

#  <br> Capital Circie Office Center • 2540 Shumard Oak Boliavard) <br> Talifahassee, Florida 32399-0850 

## -M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: September 5, 2007
TO: Shevie B. Brown, Regulatory Analyst III, Division of Economic Regulation
FROM: Denise N. Vandiver, Chief of Auditing, Division of Regulatory Compliance \& Consumer Assistance (a)

RE: Docket No: 070004-GU; Company Name: Chesapeake Utilities Corporation; Audit Purpose: Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Audit; Audit Control No: 07-074-2-1

Attached is the final audit report for the utility stated above. I am sending the utility a copy of this memo and the audit report. If the utility desires to file a response to the audit report, it should send the response to the Division of Commission Clerk. There are no confidential work papers associated with this audit.

DNV:sbj
Attachments

# Copy: Division of Regulatory Compliance and Consumer Assistance (Hoppe, District Offices, File Folder) <br> Division of Commission Clerk(2) <br> Division of Competitive Markets and Enforcement (Harvey) <br> General Counsel <br> Office of Public Counsel <br> Mr. Thomas A. Geoffroy <br> Chesapeake Utilities Corp. <br> P.O. Box 960 <br> Winter Haven, FL 33882 



Akerman Law Firm
Beth Keating
106 E. College Ave., Suite 1200
Tallahassee, FL 32301


FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## DIVISION OF REGULATORY COMPLIANCE \& CONSUMER ASSISTANCE BUREAU OF AUDITING

Tampa District Office

# CHESAPEAKE UTILITIES CORPORATION FLORIDA DIVISION <br> <br> ENERGY CONSERVATION COST RECOVERY <br> <br> ENERGY CONSERVATION COST RECOVERY TRUE-UP INVESTIGATION 

 TRUE-UP INVESTIGATION}

AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2006

DOCKET NO. 070004-GU
AUDIT CONTROL NO. 07-074-2-1


## TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUDITOR'S REPORT ..... PAGE
I. PURPOSE ..... 1
II. OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES ..... 2
III. AUDIT FINDINGS

1. ADJUSTMENT TO ADVERTISING EXPENSE ..... 4
IV. EXHIBITS ..... 8

# DIVISION OF REGULATORY COMPLIANCE \& CONSUMER ASSISTANCE AUDITOR'S REPORT 

July 20, 2007

## TO: FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION AND OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

We have performed the procedures described later in this report to meet the agreed upon objectives set forth by the Division of Economic Regulation in its audit service request dated March 14, 2007. We have applied these procedures to the attached schedules prepared by the Florida Division of Chesapeake Utilities Corporation in support of its filing for Energy Conservation Cost Recovery in Docket No. 070004-GU.

This audit was performed following general standards and field work standards found in the AICPA Statements on Standards for Attestation Engagements. This report is based on agreed upon procedures which are only for internal Commission use.

## OBJECTIVES AND PROCEDURES

## General

Objective: To determine that the company's filing is in compliance with its Commission authorized Conservation program.

Procedures: We reconciled the following individual component energy conservation cost recovery (ECCR) balances to the company's general ledger for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2006 and performed the procedures described below.

## ECCR Revenues

Objective: To determine that the company has applied the approved ECCR factor to actual therm sales during the audit period and that ECCR revenues are representative of company activity and are properly computed and recorded on the books of the company.

Procedures: We traced the company's ECCR revenues recorded in the filing to the company's general ledger and recalculated a sample of customer bills to verify that the appropriate ECCR factors were charged.

## ECCR Expenses

Objective: To determine that the actual ECCR program expenses filed by the company for the 12 -month period are representative of company activity and are properly computed and recorded on the books of the company.

Procedures: We traced the company's ECCR expenses recorded in the filing to the general ledger. We tested the allocation of company salaries and benefits to ECCR expense to verify that only conservation activity was included. We tested the company's ECCR advertising expenses for compliance with Rule 25-17.015 (5), Florida Administrative Code, guidelines. We sampled ECCR incentive rebates to verify that they complied with its Commission authorized Conservation program.

Audit Finding No. 1 discusses our adjustment to correct the company's advertising expense balance by removing an incorrect company adjustment and by removing insufficiently supported, unsupported and disallowed advertising expense amounts.

## ECCR True-Up

Objective: To determine that the true-up calculation and interest provision as filed was properly calculated using Commission approved interest rates.

Procedures: We recomputed the company's ECCR true-up balance for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2006 and reconciled the beginning true-up balance to the prior Commission order. We also traced the interest rate used to calculate the monthly true-up ending balance to the Wall Street Journal rate.

## ECCR Other

Objective: To determine that all executed company builder agreements are in compliance with Commission rules and the company's approved ECCR program.

Procedures: We reviewed all builders agreements executed in 2006 to ensure that the incentives offered to the builders reconciled to the company's approved conservation programs.

## AUDIT FINDING NO. 1

## SUBJECT: ADJUSTMENT TO ADVERTISING EXPENSE

AUDIT ANALYSIS: The company's filing reflects advertising expenses totaling $\$ 41,777$ for the following approved ECCR programs.

| Program Name | Amount |
| :--- | ---: |
| Residential Homebuilder | $\$ 20,561$ |
| Residential Appliance Replacement | 8,660 |
| Residential Water Heater Retention | 802 |
| Conservation Education | 11,754 |
| Total Advertising | $\$ 41,777$ |

Rule 25-17.015 (5) F.A.C. states that in determining whether an advertisement is "directly related to an approved conservation program", the Commission shall consider, but is not limited to, whether the advertisement or advertising campaign:
(a) Identifies a specific problem;
(b) States how to correct the problem; and
(c) Provides direction concerning how to obtain help to alleviate the problem.

The company's advertising expenses are understated by $\$ 1,245$ (\$9,237-\$7,992)for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2006 based on the following two issues discussed below. See Schedule A that follows for our calculations.

## Issue One

Our review of the company's advertising expenses indicates that the company's actual advertising expenses totaled $\$ 51,014$ for the 12 -month period ending December 31, 2006. The difference of $\$ 9,237$ ( $\$ 51,015-\$ 41,777$ ) is attributed to a company adjustment to its 2006 advertising expense for an analyst's adjustment to its 2005 ECCR filing in Docket No. 060004-GU. In that docket, the company requested a final true-up amount of $\$ 262,210$ which the analyst reduced by $\$ 9,974$ to the Commission approved amount of $\$ 252,236$. The company posted $\$ 9,237$ of the $\$ 9,974$ adjustment to its 2006 advertising expense account. See Schedule B that follows for details.

We have determined that the company's adjustment discussed above should be removed because in the current ECCR filing the company begins with the adjusted final true-up amount of $\$ 252,236$. This balance already includes the $\$ 9,974$ adjustment from the prior docket. The company's adjustment of $\$ 9,237$ to its 2006 advertising expense account would double book a substantial portion of the prior docket's adjustment.

## Issue Two

Our review of the company's advertising expenses, the Commission rule cited above and the analyst determination in the prior docket indicates that the company's actual advertising expense of $\$ 51,014$, which we determined above, is overstated by $\$ 7,992$ for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2006 based on the following. See Schedule A that follows for details.

1) The company's supporting documentation for the following vendor invoices indicates that they are not "directly related" because they satisfied only two of the three requirements identified in the Commission rule cited above. We have removed $75 \%$ of the invoiced amount which is consistent with the analyst adjustment in the prior ECCR docket.
(a) Builders Association of North Central Florida
(b) R. H. Donnelley
(c) St. Petersburg Times
(d) Yellow Pages, Inc.
2) The company's supporting documents for advertising expense from the following vendors were insufficient to allow us to determine compliance with the Commission rule cited above and should be removed.
(a) Citrus County Builders Association
(b) Inverness Seratoma
(c) Osceola Chamber of Commerce
3) The company's advertising expense included a duplicate payment to Marketing Solutions, LLC that should be removed.
4) The company did not provide adequate supporting documentation for advertising expense paid to the following vendors.
(a) Plant City Chamber of Commerce
(b) Plantation Inn
(c) School District Publications

EFFECT ON GENERAL LEDGER: Advertising expense should be increased by $\$ 9,237$ to remove the company's adjustment that was already included in the final true-up balance. The second adjustment does not effect the general ledger because it is for ECCR filing purposes only.

EFFECT ON THE FILING: The company's final true-up balance should be reduced by $\$ 1,245$ from an over-recovery balance of $\$ 10,999$ to an over-recovery balance of $\$ 9,754$ for the 12 -month period ended December 31, 2006.


## Schedule B

| Date | Vendor | Activity | Natural Account | Territory | Department | Adjusted Amount | Original Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (\$137.56) | \$183.41 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (139.20) | 185.60 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909 A | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | (184.91) | 246.55 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | (91.87) | 122.50 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | (490.67) | 1,962.69 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | (177.35) | 236.47 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | (91.87) | 122.50 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (137.56) | 183.41 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (1,579.19) | 2,105.59 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909 A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (148.60) | 198.13 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (92.42) | 123.23 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (91.87) | 122.50 |
| 12/31/06 | Reciass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (92.48) | 123.31 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (125.00) | 250.00 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | (87.60) | 116.80 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909A | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (278.49) | 371.32 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909E | 7030 | CF20 | SA107 | (36.94) | 147.75 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909E | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | $(1,279.45)$ | 1,705.93 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909E | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | $(1,224.63)$ | 1,632.84 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909E | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | $(1,460.26)$ | 1,947.01 |
| 12/31/06 | Reclass Unapproved Cons Expense | 909E | 7030 | CF10 | SA102 | (1,289.03) | 1,718.71 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ( $\$ 9,236.95$ ) |  |

Final under-recovered amount in company filing
$\$ 262,210.00$
Analyst adjustments to company filing
(\$9,974.00)
Final under-recovered amount in Order PSC-06-0996-FOF-GU
\$252,236.00

The company posted the analyst adjustment for 2005 ECCR disallowed advertising expenses to its 2006 account. They did not, however, post the entire amount. The above schedule displays the company adjustments that were posted. The entire $\$ 9,237$ needs to be removed because the company filing in 2006 begins with the final order amount of $\$ 252,236$ which included the analyst's adjustment in the prior docket.
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