

VOTE SHEET

DATE: February 7, 1995

RE: DOCKET NO. 940109-WU - Petition for interim and permanent rate increase in Franklin County by St. George Island Utility Company, Ltd.

Issue 1: Should the Commission grant OPC's motion to strike Attachment 3 to St. George's motion for reconsideration?

Recommendation: Yes. The attachment is not part of the record and cannot be considered by the Commission in any regard.

APPROVED

Issue 2: Should the Commission grant OPC's motion to strike St. George's reply to OPC's response to St. George's motion for reconsideration?

Recommendation: No. Although the Commission's rules do not expressly authorize the reply, they also do not expressly forbid it. ~~Further, the reply will not work to prejudice any other party.~~

MODIFIED

Approved with deletion of last sentence.

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: DS KS

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

June K. Kuss
J. Terry Deas

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

PSC/RAR33 (5/90)

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01409 FEB-7 95

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Vote Sheet
Docket No. 940109-WU
February 7, 1995

Issue 3: Should the Commission reject St. George's allegations that Staff is a party and that the utility is adversely affected by the Commission's final decision?

Recommendation: Yes.

APPROVED

Issue 4: Should the Commission grant the Utility's motion for reconsideration regarding a duplication of a pro forma CIAC adjustment?

Recommendation: No.

APPROVED

Issue 5: Should the Commission grant the Utility's motion for reconsideration matching the property contribution to CIAC with the corresponding investment in plant in service?

Recommendation: No.

APPROVED

Issue 6: Should the Commission reconsider its decision regarding the cost of lines located within the State Park in the original cost calculation and, if so, is a \$27,873 reduction to CIAC required?

Recommendation: No. No adjustment is necessary.

APPROVED

Issue 7: Should the Commission reconsider its disallowance of duplicative engineering design fees?

Recommendation: No. St. George has not identified any error or omission of fact or law in this regard.

APPROVED

Issue 8: Should the Commission reconsider its disallowance of travel expense for Tallahassee-based utility employees?

Recommendation: No. St. George has not identified any error or omission of fact or law in this regard.

APPROVED

Issue 9: Should the Commission reconsider its decision regarding fees for legal contractual service?

Recommendation: No. St. George has not identified any error or omission of fact or law in this regard.

APPROVED

Issue 10: Should the Commission grant St. George's motion for reconsideration of the original cost of the utility?

Recommendation: No. St. George has not identified any error or omission of fact or law in this regard.

APPROVED

Issue 11: Should the Commission grant OPC's cross-motion for reconsideration?

Recommendation: To the extent that it is legally significant, the Commission may wish to reconsider the justification for disallowing fees for TMB Associates. However, to the extent that OPC's cross-motion for reconsideration relates to the issue of original cost, it should be rejected because OPC has not identified any error or omission of fact or law.

APPROVED

Vote sheet
Docket No. 940109-WU
February 7, 1995

Issue 12: Should the Commission grant the Utility's motion for extension of time up to and including February 1, 1995 to complete and file the permit application and fire protection study as ordered in PSC-94-1383-FOF-WU?
Recommendation: Yes.

APPROVED

Issue 13: Should this docket be closed?
Recommendation: No.

APPROVED