

SALEM, SAXON & NIELSEN

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Professional Association

STEVEN M. BERMAN
 J. FRAZIER CARRAWAY
 LISA M. CASTELLANO
 PATRICIA M. HAISTEN
 MARILYN MULLEN HEALY
 TROY M. LOVELL
 SAMUEL R. MANDELBAUM
 BOARD CERTIFIED CIVIL TRIAL LAWYER
 PAUL J. MARINO

EVIN L. NETZER
 RICHARD A. NIELSEN
 BOARD CERTIFIED CIVIL TRIAL LAWYER
 KEVIN P. O'BRIEN
 LYNN V.H. RAMEY
 MARIAN B. RUSH
 RICHARD J. SALEM

BERNICE S. SAXON
 SUSAN K. S. SCARCELLI
 JACQUELINE M. SPOTO
 DAVID J. TONG
 TARA M. WALL
 ANDREA E. ZELMAN
 CERTIFIED STATE AND FEDERAL MEDIATOR

ORIGINAL
FILE COPY

March 5, 1996

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Blanca S. Bayo, Director
 Florida Public Service Commission
 Division of Records & Recording
 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. - Room 110
 Tallahassee, FL 32399

Re: Docket No. 950307-EU
 Notice of Administrative Appeal

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing please find an original and fifteen copies of Florida Steel Corporation's Notice of Administrative Appeal. A copy of this Notice along with this firm's check in the amount of \$200 for the filing fee has been provided to the Florida Supreme Court in connection with this appeal.

With kindest personal regards, I am

ACK Very truly yours,

AFA _____ SALEM, SAXON & NIELSEN, P.A.

APP _____
CAF *Marian B. Rush*

CMU _____ Marian B. Rush

CTR _____ MBR/dr

EAG _____
LEG _____ Enclosures

(LIN) _____ cc: Honorable Sid J. White, Clerk
OPC _____ Supreme Court of Florida

RCH _____ All Parties of Record

SEC 1

WAS _____ F:\CL\FLSTEEL\LETR\BAYO.83a

OTH _____



DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02752 MAR-6 96

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

SALEM, SAXON & NIELSEN

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Professional Association

STEVEN M. BERMAN
J. FRAZIER CARRAWAY
LISA M. CASTELLANO
PATRICIA M. HAISTEN
MARILYN MULLEN HEALY
TROY M. LOVELL
SAMUEL R. MANDELBAUM
BOARD CERTIFIED CIVIL TRIAL LAWYER
PAUL J. MARINO

EVIN L. NETZER
RICHARD A. NIELSEN
BOARD CERTIFIED CIVIL TRIAL LAWYER
KEVIN P. O'BRIEN
LYNN V.H. RAMEY
MARIAN B. RUSH
RICHARD J. SALEM

BERNICE S. SAXON
SUSAN K. S. SCARCELLI
JACQUELINE M. SPOTO
DAVID J. TONG
TARA M. WALL
ANDREA E. ZELMAN
CERTIFIED STATE AND FEDERAL MEDIATOR

March 5, 1996

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Honorable Sid J. White
The Supreme Court of Florida
Supreme Court Building
500 South Duval St.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1927

RE: Docket No. 950307-EU
Notice of Administrative Appeal

Dear Mr. White:

Enclosed please find a copy of Notice of Administrative Appeal, the original of which is being simultaneously filed with the Florida Public Service Commission along with Salem, Saxon & Nielsen, P.A.'s check in the amount of \$200 representing the filing fee in conjunction with this appeal.

Should you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

SALEM, SAXON & NIELSEN, P.A.

Marian B. Rush
Marian B. Rush

MBR/dr/np

Enclosures

cc: Blanca Bayo, Clerk
Florida Public Service Commission

All Parties of Record

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 950307-EU
ORDER NO. PSC-96-0158-PCO-EU
ISSUED: February 5, 1996

In Re: Petition of Jacksonville
Electric Authority to Resolve a
Territorial Dispute with Florida
Power & Light Company in St.
Johns County.

_____))
NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL

NOTICE IS GIVEN pursuant to 9.030(a)(1)(B)(ii) and 9.110 of the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure governing appeals of statewide agencies relating to the service of electric utilities that Florida Steel Corporation, Appellant, appeals to the Supreme Court of Florida, the order of the Public Service Commission rendered on February 5, 1996, a conformed copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A". The nature of the order is a denial of Florida Steel Corporation's Motion to Intervene.

By: Marian B. Rush
Richard Salem
Florida Bar No. 152524
Marian B. Rush
Florida Bar No. 373583
SALEM, SAXON & NIELSEN, P.A.
101 E. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 3200
P.O. Box 3399
Tampa, Florida 33602
(813) 224-9000

Peter J.P. Brickfield
James W. Brew
BRICKFIELD, BURCHETTE & RITTS, P.C.
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Eighth Floor - West Tower
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 342-0800

F:\CL\FLSTEEL\PLD-G\ADMINAPP.NOT

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

02752 MAR-6 86

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

408

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Petition of Jacksonville) DOCKET NO. 950307-EU
 Electric Authority to Resolve a) ORDER NO. PSC-96-0158-PCO-EU
 Territorial Dispute with Florida) ISSUED: February 5, 1996
 Power & Light Company in St.)
 Johns County.)

ORDER DENYING INTERVENTION

On March 20, 1995, Jacksonville Electric Authority (JEA) petitioned the Commission to resolve a territorial dispute with Florida Power and Light Company (FPL). On August 28, 1995, JEA and FPL filed a Joint Motion to Suspend Remaining Filing and Hearing Dates. In that motion, the parties stated that they had reached a settlement of the dispute and intended to file the appropriate documentation at a future date. By Order No. PSC-95-1086-PCO-EU, issued on August 31, 1995, I suspended and held in abeyance the remaining filing and hearing deadlines scheduled for this docket pending resolution of matters concerning the settlement agreement.

On October 6, 1995, JEA and FPL filed a Joint Motion to Approve a Territorial Agreement. The proposed agreement is intended to replace the previous agreement between the two utilities in Clay, Duval, Nassau and St. Johns Counties. The previous agreement was approved by the Commission in Order No. 9363, issued May 9, 1980, in Docket No. 790886-EU.

On December 5, 1995, Florida Steel Corporation (Florida Steel) filed a Motion to Intervene in this proceeding and Objection to Preliminary Agency Action. On Monday, December 18, 1995, FPL filed a Memorandum in Opposition to Florida Steel's Motion to Intervene and Objection to Preliminary Agency Action. On January 18, 1996, Florida Steel filed a Response to Florida Power and Light's Memorandum in Opposition to Florida Steel Corporation's Petition to Intervene. Florida Steel's Objection to Preliminary Agency Action, filed prior to the issuance of a proposed agency action in this docket, is not contemplated by Commission rules. Florida Steel's Response to FPL's Memorandum in Opposition to Florida Steel's Petition to Intervene was not timely filed in accordance with the provisions for responding to motions, Rule 25-22.037(2)(b), Florida Administrative Code. I have, therefore, addressed only Florida Steel's request for leave to intervene.

In its Motion to Intervene, Florida Steel states that it has been a FPL customer since 1974 and that it will remain a FPL customer under the proposed territorial agreement. As a customer of FPL, Florida Steel asserts that it pays significantly higher rates for electric service than do its major competitors. Florida

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

EXHIBIT "A"

01262 FEB-5%

407

ORDER NO. PSC-96-0158-PCO-EU
DOCKET NO. 950307-EU
PAGE 2

Steel believes that if it is required to remain a FPL customer, these higher rates could be a factor in decisions concerning the continued operation of its Jacksonville mill.

FPL asserts that Florida Steel claims only that it is dissatisfied with the rate charged by FPL. FPL also notes that Florida Steel does not claim that approval of the agreement will change its circumstances. FPL, therefore, asserts that Florida Steel's allegations of potential economic harm to Florida Steel and the City of Jacksonville are too speculative, indirect, and remote to support standing in this matter.

Pursuant to Rule 25-22.039, Florida Administrative Code, persons seeking to become parties in a proceeding must demonstrate that they are entitled to participate as a matter of constitutional or statutory right or pursuant to Commission rule, or that their substantial interests are subject to determination or will be affected through the proceeding. Florida Steel has not alleged that it is entitled to intervene as a matter of right or pursuant to Commission rule. It is appropriate, therefore, to apply the two-pronged test for "substantial interest" set forth in Agrico Chemical Co. v. Dept. of Environmental Regulation, 406 So.2d 478, 482 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1981), rev. denied 415 So. 2d 1359 (Fla. 1982). According to the Agrico test, a party must show (1) that he will suffer injury in fact which is of sufficient immediacy to entitle him to a Section 120.57, Florida Statutes, hearing, and (2) that his substantial injury is of a type or nature which the proceeding is designed to protect. Id. at 482.

With respect to the first prong of the test, Florida Steel's petition contains a number of allegations concerning its failed attempts to negotiate a lower rate with FPL and the resulting threat to the survival of its Jacksonville mill. Florida Steel asserts that if it is not allowed to negotiate a lower rate with JEA, it will consider relocating the Jacksonville mill. Florida Steel claims that the City of Jacksonville's economic well-being will suffer should the mill be relocated.

After consideration, I find that Florida Steel has not shown that it will suffer an injury in fact which is of sufficient immediacy to warrant a Section 120.57 hearing. Florida Steel admits in its petition that FPL's rates will not be the sole determinant in whether the company decides to relocate the Jacksonville mill. Also, Florida Steel can only speculate as to the effect that such a loss might have on the City. As explained in Order No. PSC-95-0348-FOF-GU, the Commission has already determined that such conjecture as to future economic detriment is too remote to establish standing. Citing International Jai-Alai

ORDER NO. PSC-96-0158-PCO-EU
DOCKET NO. 950307-EU
PAGE 3

Players Assoc. v. Florida Pari-Mutuel Commission, 561 So. 2d 1224, at 1225-1226 (Fla. 3rd DCA 1990). See also Village Park Mobile Home Association, Inc. v. State, Dept. of Business Regulation, 506 So. 2d 426, 434 (Fla. 1st DCA 1987), rev. denied, 513 So. 2d 1063 (Fla. 1987) (speculations on the possible occurrence of injurious events are too remote to warrant inclusion in the administrative review process).

With respect to the second prong of the Agrico test, Florida Steel asserts that the public interest as a whole, as well as the economic interests of the City of Jacksonville, would be better served if the territorial boundary was modified to allow JEA to serve the area currently served by FPL in Duval County. In support of this assertion, Florida Steel states only that if it is required to remain in FPL's territory and is not allowed to negotiate with JEA for service at lower rate, then it will consider relocating its Jacksonville mill.

I find that the alleged injury claimed by Florida Steel is not of a type designed to be protected by proceedings to approve a territorial agreement. Sections 366.04(2) and (5), Florida Statutes, commonly called the "Grid Bill," authorize the Commission to approve territorial agreements and resolve territorial disputes in order to ensure the reliability of Florida's energy grid and to prevent further uneconomic duplication of electric facilities. The Grid Bill does not authorize the Commission to set territorial boundaries in response to one customer's desire for lower rates. This Commission has consistently adhered to the principle set forth in Storey v. Mayo, 217 So. 2d 304, 307-308 (Fla. 1968), and reaffirmed in Lee County Electric Cooperative v. Marks, 501 So. 2d 585 (Fla. 1987), that no person has a right to compel service from a particular utility simply because he believes it to be to his advantage. The Court went on to say in Lee County that "larger policies are at stake than one customer's self-interest, and those policies must be enforced and safeguarded by the Florida Public Service Commission." Lee County Electric Cooperative, at 587.

In Docket No. 870816-EU, Joint Petition for Approval of Territorial Agreement Between Florida Power and Light Company and Peace River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Order No. 19140, the Commission cited Storey and Lee County Electric Cooperative in concluding that the petitioner, Schroeder-Manatee, Inc., lacked standing to intervene in the proceedings. The Commission stated that

. . . the court has firmly established the general rule that a territorial agreement is not one in which the personal preference of a customer is an issue.

ORDER NO. PSC-96-0158-PCO-EU
DOCKET NO. 950307-EU
PAGE 4

Therefore, the alleged injury, even if real and direct, is not within the zone of interest of the law.
Order Dismissing Petition and Finalizing Order No. 18332, Order No. 19140, April 13, 1988.

In Docket No. 891245-EU, Petition of Florida Power and Light Company for Resolution of a Territorial Dispute with Fort Pierce Utilities Authority, the prehearing officer invoked a similar rationale in denying a petition to intervene filed by Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institution, Inc. (Harbor Branch), a Fort Pierce Utilities Authority (FPUA) customer. The prehearing officer noted that

Harbor Branch has not alleged that it is located in an area that is subject to dispute or that is subject to any duplication of facilities by the two utilities. Harbor Branch has not alleged that either approval or disapproval of the territorial agreement will cause any change in its circumstances. Harbor Branch simply alleges that it is unhappy with the quality of service that is provided by FPUA and that FPUA charges a higher rate than FPL. Neither of these allegations are sufficient to show that Harbor Branch's substantial interests will be affected by the outcome of this proceeding.

Order Denying Intervention, Order No. PSC-94-0909-PCO-EU, July 25, 1994.

I find that Florida Steel's position is quite similar to that presented by Harbor Branch in Docket No. 891245-EU. Florida Steel acknowledges that it has been and will remain a FPL customer under the proposed territorial agreement. Florida Steel claims only that FPL's rates could be a factor in decisions concerning the continued operation of its Jacksonville mill and that those decisions may have some bearing on the economy of the area. This allegation is not sufficient to support standing in this docket. Based on the foregoing, Florida Steel Corporation's Petition to Intervene in these proceedings is denied.

Although Florida Steel shall not be granted intervenor status, it has ample opportunity to participate at the February 6, 1996, Commission Agenda Conference at which the proposed territorial agreement is scheduled to be addressed, pursuant to Section 366.04(4), Florida Statutes, and Rules 25-6.0442(1) and 25-22.0021(1), Florida Administrative Code. In addition, Florida Steel's right to due process is protected by our Rule 25-22.0376, Florida Administrative Code, whereby an adversely affected party


ORDER NO. PSC-96-0158-PCO-EU
DOCKET NO. 950307-EU
PAGE 5

may petition for reconsideration of an order of a prehearing officer within 10 days after the issuance of the order.

Based on the foregoing, it is therefore

ORDERED by Commissioner Julia L. Johnson, as Prehearing Officer, that the Motion to Intervene filed by Florida Steel Corporation is hereby denied.

By ORDER of Commissioner Julia L. Johnson, as Prehearing Officer, this 5th day of February, 1996.



JULIA L. JOHNSON, Commissioner and
Prehearing Officer

(S E A L)

BC

ORDER NO. PSC-96-0158-PCO-EU
DOCKET NO. 950307-EU
PAGE 6

NOTICE OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OR JUDICIAL REVIEW

The Florida Public Service Commission is required by Section 120.59(4), 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.

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, if issued by a Prehearing Officer; (2) reconsideration within 15 days pursuant to Rule 25-22.060, Florida Administrative Code, if issued by the Commission; or (3) 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 Director, Division of Records and Reporting, in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, 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.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
DOCKET NO. 950307-EU**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Notice of Administrative Appeal has been furnished via Federal Express on the 5th day of March 1996, to the following:

Beth Culpepper, Esq.
Florida Public Service Commission
Gerald L. Gunter Building
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Room 301
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850


Mark K. Logan, Esq.
Bryant, Miller and Olive, P.A.
201 S. Monroe St.
Suite 500
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Edward Tancer, Esq.
Florida Power & Light Company
11770 U.S. Highway One
North Palm Beach, FL 33408

Kenneth A. Hoffman, Esq.
Rutledge, Ecenia, Underwood,
Purnell & Hoffman
215 S. Monroe St.
Suite 420
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Bruce Page, Esq.
600 City Hall
220 East Bay Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Roger Howe, Esq.
Office of Public Counsel
111 West Madison Street
Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399


RICHARD J. SALEM
MARIAN B. RUSH