

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 28, 2000

RE: DOCKET NO. 991437-WU - Application for increase in water rates in Orange County by Wedgefield Utilities, Inc. (Deferred from the 11/7/00 Commission Conference and revised recommendation filed.)

Issue 1: Should Wedgefield's Motion for Summary Final Order be granted?
Recommendation: Yes, Wedgefield's Motion for Summary Final Order should be granted.

DENIED *without prejudice*

COMMISSIONERS ASSIGNED: DS JB BZ

COMMISSIONERS' SIGNATURES

MAJORITY

DISSENTING

[Handwritten signatures in majority column]

[Empty lines in dissenting column]

REMARKS/DISSENTING COMMENTS:

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

~~XXXXXX~~ DEC-18

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

VOOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 28, 2000

DOCKET NO. 991437-WU - Application for increase in water rates in Orange County by Wedgefield Utilities, Inc. (Deferred from the 11/7/00 Commission Conference and revised recommendation filed.)

(Continued from previous page)

Issue 2: Should Wedgefield's Motion to Amend its Motion to Strike and Dismiss be granted? If so, 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: If the Commission approves staff's recommendation in Issue 1 above, then no ruling is necessary on the Motion to Amend Wedgefield's Motion to Strike and Dismiss and Wedgefield's Motion to Strike and Dismiss because they are moot. However, if the Commission denies the utility's Motion for Summary Final Order, then Wedgefield's Motion to Amend its Motion to Strike and Dismiss and its Motion to Strike and Dismiss should also be denied.

DENIED

Consistent with vote in issue 1. Wedgefield's Motion to Strike and Dismiss was denied. The Motion to Amend and take official notice of the Wedgefield order was approved.

Issue 3: Should the Commission accept Wedgefield's settlement offer contained in its response to Order No. PSC-00-1528-PAA-WU, which required the utility to show cause as to why it should not be fined \$3,000 for its apparent violation of Rule 25-30.115, Florida Administrative Code, and Order No. PSC-97-0531-FOF-WU?

Recommendation: Yes. The Commission should accept Wedgefield's settlement offer contained in its response to Order No. PSC-00-1528-PAA-WU, which required the utility to show cause as to why it should not be fined \$3,000 for its apparent violation of Rule 25-30.115, Florida Administrative Code, and Order No. PSC-97-0531-FOF-WU. The utility should be ordered to correct any remaining areas of noncompliance with the USOA by January 31, 2001. Therefore, staff also recommends that the \$3,000 fine be permanently suspended. Further, the utility and its parent should be ordered to file, in future proceedings before this Commission, MFRs which begin with utility book balances, and to show all adjustments to book balances after the "per book" column in the MFRs. The utility should also be ordered to file, with its MFRs, a statement which affirms that the MFRs begin with actual book balances.

APPROVED

VOTE SHEET

NOVEMBER 28, 2000

DOCKET NO. 991437-WU - Application for increase in water rates in Orange County by Wedgefield Utilities, Inc. (Deferred from the 11/7/00 Commission Conference and revised recommendation filed.)

(Continued from previous page)

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.

APPROVED