



Florida Power & Light Company, P.O. Box 14000, Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420  
Law Department

Jessica Cano  
Principal Attorney  
Florida Power & Light Company  
700 Universe Boulevard  
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420  
(561) 304-5226  
(561) 691-7135 (Facsimile)

RECEIVED-FPSC

11 JUL -1 PM 2: 24

COMMISSION  
CLERK

July 1, 2011

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Ms. Ann Cole  
Division of the Commission Clerk and  
Administrative Services  
Florida Public Service Commission  
Betty Easley Conference Center  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Room 110  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

110000-OT

**RE: Florida Power & Light Company's 2011 Ten Year Power Plant Site Plan**

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed are Florida Power & Light Company's responses to Staff's Fourth Set of Data Requests related to FPL's 2011 Ten Year Site Plan.

If you have any questions or concerns please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

Jessica A. Cano

Enclosure

- COM \_\_\_\_\_
- APA \_\_\_\_\_
- ECR \_\_\_\_\_
- GCL \_\_\_\_\_
- KAD** 8 (Phillip Ellis)
- SSC \_\_\_\_\_
- ADM \_\_\_\_\_
- OPC \_\_\_\_\_
- CLK \_\_\_\_\_

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
04571 JUL-1-11  
FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**Q.**

Please verify that the figures in the attached chart are correct, including those representing the differences between the original and revised figures. If any figures are erroneous, please provide the correct value(s).

**A.**

In schedule 3.1, the revised number for Residential Load Management for 2008 should be 966 MW, for a difference of 0.

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

04571 JUL-1 =

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

**Q.**

Please explain or describe the reason(s) for the figures in Schedule 3.1 being revised. Please discuss each column of revised figures separately, including Residential Load Management, Residential Conservation, C/I Load Management, C/I Conservation, and Net Firm Demand.

**A.**

The values in Schedule 3.1 of the errata sheet have been revised to revert back to the prior methodology of reporting annual MW savings (i.e., from year-end to year-end.) The values originally provided in the Site Plan were based on a different methodology. This different methodology was to report values from actual peak month to actual peak month instead of from year-end to year-end. In the errata sheet, the annual MW values are year-end values for all years except for 2010 where the savings are as of August 2010. (The MW values for the remaining months of September through December 2010 are reflected in the projected 2011 incremental MW values.)

In addition, one other change was made for the Residential Conservation values as explained below.

**Residential Load Management:** The changes in this column are all due to a return to the prior year-end to year-end methodology as explained above.

**Residential Conservation:** The changes in this column are due, in part, to a return to the prior year-end to year-end methodology as explained above.

In addition, the residential conservation values in the original filing had an error in the starting point of the cumulative values from 1988 to 2000. The errata sheet corrects the starting point.

**C/I Load Management:** The changes in this column are all due to a return to the prior year-end to year-end methodology as explained above.

**C/I Conservation:** The changes in this column are all due to a return to the prior year-end to year-end methodology as explained above.

**Net Firm Demand:** The change in the net firm demand is a result of the changes in the prior columns for residential load management, residential conservation, C/I load management and C/I conservation.

**Q.**

Please explain or describe the reason(s) for the figures in Schedule 3.2 being revised. Please discuss each column of revised figures separately, including Residential Load Management, C/I Load Management, and C/I Conservation.

**A.**

The schedule 3.2 has been revised to revert back to the prior methodology of reporting year-end to year-end savings as explained above for Schedule 3.1. In addition, there was one other change as explained below for C/I Conservation.

**Residential Load Management:** The changes in this column are all due to a return to the prior year-end to year-end methodology as explained above.

**C/I Load Management:** The changes in this column are all due to a return to the prior year-end to year-end methodology as explained above.

**C/I Conservation:** The changes in this column are due, in part, to a return to the prior year-end to year-end methodology as explained above.

In addition, changes in this column are also due to correcting an error of entering the correct MW values in the wrong years. For example the 2001 value in the Site Plan of 196 MW should be the savings for the year 2002 as shown in the errata sheet. This correction affects all subsequent years.

**Florida Power & Light Company**  
**Docket No.**  
**2011 Ten Year Site Plan - Staff's Data Request No. 4**  
**Question No. 4**  
**Page 1 of 1**

**Q.**

Please explain or describe the reason(s) for the figures in Schedule 8 being revised. Please discuss each revision separately, including the 2013 St. Lucie uprates and the total changes/additions with Inactive Reserve for 2013.

**A.**

The value originally shown for the St. Lucie Unit #2 uprate did not correctly account for the interim incremental 17 MW from the EPU project. The 17 MW of capacity should have been included when the unit comes back in-service from its last EPU outage in 2013. The value shown in the Site Plan of 93 MW should have also included this 17 MW increase resulting in a total of 110 MW of increased capacity (as shown on the errata sheet).

**Q.**

Please explain or describe the reason(s) for the number of customer-owned renewable generation facilities interconnected with FPL on December 31, 2010 being revised on Note 1 for Schedule 11.2.

**A.**

The value shown for “approximate number of customer-owned renewable generation facilities interconnected to FPL” changed because customers were being double counted. Two customers had installed two different renewable devices (both PV and wind) and were incorrectly being counted twice. There were another eight customers that had cancelled their accounts at their former locations and new customers had opened an account at that same location. Both the cancelled accounts, and the new accounts, were incorrectly being counted. Both problems have been corrected with the revised values.