

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. 20180053-GU – In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 for Florida Public Utilities Company – Fort Meade.**

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

Attached for filing in the referenced docket, 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 Florida Public Utilities Company – Fort Meade.

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. 20180053-GU

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

Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel

Date of Filing: June 1, 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 – Fort Meade (“Ft.  
Meade”) 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  
Florida business units. Since that time, I have held various management

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

21

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

23 A. Yes. I've provided written, pre-filed testimony in a variety of the  
24 Company's annual proceedings, including the Fuel and Purchased  
25 Power Cost Recovery Clause for our electric division, Docket No.  
26 20160001-EI, and the Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program ("GRIP")



1 Cost Recovery Factors proceeding, Docket No. 20160199-GU for Ft.  
2 Meade and our sister company, the Florida Division of Chesapeake  
3 Utilities Corporation. Most recently, I provided written, pre-filed  
4 testimony in Fort Meade's electric Limited Proceeding, Docket No.  
5 20170150-EI.

6

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

8 A. I will explain and support Ft. Meade's natural gas proposal for disposition  
9 of tax benefits related to the Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017  
10 ("2017 Tax Act").

11

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

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

16

17 I. FT. MEADE'S PROPOSAL

18

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

21 A. No, Ft. Meade 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 **Q. Could you please identify the components of the 2017 Tax Act**  
2 **being addressed by Ft. Meade in this proposal?**

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

6

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

9 A. For Ft. Meade, the annual tax detriment amount associated with the tax  
10 rate change, based on the 2018 proforma surveillance report, is  
11 estimated to be approximately \$17,929.

12

13 **Q. How does Ft. Meade propose that this amount be addressed?**

14 A. At present, the Company is not over-earning. In fact, the Company is  
15 earning below its allowable range and is projected to continue to do so  
16 for the foreseeable future. As such, the Company is requesting that the  
17 detriment of \$17,929, resulting from the federal tax rate change, be  
18 recovered through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery ("ECCR")  
19 clause. While this amount will not put the Company into its allowed  
20 range, it will help the Company continue to make additional investments  
21 in infrastructure.

22

1 **Q. What is Ft. Meade's proposed resolution for the Unprotected**  
2 **Deferred Tax balance?**

3 A. Ft. Meade has a regulatory liability recorded on its balance sheet for the  
4 estimated Unprotected Deferred Tax at a rate of 35% consistent with the  
5 applicable law prior to the 2017 Tax Act. At the implementation of the  
6 new tax rate, the Company is only required to pay those taxes out at  
7 21%. Exhibit FTMC-1 (revised) demonstrates the impact of these  
8 calculations.

9 The Unprotected Deferred Tax Liability is an estimated balance of  
10 \$45,881. Because the Company is earning well below its authorized  
11 range and anticipates that condition to continue into the foreseeable  
12 future, we request to amortize the regulatory tax liability over ten years  
13 and retain the estimated annual Unprotected Deferred Tax Liability  
14 amortization benefit of \$4,588.

15

16 **Q. What is Ft. Meade's proposed resolution for the Protected Deferred**  
17 **Tax savings?**

18 A. Ft. Meade has a regulatory liability recorded on its balance sheet for the  
19 Protected Deferred Tax at a rate of 35% consistent with the applicable  
20 law prior to the 2017 Tax Act. As a result of the 2017 Tax Act, the  
21 Company will only be required to pay those taxes out at 21%. The  
22 estimated benefit in the Protected Deferred Tax is recorded on Ft.  
23 Meade's balance sheet as an estimated grossed-up Deferred Regulatory  
24 Tax liability of approximately \$46,451. This deferred balance will be



1           amortized using the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) prescribed  
2           methodology and is estimated to flow back over 26 years at  
3           approximately \$1,787 per year. Exhibit FTMC-1 (revised) provides the  
4           calculation of this amount. 2018 final amounts will not be available until  
5           late 2018, as further explained by FPUC’s Ft Meade witness Matthew  
6           Dewey. Ft Meade proposes retaining the estimated annual amount of  
7           \$1,787 plus the Unprotected Deferred Tax Amortization, as discussed  
8           above, of \$4,588 for a net benefit of \$6,375. This meets the intended  
9           goal of the 2017 Tax Act by allowing the Company to continue making  
10          capital investments while potentially delaying the need for a costly rate  
11          proceeding.

12

13   **Q. Will the retention of the estimated Unprotected and Protected**  
14   **Deferred Tax balances put the Company in an over-earnings**  
15   **position?**

16   A. No. The Company is earning well below its authorized range and  
17   anticipates that condition to continue into the foreseeable future. While  
18   retention of the estimated Unprotected and estimated Protected Deferred  
19   Tax liabilities will not put Ft. Meade into its authorized range, it will meet  
20   the intended goal of the 2017 Tax Act by allowing the Company to  
21   continue making capital investments. Additionally, the Company  
22   anticipates the eventual consolidation of the CUC’s natural gas units and  
23   this interim step helps to build consistency amongst those units.

24

1 **Q. Is there a direct tax impact to the Company's Gas Reliability**  
2 **Infrastructure Program ("GRIP")?**

3 A. Yes. There is a benefit related to the tax rate change that impacts GRIP.  
4 The first component is the amount of tax savings on the 2018 GRIP  
5 surcharge from the jurisdictional date until December 31, 2018. The  
6 second component is the change in the ongoing GRIP surcharge from  
7 2019 and beyond.

8

9 **Q. How does Ft. Meade propose treating the tax impact of these two**  
10 **components relative to the GRIP?**

11 A. For the first component, Ft. Meade calculates the 2018 tax savings that  
12 will accumulate between the Jurisdictional Date and the date GRIP rates  
13 will be changed on customer bills (1/1/2019) to be approximately \$2,376.  
14 Exhibit FTMC-2 demonstrates this calculation. The Company proposes  
15 retaining that benefit.

16

17 The second component is the GRIP surcharge rates for periods 2019  
18 and beyond. The Company proposes incorporating the new, lower  
19 federal tax rate into the 2019 GRIP surcharge projections and future  
20 projections, which will reduce the annual GRIP revenue amount by the  
21 annual tax savings. This is currently estimated to be approximately two  
22 thousand dollars.

23



1 **Q. Is Ft. Meade's proposal the best approach for your customers?**

2 A. Yes. Ft. Meade's proposal provides a fair and reasonable resolution of  
3 the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act. Ft. Meade's proposal allows Ft. Meade  
4 to collect the annual tax detriment through its ECCR clause and retain a  
5 fair portion of the tax benefit arising from the 2017 Tax Act in a manner  
6 that not only allows the Company to earn closer to its jurisdictional range,  
7 but also allows the Company to recover costs not currently recovered in  
8 base rates such that the Company may be able to maintain base rates at  
9 their current levels for longer than would otherwise be possible given the  
10 Company's current earnings posture. It also returns benefits directly to  
11 Ft. Meade's customers through the GRIP surcharge, while encouraging  
12 continued investment of capital. As such, our customers benefit from  
13 extended stability of our base rates.

14

15 **Q. Does Ft. Meade believe this treatment is the most appropriate**  
16 **treatment for the Company?**

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

1 basis, which is again inconsistent with the objectives and goals of rate-  
2 making and produces an unreasonable result for Ft. Meade.

3

4 **Q. Will the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act put Ft. Meade into an over-**  
5 **earnings position?**

6 A. No. Ft. Meade's proposed treatment of the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act  
7 benefits will not put the Company into an over-earning position.

8

9 II. SUMMARY

10

11 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

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

22

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

24 A. Yes.

**FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMPANY-FT. MEADE**  
**Computation of Gas Tax Savings**  
**Projected 2018 Test Year**

**DOCKET NO.: 20180053-GU**  
**EXHIBIT NO.: FTMC-1 - revised**  
Page 1 of 1

	FT	FC Allocated	Total FT	ANNUAL	
<b>ANNUAL TAX SAVINGS FROM RATE CHANGE:</b>					
NOI BEFORE TAX CHANGE	\$ (50,941)		\$ (50,941)		
NOI AFTER TAX CHANGE	<u>\$ (64,326)</u>		<u>\$ (64,326)</u>		
NET INCOME EFFECT OF TAX CHANGE	\$ (13,385)		\$ (13,385)		
GROSS UP	<u>\$ (4,544)</u>		<u>\$ (4,544)</u>		
PRETAX - GROSSED UP SAVINGS (EXPENSE)	<u>\$ (17,929)</u>	\$ -	<u>\$ (17,929)</u>	\$	(17,929)
<b>REGULATORY TAX LIABILITY:</b>					
ESTIMATED PROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY	\$ 45,619	\$ 832	\$ 46,451	\$	1,787 26 YEARS
ESTIMATED UNPROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY	<u>\$ 47,421</u>	<u>\$ (1,540)</u>	<u>\$ 45,881</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>4,588 10 YEARS</u>
NET ESTIMATED REGULATORY TAX LIABILITY	<u>\$ 93,040</u>	<u>\$ (708)</u>	<u>\$ 92,332</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>6,375</u>
TOTAL				<u>\$</u>	<u>(11,554)</u>
As Filed FTMC-1				\$	(12,032)
Difference				<u>\$</u>	<u>478</u>



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

DOCKET NO.: 20180053-GU  
 EXHIBIT NO.: FTMC-2  
 Page 1 of 1

Item	GRIP CALCULATION	GRIP CALCULATION	DIFFERENCE
	WITH NEW TAX EXPANSION FACTOR Year End Total/Balance	WITH 2017 TAX RATE IN EXPANSION FACTOR Year End Total/Balance	
Qualified Investment			
Qualified Investment - Mains - Current 1070 Activity	\$0	\$0	\$0
Qualified Investment - Mains - Closed 1070 Activity to Plant	\$0	\$0	\$0
Qualified Investment - Services - Current 1070 Activity	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
Qualified Investment - Services - Closed 1070 Activity to Plant	(\$100,000)	(\$100,000)	\$0
Qualified Investment - Mains - Current 1010 Activity	\$0	\$0	\$0
Qualified Investment - Services - Current 1010 Activity	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Mains 1070	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Services 1070	\$1,589	\$1,589	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Mains 1010	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Qualified Investment - Services 1010	\$250,998	\$250,998	\$0
Total Qualified Investment	\$252,587	\$252,587	\$0
Less: Accumulated Depreciation	(\$8,554)	(\$8,554)	\$0
Net Book Value	\$244,033	\$244,033	\$0
Average Net Qualified Investment			
Depreciation Rates			
Approved Depreciation Rate-Mains	2.60%	2.600%	0.00%
Approved Depreciation Rate-Services	2.70%	2.700%	0.00%
Return on Average Net Qualified Investment			
Equity - Cost of Capital, inclusive of Income Tax Gross-up	6.1400%	7.450%	-1.31%
Debt - Cost of Capital	1.0400%	1.040%	0.00%
Equity Component - inclusive of Income Tax Gross-up	\$12,090	\$14,670	(\$2,580)
Debt Component	\$2,048	\$2,048	\$0
Return Requirement	\$14,138	\$16,718	(\$2,580)
Investment Expenses			
Depreciation Expense - Mains	\$0	\$0	\$0
Depreciation Expense - Services	\$5,313	\$5,313	\$0
Property Taxes	\$2,988	\$2,988	\$0
General Public Notice Expense and Customer Notice Expense	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Expense	\$8,301	\$8,301	\$0
Total Revenue Requirements	\$22,439	\$25,019	(\$2,580)
Less January 1 to February 6 Amount Revenue Requirement			\$204
Net Effect on GRIP of Lower Expansion Factor			(\$2,376)

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. 20180053-GU

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

Direct Testimony of Matthew Dewey

Date of Filing: June 1, 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, 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 FTMD-1 (revised) and exhibit FTMD-2  
19 (revised). The exhibit FTMD-1 (revised) shows the Company's  
20 calculations to support the estimated regulatory liabilities of \$93,040.  
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-FT Meade, 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          FTMD-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 \$708 or 0.2% is allocated to FPUC-FT  
21          Meade.

22  
23       **Q. FTMD-1 is noted as revised. What line items changed between the**  
24       **original filed on May 31, 2018, and the revised FTMD-1?**

1    **A.**    The lines that changed between the filed exhibit FTMD-1 and the revised  
2           exhibit FTMD-1 (revised) are the lines that show “Depreciation”, “Cost of  
3           Removal”, and the “Repairs Deduction” in the “Name” column of the  
4           worksheet. The amounts for “Cost of Removal” and the “Repairs  
5           Deduction” on the original FTMD-1 only contained the ADIT balances  
6           that occurred after the “One Source” tax software was obtained in 2015.  
7           In prior years, this activity was recorded in the ADIT for “Depreciation”.  
8           In order to accurately show the balances as protected or unprotected it  
9           was first 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          FTMD-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”. In this case, the separation decreased the  
19          protected liability and increased the unprotected liability.  
20          Although the “Repairs Deduction” was included in the “Unprotected  
21          Plant” column in the original FTMD-1, the amount related to this  
22          deduction is being decreased because the line now includes the  
23          amounts related prior to the implementation of the tax software in 2015  
24          and the “Depreciation” line is being increased since prior to the tax

1 software, "Depreciation" was the ADIT account that the deduction was  
2 recorded in. The net of the above adjustments results in the protected  
3 regulatory liability being decreased and the unprotected increased.

4

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

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

11

12 **Q. The total net estimated regulatory liability balance of \$92,332**  
13 **related to the federal rate change from 35% to 21% per the 2017 Tax**  
14 **Act, is described as estimated, why?**

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

23



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

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

7

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

9 A. Yes.

FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES-FT MEADE DIVISION  
Computation of Regulatory Liability (FT)

Docket No.: 20180053-GU  
Exhibit No.: FTMD-1 revised

Seg 3	FERC	Code	Name	BEFORE		AFTER									
				35.00%	21.00%	21.00%		Allocation from Parent		3/31/18		03/31/2018 Balance			
				38.58% Beginning Balance See Note A	25.35% Rate Change	Protected	UnProtected Plant	UnProtected NonPlant	OTP Adj	12/31/2017 Balance	UnProtected NonPlant		NetAdjust to LT Bonus	Q1 Entries	
25AF	282	UNPP 25AF	AFUDC	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25AM	283	UNNP 25AM	Customer Based Intangibles	\$ 347	\$ (119)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (119)	\$ (5)	\$ 223	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 223	
25AM	283	UNNP 25AM.01	Amortization Schedules Prior Acquisitions	\$ (92,141)	\$ 31,602	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,602	\$ -	\$ (60,539)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (3,016)	\$ (63,555)	
25BD	283	UNNP 25BD	Bad Debts	\$ 706	\$ (242)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (242)	\$ -	\$ 464	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 258	\$ 722	
25BN	283	UNNP 25BN.01	Short Term Bonus	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,426	\$ 969	\$ -	\$ 2,395	
25CN	283	UNNP 25CN	Conservation	\$ 3,169	\$ (1,087)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,087)	\$ -	\$ 2,082	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 492	\$ 2,574	
25DP	282	P 25DP.01	Depreciation	\$ (99,301)	\$ 34,057	\$ 34,057	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (3)	\$ (65,247)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (44)	\$ (65,291)	
25DP	282	P 25DP.02	Contribution in Aid of Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25DP	282	UNNP 25DP.03	Cost of Removal	\$ (16,926)	\$ 5,805	\$ 5,805	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (11,121)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,286)	\$ (12,407)	
25DP	282	P 25DP.04	Asset Gain/Loss	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25ID	283	UNNP 25ID	Reserve for Insurance Deductibles	\$ (456)	\$ 156	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 156	\$ -	\$ (300)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1)	\$ (301)	
25PG	283	UNNP 25PG	Purchased Gas Cots	\$ 4,561	\$ (1,564)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,564)	\$ (4)	\$ 2,993	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,997	\$ 15,990	
25RE	282	UNPP 25RE	Repairs Deduction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25RT	283	UNNP 25RT	Rabbi Trust	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,369	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,369	
25SI	283	UNNP 25SI.01	Self Insurance (Current)	\$ (12,869)	\$ 4,414	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,414	\$ -	\$ (8,455)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (8,455)	
25SR	283	UNNP 25SR.01	SERP (Current)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,063	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,063	
25SL	283	UNNP S_NOL_SYS	S_NOL_SYS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$ (212,910)</b>	<b>\$ 73,022</b>	<b>\$ 34,057</b>	<b>\$ 5,805</b>	<b>\$ 33,160</b>	<b>\$ (12)</b>	<b>\$ (139,900)</b>	<b>\$ 5,858</b>	<b>\$ 969</b>	<b>\$ 9,400</b>	<b>\$ (123,673)</b>	
Protected Gross-up				\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 11,562	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,562	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,562	
UnProtected Plant Gross-up				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,971	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,971	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,971	
UnProtected NonPlant Gross-up				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,258	\$ -	\$ 11,258	\$ (1,039)	\$ (171)	\$ -	\$ 10,048	
Unrecorded adjustment to correct grossup calculation at year end				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25TX	25TX		Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,562	\$ 1,971	\$ 11,258	\$ -	\$ 24,791	\$ (1,039)	\$ (171)	\$ -	\$ 23,581	
<b>Total with Gross-up</b>				<b>\$ 45,619</b>	<b>\$ 7,776</b>	<b>\$ 44,418</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 44,418</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (115,109)</b>	<b>\$ 4,819</b>	<b>\$ 798</b>	<b>\$ 9,400</b>	<b>\$ (100,092)</b>	
<b>Excess Deferred Tax Liability before gross up</b>						<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>							
Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Protected				\$ -	\$ (34,057)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (34,057)	
Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Plant				\$ -	\$ (5,805)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (5,805)	
Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Non Plant				\$ -	\$ (33,160)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (5,858)	\$ (969)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (39,987)	
<b>Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Total</b>				<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (73,022)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (5,858)</b>	<b>\$ (969)</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (79,849)</b>	
										<b>FT ADIT</b>	<b>G/L</b>	\$ (115,109)	\$ (100,092)		
										Adjust G/L 25TX		\$ (0)	\$ (0)		
25TX	25TX		Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,562	\$ 1,971	\$ 11,258	\$ -	\$ 24,791	\$ (1,039)	\$ (171)	\$ -	\$ 23,581	
										Adjust G/L 25TX		\$ (0)	\$ (0)		
										<b>d</b>		\$ (0)	\$ (0)		
280R-254P	280R-254N		Reg Liability - Protected	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (45,619)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (45,619)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (45,619)	
										<b>a</b>		\$ (45,619)	\$ (45,619)		
										<b>d-b-c</b>	\$ 4,097	\$ 676	\$ (47,421)		
										\$ (97,813)		\$ (97,813)	\$ (97,813)		
										\$ (7,776)		\$ (7,776)	\$ (7,776)		
										\$ (44,418)	\$ 4,097	\$ 676	\$ (39,645)		
										\$ (52,193)		\$ (52,193)	\$ (52,193)		

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

Docket No.: 20180053-EI  
 Exhibit No.: FTMD-2 revised

			BEFORE		AFTER									
			35.00%	21.00%	21.00%									
			Blended		Allocation from Parent 3/31/18									
			38.58%	25.35%	25.35%									
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)		\$ (221,693)	\$ 43	\$ 424,746			\$ 14,462	\$ 439,208
25BN	283	UNNP	25BN.02	Long Term Bonus	\$ 12,907	\$ (4,427)		\$ (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		\$ 487	\$ (1)	\$ (935)			\$ (1)	\$ (936)
25PN	283	UNNP	25PN	Pension	\$ 1,281,408	\$ (439,482)		\$ (439,482)	\$ 15	\$ 841,941			\$ (5,222)	\$ 836,719
25PR	283	UNNP	25PR	Post Retirement Benefits	\$ (3,007)	\$ 1,031		\$ 1,031	\$ (3,550)	\$ (5,526)			\$ -	\$ (5,526)
25PR	283	UNNP	25PR.02	Post Retirement Benefits (Non-Current)	\$ (7,376)	\$ 2,530		\$ 2,530	\$ (4,846)	\$ (4,846)			\$ -	\$ (4,846)
25RC	283	UNNP	25RC	Rate Case	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25RD	283	UNNP	25RD	Loss on Reacquired Debt	\$ (397,679)	\$ 136,391		\$ 136,391	\$ 33,873	\$ (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)		\$ (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)	\$ (54,602)		\$ (54,602)	\$ (3,104)	\$ (311,216)			\$ -	\$ (311,216)
25SL	283	UNNP	S_NOL_SYS - 20	S_NOL_SYS - 2014 - FL	\$ 256,614	\$ 55,271		\$ 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
				\$ -	\$ -									
Protected Gross-up						\$ 105,439				\$ 105,439				\$ 105,439
UnProtected Plant Gross-up							\$ (652)			\$ (652)				\$ (652)
UnProtected NonPlant Gross-up								\$ (195,247)		\$ (195,247)				\$ (195,247)
Unrecorded adjustment to correct grossup calculation at year end								\$ 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						



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

Docket No.:  
 Exhibit No.:

20180053-EI  
 FTMD-2 revised

FL	5.50%	Fed	BEFORE		AFTER																																																							
			35.00%	21.00%	21.00%	Allocation from Parent		3/31/18																																																				
		Blended	38.58%	25.35%																																																								
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																																														
			Excess Deferred Tax Liability before gross up																																																									
			Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Protected				\$ (310,577)								\$ (310,577)																																													
			Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Plant				\$ 1,920								\$ 1,920																																													
			Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Non Plant				\$ 575,110				\$ -	\$ -			\$ 575,110																																													
			Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Total				\$ 266,453								\$ 266,453																																													
			<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><b>FN ADIT</b></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><b>G/L</b></td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: right;">\$ 455,012</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: right;">\$ 423,428</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">Adjust G/L 25TX</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 59</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 59</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25TX</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (87,724)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (87,724)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25TX</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">G/L</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (87,725)</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ (87,725)</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">Adjust G/L 25TX</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 1</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>d</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>														<b>FN ADIT</b>	<b>G/L</b>		\$ 455,012		\$ 423,428					Adjust G/L 25TX	\$ 59	\$ 59	25TX			Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up			\$ (87,724)	\$ (87,724)	25TX			G/L			\$ (87,725)	\$ (87,725)						Adjust G/L 25TX	\$ 1	\$ 1						<b>d</b>	
	<b>FN ADIT</b>	<b>G/L</b>		\$ 455,012		\$ 423,428																																																						
				Adjust G/L 25TX	\$ 59	\$ 59																																																						
25TX			Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up			\$ (87,724)	\$ (87,724)																																																					
25TX			G/L			\$ (87,725)	\$ (87,725)																																																					
					Adjust G/L 25TX	\$ 1	\$ 1																																																					
					<b>d</b>																																																							
		280R-254P	Reg Liability - Protected							\$ (416,016)				\$ (416,016)																																														
		280R-254N	Reg Liability -UnProtected							\$ 770,194				\$ 770,194																																														
										\$ 354,178				\$ 354,178																																														
			Reg Liability -UnProtected Plant							\$ 2,572				\$ 2,572																																														
			Reg Liability -UnProtected Non Plant							\$ 767,622	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 767,622																																														
										\$ 770,194				\$ 770,194																																														
			<b>Note A:</b> Highlighted numbers were revised for adjustments discussed in the revised testimony and will be booked in 4th quarter 2018.																																																									

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. 20180053-GU

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

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 – Fort Meade (“Ft.  
Meade”) 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 Ft.  
4 Meade and our sister company, the Florida Division of Chesapeake  
5 Utilities 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 Ft. Meade be required to seek a PLR from the IRS regarding  
18 the proper classification of Accumulated Deferred Income Tax  
19 ("ADIT") associated with the cost of removal?**

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

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

15

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

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

1 **Q. If Ft. Meade 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 Ft. Meade 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 Ft. Meade's current base rates, and therefore Ft. Meade  
5           should be allowed to defer its allocated portion of the cost and amortize  
6           the 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 Michael Cassel, the revised Direct Testimony and exhibits of Matthew Dewey and the Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel, on behalf of FPUC-Ft. Meade Division the referenced docket, have been served by Electronic Mail this 27th day of August, 2018, upon the following:

Margo Duval Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 <a href="mailto:mduval@psc.state.fl.us">mduval@psc.state.fl.us</a>	J.R. Kelly/Virginia Ponder 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> <a href="mailto:Ponder.Virginia@leg.state.fl.us">Ponder.Virginia@leg.state.fl.us</a>
--	--

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