BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for increase in rates by Florida Power & Light Company.	DOCKET NO. 080677-EI ORDER NO. PSC-09-0215-PCO-EI ISSUED: April 9, 2009

ORDER GRANTING PETITION TO INTERVENE

On November 17, 2008, Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) filed a test year letter, as required by Rule 25-6.140, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), notifying this Commission of its intent to file a petition in the Spring of 2009 for an increase in rates effective January 1, 2010. Pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 366, Florida Statutes (F.S.), and Rules 25-6.0425 and 25-6.043, F.A.C., FPL filed the petition for an increase in rates on March 18, 2009.

Petition for Intervention

By petition dated February 12, 2009, I.B.E.W. System Council U-4 (SCU-4) requested permission to intervene in this proceeding. SCU-4 states that it is a labor organization that acts as a collective bargaining representative for approximately 3,500 employees of FPL, many of whom are ratepayers. SCU-4 states that FPL's proposed rate change will affect FPL's revenues, thereby substantially affecting the availability of funds FPL has to pay wages and benefits to SCU-4 members, as well as the number of SCU-4 members that FPL retains or lays off. SCU-4 contends that its substantial interests will be affected by this Commission's determination in this proceeding, because the wages paid to and benefits received by SCU-4 members and retirees are dependent upon the level of FPL's revenues, as is the number of employees retained or laid off by FPL. No party has filed an objection to SCU-4's Petition, and the time for doing so has expired.

Standards for Intervention

Pursuant to Rule 25-22.039, 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 petition for leave to intervene. Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed at least five (5) days before the final hearing, conform with Rule 28-106.201(2), F.A.C., and 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 two-prong standing test set forth in Agrico Chemical Company v. Department of Environmental Regulation, 406 So. 2d 478, 482 (Fla. 2nd DCA 1981). 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) this 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. 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. 3rd 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).

Further, the test for associational standing was established in Florida Home Builders v. Dept. of Labor and Employment Security, 412 So. 2d 351 (Fla. 1982), and Farmworker Rights Organization, Inc. v. Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services, 417 So. 2d 753 (Fla. 1st DCA 1982), which is also based on the basic standing principles established in Agrico. 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.

Analysis & Ruling

It appears that SCU-4 meets the two-prong standing test in Agrico as well as the three-prong associational standing test established in Florida Home Builders. SCU-4 asserts that it is a labor organization whose members are FPL employees and that it acts as the collective bargaining representative of approximately 3,500 FPL employees. SCU-4 further states that this is the type of proceeding designed to protect its members' interests. Therefore, SCU-4's members meet the two-prong standing test of Agrico.

With respect to the first prong of the associational standing test, SCU-4 asserts that its members are employees of FPL and that its members' substantial interests will be directly affected by the Commission's decision to change FPL's rates. With respect to the second prong of the associational standing test, the subject matter of the proceeding appears to be within SCU-4's general scope of interest and activity. SCU-4 is a labor organization whose members are employed by FPL. Accordingly, SCU-4's members' wages, benefits, and continued employment with FPL depend on FPL's revenues, which are determined by the rates this Commission approves for FPL. As for the third prong of the associational standing test, SCU-4 is seeking intervention in this docket to represent the interests of its members in seeking the highest rates consistent with governing law and policy. Because FPL's rates, and thus revenues, affect the wages and benefits that SCU-4's members receive, SCU-4 appears to be in a position to request the Commission to grant relief on behalf of its members.

Because SCU-4 meets the two-prong standing test established in Agrico as well as the three-prong associational standing test established in Florida Home Builders, SCU-4's petition for intervention shall be granted. Pursuant to Rule 25-22.039, F.A.C., SCU-4 takes the case as it finds it.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED by Commissioner Katrina J. McMurrian, as Prehearing Officer, that the Petition to Intervene filed by I.B.E.W. System Council U-4 is hereby granted as set forth in the body of this Order. 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:

SUGARMAN & SUSSKIND, P.A.
Attorneys for SCU-4
Robert A. Sugarman
D. Marcus Braswell, Jr.
100 Miracle Mile, Suite 300
Coral Gables, FL 33134
Telephone: (305) 529-2801
Fax: (305) 447-8115

By ORDER of Commissioner Katrina J. McMurrian, as Prehearing Officer, this 9th day of April, 2009.

Katrina J. McMurrian
KATRINA J. McMURRIAN
Commissioner and Prehearing Officer

(SEAL)

ARW

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.