

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition to determine  
need for Hines Unit 3 in Polk  
County by Florida Power  
Corporation.

DOCKET NO. 020953-EI  
ORDER NO. PSC-03-0175-FOF-EI  
ISSUED: February 4, 2003

The following Commissioners participated in the disposition of  
this matter:

J. TERRY DEASON  
BRAULIO L. BAEZ  
RUDOLPH "RUDY" BRADLEY

APPEARANCES:

JAMES A. MCGEE, ESQUIRE, Progress Energy Service Co., LLP,  
P.O. Box 14042, St. Petersburg, FL 33733; GARY L. SASSO,  
ESQUIRE and JILL H. BOWMAN, ESQUIRE, Carlton Fields, P.A.,  
P.O. Box 2861, St. Petersburg, FL 33731-2861; and W. DOUGLAS  
HALL, ESQUIRE, Carlton Fields, P.A., P.O. Drawer 190,  
Tallahassee, FL 32302-0190  
On behalf of Florida Power Corporation.

JON C. MOYLE, JR., ESQUIRE and CATHY M. SELLERS, ESQUIRE,  
Moyle Flanigan Katz Raymond & Sheehan, P.A., 118 North Gadsden  
Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
On behalf of Florida Partnership for Affordable Competitive  
Energy.

LAWRENCE D. HARRIS, ESQUIRE, Public Service Commission, 2540  
Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850  
On behalf of the Florida Public Service Commission.

ORDER GRANTING DETERMINATION OF NEED

BY THE COMMISSION:

BACKGROUND

On September 4, 2002, Florida Power Corporation (FPC), n/k/a  
Progress Energy Florida, filed a Petition to Determine Need for its

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01115 FEB-4 8

FPSC-COMMISSION CLERK

proposed Hines Unit 3 power plant, a natural gas-fired, combined-cycle electrical power plant with expected winter and summer capacity ratings of 582 MW and 516 MW, respectively. The plant will consist of a 2-on-1 combined cycle unit. The Hines Unit 3 combustion turbines will be designed with the capability to burn oil as a backup fuel. The plant will be located at the Hines Energy Complex (HEC) in Polk County, Florida, and is expected to be placed in service by December 2005. In 1994, FPC obtained Site Certification from the Florida Power Plant Siting Board (Siting Board) for the HEC site to build Hines Unit 1 and ultimately to locate up to 3,000 MW of generating capacity at the site. In 2001, the Siting Board approved the supplemental site certification application (SSCA) for construction of Hines Unit 2. Pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 403.501-518, Florida Statutes, the Power Plant Siting Act, and Chapter 62-17, Florida Administrative Code, FPC must submit a SSCA to the siting board for approval to build Hines Unit 3. On September 4, 2002, FPC filed the SSCA with the Department of Environmental Protection.

A separate public hearing will be held by the Department of Environmental Protection, the South West Florida Water Management District, local governments, and others before the Division of Administrative Hearings to consider the environmental and other impacts of the proposed plant. Ultimately the Siting Board will issue or deny Site Certification, considering the need for power balanced with the expected environmental impacts.

On November 26, 2001, FPC issued a request for proposals (RFP) seeking power supply resources from eligible bidders to meet an anticipated need for 500 MW of capacity in the Winter of 2005/2006. In this RFP, FPC described Hines Unit 3 as its next-planned generating alternative and invited interested persons to make alternative proposals to FPC that might offer superior value and other attributes. On February 12, 2002, seven bidders submitted proposals. FPC submitted detailed descriptions of the proposals on a confidential basis to the Commission.

Subsequent to FPC's filing, the Florida Partnership for Affordable Competitive Energy (PACE) petitioned to intervene in this proceeding. At the November 20, 2002, Prehearing Conference, the Prehearing Officer granted intervention and that ruling was

incorporated into the Prehearing Order, Order No. PSC-02-1536-PCO-EI, issued November 25, 2002.

Our jurisdiction and the substantive considerations of this case are governed by Section 403.519, Florida Statutes, which contains the following five areas we must review when determining the need for an electrical power plant:

- (1) the need for electric system reliability and integrity;
- (2) the need for adequate electricity at reasonable cost;
- (3) whether the proposed plant is the most cost-effective alternative available;
- (4) conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to the applicant which might mitigate the need for the proposed power plant; and
- (5) other matters within our jurisdiction which we deem relevant.

At the Prehearing conference held on November 20, 2002, eight substantive issues were identified for resolution in this proceeding. A hearing was conducted on December 3 and 4, 2002 and briefs were filed on December 27, 2002.

#### NEED FOR ELECTRIC SYSTEM RELIABILITY AND INTEGRITY

FPC has demonstrated a need for additional capacity through its resource planning process. FPC's System Demand and Energy Forecast, the first step in this process, provides the timing and magnitude of FPC's additional capacity needs. FPC made the decision to seek approval to build Hines Unit 3 after screening various other supply-side and demand-side alternatives as part of its resource planning process and then through a RFP process.

#### Load Forecast

The company's load forecast supporting the petition was sponsored by FPC witness Crisp. Mr. Crisp offered direct testimony, exhibits attached to his testimony summarizing the

forecasts, and the historical data, forecast assumptions, and the regression models used to create the projected system peaks. According to witness Crisp's direct testimony, between the winters of 2002/2003 and 2010/2011, net firm demand is projected to grow from 8,559 MW to 10,190 MW, which represents approximately a two percent annual growth rate. No other witness offered an alternative forecast to that presented by FPC witness Crisp.

FPC's forecast assumptions were drawn from independent sources which we have relied upon in prior power plant siting cases. We find that the regression models used to calculate the projected peak demands conform to accepted economic and statistical practices. We also find that the projected peak demands produced by the models appear to be a reasonable extension of historical trends, and FPC's system demand and energy forecast assumptions and regression models are appropriate.

#### Reserve Margin

PACE questioned whether there is a present need for the Hines Unit 3. PACE argues that FPC has done well over the past with a 15 percent reserve margin and if this margin is maintained, Hines Unit 3 is not needed. Regardless of past experience, however, Order No. PSC-99-2507-S-EU, issued December 22, 1999, in Docket No. 981890-EU, requires Florida's investor owned utilities (IOUs) to increase minimum planning reserve margins to a 20% reserve margin by the summer of 2004. By approving the stipulation proposed by the IOUs and issuing the above Order, we have already determined that 20% is the appropriate reserve margin criteria, and the IOUs are required to utilize this criteria, unless modified in a subsequent proceeding.

To provide reliable service, utilities are required to maintain a margin of generating capacity above the firm demand of their customers (planned reserves). At any given time during the year, some generating plants will be out of service and unavailable due to forced outages, periodic maintenance, refueling of nuclear plants, etc. Therefore, adequate reserves must be available to provide for this unavailable capacity and for higher than projected peak demand due to forecast uncertainty and abnormal weather. The proper forum to address what minimum reserves are necessary should

be in a generic docket, as was previously done, and not in a particular utility's power plant need determination docket.

FPC has relied heavily in the past on demand side management (DSM) to meet its reserve requirements. FPC cannot use DSM as often or with the same duration as physical generation without eventually affecting customer participation levels, as was demonstrated by FPC's customer attrition from its DSM programs in 1998 and 1999. The record indicates FPC's DSM programs are becoming less cost-effective compared to the cost of generation. For these reasons, FPC is attempting to build up its physical reserve percentage.

#### Underfrequency Standard

Hines Unit 3 is planned to be a state-of-the-art gas-fired, combined-cycle power unit with an expected winter rating of 582 megawatts. It will employ a Siemens-Westinghouse generator that replicates FPC's Hines Unit 2. Our staff had expressed concerns about the "trip point" of the Hines generator, where it could cease operation at 58 Hz with zero time delay. FPC has agreed to not connect Hines Unit 3 to the transmission grid unless the unit complies with the Florida Reliability Coordinating Council (FRCC) underfrequency standards. According to FPC, a FRCC study is underway to determine any potential reliability impacts. The unit has a relay switch that can be modified to achieve the necessary criterion established by the FRCC. This change could be accomplished for little or no cost. Also, FPC could comply with the FRCC standard by shedding load in the case of an underfrequency event. In addition, FPC, through witness Murphy, commits to the Commission that Hines Unit 3 will be in compliance with the FRCC's underfrequency generator interconnection requirements when the unit is brought on-line in 2005. In the unlikely event that Hines Unit 3 does not comply with the FRCC underfrequency standards or a load shedding equivalence cannot be found, we will address whether FPC or its customers should bear any of the resulting incremental cost.

In summary, we find that FPC's load forecast is reasonable. FPC's projected reserve margin in the winter of 2005/2006 is 17 percent if Hines Unit 3 is not brought into service, and therefore FPC will violate its 20 percent minimum reserve margin in the winter of 2005/06. FPC projects that the growth in winter peak

demand will average approximately 159 MW a year from 2002/03 to 2006/07, with a projected peak in 2006/07 of 9,195 MW. FPC has projected a growth in winter peak demand of 416 MW for the period 2004/05 to 2006/07. Therefore, we find that Hines Unit 3 will be needed by December 2005, to maintain FPC's electric system reliability and integrity.

THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE ELECTRICITY AT A REASONABLE COST

FPC has demonstrated that Hines Unit 3 will improve projected reserve margins and will result in FPC meeting its minimum 20% reserve margin criteria, as discussed above. If Hines Unit 3 is not brought into service, winter reserve margins for the years 2005/06 and 2006/07 would be 17 percent and 14 percent, respectively. This would result in a violation of the 20 percent minimum reserve criterion.

Hines Unit 3 is planned to be a state-of-the-art gas-fired, combined-cycle power unit consisting of two combustion turbines, two unfired heat recovery steam generators, one steam turbine, and a recirculating water cooling system. The unit is a dual-fuel generation system, meaning that the combustion turbines can be operated on natural gas or distillate oil. Natural gas is the primary fuel. Hines Unit 3 is projected to operate at capacity factors in the range of 50 - 60 percent.

The total installed cost for Hines Unit 3 is projected to be approximately \$258,000,000 or \$443/kW. Hines Unit 3 is located at the Hines Energy Complex (HEC) on an 8200 acre site in southwest Polk County, Florida. The location of Hines Unit 3 at the HEC provides economies of scale by using existing infrastructure at the site.

By building Hines Unit 3 at the HEC instead of contracting with one of the bidders, FPC is able to take advantage of the existing access roads, cooling pond, reclaimed water supply pipeline, water treatment and wastewater disposal facilities, gas laterals, transmission facilities, and other site facilities. The location of Hines Unit 3 at HEC will save FPC the site development cost that otherwise would have been incurred. As a result, the Company and its ratepayers will save additional engineering and construction costs. In addition, FPC's equipment contract with

Siemens Westinghouse plays a critical role in the cost advantage Hines Unit 3 enjoys over the RFP respondents. FPC originally contracted with Siemens Westinghouse to provide the equipment for Hines Unit 1. An option for additional units was included with favorable pricing discounts if FPC were to place those units in service by a certain date. Therefore, these factors give Hines Unit 3 a cost advantage over other generating technologies and alternatives evaluated pursuant to FPC's RFP. The existing infrastructure and contractor discounts result in Hines Unit 3 providing electricity at a reasonable cost due to it being the most cost-effective alternative.

PACE argued that there is no present need for the Hines Unit 3, but for a voluntary stipulation entered into by FPC to increase its reserve margin from 15% to 20%. This argument has been addressed above. In addition, PACE argued that the unit is not economic, and adding it in 2005 will raise the average cost of electricity delivered by FPC. The record evidence presented, however, indicates the Hines Unit 3 is approximately \$90 million less expensive than the next best proposal.

We find that FPC has chosen a proven technology, and has experience with the construction and operation of combine-cycle units. We find that the estimated costs are reasonable. Therefore, we find that Hines Unit 3 will contribute to the provision of adequate electricity at a reasonable cost.

COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 25-22.082, FLORIDA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

In accordance with Rule 25-22.082(3) Florida Administrative Code, FPC published notices in newspapers of state and national circulation on various dates between November 20-22, 2001. The notices provided a general description of FPC's next planned generating unit, the name and address of the contact person from whom an RFP package may be requested, and the schedule of critical dates for the RFP process. Fifty-five entities that had previously expressed an interest in other RFPs in the State of Florida were sent an electronic copy of the public notice, via e-mail.

In accordance with Rule 25-22.082(2) and (4), Florida Administrative Code, on November 26, 2001, FPC issued its RFP package to evaluate supply-side alternatives to its next planned

generating unit. FPC also filed the RFP package with the Commission on December 20, 2001. On February 12, 2002, FPC received proposals from seven bidders. FPC labeled the bidders A thru G. Five of the seven proposals were Greenfield Proposals (new generation) and two were System Power Proposals. In accordance with the RFP, FPC informed each of the seven bidders of various deficiencies in their proposals. Witness Roeder stated that five of the seven bidders submitted clarification and additional information sufficient to pass the Threshold Requirements screening process. Two of the proposals (Bidders A and G) were deficient in meeting the information requirement of the RFP and were eliminated from the RFP process. The next phase of the RFP process involved the economic evaluation process. FPC's economic analysis showed that all five proposals had present worth costs that were close to each other. According to witness Roeder, FPC passed all five proposals on to the RFP optimization analysis. The purpose of the optimization analysis was to develop an optimal resource plan for each bidder's proposal. The optimization analysis was performed for a period of 25 years to capture all the costs associated with each alternative. The PROVIEW optimization model was used to assess the impact of each proposal on total system costs. The PROVIEW optimization analysis showed that Hines Unit 3 to be approximately \$90 million less expensive than the least-cost proposal (Bidder E). None of the five proposals were eliminated in the evaluation process based on economics.

The results of the Technical Evaluation in the RFP process showed that four of the five proposals were technically viable. Bidder B's proposal failed to meet two of the Minimum Evaluation Requirements in the environmental category. Furthermore, Bidder B also failed to demonstrate site control and did not provide a transmission plan, both of which were Threshold Requirements. Thus, Bidder B was not placed on the short list. The four remaining bidders (Bidders C, D, E, and F) were notified on April 29, 2002, that they were placed on the short list. These bidders were provided with a list of questions for clarification or additional information derived from the technical evaluation of their proposals. The bidders were given 10 days to provide answers to the questions. At the same time FPC informed the bidders that FPC was lowering the cost estimate for Hines Unit 3 and that each of them could submit a revised bid. The bidders were given the new lower value for the Hines Unit 3 cost estimate. FPC encouraged



the bidders to "sharpen their pencils" to see if they could reduce the price in their proposals. The bidders were given ten days to submit new prices. No bidder revised its prices within that time. However, Bidder D proposed a lower priced proposal 10 days after the expiration of the 10-day time limit. FPC used this new submittal in its detailed evaluation of the Bidder D proposal.

FPC performed a self-assessment of Hines Unit 3, and ranked it among the proposals on the short list during the final technical evaluation. The technical evaluation included permitting certainty, financial viability, commercial operation date certainty, bidder experience, etc. The results of the evaluation showed that Hines Unit 3 was ranked either first or second among the proposals. In terms of cumulative present worth of revenue requirements, the evaluation showed Hines Unit 3 to be over \$92 million (2002 dollars) less expensive than the present worth cost of the lowest cost bidder (Bidder E). Hines unit 3 was found to be more than \$187 million (2002 dollars) less expensive than the least-cost Greenfield proposal (Bidder D).

PACE argues that FPC did not perform an "apples to apples" comparison when considering the costs of outside proposals with that of Hines unit 3 in evaluating the respondents' bids. The costs that PACE cited are associated with Hines Unit 3 cooling water. FPC's witness Roeder testified that cooling water costs (the amount of water consumed by Hines unit 3) are part of the variable plant O&M cost. FPC knew what those costs are for Hines Unit 1, and assumed the same costs for Hines Unit 3 in terms of dollars per megawatt hour. Witness Roeder also stated that existing facilities at HEC (cooling pond, oil storage facilities, roads, etc.) are not included in the incremental cost to build Hines Unit 3 because these are sunk costs. FPC included the O&M costs related to those facilities that are shared by Hines 3 such as oil stored into the tanks and water usage.

PACE also argues that the record supports the conclusion that the FPC evaluation team considered whether a bidder's proposal would facilitate development of a merchant plant, which would constitute an evaluation criterion that was not disclosed to bidders in the RFP. We find that the record does not support this conclusion. While there are two brief references to "merchant plants" in a document, the record is devoid of evidence that FPC

considered this in any way in evaluating the proposals. PACE's further argument, that FPC used a double standard of requiring bidders to have a firm fuel transport contract, while not having one itself, is not supported by the record. To the contrary, the record indicates that FPC did not disqualify any bidder for failing to have a firm fuel transport contract.

In summary, prior to filing its petition for determination of need for an electrical power plant, FPC provided timely notification of the issuance of the RFP by publishing notices in major newspapers, periodicals, and trade publications to ensure statewide and national circulation. FPC then issued a RFP which has met or exceeded the minimum requirements of Rule 25-22.082(4), Florida Administrative Code. The RFP contains a detailed technical description of the utility's next planned generating unit on which the RFP is based, as well as the financial assumptions and the parameters associated with it. FPC received seven proposals in response to the RFP. FPC evaluated these supply-side alternatives to its next planned generating unit (Hines Unit 3).

We find that the bidders were treated fairly and consistently by FPC during the RFP process. As discussed below, Hines Unit 3 is the least-cost alternative when compared to the RFP proposals. Therefore, we find that FPC has met the requirement of Commission Rule 25-22.082, Florida Administrative Code.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS AS USED IN SECTION 403.519, FLORIDA STATUTES

FPC used an integrated resource planning process to evaluate FPC's need for power and available alternatives, including DSM in order to determine its Integrated Optimal Plan. FPC evaluated a variety of traditional and non-traditional supply sources using a commercially available computerized costing model named PROVIEW. The most cost-effective supply resource plans (or combinations) were evaluated, resulting in a ranking of various generation plans by system revenue requirement. Generally the generation plan with the lowest cumulative present worth revenue requirements (CPWRR) over the study period is chosen as the Base Generation Plan.

FPC plans to build Hines Unit 3 at the HEC. That site contains the Hines 1 combined-cycle generation unit and associated facilities. Hines 2 is currently under construction with an

expected commercial operation date in December 2003. Hines Unit 3 will share many of the existing facilities at the site with Hines 1 and 2.

Equipment/site Impacts

The total cost of Hines Unit 3 is approximately \$231 million (excluding AFUDC) in actual dollars. AFUDC is estimated to be approximately \$27 million, giving it a total installed cost of \$258 million. This cost was developed on the basis of replicating the design and layout of Hines Unit 2. The project cost for Hines Unit 3 reflects competitive equipment pricing because FPC was able to negotiate and preserve beneficial combustion turbine equipment pricing and other favorable contract terms and conditions with Siemens Westinghouse and Gemma Power Systems. In addition, FPC also has a cost advantage over the RFP respondents because it plans to site Hines Unit 3 on the existing HEC in Polk County. This will require minimal additional site preparation costs compared to a greenfield site which five of the seven bidders were proposing.

FPC's Integrated Resource Planning process established a resource plan with Hines Unit 3, with an in-service date of December 2005, as the least cost plan. This analysis was based on FPC's internal review of alternative technologies, as well as DSM, for meeting FPC's need for power. Once this plan was finalized, FPC issued its RFP in November, 2001. As discussed above, FPC received proposals from seven bidders. Five of the seven proposals were greenfield proposals (new generation at new sites) and two were system power proposals. There were four proposals that were put on the Short List and compared to FPC's self-build alternative, Hines Unit 3. FPC performed a significant amount of analysis, evaluating the price and non-price attributes of the four alternatives. The final analysis showed Hines Unit 3 to be approximately \$92 million (2002 dollars) less expensive than the least-cost alternative. The lowest cost greenfield proposal (another combined-cycle plant) was found to be more than \$187 million (2002 dollars) more expensive than Hines Unit 3. For the foregoing reasons, we find that Hines Unit 3 is the most cost effective alternative over the 25 years during which FPC's ratepayers will be obligated for the cost of the unit.

CONSERVATION

We approved FPC's DSM Goals and DSM plan in Docket Nos. 971005-EG and 991789-EG, respectively. These cost-effective DSM programs include both dispatchable and non-dispatchable DSM resources. FPC's DSM programs have successfully met our established DSM goals and if FPC achieves its future goals, then there appears to be very little additional conservation measures that can be taken by or reasonably available which might mitigate the need for the proposed power plant. FPC cannot avoid the need to build Hines Unit 3 by relying much more than they have on load management or any other conservation measures. FPC made the decision to seek permission to build Hines Unit 3 after screening various other supply-side and demand-side alternatives as part of FPC's resource planning process and then through conducting an RFP process. We find there are no additional cost-effective conservation measures available that might mitigate FPC's need for Hines Unit 3.

FUEL COMMODITY AND TRANSPORTATION

At the present time there are no signed firm natural gas supply or transportation contracts in place. FPC witness Pamela Murphy indicated, however, that FPC is confident that it will be able to arrange for all of the firm gas transportation service it will require for Hines Unit 3 in time to meet the expected in-service date for that unit. In addition, witness Pamela Murphy stated that FPC has relationships with a number of gas producers and marketers, and are confident that they will be able to negotiate a contract at competitive prices closer to the in-service date. It would not be cost-effective to execute those contracts now since most suppliers would require significant up-front and standby payments to reserve supply this far in advance.

The Hines Energy Complex is currently being served with natural gas for the Hines Unit 1, and in order to place Hines Unit 2 in service by December, 2003, additional fuel will be required. In order to supply fuel to Hines Unit 3, it will only be necessary to add the laterals to the plant from the existing pipeline. Given that FPC currently has fuel supplies for both Hines 1 and Hines 2, we find fuel commodity will be available to meet the needs of Hines Unit 3.

PACE asserts that FPC has not adequately ensured the supply and transportation of fuel to serve Hines Unit 3 because no contract has yet been signed. It is appropriate for FPC to gain regulatory approval for a generating unit prior to signing a firm gas transportation contract. The preponderance of the evidence indicated that FPC will not have difficulty acquiring fuel commodity or transportation. For the reasons stated herein, we find that FPC has adequately ensured the availability of fuel commodity and transportation to serve Hines Unit 3.

#### CONCLUSION

We find FPC's petition for determination of need for Hines Unit 3 meets the statutory requirements of Section 403.519, Florida Statutes, as discussed previously and summarized here:

- Hines Unit 3 will help ensure that FPC does not violate our approved stipulation to increase reserves to at least 20 percent by the summer of 2004.
- Hines Unit 3 will allow for a transition from reliance on load management to generation for reserves.
- The equipment supply arrangements for Hines Unit 3 provides a benefit to FPC's ratepayers.
- FPC's evaluation of alternative supply options, DSM options, and its RFP analysis shows Hines Unit 3 to be the most cost-effective option in the short-term and over the long-term.
- There are no conservation measures taken by or reasonably available to FPC which might mitigate the need for the proposed power plant.

Therefore, FPC's petition for determination of need for Hines Unit 3 is granted.

Based upon the foregoing, it is

ORDER NO. PSC-03-0175-FOF-EI  
DOCKET NO. 020953-EI  
PAGE 14

ORDERED by the Florida Public Service Commission that Florida Power Corporation's Petition to determine need for the Hines Unit 3 power plant in Polk County is hereby granted. It is further

ORDERED that this Docket shall be closed.

By ORDER of the Florida Public Service Commission this 4th day of February, 2003.

BLANCA S. BAYÓ, Director  
Division of the Commission Clerk  
and Administrative Services

By: Kay Flynn  
Kay Flynn, Chief  
Bureau of Records and Hearing  
Services

( S E A L )

LDH

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.

ORDER NO. PSC-03-0175-FOF-EI  
DOCKET NO. 020953-EI  
PAGE 15

Any party adversely affected by the Commission's final action in this matter may request: 1) reconsideration of the decision by filing a motion for reconsideration with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850, within five (5) days of the issuance of this order in the form prescribed by Rule 25-22.060, 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 and/or wastewater utility by filing a notice of appeal with the Director, Division of the Commission Clerk and Administrative Services and filing a copy of the notice of appeal and the filing fee with the appropriate court. This filing must be completed within thirty (30) days after the issuance of this order, pursuant to Rule 9.110, Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure. The notice of appeal must be in the form specified in Rule 9.900(a), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.