BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 for Florida Division ______/	DOCKET NO. 20180054-GU FILED: October 22, 2018

PREHEARING STATEMENT OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

The Citizens of the State of Florida, through the Office of Public Counsel ("OPC" or "Citizens"), pursuant to the Order Establishing Procedure in this docket, Order PSC-2018-0216-PCO-GU issued April 25, 2018, Order PSC-2018-0277-PCO-GU issued May 31, 2018, and Order PSC-2018-0412-PCO-GU issued August 20, 2018, submit this Prehearing Statement.

APPEARANCES:

Virginia Ponder
Associate Public Counsel

Charles J. Rehwinkel
Deputy Public Counsel

J.R. Kelly
Public Counsel
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1400
On behalf of the Citizens of the State of Florida

A. WITNESSES:

Witness	Subject Matter	Issue Numbers
Direct		
Ralph Smith	Impacts of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017	1-9, 11, 12, 17-20

B. EXHIBITS:

Witness	Proffered By	Exhibit No.	Description
Direct			
Ralph C. Smith, CPA	OPC	Exhibit RCS-1	Qualifications of Ralph C. Smith, CPA

C. STATEMENT OF BASIC POSITION

Florida Division of Chesapeake Utilities Corporation d/b/a Central Florida Gas ("CFG" or "Company"), in its May 31, 2018 petition, seeks determination by the Florida Public Service Commission of the tax benefits arising from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 ("TCJA"). The Company proposes to retain the net gross-up tax benefit arising from the excess accumulated deferred income taxes which is approximately $250,042 annually. OPC contests the Company's proposal to retain the net benefit of the excess accumulated deferred income taxes amortization and recommends that the estimated net benefit amount of $250,042 be returned to customers via a base rate reduction.

The Company indicates the impact of the TCJA on the Company's Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program ("GRIP") results (i) in a 2018 tax savings of $324,362 and (ii) in an annual tax savings, for the period 2019 and beyond, of approximately $358,889. CFG proposes to flow back the 2018 tax savings benefit to its customers by incorporating it as an over-recovery in its 2019 GRIP projection. Additionally, CFG indicates it will apply the new 21 percent federal income tax rate into its 2019 GRIP surcharge projections and future projections, which will reduce the annual GRIP revenue amount by the annual tax savings of approximately $358,889. OPC agrees with the Company's proposals to flow through the GRIP-related TCJA savings directly to its customers.

CFG revised filing on August 27, 2018, contained a reclassification of excess ADIT related to cost-of-removal from protected to unprotected. OPC does not disagree with this classification; however, due to the uncertainty in this area and the fact that different utilities have taken different positions as to the classification, OPC suggests it may be appropriate for CFG to seek a private letter ruling ("PLR") from the IRS regarding its classification of the excess ADIT relating to cost of removal/negative net salvage as "unprotected". Notwithstanding, because of the cost involved in seeking such a ruling, OPC acknowledges that guidance provided by PLRs to larger Florida utilities may be sufficiently clear so as to prevent CFG and its affiliates from having to obtain their own specific PLR.

D. STATEMENT OF FACTUAL ISSUES AND POSITIONS

ISSUE 1: Is the methodology and process Florida Public Utilities Company – Chesapeake Division d/b/a Central Florida Gas (CFG) used to calculate the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (TCJA) appropriate?

OPC: Yes, the Citizens have identified no errors.

ISSUE 2: Were Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes (ADIT) appropriately calculated?

OPC: Yes, the Citizens have identified no errors.

ISSUE 3: Are CFG's classifications of the excess ADIT between "protected" and "unprotected" appropriate?

OPC: Yes, the Citizens have identified no errors.

ISSUE 4: **A.** Were "protected excess deferred taxes" for 2018 using a 21 percent corporate tax rate appropriately calculated?

OPC: Yes, the Citizens have identified no errors.

B. What is the appropriate disposition of the protected excess deferred taxes?

OPC: The Company should not be allowed to retain the benefit of the protected excess ADIT. The protected excess ADIT should be reversed using an Average Rate Assumption Method ("ARAM") if the utility has the available information to calculate the ARAM, or via another appropriate method that complies with normalization requirements, if the Company does not have the information to compute the ARAM.

ISSUE 5: **A**. Were "unprotected excess deferred taxes" for 2018 using a 21 percent corporate tax rate appropriately calculated?

OPC: Yes, the Citizens have identified no errors in the Company's calculation of the unprotected excess ADIT.

B. What is the appropriate disposition of the unprotected excess deferred taxes?

OPC: The Company should not be allowed to retain the benefit of the unprotected excess ADIT. The Unprotected excess ADIT net asset of $1,195,541 should be amortized over 10 years at $119,554 per year.

ISSUE 6: Should CFG seek a private letter ruling from the IRS regarding its classification of the excess ADIT relating to cost of removal/negative net salvage as "unprotected"?

OPC: Possibly, yes.

ISSUE 7: If CFG seeks a private letter ruling and the IRS rules therein (or in another private letter ruling) that the excess ADIT relating to cost of removal/negative net salvage is to be treated as "protected," what process should be followed for the reclassification?

OPC: Pending clarification of the appropriate classification of excess ADIT for cost of removal/negative net salvage, CFG should amortize the related excess ADIT using the ARAM if the classification ruled by the IRS indicates this is "protected".

ISSUE 8: What mechanism should be utilized to avoid the negative impact to CFG of the cost of seeking a Private Letter Ruling?

OPC: By awaiting IRS rulings from the larger Florida utilities on their respective PLRs, CFG could potentially avoid the need to seek its own PLR. If the PLRs for the larger Florida utilities are clear and consistent in their rulings, having CFG and its affiliates request their own PLR may be unnecessary. Thus, the cost for having CFG and its Florida affiliates request a PLR does not need to be incurred at this time.

ISSUE 9: Were appropriate adjustments made to CFG's Gas Reliability Infrastructure Program "GRIP" for the impact of the TCJA for the tax year 2018?

OPC: Yes, the Citizens have identified no errors and agree with CFG's proposals to flow GRIP-related TCJA savings through its GRIP surcharge filings.

ISSUE 10: What is the forecasted tax expense for CFG for the tax year 2018 at a 21 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: The Citizens have identified no errors in CFG's forecasted tax expense for the tax year 2018 as estimated to be $954,499.

ISSUE 11: What is the forecasted tax expense for CFG for the tax year 2018 at a 35 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: No Position at this time.

ISSUE 12: What is the forecasted NOI for the tax year 2018 at a 21 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: The Citizens have identified no errors in CFG's forecasted NOI of $5,158,109 for the tax year 2018 at the 21 percent corporate tax rate.

ISSUE 13: What is the forecasted NOI for the tax year 2018 at a 35 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: The Citizens have identified no errors in CFG's forecasted NOI of $4,445,528 for the tax year 2018 at the 35 percent corporate tax rate.

ISSUE 14: What is the forecasted capital structure for the tax year 2018 at a 21 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: No Position at this time.

ISSUE 15: What is the annual forecasted capital structure for the tax year 2018 at a 35 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: No Position at this time.

ISSUE 16: What is the forecasted annual revenue requirement for CFG for the tax year 2018 using a 21 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: No Position at this time.

ISSUE 17: What is the forecasted annual revenue requirement for CFG for the tax year 2018 using a 35 percent corporate tax rate?

OPC: No Position at this time.

ISSUE 18: Should CFG be allowed to retain any of the tax benefit associated with the tax rate change implemented by the TCJA and if so, how much?

OPC: No, CFG should not be allowed to retain any of the tax benefit associated with the tax rate change implemented by the TCJA.

ISSUE 19: Should CFG be allowed to retain the total net benefit associated with the Protected Deferred Tax Liability and the Unprotected Deferred Tax Asset, and should CFG be allowed to amortize the Protected Deferred Tax Liability over 26 years and the Unprotected Deferred Tax Asset over 10 years?

OPC: No, CFG should not be allowed to retain the total net benefit associated with the Protected Deferred Tax Liability and the Unprotected Deferred Tax Asset. Yes, CFG should be allowed to amortize the Protected Deferred Tax Liability over 26 years and the Unprotected Deferred Tax Asset over 10 years.

ISSUE 20: Should the tax benefit arising from the TCJA rate reduction, excluding the 2018 GRIP savings, be retained by CFG?

OPC: No the tax benefit arising from the TCJA rate reduction should not be retained by CFG.

ISSUE 21: Should CFG pass-on to customers all tax benefits directly associated with the GRIP program through future GRIP surcharges?

OPC: Yes, the GRIP-related TCJA savings should be passed-on to customers through CFG's GRIP surcharge filings.

ISSUE 22: Should CFG update the estimated tax benefits for any adjustments to those estimates through December 22, 2018? If so, how should it be handled?

OPC: Yes, adjustments or corrections to the amounts should be addressed in a true-up filing.

ISSUE 23: Should this docket be closed?

OPC: No.

E. STIPULATED ISSUES:

None.

F. PENDING MOTIONS:

None.

G. REQUESTS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

Citizens have no pending requests for claims for confidentiality.

H. OBJECTIONS TO QUALIFICATIONS

None.

I. REQUIREMENTS OF ORDER

There are no requirements of the Order Establishing Procedure with which the Office of Public Counsel cannot comply.

Dated this 22nd day of October, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

JR Kelly
Public Counsel

/s/Virginia Ponder
Virginia Ponder
Associate Public Counsel
Office of Public Counsel
c/o The Florida Legislature
111 West Madison Street, Room 812
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400
(850) 488-9330

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
20180054-GU

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Prehearing Statement** has been furnished by electronic mail on this 22nd day of October, 2018, to the following:

Charles Murphy
Margo Duval
Rachael Dziechciarz
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
cmurphy@psc.state.fl.us
mduval@psc.state.fl.us
RDziechc@psc.state.fl.us

Beth Keating
Gregory M. Munson
Gunster Law Firm
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601
Tallahassee FL 32301-1839
bkeating@gunter.com
gmunson@gunster.com

Mr. Mike Cassel
Florida Public Utilities Company
1750 S.W. 14th Street, Suite 200
Fernandina Beach FL 32034
(904) 491-4361
mcassel@fpuc.com

/s/Virginia Ponder
Virginia Ponder
Associate Public Counsel