

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Petition for a limited proceeding to
approve large load tariff, by Duke Energy
Florida, LLC.

DOCKET NO. 20250113-EI
ORDER NO. PSC-2025-0446-PCO-EI
ISSUED: December 10, 2025

ORDER GRANTING PETITION TO INTERVENE
FOR FLORIDA INDUSTRIAL POWER USERS GROUP

On September 5, 2025, Duke Energy Florida, LLC (DEF or Utility) filed a petition to approve a new Large Load Customer (LLC-1) rate schedule and corresponding agreements and policies. Discovery guidelines, hearing procedures, and controlling dates were established by the Order Establishing Procedure, Order No. PSC-2025-0430-PCO-EI,¹ issued on November 21, 2025. This docket is currently scheduled for hearing on April 8, 2026.

Petition for Intervention

On November 25, 2025, the Florida Industrial Power Users Group (FIPUG) filed a Petition to Intervene (Petition) in this proceeding. According to its Petition, FIPUG is an association consisting of industrial and commercial users of electricity within DEF's service territory. FIPUG further states that the cost of electricity constitutes a significant portion of its members' overall costs of production. FIPUG asserts that its members require adequate, reasonably priced electricity in order to compete within their respective markets. As such, FIPUG contends that the substantial interests of its members will be directly affected by the Commission's action taken in this docket. No party has filed an objection² to FIPUG's Petition and the time for doing so has expired.

Standards 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 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 three-prong standing test set forth in Florida Home Builders Association v. Department of Labor and Employment Security, 412 So. 2d 351, 353-54 (Fla. 1982), and Farmworker Rights Organization, Inc. v. Department of Health

¹ As modified by Order No. PSC-2025-0430A-PCO-EI.

² On December 9, 2025, DEF untimely filed a response to FIPUG's Petition to clarify that its lack of objection to the intervention "is not a concession that the issues [FIPUG] include[d in its Petition] are appropriate."

and Rehabilitative Services, 417 So. 2d 753, 754 (Fla. 1st DCA 1982), which is based on the basic standing principles established in Agrico Chemical Company v. Department of Environmental Regulation, 406 So. 2d 478, 481-82 (Fla. 2d DCA 1981).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. Fla. Home Builders, 412 So. 2d at 353-54; Farmworker Rights Org., 417 So. 2d at 754.

Analysis and Ruling

With respect to the first prong of the associational standing test established in Florida Home Builders, FIPUG asserts that its members are electric customers of DEF and that its members' substantial interests will be directly affected by the Commission's decision on DEF's petition. With respect to the second prong, the subject matter of the proceeding appears to be within FIPUG's general scope of interest and activity. FIPUG is an association whose members are retail consumers of DEF. FIPUG contends that its members will be directly affected by the outcome of this docket. As for the third prong, FIPUG is seeking intervention in this docket in order to represent the interests of its members in this rate proceeding. Based on the foregoing analysis, FIPUG's standing in this docket has been established.

Based on the foregoing, FIPUG has made allegations sufficient to meet the three-prong associational standing test established in Florida Home Builders and its petition to intervene shall be granted subject to proof of standing or stipulations that there are sufficient facts to support all elements for standing. See Delgado v. Agency for Health Care Admin., 237 So. 3d 432, 437 (Fla. 1st DCA 2018) (proper pretrial stipulations to the facts supporting all elements of standing are binding upon the parties and the court). As an intervenor, FIPUG takes the case as it finds it.

Based on the above representations, it is

ORDERED by Commissioner Gary F. Clark, as Prehearing Officer, that the Motion to Intervene filed by the 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

³ Under Agrico, 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) the 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. 406 So. 2d 478 at 482. 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. 3d 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).

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.
Karen A. Putnal
Moyle Law Firm, P.A.
118 North Gadsden Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(850) 681-3828
jmoyle@moylelaw.com
kputnal@moylelaw.com
mqualls@moylelaw.com

By ORDER of Commissioner Gary F. Clark, as Prehearing Officer, this 10th day of December, 2025.



GARY F. CLARK
Commissioner 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.

MRT

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.