

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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Patch".

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