

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for a limited proceeding to
approve second solar base rate adjustment, by
Duke Energy Florida, LLC.

DOCKET NO. 20190072-EI
ORDER NO. PSC-2019-0244-PCO-EI
ISSUED: June 25, 2019

ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION FOR ASSOCIATION

Duke Energy Florida, LLC's (DEF) petition for a limited proceeding to approve its 2017 Second Revised and Restated Settlement Agreement (2017 Settlement) was approved by the Commission on November 20, 2017, by Order No. PSC-2017-0451-AS-EU.¹ Paragraph 15(a) of the 2017 Settlement allows DEF to petition the Commission for cost recovery of up to 350 megawatts (MW) of solar generation in 2019.

The Commission approved DEF's first solar rate base adjustment by Order No. PSC-2019-0159-FOF-EI, issued on April 30, 2019.² On March 25, 2019, DEF filed a petition for a limited proceeding seeking approval for its second solar base rate adjustment. In its petition, DEF seeks cost recovery approval for the Trenton Solar Power Plant, the Lake Placid Solar Power Plant, and DEF's existing DeBary Generating Station pursuant to paragraph 15 of the 2017 Settlement. This docket is currently scheduled for hearing on July 9, 2019.

Petition for Intervention

By petition dated June 12, 2019, the Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG) requested permission to intervene in this proceeding. FIPUG states that the rates for certain solar power facilities under consideration in this proceeding, if approved, will be recovered from DEF's customers—a substantial number a substantial number of which are FIPUG members. FIPUG also states that it appears on a regular basis before the Commission on behalf of its members in cases concerning utility regulation, as the cost of electricity represents a significant portion of its members' production costs. FIPUG alleges that it has an interest in ensuring that its members that receive electrical service from DEF are charged fair, just, and reasonable rates for power that is both needed and cost-effective, and that this interest is of the type that this proceeding is designed to protect. No party has filed an objection to FIPUG's intervention in this matter, and the time for doing so has expired.

Standards for Intervention

Pursuant to Rule 28-106.205, F.A.C., persons, other than the original parties to a pending proceeding, who have a substantial interest in the proceeding and who desire to become parties

¹ Order No. PSC-2017-0451-AS-EU, issued November 20, 2017, in Docket No. 20170183-EI, *In re: Application for limited proceeding to approve 2017 second revised and restated settlement agreement, including certain rate adjustments, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.*

² In Docket No. 20180149-EI, *In re: Petition for a limited proceeding to approve first solar base rate adjustment, by Duke Energy Florida, LLC.*

may move for leave to intervene. Motions for leave to intervene must be filed at least twenty (20) days before the final hearing, must comply with Rule 28-106.204(3), F.A.C., and must include allegations sufficient to demonstrate that the intervenor is entitled to participate in the proceeding as a matter of constitutional or statutory right or pursuant to Commission rule, or that the substantial interests of the intervenor are subject to determination or will be affected through the proceeding. Intervenors take the case as they find it.

To have standing, the intervenor must meet the three-prong standing test set forth in Florida Home Builders Association v. Department of Labor and Employment Security, 412 So. 2d 351, 353-54 (Fla. 1982), and Farmworker Rights Organization, Inc. v. Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 417 So. 2d 753, 754 (Fla. 1st DCA 1982), which is based on the basic standing principles established in Agrico Chemical Company v. Department of Environmental Regulation, 406 So. 2d 478, 481-82 (Fla. 2d DCA 1981).³ Associational standing may be found where: (1) the association demonstrates that a substantial number of an association's members may be substantially affected by the Commission's decision in a docket; (2) the subject matter of the proceeding is within the association's general scope of interest and activity; and (3) the relief requested is of a type appropriate for the association to receive on behalf of its members. Fla. Home Builders, 412 So. 2d at 353-54; Farmworker Rights Org., 417 So. 2d at 754.

Based on the above representations, it appears that FIPUG has met the associational standing requirements of Florida Home Builders as stated above. FIPUG asserts that it has a substantial number of its members that are ratepayers of DEF and, as a result, those members are directly and substantially affected by the decision in this case. Further, keeping electricity costs as low as possible falls within the purview of FIPUG's general scope of interest and is the type of relief appropriate for FIPUG to receive on behalf of its members. Therefore, it is

ORDERED by Commissioner Donald J. Polmann, as Prehearing Officer, that the Petition to Intervene filed by Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG) is hereby granted as set forth in the body of this Order. It is further


ORDERED that FIPUG takes the case as it finds it. It is further

ORDERED that all parties to this proceeding shall furnish copies of all testimony, exhibits, pleadings, and other documents which may hereinafter be filed in this proceeding to:

³ Under Agrico, the intervenor must show that (1) he will suffer injury in fact which is of sufficient immediacy to entitle him to a Section 120.57, F.S., hearing, and (2) the substantial injury is of a type or nature which the proceeding is designed to protect. The first aspect of the test deals with the degree of injury. The second deals with the nature of the injury. 406 So. 2d 478 at 482. The "injury in fact" must be both real and immediate and not speculative or conjectural. International Jai-Alai Players Assn. v. Florida Pari-Mutuel Commission, 561 So. 2d 1224, 1225-26 (Fla. 3d DCA 1990). See also: Village Park Mobile Home Assn., Inc. v. State Dept. of Business Regulation, 506 So. 2d 426, 434 (Fla. 1st DCA 1987), rev. den., 513 So. 2d 1063 (Fla. 1987) (speculation on the possible occurrence of injurious events is too remote).

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.
Karen A. Putnal
Ian E. Waldick
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Telephone: (850) 681-3828
Facsimile: (850) 681-8788
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
kputnal@moylelaw.com
iwaldick@moylelaw.com
mqualls@moylelaw.com

By ORDER of Commissioner Donald J. Polmann, as Prehearing Officer, this 25th day
of June, 2019.



DONALD J. POLMANN, Ph.D., P.E.
Commissioner and Prehearing Officer
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 413-6770
www.floridapsc.com

Copies furnished: A copy of this document is provided to the parties of record at the time of issuance and, if applicable, interested persons.

KMS

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.569(1), Florida Statutes, to notify parties of any administrative hearing or judicial review of Commission orders that is available under Sections 120.57 or 120.68, Florida Statutes, as well as the procedures and time limits that apply. This notice should not be construed to mean all requests for an administrative hearing or judicial review will be granted or result in the relief sought.

Mediation may be available on a case-by-case basis. If mediation is conducted, it does not affect a substantially interested person's right to a hearing.

Any party adversely affected by this order, which is preliminary, procedural or intermediate in nature, may request: (1) reconsideration within 10 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code; or (2) judicial review by the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of an electric, gas or telephone utility, or the First District Court of Appeal, in the case of a water or wastewater utility. A motion for reconsideration shall be filed with the Office of Commission Clerk, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code. Judicial review of a preliminary, procedural or intermediate ruling or order is available if review of the final action will not provide an adequate remedy. Such review may be requested from the appropriate court, as described above, pursuant to Rule 9.100, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.