FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

52

VOTE SHEET

DECEMBER 16, 1997

RE: DOCKET NO. 930885-EU - Petition to resolve territorial dispute with Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc. by Gulf Power Company. (Deferred from the November 18, 1997 Commission Conference)

<u>Issue 1</u>: What are the areas in South Washington and Bay Counties where the electric facilities of Gulf Power and Gulf Coast are commingled and in close proximity? <u>Recommendation</u>: There are at least 27 areas identified on the listed maps where the electric facilities of Gulf Power and Gulf Coast are commingled and in close proximity. The map numbers are: 2218NE, 2218NW, 2218SE, 2218SW, 2220, 2221, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2518, 2519, 2618, 2533, 2534, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2639, 2731, 2733, 2828NW, 2828SW, 2828NE, 2828SE, 2830NE, 2830NW, and 2830SW.

APPROVED

. •

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: JN DS CL

MAJORITY	DISSENTING Jusium O Clark
Affing warson	
REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:	
	DOCUMENT NUMBURHDATE

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

PSC/HAR33 (5/90)

VOTE'SHEET
DECEMBER 16, 1997
DOCKET NO. 930885-EU - Petition to resolve territorial dispute with Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc. by Gulf Power Company. (Deferred from the Novamber 18, 1997 Commission Conference)

(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 2</u>: What are the areas in South Washington and Bay Counties where further uneconomic duplication of electric facilities is likely to occur? <u>Recommendation</u>: There are at least 27 areas identified on the listed maps where further uneconomic duplication of electric facilities is likely to occur. The map numbers are: 2218NE, 2218NW, 2218SE, 2218SW, 2220, 2221, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2518, 2519, 2618, 2533, 2534, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2639, 2731, 2733, 2828NW, 2828SW, 2828NE, 2828SE, 2830NE, 2830NW, and 2830SW.


Hulf Power's position was adopted as stated in staff's 10/23/97 recommen-tation Commissioner Clark dissented. DENIED

<u>Issue 3</u>: What is the expected customer load, energy, and population growth in the areas identified in response to Issues 1 and 2? <u>Recommendation</u>: The respective company forecasts of load, energy and population growth in the areas identified in response to Issues 1 and 2 are reasonable.

APPROVED

<u>Issue 4</u>: What is the location, purpose, type and capacity of each utility's facilities in the areas identified in response to Issues 1 and 2? <u>Recommendation</u>: The descriptions of the respective distribution facilities, as stated by each company, are reasonable and appropriate.

APPROVED



(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 5</u>: Is each utility capable of providing adequate and reliable electric service to the areas identified in response to Issues 1 and 2? <u>Recommendation</u>: Yes. Both utilities are capable of providing adequate and reliable electric service to the identified areas.


APPROVED

<u>Issue 6</u>: How should the Commission establish the territorial boundary between Gulf Power and Gulf Coast in South Washington and Bay Counties where the electric facilities are commingled and in close proximity and further uneconomic duplication of facilities is likely to occur? <u>Recommendation</u>: <u>To resolve the ongoing dispute in South Washington and Day</u> <u>Sounties</u>, the Commission should establish a territorial boundary between. <u>Gulf Power and Gulf Goast consistent with prior orders in this case as Well</u> as past Commission practices in reviewing territorial agreements and <u>sottling territorial disputes</u>. In addition, the companies should establish detailed procedures and guidelines addressing subtransmission, distribution, and requests for new services within in Macdias.

MODIFIED

<u>Issue 7</u>: Where should the territorial boundary be established? <u>Recommendation</u>: A territorial boundary should be established between Gulf Power and Gulf Coast, as detailed in Exhibit 2. No existing customers should be required to be transferred. Transfer of service will occur only upon change in customer of record or change in use.

ENIED Commissioner Clark dussinted



(Continued from previous page)

<u>Issue 8</u>: How should the Commission rule on Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc.'s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law? <u>Recommendation</u>: The appropriate rulings are detailed in Attachment 1 of staff's 10/23/97 memorandum.

APPROVED

<u>Issue 9</u>: Should this docket be closed? <u>Recommendation</u>: Tes. This docket should be closed. remain open for No Receipt of companies' procedure **MODIFIED MODIFIED**