

**Douglas L. Patch**  
dpatch@orr-reno.com  
Direct Dial 603.223.9161  
Direct Fax 603.223.9061

**Orr&Reno**  
*Professional Association*

One Eagle Square, P.O. Box 3550  
Concord, NH 03302-3550  
Telephone 603.224.2381  
Facsimile 603.224.2318  
www.orr-reno.com

HAND DELIVERED

March 19, 2010



Debra A. Howland, Executive Director & Secretary  
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
21 South Fruit St., Suite 10  
Concord, NH 03301-2429

*Re: DE 08-164 Petition for Approval of Financing for Seabrook Transmission Substation Upgrade – Motion to Amend Financing Order to Increase Amount of Loans*

Dear Ms. Howland:

I am writing on behalf of Florida Power & Light Company with regard to the Motion to Amend Financing Order to Increase Amount of Loans which we filed in DE 08-164 on March 18, 2010. Attached to the Motion was the Supplemental Testimony of William C. Locke, Jr. Please replace page 6 of 7 of that testimony with the enclosed page. We discovered that we had inadvertently referred to the "Nuclear Regulatory Commission" in line 4 instead of just stating "nuclear," and have corrected this reference. I have enclosed an original and seven copies of the replacement page.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Douglas L. Patch

cc. Service list in DE 08-164

641175\_1.DOC

1 to November 2008, prohibited the sharing of information between the FPL project  
2 engineering team and members of the Seabrook Generator Team. As a result, FPL was  
3 unable to completely factor into its original estimate: i) the additional costs associated  
4 with nuclear oversight for this complex construction Project and working in the protected  
5 area of Seabrook Generator; and ii) the full costs of coordination and implementation of  
6 FPL's activities during a Seabrook Generator refueling outage. The construction of the  
7 platform structure which houses the 5 Breakers required significantly more steel than  
8 originally anticipated by the contractor in order to meet the requirement that the structure  
9 must survive the loss of any one support (i.e., meet single contingency criteria).  
10 Moreover, the placement of the steel supports between other energized equipment  
11 required a substantial increase in time and labor to construct. The additional \$23M for  
12 Mitsubishi Electric Power Production, Inc. (\$6.9M plus \$16.1M – see Attachment A) was  
13 due primarily to a) additional structure costs; b) technical changes to final design; c)  
14 additional subcontractor supervisory requirements; d) additional second shift engineer; e)  
15 expanded work hours to meet deadlines; and f) additional construction support. The  
16 increase of \$4.2M in FPL and Seabrook Support costs result from additional personnel,  
17 technical, and site support for the Project. The \$200,000 savings for the security  
18 enclosure was due to a revision to the scope for the enclosure.

19 **Q. How does FPL plan to use the net proceeds of the maximum line of**  
20 **credit?**

21 A. As we indicated in the Petition and the previously filed testimony, the  
22 Line of Credit Agreement requires FPL to use the loan proceeds for the sole purpose of  
23 financing the acquisition of goods, equipment, fixtures or other property necessary to