

Interrogatory:

14. Based on PEF's current updated project data, please state the NCRC estimated average 1000 kwh residential monthly bill impact amounts for the Levy Units 1&2 project beginning in 2013 and for each year thereafter until the currently estimated commercial operation date. In your response, please state all assumptions used in calculating the bill impacts.

RESPONSE:

	NCRC - Est. Avg 1000 KWH Retail & Residential monthly bill impact for Levy 1 & 2 (100% LNP Ownership)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Retail RRs Driven by LNP in 2013-2025 (\$000)	Projected Total Retail Sales (GWH)	Avg. Retail Rate (\$/1000 KWH)	Residential Rate (\$/1000 KWH)
2013	102,771	36,444	2.82	3.45
2014	108,969	38,641	2.82	3.45
2015	110,000	39,007	2.82	3.45
2016	111,140	39,411	2.82	3.45
2017	112,405	39,860	2.82	3.45
2018	774,679	40,376	19.19	23.47
2019	415,987	40,854	10.18	12.45
2020	694,527	41,366	16.79	20.53
2021	993,028	41,875	23.71	29.00
2022	1,296,200	42,324	30.63	37.46
2023	1,645,932	42,802	38.45	47.03
2024	1,155,311	43,311	26.67	32.62
2025	689,400	43,685	15.78	19.30

Assumptions:

(1) Simplifying assumptions were made regarding assets placed in-service for the purposes of calculating these estimates. Both units are assumed to be in-service in 2026 (U1=2024 & U2=2025) therefore no further NCRC recovery is anticipated after 2025.

(2) For years 2013-2017, the RR's in Column (1) are based on the Retail and Residential rate impacts as presented in the Settlement Agreement in Docket No. 120022-EI approved by the FPSC on February 22, 2012.

(3) Retail Sales for 2013-2025 were obtained from the 2011 10 Year Site Plan with the exception of 2013 which was updated consistent with the April 30, 2012 Filing.

(4) Rate impacts are based on the capital spend projections and revenue requirements contained in the TOR schedules as filed April 30, 2012.

Interrogatory:

15. Witness Franke's April 30, 2012, prefiled testimony, page 29, says the feasibility analysis of the CR3 uprate was performed in a manner consistent with the Company's feasibility analysis of the Levy Nuclear Project. What financial and economic assumptions were used in evaluating the EPU? Please provide a response in a format similar to that used in witness Elnitsky's April 30, 2012, prefiled testimony Exhibit JE-2, pages 9-17 of the Appendix.

RESPONSE:

Subject to PEF's objections filed on July 2, 2012, the financial and economic assumptions used in the evaluation of the EPU were substantially the same as those used in the analyses for the LNP and were derived from data used in the preparation of PEF's 2012 Ten Year Site Plan ("TYSP"). Fuel price data is developed as discussed in the response to interrogatory number 9 above. In the case of the EPU, PEF used a single estimate of the future CO2 price that is approximately a center line to the range of price scenarios used in the LNP analyses. The project was also analyzed using a zero CO2 price scenario. This information is provided in tabular form in the charts attached in Bates range 12NC-FPSCROG1-15-1 through 12NC-FPSCROG1-15-8.