

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. 20180052 – In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 for Florida Public Utilities Company – Indiantown Division.**

Dear Ms. Stauffer:

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

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. 20180052-GU

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

Prepared 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 (“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-Indiantown’s natural gas proposal for  
9 disposition of tax benefits related to the Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act  
10 of 2017 (“2017 Tax Act”).

11

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

13 A. Yes. I am sponsoring Exhibit FIMC-1 (revised), which provides a  
14 summary of FPUC-Indiantown’s natural gas proposed treatments of the  
15 impacts resulting from the 2017 Tax Act.

16

17 I. FPUC-Indiantown’s PROPOSAL

18

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

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

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

3    A.    The components of the 2017 Tax Act being addressed by FPUC-  
4           Indiantown are: 1) the federal rate change from 35% to 21%; 2) the  
5           Unprotected Deferred Tax Liability; and 3) the Protected Deferred Tax  
6           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-Indiantown, the annual tax detriment amount associated with  
11           the tax rate change, based on the 2018 proforma surveillance report, is  
12           estimated to be approximately \$54,096.

13

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

16   A.    At present, the Company is not over-earning. In fact, the Company is  
17           earning below its allowable range and is projected to continue to do so  
18           for the foreseeable future. As such, the Company should be allowed to  
19           recover this annual tax detriment through the Energy Conservation Cost  
20           Recovery (“ECCR”) clause for purposes of addressing ongoing,  
21           incremental costs that have been incurred since the Company’s last  
22           base rate increase, which was initiated in 2003. Even with this recovery,  
23           the Company will still be operating at a loss.

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

3 A. FPUC-Indiantown has a regulatory liability recorded on its balance sheet  
4 for the 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%.

8 Exhibit FIMC-1 (revised) demonstrates the impact of these calculations.

9 The Unprotected Deferred Tax Asset is an estimated balance of \$6,484.  
10 The Company requests this Deferred Tax Asset be amortized over 10  
11 years or \$648 per year. This annual amortization could be netted with the  
12 annual Protected benefit, as discussed below on page 5, and the  
13 Company requests that the total of these amounts be retained by the  
14 Company.

15

16 **Q. What is FPUC-Indiantown's proposed resolution for the Protected**  
17 **Deferred Tax savings?**

18 A. FPUC-Indiantown has a regulatory liability recorded on its balance sheet  
19 for the Protected Deferred Tax at a rate of 35% consistent with the  
20 applicable law prior to the 2017 Tax Act. As a result of the 2017 Tax  
21 Act, the Company will only be required to pay those taxes out at 21%.  
22 The benefit in the Protected Deferred Tax is recorded on FPUC-  
23 Indiantown's balance sheet as a grossed-up Deferred Regulatory Tax  
24 Liability currently estimated to be \$221,269. This deferred balance will

1 be amortized using the Internal Revenue Service's prescribed  
2 methodology and is estimated to flow back over 26 years at  
3 approximately \$8,510 per year. Exhibit FIMC-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-Indiantown's witness Matthew  
6 Dewey. FPUC-Indiantown proposes retaining the estimated annual  
7 amount of \$8,510 less the Unprotected Deferred Tax Amortization, as  
8 discussed above, of \$648 for a total benefit of \$7,862. This meets the  
9 intended goal of the 2017 Tax Act by allowing the Company to continue  
10 making capital investments while potentially delaying the need for a  
11 costly rate proceeding.

12

13 **Q. Is FPUC-Indiantown's proposal the best approach for your**  
14 **customers?**

15 A. Yes. FPUC-Indiantown's proposal provides a fair and reasonable  
16 resolution of the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act. The annual detriment will  
17 be collected in the ECCR clause rather than increasing the Company's  
18 base rates. FPUC-Indiantown's proposal eliminates the inherent  
19 confusion of mixed price signals that exist when individual components  
20 of customer bills change in opposite directions. FPUC-Indiantown's  
21 proposal also allows FPUC-Indiantown to retain a fair portion of the tax  
22 benefit arising from the 2017 Tax Act in a manner that not only allows the  
23 Company to earn close to or within its jurisdictional range, but also  
24 allows the Company to recover costs not currently recovered in base  
25 rates such that the Company may be able to maintain base rates at their

1 current levels for longer than would otherwise be possible given the  
2 Company's current earnings posture. As such, our customers benefit  
3 from extended stability of our base rates.

4

5 **Q. Does FPUC-Indiantown believe this treatment is the most**  
6 **appropriate treatment for the Company?**

7 A. Yes. Adjusting the rates for just one component, such as taxes, of a  
8 customer's bill is akin to single-issue rate-making and is inconsistent with  
9 fundamental regulatory principles. Additionally, this type of rate-making  
10 principle assumes that the Company is currently earning its authorized  
11 Return on Equity ("ROE") and that nothing has changed since the last  
12 rate proceeding. However, FPUC-Indiantown is currently under-earning  
13 relative to its authorized ROE so a reduction to its rates based on the  
14 authorized ROE would push the utility's earned ROE even lower on a  
15 pro-forma basis, which is again inconsistent with the objectives and  
16 goals of rate-making and produces an unreasonable result for FPUC-  
17 Indiantown.

18

19 **Q. Will the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act put FPUC-Indiantown into an**  
20 **over-earnings position?**

21 A. No. FPUC-Indiantown's proposed treatment of the impacts of the 2017  
22 Tax Act benefits and detriments will not put the Company into an over-  
23 earning position.

24



1 II. SUMMARY

2

3 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

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

14

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

16 A. Yes.

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

DOCKET NO.: 20180052-GU  
 EXHIBIT NO.: FIMC-1 - revised  
 Page 1 of 1

	FI	FC Allocated	Total FI	ANNUAL
<b>ANNUAL TAX SAVINGS FROM RATE CHANGE:</b>				
NOI BEFORE TAX CHANGE	\$ (156,494)		\$ (156,494)	
NOI AFTER TAX CHANGE	\$ (196,879)		\$ (196,879)	
NET INCOME EFFECT OF TAX CHANGE	\$ (40,385)		\$ (40,385)	
GROSS UP	\$ (13,711)		\$ (13,711)	
PRETAX - GROSSED UP SAVINGS (EXPENSE)	\$ (54,096)	\$ -	\$ (54,096)	\$ (54,096)
<b>REGULATORY TAX LIABILITY:</b>				
ESTIMATED PROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY	\$ 219,605	\$ 1,664	\$ 221,269	\$ 8,510 26 YEARS
ESTIMATED UNPROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY	\$ (3,403)	\$ (3,081)	\$ (6,484)	\$ (648) 10 YEARS
NET ESTIMATED REGULATORY TAX LIABILITY	\$ 216,202	\$ (1,417)	\$ 214,785	\$ 7,862
TOTAL				\$ (46,234)
As Filed FIMC-1				\$ (44,207)
Difference				\$ (2,027)

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. 20180052-GU

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

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 FIMD-1 (revised) and exhibit FIMD-2  
19 (revised). The exhibit FIMD-1 (revised) shows the Company's  
20 calculations to support the estimated regulatory liabilities of \$216,202.  
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, Chesapeake Utilities Corporation, to all Chesapeake subsidiaries  
15          and divisions, including FPUC-Indiantown, at the blended tax rate. I do  
16          not expect these adjustments to re-occur. The net difference between  
17          the 35% and 21% was reported with a net effect of zero to the balance  
18          sheet. The exhibit FIMD-2 (revised) supports the same calculation  
19          described above for the Florida Corporate general ledger. The result is  
20          an estimated regulatory asset of \$354,178 of which \$1,417 or 0.4% is  
21          allocated to FPUC- Indiantown.

22

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

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

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

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 \$214,785**  
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-INDIANTOWN DIVISION  
Computation of Regulatory Liability (FI)

Docket No.: 20180052-GU  
Exhibit No.: FIMD-1 revised

Seg 3	FERC	Code	Name	BEFORE		AFTER									
				35.00%	21.00%	Blended		21.00%		Allocation from Parent 3/31/18					
				38.58%	25.35%	UnProtected Plant	UnProtected NonPlant	OTP Adj	12/31/2017 Balance	UnProtected NonPlant	NetAdjust to LT Bonus	Q1 Entries	03/31/2018 Balance		
25AF	282	UNNP	25AF	AFUDC	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25AM	283	UNNP	25AM	Customer Based Intangibles	\$ (65,525)	\$ 22,473	\$ -	\$ 22,473	\$ 43,052	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
25BD	283	UNNP	25BD	Bad Debts	\$ 756	\$ (259)	\$ -	\$ (259)	\$ -	\$ 497	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (90)	\$ 407	
25BN	283	UNNP	25BN.01	Short Term Bonus	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,637	\$ 1,158	\$ -	\$ 2,795	
25CN	283	UNNP	25CN	Conservation	\$ 3,563	\$ (1,222)	\$ -	\$ (1,222)	\$ -	\$ 2,341	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 644	\$ 2,985	
25DP	282	P	25DP.01	Depreciation	\$ (450,908)	\$ 154,647	\$ 154,647	\$ -	\$ (28)	\$ (296,289)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,448	\$ (291,841)	
25DP	282	P	25DP.02	Contribution in Aid of Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25DP	282	UNNP	25DP.03	Cost of Removal	\$ 72,370	\$ (24,821)	\$ (24,821)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 47,549	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (80)	\$ 47,469	
25DP	282	P	25DP.04	Asset Gain/Loss	\$ (27,113)	\$ 9,299	\$ 9,299	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (17,814)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (17,814)	
25DP	282	P	25DP.05	Adjustment for Repairs Depreciation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25ID	283	UNNP	25ID	Reserve for Insurance Deductibles	\$ (756)	\$ 259	\$ -	\$ 259	\$ (1)	\$ (498)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63	\$ (435)	
25PG	283	UNNP	25PG	Purchased Gas Cots	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1)	\$ (1)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (495)	\$ (496)	
25RE	282	UNNP	25RE	Repairs Deduction	\$ (3,620)	\$ 1,242	\$ 1,242	\$ -	\$ (1)	\$ (2,379)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (2,379)	
25RP	282	UNNP	25RP	Property Taxes	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25RT	283	UNNP	25RT	Rabbi Trust	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,835	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,835	
25SR	283	UNNP	25SR.01	SERP (Current)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,889	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,889	
25SD	283	UNNP	25SD	ADIT State Decoupling	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25SL	283	UNNP	S_NOL_SYS	S_NOL_SYS	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
25SL	283	UNNP	S_NOL_SYS - 2014 - S_NOL_SYS - 2014 - FL		\$ 3,094	\$ 666	\$ -	\$ 666	\$ (3,094)	\$ 666	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 666	
<b>Total</b>					\$ (468,139)	\$ 162,284	\$ 163,946	\$ (23,579)	\$ 21,917	\$ 39,927	\$ (265,928)	\$ 7,361	\$ 1,158	\$ 4,490	\$ (252,919)
Protected Gross-up					\$ -	\$ (1)	\$ 55,659	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,659	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,659
UnProtected Plant Gross-up					\$ -	\$ -	\$ (8,005)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (8,005)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (8,005)	
UnProtected NonPlant Gross-up					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,441	\$ -	\$ 7,441	\$ (1,304)	\$ (205)	\$ -	\$ 5,932	
Unrecorded adjustment to correct grossup calculation at year end					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,778	\$ -	\$ 4,778	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,778	
25TX	25TX		25TX	Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 55,659	\$ (8,005)	\$ 12,219	\$ 59,873	\$ (1,304)	\$ (205)	\$ -	\$ 58,364	
<b>Total with Gross-up</b>					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 219,605	\$ (31,584)	\$ 34,136	\$ (206,055)	\$ 6,057	\$ 953	\$ 4,490	\$ (194,555)	
<b>Excess Deferred Tax Liability before gross up</b>							<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>						
Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Protected					\$ -	\$ -	\$ (163,946)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (163,946)	
Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Plant					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,579	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (1,762)	
Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Non Plant					\$ -	\$ -	\$ (21,917)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (7,361)	\$ (1,158)	\$ -	\$ (30,436)	
<b>Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Total</b>					\$ -	\$ -	\$ (162,284)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (196,144)	
										\$ (206,055)			\$ (194,555)		
										\$ (0)			\$ (0)		
25TX	25TX		25TX	Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,873	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 59,873	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 58,364	
										\$ (0)			\$ (0)		
										<b>d</b>					
280R-254P	280R-254N		280R-254N	Reg Liability - Protected	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (219,605)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (219,605)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (219,605)	
										\$ (2,552)	\$ 5,146	\$ 809	\$ 3,403		
										\$ (222,157)			\$ (216,202)		
Reg Liability -UnProtected Plant					\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,584	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,584	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,584	
Reg Liability -UnProtected Non Plant					\$ -	\$ -	\$ (34,136)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (34,136)	\$ 5,146	\$ 809	\$ -	\$ (28,181)	
										\$ (2,552)			\$ 3,403		

Note A: Highlighted numbers were revised for adjustments discussed in the revised testimony and will be booked in 4th quarter 2018.

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

Docket No.:  
 Exhibit No.:

20180052-EI  
 FIMD-2 revised

			BEFORE		AFTER									
FL	5.50%	Fed	35.00%	21.00%	21.00%									
			Blended		Allocation from Parent 3/31/18									
Seg 3	FERC	Code	Name	38.58% 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)
25RC	283	UNNP 25RC	Rate Case	\$ -	\$ -			\$ -		\$ -			\$ -	\$ -
25RD	283	UNNP 25RD	Loss on Recquired Debt	\$ (397,679)	\$ 136,391			\$ 136,391	\$ 33,873	\$ (227,415)			\$ 7,208	\$ (220,207)
25RE	282	UNNP 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>				<b>\$ 781,956</b>	<b>\$ (266,453)</b>	<b>\$ 310,577</b>	<b>\$ (1,920)</b>	<b>\$ (575,110)</b>	<b>\$ 27,293</b>	<b>\$ 542,796</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (31,584)</b>	<b>\$ 511,212</b>
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	25TX	Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up			\$ 105,439	\$ (652)	\$ (192,512)		\$ (87,724)	\$ -	\$ -		\$ (87,724)
<b>Total with Gross-up</b>						<b>\$ 416,016</b>	<b>\$ (2,572)</b>	<b>\$ (767,622)</b>		<b>\$ 455,072</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ (31,584)</b>	<b>\$ 423,488</b>
						<b>a</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>c</b>						



1 Before the Florida Public Service Commission

2 Docket No. 20180052-GU

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

5  
6 Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel

7 Date of Filing: August 27, 2018

8  
9 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

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

12  
13 **Q. By whom are you employed and what is your position?**

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

16  
17 **Q. Please describe your educational background and professional  
18 experience.**

19 A. I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting from Delaware  
20 State University in Dover, Delaware in 1996. I was hired by Chesapeake  
21 Utilities Corporation (“CUC” or “the Company”) as a Senior Regulatory  
22 Analyst in March 2008. As a Senior Regulatory Analyst, I was primarily  
23 involved in the areas of gas cost recovery, rate of return analysis, and  
24 budgeting for CUC’s Delaware and Maryland natural gas distribution  
25 companies. In 2010, I moved to Florida in the role of Senior Tax  
26 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. Most recently, I provided written, pre-filed testimony in  
6 FPUC's electric Limited Proceeding, Docket No. 20170150-EI, as well as  
7 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-Indiantown be required to seek a PLR from the IRS  
18 regarding the proper classification of Accumulated Deferred Income  
19 Tax ("ADIT") associated with the cost of removal?**

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

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

26

1 **Q. If FPUC-Indiantown is required to pursue a PLR, should the**  
2 **Company be allowed to recover the costs associated with the**  
3 **process to obtain a 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-Indiantown propose that this amount be**  
11 **addressed?**

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

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

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



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

8

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

10 **A. Yes.**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing revised Direct Testimony and exhibit of Michael Cassel, the revised Direct Testimony and exhibits of Matthew Dewey and the Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael Cassel, on behalf of FPUC-Indiantown Division the referenced docket have been served by Electronic Mail this 27th 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. Sayler 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:Sayler.Eric@leg.state.fl.us">Sayler.Eric@leg.state.fl.us</a>
---	--

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