

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 4, 1997

RE: DOCKET NO.930885-EU - Petition to resolve territorial dispute with Gulf Coast Electric Cooperation, Inc. by Gulf Power Company.

Issue 1: 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?

Recommendation: 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.

DEFERRED

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: JN DS CL

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

*To the 11-18-97
Commissioner Conference*

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

11441 NOV-55

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 4, 1997

DOCKET NO. 930885-EU - Petition to resolve territorial dispute with Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc. by Gulf Power Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: What are the areas in South Washington and Bay Counties where further uneconomic duplication of electric facilities is likely to occur?
Recommendation: 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.

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

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

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 4, 1997

DOCKET NO. 930885-EU - Petition to resolve territorial dispute with Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc. by Gulf Power Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 5: Is each utility capable of providing adequate and reliable electric service to the areas identified in response to Issues 1 and 2?

Recommendation: Yes. Both utilities are capable of providing adequate and reliable electric service to the identified areas.

Issue 6: 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?

Recommendation: To resolve the ongoing dispute in South Washington and Bay Counties, the Commission should establish a territorial boundary between Gulf Power and Gulf Coast consistent with prior orders in this case as well as past Commission practices in reviewing territorial agreements and settling territorial disputes. In addition, the companies should establish detailed procedures and guidelines addressing subtransmission, distribution, and requests for new services.

Issue 7: Where should the territorial boundary be established?

Recommendation: 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.

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 4, 1997

DOCKET NO. 930885-EU - Petition to resolve territorial dispute with Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc. by Gulf Power Company.

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 8: How should the Commission rule on Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative, Inc.'s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law?

Recommendation: The appropriate rulings are detailed in Attachment 1 of staff's 10/23/97 memorandum.

Issue 9: Should this docket be closed?

Recommendation: Yes. This docket should be closed.