BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| In re: Petition for rate increase by Tampa Electric Company.In re: Petition for approval of 2023 depreciation and dismantlement study, by Tampa Electric Company.In re: Petition to implement 2024 generation base rate adjustment provisions in paragraph 4 of the 2021 stipulation and settlement agreement, by Tampa Electric Company. | DOCKET NO. 20240026-EIDOCKET NO. 20230139-EIDOCKET NO. 20230090-EIORDER NO. PSC-2024-0125-PCO-EIISSUED: April 23, 2024 |

ORDER GRANTING INTERVENTION OF

FLORIDA INDUSTRIAL POWER USERS GROUP

On April 2, 2024, Tampa Electric Company (“TECO”) filed a petition, minimum filing requirements, and testimony for an increase in base rates effective January 2025.

Petition for Intervention

Florida Industrial Power Users Group (“FIPUG”) filed a Petition to Intervene on March 15, 2024. Petitioner represents that TECO does not object to its intervention. The Office of Public Counsel did not file any objection to FIPUG’s intervention in this matter.

FIPUG states it is an ad hoc association consisting of industrial users of electricity which routinely appears on behalf of its members in cases concerning utility regulation. FIPUG alleges that it has a substantial number of members in TECO’s service territory who will be substantially affected by rates set in this proceeding because electricity costs represent a significant portion of its members’ production costs. Its members require adequate, reasonably priced electricity to compete effectively in their respective markets. FIPUG asserts that its participation in this matter is appropriate to ensure the rates charged to its affected members are fair, just, and reasonable.

Standard 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, 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, pursuant to Florida Public Service Commission (“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.

The test for associational standing was established in *Florida Home Builders Association v. Department of Labor and Employment Security*[[1]](#footnote-1) and *Farmworker Rights Organization, Inc. v. Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services*,[[2]](#footnote-2) which is based on the basic standing principles established in *Agrico Chemical Company v. Department of Environmental Regulation*.[[3]](#footnote-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.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Analysis & Ruling

 Based on a review of the materials provided by FIPUG, it appears that FIPUG meets the three-prong associational standing test established in *Florida Home Builders*. With respect to the first prong, FIPUG demonstrates that a substantial number of its members will be substantially affected by the Commission’s determination in this rate proceeding. Electricity costs represent a significant portion of its members’ production costs and they face the prospect of paying higher electricity base rates going forward. With respect to the second prong, the subject matter of this proceeding appears to be within FIPUG’s general scope of interest and activity. FIPUG routinely appears on behalf of its members in cases concerning utility regulation to advocate for adequate, reasonably priced electricity. With respect to the third prong, the relief being requested by FIPUG appears to be of a type appropriate for this association to obtain on behalf of its members. FIPUG seeks to intervene in this docket to represent the interests of its members in seeking fair, just, and reasonable rates. Therefore, FIPUG meets the requirements for associational standing and will be permitted to intervene as a party in this proceeding.

 Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by Commissioner Gary F. Clark, as Prehearing Officer, that the Petition to Intervene by Florida Industrial Power Users Group is hereby granted as set forth in the body of this Order. It is further

ORDERED that Florida Industrial Power Users Group 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:

Jon C. Moyle Jr., Esq.

Karen A. Putnal, Esq.

Moyle Law Finn, P.A.

118 North Gadsden Street

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Telephone: (850) 681-3828

Facsimile: (850) 681-8788

jmoyle@moylelaw.com

kputnal@moylelaw.com

 By ORDER of Commissioner Gary F. Clark, as Prehearing Officer, this 23rd day of April, 2024.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | /s/ Gary F. Clark |
|  | GARY F. CLARKCommissioner 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.

CMM

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. 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.
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