

53. Bradford County has standing as the applicant for the Exemption. *Ft. Myers Real Estate Holdings, LLC v. Dep't of Bus. & Prof'l Reg.*, 53 So. 3d 1158, 1162 (Fla. 1st DCA 2011); *Maverick Media Group v. Dep't of Transp.*, 791 So. 2d 491, 492 (Fla. 1st DCA 2001).

Nature of the Proceeding

54. This is a de novo proceeding, intended to formulate final agency action and not to review action taken earlier and preliminarily. § 120.57(1)(k), Fla. Stat; *Young v. Dep't of Cmty. Aff.*, 625 So. 2d 831, 833 (Fla. 1993); *Hamilton Cty. Bd. of Cty. Comm'rs v. Dep't of Env'tl. Reg.*, 587 So. 2d 1378, 1387 (Fla. 1st DCA 1991); *McDonald v. Dep't of Banking & Fin.*, 346 So. 2d 569, 584 (Fla. 1st DCA 1977).

Burden and Standard of Proof

55. Section 120.569(2)(p) provides that:

For any proceeding arising under chapter 373, chapter 378, or chapter 403, if a nonapplicant petitions as a third party to challenge an agency's issuance of a license, permit, or conceptual approval, the order of presentation in the proceeding is for the permit applicant to present a prima facie case demonstrating entitlement to the license, permit, or conceptual approval, followed by the agency. This demonstration may be made by entering into evidence the application and relevant material submitted to the agency in support of the application, and the agency's staff report or notice of intent to approve the permit, license, or conceptual approval. Subsequent to the presentation of the applicant's prima facie case and any direct evidence submitted by the agency, the petitioner initiating the action challenging the issuance of the permit, license, or conceptual approval has the burden of ultimate persuasion and has the burden of going forward to prove the case in opposition to the license, permit, or