

Writer's Direct Dial Number: (850) 521-1706  
Writer's E-Mail Address: bkeating@gunster.com

August 27, 2018

**E-PORTAL FILING**

Ms. Carlotta Stauffer, Clerk  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

**Re: Docket No. 20180051 – In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 for Florida Public Utilities Company –Gas.**

Attached for filing, please find the revised Direct Testimony and exhibits of Michael Cassel, the revised Direct Testimony and exhibits of Matthew Dewey, and the Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel on behalf of FPUC-Gas.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing. As always, please don't hesitate to let me know if you have any questions whatsoever.

Kind regards,



---

Beth Keating  
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.  
215 South Monroe St., Suite 601  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
(850) 521-1706

MEK

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

Before the Florida Public Service Commission

Docket No. 20180051-GU

In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act  
of 2017 for Florida Public Utilities Company

Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel

Date of Filing: May 31, 2018

**Revised: August 27, 2018**

**Q. Please state your name and business address.**

A. My name is Michael Cassel. My business address is 1750 South 14<sup>th</sup>  
Street, Suite 200, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034.

**Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

A. I am employed by Florida Public Utilities Company ("FPUC") as the  
Director of Regulatory and Governmental Affairs.

**Q. Please describe your educational background and professional  
experience.**

A. I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting from Delaware  
State University in Dover, Delaware in 1996. I was hired by Chesapeake  
Utilities Corporation ("CUC") as a Senior Regulatory Analyst in March  
2008. As a Senior Regulatory Analyst, I was primarily involved in the  
areas of gas cost recovery, rate of return analysis, and budgeting for  
CUC's Delaware and Maryland natural gas distribution companies. In  
2010, I moved to Florida in the role of Senior Tax Accountant for CUC's

1 Florida business units. Since that time, I have held various management  
2 roles including Manager of the Back Office in 2011, Director of Business  
3 Management in 2012. I am currently the Director of Regulatory and  
4 Governmental Affairs for CUC's Florida business units. In this role, my  
5 responsibilities include directing the regulatory and governmental affairs  
6 for the Company in Florida including regulatory analysis, and reporting  
7 and filings before the Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC") for  
8 FPUC, FPUC-Indiantown, FPUC-Fort Meade, Central Florida Gas, and  
9 Peninsula Pipeline Company. Prior to joining Chesapeake, I was  
10 employed by J.P. Morgan Chase & Company, Inc. from 2006 to 2008 as  
11 a Financial Manager in their card finance group. My primary  
12 responsibility in this position was the development of client specific  
13 financial models and profit loss statements. I was also employed by  
14 Computer Sciences Corporation as a Senior Finance Manager from  
15 1999 to 2006. In this position, I was responsible for the financial  
16 operation of the company's chemical, oil and natural resources business.  
17 This included forecasting, financial close and reporting responsibility, as  
18 well as representing Computer Sciences Corporation's financial interests  
19 in contract/service negotiations with existing and potential clients. From  
20 1996 to 1999, I was employed by J.P. Morgan, Inc., where I had various  
21 accounting/finance responsibilities for the firm's private banking clientele.

22

23 **Q. Have you ever testified before the FPSC?**

24 A. Yes. I've provided written, pre-filed testimony in a variety of the  
25 Company's annual proceedings, including the Fuel and Purchased  
26 Power Cost Recovery Clause for our electric division, Docket No.

1           20160001-EI, and the Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program (“GRIP”)  
2           Cost Recovery Factors proceeding, Docket No. 20160199-GU for FPUC  
3           and our sister company, the Florida Division of Chesapeake Utilities  
4           Corporation. Most recently, I provided written, pre-filed testimony in  
5           FPUC’s electric Limited Proceeding, Docket No. 20170150-EI.

6

7   **Q.    What is the purpose of your testimony?**

8    A.    I will explain and support FPUC’s natural gas proposal for disposition of  
9           tax benefits related to the Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (“2017  
10           Tax Act”).

11

12   **Q.    Are you sponsoring any exhibits in this case?**

13   A.    Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibits NGMC-1 (revised) and NGMC-2, which  
14           provide a summary of FPUC’s natural gas proposed treatments of the  
15           impacts resulting from the 2017 Tax Act.

16

17   I.    FPUC’s PROPOSAL

18

19   **Q.    Is FPUC subject to a settlement that includes provisions addressing**  
20           **the 2017 Tax Act?**

21   A.    No, FPUC is not subject to any settlement including provisions  
22           addressing the 2017 Tax Act. As such, by Order No. PSC-2018-0104-  
23           PCO-PU, the Commission asserted jurisdiction over the subject matter of  
24           responsive tax adjustments effective on the date of the Commission’s  
25           vote, February 6, 2018 (“Jurisdictional Date”).

1

2 **Q. Could you please identify the components of the 2017 Tax Act**  
3 **being addressed by FPUC in this proposal?**

4 A. The components of the 2017 Tax Act being addressed by FPUC are: 1)  
5 the federal rate change from 35% to 21%; 2) the Unprotected Deferred  
6 Tax Liability and Tax Asset; and 3) the Protected Deferred Tax Liability.

7

8 **Q. What is the impact of the federal income tax rate change from 35%**  
9 **to 21% resulting from the 2017 Tax Act?**

10 A. For FPUC, the annual tax savings amount associated with the tax rate  
11 change, based on the 2018 proforma surveillance report, is estimated to  
12 be approximately \$2,181,275.

13

14 **Q. How does FPUC propose that this amount be addressed?**

15 A. At present, the Company is not over-earning and is projected to be  
16 earning at the bottom of its range for the foreseeable future. As such,  
17 the Company should be allowed to retain the annual tax benefit  
18 excluding the portion related to the GRIP, for purposes of addressing  
19 ongoing, incremental costs that have been incurred since the Company's  
20 last base rate increase. This amount is \$1,141,134. This will enable the  
21 Company to earn within, or near, its allowed range until its next base rate  
22 increase while continuing to make additional investments in  
23 infrastructure. The Company does believe that the tax savings

1 associated with GRIP investments should be returned to customers as  
2 discussed in more detail on page seven of my testimony.

3

4 **Q. What are the different components to the Unprotected Deferred Tax**  
5 **balance and the proposed treatment?**

6 A. FPUC has a regulatory liability and asset recorded on its balance sheet  
7 for the Unprotected Deferred Tax at a rate of 35% consistent with the  
8 applicable law prior to the 2017 Tax Act. At the implementation of the  
9 new tax rate, the Company is only required to pay those taxes out at  
10 21%.

11 Exhibit NGMC-1 (revised) demonstrates the impact of these calculations.  
12 There are two distinct components of the Unprotected Deferred Tax  
13 balance.

14 The first component is a deferred tax liability associated with the  
15 acquisition adjustment. This grossed up balance is \$6,518,569 and the  
16 Company requests that this be included with the net acquisition  
17 adjustment and amortized at \$298,560 per year based on the remaining  
18 amortization months of the acquisition adjustment.

19 The second component is a net Unprotected Deferred Tax Asset and  
20 has an estimated balance of \$3,072,874. The Company requests this  
21 Deferred Tax Asset be amortized over 10 years at \$307,287 per year.  
22 This annual amortization detriment could be netted against the annual  
23 Protected benefit, as discussed below, and the Company requests that  
24 the net of these amounts be retained by the Company.



1 **Q. What is FPUC's proposed resolution for the Protected Deferred Tax**  
2 **savings?**

3 A. FPUC has a regulatory liability recorded on its balance sheet for the  
4 Protected Deferred Tax at a rate of 35% consistent with the applicable  
5 law prior to the 2017 Tax Act. As a result of the 2017 Tax Act, the  
6 Company will only be required to pay those taxes out at 21%. The  
7 benefit in the Protected Deferred Tax is recorded on FPUC's balance  
8 sheet as a grossed-up Deferred Regulatory Tax Liability currently  
9 estimated to be \$21,955,992. This deferred balance will be amortized  
10 using the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") prescribed methodology and  
11 is estimated to flow back over 26 years at approximately \$844,461 per  
12 year. Exhibit NGMC-1 (revised) provides the calculation of this amount.  
13 2018 final amounts will not be available until late 2018, as further  
14 explained by FPUC's witness Matthew Dewey. FPUC proposes retaining  
15 the estimated annual amount of \$844,461 less the Unprotected Deferred  
16 Tax Amortization, as discussed above, of \$307,287 for a net benefit of  
17 \$537,174. This meets the intended goal of the 2017 Tax Act by allowing  
18 the Company to continue making capital investments while potentially  
19 delaying the need for a costly rate proceeding.

20

21 **Q. Is there a direct tax impact to the Company's GRIP?**

22 A. Yes. There are two components of the tax rate change that impact  
23 GRIP. The first component is the amount of tax savings on the 2018  
24 GRIP surcharge from the jurisdictional date. The second component is  
25 the change in the ongoing GRIP surcharge from 2019 and beyond.

1 **Q. How does FPUC propose treating the tax impact of these two**  
2 **components relative to the GRIP?**

3 A. For the first component, FPUC calculates the 2018 tax savings that will  
4 accumulate between the Jurisdictional Date and the date GRIP rates will  
5 be changed on customer bills (1/1/2019) to be \$1,040,141. Exhibit  
6 NGMC-2 demonstrates this calculation. The Company proposes flowing  
7 this benefit back to customers by incorporating it as an over-recovery in  
8 the 2019 GRIP projection. This will have the effect of lowering customer  
9 GRIP surcharges by the amount of the benefit.

10

11 The second component is the GRIP surcharge rates for periods 2019  
12 and beyond. The Company proposes, incorporating the new, lower  
13 federal tax rate into the 2019 GRIP surcharge projections and future  
14 projections, which will reduce the annual GRIP revenue amount by the  
15 annual tax savings. This is currently estimated to be approximately \$1.2  
16 million.

17 These two requests will, if approved, directly pass the benefit of the  
18 lower tax rate on GRIP related revenues created by the 2017 Tax Act  
19 back to FPUC's customers.

20

21 **Q. Is FPUC's proposal the best approach for your customers?**

22 A. Yes. FPUC's proposal provides a fair and reasonable balancing of the  
23 benefits of the 2017 Tax Act. It returns many of the benefits directly to  
24 FPUC's customers and does so in a manner that will reduce customer



1           confusion and promote bill stability by applying those tax benefits to  
2           offset other beneficial system investments that otherwise would  
3           potentially subject our customers to rate increases.    FPUC’s proposal  
4           eliminates the inherent confusion of mixed price signals that exist when  
5           individual components of customer bills change in opposite directions.  
6           FPUC’s proposal also allows FPUC to retain a fair portion of the tax  
7           benefit arising from the 2017 Tax Act in a manner that not only allows the  
8           Company to earn close to or within its jurisdictional range, but also  
9           allows the Company to recover costs not currently recovered in base  
10          rates such that the Company may be able to maintain base rates at their  
11          current levels for longer than would otherwise be possible given the  
12          Company’s current earnings posture.

13

14   **Q.    Does FPUC believe this treatment is the most appropriate treatment**  
15   **for the Company?**

16   A.    Yes. Adjusting the rates for just one component, such as taxes, of a  
17          customer’s bill is akin to single-issue rate-making and is inconsistent with  
18          fundamental regulatory principles.  Additionally, this type of rate-making  
19          principle assumes that the Company is currently earning its authorized  
20          Return On Equity (“ROE”) and that nothing has changed since the last  
21          rate proceeding.  However, FPUC is currently under-earning relative to  
22          its authorized ROE so a reduction to its rates based on the authorized  
23          ROE would push the utility’s earned ROE even lower on a pro-forma  
24          basis, which is again inconsistent with the objectives and goals of rate-  
25          making and produces an unreasonable result for FPUC.

1

2 **Q. Will the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act put FPUC into an over-earnings**  
3 **position?**

4 A. No. FPUC's proposed treatment of the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act  
5 benefits will not put the Company into an over-earning position.

6

7 II. SUMMARY

8

9 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

10 A. FPUC's proposal, as outlined above, not only meets the intended goal of  
11 the 2017 Tax Act by encouraging investment in infrastructure, but it does  
12 so in the most efficient, timely and responsible manner possible. FPUC's  
13 proposal also allows FPUC to retain a fair portion of the tax benefit  
14 arising from the 2017 Tax Act in a manner that allows the Company to  
15 earn at or within its jurisdictional range, ensuring that FPUC's customers  
16 receive the dual benefits of direct savings and a financially strong service  
17 provider able to ensure continued system improvements for safe and  
18 reliable service consistent with fundamental regulatory principles.

19

20 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

21 A. Yes.

FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMPANY  
 Computation of Gas Tax Savings  
 Projected 2018 Test Year

DOCKET NO.: 20180051-GU  
 EXHBIT NO.: NGMC-1 revised  
 Page 1 of 1

	FN	FC Allocated	Total FN	ANNUAL
<b>ANNUAL TAX SAVINGS FROM RATE CHANGE:</b>				
NOI BEFORE TAX CHANGE	\$ 10,640,348		\$ 10,640,348	
NOI AFTER TAX CHANGE	\$ 12,268,779		\$ 12,268,779	
NET INCOME EFFECT OF TAX CHANGE	\$ 1,628,431		\$ 1,628,431	
GROSS UP	\$ 552,844		\$ 552,844	
PRETAX - GROSSED UP SAVINGS (EXPENSE)	\$ 2,181,275	\$ -	\$ 2,181,275	\$ 2,181,275
<b>REGULATORY TAX LIABILITY:</b>				
ESTIMATED PROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY	\$ 21,767,953	\$ 188,039	\$ 21,955,992	\$ 844,461 26 YEARS
ESTIMATED UNPROTECTED ACQ ADJUSTMENT PRETAX GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY	\$ 6,518,569		\$ 6,518,569	\$ 298,560 LIFE OF ACQ. ADJ.
ESTIMATED UNPROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY	\$ (2,724,746)	\$ (348,128)	\$ (3,072,874)	\$ (307,287) 10 YEARS
NET ESTIMATED REGULATORY LIABILITY	\$ 25,561,776	\$ (160,088)	\$ 25,401,688	\$ 835,734
TOTAL				<u>\$ 3,017,009</u>
As Filed NGMC-1				\$ 3,026,609
Difference				<u>\$ (9,600)</u>

**Florida Public Utilities Company**  
 Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program (GRIP)  
 Calculation of the Projected Revenue Requirements  
 January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018

DOCKET NO.: 20180051-GU  
 EXHIBIT NO.: NGMC-2  
 Page 1 of 1

Item	GRIP CALCULATION		DIFFERENCE
	GRIP CALCULATION WITH NEW TAX EXPANSION FACTOR	GRIP CALCULATION WITH 2017 TAX RATE IN EXPANSION FACTOR	
	Year End Total/Balance	Year End Total/Balance	
Qualified Investment			
Qualified Investment - Mains - Current Year 1070 Activity	\$5,412,000	\$5,412,000	\$0
Qualified Investment - Mains - Closed 1070 Activity to Plant	(\$5,141,400)	(\$5,141,400)	\$0
Qualified Investment - Services - Current Year 1070 Activity	\$1,188,000	\$1,188,000	\$0
Qualified Investment - Services - Closed 1070 Activity to Plant	(\$1,188,000)	(\$1,188,000)	\$0
Qualified Investment - Mains - Current 1010 Activity	\$5,141,400	\$5,141,400	\$0
Qualified Investment - Services - Current 1010 Activity	\$1,188,000	\$1,188,000	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Mains 1070	\$1,268,943	\$1,268,943	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Service 1070	\$138,427	\$138,427	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Mains 1010	\$69,736,070	\$69,736,070	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Service 1010	\$21,655,147	\$21,655,147	\$0
Total Qualified Investment	\$92,798,587	\$92,798,587	\$0
Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$7,932,305)	(\$7,932,305)	\$0
Net Book Value	\$84,866,282	\$84,866,282	\$0
Average Net Qualified Investment			
Depreciation Rates			
Approved Depreciation Rate-Mains	2.60%	2.60%	0.00%
Approved Depreciation Rate-Services	2.70%	2.70%	0.00%
Return on Average Net Qualified Investment			
Equity - Cost of Capital, inclusive of Income Tax Gross-up	6.470%	7.674%	-1.20%
Debt - Cost of Capital	1.410%	1.410%	0.00%
Equity Component - inclusive of Income Tax Gross-up	\$5,352,891	\$6,502,894	(\$1,150,003)
Debt Component	\$1,166,550	\$1,166,550	\$0
Return Requirement	\$6,519,441	\$7,669,444	(\$1,150,003)
Investment Expenses			
Depreciation Expense - Mains	\$1,740,730	\$1,740,730	\$0
Depreciation Expense - Services	\$567,314	\$567,314	\$0
Property Taxes	\$1,611,487	\$1,611,487	\$0
General Public Notice Expense & Customer Notice Expense	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$0
Total Expense	\$3,971,531	\$3,971,531	\$0
Total Revenue Requirements	\$10,490,971	\$11,640,975	(\$1,150,003)
Annual Revenue Requirement for Bare Steel Replacement Investment	\$747,727	\$747,727	\$0
Net Annual Revenue Requirements	\$9,743,244	\$10,893,248	(\$1,150,003)
Less January 1 to February 6 Amount Revenue Requirement		\$	109,862
Net Effect on GRIP of Lower Expansion Factor			(\$1,040,141)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

Before the Florida Public Service Commission

Docket No. 20180051-GU

In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act  
of 2017 for Florida Public Utilities Company  
Direct Testimony of Matthew Dewey

Date of Filing: May 31, 2018

**Revised: August 27, 2018**

**Q. Please state your name and business address.**

A. My name is Matthew Dewey. My business address is 909 Silver Lake  
Blvd, Dover, DE 19904.

**Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

A. I am employed by Chesapeake Utilities Corporation ("CUC"), the parent  
of Florida Public Utilities Company, as an Accounting Director.

**Q. Please describe your educational background and professional  
experience.**

A. I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting from Goldey-Beacom  
College and have been employed with Chesapeake Utilities Corporation  
in various accounting positions since 1987.

**Q. Have you ever testified before the Florida Public Service  
Commission ("FPSC")?**

1 A. Yes, I have pre-filed written testimony for the Florida Division of  
2 Chesapeake Utilities Corporation, which does business as Central  
3 Florida Gas Company, in its 2009 base rate case, Docket No. 20090125-  
4 GU.

5  
6 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

7 A. I will explain how the tax impacts associated with the Federal Tax Cuts  
8 and Jobs Acts of 2017 (the "2017 Tax Act") were calculated. I will also  
9 explain the methodology used to make these calculations, and how  
10 these tax impacts affected FPUC's balance sheet.

11

12 **Q. Were these calculations of the Deferred Regulatory Liabilities**  
13 **related to the 2017 Tax Act calculations performed by you, or under**  
14 **your direct supervision?**

15 A. These calculations were performed under my direct supervision.

16

17 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits in this case?**

18 A. Yes. I am sponsoring exhibit NGMD-1 (revised) and exhibit NGMD-2  
19 (revised). The exhibit NGMD-1 (revised) shows the Company's  
20 calculations to support the estimated regulatory liabilities of \$25,561,776.  
21 This amount resulted from implementing the reduction in federal tax rate  
22 from 35% to 21% per the 2017 Tax Act. The worksheet lists the  
23 estimated Accumulated Deferred Income Tax ("ADIT") revised account  
24 balances at the blended tax rate, which includes the federal tax rate at



1           35%. The worksheet also calculates the Company's estimated ADIT  
2           revised account balances at the blended tax rate, which adjusts for  
3           reduced federal tax rate of 21% per the 2017 Tax Act. The worksheet  
4           shows the classification of each estimated excess or deficient deferred  
5           income taxes into one of the following classifications: Protected,  
6           Unprotected plant and Unprotected. This classification is required since  
7           protected excess deferred income taxes are required to be flowed back  
8           based on Internal Revenue Service normalization guidelines. To record  
9           the regulatory liability we are required at add back the income tax gross-  
10          up to get to an applicable revenue amount. The worksheet also  
11          calculates the gross-up to record the estimated regulatory liability for  
12          Protected, Unprotected plant and Unprotected. In February 2018 and  
13          March 2018, estimated deferred tax assets were allocated from the  
14          parent, CUC, to all Chesapeake subsidiaries and divisions, including  
15          FPUC- Natural Gas, at the blended tax rate. I do not expect these  
16          adjustments to re-occur. The net difference between the 35% and 21%  
17          was reported with a net effect of zero to the balance sheet. The exhibit  
18          NGMD-2 (revised) supports the same calculation described above for the  
19          Florida Corporate general ledger. The result is an estimated regulatory  
20          asset of \$354,178 of which \$160,088 or 45.2% is allocated to FPUC-  
21          Natural Gas.

22

23   **Q.    NGMD-1 is noted as revised. What line items changed between the**  
24   **original filed on May 31, 2018 and the revised NGMD-1?**

1 A. The lines that changed between the filed exhibit NGMD-1 and the  
2 revised exhibit NGMD-1 (revised) are the lines that show "Depreciation",  
3 "Cost of Removal", and the "Repairs Deduction" in the "Name" column of  
4 the worksheet: The amounts for "Cost of Removal" and the "Repairs  
5 Deduction" on NGMD-1 only contained the ADIT balances that occurred  
6 after the "One Source" tax software was obtained in 2015. In prior years,  
7 this activity was recorded in the ADIT for "Depreciation". In order to  
8 accurately show the balances as protected or unprotected it was first  
9 necessary to separate the portion of ADIT that had been on the  
10 "Depreciation" line which related to the "Cost of Removal" and "Repairs  
11 Deduction" for periods prior to the tax software being obtained. The  
12 beginning balances and the tax change effect have been revised in  
13 NGMD-1 (revised) to the balances as if the prior year's data had been  
14 separated as "Cost of Removal" and the "Repairs Deduction" instead of  
15 being included in the "Depreciation" deferred tax amount.  
16 Once the balances were separated, the tax change related to "Cost of  
17 Removal" was moved from the column titled "Protected" to the column  
18 titled "Unprotected Plant".  
19 Although the "Repairs Deduction" was included in the "Unprotected  
20 Plant" column in the original NGMD-1, the amount related to this  
21 deduction is being decreased because the line now includes the  
22 amounts related prior to the implementation of the tax software in 2015  
23 and the "Depreciation" line is being increased since prior to the tax  
24 software, "Depreciation" was the ADIT account that the deduction was

1 recorded in. Therefore, the protected regulatory liability is increased and  
2 unprotected decreased.

3

4 **Q. Could you clarify the meaning of a “gross-up” as it pertains to**  
5 **deferred taxes?**

6 A. Yes. The deferred tax impact as a result of the tax rate change is  
7 increased, or “grossed up” for the current tax rate. This balance will then  
8 be amortized and subject to income taxes at the current rate so that the  
9 net income impact equals the amortized tax benefit or detriment.

10

11 **Q. The total net estimated regulatory liability balance of \$25,401,688**  
12 **related to the federal rate change from 35% to 21% per the 2017 Tax**  
13 **Act, is described as estimated, why?**

14 A. The staff of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission has  
15 recognized the complexity of reflecting the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act,  
16 and on December 22, 2017 issued guidance in Staff Accounting Bulletin  
17 118, which clarifies accounting for income taxes under ASC 740 if  
18 information is not yet available or complete and provides for up to a one  
19 year period in which to complete the required analyses and accounting.  
20 Therefore, we will complete our measurement and accounting for the  
21 impact of the tax law changes on or before December 22, 2018.

22

23 **Q. Does the Company know of any expected changes which could**  
24 **adjust the regulatory liability?**

1 A. Not at this time. However, once the 2017 federal and state tax returns  
2 are filed, the Company will be adjusting entries based on the differences  
3 between the tax returns as filed and the 2017 Tax Act. These  
4 adjustments could affect the ADIT balances as of December 31, 2017.

5

6 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

7 A. Yes.

FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES  
Computation of Regulatory Liability (FN)

Docket No.: 20180051-GU  
Exhibit No.: NGMD-1 revised

Seg 3	FERC	Code	Name	BEFORE		AFTER						Allocation from Parent	3/31/18	03/31/2018 Balance	
				35.00%	21.00%	38.58%	25.35%	UnProtected Plant	UnProtected NonPlant	OTP Adj	12/31/2017 Balance				UnProtected NonPlant
2500	282	UNNP	2500	ADIT Property LT	\$ 258,328	\$ (88,598)			\$ (88,598)		\$ 169,730			\$ 169,730	
25AA	283	UNRP	25AA	Acquisition Adjustment	\$ (14,189,179)	\$ 4,866,438		\$ 4,866,438	\$ -	\$ (53)	\$ (9,322,794)		\$ 106,749	\$ (9,216,045)	
25AF	282	UNRP	25AF	AFUDC	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25AM	283	UNNP	25AM	Customer Based Intangibles	\$ 2,105,813	\$ (722,227)			\$ (722,227)		\$ 1,383,586		\$ 35,113	\$ 1,418,699	
25AM	283	UNNP	25AM.01	Amortization Schedules Prior Acquisitions	\$ (147,060)	\$ 50,437			\$ 50,437		\$ (96,623)		\$ 1,226	\$ (95,397)	
25BD	283	UNNP	25BD	Bad Debts	\$ 51,440	\$ (17,642)			\$ (17,642)		\$ 33,798		\$ 7,856	\$ 41,654	
25BN	283	UNNP	25BN.01	Short Term Bonus	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -		\$ -	\$ 182,315	\$ 72,484	\$ -	
25CN	283	UNNP	25CN	Conservation	\$ 297,076	\$ (101,888)			\$ (101,888)	\$ (45)	\$ 195,143		\$ 60,523	\$ 255,666	
25DP	282	P	25DP.01	Depreciation	\$ (48,697,009)	\$ 16,701,528	\$ 16,701,528		\$ -	\$ 618	\$ (31,994,863)		\$ (144,030)	\$ (32,138,893)	
25DP	282	P	25DP.02	Contribution in Aid of Construction	\$ 1,350,259	\$ (463,096)	\$ (463,096)		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 887,163		\$ 82,766	\$ 969,929	
25DP	282	UNNP	25DP.03	Cost of Removal	\$ 45,352	\$ (114,229)		\$ (114,229)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (68,877)		\$ (104,876)	\$ (173,753)	
25DP	282	P	25DP.04	Asset Gain/Loss	\$ (36,252)	\$ 12,433	\$ 12,433		\$ -	\$ -	\$ (23,819)		\$ 533	\$ (23,286)	
25DP	282	P	25DP.05	Adjustment for Repairs Depreciation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25EN	283	UNNP	25EN	Environmental	\$ 2,572,576	\$ (882,312)			\$ (882,312)	\$ (8)	\$ 1,690,256		\$ 17,027	\$ 1,707,283	
25GP	282	UNNP	25GP	Grip Over Recoveries	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25ID	283	UNNP	25ID	Reserve for Insurance Deductibles	\$ (89,296)	\$ 30,626			\$ 30,626	\$ -	\$ (58,670)		\$ (476)	\$ (59,146)	
25IT	255	UNNP	25IT	Investment Tax Credit	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25MC	283	UNNP	25MC	Merger Cost Amortization	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25PC	282	UNNP	25PC	Piping and Conservation	\$ 410,586	\$ (140,818)			\$ (140,818)	\$ (9)	\$ 269,759		\$ 9,130	\$ 278,889	
25PG	283	UNNP	25PG	Purchased Gas Cots	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25PN	283	UNNP	25PN	Pension	\$ (233,083)	\$ 79,940			\$ 79,940	\$ 6	\$ (153,137)		\$ 26,462	\$ (126,675)	
25PR	283	UNNP	25PR	Post Retirement Benefits	\$ 2	\$ (1)			\$ (1)	\$ 1	\$ 2		\$ -	\$ 2	
25PR	283	UNNP	25PR.02	Post Retirement Benefits (Non-Current)	\$ 251,877	\$ (86,386)			\$ (86,386)	\$ -	\$ 165,491		\$ 135	\$ 165,626	
25RC	283	UNNP	25RC	Rate Case	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25RE	282	UNNP	25RE	Repairs Deduction	\$ (337,762)	\$ 115,821		\$ 115,821	\$ -	\$ 21	\$ (221,920)		\$ -	\$ (221,920)	
25RG	283	UNNP	25RG	ADIT Reg Asset	\$ (98,878)	\$ 33,912			\$ 33,912	\$ (33,920)	\$ (98,886)		\$ -	\$ (98,886)	
25RP	282	UNNP	25RP	Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25RT	283	UNNP	25RT	Rabbi Trust	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 135,072	\$ -	\$ 135,072	
25SD	283	UNNP	25SD	ADIT State Decoupling	\$ 1,177,120	\$ 260,609			\$ 260,609	\$ -	\$ 1,437,729		\$ -	\$ 1,437,729	
25SI	283	UNNP	25SI.01	Self Insurance (Current)	\$ (855)	\$ 303			\$ 303	\$ -	\$ (582)		\$ -	\$ (582)	
25SR	283	UNNP	25SR.01	SERP (Current)	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 303,293	\$ -	\$ 303,293	
25SV	283	UNNP	25SV	ADIT Outside Services	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	
25WR	283	UNNP	25WR	Storm Reserve	\$ 258,161	\$ (88,541)			\$ (88,541)	\$ 1	\$ 169,621		\$ 380	\$ 170,001	
25SL	283	UNNP	S_NOL_SYS	S_NOL_SYS	\$ (56,291)	\$ (12,124)			\$ (12,124)	\$ 6,202	\$ (62,213)		\$ -	\$ (62,213)	
25SL2	283	UNNP	S_NOL_SYS - 2014 - FL	S_NOL_SYS - 2014 - FL	\$ 50,089	\$ 10,788			\$ 10,788	\$ -	\$ 60,877		\$ -	\$ 60,877	
<b>Total</b>					\$ (55,057,016)	\$ 19,444,973	\$ 16,250,865	\$ 4,868,030	\$ (1,673,922)	\$ (27,186)	\$ (35,639,229)	\$ 620,680	\$ 72,484	\$ 98,518	\$ (34,847,547)
					\$ (1)	\$ (1)									
				Protected Gross-up		\$ 5,517,088					\$ 5,517,088			\$ 5,517,088	
				UnProtected Plant Gross-up		\$ 1,652,672	\$ 1,652,672				\$ 1,652,672			\$ 1,652,672	
				UnProtected NonPlant Gross-up		\$ (568,288)	\$ (568,288)				\$ (568,288)	\$ (109,994)	\$ (12,845)	\$ (691,127)	
				Unrecorded adjustment to correct grossup calculation at year end		\$ -	\$ -				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25TX	25TX		25TX	Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up		\$ 5,517,088	\$ 1,652,672	\$ (568,288)			\$ 6,601,471	\$ (109,994)	\$ (12,845)	\$ -	\$ 6,478,632
<b>Total with Gross-up</b>					\$ 21,767,953	\$ 6,520,702	\$ (2,242,210)	\$ (568,288)	\$ (1,673,922)	\$ (27,186)	\$ (29,037,758)	\$ 510,686	\$ 59,639	\$ 98,518	\$ (28,368,915)
						<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>							





FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMPANY  
 Computation of Regulatory Liability Common Division (FC)

Docket No.: 20180051-EI  
 Exhibit No.: NGMD-2 revised

			BEFORE		AFTER									
FL	5.50%	Fed	35.00%	21.00%	21.00%							Allocation from Parent		
			Blended	38.58%	25.35%	25.35%							3/31/18	
Seg 3	FERC	Code	Name	Beginning Balance See Note A	Rate Change	Protected	UnProtected Plant	UnProtected NonPlant	OTP Adj	12/31/2017 Balance	UnProtected NonPlant	NetAdjust to LT Bonus	Q1 Entries	03/31/2018 Balance
2500	282	UNNP	2500	ADIT Property LT	\$ 2,791	\$ (957)				\$ (957)	\$ 1,834		\$ -	\$ 1,834
25BN	283	UNNP	25BN.01	Short Term Bonus	\$ 646,396	\$ (221,693)			\$ 43	\$ 424,746			\$ 14,462	\$ 439,208
25BN	283	UNNP	25BN.02	Long Term Bonus	\$ 12,907	\$ (4,427)				\$ 8,480			\$ -	\$ 8,480
25DP	282	P	25DP.01	Depreciation	\$ (888,432)	\$ 304,565	\$ 304,565			\$ (583,867)			\$ (43,664)	\$ (627,531)
25DP	282	P	25DP.04	Asset Gain/Loss	\$ (17,530)	\$ 6,012	\$ 6,012			\$ (11,518)			\$ (2,334)	\$ (13,852)
25DP	282	P	25DP.05	Adjustment for Repairs Depreciation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25EN	283	UNNP	25EN	Environmental	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
25ID	283	UNNP	25ID	Reserve for Insurance Deductibles	\$ (1,421)	\$ 487			\$ (1)	\$ (935)			\$ (1)	\$ (936)
25PN	283	UNNP	25PN	Pension	\$ 1,281,408	\$ (439,482)			\$ 15	\$ 841,941			\$ (5,222)	\$ 836,719
25PR	283	UNNP	25PR	Post Retirement Benefits	\$ (3,007)	\$ 1,031			\$ (3,550)	\$ (5,526)			\$ -	\$ (5,526)
25PR	283	UNNP	25PR.02	Post Retirement Benefits (Non-Current)	\$ (7,376)	\$ 2,530				\$ (4,846)			\$ -	\$ (4,846)
25RC	283	UNNP	25RC	Rate Case	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25RD	283	UNNP	25RD	Loss on Recquired Debt	\$ (397,679)	\$ 136,391				\$ (227,415)			\$ 7,208	\$ (220,207)
25RE	282	UNPP	25RE	Repairs Deduction	\$ 6,003	\$ (1,920)	\$ (1,920)		\$ 5	\$ 4,088			\$ (420)	\$ 3,668
25RT	283	UNNP	25RT	Rabbi Trust	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25SD	283	UNNP	25SD	ADIT State Decoupling	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25SD	283	UNNP	25SD	ADIT State Decoupling	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25SI	283	UNNP	25SI.01	Self Insurance (Current)	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25SI	283	UNNP	25SI.02	Self Insurance (Non-Current)	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25SL	283	UNNP	25SL	ADIT State NOL	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25VA	283	UNNP	25VA	Vacation	\$ 144,792	\$ (49,659)			\$ 12	\$ 95,145			\$ (1,613)	\$ 93,532
NOL_	283	UNNP	NOL_SYS	NOL_SYS	\$ -	\$ -				\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25SL	283	UNNP	S_NOL_SYS	S_NOL_SYS	\$ (253,510)	\$ (54,802)			\$ (3,104)	\$ (311,216)			\$ -	\$ (311,216)
25SL	283	UNNP	S_NOL_SYS - 20	S_NOL_SYS - 2014 - FL	\$ 256,614	\$ 55,271				\$ 311,885			\$ -	\$ 311,885
<b>Total</b>				\$ 781,956	\$ (266,453)	\$ 310,577	\$ (1,920)	\$ (575,110)	\$ 27,293	\$ 542,796	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (31,584)	\$ 511,212
				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
						\$ 105,439				\$ 105,439				\$ 105,439
							\$ (652)			\$ (652)				\$ (652)
								\$ (195,247)		\$ (195,247)	\$ -			\$ (195,247)
								\$ 2,735		\$ 2,735				\$ 2,735
25TX	25TX		Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up			\$ 105,439	\$ (652)	\$ (192,512)		\$ (87,724)	\$ -	\$ -		\$ (87,724)
<b>Total with Gross-up</b>						\$ 416,016	\$ (2,572)	\$ (767,622)		\$ 455,072	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (31,584)	\$ 423,488
						a	b	c						



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

Before the Florida Public Service Commission

Docket No. 20180051-GU

In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act  
of 2017 for Florida Public Utilities Company

Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel

Date of Filing: August 27, 2018

**Q. Please state your name and business address.**

A. My name is Michael Cassel. My business address is 1750 South 14<sup>th</sup>  
Street, Suite 200, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034.

**Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

A. I am employed by Florida Public Utilities Company ("FPUC") as the  
Director of Regulatory and Governmental Affairs.

**Q. Please describe your educational background and professional  
experience.**

A. I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting from Delaware  
State University in Dover, Delaware in 1996. I was hired by Chesapeake  
Utilities Corporation ("CUC" or "the Company") as a Senior Regulatory  
Analyst in March 2008. As a Senior Regulatory Analyst, I was primarily  
involved in the areas of gas cost recovery, rate of return analysis, and  
budgeting for CUC's Delaware and Maryland natural gas distribution  
companies. In 2010, I moved to Florida in the role of Senior Tax  
Accountant for CUC's Florida business units. Since that time, I have



1 held various management roles including Manager of the Back Office in  
2 2011, Director of Business Management in 2012. I am currently the  
3 Director of Regulatory and Governmental Affairs for CUC's Florida  
4 business units. In this role, my responsibilities include directing the  
5 regulatory and governmental affairs for the Company in Florida including  
6 regulatory analysis, and reporting and filings before the Florida Public  
7 Service Commission ("FPSC") for FPUC, FPUC-Indiantown, FPUC-Fort  
8 Meade, the Florida Division of Chesapeake Utilities Corporation d/b/a  
9 Central Florida Gas ("CFG"), and Peninsula Pipeline Company. Prior to  
10 joining Chesapeake, I was employed by J.P. Morgan Chase & Company,  
11 Inc. from 2006 to 2008 as a Financial Manager in their card finance  
12 group. My primary responsibility in this position was the development of  
13 client specific financial models and profit loss statements. I was also  
14 employed by Computer Sciences Corporation as a Senior Finance  
15 Manager from 1999 to 2006. In this position, I was responsible for the  
16 financial operation of the company's chemical, oil and natural resources  
17 business. This included forecasting, financial close and reporting  
18 responsibility, as well as representing Computer Sciences Corporation's  
19 financial interests in contract/service negotiations with existing and  
20 potential clients. From 1996 to 1999, I was employed by J.P. Morgan,  
21 Inc., where I had various accounting/finance responsibilities for the firm's  
22 private banking clientele.

23

24 **Q. Have you ever testified before the FPSC?**

25 A. Yes. I've provided written, pre-filed testimony in a variety of the  
26 Company's annual proceedings, including the Fuel and Purchased

1 Power Cost Recovery Clause for our electric division, Docket No.  
2 20160001-EI, and the Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program (“GRIP”)  
3 Cost Recovery Factors proceeding, Docket No. 20160199-GU for FPUC  
4 and our sister company, the Florida Division of Chesapeake Utilities  
5 Corporation (“CFG”). Most recently, I provided written, pre-filed  
6 testimony in FPUC’s electric Limited Proceeding, Docket No. 20170150-  
7 EI, as well as Direct Testimony in this proceeding.

8

9 **Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental direct testimony?**

10 A. I will address the Company’s position regarding seeking a Private Letter  
11 Ruling (“PLR”) from the federal Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”).

12

13 **Q. Are you sponsoring any additional exhibits associated with your  
14 supplemental testimony?**

15 A. No.

16

17 **Q. Should FPUC be required to seek a PLR from the IRS regarding the  
18 proper classification of Accumulated Deferred Income Tax (“ADIT”)  
19 associated with the cost of removal?**

20 A. No. FPUC believes, for several reasons, that seeking a PLR from the  
21 IRS regarding this issue is not the most prudent action for its ratepayers.  
22 First, FPUC believes its revised treatment of this issue, resulting from the  
23 guidance of its tax experts, is consistent with the law. Second, while the  
24 ADIT at issue is unprotected, the Commission has historically allowed  
25 the Company to seek amortization of it in a manner similar to the  
26 protected plant related assets from which it is derived such that any

1 change in classification is likely to have a minimal impact to FPUC and  
2 its ratepayers. Third, the Company estimates a conservative timeframe  
3 for the IRS to rule on a PLR to be between three to six months or longer  
4 depending on the complexity of the issue. Fourth, and most importantly  
5 is that retaining the tax expert needed to compile, file and resolve the  
6 PLR issue with the IRS, could potentially have a material financial impact  
7 on the Company. The Company's preliminary estimate to seek a PLR is  
8 somewhere between \$20,000 and \$50,000 to complete. FPUC believes  
9 that seeking a PLR adds value in that it may potentially clarify a complex  
10 tax issue for the IRS, but given the historical treatment of amortization  
11 allowed by the Commission, there would be little to no beneficial impact  
12 to FPUC and its ratepayers. Rather it would serve to add additional,  
13 unnecessary cost and time to arrive at a similar result.

14

15 **Q. Does the Company know what the cost of obtaining a PLR for this**  
16 **issue will be?**

17 A. The Company is currently working to obtain a more firm estimate of the  
18 cost that will be incurred should a PLR be requested. Should the  
19 Commission determine in this proceeding that the Company must seek a  
20 PLR, the Company would seek to mitigate as much of the cost as  
21 possible. To that end, FPUC should be allowed to file a PLR jointly with  
22 the other CUC entities in Florida. Filing individual PLR's on each  
23 company for the same issue would be highly inefficient and expensive, to  
24 the detriment of FPUC's ratepayers.

25



1 **Q. If FPUC is required to pursue a PLR, should the Company be**  
2 **allowed to recover the costs associated with the process to obtain a**  
3 **PLR?**

4 A. Yes. The Company is pursuing classification of the ADIT in a manner  
5 that it believes is correct and is consistent with the recommendations of  
6 its nationally-recognized tax experts. As such, should the Company be  
7 required to pursue a PLR, it should also be allowed to recover the costs  
8 associated with that process.

9  
10 **Q. How does FPUC propose that this amount be addressed?**

11 A. At present, the Company is not over-earning and is projected to be  
12 earning at the bottom of its range for the foreseeable future. As such,  
13 the Company is requesting that the Commission allow it to defer the cost  
14 associated with seeking a PLR and to amortize the balance over four  
15 years in a manner consistent with rate case expense.

16  
17 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

18 A. The Company believes its treatment of this ADIT is consistent with the  
19 law and that it should not be required to seek a PLR. This is a costly and  
20 time-consuming process that likely ends with a similar treatment for the  
21 Company and its ratepayers, except for an additional \$20,000 - \$50,000  
22 in costs to seek a PLR. Should the Commission determine, however,  
23 that the Company should pursue a PLR, then the Company should be  
24 protected from the detrimental impacts associated with the expected high  
25 cost of pursuing guidance from the IRS. As such, if the Company is

1           required to pursue a PLR, the Company should be allowed to do so on a  
2           joint basis with the other Florida natural gas business units of CUC.  
3           Additionally, the cost associated with seeking a PLR was not  
4           contemplated in FPUC's current base rates, and therefore FPUC should  
5           be allowed to defer its allocated portion of the cost and amortize the  
6           balance over four years.

7

8   **Q.   Does this conclude your testimony?**

9   **A.   Yes.**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing revised Direct Testimony and exhibits of Matthew Dewey, and the Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel, in the referenced docket have been served by Electronic Mail this 27<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2018, upon the following:

Rachael A. Dziechciarz Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 <a href="mailto:RDziehc@psc.state.fl.us">RDziehc@psc.state.fl.us</a>	J.R. Kelly/E. Saylor Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 <a href="mailto:kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us">kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us</a>
---	--

  
Beth Keating

Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.  
215 South Monroe St., Suite 601  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
(850) 521-1706