FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT CO
Form 10-K
February 27, 2007

UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20549

FORM 10-K

[X] ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d)
OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

For the fiscal year ended **December 31, 2006**

OR

[ ] TRANSITION REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 13 OR 15(d)
OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

Commission File Number	Exact name of registrants as specified in their charters, address of principal executive offices and registrants' telephone number	IRS Employer Identification Number
1-8841	**FPL GROUP, INC.**	
2-27612	**FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**	
	700 Universe Boulevard	

Juno Beach, Florida 33408
(561) 694-4000

59-2449419

59-0247775

State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization: Florida

Name of exchange
on which registered

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(b) of the Act:

FPL Group, Inc.:

Common Stock, $0.01 Par Value

New York Stock Exchange

Florida Power & Light Company:

None

Securities registered pursuant to Section 12(g) of the Act: None

Indicate by check mark if the registrants are well-known seasoned issuers, as defined in Rule 405 of the Securities Act of 1933.

FPL Group, Inc. Yes __X__ No ____

Florida Power & Light Company Yes __X__ No _____

Indicate by check mark if the registrants are not required to file reports pursuant to Section 13 or Section 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

FPL Group, Inc. Yes ____ No __X__

Florida Power & Light Company Yes _____ No __X__

Indicate by check mark whether the registrants (1) have filed all reports required to be filed by Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 during the preceding 12 months and (2) have been subject to such filing requirements for the past 90 days.

FPL Group, Inc. Yes __X__ No ____

Florida Power & Light Company Yes __X__ No ____

Indicate by check mark if disclosure of delinquent filers pursuant to Item 405 of Regulation S-K is not contained herein, and will not be contained, to the best of registrants' knowledge, in definitive proxy or information statements incorporated by reference in Part III of this Form 10-K or any amendment to this Form 10-K. [X]

Indicate by check mark whether the registrants are a large accelerated filer, an accelerated filer, or a non-accelerated filer. See definition of "large accelerated filer" and "accelerated filer" in Rule 12b-2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

FPL Group, Inc. Large Accelerated Filer __X__ Accelerated Filer ____ Non-Accelerated Filer ____

Florida Power & Light Company Large Accelerated Filer ____ Accelerated Filer ____ Non-Accelerated Filer __X__

Indicate by check mark whether the registrants are shell companies (as defined in Rule 12b-2 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934). Yes ____ No _X_

Aggregate market value of the voting and non-voting common equity of FPL Group, Inc. held by non-affiliates as of June 30, 2006 (based on the closing market price on the Composite Tape on June 30, 2006) was $16,694,263,323.

There was no voting or non-voting common equity of Florida Power & Light Company held by non-affiliates as of June 30, 2006.

The number of shares outstanding of FPL Group, Inc. common stock, as of the latest practicable date: Common Stock, $0.01 par value, outstanding at January 31, 2007: 405,590,044 shares.

As of January 31, 2007, there were issued and outstanding 1,000 shares of Florida Power & Light Company common stock, without par value, all of which were held, beneficially and of record, by FPL Group, Inc.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Portions of FPL Group, Inc.'s Proxy Statement for the 2007 Annual Meeting of Shareholders are incorporated by reference in Part III hereof.

This combined Form 10-K represents separate filings by FPL Group, Inc. and Florida Power & Light Company. Information contained herein relating to an individual registrant is filed by that registrant on its own behalf. Florida Power & Light Company makes no representations as to the information relating to FPL Group, Inc.'s other operations.

Florida Power & Light Company meets the conditions set forth under General Instruction (I)(1)(a) and (b) of Form 10-K and is therefore filing this form with reduced disclosure format.

DEFINITIONS

Acronyms and defined terms used in the text include the following:

Term	Meaning
AFUDC	allowance for funds used during construction
BART	Best Available Retrofit Technology
capacity clause	capacity cost recovery clause, as established by the FPSC
Charter	restated articles of incorporation, as amended, of FPL Group or FPL, as the case may be
Constellation Energy	Constellation Energy Group, Inc.
CRDM	control rod drive mechanism
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
Duane Arnold	Duane Arnold Energy Center
EMF	electric and magnetic fields
EMT	Energy Marketing & Trading
2005 Energy Act	Energy Policy Act of 2005
environmental clause	environmental compliance cost recovery clause, as established by the FPSC
ERCOT	Electric Reliability Council of Texas
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

FAS	Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No.
FASB	Financial Accounting Standards Board
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FGT	Florida Gas Transmission Company
FIN	FASB Interpretation No.
FMPA	Florida Municipal Power Agency
FPL	Florida Power & Light Company
FPL Energy	FPL Energy, LLC
FPL FiberNet	FPL FiberNet, LLC
FPL Group	FPL Group, Inc.
FPL Group Capital	FPL Group Capital Inc
FPSC	Florida Public Service Commission
fuel clause	fuel and purchased power cost recovery clause, as established by the FPSC
Gexa	Gexa Energy, LP
Gulfstream	Gulfstream Natural Gas System, L.L.C.
Holding Company Act	Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2005
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
kv	kilovolt(s)
kwh	kilowatt-hour(s)
LIBOR	London InterBank Offered Rate
LTIP	FPL Group, Inc. Amended and Restated Long Term Incentive Plan
Management's Discussion	Item 7. Management's Discussion and Analysis of Financial Condition and Results of Operations
mortgage	mortgage and deed of trust dated as of January 1, 1944, from FPL to Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, as supplemented and amended
MRO	Midwest Reliability Organization
mw	megawatt(s)
NEPOOL	New England Power Pool
NERC	North American Electric Reliability Council
Note ___	note ___ to consolidated financial statements
NO_x	Nitrogen oxide
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Nuclear Waste Policy Act	Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982
NYPP	New York Power Pool
O&M expenses	other operations and maintenance expenses in the consolidated statements of income
PJM	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
PMI	FPL Energy Power Marketing, Inc.
Point Beach	Point Beach Nuclear Power Plant
PTC	production tax credits

PURPA	Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978, as amended
qualifying facilities	non-utility power production facilities meeting the requirements of a qualifying facility under the PURPA
RFC	ReliabilityFirst Corporation
RFP	request for proposal
ROE	return on common equity
Seabrook	Seabrook Station
SEC	U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
SERC	Southeastern Electric Reliability Council
SO_2	Sulfur dioxide
SPP	Southwest Power Pool
VIE	variable interest entity
WECC	Western Electricity Coordinating Council

FPL Group, FPL, FPL Group Capital and FPL Energy each have subsidiaries and affiliates with names that include FPL, FPL Energy, FPLE and similar references. For convenience and simplicity, in this report the terms FPL Group, FPL, FPL Group Capital and FPL Energy are sometimes used as abbreviated references to specific subsidiaries, affiliates or groups of subsidiaries or affiliates. The precise meaning depends on the context.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD-LOOKING STATEMENTS

This report includes forward-looking statements within the meaning of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995. Any statements that express, or involve discussions as to, expectations, beliefs, plans, objectives, assumptions or future events or performance (often, but not always, through the use of words or phrases such as will likely result, are expected to, will continue, is anticipated, believe, could, estimated, may, plan, potential, projection, target, outlook) are not statements of historical facts and may be forward-looking. Forward-looking statements involve estimates, assumptions and uncertainties. Accordingly, any such statements are qualified in their entirety by reference to important factors included in Part I, Item 1A. Risk Factors (in addition to any assumptions and other factors referred to specifically in connection with such forward-looking statements) that could have a significant impact on FPL Group's and/or FPL's operations and financial results, and could cause FPL Group's and/or FPL's actual results to differ materially from those contained in forward-looking statements made by or on behalf of FPL Group and/or FPL in this combined Form 10-K, in presentations, on their respective websites, in response to questions or otherwise.

Any forward-looking statement speaks only as of the date on which such statement is made, and FPL Group and FPL undertake no obligation to update any forward-looking statement to reflect events or circumstances, including unanticipated events, after the date on which such statement is made. New factors emerge from time to time and it is not possible for management to predict all of such factors, nor can it assess the impact of each such factor on the business or the extent to which any factor, or combination of factors, may cause actual results to differ materially from those contained in any forward-looking statement.

PART I

Item 1. Business

FPL GROUP

FPL Group was incorporated in 1984 under the laws of Florida. FPL Group's principal subsidiary, FPL, is a rate-regulated utility engaged primarily in the generation, transmission, distribution and sale of electric energy. FPL Group Capital, a wholly-owned subsidiary of FPL Group, holds the capital stock and provides funding for FPL Group's operating subsidiaries other than FPL. The business activities of these operating subsidiaries primarily consist of FPL Energy's competitive energy business. At December 31, 2006, FPL Group and its subsidiaries employed approximately 13,300 people. For financial information regarding FPL Group's business segments, see Note 17.

In 2005, President Bush signed into law the 2005 Energy Act, which substantially affected the regulation of energy companies. The 2005 Energy Act included provisions that, among other things, amended federal energy laws, provided the FERC with new oversight responsibilities, repealed the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as amended, which regulated the financial structure of certain utility holding companies and, among other things, restricted mergers and acquisitions in the electric industry, and enacted the Holding Company Act. FPL Group is a holding company, as defined in the Holding Company Act.

In December 2005, FPL Group and Constellation Energy announced a proposed merger. As a result of continued uncertainty over regulatory and judicial matters in Maryland, on October 24, 2006, FPL Group and Constellation Energy mutually agreed to terminate the proposed merger. No termination fee is payable under the termination agreement unless Constellation Energy agrees with another party to a comparable transaction on or prior to September 30, 2007, in which case a fee will be payable to FPL Group by Constellation Energy. For additional information, see Note 2.

Environmental. Federal, state and local environmental laws and regulations cover air and water quality, land use, power plant and transmission line siting, EMF from power lines and substations, oil discharge from transformers, lead paint, asbestos, noise and aesthetics, solid waste, natural resources, wildlife mortality and other environmental matters. Compliance with these laws and regulations increases the cost of electric service by requiring, among other things, changes in the design and operation of existing facilities and changes or delays in the location, design, construction and operation of new facilities. Environmental regulations are subject to change. The following is a discussion of emerging federal initiatives and rules that could potentially affect FPL Group. See FPL Operations - Environmental and FPL Energy Operations - Environmental for a discussion of certain impacts specific to those entities.

Climate Change – As a participant in President Bush's Climate Leader Program to reduce greenhouse gas intensity in the United States by 18% by 2012, FPL Group has inventoried its greenhouse gas emission rates and has committed to a 2008 reduction target of 18% below a 2001 baseline emission rate measured in pounds per megawatt-hour. FPL Group believes that the planned operation of its generating portfolio, along with its current efficiency initiatives, greenhouse gas management efforts and increased use of renewable energy, will allow it to achieve this target. In

addition, FPL Group has joined the U.S. Climate Action Partnership, an alliance made up of a diverse group of U.S.-based businesses and environmental organizations, which in early 2007 issued a set of principles and recommendations to address global climate change and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

The U.S. Congress is considering several legislative proposals that would establish new mandatory regulatory requirements and reduction targets for greenhouse gases. Based on the most current reference data available from government sources, FPL Group is among the lowest emitters of greenhouse gases measured by its rate of emissions to generation in pounds per megawatt-hour. However, these legislative proposals have differing methods of implementation and the impact on FPL's and FPL Energy's generating units and/or the financial impact (either positive or negative) to FPL Group and FPL could be material, depending on the eventual structure of any legislation enacted and specific implementation rules adopted.

Multi-Pollutant Legislation – The U.S. Congress and the Bush Administration are considering several legislative proposals that would establish new regulatory requirements and reduction targets for sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury, and in some proposals, carbon dioxide. Based on the most current reference data available from government sources, FPL Group is among the lowest generators of these emissions measured by its rate of emissions to generation in pounds per megawatt-hour. However, these multi-pollutant proposals have differing methods of implementation and the impact on FPL's and FPL Energy's generating units and/or the financial impact (either positive or negative) to FPL Group and FPL could be material, depending on the eventual structure of any legislation enacted and specific implementation rules adopted.

Clean Air Act Mercury/Nickel Rule – In 2005, the EPA proposed a final rule to regulate mercury emissions from coal-fired electric utility steam generating units under Section 111 of the Clean Air Act. The EPA's proposed final rule seeks to reduce mercury emissions starting in 2010 through "cobenefits" reduction occurring as a result of pollution control equipment currently installed or to be installed in response to the Clean Air Interstate Rule or other environmental rules. This proposed final rule would also allow the EPA to implement a mercury emissions trading program. There is considerable opposition to the proposed final rule from environmental groups, which contend that there should be more stringent control of mercury emissions.

During 2005, the EPA determined that new data indicated that nickel emissions from oil-fired units should not be regulated under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act, which set Maximum Achievable Control Technology standards, and as a result the EPA published a final rule delisting nickel from the requirements of regulation under Section 112. Both the mercury and nickel rulemaking decisions are being challenged by various states and environmental groups.

Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) – In 2005, the EPA published a final CAIR that requires SO_2 and NOx emissions reductions from electric generating units in 28 states where their emissions are transported to downwind states allegedly resulting in fine particulate (PM 2.5) and ozone non-attainment. The final rule requires phased reductions in SO_2 emissions by 2010 and by 2015, and reductions in NOx emissions by 2009 and by 2015, eventually reaching a nationwide reduction of 65% below a 2002 baseline emission rate for each. In the final rule, through the use of modeling data, the states in which FPL facilities are located were determined to be contributors of PM 2.5 and/or ozone production in downwind states. However, FPL Group believes that the emissions from most of its Florida generating facilities are not affecting the non-attainment status of downwind areas. In 2005, FPL Group filed a petition for reconsideration with the EPA and a lawsuit in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia challenging the SO_2 and NOx provisions in CAIR. In March 2006, the EPA denied FPL Group's and other petitioners' requests to revise the final rule. FPL Group will continue to challenge the SO_2 and NOx provisions of the final rule through the lawsuit that it filed.

Clean Air Visibility Rule – In 2005, the EPA issued the Clean Air Visibility Rule to address regional haze in areas which include certain national park and wilderness areas through the installation of BART for electric generating units. BART eligible units include those built between 1962 and 1977 that have the potential to emit more than 250 tons of visibility-impairing pollution a year. The rule requires states to identify the facilities required to install BART controls by 2008 and allows for a five-year period to implement pollution controls.

Clean Water Act Section 316(b) – In 2004, the EPA issued a rule under Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act to address location, design, construction and capacity of intake structures at existing power plants with once-through cooling water systems. The rule requires FPL Group to demonstrate that it has met or will meet new impingement mortality (the loss of organisms against screens and other exclusion devices) and/or entrainment (the loss of organisms by passing through the cooling water system) reductions by complying with one of several compliance alternatives, including the use of technology and/or operational measure and response to the rule may involve the performance of biological studies. FPL Group has been conducting the necessary studies/analyses over the past few years and was planning to submit solutions for regulatory approval in early 2008. However, on January 25, 2007, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit ruled on a challenge to the rule by a number of environmental groups and six northeastern states. In its ruling, the court eliminated several of the compliance alternatives, including the use of restoration measures, from consideration and remanded the rule to the EPA for further rulemaking. Accordingly, the final requirements are uncertain.

Website Access to SEC Filings. FPL Group and FPL make their SEC filings, including their annual report on Form 10-K, quarterly reports on Form 10-Q, current reports on Form 8-K, and any amendments to those reports, available free of charge on FPL Group's internet website, www.fplgroup.com, as soon as reasonably practicable after they are electronically filed with or furnished to the SEC.

FPL OPERATIONS

General. FPL was incorporated under the laws of Florida in 1925 and is a wholly-owned subsidiary of FPL Group. FPL supplies electric service to a population of more than 8.5 million throughout most of the east and lower west coasts of Florida. During 2006, FPL served approximately 4.4 million customer accounts. The percentage of FPL's operating revenues by customer class was as follows:

	Years Ended December 31,		
	2006	2005	2004
Residential	54 %	55 %	54 %
Commercial	39	37	37
Industrial	3	3	3
Other, including deferred or recovered clause revenues, the net change in unbilled revenues, any provision for retail rate refund, gas, transmission and wholesale sales and customer-related fees	4	5	6
	100 %	100 %	100 %

FPL currently holds 176 franchise agreements to provide electric service in various municipalities and counties in Florida with varying expiration dates through 2037. Of the 176 franchise agreements, 13 expire in 2007, six expire in

2008 and 157 expire during the period 2009 through 2037. Ongoing negotiations are taking place to renew franchises with upcoming expirations. FPL considers its franchises to be adequate for the conduct of its business.

Regulation. FPL's retail operations provided approximately 99% of FPL's 2006 operating revenues. Retail operations are regulated by the FPSC, which has jurisdiction over retail rates, service territory, issuances of securities, planning, siting and construction of facilities and other matters. FPL is also subject to regulation by the FERC with respect to certain aspects of its operations, including the acquisition and disposition of facilities, interchange and transmission services and wholesale purchases and sales of electric energy. In addition, FPL's nuclear power plants are subject to the jurisdiction of the NRC. NRC regulations govern the granting of licenses for the construction, operation and retirement of nuclear power plants and subject these plants to continuing review and regulation.

Retail Ratemaking. The underlying concept of utility ratemaking is to set rates at a level that allows the utility the opportunity to collect from customers total revenues (revenue requirements) equal to its cost of providing service, including a reasonable rate of return on invested capital. To accomplish this, the FPSC uses various ratemaking mechanisms.

The basic costs of providing electric service, other than fuel and certain other costs, are recovered through base rates, which are designed to recover the costs of constructing, operating and maintaining the utility system. These basic costs include O&M expenses, depreciation and taxes, as well as a return on FPL's investment in assets used and useful in providing electric service (rate base). The rate of return on rate base approximates FPL's weighted-average cost of capital, which includes its costs for outstanding debt and preferred stock and, typically, an allowed ROE. The FPSC monitors FPL's actual ROE through a surveillance report that is filed monthly by FPL with the FPSC. The FPSC does not provide assurance that an allowed ROE will be achieved. Base rates are determined in rate proceedings or through negotiations, which occur at irregular intervals at the initiative of FPL, the FPSC, the State of Florida Office of Public Counsel or a substantially affected party.

In 2005, the FPSC approved a stipulation and settlement agreement regarding FPL's retail base rates (2005 rate agreement), signed by FPL and all of the interveners in its 2005 rate case filing. FPL expects the 2005 rate agreement to be in effect through December 31, 2009, and thereafter shall remain in effect until terminated on the date new retail base rates become effective pursuant to an FPSC order. The 2005 rate agreement replaced a rate agreement that was effective April 15, 2002 through December 31, 2005 (2002 rate agreement).

The 2005 rate agreement provides that retail base rates will not increase during the term of the agreement except to allow recovery of the revenue requirements of any power plant approved pursuant to the Florida Power Plant Siting Act (Siting Act) that achieves commercial operation during the term of the 2005 rate agreement. Retail base rates will increase approximately $127 million on an annualized basis when a 1,144 mw natural gas-fired plant at FPL's Turkey Point site (Turkey Point Unit No. 5) is placed in service, which is expected to occur in the second quarter of 2007 (see System Capability and Load below). The 2005 rate agreement also continues the revenue sharing mechanism in FPL's 2002 rate agreement, whereby revenues from retail base operations in excess of certain thresholds will be shared with customers on the basis of two-thirds refunded to customers and one-third retained by FPL. Revenues from retail base operations in excess of a second, higher threshold (cap) will be refunded 100% to customers. The revenue sharing threshold and cap for 2007 and each succeeding year is established by increasing the prior year's threshold and cap by the sum of the following: (i) the average annual growth rate in retail kwh sales for the ten-year period ending December 31 of the preceding year multiplied by the prior year's retail base rate revenue sharing threshold and cap and (ii) the amount of any incremental base rate increases for power plants approved pursuant to the Siting Act that achieve commercial operation during the term of the 2005 rate agreement. The revenue sharing threshold and cap for 2007 is estimated to be $4,203 million and $4,373 million, respectively, and will be adjusted based on the actual incremental base revenues associated with Turkey Point Unit No. 5 going into service in the second quarter of 2007. For the year ended December 31, 2006, revenues from retail base operations did not exceed the 2006 threshold.

Under the terms of the 2005 rate agreement: (i) FPL's electric property depreciation rates are based upon the comprehensive depreciation studies it filed with the FPSC in March 2005; however, FPL may reduce depreciation by up to $125 million annually which was also permitted under the 2002 rate agreement, (ii) FPL suspended contributions of approximately $79 million per year to its nuclear decommissioning fund beginning in September

2005, (iii) FPL suspended contributions of $20.3 million per year to its storm and property insurance reserve beginning in 2006 and has the ability to recover prudently incurred storm restoration costs, either through securitization pursuant to Section 366.8260 of the Florida Statutes or through surcharges, and (iv) FPL will be allowed to recover through a cost recovery clause prudently incurred incremental costs associated with complying with an FPSC or FERC order regarding a regional transmission organization.

FPL does not have an authorized regulatory ROE under the 2005 rate agreement for the purpose of addressing earnings levels. For all other regulatory purposes, FPL has an ROE of 11.75%. Under the 2005 rate agreement, the revenue sharing mechanism described above is the appropriate and exclusive mechanism to address earnings levels. However, if FPL's regulatory ROE, as reported to the FPSC in FPL's monthly earnings surveillance report, falls below 10% during the term of the 2005 rate agreement, FPL may petition the FPSC to amend its base rates.

Fuel costs are recovered from customers through levelized charges per kwh established under the fuel clause. These charges are calculated annually based on estimated fuel costs and estimated customer usage for the following year, plus or minus a true-up adjustment to reflect the variance of actual costs and usage from the estimates used in setting the fuel adjustment charges for prior periods. An adjustment to the levelized charges may be approved during the course of a year to reflect a projected variance based on actual costs and usage. In 2006, approximately $6.4 billion of costs were recovered through the fuel clause. The FPSC has approved a risk management fuel procurement program which is intended to reduce the risk of unexpected fuel price volatility by locking in fuel prices for a portion of FPL's fuel requirements. The results of the program are reviewed by the FPSC as part of the annual review of fuel costs. See Energy Marketing and Trading, Management's Discussion - Results of Operations, Note 1 - Regulation and Note 4.

Capacity payments to other utilities and generating companies for purchased power are recovered from customers through the capacity clause and base rates. In 2006, approximately $583 million of costs were recovered through the capacity clause. Costs associated with implementing energy conservation programs totaled approximately $174 million in 2006 and were recovered from customers through the energy conservation cost recovery clause. Costs of complying with federal, state and local environmental regulations enacted after April 1993 totaled $26 million in 2006 and were recovered through the environmental clause to the extent not included in base rates.

In February 2007, the FPSC approved a nuclear cost recovery rule that provides for the recovery of all prudently incurred costs for siting, designing, licensing and constructing new nuclear power plants. FPL is in the process of evaluating the economics, risks and advisability, among other things, of potentially building a new nuclear power plant in its service area.

FPL was impacted by four hurricanes in 2005 and three hurricanes in 2004, which caused major damage in parts of FPL's service territory. Storm restoration costs incurred by FPL during 2005 and 2004 exceeded the amount in the storm and property insurance reserve. At December 31, 2006, FPL's storm reserve deficiency totaled approximately $868 million. In May 2006, the FPSC approved the issuance of up to $708 million of bonds pursuant to the securitization provisions of Section 366.8260 of the Florida Statutes for the net-of-tax recovery by FPL of the estimated storm reserve deficiency, including interest, and for a storm and property insurance reserve of $200 million. The unrecovered 2004 storm restoration costs are being recovered through a previously approved storm damage surcharge applied to retail customer bills since February 2005. Once the bonds are issued, a surcharge to retail customers will be used for repayment of the outstanding bonds. FPL is working with the FPSC staff and its financial advisors to complete the issuance of the bonds. See Note 1 - Storm Reserve Deficiency.

In January 2006, FPL introduced an initiative to enhance its electrical grid as a result of heightened hurricane activity and in response to concerns expressed by the community, state leaders and regulators. The estimated capital expenditures associated with this initiative, as well as the FPSC's approved storm preparedness plan (collectively, Storm Secure^{SM} Plan) for 2007 through 2011 are included in FPL's projected capital expenditures. See Capital Expenditures below and Note 16 - Commitments. See also Management's Discussion - Results of Operations - FPL for further discussion regarding the impact of Storm Secure Plan costs on O&M expenses. The estimated costs

associated with the Storm Secure Plan, both capital expenditures and O&M expenses, are subject to change over time based on, among other things, productivity enhancements and prioritization.

The FPSC has the authority to disallow recovery of costs that it considers excessive or imprudently incurred. Such costs may include, among others, O&M expenses, the cost of replacing power lost when fossil and nuclear units are unavailable, storm restoration costs and costs associated with the construction or acquisition of new facilities.

Competition. FPL currently faces competition from other suppliers of electrical energy to wholesale customers and from alternative energy sources and self-generation for other customer groups, primarily industrial customers. The FERC has jurisdiction over potential changes that could affect competition in wholesale transactions. In 2006, operating revenues from wholesale and industrial customers combined represented approximately 4% of FPL's total operating revenues. Various states, other than Florida, have enacted legislation or have state commissions that have issued orders designed to allow retail customers to choose their electricity supplier. Management believes it is unlikely there will be any state actions to restructure the retail electric industry in Florida in the near future. If the basis of regulation for some or all of FPL's business changes from cost-based regulation, existing regulatory assets and liabilities would be written off unless regulators specify an alternative means of recovery or refund. Further, other aspects of the business, such as generation assets and long-term power purchase commitments, would need to be reviewed to assess their recoverability in a changed regulatory environment. See Management's Discussion - Critical Accounting Policies and Estimates - Regulatory Accounting.

The FPSC promotes cost competitiveness in the building of new steam generating capacity by requiring investor-owned electric utilities, such as FPL, to issue an RFP. The RFP process allows independent power producers and others to bid to supply the new generating capacity. If a bidder has the most cost-effective alternative, meets other criteria such as financial viability and demonstrates adequate expertise and experience in building and/or operating generation capacity of the type proposed, the investor-owned electric utility would seek to negotiate a power purchase agreement with the selected bidder and request that the FPSC approve the terms of the power purchase agreement and, if appropriate, provide the required authorization for the construction of the bidder's generation capacity. In September 2006, the FPSC granted FPL an exemption from the FPSC's bid rule for two ultra super critical pulverized coal generating units that FPL is seeking to build in Glades County, Florida. See System Capability and Load. Effective February 2007, the FPSC eliminated the requirement for utilities to issue an RFP for new nuclear power plants sited after June 2006.

System Capability and Load. At December 31, 2006, FPL's resources for serving load consisted of 24,651 mw, of which 20,981 mw were from FPL-owned facilities (see Item 2 – Generating Facilities) and 3,670 mw were available through purchased power contracts (see Note 16 - Contracts). FPL's projected reserve margin for the summer of 2007 is approximately 22.6% and reflects the addition of Turkey Point Unit No. 5, which is expected to be placed in service during the second quarter of 2007. This reserve margin is expected to be achieved through the combination of output from FPL's generating units, purchased power contracts and the capability to reduce peak demand through the implementation of load management, which was estimated to be 1,444 mw at December 31, 2006. Occasionally, unusually cold temperatures during the winter months result in significant increases in electricity usage for short periods of time. However, customer usage and operating revenues are typically higher during the summer months largely due to the prevalent use of air conditioning in FPL's service territory. The highest peak FPL has served to date was a summer peak of 22,361 mw, which occurred on August 17, 2005. FPL had adequate resources available at the time of this peak to meet customer demand.

Turkey Point Unit No. 5 is currently under construction and is expected to be placed in service during the second quarter of 2007. In June 2006, the FPSC approved FPL's proposal to build two approximately 1,220 mw natural gas-fired combined-cycle units in western Palm Beach County, Florida, with planned in-service dates of 2009 and 2010, which were subsequently approved by the Siting Board (comprised of the Florida governor and cabinet) under the Siting Act in December 2006. In February 2007, FPL filed a need application with the FPSC to build two ultra super critical pulverized coal generating units totaling approximately 1,960 mw in Glades County, Florida with planned in-service dates of 2013 and 2014.

Fuel Mix. FPL's generating plants use a variety of fuels. The diverse fuel options, along with purchased power, enable FPL to shift between sources of generation to achieve a more economical fuel mix. See Fossil Operations, Nuclear Operations and Item 2 - Generating Facilities.

FPL's 2006 fuel mix based on kwh produced was as follows:

Source	
Natural gas	50 %
Nuclear	20 %
Purchased power	17 %
Oil	8 %
Coal	5 %

Fossil Operations. FPL owns and operates 82 units that utilize fossil fuels such as natural gas and/or oil, and has a joint-ownership interest in three coal units. FPL's fossil units are out of service from time to time for routine maintenance or on standby during periods of mild weather. Since June 2006, FPL has experienced compressor blade failures in three combustion turbine compressors (CTCs) at two of its fossil generating plants, resulting in significant damage to the combustion turbines. FPL has 28 of this type of CTCs in its generating fleet, which were all made by the same manufacturer. Recently other companies in the electric industry have reported similar failures. The manufacturer of the CTCs has determined the root cause of the first failure experienced by FPL involving a rotating blade and is in the process of determining how to remediate the issue. In the interim, FPL is conducting inspections of all rotating compressor blades in its generating fleet and replacing any blade sets found to have cracks. FPL Group is currently working with the manufacturer of the CTCs to determine the root cause of the other two failures in the stationary section of the compressor and how to remediate the issue. In the interim, FPL is planning to proactively replace a portion of the stationary compressor blades it considers to be at higher risk of failure. Repairs to all three of the units affected have been completed and the units returned to service.

FPL has four firm transportation contracts in place with FGT and one firm transportation contract with Gulfstream that together are expected to satisfy substantially all of the anticipated needs for natural gas transportation at its existing units. The four existing FGT contracts expire between 2015 and 2022, while the Gulfstream contract expires in 2028. The two contracts expiring in 2015 may be extended by FPL until 2030. To the extent desirable, FPL can also purchase interruptible gas transportation service from FGT and Gulfstream based on pipeline availability. FPL has several short- and medium-term natural gas supply contracts to provide a portion of FPL's anticipated needs for natural gas. The remainder of FPL's gas requirements are purchased under other contracts and in the spot market. In addition, FPL has entered into several long-term agreements for storage capacity and transportation of natural gas from facilities that have not yet begun construction. These agreements range from 12 to 23 years in length and are contingent upon certain events, including approval by the FERC and completion of construction of the facilities in 2008 and 2009. FPL's oil requirements are obtained under short-term contracts and in the spot market. See Note 16 - Contracts.

FPL has, through its joint ownership interest in St. Johns River Power Park (SJRPP) Units Nos. 1 and 2, long-term coal supply and transportation contracts for a portion of the fuel needs for those units. All of the transportation requirements and a portion of the fuel supply needs for Scherer Unit No. 4 are covered by a series of annual and long-term contracts. FPL's remaining fuel requirements for these units will be obtained in the spot market. See Note 16 - Contracts.

Nuclear Operations. FPL owns and operates four nuclear units, two at Turkey Point and two at St. Lucie. FPL has received operating license extensions to operate Turkey Point Units Nos. 3 and 4 and St. Lucie Units Nos. 1 and 2 until 2032, 2033, 2036 and 2043, respectively. The nuclear units are periodically removed from service to accommodate normal refueling and maintenance outages, repairs and certain other modifications. Scheduled nuclear refueling outages typically require the unit to be removed from service for approximately 30 days.

Scheduled nuclear refueling outages by unit are as follows:

	Refueling Outage	
Unit	Most Recent	Next Scheduled
St. Lucie Unit No. 1	Fall 2005	Spring 2007 (a)
St. Lucie Unit No. 2	Spring 2006	Fall 2007 (b)
Turkey Point Unit No. 3	Spring 2006	Fall 2007
Turkey Point Unit No. 4	Fall 2006	Spring 2008

(a) FPL anticipates replacing incore instrument thimbles during this outage, which is expected to extend the number of days the unit will be removed from service to approximately 50 days.

(b) FPL anticipates replacing the reactor vessel head and steam generators during this outage, which is expected to extend the number of days the unit will be removed from service to approximately 85 days.

In 2003, the NRC issued an order requiring all pressurized water reactor licensees, including FPL, to perform visual and volumetric inspections of reactor vessel heads at each unit's scheduled refueling outage to identify if degradation such as cracking or corrosion has occurred. In conjunction with the NRC order, FPL has performed visual and volumetric inspections of its nuclear units' reactor vessel heads during their scheduled refueling outages since October 2002. FPL replaced the reactor vessel heads at Turkey Point Unit No. 3, Turkey Point Unit No. 4 and St. Lucie Unit No. 1 during their scheduled refueling outages in the fall of 2004, spring of 2005 and fall of 2005, respectively, and therefore no further inspections will be required at these units until 2009. The inspections during scheduled refueling outages at St. Lucie Unit No. 2 in 2003 and 2005 revealed CRDM nozzles with cracks, which were repaired during the outages. FPL intends to replace the reactor vessel head at St. Lucie Unit No. 2 during its next scheduled refueling outage in the fall of 2007. The cost to replace St. Lucie Unit No. 2's reactor vessel head, including AFUDC, is included in FPL's estimated capital expenditures below. See Management's Discussion - Results of Operations - FPL and Note 16 - Commitments.

St. Lucie Unit No. 2's steam generators are reaching the end of their useful life. As flaws were identified in individual tubes, they were plugged in order to prevent the tubes from leaking during plant operations. FPL intends to replace the steam generators along with the reactor vessel head at St. Lucie Unit No. 2 during its next scheduled refueling outage in the fall of 2007. The cost to replace St. Lucie Unit No. 2's steam generators, including AFUDC, is included in FPL's estimated capital expenditures below. See 16 - Commitments.

During 2003, nuclear utilities other than FPL identified that pressurizer heater sleeves made with a particular material (alloy 600) were experiencing penetration cracks and leaks as a result of primary water stress corrosion cracking. As a result, in 2004, the NRC issued a bulletin requesting utilities to identify and inspect all alloy 600 and weld materials in all pressurizer locations and connected steam space piping. Due to the amount of time and cost associated with

correcting potential leaks, FPL replaced St. Lucie Unit No. 1's pressurizer during its fall 2005 outage. FPL will begin the repair of St. Lucie Unit No. 1's non-pressurizer penetrations with alloy 600 weld materials during its fall 2008 outage and expects to complete the repairs by 2010. The St. Lucie Unit No. 2 pressurizer has 30 heater sleeves as compared to 120 heater sleeves in the St. Lucie Unit No. 1 pressurizer. Accordingly, FPL has decided to repair rather than replace St. Lucie Unit No. 2's alloy 600 pressurizer heater sleeves during its spring 2009 outage. During St. Lucie Unit No. 2's next scheduled refueling and steam generator and reactor vessel head replacement outage in the fall of 2007, FPL will inspect the pressurizer heater sleeves and begin repairs of other pressurizer and non-pressurizer penetrations with alloy 600 weld materials. The repairs to St. Lucie Unit No. 2's other penetrations are scheduled to be completed by 2010. The estimated cost of repairs for the St. Lucie units are included in FPL's estimated capital expenditures below. See Note 16 - Commitments. All pressurizer penetrations and welds at Turkey Point Units Nos. 3 and 4 utilize a different material.

FPL leases nuclear fuel for all four of its nuclear units. See Note 1 - Nuclear Fuel. FPL Group and FPL consolidate the lessor entity in accordance with FIN 46, "Consolidation of Variable Interest Entities", as revised (FIN 46(R)). See Note 9 - FPL. The contracts for the supply, conversion, enrichment and fabrication of FPL's nuclear fuel have expiration dates ranging from 2008 through 2016. Currently, FPL is storing spent fuel on site pending its removal by the DOE. Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the DOE was required to construct permanent disposal facilities and take title to and provide transportation and disposal for spent nuclear fuel by January 31, 1998 for a specified fee based on current generation from nuclear power plants. Through December 2006, FPL has paid approximately $562 million in such fees to the DOE's nuclear waste fund. The DOE did not meet its statutory obligation for disposal of spent nuclear fuel under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. In 1997, a federal court ruled, in response to petitions filed by utilities, state governments and utility commissions, that the DOE could not assert a claim that its delay was unavoidable in any defense against lawsuits by utilities seeking money damages arising out of the DOE's failure to perform its obligations. In 1998, FPL filed a lawsuit against the DOE seeking damages caused by the DOE's failure to dispose of spent nuclear fuel from FPL's nuclear power plants. The matter is pending. In October 2006, a federal court ruled in another utility's case that the 1997 court decision regarding DOE's unavoidable delay defense was not binding on this federal court. An appeal is pending in that case. Based on current projections, FPL will lose its ability to store additional spent fuel on site for St. Lucie Unit No. 1 in 2008, St. Lucie Unit No. 2 in 2010, Turkey Point Unit No. 3 in 2010 and Turkey Point Unit No. 4 in 2012. Degradation in a material used in the spent fuel pools at Turkey Point Units Nos. 3 and 4 could result in implementation of alternative spent fuel storage options sooner than projected. FPL expects to extend the storage capacity of Turkey Point Unit No. 3 to early 2012 by recovering storage cells in the spent fuel pools that are currently damaged or otherwise unusable. In addition, FPL plans to begin using dry storage casks to store spent fuel at the St. Lucie Units prior to 2009 and at the Turkey Point Units prior to 2012, which would extend their capability to store spent fuel indefinitely. The cost for the dry storage casks is included in FPL's estimated capital expenditures below.

In 2002, the governor of Nevada submitted a Notice of Disapproval to Congress regarding President Bush's recommendation to develop Yucca Mountain as a nuclear waste repository. The Yucca Mountain site is the DOE's recommended location to store and dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. In 2002, Congress overrode the Notice of Disapproval through a majority vote of both houses and the President signed the joint resolution of Congress into law. The State of Nevada has initiated legal actions to attempt to block the project. In 2004, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled on a series of challenges to the statutes and regulations established to govern a nuclear waste repository at the Yucca Mountain site. The court denied all the challenges except for one, regarding an EPA rule governing the time period the public would be protected from hypothetical radiation leaks at the Yucca Mountain repository. The court's decision will likely result in revisions to the EPA's and NRC's licensing rules for Yucca Mountain and could further delay the licensing process for Yucca Mountain. In a progress report submitted to Congress, the DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management stated that the DOE plans to submit a license application for a permanent disposal facility for spent nuclear fuel to the NRC by June 20, 2008, and indicated that the best achievable schedule would anticipate commencing initial

repository operations in 2017. Although the DOE has stated that it anticipates that its permanent disposal facility will commence operations in 2017, there is considerable doubt within the utility industry that this schedule will be met.

The NRC's regulations require FPL to submit a plan for decontamination and decommissioning five years prior to the projected end of plant operation. FPL's current plans, under the extended operating licenses, provide for prompt dismantlement of Turkey Point Units Nos. 3 and 4 with decommissioning activities commencing in 2032 and 2033, respectively. Current plans provide for St. Lucie Unit No. 1 to be mothballed beginning in 2036 with decommissioning activities to be integrated with the prompt dismantlement of St. Lucie Unit No. 2 at the end of its useful life in 2043. See estimated decommissioning cost data in Note 1 - Decommissioning of Nuclear Plants, Dismantlement of Plants and Other Accrued Asset Removal Costs - FPL.

Capital Expenditures. Capital expenditures at FPL include, among other things, the cost for construction or acquisition of additional facilities and equipment to meet customer demand, as well as capital improvements to and maintenance of existing facilities. FPL's capital expenditures totaled $1.7 billion in 2006 (including AFUDC of approximately $32 million), $1.8 billion in 2005 (including AFUDC of approximately $41 million) and $1.4 billion in 2004 (including AFUDC of approximately $48 million). Capital expenditures for 2007 through 2011 are estimated as follows:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
	(millions)					
Generation:						
New (a) (b) (c)	$ 420	$ 720	$ 210	$ 10	$ -	$ 1,360
Existing	630	600	485	565	425	2,705
Transmission and distribution (d)	885	985	1,105	1,055	1,080	5,110
Nuclear fuel	105	130	140	170	110	655
General and other	145	160	170	205	205	885
Total	$ 2,185	$ 2,595	$ 2,110	$ 2,005	$ 1,820	$ 10,715

(a) Includes AFUDC of approximately $37 million, $52 million, $53 million and $6 million in 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010, respectively.

(b) Includes land, generating structures, transmission interconnection and integration, licensing and AFUDC.

(c) Excludes capital expenditures of approximately $3.4 billion (approximately $310 million in 2008) for the two ultra super critical pulverized coal generating units for the period from early 2008 (expected Siting Board approval) through 2011.

(d) Includes estimated capital costs associated with FPL's Storm Secure Plan. These capital costs are subject to change over time based on, among other things, productivity enhancements and prioritization.

These estimates are subject to continuing review and adjustment and actual capital expenditures may vary from these estimates. See Management's Discussion – Liquidity and Capital Resources - Contractual Obligations and Planned

Capital Expenditures and Note 16 – Commitments.

Energy Marketing and Trading. EMT, a division of FPL, buys and sells wholesale energy commodities, such as natural gas, oil and electricity. EMT procures natural gas and oil for FPL's use in power generation and sells excess gas, oil and electricity. EMT also uses derivative instruments, such as swaps, options and forwards to manage the commodity price risk inherent in fuel and electricity sales and purchases. Substantially all of the results of EMT's activities are passed through to customers in the fuel or capacity clauses. See Retail Ratemaking, Management's Discussion - Results of Operations - FPL and Energy Marketing and Trading and Market Risk Sensitivity and Note 4.

Environmental. FPL is subject to environmental laws and regulations and is affected by emerging issues included in the discussion of FPL Group's business (see FPL Group - Environmental). FPL would generally seek recovery under the environmental clause for compliance costs associated with any new environmental laws and regulations. While the final requirements for Section 111 of the Clean Air Act for mercury emissions are subject to challenge, it is likely that Scherer Unit No. 4, St. Johns River Power Park Units Nos. 1 and 2 and certain coal-fired units from which FPL purchases power will be required to add additional pollution control equipment or purchase emission allowances in order to achieve compliance with the proposed mercury emission limits. In addition, while the final CAIR requirements are uncertain, it is possible that the FPL generating facilities in Florida and Georgia may be required to add additional SO_2 and NOx controls or purchase emissions allowances to meet the compliance requirements of the final rule. Furthermore, while the impact of final BART requirements of the Clean Air Visibility Rule are uncertain, it is possible that some of FPL's BART eligible units may be required to add additional emissions controls or switch fuels to meet the BART compliance requirements. Lastly, the rule under Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act impacts eight of FPL's generating facilities (Cape Canaveral, Cutler, Fort Myers, Lauderdale, Port Everglades, Sanford, Riviera and St. Lucie); however, the final requirements are uncertain.

During 2006, FPL spent approximately $82 million on capital additions to comply with environmental laws and regulations. FPL's capital expenditures to comply with environmental laws and regulations are estimated to be $347 million for 2007 through 2009, including approximately $106 million in 2007, and are included in estimated capital expenditures set forth in Capital Expenditures above.

Electric and Magnetic Fields. Since the 1970s, there has been public, scientific and regulatory attention given to the question of whether EMF causes or contributes to adverse health effects. EMF are present around electrical facilities, including appliances, power lines, and building wiring.

In 1999, the U.S. National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, at the culmination of a five-year federally supported EMF research effort, concluded that the scientific evidence suggesting that EMF exposures pose any health risk is weak, but cannot be completely discounted. In 2001, the IARC conducted an evaluation of power frequency EMF and cancer; it classified power frequency magnetic fields as "possibly carcinogenic" based on an association with childhood leukemia reported in some epidemiology studies. The IARC did not conclude that power frequency EMF cause or contribute to the development of childhood leukemia or any other cancer. In 2002, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences said in a booklet it published on EMF: "For most health outcomes, there is no evidence that EMF exposures have adverse effects. There is some evidence from epidemiology studies that exposure to power-frequency EMF is associated with an increased risk for childhood leukemia. This association is difficult to interpret in the absence of reproducible laboratory evidence or a scientific explanation that links magnetic fields with childhood leukemia."

Florida has had EMF regulations in place for many years, and FPL believes it is in compliance with the FDEP regulations regarding EMF levels within and at the edge of the rights of way for transmission lines. Future changes in the FDEP regulations could require additional capital expenditures by FPL for such things as increasing the right of way corridors or relocating or reconfiguring transmission facilities. It is not presently known whether any such expenditures will be required. Currently, there are no such changes proposed to the FDEP regulations.

Employees. FPL had approximately 10,400 employees at December 31, 2006. Approximately 31% of the employees are represented by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) under a collective bargaining agreement with FPL that expires October 31, 2008.

FPL ENERGY OPERATIONS

General. FPL Energy, a wholly-owned subsidiary of FPL Group Capital, was formed in 1998 to aggregate FPL Group's existing competitive energy business. It is a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware. FPL Energy through its subsidiaries currently owns, develops, constructs, manages and operates domestic electric-generating facilities in wholesale energy markets. FPL Energy also provides full energy and capacity requirements services to distribution utilities in certain markets and owns a retail electric provider in Texas.

FPL Energy manages or participates in the management of approximately 95% of its projects, which represent approximately 98% of the net generating capacity in which FPL Energy has an ownership interest. At December 31, 2006, FPL Energy had ownership interests in operating independent power projects with a net generating capability totaling 13,343 mw (see Item 2 - Generating Facilities). Generation capacity spans various regions and is produced utilizing a variety of fuel sources, thereby reducing overall volatility related to varying market conditions and seasonality on a portfolio basis. At December 31, 2006, the percentage of capacity by NERC region or power pool was:

NERC Region/Power Pool	Percentage of Generation Capacity
MRO/RFC/SPP/ERCOT	42 %
NEPOOL/NYPP	22 %
SERC/PJM	21 %
WECC	15 %

Fuel sources for these projects were as follows:

Fuel Source	Percentage of Generation Capacity
Natural Gas	49 %
Wind	30 %
Nuclear	11 %
Oil	5 %
Hydro	3 %
Other	2 %

FPL Energy expects its future portfolio capacity growth to come primarily from wind development and from asset acquisitions. FPL Energy plans to add a total of at least 1,500 mw of new wind generation over the 2007 and 2008 period, including approximately 450 mw which are currently under construction. In December 2006, FPL Energy entered into an agreement to purchase Point Beach, a two-unit, 1,033 mw nuclear power plant. The transaction is subject to, among other things, the receipt of approvals from various federal and state regulatory agencies. FPL

Energy expects to close the transaction in the third quarter of 2007. See Nuclear Operations.

FPL Energy's capital expenditures and investments totaled approximately $1.8 billion, $0.9 billion and $0.4 billion in 2006, 2005 and 2004, respectively. Capital expenditures for 2007 through 2011 are estimated as follows:

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
			(millions)			
Wind (a)	$ 1,565	$ 1,300	$ 10	$ 5	$ 5	$ 2,885
Nuclear (b)	1,140	155	120	165	110	1,690
Gas	105	30	15	15	20	185
Other	65	40	5	10	10	130
Total	$ 2,875	$ 1,525	$ 150	$ 195	$ 145	$ 4,890

(a) Capital expenditures for new wind projects are estimated through 2008, when eligibility for PTCs for new wind projects is scheduled to expire.

(b) Includes nuclear fuel for Seabrook and Duane Arnold and, in 2007, the pending acquisition of Point Beach (see Nuclear Operations).

These estimates are subject to continuing review and adjustment and actual capital expenditures may vary from these estimates. See Management's Discussion – Liquidity and Capital Resources - Contractual Obligations and Planned Capital Expenditures and Note 16 – Commitments.

During 2006, other companies in the electric industry, including FPL, experienced compressor blade failures in certain CTCs made by a single manufacturer. FPL Energy has 19 of these CTCs in its generating fleet. FPL Energy is conducting inspections of its rotating compressor blades in its generating fleet and replacing any blade sets found to have cracks. FPL Energy is also planning to proactively replace a portion of the stationary compressor blades it considers to be at higher risk of failure. See the discussion at FPL Operations - Fossil Operations.

Regulation. At December 31, 2006, FPL Energy had ownership interests in operating independent power projects that have received exempt wholesale generator status as defined under the Holding Company Act, which represent approximately 96% of FPL Energy's net generating capacity. Exempt wholesale generators own or operate a facility exclusively to sell electricity to wholesale customers. They are barred from selling electricity directly to retail customers. FPL Energy's exempt wholesale generators produce electricity from wind, hydropower, fossil fuels and nuclear facilities. In addition, approximately 4% of FPL Energy's net generating capacity has qualifying facility status under PURPA. FPL Energy's qualifying facilities generate electricity from wind, solar, fossil fuels or waste-product combustion. Qualifying facility status exempts the projects from, among other things, many of the provisions of the Federal Power Act, as well as state laws and regulations relating to rates and financial or organizational regulation of electric utilities. While projects with qualifying facility and exempt wholesale generator status are exempt from various restrictions, each project must still comply with other federal, state and local laws, including those regarding siting, construction, operation, licensing, pollution abatement and other environmental laws.

FPL Energy continues to evaluate regional market redesigns of existing operating rules for the purchase and sale of energy commodities. During 2006, revised market rules for capacity were approved in the NEPOOL and PJM regions. California is scheduled to implement a revised market design no earlier than late 2008. ERCOT is

considering adopting a revised market design with potential implementation in 2009. In the California and ERCOT markets, the final market design is not fully known at this time and FPL Energy is currently unable to determine the effects, if any, on its operations resulting from the implementation of such revised market designs.

Competition. Competitive wholesale markets in the United States continue to evolve and vary by geographic region. Revenues from electricity sales in these markets vary based on the prices obtainable for energy, capacity and other ancillary services. Some of the factors affecting success in these markets include the ability to operate generating assets efficiently and reliably, the price and supply of fuel, transmission constraints, wind and hydro resources (weather conditions), competition from new sources of generation, effective risk management, demand growth and exposure to legal and regulatory changes.

Expanded competition in a frequently changing regulatory environment presents both opportunities and risks for FPL Energy. Opportunities exist for the selective acquisition of generation assets and for the construction and operation of efficient plants that can sell power in competitive markets. FPL Energy seeks to reduce its market risk by having a diversified portfolio, by fuel type and location, as well as by contracting for the sale of a significant amount of the electricity output of its plants. The major markets in which FPL Energy operates have shown signs of continued improvement since 2004, such as improved spark spreads and energy prices in ERCOT and NEPOOL. The combination of new wind projects, expected increase in contribution from merchant assets and asset acquisitions are expected to be the key drivers in supporting FPL Energy's growth over the next few years.

Portfolio by Category. FPL Energy's assets can be categorized into the following three groups: wind, contracted and merchant.

Wind Assets – At December 31, 2006, FPL Energy had ownership interests in wind plants with a combined capacity of approximately 4,016 mw (net ownership), of which approximately 77% have long-term contracts with utilities and power marketers predominantly under fixed-price agreements with expiration dates ranging from 2011 to 2031. The expected output of the remaining 23% is hedged against changes in commodity prices for at least five years. FPL Energy operates substantially all of these wind facilities. Approximately 93% of FPL Energy's net ownership in wind facilities has received exempt wholesale generator status as defined under the Holding Company Act. The remaining facilities have qualifying facility status under PURPA. FPL Energy's wind facilities are located in fifteen states, thereby reducing weather-related performance risk on a portfolio basis. FPL Energy plans to add a total of at least 1,500 mw of new wind generation over the 2007 and 2008 period, including approximately 450 mw which are currently under construction.

Contracted Assets - At December 31, 2006, FPL Energy had 2,469 mw of contracted assets. The contracted category includes all projects, other than wind, with contracts for substantially all of their output. Essentially all of these contracted assets were under power sales contracts with utilities, with contract expiration dates ranging from 2008 to 2020 and have firm fuel and transportation agreements with expiration dates ranging from 2007 to 2017. Approximately 1,776 mw of this capacity is gas-fired generation. The remaining 693 mw uses a variety of fuels and technologies such as nuclear, waste-to-energy, oil, solar, coal and petroleum coke. As of December 31, 2006, approximately 91% of FPL Energy's contracted generating capacity is from power plants that have received exempt wholesale generator status under the Holding Company Act, while the remaining 9% has qualifying facility status under PURPA.

Merchant Assets - At December 31, 2006, FPL Energy's portfolio of merchant assets includes 6,858 mw of owned

nuclear, natural gas, oil and hydro generation, of which 2,700 mw is located in the ERCOT region, 2,686 mw in the NEPOOL region and 1,472 mw in other regions. The merchant assets include 898 mw of peak generating facilities. Merchant assets are plants that do not have long-term power sales agreements to sell their output and therefore require active marketing and hedging. Approximately 62% of the merchant assets have gas supply agreements or a combination of gas supply and transportation agreements to provide for on-peak gas requirements. Derivative instruments (primarily swaps, options and forwards) are used to lock in pricing and manage the commodity price risk inherent in power sales and fuel purchases. Reducing market risk through these instruments introduces other types of risk however, primarily counterparty and operational risks. See Energy Marketing and Trading.

Nuclear Operations. FPL Energy owns undivided interests in and operates two nuclear power plants, Seabrook, a 1,098 mw (net ownership) merchant power plant in New Hampshire, and Duane Arnold, a 424 mw (net ownership) power plant in Iowa which sells substantially all of its output under a long-term contract. FPL Energy is responsible for all plant operations and the ultimate decommissioning of the plants, the cost of which is shared on a pro-rata basis by the joint owners. See estimated decommissioning cost data in Note 1 - Decommissioning of Nuclear Plants, Dismantlement of Plants and Other Accrued Asset Removal Costs - FPL Energy. In December 2006, FPL Energy entered into an agreement to purchase another nuclear power plant, Point Beach. See the discussion of the Point Beach transaction below.

Seabrook completed the second phase of a power uprate in October 2006 which increased FPL Energy's net plant output to 1,098 mw. In December 2005, FPL Energy obtained NRC approval to extend Seabrook's operating license from 2026 to 2030 to recapture the period of non-operation from 1986 to 1990. FPL Energy intends to seek approval from the NRC to renew Seabrook's operating license for an additional 20 years. If granted, this approval would extend the term of the NRC operating license for Seabrook to 2050. Seabrook is periodically removed from service to accommodate normal refueling and maintenance outages, repairs and certain other modifications. The next refueling outage at Seabrook is scheduled for April 2008.

In 2003, the NRC issued an order requiring all pressurized water reactor licensees, including Seabrook, to perform visual and volumetric inspections of reactor vessel heads at certain scheduled refueling outages to identify if degradation such as cracking or corrosion has occurred. Seabrook performed 100% visual and volumetric inspections during its fall 2006 refueling outage, and no degradation was identified. Seabrook will be required to perform visual inspections every third refueling outage and volumetric inspections every fourth refueling outage.

In 2004, the NRC issued a bulletin requesting utilities to identify and inspect all alloy 600 and weld materials in all pressurizer locations and connected steam space piping. This issue impacts some pressurizer and reactor vessel penetrations at Seabrook. In order to meet industry requirements, FPL Energy is planning to repair Seabrook's pressurizer penetrations with alloy 600 weld materials during its April 2008 outage and begin inspections of the reactor vessel alloy 600 penetrations during the fall 2009 outage. The estimated cost of repairs is included in FPL Energy's estimated capital expenditures set forth in General above. Based on alloy 600 issues recently identified at another company's nuclear plant, the NRC may mandate that certain nuclear plants, including Seabrook, accelerate repairs to their pressurizer penetrations into 2007. Accelerated repairs at Seabrook would have an adverse effect on FPL Energy's 2007 results of operations.

In January 2006, FPL Energy completed the acquisition of Duane Arnold from Interstate Power and Light Company (IP&L), a subsidiary of Alliant Energy Corporation. In October 2006, Duane Arnold completed a power uprate which increased FPL Energy's net plant output to 424 mw. FPL Energy sells substantially all of its share of the output of Duane Arnold to IP&L under a long-term contract expiring in 2014. FPL Energy expects to file for a license extension for Duane Arnold in 2009, which, if approved, will enable the plant to continue to operate for an additional 20 years beyond its current license expiration of 2014. Duane Arnold's most recent scheduled refueling outage began

in February 2007, and the next one is expected to begin in January 2009.

FPL Energy's nuclear facilities have several contracts for the supply, conversion, enrichment and fabrication of nuclear fuel with expiration dates ranging from 2007 to 2014. See Note 16 - Contracts. Currently, Seabrook and Duane Arnold are storing spent fuel on site pending its removal by the DOE. Under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, the DOE was required to construct permanent disposal facilities and take title to and provide transportation and disposal for spent nuclear fuel by January 31, 1998 for a specified fee based on current generation from nuclear power plants. The total cumulative amount of such fees paid to the DOE's nuclear waste fund for Seabrook and Duane Arnold, including amounts paid by all joint owners since the start of the plants' operations, is approximately $234 million, of which FPL Energy has paid approximately $35 million since the date of the plants' acquisition. FPL Energy through its ownership interest in Seabrook and Duane Arnold is involved in litigation against the DOE seeking damages caused by the DOE's failure to dispose of spent nuclear fuel from the Seabrook and Duane Arnold facilities. The matter is pending. For details on the current status of permanent fuel storage with the DOE, see FPL Operations - Nuclear Operations. Based on current projections, FPL Energy will lose its ability to store spent fuel as early as 2009 at Seabrook and 2014 at Duane Arnold. FPL Energy is proceeding with a dry cask storage system at Seabrook which will be placed into commercial operation prior to 2009, the cost of which is included in FPL Energy's estimated capital expenditures set forth in General above. This would allow for all of Seabrook's spent fuel to be stored on site, including spent fuel storage through its license extension period of 2050, if granted. Duane Arnold currently is using both a spent fuel pool and a dry cask storage system and is making plans for additional dry cask storage modules to increase on site storage capability beginning in 2009, the estimated cost of which is included in FPL Energy's estimated capital expenditures set forth in General above.

In December 2006, FPL Energy entered into an agreement to purchase Point Beach, a two-unit, 1,033 mw nuclear power plant located in Wisconsin from Wisconsin Electric Power Company (Wisconsin Electric), a subsidiary of Wisconsin Energy Corporation. Under the agreement, FPL Energy will sell the output of Point Beach to Wisconsin Electric under a long-term contract. The duration of the contract will be, at the option of Wisconsin Electric, either through the current license terms of 2030 for Unit 1 and 2033 for Unit 2 or for a term of 16 or 17 years from the closing date for Units 1 and 2, respectively. FPL Energy will assume responsibility for decommissioning the plant. Also, upon closing, FPL Energy will assume management and operation of Point Beach. The transaction is subject to, among other things, the receipt of approvals from various federal and state regulatory agencies. FPL Energy expects to close the transaction in the third quarter of 2007.

Energy Marketing and Trading. PMI, a subsidiary of FPL Energy, buys and sells wholesale energy commodities, such as natural gas, oil and electricity. PMI procures natural gas and oil for FPL Energy's use in power generation, as well as substantially all of the electricity needs for FPL Energy's retail operations in Texas, which at December 31, 2006 served approximately 1,000 mw of peak load to approximately 185,000 customers. PMI also sells the output from FPL Energy's plants which has not been sold under long-term contracts and purchases replacement power when needed. PMI uses derivative instruments, such as swaps, options and forwards to manage the risk associated with fluctuating commodity prices and to optimize the value of FPL Energy's power generation assets. PMI also provides full energy and capacity requirements services to distribution utilities in certain markets and engages in energy trading activities to take advantage of expected future favorable price movements. Full energy and capacity requirements services include load-following services, which require the supplier of energy to vary the quantity delivered based on the load demand needs of the customer, as well as various ancillary services. At December 31, 2006, PMI provided full energy and capacity requirements services totaling approximately 3,500 mw of peak load in the NEPOOL, PJM and ERCOT markets. The results of PMI's activities are included in FPL Energy's operating results. See Management's Discussion - Energy Marketing and Trading and Market Risk Sensitivity, Note 1 - Energy Trading and Note 4.

Environmental. FPL Energy is subject to environmental laws and regulations and is affected by emerging issues included in the discussion of FPL Group's business (see FPL Group - Environmental). While the impact of final BART requirements of the Clean Air Visibility Rule are uncertain, it is possible that two of FPL Energy's BART eligible units located in Maine may be required to add additional emissions controls or switch fuels to meet the BART compliance requirements. In addition, pursuant to the rule under Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act, two FPL Energy plants (Seabrook and an oil-fired plant in Maine) will be required to demonstrate that they currently meet, or will meet, the prescribed performance standards for the reduction of impingement and/or entrainment at their cooling water intakes through technology and/or operational measures;

however, the final requirements are uncertain.

During 2006, FPL Energy spent approximately $3 million on capital additions to comply with environmental laws and regulations. FPL Energy's capital additions to comply with environmental laws and regulations are estimated to be $15 million for 2007 through 2009, including approximately $4 million in 2007, and are included in estimated capital expenditures set forth in General above.

Employees. FPL Energy had approximately 2,760 employees at December 31, 2006. Subsidiaries of FPL Energy have collective bargaining agreements with the IBEW in Maine and Iowa, the Security Police and Fire Professionals of America (SPFPA) in Iowa and the Utility Workers Union of America (UWUA) in Maine, which expire in February 2008, May 2011, July 2012 and December 2008, respectively. As of December 31, 2006, the IBEW in Maine and Iowa, the SPFPA and the UWUA represented approximately 3%, 6%, 3% and 7%, respectively, of FPL Energy's employees.

OTHER FPL GROUP OPERATIONS

FPL Group's Corporate and Other segment represents other business activities, primarily FPL FiberNet, that are not separately reportable. See Note 17.

FPL FiberNet. FPL FiberNet was formed in 2000 to enhance the value of FPL Group's fiber-optic network assets that were originally built to support FPL operations. Accordingly, in 2000, FPL's existing fiber-optic lines were transferred to FPL FiberNet. FPL FiberNet is a limited liability company organized under the laws of Delaware. FPL FiberNet leases wholesale fiber-optic network capacity and dark fiber to FPL and other customers, primarily telephone, internet and other telecommunications companies. Dark fiber in the Florida metropolitan (metro) market is also sold to third parties. FPL FiberNet's primary business focus is the Florida metro market. Metro networks cover Miami, Ft. Lauderdale, West Palm Beach, Tampa, St. Petersburg, Orlando and Jacksonville. FPL FiberNet also has a long-haul network within Florida that leases bandwidth at wholesale rates. At December 31, 2006, FPL FiberNet's network consisted of approximately 2,500 route miles, which interconnect major cities throughout Florida.

In light of recent significant changes in the business climate, FPL FiberNet performed an impairment analysis in the fourth quarter of 2006 and concluded that an impairment charge related to its metro market assets was necessary. The business climate changes include customer consolidations, migration to a more efficient form of networking technology and lack of future benefits to be achieved through competitive pricing, all of which have a negative impact on the value of FPL FiberNet's metro market assets. While the metro market business is expected to continue to generate positive cash flows, management's expectation of the rate of future growth in cash flow has been reduced as a result of these business climate changes. Accordingly, FPL FiberNet recorded an impairment charge of $98 million ($60 million after-tax).

At December 31, 2006, FPL Group's remaining investment in FPL FiberNet totaled approximately $130 million. FPL FiberNet invested approximately $14 million during 2006 and plans to invest a total of $57 million over the next five years to meet customers' specific requirements and sustain its fiber-optic network.

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF FPL GROUP

(a)

Name	Age	Position	Effective Date

Paul I. Cutler	47	Treasurer and Assistant Secretary of FPL Group	February 19, 2003
		Treasurer and Assistant Secretary of FPL	February 18, 2003
F. Mitchell Davidson	44	President of FPL Energy	December 15, 2006
K. Michael Davis	60	Controller and Chief Accounting Officer of FPL Group	May 13, 1991
		Vice President, Accounting, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer of FPL	July 1, 1991
Moray P. Dewhurst	51	Vice President, Finance and Chief Financial Officer of FPL Group	July 17, 2001
		Senior Vice President, Finance and Chief Financial Officer of FPL	July 19, 2001
Robert H. Escoto	53	Vice President, Human Resources of FPL Group	January 25, 2005
		Assistant Secretary of FPL Group	November 9, 2004
		Senior Vice President, Human Resources of FPL	February 21, 2005
		Assistant Secretary of FPL	January 25, 2005
Lewis Hay, III	51	Chief Executive Officer of FPL Group	June 11, 2001
		Chairman of the Board of FPL Group	January 1, 2002
		Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of FPL	January 1, 2002
Robert L. McGrath	53	Vice President, Engineering, Construction & Corporate Services of FPL Group	February 21, 2005
		Senior Vice President, Engineering, Construction & Corporate Services of FPL	February 21, 2005
Armando J. Olivera	57	President of FPL	June 24, 2003
James L. Robo	44	President and Chief Operating Officer of FPL Group	December 15, 2006
Antonio Rodriguez	64	Vice President, Power Generation Division of FPL Group	January 1, 2007
		Senior Vice President, Power Generation Division of FPL	July 1, 1999
John A. Stall	52	Vice President, Nuclear Division of FPL Group	January 1, 2007
		Senior Vice President, Nuclear Division of FPL	June 4, 2001
Edward F. Tancer	45		

Vice President & General Counsel of FPL Group	February 21, 2005
Assistant Secretary of FPL Group	January 1, 1997
Senior Vice President & General Counsel of FPL	February 21, 2005
Assistant Secretary of FPL	January 1, 1997

(a) Executive officers are elected annually by, and serve at the pleasure of, their respective boards of directors. Except as noted below, each officer has held his present position for five years or more and his employment history is continuous. The business experience of the executive officers is as follows: Mr. Cutler was assistant treasurer of FPL Group from May 1999 to February 2003. He was assistant treasurer of FPL from May 1997 to February 2003. Mr. Cutler has served as assistant secretary of FPL Group and FPL since December 1997. Mr. Davidson was senior vice president of business management of FPL Energy from March 2005 to December 2006. He was vice president of business management of FPL Energy from June 2004 to March 2005. From March 2001 to September 2003, Mr. Davidson was senior vice president, energy management of Duke Energy North America (Duke) where his primary responsibility was for the overall direction, profitability, growth and risk mitigation for Duke's trading business. Mr. Escoto was vice president, human resources of FPL from March 2004 to February 2005. Mr. Escoto has served as vice president, human resources of FPL Energy since April 2002. Prior to that, Mr. Escoto was director of human resources of FPL. Mr. Hay was president of FPL Group from June 2001 to December 2006. Mr. McGrath was senior vice president, engineering and construction of FPL from November 2002 to February 2005 and treasurer of FPL Group and FPL from January 2000 to November 2002. He was also vice president, finance and chief financial officer of FPL Energy from June 2000 to November 2002. Mr. Olivera was senior vice president, power systems of FPL from July 1999 to June 2003. Mr. Robo was president of FPL Energy from July 2002 to December 2006. He was also vice president, corporate development and strategy of FPL Group from March 2002 to December 2006. Prior to March 2002, Mr. Robo was president and chief executive officer of GE Capital TIP, a company that provides trailer and storage equipment services, and GE Capital Modular Space, a supplier of mobile and modular buildings. Mr. Tancer was associate general counsel of FPL Group from April 2003 to February 2005. He was also vice president and general counsel of FPL Energy from February 2001 to February 2005.

Item 1A. Risk Factors

Risks Relating to FPL Group's and FPL's Business

FPL Group and FPL are subject to complex laws and regulations and to changes in laws and regulations as well as changing governmental policies and regulatory actions, including initiatives regarding deregulation and restructuring of the energy industry and environmental matters. FPL holds franchise agreements with local municipalities and counties, and must renegotiate expiring agreements. These factors may have a negative impact on the business and results of operations of FPL Group and FPL.

- FPL Group and FPL are subject to complex laws and regulations, and to changes in laws or regulations, including the PURPA, the Holding Company Act, the Federal Power Act, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the 2005 Energy Act and certain sections of the Florida statutes relating to public utilities, changing governmental policies and regulatory actions, including those of the FERC, the FPSC and the legislatures and utility commissions

of other states in which FPL Group has operations, and the NRC, with respect to, among other things, allowed rates of return, industry and rate structure, operation of nuclear power facilities, operation and construction of plant facilities, operation and construction of transmission facilities, acquisition, disposal, depreciation and amortization of assets and facilities, recovery of fuel and purchased power costs, decommissioning costs, ROE and equity ratio limits, and present or prospective wholesale and retail competition (including but not limited to retail wheeling and transmission costs). The FPSC has the authority to disallow recovery by FPL of any and all costs that it considers excessive or imprudently incurred. The regulatory process generally restricts FPL's ability to grow earnings and does not provide any assurance as to achievement of earnings levels.

- FPL Group and FPL are subject to extensive federal, state and local environmental statutes as well as the effect of changes in or additions to applicable statutes, rules and regulations relating to air quality, water quality, climate change, waste management, wildlife mortality, natural resources and health and safety that could, among other things, restrict or limit the output of certain facilities or the use of certain fuels required for the production of electricity and/or require additional pollution control equipment and otherwise increase costs. There are significant capital, operating and other costs associated with compliance with these environmental statutes, rules and regulations, and those costs could be even more significant in the future.

- FPL Group and FPL operate in a changing market environment influenced by various legislative and regulatory initiatives regarding deregulation, regulation or restructuring of the energy industry, including deregulation or restructuring of the production and sale of electricity. FPL Group and its subsidiaries will need to adapt to these changes and may face increasing competitive pressure.

- FPL Group's and FPL's results of operations could be affected by FPL's ability to renegotiate franchise agreements with municipalities and counties in Florida.

The operation and maintenance of power generation facilities, including nuclear facilities, involve significant risks that could adversely affect the results of operations and financial condition of FPL Group and FPL.

- The operation and maintenance of power generation facilities involve many risks, including, but not limited to, start up risks, breakdown or failure of equipment, transmission lines or pipelines, the inability to properly manage or mitigate known equipment defects throughout our generation fleets unless and until such defects are remediated, use of new technology, the dependence on a specific fuel source, including the supply and transportation of fuel, or the impact of unusual or adverse weather conditions (including natural disasters such as hurricanes), as well as the risk of performance below expected or contracted levels of output or efficiency. This could result in lost revenues and/or increased expenses, including, but not limited to, the requirement to purchase power in the market at potentially higher prices to meet contractual obligations. Insurance, warranties or performance guarantees may not cover any or all of the lost revenues or increased expenses, including the cost of replacement power. In addition to these risks, FPL Group's and FPL's nuclear units face certain risks that are unique to the nuclear industry including, but not limited to, the ability to store and/or dispose of spent nuclear fuel, the potential payment of significant retrospective insurance premiums, as well as additional regulatory actions up to and including shutdown of the units stemming from public safety concerns, whether at FPL Group's and FPL's plants, or at the plants of other nuclear operators. Breakdown or failure of an operating facility of FPL Energy may prevent the facility from performing under applicable power sales agreements which, in certain situations, could result in termination of the agreement or incurring a liability for liquidated damages.

The construction of, and capital improvements to, power generation facilities involve substantial risks. Should construction or capital improvement efforts be unsuccessful, the results of operations and financial condition of FPL Group and FPL could be adversely affected.

- FPL Group's and FPL's ability to successfully and timely complete their power generation facilities currently under construction, those projects yet to begin construction or capital improvements to existing facilities within

established budgets is contingent upon many variables and subject to substantial risks. Should any such efforts be unsuccessful, FPL Group and FPL could be subject to additional costs, termination payments under committed contracts, and/or the write-off of their investment in the project or improvement.

The use of derivative contracts by FPL Group and FPL in the normal course of business could result in financial losses that negatively impact the results of operations of FPL Group and FPL.

- FPL Group and FPL use derivative instruments, such as swaps, options and forwards to manage their commodity and financial market risks. FPL Group provides full energy and capacity requirements services and engages in trading activities. FPL Group could recognize financial losses as a result of volatility in the market values of these contracts, or if a counterparty fails to perform. In the absence of actively quoted market prices and pricing information from external sources, the valuation of these derivative instruments involves management's judgment or use of estimates. As a result, changes in the underlying assumptions or use of alternative valuation methods could affect the reported fair value of these contracts. In addition, FPL's use of such instruments could be subject to prudency challenges and if found imprudent, cost recovery could be disallowed by the FPSC.

FPL Group's competitive energy business is subject to risks, many of which are beyond the control of FPL Group, that may reduce the revenues and adversely impact the results of operations and financial condition of FPL Group.

- There are other risks associated with FPL Group's competitive energy business. In addition to risks discussed elsewhere, risk factors specifically affecting FPL Energy's success in competitive wholesale markets include the ability to efficiently develop and operate generating assets, the successful and timely completion of project restructuring activities, maintenance of the qualifying facility status of certain projects, the price and supply of fuel (including transportation), transmission constraints, competition from new sources of generation, excess generation capacity and demand for power. There can be significant volatility in market prices for fuel and electricity, and there are other financial, counterparty and market risks that are beyond the control of FPL Energy. FPL Energy's inability or failure to effectively hedge its assets or positions against changes in commodity prices, interest rates, counterparty credit risk or other risk measures could significantly impair FPL Group's future financial results. In keeping with industry trends, a portion of FPL Energy's power generation facilities operate wholly or partially without long-term power purchase agreements. As a result, power from these facilities is sold on the spot market or on a short-term contractual basis, which may affect the volatility of FPL Group's financial results. In addition, FPL Energy's business depends upon transmission facilities owned and operated by others; if transmission is disrupted or capacity is inadequate or unavailable, FPL Energy's ability to sell and deliver its wholesale power may be limited.

FPL Group's ability to successfully identify, complete and integrate acquisitions is subject to significant risks, including the effect of increased competition for acquisitions resulting from the consolidation of the power industry.

- FPL Group is likely to encounter significant competition for acquisition opportunities that may become available as a result of the consolidation of the power industry, in general, as well as the passage of the 2005 Energy Act. In addition, FPL Group may be unable to identify attractive acquisition opportunities at favorable prices and to successfully and timely complete and integrate them.

Because FPL Group and FPL rely on access to capital markets, the inability to maintain current credit ratings and access capital markets on favorable terms may limit the ability of FPL Group and FPL to grow their businesses and would likely increase interest costs.

- FPL Group and FPL rely on access to capital markets as a significant source of liquidity for capital requirements not satisfied by operating cash flows. The inability of FPL Group, FPL Group Capital and FPL to maintain their current credit ratings could affect their ability to raise capital on favorable terms, particularly during times of uncertainty in the capital markets, which, in turn, could impact FPL Group's and FPL's ability to grow their businesses and would likely increase their interest costs.

Customer growth in FPL's service area affects FPL Group's and FPL's results of operations.

- FPL Group's and FPL's results of operations are affected by the growth in customer accounts in FPL's service area. Customer growth can be affected by population growth as well as economic factors in Florida, including job and income growth, housing starts and new home prices. Customer growth directly influences the demand for electricity and the need for additional power generation and power delivery facilities at FPL.

Weather affects FPL Group's and FPL's results of operations.

- FPL Group's and FPL's results of operations are affected by changes in the weather. Weather conditions directly influence the demand for electricity and natural gas and affect the price of energy commodities, and can affect the production of electricity at wind and hydro-powered facilities. FPL Group's and FPL's results of operations can be affected by the impact of severe weather which can be destructive, causing outages and/or property damage, may affect fuel supply, and could require additional costs to be incurred. At FPL, recovery of these costs is subject to FPSC approval.

FPL Group and FPL are subject to costs and other effects of legal proceedings as well as changes in or additions to applicable tax laws, rates or policies, rates of inflation, accounting standards, securities laws and corporate governance requirements.

- FPL Group and FPL are subject to costs and other effects of legal and administrative proceedings, settlements, investigations and claims, as well as the effect of new, or changes in, tax laws, rates or policies, rates of inflation, accounting standards, securities laws and corporate governance requirements.

Threats of terrorism and catastrophic events that could result from terrorism may impact the operations of FPL Group and FPL in unpredictable ways.

- FPL Group and FPL are subject to direct and indirect effects of terrorist threats and activities. Generation and transmission facilities, in general, have been identified as potential targets. The effects of terrorist threats and activities include, among other things, terrorist actions or responses to such actions or threats, the inability to generate, purchase or transmit power, the risk of a significant slowdown in growth or a decline in the U.S. economy, delay in economic recovery in the U.S., and the increased cost and adequacy of security and insurance.

The ability of FPL Group and FPL to obtain insurance and the terms of any available insurance coverage could be affected by national, state or local events and company-specific events.

- FPL Group's and FPL's ability to obtain insurance, and the cost of and coverage provided by such insurance, could be affected by national, state or local events as well as company-specific events.

FPL Group and FPL are subject to employee workforce factors that could affect the businesses and financial condition of FPL Group and FPL.

- FPL Group and FPL are subject to employee workforce factors, including loss or retirement of key executives, availability of qualified personnel, collective bargaining agreements with union employees and work stoppage that could affect the businesses and financial condition of FPL Group and FPL.

The risks described herein are not the only risks facing FPL Group and FPL. Additional risks and uncertainties not currently known to FPL Group or FPL, or that are currently deemed to be immaterial, also may materially adversely affect FPL Group's or FPL's business, financial condition and/or future operating results.

Item 1B. Unresolved Staff Comments

None

Item 2. Properties

FPL Group and its subsidiaries maintain properties which are adequate for their operations. At December 31, 2006, the electric generating, transmission, distribution and general facilities of FPL represented approximately 44%, 13%, 38% and 5%, respectively, of FPL's gross investment in electric utility plant in service.

Generating Facilities. At December 31, 2006, FPL Group had the following generating facilities:

FPL Facilities	Location	No. of Units	Fuel	Net Capability (mw) [(a)]
Nuclear				
St. Lucie	Hutchinson Island, FL	2	Nuclear	1,553 (b)
Turkey Point	Florida City, FL	2	Nuclear	1,386
Steam turbines				
Cape Canaveral	Cocoa, FL	2	Oil/Gas	792
Cutler	Miami, FL	2	Gas	204
Manatee	Parrish, FL	2	Oil/Gas	1,638
Martin	Indiantown, FL	2	Oil/Gas	1,678
Port Everglades	Port Everglades, FL	4	Oil/Gas	1,219
Riviera	Riviera Beach, FL	2	Oil/Gas	565
St. Johns River Power Park	Jacksonville, FL	2	Coal/Petroleum Coke	250 (c)
Sanford	Lake Monroe, FL	1	Oil/Gas	138
Scherer	Monroe County, GA	1	Coal	646 (d)
Turkey Point	Florida City, FL	2	Oil/Gas	788
Combined-cycle				
Fort Myers	Fort Myers, FL	1	Gas	1,440
Lauderdale	Dania, FL	2	Gas/Oil	872
Manatee	Parrish, FL	1	Gas	1,104
Martin	Indiantown, FL	1	Gas/Oil	1,104
Martin	Indiantown, FL	2	Gas	956
Putnam	Palatka, FL	2	Gas/Oil	498
Sanford	Lake Monroe, FL	2	Gas	1,906

Simple-cycle combustion turbines				
Fort Myers	Fort Myers, FL	1	Gas/Oil	324
Gas turbines/diesels				
Fort Myers	Fort Myers, FL	12	Oil	648
Lauderdale	Dania, FL	24	Oil/Gas	840
Port Everglades	Port Everglades, FL	12	Oil/Gas	420
Turkey Point	Florida City, FL	5	Oil	12
TOTAL				20,981 (e)

(a) Represents FPL's net ownership interest in plant capacity.

(b) Excludes Orlando Utilities Commission's and the FMPA's combined share of approximately 15% of St. Lucie Unit No. 2.

(c) Represents FPL's 20% ownership interest in each of St. Johns River Power Park Units Nos. 1 and 2, which are jointly owned with JEA.

(d) Represents FPL's approximately 76% ownership of Scherer Unit No. 4, which is jointly owned with JEA.

(e) Substantially all of FPL's properties are subject to the lien of FPL's mortgage.

FPL Energy Facilities	Location	No. of Units	Fuel	Net Capability (mw)[a]
Wind				
Cabazon	Riverside County, CA	53	Wind	40
Callahan Divide [b]	Taylor County, TX	76	Wind	114
Cerro Gordo [b]	Cerro Gordo County, IA	55	Wind	41
Delaware Mountain	Culberson County, TX	39	Wind	30
Diablo Wind	Alameda County, CA	31	Wind	21
Gray County	Gray County, KS	170	Wind	112
Green Mountain	Somerset County, PA	8	Wind	10
Green Power	Riverside County, CA	22	Wind	17
Green Ridge Power	Alameda & Contra Costa Counties, CA	1,463	Wind	80
Hancock County [b]	Hancock County, IA	148	Wind	98
High Winds	Solano County, CA	90	Wind	162

(b)				
Horse Hollow Wind (b)	Taylor County, TX	142	Wind	213
Horse Hollow Wind II (b)	Taylor & Nolan Counties, TX	130	Wind	299
Horse Hollow Wind III (b)	Nolan County, TX	149	Wind	224
Indian Mesa	Upton County, TX	125	Wind	83
King Mountain	Upton County, TX	215	Wind	281
Lake Benton II (b)	Pipestone County, MN	138	Wind	104
Meyersdale (b)	Somerset County, PA	20	Wind	30
Mill Run	Fayette County, PA	10	Wind	15
Montfort (b)	Iowa County, WI	20	Wind	30
Mountaineer (b)	Preston & Tucker Counties, WV	44	Wind	66
Mower County Wind	Mower County, MN	43	Wind	99
New Mexico (b)	Quay & Debaca Counties, NM	136	Wind	204
North Dakota (b)	LaMoure County, ND	41	Wind	62
Oklahoma / Sooner (b)	Harper & Woodward Counties, OK	68	Wind	102
Oliver County Wind	Oliver County, ND	22	Wind	51
Red Canyon Wind Energy (b)	Borden, Garza & Scurry Counties, TX	56	Wind	84
Sky River	Kern County, CA	342	Wind	77
Somerset Wind Power	Somerset County, PA	6	Wind	9
South Dakota (b)	Hyde County, SD	27	Wind	41
Southwest Mesa (b)	Upton & Crockett Counties, TX	107	Wind	75
Stateline (b)	Umatilla County, OR and Walla Walla County, WA	454	Wind	300

Vansycle [b]	Umatilla County, OR	38	Wind	25
Victory Garden	Kern County, CA	96	Wind	22
Waymart [b]	Wayne County, PA	43	Wind	65
Weatherford Wind [b]	Custer County, OK	98	Wind	147
Wilton Wind [b]	Burleigh County, ND	33	Wind	49
Windpower Partners 1991-92	Alameda & Contra Costa Counties, CA	279	Wind	14
Windpower Partners 1992	Alameda & Contra Costa Counties, CA	300	Wind	15
Windpower Partners 1994	Culberson County, TX	110	Wind	40
Woodward Mountain	Upton & Pecos Counties, TX	242	Wind	160
Wyoming [b]	Uinta County, WY	80	Wind	144
Windpower Partners 1993	Riverside County, CA	115	Wind	41
Windpower Partners 1993	Lincoln County, MN	73	Wind	26
Investments in joint ventures	Various	969	(c)	94
Total Wind				4,016
Contracted				
Bayswater [b]	Far Rockaway, NY	2	Gas	56
Calhoun [b]	Eastaboga, AL	4	Gas	668
Doswell [b]	Ashland, VA	6	Gas/Oil	708
Duane Arnold	Cedar Rapids, IA	1	Nuclear	424 (d)
Jamaica Bay [b]	Far Rockaway, NY	2	Oil/Gas	54
Port of Stockton	Stockton, CA	1	Coal/Petroleum Coke	44
Investments in joint ventures	Various	18	(e)	515
Total Contracted				2,469

Merchant				
Blythe Energy	Blythe, CA	3	Gas	507
Doswell - Expansion [b]	Ashland, VA	1	Gas/Oil	171
Forney	Forney, TX	8	Gas	1,700
Lamar Power Partners	Paris, TX	6	Gas	1,000
Maine	Various - ME	6	Oil	677 (f)
Maine	Various - ME	83	Hydro	361
Marcus Hook 50	Marcus Hook, PA	1	Gas	50
Marcus Hook 750 [b]	Marcus Hook, PA	4	Gas	744
RISEP [b]	Johnston, RI	3	Gas	550
Seabrook	Seabrook, NH	1	Nuclear	1,098 (g)
Total Merchant				6,858
TOTAL				13,343

(a) Represents FPL Energy's net ownership interest in plant capacity.

(b) These consolidated generating facilities are encumbered by liens against their assets securing various financings.

(c) Represents plants with no more than 50% ownership using wind technology.

(d) Excludes Central Iowa Power Cooperative and Cornbelt Power Cooperative's combined share of 30%.

(e) Represents plants with no more than 50% ownership using fuels and technologies such as gas, waste-to-energy, solar and coal.

(f) Excludes nine other energy-related partners' combined share of 34.9%.

(g) Excludes Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company's, Taunton Municipal Lighting Plant's and Hudson Light & Power Department's combined share of 11.77%.

Transmission and Distribution. At December 31, 2006, FPL owned and operated the following electric transmission and distribution lines:

Nominal Voltage	Overhead Lines Pole Miles	Trench and Submarine Cables Miles
500 kv	1,106 (a)	-
230 kv	2,904	25
138 kv	1,608	50
115 kv	750	-
69 kv	164	14

Less than 69 kv	41,619	24,679
Total	48,151	24,768

(a) Includes approximately 75 miles owned jointly with JEA.

In addition, at December 31, 2006, FPL owned and operated 558 substations, one of which is jointly owned. See Note 8.

Character of Ownership. Substantially all of FPL's properties are subject to the lien of FPL's mortgage, which secures most debt securities issued by FPL. The majority of FPL Group's principal properties are held by FPL in fee and are free from other encumbrances, subject to minor exceptions, none of which is of such a nature as to substantially impair the usefulness to FPL of such properties. Some of FPL's electric lines are located on land not owned in fee but are covered by necessary consents of governmental authorities or rights obtained from owners of private property. The majority of FPL Energy's generating facilities are held in fee and a number of those facilities are encumbered by liens against their assets securing various financings. Additionally, some of FPL Energy's wind turbines are located on land leased from owners of private property. See Generating Facilities and Note 1 - Electric Plant, Depreciation and Amortization.

Item 3. Legal Proceedings

In November 1999, the Attorney General of the United States, on behalf of the EPA, brought an action in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia against Georgia Power Company and other subsidiaries of The Southern Company for certain alleged violations of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) provisions and the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) of the Clean Air Act. In May 2001, the EPA amended its complaint. The amended complaint alleges, among other things, that Georgia Power Company constructed and is continuing to operate Scherer Unit No. 4, in which FPL owns a 76% interest, without obtaining a PSD permit, without complying with NSPS requirements, and without applying best available control technology for nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxides and particulate matter as required by the Clean Air Act. It also alleges that unspecified major modifications have been made at Scherer Unit No. 4 that require its compliance with the aforementioned Clean Air Act provisions. The EPA seeks injunctive relief requiring the installation of best available control technology and civil penalties of up to $25,000 per day for each violation from an unspecified date after June 1, 1975 through January 30, 1997 and $27,500 per day for each violation thereafter. The EPA further revised its civil penalty rule in February 2004, such that the maximum penalty is $32,500 per day for each violation after March 15, 2004. Georgia Power Company has answered the amended complaint, asserting that it has complied with all requirements of the Clean Air Act, denying the plaintiff's allegations of liability, denying that the plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief that it seeks and raising various other defenses. In June 2001, a federal district court stayed discovery and administratively closed the case pending resolution of the EPA's motion for consolidation of discovery in several Clean Air Act cases that was filed with a Multi-District Litigation (MDL) panel. In August 2001, the MDL panel denied the motion for consolidation. In September 2001, the EPA moved that the federal district court reopen this case for purposes of discovery. Georgia Power Company opposed that motion asking that the case remain closed until the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) appeal of an EPA administrative compliance order relating to legal issues that are also central to this case. In August 2002, the federal district court denied without prejudice the EPA's motion to reopen. In June 2003, the Eleventh Circuit issued its order dismissing the TVA's appeal because it found the provision of the Clean Air Act allowing the EPA to issue binding administrative compliance orders was unconstitutional, and hence found that the TVA order was a non-final order that courts of appeal do not have jurisdiction to review. In September 2003, the Eleventh Circuit denied the EPA's motion for rehearing. In May 2004, the U.S. Supreme Court denied the EPA's petition for review of the Eleventh Circuit order. The EPA has not yet moved to reopen the Georgia Power Company case.

In August 2001, FMPA filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (DC Circuit) a petition for review asking the DC Circuit to reverse and remand orders of the FERC denying FMPA's request for credits for transmission facilities owned by FMPA members. In 1993, FPL filed a comprehensive restructuring of its then-existing tariff structure. All issues in that case were settled in September 2000 except for three issues reserved by FMPA: (i) FMPA's request for transmission credits related to the costs of its transmission facilities (the crediting issue), (ii) treatment of behind-the-meter generation and load ratio pricing for network integration transmission service (the behind-the-meter issue), and (iii) exclusions from FPL's transmission rates of the costs of FPL's facilities that fail to meet the same integration test that was applied to FMPA's facilities with respect to the crediting issue (the rate base issue). The FERC and the DC Circuit have rejected FMPA's claim for transmission credits, which would have reduced FMPA's payment obligation to FPL for network integration transmission service.

With regard to the behind-the-meter issue, the FERC rejected FMPA's argument that its obligation to pay for network integration transmission service should be reduced to the extent that FPL allegedly cannot provide transmission service because of "physical transmission limitations." In June 2005, the DC Circuit remanded the case to the FERC for further consideration. In December 2005, the FERC issued an order on remand finding that load ratio share pricing is appropriate notwithstanding constraints on a third-party's system. In January 2006, FMPA filed a rehearing request of this order with the FERC, which the FERC denied in July 2006. FMPA submitted a petition for review of the FERC's December 2005 and July 2006 orders at the DC Circuit. A briefing schedule has not yet been established in that proceeding.

With regard to the rate base issue, in May 2004 FPL made a compliance filing of a proposed rate schedule that does not include those facilities of FPL that fail to meet the same integration test that was applied to the FMPA facilities. Pursuant to that filing, FPL's current network transmission rate would have been reduced by $0.02 per kilowatt (kw) per month. In June 2004, FMPA filed a protest to FPL's compliance filing, arguing that FPL's current network transmission rate should be reduced by approximately $0.41 per kw per month. In January 2005, the FERC issued an order on FPL's compliance filing. In the order, the FERC accepted FPL's standards for analyzing the transmission system and agreed that FPL's "Georgia Ties" and "Turkey Point Lines" are part of FPL's integrated grid. The FERC required FPL to make an additional compliance filing removing the cost of all radial transmission lines from transmission rates, analyzing the FPL transmission system to remove the cost of any transmission facilities that provide only "unneeded redundancy," and calculating rate adjustments using 1993 data rather than 1998 data. FPL made this compliance filing in April 2005, which would reduce FPL's current rate by $0.04 per kw per month. In May 2005, FMPA protested FPL's compliance filing and argued that FPL's rates should be reduced by an additional $0.20 per kw per month, potentially resulting in a refund obligation to FMPA of approximately $22 million at December 31, 2006. Any reduction in FPL's network service rate also would apply effective January 1, 2004 to Seminole Electric Cooperative Inc. (Seminole), FPL's other network customer. The potential refund obligation to Seminole based on FMPA's position is approximately $9 million at December 31, 2006.

In December 2005, the FERC issued an order accepting FPL's April 2005 compliance filing in part, rejecting it in part, and directing the submission of a further compliance filing. The FERC concluded that it is not clear whether FPL failed to test its non-radial facilities in a manner comparable to the way it tested FMPA's facilities. FPL filed a rehearing request in January 2006, which the FERC denied in July 2006. FPL filed a request for rehearing of the FERC's July 2006 order. In September 2006, FPL made the required compliance filing, removing additional transmission facilities from rates, which resulted in a refund liability of approximately $4 million to FMPA and approximately $1 million to Seminole at December 31, 2006. FMPA has protested FPL's filing, claiming again that FPL's rates should be reduced by an additional $0.20 per kw per month.

In 1995 and 1996, FPL Group, through an indirect subsidiary, purchased from Adelphia Communications Corporation (Adelphia) 1,091,524 shares of Adelphia common stock and 20,000 shares of Adelphia preferred stock (convertible into 2,358,490 shares of Adelphia common stock) for an aggregate price of approximately $35,900,000. On January 29, 1999, Adelphia repurchased all of these shares for $149,213,130 in cash. On June 24, 2004, Adelphia, Adelphia Cablevision, L.L.C. and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Adelphia filed a complaint against FPL Group and its indirect subsidiary in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of New York. The complaint alleges that the repurchase of these shares by Adelphia was a fraudulent transfer, in that at the time of the transaction Adelphia (i) was insolvent or was rendered insolvent, (ii) did not receive reasonably equivalent value in exchange for the cash it paid, and (iii) was engaged or about to engage in a business or transaction for which any property remaining with Adelphia had unreasonably small capital. The complaint seeks the recovery for the benefit of Adelphia's bankruptcy estate of the cash paid for the repurchased shares, plus interest. FPL Group has filed an answer to the complaint. FPL Group believes that the complaint is without merit because, among other reasons, Adelphia will be unable to demonstrate that (i) Adelphia's repurchase of shares from FPL Group, which repurchase was at the market value for those shares, was not for reasonably equivalent value, (ii) Adelphia was insolvent at the time of the repurchase, or (iii) the repurchase left Adelphia with unreasonably small capital. The case is in discovery and has been reset for trial in March 2008.

In February 2003, Scott and Rebecca Finestone brought an action on behalf of themselves and their son Zachary Finestone in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida alleging that their son has developed cancer (neuroblastoma) as a result of the release and/or dissipation into the air, water, soil and underground areas of radioactive and non-radioactive hazardous materials, including strontium 90, and the release of other toxic materials from FPL's St. Lucie nuclear power plant. The complaint, as subsequently amended, includes counts against FPL for strict liability for allegedly engaging in an ultra-hazardous activity and for alleged negligence in operating the plant in a manner that allowed emissions of the foregoing materials and failing to limit its release of nuclear fission products as prescribed by federal and state laws and regulations. The plaintiffs seek damages in excess of $1 million. In January 2006, the court granted FPL's motion for final summary judgment and dismissed the case. On February 8, 2006, the plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal of the court's decision granting final summary judgment for FPL. The appeal is pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

In May 2003, Tish Blake and John Lowe, as personal representatives of the Estate of Ashton Lowe, on behalf of the estate and themselves, as surviving parents, brought an action in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida alleging that their son developed cancer (medulo-blastoma) as a result of the release and/or dissipation into the air, water, soil and underground areas of radioactive and non-radioactive hazardous materials, including strontium 90, and the release of other toxic materials from FPL's St. Lucie nuclear power plant. The allegations, counts and damages demanded in the complaint, as subsequently amended, are virtually identical to those contained in the Finestone lawsuit described above. In January 2006, the court granted FPL's motion for final summary judgment and dismissed the case. On February 8, 2006, the plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal of the court's decision granting final summary judgment for FPL. The appeal is pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

In August 2003, Pedro C. and Emilia Roig brought an action on behalf of themselves and their son, Pedro Anthony Roig, in the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida (the state court), which was removed in October 2003 to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida, against Aventis Pasteur and a number of other named and unnamed drug manufacturing and distribution companies and FPL, alleging that their son has suffered toxic neurological effects from mercury poisoning. The sources of mercury exposure are alleged to be vaccines containing a preservative called thimerosal that were allegedly manufactured and distributed by the drug companies, mercury amalgam dental fillings, and emissions from FPL power plants in southeast Florida. The complaint includes counts against all defendants for civil battery and against FPL for alleged negligence in operating

the plants such that the son was exposed to mercury and other heavy metals emissions. The damages demanded from FPL are for injuries and losses allegedly suffered by the son as a result of his exposure to the plants' mercury emissions and the parents' alleged pain and suffering, medical expenses, loss of wages, and loss of their son's services and companionship. No amount of damages is specified. The U.S. District Court remanded the action back to the state court. The drug manufacturing and distribution companies have moved to dismiss the action. Plaintiffs and FPL have agreed that FPL will not respond to the complaint until requested by the plaintiffs.

In December 2003, Edward and Janis Shiflett brought an action on behalf of themselves and their son, Phillip Benjamin Shiflett, in the Circuit Court of the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit in and for Brevard County, Florida (the state court), which was removed in January 2004 to the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida, against Aventis Pasteur and a number of other named and unnamed drug manufacturing and distribution companies, FPL and the Orlando Utilities Commission, alleging that their son has suffered toxic neurological effects from mercury poisoning. The allegations, counts and damages demanded in the complaint with respect to FPL are virtually identical to those contained in the Roig lawsuit described above. FPL's motion to dismiss the complaint was denied. The U.S. District Court subsequently remanded the action back to the state court. The state court subsequently dismissed the drug manufacturing and distribution companies from the action. Plaintiffs' appeal of that order is pending before the Florida Fifth District Court of Appeal. Plaintiffs and FPL have agreed that FPL will not respond to the complaint until requested by the plaintiffs.

In October 2004, TXU Portfolio Management Company (TXU) served FPL Energy Pecos Wind I, LP, FPL Energy Pecos Wind I GP, LLC, FPL Energy Pecos Wind II, LP, FPL Energy Pecos Wind II GP, LLC and Indian Mesa Wind Farm, LP (FPL Energy Affiliates) as defendants in a civil action filed in the District Court in Dallas County, Texas. The petition alleges that the FPL Energy Affiliates had a contractual obligation to produce and sell to TXU a minimum quantity of energy each year and that the FPL Energy Affiliates failed to meet this obligation. The plaintiff has asserted claims for breach of contract and declaratory judgment and seeks damages of approximately $34 million. The FPL Energy Affiliates filed their answer and counterclaim in November 2004, denying the allegations. The counterclaim, as now amended, asserts claims for conversion, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of warranty, conspiracy, breach of contract and fraud and seeks termination of the contract and damages. At the end of 2005, TXU amended its complaint to add FPL Group, FPL Energy, FPL Group Capital and ESI Energy, LLC (ESI Energy), as defendants. Motions to dismiss those entities as defendants were filed, and FPL Group, FPL Group Capital and ESI Energy have been dismissed. The case is in discovery and has been reset for trial in April 2007.

During 2006, a U.S. court judgment in favor of Karaha Bodas Company, LLC (KBC) totaling approximately $320 million, including interest, became final. FPL Energy owns an equity interest in KBC. The judgment related to proceedings initiated by KBC against PT Pertamina, Indonesia's state-owned oil/energy company to recover KBC's investment in a power generation project suspended indefinitely by the Indonesian government in 1998 and for lost profits. A portion of the final judgment, or approximately $290 million, was received by KBC in 2006, of which approximately $7 million was distributed to FPL Energy in May 2006 and approximately $90 million, FPL Energy's portion of the remaining funds, was distributed to FPL Energy in mid-February 2007. FPL Group recorded a $97 million pretax gain in equity in earnings of equity method investees in 2006 relating to the judgment. Also, during 2004, judgment funds of approximately $30 million were received by KBC, of which approximately $7 million was distributed to FPL Energy.

In September 2006, PT Pertamina filed an action against KBC in the Grand Court of the Cayman Islands for fraud and for an injunction prohibiting KBC from disposing of, dealing with or diminishing the value of any of KBC's assets up to the value of PT Pertamina's funds KBC received as a result of the court judgment (approximately $320 million) pending resolution of the fraud claim. FPL Energy's portion of the damages being sought is approximately $145

million. KBC sought and in December 2006 received from the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York an anti-suit injunction against the plaintiff, prohibiting the plaintiff from pursuing the fraud action, or any similar action, and the request for injunctive relief in the Cayman court or any other court worldwide. The plaintiff's appeal of that order to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is pending. In January 2007, the district court granted plaintiff's motion for stay pending appeal prohibiting the judgment funds from being distributed to KBC's owners, and in mid-February 2007, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit lifted the stay and the judgment funds of approximately $265 million were distributed.

In addition to those legal proceedings discussed above, FPL Group and its subsidiaries, including FPL, are involved in a number of other legal proceedings and claims in the ordinary course of their businesses. Generating plants in which FPL Group or FPL have an ownership interest are also involved in legal proceedings and claims, the liabilities from which, if any, would be shared by FPL Group or FPL.

In the event that FPL Group and FPL, or their affiliates, do not prevail in these lawsuits, there may be a material adverse effect on their financial statements. However, FPL Group and FPL believe that they, or their affiliates, have meritorious defenses to all the pending litigation and proceedings discussed above under the heading Legal Proceedings and are vigorously defending the lawsuits. While management is unable to predict with certainty the outcome of the legal proceedings and claims discussed or described herein, based on current knowledge it is not expected that their ultimate resolution, individually or collectively, will have a material adverse effect on the financial statements of FPL Group or FPL.

Item 4. Submission of Matters to a Vote of Security Holders

The Annual Meeting of FPL Group's shareholders was held on December 15, 2006. Of the 404,915,470 shares of common stock outstanding on the record date of October 25, 2006, a total of 347,815,519 shares (or 85.9% of the outstanding shares) were represented in person or by proxy.

The following directors were elected effective December 15, 2006:

	For	Withheld
Sherry S. Barrat	342,489,549	5,325,970
Robert M. Beall, II	341,620,508	6,195,011
J. Hyatt Brown	290,711,809	57,103,710
James L. Camaren	342,601,389	5,214,130
J. Brian Ferguson	342,482,604	5,332,915
Lewis Hay, III	340,759,425	7,056,094
Rudy E. Schupp	342,625,649	5,189,870
Michael H. Thaman	342,505,153	5,310,366
Hansel E. Tookes, II	342,437,527	5,377,992
Paul R. Tregurtha	340,822,923	6,992,596

The vote ratifying the appointment of Deloitte & Touche LLP as FPL Group's independent registered public accounting firm was 342,961,240 for, 1,830,348 against and 3,023,931 abstaining.

PART II

Item 5. Market for Registrants' Common Equity, Related Stockholder Matters and Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities

Common Stock Data. All of FPL's common stock is owned by FPL Group. FPL Group's common stock is traded on the New York Stock Exchange. The high and low sales prices for the common stock of FPL Group as reported in the consolidated transaction reporting system of the New York Stock Exchange for each quarter during the past two years are as follows:

	2006		2005	
Quarter	High	Low	High	Low
First	$ 43.42	$ 38.85	$ 41.38	$ 35.90
Second	$ 41.97	$ 37.81	$ 42.72	$ 39.16
Third	$ 45.87	$ 40.59	$ 48.11	$ 40.30
Fourth	$ 55.57	$ 44.97	$ 48.05	$ 40.75

Approximate Number of Shareholders. As of the close of business on January 31, 2007, there were 30,981 holders of record of FPL Group's common stock.

Dividends. Quarterly dividends have been paid on common stock of FPL Group during the past two years in the following amounts per share:

Quarter	2006	2005
First	$ 0.375	$ 0.355
Second	$ 0.375	$ 0.355
Third	$ 0.375	$ 0.355
Fourth	$ 0.375	$ 0.355

The amount and timing of dividends payable on FPL Group's common stock are within the sole discretion of FPL Group's board of directors. The board of directors reviews the dividend rate at least annually (generally in February) to determine its appropriateness in light of FPL Group's financial position and results of operations, legislative and regulatory developments affecting the electric utility industry in general and FPL in particular, competitive conditions and any other factors the board deems relevant. The ability of FPL Group to pay dividends on its common stock is dependent upon, among other things, dividends paid to it by its subsidiaries. There are no restrictions in effect that currently limit FPL's ability to pay dividends to FPL Group.

In February 2007, FPL Group announced that it would increase its quarterly dividend on its common stock from $0.375 to $0.41 per share. See Management's Discussion – Liquidity and Capital Resources - Covenants with respect to dividend restrictions and Note 12 – Common Stock Dividend Restrictions regarding dividends paid by FPL to FPL Group.

Issuer Purchases of Equity Securities. The following table presents information regarding purchases made by FPL Group of its common stock:

Period	Total Number of Shares Purchased (a)	Average Price Paid Per Share (a)	Total Number of Shares Purchased as Part of a Publicly Announced Program	Maximum Number of Shares that May Yet be Purchased Under the Program (b)
10/1/06 - 10/31/06	5,747	$ 46.96	-	20,000,000
11/1/06 - 11/30/06	19,223	$ 53.14	-	20,000,000
12/1/06 - 12/31/06	2,421	$ 54.82	-	20,000,000
Total	27,391		-	

(a) Shares of common stock purchased from employees to pay certain withholding taxes upon the vesting of stock awards granted to such employees under the LTIP.

(b) In February 2005, FPL Group's board of directors authorized a common stock repurchase plan of up to 20 million shares of common stock over an unspecified period, which authorization was ratified and confirmed by FPL Group's board of directors in December 2005.

Item 6. Selected Financial Data

	Years Ended December 31,				
	2006	2005[a]	2004[a]	2003[a]	2002[a]
SELECTED DATA OF FPL GROUP (millions, except per share amounts):					
Operating revenues	$ 15,710	$ 11,846	$ 10,522	$ 9,630	$ 8,173
Income before cumulative effect of changes in accounting principles	$ 1,281 (b)	$ 901 (c)	$ 896 (d)	$ 906 (c)	$ 701 (e)
Cumulative effect of adopting FAS 142, net of income taxes of $143	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ (222)
Cumulative effect of adopting FIN 46, net of income taxes of $2	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ (3)	$ -
Net income	$ 1,281 (b)	$ 901 (c)	$ 896 (d)	$ 903 (f)	$ 479 (g)

Earnings per share of common stock - basic:					
Earnings per share before cumulative effect of changes in accounting principles	$ 3.25 (b)	$ 2.37 (c)	$ 2.50 (d)	$ 2.55 (c)	$ 2.02 (e)
Cumulative effect of changes in accounting principles	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ (0.01)	$ (0.64)
Earnings per share	$ 3.25 (b)	$ 2.37 (c)	$ 2.50 (d)	$ 2.54 (f)	$ 1.38 (g)
Earnings per share of common stock - assuming dilution:					
Earnings per share before cumulative effect of changes in accounting principles	$ 3.23 (b)	$ 2.34 (c)	$ 2.48 (d)	$ 2.54 (c)	$ 2.02 (e)
Cumulative effect of changes in accounting principles	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ (0.01)	$ (0.64)
Earnings per share	$ 3.23 (b)	$ 2.34 (c)	$ 2.48 (d)	$ 2.53 (f)	$ 1.38 (g)
Dividends paid per share of common stock	$ 1.50	$ 1.42	$ 1.30	$ 1.20	$ 1.16
Total assets [h]	$ 35,991	$ 32,990	$ 28,324	$ 26,955	$ 23,184
Long-term debt, excluding current maturities [h]	$ 9,591	$ 8,039	$ 8,027	$ 8,723	$ 5,790
Obligations of FPL under capital lease, excluding current maturities [h]	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 140
SELECTED DATA OF FPL (millions):					
Operating revenues	$ 11,988	$ 9,528	$ 8,734	$ 8,293	$ 7,378
Net income available to FPL Group	$ 802	$ 748	$ 749	$ 733	$ 717
Total assets [h]	$ 23,073	$ 22,726	$ 19,114	$ 17,817	$ 16,032
Long-term debt, excluding current maturities [h]	$ 4,214	$ 3,271	$ 2,813	$ 3,074	$ 2,364
Energy sales (kwh)	107,513	105,648	103,635	103,202	98,605
Energy sales:					
Residential	50.8 %	51.4 %	50.7 %	51.8 %	51.6 %
Commercial	41.4	41.1	40.6	40.1	40.6
Industrial	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.1
Interchange power sales	2.1	2.0	2.9	2.3	1.8
Other [i]	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.9
Total	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
Approximate 60-minute peak load (mw): [j]					
Summer season	21,819	22,361	20,545	19,668	19,219

Winter season	17,260	19,683	18,108	15,989	20,190
Average number of customer accounts (thousands):					
Residential	3,906	3,828	3,745	3,653	3,566
Commercial	47				