.2	7.0	6.7	12.0	6.8	7.9	7.9	10.0	6.8	7.6	6.3	7.0
1983	8.6	7.6	7.3	12.2	7.8	8.3	8.1	9.8	7.3	8.5	6.6	7.4
1984	6.3	5.1	5.0	8.4	5.6	5.3	5.3	7.8	5.4	6.3	4.4	5.2
1985	6.0	4.7	4.9	7.3	5.1	5.3	4.8	7.5	4.9	6.2	4.2	4.8
1986	5.7	6.0	4.5	5.9	5.4	5.7	4.2	6.7	4.7	5.9	4.2	5.0
1987	5.3	5.5	4.2	4.9	5.4	5.1	3.8	5.8	4.7	5.4	4.2	4.7
1988	5.0	4.7	4.1	4.3	5.4	4.5	3.6	5.4	4.6	5.0	4.4	4.5
1989	5.6	5.2	5.1	4.6	5.8	4.9	3.9	6.4	5.0	6.0	4.7	5.4
1990	6.0	5.3	5.6	5.4	5.2	4.7	3.8	7.8	5.4	7.0	4.5	5.0
1991	7.4	7.0	7.7	7.8	6.3	6.1	6.0	9.4	6.8	8.9	6.0	6.5
1992	8.3	7.9	8.5	9.5	6.8	7.1	7.4	10.5	7.4	10.3	6.6	7.6
1993	7.0	7.6	6.9	8.4	5.5	6.4	5.7	8.2	6.2	9.0	6.0	6.7
1994	6.6	7.4	6.5	8.2	4.9	5.2	4.9	8.4	5.7	8.8	5.0	6.2
1995	5.5	6.5	5.7	7.0	3.8	4.3	4.2	7.4	4.5	7.2	4.1	4.8
1996	5.1	5.4	5.1	5.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	7.3	3.8	6.6	3.7	4.3
1997	4.8	4.6	4.9	5.0	3.8	3.3	3.4	7.1	3.3	6.3	3.4	3.9
1998	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.2	3.2	2.8	3.0	6.4	3.0	5.6	3.1	3.4
1999	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.7	3.1	2.6	2.6	5.8	2.7	5.0	2.7	3.1
2000	3.6	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.3	2.6	2.6	5.3	2.5	4.4	2.5	2.9

County's unemployment rate is greater than state

## GROWTH IN PER CAPITA INCOME

Year	Florida	County										
		Brevard	Broward	Collier	Duval	Hills- borough	Lee	Miami- Dade	Orange	Palm Beach	Pinellas	Volusia
1981	2.5%	3.9%	0.7%	3.8%	3.4%	3.3%	1.8%	1.0%	4.1%	6.5%	4.7%	1.5%
1982	-0.4%	-2.1%	-0.4%	-3.9%	1.5%	1.1%	-4.1%	-0.8%	2.1%	-0.7%	0.0%	-0.8%
1983	2.8%	2.1%	2.8%	4.5%	2.3%	3.3%	3.0%	1.4%	3.0%	5.6%	2.1%	3.5%
1984	5.0%	5.2%	6.2%	5.2%	7.6%	6.0%	4.4%	3.6%	5.6%	5.1%	5.2%	4.7%
1985	3.3%	2.5%	3.1%	3.0%	3.6%	3.4%	5.1%	2.2%	3.9%	5.2%	2.3%	3.5%
1986	2.4%	2.3%	0.1%	4.6%	2.1%	1.5%	3.0%	1.1%	2.3%	2.4%	3.1%	2.4%
1987	2.6%	2.7%	2.0%	7.6%	2.0%	2.8%	2.9%	2.9%	2.0%	4.8%	0.7%	1.3%
1988	3.1%	1.8%	3.0%	12.7%	1.1%	2.5%	4.1%	1.0%	3.0%	4.8%	2.0%	1.8%
1989	3.5%	4.0%	3.7%	1.5%	3.6%	3.2%	6.1%	2.0%	1.0%	4.3%	5.7%	1.7%
1990	-0.4%	-0.8%	-2.3%	-2.0%	0.3%	1.8%	-2.0%	-0.9%	-0.8%	2.9%	-2.9%	-1.9%
1991	-1.7%	-3.4%	-2.2%	-1.9%	-1.7%	0.2%	-3.7%	-2.2%	-1.3%	2.0%	-2.4%	-3.4%
1992	-0.7%	-1.3%	0.7%	6.3%	0.8%	1.4%	0.8%	-8.3%	0.5%	-0.4%	0.9%	-0.6%
1993	2.3%	0.4%	-1.2%	3.3%	2.3%	1.4%	0.3%	11.8%	1.4%	-0.4%	3.7%	0.2%
1994	1.2%	-0.1%	0.1%	4.5%	2.3%	3.1%	1.8%	0.1%	0.6%	0.5%	0.0%	1.7%
1995	2.9%	2.4%	1.0%	1.1%	3.2%	4.3%	4.0%	1.8%	3.0%	3.4%	3.8%	3.3%
1996	2.5%	1.2%	1.3%	3.7%	2.2%	3.4%	1.0%	1.3%	2.7%	3.3%	2.9%	3.1%
1997	2.5%	0.3%	4.0%	6.2%	2.2%	3.5%	4.0%	0.9%	3.3%	-1.0%	4.7%	2.9%
1998	3.6%	2.7%	2.5%	1.1%	4.4%	4.6%	3.0%	3.6%	5.1%	3.6%	4.0%	2.2%
1999	1.3%	1.0%	0.2%	1.6%	2.0%	3.1%	0.3%	1.0%	4.7%	1.4%	3.2%	0.7%
2000	3.1%	1.4%	1.1%	2.4%	2.4%	2.5%	1.1%	1.6%	0.7%	1.6%	1.8%	1.0%

County's Growth in Per Capita Income is less than state

**FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**  
**IMPACT OF ECONOMIC RECESSIONS ON DEMAND FOR ELECTRICITY**  
**(INCOME, CUSTOMERS GROWTH AND USE OF ELECTRICITY PER CUSTOMER)**

Year	Florida Real Per Capita Income (Chained \$1996)	% Change	Customers	Absolute Change	% Change	Use Per Customer (KWH)	% Change
1972	15,440		1,446,114			21,782	
1973	16,323	5.7%	1,567,638	121,524	8.4%	22,445	3.0%
1974	15,957	-2.2%	1,676,022	108,384	6.9%	21,160	-5.7%
1975	15,482	-3.0%	1,738,071	62,050	3.7%	21,375	1.0%
1976	15,858	2.4%	1,795,793	57,721	3.3%	21,225	-0.7%
1977	16,336	3.0%	1,875,821	80,028	4.5%	21,704	2.3%
1978	17,201	5.3%	1,967,352	91,531	4.9%	22,215	2.4%
1979	17,720	3.0%	2,074,327	106,975	5.4%	21,859	-1.6%
1980	18,119	2.3%	2,184,974	110,646	5.3%	22,174	1.4%
1981	18,574	2.5%	2,285,187	100,214	4.6%	21,890	-1.3%
1982	18,509	-0.4%	2,358,167	72,980	3.2%	21,429	-2.1%
1983	19,021	2.8%	2,429,688	71,521	3.0%	21,608	0.8%
1984	19,977	5.0%	2,520,523	90,835	3.7%	21,086	-2.4%
1985	20,638	3.3%	2,617,556	97,033	3.8%	21,393	1.5%
1986	21,130	2.4%	2,723,555	105,999	4.0%	21,394	0.0%
1987	21,670	2.6%	2,840,207	116,651	4.3%	21,694	1.4%
1988	22,346	3.1%	2,953,663	113,457	4.0%	21,910	1.0%
1989	23,127	3.5%	3,064,436	110,773	3.8%	22,828	4.2%
1990	23,044	-0.4%	3,158,817	94,381	3.1%	22,486	-1.5%
1991	22,662	-1.7%	3,226,455	67,638	2.1%	22,675	0.8%
1992	22,505	-0.7%	3,281,238	54,783	1.7%	22,277	-1.8%
1993	23,024	2.3%	3,355,794	74,556	2.3%	22,580	1.4%
1994	23,296	1.2%	3,422,187	66,393	2.0%	23,487	4.0%
1995	23,963	2.9%	3,488,796	66,609	1.9%	24,066	2.5%
1996	24,558	2.5%	3,550,747	61,951	1.8%	23,937	-0.5%
1997	25,184	2.5%	3,615,485	64,738	1.8%	24,022	0.4%
1998	26,095	3.6%	3,680,470	64,985	1.8%	25,177	4.8%
1999	26,442	1.3%	3,756,009	75,539	2.1%	24,350	-3.3%
2000	27,260	3.1%	3,848,350	92,341	2.5%	24,943	2.4%

Note: Shaded areas represent recession years.

**Revised Load Forecast  
(Net Energy For Load & Customers)**

<u>Year</u>	<u>Net Energy for Load (NEL) (gWh)</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Revised NEL (gWh)</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>Absolute Customer Growth</u>	<u>Revised Absolute Customer Growth</u>	<u>Difference</u>	<u>NEL/ Customer kWh</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Revised NEL/ Customer kWh</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Difference</u>
2001	99,704	3.9%	98,503	2.6%	-1.2%	86,760	86,606	-0.2%	25,337	1.6%	25,032	0.4%	-1.2%
2002	103,223	3.5%	100,158	1.7%	-3.0%	85,643	65,000	-24.1%	25,672	1.3%	25,039	0.0%	-2.5%

**APPENDIX II  
FUEL COST RECOVERY  
E SCHEDULES**

KMD-7  
DOCKET NO. 010001-EI  
EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_  
PAGES 1-14  
NOVEMBER 5, 2001

## FLORIDA POWER &amp; LIGHT COMPANY

FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER  
COST RECOVERY CLAUSE CALCULATION

ESTIMATED FOR THE PERIOD: JANUARY 2002 - DECEMBER 2002

	(a)	(b)	(c)
	DOLLARS	MWH	¢/KWH
1 Fuel Cost of System Net Generation (E3)	\$2,015,046,641	81,717,455	2.4659
2 Nuclear Fuel Disposal Costs (E2)	22,562,002	24,283,718	0.0929
3 Fuel Related Transactions (E2)	12,061,527	0	0.0000
3a Security Costs (E3)	1,860,000		
4 Fuel Cost of Sales to FKEC / CKW (E2)	(30,745,716)	(1,022,607)	3.0066
5 TOTAL COST OF GENERATED POWER	\$2,020,784,454	80,694,848	2.5042
6 Fuel Cost of Purchased Power (Exclusive of Economy) (E7)	175,916,510	11,576,275	1.5196
7 Energy Cost of Sched C & X Econ Purch (Florida) (E9)	28,557,741	1,008,000	2.8331
8 Energy Cost of Other Econ Purch (Non-Florida) (E9)	37,012,500	1,020,000	3.6287
9 Energy Cost of Sched E Economy Purch (E9)	0	0	0.0000
10 Capacity Cost of Sched E Economy Purchases	0	0	0.0000
11 Mission Settlement (E2)	2,428,182	0	0.0000
11a Okeelanta/Osceola Settlement (E2)	\$10,942,995	0	0.0000
12 Payments to Qualifying Facilities (E8)	148,745,520	6,794,037	2.1894
13 TOTAL COST OF PURCHASED POWER	\$403,603,448	20,398,312	1.9786
14 TOTAL AVAILABLE KWH (LINE 5 + LINE 13)		101,093,160	
15 Fuel Cost of Economy Sales (E6)	(70,301,000)	(1,840,000)	3.8207
16 Gain on Economy Sales (E6A)	0	0	0.0000
17 Fuel Cost of Unit Power Sales (SL2 Partpts) (E6)	(1,525,200)	(493,502)	0.3091
18 Fuel Cost of Other Power Sales (E6)	0	0	0.0000
18a Revenues from Off-System Sales	(15,113,296)	(2,333,502)	0.6477
19 TOTAL FUEL COST AND GAINS OF POWER SALES	(\$86,939,496)	(2,333,502)	3.7257
19a Net Inadvertent Interchange	0	0	
20 TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS (LINE 5 + 13 + 19 + 19a)	\$2,337,448,406	98,759,658	2.3668
21 Net Unbilled Sales	(2,237,461) **	(94,535)	(0.0024)
22 Company Use	7,012,345 **	296,279	0.0076
23 T & D Losses	151,934,146 **	6,419,378	0.1649
24 SYSTEM MWH SALES (Excl sales to FKEC / CKW)	\$2,337,448,406	92,138,536	2.5369
25 Wholesale MWH Sales (Excl sales to FKEC / CKW)	\$5,298,061	208,845	2.5369
26 Jurisdictional MWH Sales	\$2,332,150,345	91,929,691	2.5369
27 Jurisdictional Loss Multiplier	-	-	1.00052
28 Jurisdictional MWH Sales Adjusted for Line Losses	\$2,333,363,063	91,929,691	2.5382
29 FINAL TRUE-UP EST/ACT TRUE-UP JAN 00 - DEC 00 JAN 01 - DEC 01 \$259,002,688 \$13,794,067 underrecovery overrecovery	245,208,621	91,929,691	0.2667
30 TOTAL JURISDICTIONAL FUEL COST	\$2,578,571,684	91,929,691	2.8049
31 Revenue Tax Factor			1.01597
32 Fuel Factor Adjusted for Taxes			2.8497
33 GPIF ***	\$9,004,713	91,929,691	0.0098
34 Fuel Factor including GPIF (Line 32 + Line 33)			2.8595
35 FUEL FACTOR ROUNDED TO NEAREST .001 CENTS/KWH			2.860

\*\* For Informational Purposes Only

\*\*\* Calculation Based on Jurisdictional KWH Sales

DETERMINATION OF FUEL RECOVERY FACTOR  
TIME OF USE RATE SCHEDULES

JANUARY 2002 - DECEMBER 2002

NET ENERGY FOR LOAD (%)

		FUEL COST (%)
ON PEAK	30.93	34.27
OFF PEAK	69.07	65.73
	100.00	100.00

FUEL RECOVERY CALCULATION

	TOTAL	ON-PEAK	OFF-PEAK
1 TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANS	\$2,337,448,406	\$801,043,569	\$1,536,404,837
2 MWH SALES	92,138,537	28,498,449	63,640,088
3 COST PER KWH SOLD	2.5369	2.8108	2.4142
4 JURISDICTIONAL LOSS FACTOR	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052
5 JURISDICTIONAL FUEL FACTOR	2.5382	2.8123	2.4155
6 TRUE-UP	0.2667	0.2667	0.2667
7			
8 TOTAL	2.8049	3.0790	2.6822
9 REVENUE TAX FACTOR	1.01597	1.01597	1.01597
10 RECOVERY FACTOR	2.8497	3.1282	2.7250
11 GPIF	0.0098	0.0098	0.0098
12 RECOVERY FACTOR including GPIF	2.8595	3.1380	2.7348
13 RECOVERY FACTOR ROUNDED TO NEAREST .001 c/KWH	2.860	3.138	2.735

HOURS: ON-PEAK	24.73 %
OFF-PEAK	75.27 %

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

SCHEDULE E - 1E

FUEL RECOVERY FACTORS - BY RATE GROUP  
(ADJUSTED FOR LINE/TRANSFORMATION LOSSES)

JANUARY 2002 - DECEMBER 2002

(1) GROUP	(2) RATE SCHEDULE	(3) AVERAGE FACTOR	(4) FUEL RECOVERY LOSS MULTIPLIER	(5) FUEL RECOVERY FACTOR
A	RS-1, GS-1, SL-2	2.860	1.00210	2.866
A-1*	SL-1, OL-1, PL-1	2.799	1.00210	2.805
B	GSD-1	2.860	1.00202	2.865
C	GSLD-1 & CS-1	2.860	1.00078	2.862
D	GSLD-2, CS-2, OS-2 & MET	2.860	0.99429	2.843
E	GSLD-3 & CS-3	2.860	0.95233	2.723
A	RST-1, GST-1 ON-PEAK OFF-PEAK	3.138 2.735	1.00210 1.00210	3.145 2.741
B	GSDT-1 ON-PEAK CILC-1(G) OFF-PEAK	3.138 2.735	1.00202 1.00202	3.144 2.740
C	GSLDT-1 & ON-PEAK CST-1 OFF-PEAK	3.138 2.735	1.00078 1.00078	3.140 2.737
D	GSLDT-2 & ON-PEAK CST-2 OFF-PEAK	3.138 2.735	0.99429 0.99429	3.120 2.719
E	GSLDT-3, CST-3, ON-PEAK CILC -1(T) OFF-PEAK & ISST-1(T)	3.138 2.735	0.95233 0.95233	2.988 2.604
F	CILC -1(D) & ON-PEAK ISST-1(D) OFF-PEAK	3.138 2.735	0.99331 0.99331	3.117 2.717

\* WEIGHTED AVERAGE 16% ON-PEAK AND 84% OFF-PEAK

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
 FUEL & PURCHASED POWER COST RECOVERY CLAUSE CALCULATION  
 FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 2002 - DECEMBER 2002

SCHEDULE E2  
 Page 1 of 2

LINE NO.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	LINE NO.
	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	ESTIMATED MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	6 MONTH SUB-TOTAL	
A1 FUEL COST OF SYSTEM GENERATION	\$140,838,890	\$125,884,800	\$132,132,160	\$154,609,473	\$181,113,173	\$188,403,511	\$922,982,007	A1
1a NUCLEAR FUEL DISPOSAL	2,030,598	1,834,089	1,921,482	1,570,368	1,980,798	1,916,901	11,254,236	1a
1b COAL CAR INVESTMENT	301,618	299,886	298,153	296,420	294,688	292,955	1,783,720	1b
1c NUCLEAR THERMAL UPRATE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1c
1d GAS LATERAL ENHANCEMENTS	197,127	195,672	194,216	192,761	191,305	189,849	1,160,930	1d
1e DOE DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING COSTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1e
1f SECURITY COSTS	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	930,000	1f
2 FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD	(7,891,020)	(6,462,490)	(5,320,070)	(4,689,580)	(6,518,050)	(6,119,120)	(37,000,330)	2
2a REVENUES FROM OFF-SYSTEM SALES	(753,140)	(948,500)	(770,042)	(580,566)	(612,092)	(1,575,882)	(5,240,222)	2a
3 FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER	15,386,080	13,719,250	14,339,070	13,670,880	15,125,030	14,644,620	86,884,930	3
3a MISSION SETTLEMENT	0	88,109	0	1,108,358	0	0	1,196,467	3a
3b OKEELANTA/OSCEOLA SETTLEMENT	925,479	923,013	920,547	918,081	915,615	913,149	5,515,886	3b
3c QUALIFYING FACILITIES	12,810,300	11,912,760	12,909,160	11,696,060	13,494,290	13,105,070	75,927,640	3c
4 ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCHASES	4,249,945	4,961,046	6,407,445	8,148,645	8,444,945	3,636,145	35,848,171	4
4a FUEL COST OF SALES TO FKEC / CKW	(2,248,087)	(2,168,424)	(2,215,322)	(2,371,169)	(2,508,016)	(2,655,147)	(14,166,165)	4a
5 TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS (SUM OF LINES A-1 THRU A-4)	\$166,002,791	\$150,394,212	\$160,971,799	\$184,724,732	\$212,076,687	\$212,907,051	\$1,087,077,271	5
6 SYSTEM KWH SOLD (MWH) (Excl sales to FKEC / CKW)	7,230,250	6,975,646	6,393,448	6,673,565	7,078,079	8,193,682	42,544,670	6
7 COST PER KWH SOLD (¢/KWH)	2.2959	2.1560	2.5178	2.7680	2.9962	2.5984	2.5551	7
7a JURISDICTIONAL LOSS MULTIPLIER	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	7a
7b JURISDICTIONAL COST (¢/KWH)	2.2971	2.1571	2.5191	2.7694	2.9978	2.5998	2.5565	7b
9 TRUE-UP (¢/KWH)	0.2826	0.2930	0.3196	0.3062	0.2887	0.2494	0.2882	9
10 TOTAL	2.5797	2.4501	2.8387	3.0756	3.2865	2.8492	2.8447	10
11 REVENUE TAX FACTOR 0.01597	0.0412	0.0391	0.0453	0.0491	0.0525	0.0455	0.0454	11
12 RECOVERY FACTOR ADJUSTED FOR TAXES	2.6209	2.4892	2.8840	3.1247	3.3390	2.8947	2.8901	12
13 GPIF (¢/KWH)	0.0104	0.0108	0.0117	0.0112	0.0106	0.0092	0.0106	13
14 RECOVERY FACTOR including GPIF	2.6313	2.5000	2.8957	3.1359	3.3496	2.9039	2.9007	14
15 RECOVERY FACTOR ROUNDED TO NEAREST .001 ¢/KWH	2.631	2.500	2.896	3.136	3.350	2.904	2.901	15

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
 FUEL & PURCHASED POWER COST RECOVERY CLAUSE CALCULATION  
 FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 2002 - DECEMBER 2002

SCHEDULE E2  
 Page 2 of 2

LINE NO.	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	LINE NO.
	JULY	AUGUST	ESTIMATED SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	12 MONTH PERIOD	
A1 FUEL COST OF SYSTEM GENERATION	\$215,721,064	\$212,332,717	\$191,826,970	\$189,830,473	\$137,567,140	\$144,786,270	\$2,015,046,641	A1
1a NUCLEAR FUEL DISPOSAL	1,980,798	1,980,798	1,898,660	1,451,817	1,965,095	2,030,598	\$22,562,002	1a
1b COAL CAR INVESTMENT	291,223	289,490	287,757	286,025	284,292	282,560	\$3,505,067	1b
1c NUCLEAR THERMAL UPRATE	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	1c
1d GAS LATERAL ENHANCEMENTS	188,394	186,938	185,483	184,027	182,572	181,116	\$2,269,460	1d
1e DOE DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING COSTS	0	0	0	0	6,287,000	0	\$6,287,000	1e
1f SECURITY COSTS	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	\$1,860,000	1f
2 FUEL COST OF POWER SOLD	(8,204,030)	(8,294,130)	(7,179,970)	(3,026,160)	(3,530,960)	(4,590,620)	(\$71,826,200)	2
2a REVENUES FROM OFF-SYSTEM SALES	(3,602,872)	(3,537,504)	(1,473,871)	(114,012)	(263,580)	(881,235)	(\$15,113,296)	2a
3 FUEL COST OF PURCHASED POWER	15,076,390	15,336,550	14,780,760	15,193,510	14,235,170	14,409,200	\$175,916,510	3
3a MISSION SETTLEMENT	0	0	0	1,108,358	123,357	0	\$2,428,182	3a
3b OKEELANTA/OSCEOLA SETTLEMENT	910,683	908,217	905,751	903,285	900,819	898,353	\$10,942,995	3b
3c QUALIFYING FACILITIES	13,425,790	13,336,590	13,044,160	12,975,790	9,330,950	10,704,600	\$148,745,520	3c
4 ENERGY COST OF ECONOMY PURCHASES	3,689,945	4,244,945	8,198,645	6,019,945	4,698,645	2,869,945	\$65,570,241	4
4a FUEL COST OF SALES TO FKEC / CKW	(2,814,935)	(2,930,042)	(2,936,047)	(2,856,568)	(2,657,303)	(2,384,656)	(\$30,745,716)	4a
5 TOTAL FUEL & NET POWER TRANSACTIONS (SUM OF LINES A-1 THRU A-4)	\$236,817,450	\$234,009,569	\$219,693,299	\$222,111,490	\$169,278,197	\$168,461,131	\$2,337,448,406	5
6 SYSTEM KWH SOLD (MWH) (Excl sales to FKEC / CKW)	8,566,039	9,049,187	8,868,138	8,356,356	7,499,560	7,254,587	92,138,537	6
7 COST PER KWH SOLD (¢/KWH)	2.7646	2.5860	2.4773	2.6580	2.2572	2.3221	2.5369	7
7a JURISDICTIONAL LOSS MULTIPLIER	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	1.00052	7a
7b JURISDICTIONAL COST (¢/KWH)	2.7660	2.5873	2.4786	2.6594	2.2583	2.3233	2.5382	7b
9 TRUE-UP (¢/KWH)	0.2395	0.2267	0.2313	0.2455	0.2737	0.2830	0.2667	9
10 TOTAL	3.0055	2.8140	2.7099	2.9049	2.5320	2.6063	2.8049	10
11 REVENUE TAX FACTOR 0.01597	0.0480	0.0449	0.0433	0.0464	0.0404	0.0416	0.0448	11
12 RECOVERY FACTOR ADJUSTED FOR TAXES	3.0535	2.8589	2.7532	2.9513	2.5724	2.6479	2.8497	12
13 GPIF (¢/KWH)	0.0088	0.0083	0.0085	0.0090	0.0101	0.0104	0.0098	13
14 RECOVERY FACTOR including GPIF	3.0623	2.8672	2.7617	2.9603	2.5825	2.6583	2.8595	14
15 RECOVERY FACTOR ROUNDED TO NEAREST .001 ¢/KWH	3.062	2.867	2.762	2.960	2.583	2.658	2.860	15

**Generating System Comparative Data by Fuel Type**

	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02
<b>Fuel Cost of System Net Generation (\$)</b>						
1 Heavy Oil	\$58,808,150	\$58,373,170	\$61,894,110	\$67,018,680	\$76,255,360	\$75,073,380
2 Light Oil	\$776,720	\$8,540	\$19,590	\$3,168,950	\$7,254,990	\$974,880
3 Coal	\$10,572,270	\$9,605,270	\$10,092,230	\$9,766,680	\$10,730,280	\$10,392,710
4 Gas	\$63,773,560	\$51,669,200	\$53,580,790	\$69,272,193	\$80,115,733	\$95,455,651
5 Nuclear	\$6,908,190	\$6,228,620	\$6,545,440	\$5,382,970	\$6,756,810	\$6,506,890
6 <b>Total</b>	\$140,838,890	\$125,884,800	\$132,132,160	\$154,609,473	\$181,113,173	\$188,403,511
<b>System Net Generation (MWH)</b>						
7 Heavy Oil	1,565,919	1,620,692	1,804,556	1,960,451	2,205,787	2,115,639
8 Light Oil	9,341	102	233	41,878	100,784	13,988
9 Coal	625,612	565,068	579,282	555,534	617,898	597,965
10 Gas	1,536,538	1,239,808	1,314,343	1,751,329	2,038,380	2,729,605
11 Nuclear	2,185,554	1,974,049	2,068,111	1,690,203	2,131,954	2,063,180
12 <b>Total</b>	5,922,964	5,399,719	5,766,525	5,999,395	7,094,803	7,520,377
<b>Units of Fuel Burned</b>						
13 Heavy Oil (BBLs)	2,459,110	2,543,709	2,829,660	3,104,961	3,493,220	3,362,394
14 Light Oil (BBLs)	21,979	230	527	93,202	226,162	30,116
15 Coal (TONS)	333,450	300,626	315,322	305,691	332,746	322,073
16 Gas (MCF)	11,964,508	9,518,435	10,057,992	14,617,198	17,561,844	21,455,482
17 Nuclear (MBTU)	23,362,712	21,101,814	22,107,716	18,417,964	23,281,562	22,530,554
<b>BTU Burned (MMBTU)</b>						
18 Heavy Oil	15,738,298	16,279,735	18,109,822	19,871,750	22,356,602	21,519,322
19 Light Oil	127,824	1,332	3,057	541,333	1,313,587	174,811
20 Coal	6,342,469	5,728,681	5,901,118	5,714,840	6,326,755	6,122,670
21 Gas	11,964,508	9,518,435	10,057,992	14,617,198	17,561,844	21,455,482
22 Nuclear	23,362,712	21,101,814	22,107,716	18,417,964	23,281,562	22,530,554
23 <b>Total</b>	57,535,811	52,629,997	56,179,705	59,163,085	70,840,350	71,802,839

**Generating System Comparative Data by Fuel Type**

	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02
<b>Generation Mix (%MWH)</b>						
24 Heavy Oil	26.44%	30.01%	31.29%	32.68%	31.09%	28.13%
25 Light Oil	0.16%	0.00%	0.00%	0.70%	1.42%	0.19%
26 Coal	10.56%	10.46%	10.05%	9.26%	8.71%	7.95%
27 Gas	25.94%	22.96%	22.79%	29.19%	28.73%	36.30%
28 Nuclear	36.90%	36.56%	35.86%	28.17%	30.05%	27.43%
29 <b>Total</b>	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<b>Fuel Cost per Unit</b>						
30 Heavy Oil (\$/BBL)	23.9144	22.9481	21.8733	21.5844	21.8295	22.3274
31 Light Oil (\$/BBL)	35.3392	37.1304	37.1727	34.0009	32.0787	32.3708
32 Coal (\$/ton)	31.7057	31.9509	32.0061	31.9495	32.2477	32.2682
33 Gas (\$/MCF)	5.3302	5.4283	5.3272	4.7391	4.5619	4.4490
34 Nuclear (\$/MBTU)	0.2957	0.2952	0.2961	0.2923	0.2902	0.2888
<b>Fuel Cost per MMBTU (\$/MMBTU)</b>						
35 Heavy Oil	3.7366	3.5856	3.4177	3.3726	3.4109	3.4886
36 Light Oil	6.0765	6.4114	6.4082	5.8540	5.5230	5.5768
37 Coal	1.6669	1.6767	1.7102	1.7090	1.6960	1.6974
38 Gas	5.3302	5.4283	5.3272	4.7391	4.5619	4.4490
39 Nuclear	0.2957	0.2952	0.2961	0.2923	0.2902	0.2888
<b>BTU burned per KWH (BTU/KWH)</b>						
40 Heavy Oil	10,051	10,045	10,036	10,136	10,135	10,172
41 Light Oil	13,684	13,059	13,120	12,926	13,034	12,497
42 Coal	10,138	10,138	10,187	10,287	10,239	10,239
43 Gas	7,787	7,677	7,652	8,346	8,616	7,860
44 Nuclear	10,690	10,690	10,690	10,897	10,920	10,920
<b>Generated Fuel Cost per KWH (cents/KWH)</b>						
45 Heavy Oil	3.7555	3.6017	3.4299	3.4185	3.4571	3.5485
46 Light Oil	8.3152	8.3725	8.4077	7.5671	7.1986	6.9694
47 Coal	1.6899	1.6998	1.7422	1.7581	1.7366	1.7380
48 Gas	4.1505	4.1675	4.0766	3.9554	3.9304	3.4970
49 Nuclear	0.3161	0.3155	0.3165	0.3185	0.3169	0.3154
50 <b>Total</b>	2.3778	2.3313	2.2914	2.5771	2.5528	2.5052

**Generating System Comparative Data by Fuel Type**

	Jul-02	Aug-02	Sep-02	Oct-02	Nov-02	Dec-02	Total
<b>Fuel Cost of System Net Generation (\$)</b>							
1 Heavy Oil	\$79,835,450	\$74,151,020	\$67,306,520	\$70,740,330	\$35,551,350	\$29,942,680	\$754,950,200
2 Light Oil	\$1,283,170	\$2,152,930	\$634,370	\$533,050	\$230	\$23,350	\$16,830,770
3 Coal	\$10,735,170	\$10,834,140	\$10,500,730	\$10,840,820	\$4,517,810	\$4,564,620	\$113,152,730
4 Gas	\$117,238,624	\$118,566,307	\$107,027,980	\$102,802,223	\$90,954,440	\$103,467,860	\$1,053,924,561
5 Nuclear	\$6,628,650	\$6,628,320	\$6,357,370	\$4,914,050	\$6,543,310	\$6,787,760	\$76,188,380
6 <b>Total</b>	\$215,721,064	\$212,332,717	\$191,826,970	\$189,830,473	\$137,567,140	\$144,786,270	\$2,015,046,641
<b>System Net Generation (MWH)</b>							
7 Heavy Oil	2,190,198	2,015,813	1,784,044	1,866,604	977,005	889,846	20,996,554
8 Light Oil	20,171	35,033	9,692	7,763	3	488	239,476
9 Coal	617,898	617,898	597,965	617,350	279,276	286,919	6,558,665
10 Gas	3,553,674	3,513,689	3,203,586	2,995,753	2,708,266	3,054,071	29,639,042
11 Nuclear	2,131,954	2,131,954	2,043,547	1,562,606	2,115,052	2,185,554	24,283,718
12 <b>Total</b>	8,513,895	8,314,387	7,638,834	7,050,076	6,079,602	6,416,878	81,717,455
<b>Units of Fuel Burned</b>							
13 Heavy Oil (BBLs)	3,486,046	3,204,726	2,837,850	2,961,353	1,535,262	1,406,201	33,224,492
14 Light Oil (BBLs)	39,005	64,895	19,110	15,979	7	695	511,907
15 Coal (TONS)	332,497	332,820	322,054	332,624	130,159	133,115	3,493,177
16 Gas (MCF)	27,368,598	26,995,546	24,399,396	22,792,150	19,573,850	21,612,500	227,917,499
17 Nuclear (MBTU)	23,281,562	23,281,562	22,318,024	17,118,058	22,609,080	23,362,712	262,773,320
<b>BTU Burned (MMBTU)</b>							
18 Heavy Oil	22,310,692	20,510,244	18,162,240	18,952,658	9,825,676	8,999,687	212,636,726
19 Light Oil	226,682	377,396	111,035	92,820	40	4,050	2,973,967
20 Coal	6,326,755	6,326,755	6,122,670	6,321,108	2,770,284	2,845,347	66,849,452
21 Gas	27,368,598	26,995,546	24,399,396	22,792,150	19,573,850	21,612,500	227,917,499
22 Nuclear	23,281,562	23,281,562	22,318,024	17,118,058	22,609,080	23,362,712	262,773,320
23 <b>Total</b>	79,514,289	77,491,503	71,113,365	65,276,794	54,778,930	56,824,296	773,150,964

∞

**Generating System Comparative Data by Fuel Type**

	Jul-02	Aug-02	Sep-02	Oct-02	Nov-02	Dec-02	Total
<b>Generation Mix (%MWH)</b>							
24 Heavy Oil	25.72%	24.24%	23.35%	26.48%	16.07%	13.87%	25.69%
25 Light Oil	0.24%	0.42%	0.13%	0.11%	0.00%	0.01%	0.29%
26 Coal	7.26%	7.43%	7.83%	8.76%	4.59%	4.47%	8.03%
27 Gas	41.74%	42.26%	41.94%	42.49%	44.55%	47.59%	36.27%
28 Nuclear	25.04%	25.64%	26.75%	22.16%	34.79%	34.06%	29.72%
29 <b>Total</b>	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<b>Fuel Cost per Unit</b>							
30 Heavy Oil (\$/BBL)	22.9014	23.1380	23.7174	23.8878	23.1565	21.2933	22.7227
31 Light Oil (\$/BBL)	32.8976	33.1756	33.1957	33.3594	32.8571	33.5971	32.8786
32 Coal (\$/ton)	32.2865	32.5526	32.6055	32.5918	34.7099	34.2908	32.3925
33 Gas (\$/MCF)	4.2837	4.3921	4.3865	4.5104	4.6467	4.7874	4.6241
34 Nuclear (\$/MBTU)	0.2847	0.2847	0.2849	0.2871	0.2894	0.2905	0.2899
<b>Fuel Cost per MMBTU (\$/MMBTU)</b>							
35 Heavy Oil	3.5783	3.6153	3.7058	3.7325	3.6182	3.3271	3.5504
36 Light Oil	5.6607	5.7047	5.7132	5.7428	5.7500	5.7654	5.6594
37 Coal	1.6968	1.7124	1.7151	1.7150	1.6308	1.6042	1.6927
38 Gas	4.2837	4.3921	4.3865	4.5104	4.6467	4.7874	4.6241
39 Nuclear	0.2847	0.2847	0.2849	0.2871	0.2894	0.2905	0.2899
<b>BTU burned per KWH (BTU/KWH)</b>							
40 Heavy Oil	10,187	10,175	10,180	10,154	10,057	10,114	10,127
41 Light Oil	11,238	10,773	11,456	11,957	13,333	8,299	12,419
42 Coal	10,239	10,239	10,239	10,239	9,920	9,917	10,193
43 Gas	7,701	7,683	7,616	7,608	7,227	7,077	7,690
44 Nuclear	10,920	10,920	10,921	10,955	10,690	10,690	10,821
<b>Generated Fuel Cost per KWH (cents/KWH)</b>							
45 Heavy Oil	3.6451	3.6785	3.7727	3.7898	3.6388	3.3649	3.5956
46 Light Oil	6.3615	6.1454	6.5453	6.8665	7.6667	4.7848	7.0282
47 Coal	1.7374	1.7534	1.7561	1.7560	1.6177	1.5909	1.7252
48 Gas	3.2991	3.3744	3.3409	3.4316	3.3584	3.3879	3.5559
49 Nuclear	0.3109	0.3109	0.3111	0.3145	0.3094	0.3106	0.3137
50 <b>Total</b>	2.5338	2.5538	2.5112	2.6926	2.2628	2.2563	2.4659

6

POWER SOLD

Estimated For the Period of : January 2002 Through December 2002

(1) Month	(2) Sold To	(3) Type & Schedule	(4) Total MWh Sold	(5) MWh Wheeled From Other Systems	(6) MWh From Own Generation	(7A) Fuel Cost (Cents / KWh)	(7B) Total Cost (Cents / KWh)	(8) Total \$ For Fuel Adjustment (6) * (7A)	(9) Total Cost \$ (6) * (7B)	(10) \$ Gain From Off System Sales
1	January	OS	200,000		200,000	3.873	4.666	7,746,000	9,331,250	753,140
2	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	46,083		46,083	0.315	0.315	145,020	145,020	0
3										
4	Total		246,083	0	246,083	3.207	3.851	7,891,020	9,476,270	753,140
5										
6	February	OS	175,000		175,000	3.618	4.575	6,331,500	8,006,250	948,500
7	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	41,624		41,624	0.315	0.315	130,990	130,990	0
8										
9	Total		216,624	0	216,624	2.983	3.756	6,462,490	8,137,240	948,500
10										
11	March	OS	150,000		150,000	3.450	4.388	5,175,000	6,581,250	770,042
12	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	46,083		46,083	0.315	0.315	145,070	145,070	0
13										
14	Total		196,083	0	196,083	2.713	3.430	5,320,070	6,726,320	770,042
15										
16	April	OS	115,000		115,000	3.960	4.914	4,554,000	5,651,250	580,566
17	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	43,864		43,864	0.309	0.309	135,580	135,580	0
18										
19	Total		158,864	0	158,864	2.952	3.643	4,689,580	5,786,830	580,566
20										
21	May	OS	150,000		150,000	4.252	5.000	6,378,000	7,500,000	612,092
22	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	45,326		45,326	0.309	0.309	140,050	140,050	0
23										
24	Total		195,326	0	195,326	3.337	3.911	6,518,050	7,640,050	612,092
25										
26	June	OS	150,000		150,000	3.989	5.400	5,983,500	8,100,000	1,575,882
27	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	43,864		43,864	0.309	0.309	135,620	135,620	0
28										
29	Total		193,864	0	193,864	3.156	4.248	6,119,120	8,235,620	1,575,882
30										

POWER SOLD

Estimated For the Period of : January 2002 Through December 2002

(1) Month	(2) Sold To	(3) Type & Schedule	(4) Total MWh Sold	(5) MWh Wheeled From Other Systems	(6) MWh From Own Generation	(7A) Fuel Cost (Cents / KWh)	(7B) Total Cost (Cents / KWh)	(8) Total \$ For Fuel Adjustment (6) * (7A)	(9) Total Cost \$ (6) * (7B)	(10) \$ Gain From Off System Sales
1	July	OS	200,000		200,000	4.033	6.200	8,066,000	12,400,000	3,602,872
2	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	45,326		45,326	0.305	0.305	138,030	138,030	0
3										
4	Total		245,326	0	245,326	3.344	5.111	8,204,030	12,538,030	3,602,872
5										
6	August	OS	200,000		200,000	4.078	6.200	8,156,000	12,400,000	3,537,504
7	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	45,326		45,326	0.305	0.305	138,130	138,130	0
8										
9	Total		245,326	0	245,326	3.381	5.111	8,294,130	12,538,130	3,537,504
10										
11	September	OS	175,000		175,000	4.029	5.200	7,050,750	9,100,000	1,473,871
12	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	42,402		42,402	0.305	0.305	129,220	129,220	0
13										
14	Total		217,402	0	217,402	3.303	4.245	7,179,970	9,229,220	1,473,871
15										
16	October	OS	75,000		75,000	4.023	4.500	3,017,250	3,375,000	114,012
17	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	2,924		2,924	0.305	0.305	8,910	8,910	0
18										
19	Total		77,924	0	77,924	3.883	4.343	3,026,160	3,383,910	114,012
20										
21	November	OS	100,000		100,000	3.394	4.000	3,394,000	4,000,000	263,580
22	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	44,597		44,597	0.307	0.307	136,960	136,960	0
23										
24	Total		144,597	0	144,597	2.442	2.861	3,530,960	4,136,960	263,580
25										
26	December	OS	150,000		150,000	2.966	3.900	4,449,000	5,850,000	881,235
27	2002	St. Lucie Reliability	46,083		46,083	0.307	0.307	141,620	141,620	0
28										
29	Total		196,083	0	196,083	2.341	3.056	4,590,620	5,991,620	881,235
30										
31	Period	OS	1,840,000		1,840,000	3.821	5.016	70,301,000	92,295,000	15,113,296
32	Total	St. Lucie Reliability	493,502		493,502	0.309	0.309	1,525,200	1,525,200	0
33										
34	Total		2,333,502	0	2,333,502	3.078	4.021	71,826,200	93,820,200	15,113,296
35										

Economy Energy Purchases

Estimated For the Period of . January 2002 Thru December 2002

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7A)	(7B)	(8)	
Month	Purchase From	Type & Schedule	Total MWH Purchased	Transaction Cost (Cents/KWH)	Total \$ For Fuel ADJ (4) * (5)	Cost If Generated (Cents / KWH)	Cost If Generated (\$)	Fuel Savings (7B) - (6)	
1	January	Florida	OS	107,200	2.957	3,169,945	3.873	4,151,845	981,900
2	2002	Non-Florida	OS	30,000	3.600	1,080,000	3.873	1,161,900	81,900
3									
4	Total			137,200	3.098	4,249,945	3.873	5,313,745	1,063,800
5									
6									
7	February	Florida	OS	103,600	2.931	3,036,046	3.618	3,748,240	712,194
8	2002	Non-Florida	OS	55,000	3.500	1,925,000	3.618	1,989,900	64,900
9									
10	Total			158,600	3.128	4,961,046	3.618	5,738,140	777,094
11									
12									
13	March	Florida	OS	87,200	2.689	2,344,945	3.450	3,008,390	663,445
14	2002	Non-Florida	OS	125,000	3.250	4,062,500	3.450	4,312,500	250,000
15									
16	Total			212,200	3.020	6,407,445	3.450	7,320,890	913,445
17									
18									
19	April	Florida	OS	86,000	3.022	2,598,645	3.960	3,405,590	806,945
20	2002	Non-Florida	OS	150,000	3.700	5,550,000	3.960	5,940,000	390,000
21									
22	Total			236,000	3.453	8,148,645	3.960	9,345,590	1,196,945
23									
24									
25	May	Florida	OS	87,200	3.062	2,669,945	4.252	3,707,732	1,037,787
26	2002	Non-Florida	OS	150,000	3.850	5,775,000	4.252	6,378,000	603,000
27									
28	Total			237,200	3.560	8,444,945	4.252	10,085,732	1,640,787
29									
30									
31	June	Florida	OS	61,000	2.764	1,686,145	3.989	2,433,280	747,135
32	2002	Non-Florida	OS	50,000	3.900	1,950,000	3.989	1,994,500	44,500
33									
34	Total			111,000	3.276	3,636,145	3.989	4,427,780	791,635
35									
36									
37	Period	Florida	OS	532,200	2.914	15,505,671	3.843	20,455,077	4,949,406
38	Total	Non-Florida	OS	560,000	3.633	20,342,500	3.889	21,776,800	1,434,300
39									
40	Total			1,092,200	3.282	35,848,171	3.867	42,231,877	6,383,706
41									

Economy Energy Purchases

Estimated For the Period of January 2002 Thru December 2002

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7A)	(7B)	(8)	
Month	Purchase From	Type & Schedule	Total MWH Purchased	Transaction Cost (Cents/KWH)	Total \$ For Fuel ADJ (4) * (5)	Cost If Generated (Cents / KWH)	Cost If Generated (\$)	Fuel Savings (7B) - (6)	
1	July	Florida	OS	52,200	2.529	1,319,945	4.033	2,105,215	785,270
2	2002	Non-Florida	OS	60,000	3.950	2,370,000	4.033	2,419,800	49,800
3									
4	Total			112,200	3.289	3,689,945	4.033	4,525,015	835,070
5									
6									
7	August	Florida	OS	52,200	2.529	1,319,945	4.078	2,128,705	808,760
8	2002	Non-Florida	OS	75,000	3.900	2,925,000	4.078	3,058,500	133,500
9									
10	Total			127,200	3.337	4,244,945	4.078	5,187,205	942,260
11									
12									
13	September	Florida	OS	86,000	3.080	2,648,645	4.029	3,464,930	816,286
14	2002	Non-Florida	OS	150,000	3.700	5,550,000	4.029	6,043,500	493,500
15									
16	Total			236,000	3.474	8,198,645	4.029	9,508,430	1,309,786
17									
18									
19	October	Florida	OS	87,200	2.890	2,519,945	4.023	3,508,045	988,100
20	2002	Non-Florida	OS	100,000	3.500	3,500,000	4.023	4,023,000	523,000
21									
22	Total			187,200	3.216	6,019,945	4.023	7,531,045	1,511,100
23									
24									
25	November	Florida	OS	111,000	2.792	3,098,645	3.394	3,767,331	668,686
26	2002	Non-Florida	OS	50,000	3.200	1,600,000	3.394	1,697,000	97,000
27									
28	Total			161,000	2.918	4,698,645	3.394	5,464,331	765,686
29									
30									
31	December	Florida	OS	87,200	2.460	2,144,945	2.966	2,586,344	441,399
32	2002	Non-Florida	OS	25,000	2.900	725,000	2.966	741,500	16,500
33									
34	Total			112,200	2.558	2,869,945	2.966	3,327,844	457,899
35									
36									
37	Period	Florida	OS	1,008,000	2.833	28,557,741	3.771	38,015,647	9,457,906
38	Total	Non-Florida	OS	1,020,000	3.629	37,012,500	3.898	39,760,100	2,747,600
39									
40	Total			2,028,000	3.233	65,570,241	3.835	77,775,747	12,205,506
41									

COMPANY: FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

SCHEDULE E10

	CURRENT	AS FILED	REVISED	DIFFERENCE		DIFFERENCE	
	OCT 01 - DEC 01	JAN 02 - DEC 02	JAN 02 - DEC 02	FROM CURRENT	FROM AS FILED	FROM CURRENT	FROM AS FILED
				\$	%	\$	%
BASE	\$43.26	\$43.26	\$43.26	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	0.00%
FUEL	\$30.41	\$28.96	\$28.66	(\$1.75)	-5.75%	(\$0.30)	-1.04%
CONSERVATION	\$1.81	\$1.81	\$1.87	\$0.06	3.31%	\$0.06	3.31%
CAPACITY PAYMENT	\$5.27	\$6.80	\$7.01	\$1.74	33.02%	\$0.21	3.09%
ENVIRONMENTAL	<u>\$0.08</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>(\$0.08)</u>	<u>-100.00%</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>0.00%</u>
SUBTOTAL	\$80.83	\$80.83	\$80.80	(\$0.03)	-0.04%	(\$0.03)	-0.04%
GROSS RECEIPTS TAX	<u>\$0.83</u>	<u>\$0.83</u>	<u>\$0.83</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>0.00%</u>	<u>\$0.00</u>	<u>0.00%</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u>\$81.66</u></b>	<b><u>\$81.66</u></b>	<b><u>\$81.63</u></b>	<b><u>-\$0.03</u></b>	<b><u>-0.04%</u></b>	<b><u>(\$0.03)</u></b>	<b><u>-0.04%</u></b>

14

**APPENDIX III**  
**CAPACITY COST RECOVERY**

KMD-8  
DOCKET NO. 010001-EI  
EXHIBIT \_\_\_\_\_  
PAGES 1-3  
NOVEMBER 5, 2001

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
PROJECTED CAPACITY PAYMENTS  
JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2002

	PROJECTED												TOTAL
	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	
1 CAPACITY PAYMENTS TO NON-COGENERATORS	\$16,857,268	\$17,472,867	\$18,227,803	\$18,595,017	\$20,018,375	\$31,705,723	\$31,729,147	\$31,714,369	\$25,648,299	\$19,525,408	\$19,746,575	\$22,376,447	\$273,617,298
2 CAPACITY PAYMENTS TO COGENERATORS	\$28,415,860	\$28,415,860	\$28,415,860	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$28,080,250	\$337,969,830
3 CAPACITY PAYMENTS FOR MISSION SETTLEMENT	\$0	\$121,674	\$0	\$1,530,589	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,530,589	\$170,349	\$0	\$3,353,202
4 CAPACITY PAYMENTS FOR OKEELANTA/OSCEOLA SETTLEMENT	\$3,481,566	\$3,472,289	\$3,463,012	\$3,453,735	\$3,444,458	\$3,435,181	\$3,425,904	\$3,416,627	\$3,407,350	\$3,398,073	\$3,388,796	\$3,379,519	\$41,166,505
5 TRANSMISSION REVENUES FROM CAPACITY SALES	\$918,463	\$645,325	\$558,573	\$526,448	\$514,075	\$626,588	\$723,000	\$723,000	\$546,275	\$347,010	\$340,570	\$440,203	\$6,909,530
6 SJRPP SUSPENSION ACCRUAL	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$301,945	\$3,623,340
7 RETURN REQUIREMENT ON SUSPENSION PAYMENT	<u>\$192,580</u>	<u>\$195,552</u>	<u>\$198,525</u>	<u>\$201,497</u>	<u>\$204,470</u>	<u>\$207,443</u>	<u>\$210,415</u>	<u>\$213,388</u>	<u>\$216,361</u>	<u>\$219,333</u>	<u>\$222,306</u>	<u>\$225,278</u>	<u>\$2,507,148</u>
8 SYSTEM TOTAL (Lines 1+2+3+4-5+6-7)	\$44,464,030	\$45,471,469	\$46,188,510	\$47,779,856	\$47,682,025	\$59,253,887	\$59,177,927	\$59,160,176	\$53,267,858	\$48,871,849	\$47,736,243	\$50,093,161	\$650,313,497
9 JURISDICTIONAL % *													99.03598%
10 JURISDICTIONALIZED CAPACITY PAYMENTS													\$644,044,345
11 SJRPP CAPACITY PAYMENTS INCLUDED IN THE 1988 TAX SAVINGS REFUND DOCKET													(\$56,945,592)
12 FINAL TRUE-UP -- overrecovery/(underrecovery) JANUARY 2000 - DECEMBER 2000 (\$2,850,420)													\$22,152,857
													EST \ ACT TRUE-UP -- overrecovery/(underrecovery) JANUARY 2001 - DECEMBER 2001 \$25,003,277
13 TOTAL (Lines 10+11+12)													\$564,945,896
14 REVENUE TAX MULTIPLIER													1.01597
15 TOTAL RECOVERABLE CAPACITY PAYMENTS													<u>\$573,968,082</u>

\*CALCULATION OF JURISDICTIONAL %

	AVG 12 CP AT GEN (MW)	%
FPSC	15,948	99.03598%
FERC	155	0.96402%
TOTAL	16,103	100.00000%

\* BASED ON 2000 ACTUAL DATA

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
 CALCULATION OF ENERGY & DEMAND ALLOCATION % BY RATE CLASS  
 JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2002

Rate Class	(1) AVG 12CP Load Factor at Meter (%)	(2) Projected Sales at Meter (kwh)	(3) Projected AVG 12 CP at Meter (kW)	(4) Demand Loss Expansion Factor	(5) Energy Loss Expansion Factor	(6) Projected Sales at Generation (kwh)	(7) Projected AVG 12 CP at Generation (kW)	(8) Percentage of Sales at Generation (%)	(9) Percentage of Demand at Generation (%)
RS1	60.938%	48,379,415,259	9,062,923	1.096656115	1.075433109	52,028,824,964	9,938,910	52.70839%	59.62714%
GS1	71.059%	5,701,460,232	915,931	1.096656115	1.075433109	6,131,539,103	1,004,461	6.21162%	6.02613%
GSD1	78.573%	21,060,519,512	3,059,790	1.096544563	1.075351927	22,647,470,241	3,355,196	22.94327%	20.12904%
OS2	149.531%	20,882,701	1,594	1.080484913	1.063082399	22,200,032	1,722	0.02249%	0.01033%
GSLD1/CS1	81.969%	9,438,748,770	1,314,500	1.094747540	1.074025051	10,137,452,629	1,439,046	10.26986%	8.63336%
GSLD2/CS2	90.955%	1,473,704,124	184,961	1.087891242	1.068548693	1,574,724,616	201,217	1.59529%	1.20717%
GSLD3/CS3	84.688%	497,899,639	67,114	1.026933481	1.022023682	508,865,222	68,922	0.51551%	0.41349%
ISST1D	0.000%	0	0	1.096656115	1.075433109	0	0	0.00000%	0.00000%
SST1T	95.114%	88,216,694	10,588	1.026933481	1.022023682	90,159,550	10,873	0.09134%	0.06523%
SST1D	81.410%	64,487,635	9,043	1.058919085	1.046606781	67,493,196	9,576	0.06837%	0.05745%
CILC D/CILC G	93.492%	3,331,341,530	406,762	1.084866212	1.066720945	3,553,611,785	441,282	3.60003%	2.64741%
CILC T	93.120%	1,187,774,292	145,609	1.026933481	1.022023682	1,213,933,455	149,531	1.22979%	0.89709%
MET	66.484%	85,157,566	14,622	1.058368342	1.046190930	89,091,073	15,475	0.09025%	0.09284%
OL1/SL1/PL1	297.393%	516,006,457	19,807	1.096656115	1.075433109	554,930,428	21,721	0.56218%	0.13031%
SL2	100.229%	84,076,588	9,576	1.096656115	1.075433109	90,418,746	10,502	0.09160%	0.06301%
TOTAL		91,929,691,000	15,222,820			98,710,715,040	16,668,434	100.00%	100.00%

2

- (1) AVG 12 CP load factor based on actual calendar data.
- (2) Projected kwh sales for the period January 2002 through December 2002.
- (3) Calculated: Col(2)/(8760 hours \* Col(1))
- (4) Based on 2000 demand losses.
- (5) Based on 2000 energy losses.
- (6) Col(2) \* Col(5).
- (7) Col(3) \* Col(4).
- (8) Col(6) / total for Col(6)
- (9) Col(7) / total for Col(7)

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
 CALCULATION OF CAPACITY PAYMENT RECOVERY FACTOR  
 JANUARY 2002 THROUGH DECEMBER 2002

Rate Class	(1) Percentage of Sales at Generation (%)	(2) Percentage of Demand at Generation (%)	(3) Energy Related Cost (\$)	(4) Demand Related Cost (\$)	(5) Total Capacity Costs (\$)	(6) Projected Sales at Meter (kwh)	(7) Billing KW Load Factor (%)	(8) Projected Billed KW at Meter (kw)	(9) Capacity Recovery Factor (\$/kw)	(10) Capacity Recovery Factor (\$/kwh)
RS1	52.70839%	59.62714%	\$23,271,486	\$315,914,525	\$339,186,011	48,379,415,259	-	-	-	0.00701
GS1	6.21162%	6.02613%	\$2,742,519	\$31,927,427	\$34,669,946	5,701,460,232	-	-	-	0.00608
GSD1	22.94327%	20.12904%	\$10,129,775	\$106,647,022	\$116,776,797	21,060,519,512	48.23371%	49,803,291	2.34	-
OS2	0.02249%	0.01033%	\$9,930	\$54,735	\$64,665	20,882,701	-	-	-	0.00310
GSLD1/CS1	10.26986%	8.63336%	\$4,534,286	\$45,740,985	\$50,275,271	9,438,748,770	61.70922%	20,952,773	2.40	-
GSLD2/CS2	1.59529%	1.20717%	\$704,344	\$6,395,809	\$7,100,153	1,473,704,124	67.56448%	2,987,920	2.38	-
GSLD3/CS3	0.51551%	0.41349%	\$227,606	\$2,190,729	\$2,418,335	497,899,639	70.23956%	971,040	2.49	-
ISST1D	0.00000%	0.00000%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.00000%	0	**	-
SST1T	0.09134%	0.06523%	\$40,327	\$345,605	\$385,932	88,216,694	10.45089%	1,156,311	**	-
SST1D	0.06837%	0.05745%	\$30,188	\$304,379	\$334,567	64,487,635	62.93622%	140,363	**	-
CILC D/CILC G	3.60003%	2.64741%	\$1,589,462	\$14,026,427	\$15,615,889	3,331,341,530	73.24678%	6,230,283	2.51	-
CILC T	1.22979%	0.89709%	\$542,969	\$4,752,937	\$5,295,906	1,187,774,292	77.61662%	2,096,314	2.53	-
MET	0.09025%	0.09284%	\$39,849	\$491,883	\$531,732	85,157,566	55.94088%	208,531	2.55	-
OL1/SL1/PL1	0.56218%	0.13031%	\$248,210	\$690,416	\$938,626	516,006,457	-	-	-	0.00182
SL2	0.09160%	0.06301%	\$40,443	\$333,813	\$374,256	84,076,588	-	-	-	0.00445
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$44,151,394</b>	<b>\$529,816,690</b>	<b>\$573,968,082</b>	<b>91,929,691,000</b>		<b>84,546,826</b>		

**CAPACITY RECOVERY FACTORS FOR STANDBY RATES**

Note: There are currently no customers taking service on Schedule ISST1(T). Should any customer be taking service on this schedule during the period, they will be billed using the ISST(D) Factor.

- (1) Obtained from Page 2, Col(8)
- (2) Obtained from Page 2, Col(9)
- (3) (Total Capacity Costs/13) \* Col (1)
- (4) (Total Capacity Costs/13 \* 12) \* Col (2)
- (5) Col (3) + Col (4)
- (6) Projected kwh sales for the period January 2001 through December 2001
- (7) (kWh sales / 8760 hours)/((avg customer NCP)/(8760 hours))
- (8) Col (6) / ((7) \*730) For GSD-1, only 83.265% of KW are billed due to 10 KW exemption
- (9) Col (5) / ( 8)
- (10) Col (5) / (6)

Totals may not add due to rounding.

<b>Reservation</b>		
Demand =	$(\text{Total col 5}) / (\text{Doc 2, Total col 7}) / (10) / (\text{Doc 2, col 4})$	
Charge (RDC)	12 months	
<b>Sum of Daily</b>		
Demand =	$(\text{Total col 5}) / (\text{Doc 2, Total col 7}) / (21 \text{ onpeak days}) / (\text{Doc 2, col 4})$	
Charge (SDD)	12 months	
<b>CAPACITY RECOVERY FACTOR</b>		
	<b>RDC</b>	<b>SDD</b>
	<b>** (\$/kw)</b>	<b>** (\$/kw)</b>
ISST1 (D)	\$0.31	\$0.15
SST1 (T)	\$0.29	\$0.14
SST1 (D)	\$0.30	\$0.14