

**BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In re: Petition for determination that the Osprey Plant acquisition or, alternatively, the Suwannee Simple Cycle Project is the most cost effective generation alternative to meet remaining need prior to 2018, by Duke Energy Florida, Inc.

---

DOCKET NO.: 150043-EI

FILED: February 25, 2015

**FLORIDA INDUSTRIAL POWER USERS GROUP'S  
PETITION TO INTERVENE**

Pursuant to sections 120.569, 120.57, Florida Statutes, and rules 25-22.039, 28-106.201 and 28-106.205, Florida Administrative Code, the Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG), through its undersigned counsel, files its Petition to Intervene. In support thereof, FIPUG states the following:

1. Name and address of agency. The affected agency is the Florida Public Service Commission, 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850.

2. Name and address of Petitioner. The name and address of the Petitioner is:

Florida Industrial Power Users Group  
c/o Moyle Law Firm, P.A.  
118 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
Telephone: (850) 681-3828  
Facsimile: (850) 681-8788

3. Petitioner's representatives. Copies of all pleadings, notices and orders in this docket should be provided to:

Jon C. Moyle, Jr.  
Karen A. Putnal  
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.  
118 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
Telephone: (850) 681-3828

Facsimile: (850) 681-8788  
[jmoyle@moylelaw.com](mailto:jmoyle@moylelaw.com)  
[kputnal@moylelaw.com](mailto:kputnal@moylelaw.com)

4. Notice of docket. Petitioner received notice of this docket by an informal communication and a subsequent review of the Commission's website.

5. Statement of Substantial Interests. FIPUG is an ad hoc association consisting of industrial users of electricity in Florida. The cost of electricity constitutes a significant portion of FIPUG members' overall costs of production. FIPUG members require adequate, reasonably-priced electricity in order to compete in their respective markets.

6. Duke requests an affirmative determination that it needs additional generation capacity prior to 2018 and asserts that the Osprey Plant acquisition, or alternatively, the Suwannee Simple Cycle project, is the most cost effective generation alternatives to meet that need. In this proceeding, it is anticipated that the Commission will review the need for electric system reliability and integrity, the need for adequate reasonable cost electricity, the need for fuel diversity and supply reliability, the cost-effectiveness of Duke's proposals compared to alternatives available, and whether renewable energy sources and technologies, as well as conservation measures, are utilized to the extent reasonably available. Numerous FIPUG members, as large retail customers of Duke, will be required to fund the costs of the proposed Osprey Plant acquisition, or alternatively, the Suwannee Simple Cycle project in rates if either project is approved by the Commission. Consequently, FIPUG members will be directly and substantially affected by the outcome of these proceedings. FIPUG has associational standing and should be permitted to intervene.

7. FIPUG's interests are of the type that this proceeding is designed to protect. *See, Agricola Chemical Company v. Department of Environmental Regulation*, 406 So.2d 478 (Fla. 2nd

DCA 1981). The purpose of the proceeding is to evaluate Duke's requests and determine the merits of those requests. Thus, the purpose of the proceeding coincides with numerous FIPUG members' substantial interests, which is to ensure that the rates they pay to Duke are just and reasonable.

8. Disputed Issues of Material Fact. Disputed issues of material fact include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) What is Duke's need, if any, for additional generation capacity before 2018?
- (b) Whether, if such a need exists, Duke's proposed Osprey Plant acquisition, or alternatively, Suwannee Simple Cycle project is the most cost effective method of satisfying its need considering the need for electric system reliability and integrity, the need for adequate electricity at a reasonable cost, the need for fuel diversity and supply reliability, whether Duke's proposal is the most cost-effective alternative available, and whether renewable energy sources and technologies, as well as conservation measures, are utilized to the extent reasonably available.
- (c) What is the scope and breath of Duke's request for a commission prudence determination and is any such prudence determination limited to such issue(s)?
- (d) FIPUG reserves the right to raise additional disputed issues in this proceeding.

9. Disputed Legal Issues. None at this time.

10. Statement of Ultimate Facts Alleged. Alleged ultimate facts include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (e) What is Duke's need, if any, for additional generation capacity before 2018.
- (f) Whether Duke's proposed Osprey Plant acquisition, or alternatively, the Suwannee Simple Cycle project is the most cost effective method of satisfying any need Duke may have before 2018?

Additional alleged ultimate facts may be identified in the course of these proceedings.

11. Rules and statutes justifying relief. FIPUG is entitled to relief under the following

legal authorities: Sections 120.569 and 120.57(1), Florida Statutes, and Rules 25-22.039, 25-22.080 and 25-22.082, Florida Administrative Code.

12. Position of Duke regarding FIPUG's petition to intervene. The undersigned is authorized to represent that Duke does not object to FIPUG being granted full party status as an intervenor in this case.

**WHEREFORE**, FIPUG requests that the Commission enter an order allowing it to intervene and participate as a full party in this docket.

*/s/ Jon C. Moyle*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jon C. Moyle, Jr.  
Karen A. Putnal  
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.  
118 North Gadsden Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301  
Telephone: (850)681-3828  
Facsimile: (850)681-8788  
[jmoyle@moylelaw.com](mailto:jmoyle@moylelaw.com)  
[kputnal@moylelaw.com](mailto:kputnal@moylelaw.com)

Attorneys for Florida Industrial Power Users Group

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Florida Industrial Power Users Group's Petition to Intervene has been furnished by electronic mail this 25th day of February, 2015, to the following:

Charles Murphy  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
[cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us](mailto:cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us)

Matthew R. Bernier  
Duke Energy Florida  
106 East College Avenue, Suite 800  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
[matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com](mailto:matthew.bernier@duke-energy.com)

J. Michael Walls  
Blaise N. Gamba  
Carlton Law Firm  
4221 W. Boy Scout Blvd., Ste. 1000  
Tampa, FL 33607-5780  
[mwalls@CFJBLaw.com](mailto:mwalls@CFJBLaw.com)

J.R. Kelly, Esq.  
Charles J. Rehwinkel  
Office of Public Counsel  
111 West Madison Street, room 812  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400  
[kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us](mailto:kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us)  
[Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us](mailto:Rehwinkel.charles@leg.state.fl.us)

John T. Burnett  
Diane M. Triplett  
Duke Energy  
P.O. Box 14042 Saint Petersburg, FL 33733  
[john.burnett@duke-energy.com](mailto:john.burnett@duke-energy.com)  
[dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com](mailto:dianne.triplett@duke-energy.com)

Robert Scheffel Wright  
John T. LaVia c/o Gardner Law Firm 1300  
Thomaswood Drive Tallahassee, FL 32308  
[Schef@gbwlegal.com](mailto:Schef@gbwlegal.com)  
[jlavia@gbwlegal.com](mailto:jlavia@gbwlegal.com)

*/s/ Jon C. Moyle*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jon C. Moyle, Jr.