### VOTE SHEET

#### JULY 10, 2001

RE: DOCKET NO. 991437-WU - Application for increase in water rates in Orange County by Wedgefield Utilities, Inc.

ISSUE 1: Should Wedgefield's Motion for Summary Final Order be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Staff recommends that Wedgefield's Motion for Summary

Final Order should be denied.

### **APPROVED**

ISSUE 2: Should Wedgefield's Motion to Strike and Dismiss the Office of Public Counsel's Petition Requesting Section 120.57 Hearing and Protest of Proposed Agency Action be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No. Based on the doctrine of res judicata, Wedgefield's

renewed Motion to Strike and Dismiss should be denied.

# APPROVED as clarified

fact that no new grounds have been raised and that the Commission ruled on this at a prior agenda Conference

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED:	DS JB BZ		added after review	
	COMMISSIONERS'	SIGNATURES	of audio tape.	6.4
MAJORITY	, ·		DISSENTING	8/101
A Jan Dea				
Mulikan				

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08399 JUL 10a

CCA note: Clarification

FPSC-RECORDS MERCRING

VOTE SHEET JULY 10, 2001

DOCKET NO. 991437-WU - Application for increase in water rates in Orange County by Wedgefield Utilities, Inc.

(Continued from previous page)

ISSUE 3: Should Wedgefield's Motion to Strike Portions of Prefiled Direct Testimony of OPC Witnesses Larkin and Biddy be granted?

RECOMMENDATION: No. If the Commission denies Wedgefield's motion for Summary Final Order in Issue 1, Wedgefield's Motion to Strike should also be denied. If Wedgefield's Motion for Summary Final Order is granted, then the Motion to Strike Portions of Prefiled Direct Testimony of OPC Witnesses Larkin and Biddy should also be granted.

### **APPROVED**

ISSUE 4: Should this docket be closed?

RECOMMENDATION: No. This docket should remain open pending a hearing and the Commission's final determination of the issues in dispute.

## ArrkuvED