GATLIN, SCHIEFELBEIN & COWDERY, P.A.

Attorneys at Law

The Mahan Station 1709-D Mahan Drive Tallahassee, Florida 32308

B. KENNETH GATLIN WAYNE L. SCHIEFELBEIN KATHRYN G.W. COWDERY

TELEPHONE (904) 877-5609 TELECOPIER (904) 877-9031 E-MAIL: bkgatlin@nettally.com

February 19, 1997

Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE: Docket No. 960725-GU

Unbundling of Natural Gas Services

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Enclosed for filing in the above docket are an original and 15 copies of Chesapeake Utilities Corporation's Response to February 6, 1997 Staff Memorandum, together with our Certificate of Service.

Please acknowledge receipt of the foregoing by stamping the enclosed extra copy of this letter and returning same to my attention. Thank you for your assistance.

	Sincerely,
ACK	N. I Colis Gelleria
AFA	Jane L. Johnsfelben
APP	Wayne L. Schiefelbein
CAF WL S/pav CMU <u>En</u> closures	
CTR — cc w/encl: EAG — LEG —	Anne Wood (w/cover letter & certificate of service only) Chesapeake Utilities Corporation
OPC RCH	Marc Schneidermann Florida Public Utilities Company
SEC WAS	
014	DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

01862 FEB 195



P.O. Box 960

Winter Haven Office 1015 6th Street N.W Winter Haven, Florida 33881

Winter Haven, Florida 33882 (941) 293-2125

February 18, 1997

Plant City Office 1514 N. Alexander St., Suite 107 Plant City, Florida 33566 (813) 752-1363 Fax (813) 754-6183

Mr. Wayne R. Makin Florida Public Service Commission Division of Electric and Gas 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0868

RE: Docket No. 960725-GU

Dear Wayne,

(941) 293-2125

Fax (941) 294-3895

This is in response to your memorandum dated February 6, 1997 in which you requested responses to the following question.

Question:

Should the Commission proceed to further direct the LDC's to unbundle natural gas services?

Chesapeake Utilities Corporation's Response:

Chesapeake Utilities Corporation ("CUC") submitted written comments on the unbundling of natural gas services in Florida at the outset of these proceedings in which we supported Staff's investigation into "unbundling". However, we identified several issues that Staff needed to address in order to more clearly define the objectives of this docket. The five issues addressed in our comments are restated below.

- 1) What is Staff's definition of unbundling?
- 2) Staff should convey to all parties its intended goal of these proceedings.
- 3) Staff should consider whether all of the Florida LDCs should be subject to unbundling.
- 4) To what degree will LDCs be required to unbundle?
- 5) What will be the implementation schedule for unbundling?

CUC has participated in the three PSC sponsored workshops on unbundling and has submitted written comments at the conclusion of each workshop. At this point in the process, we believe that the only issue listed above to which we may have reached consensus is issue #1. We believe

1

that all parties would agree that an appropriate <u>definition</u> of unbundling is the separating of the LDC's traditional sales service into its individual components (i.e., pipeline capacity, gas commodity, transportation, storage, etc.) and determining how the LDC will recover the segregated costs of these services that were formerly borne by the sales customers.

To date we do not yet know Staff's goal with respect to this docket (CUC issues #2, #3, #4 and #5). Chesapeake does not believe that the Commission should proceed to further direct the LDCs to unbundle natural gas service until the goals of this docket are developed and parties have an opportunity to respond to them. There are some very important questions related to unbundling which have not been addressed to date. These questions are: 1) Are there economic benefits to ratepayers as a whole from unbundling LDCs; and, 2) Is further Commission unbundling action warranted? CUC believes that what has been demonstrated in the workshop discussions and comments to date is that unbundling LDCs will potentially only shift costs from one class of customers (the largest with good load factors) to all other classes of customers.

We believe that the workshops have clarified that transportation only saves money to end-use customers in two (2) primary ways: through the use of discounted capacity and the avoidance of certain taxes and fees. CUC acquired primary firm capacity on FGT at FERC approved tariff rates for the benefit of all of our customers. The costs associated with this capacity are paid to FGT regardless of whether or not this capacity is fully utilized or not. If it is not fully utilized, then CUC attempts to release the unused portion on the secondary market. All unrecovered costs of this capacity are then rolled back into our PGA and are paid for by the sales customers on our system. Potentially, a third party can purchase our unused capacity on the secondary market, at a steep discount, and resell this capacity, and the associated supply, to transportation customers. The transportation customer receives some benefit from the discounted capacity, the third party receives benefits from marking up the discounted capacity and the remaining sales customers pay for the redistribution of these savings/profits.

Third parties may also transact these sales in such a manner as to avoid the taxation of the sale in the State of Florida. This reduces the amount of revenues received by the State of Florida, the FPSC and local governments. This lost revenue must be compensated for by either a reduction in services rendered by the governing body or, more likely, an increase in taxes and fees to the taxpayers or remaining sales customers of the utility. To demonstrate the impact on CUC's system alone, the avoided gross receipts taxes and regulatory assessment fees during 1996 were approximately \$274,747. On many systems there would have also been an avoidance of State sales tax and local government taxes and fees, but on our system these amounts were either zero or minimal.

In summary, it is CUC's belief that unbundling does not result in savings to our entire body of customers but rather simply redistributes costs among the various customer classes. It is also our belief that unbundling may place a heavier burden on the taxpayers of the state to make up for the avoidance of taxes afforded by transporting through third party transactions.

We believe that these issues should be recognized and addressed by the Commission and Commission staff in conjunction with the development of goals for this docket before proceeding with further unbundling of LDCs in Florida.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely.

Thomas A. Geoffroy

Florida Regional Manager

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re: Unbundling of Natural Gas)
Services

Docket No. 960725-GU Filed: February 19, 1997

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of Chesapeake Utilities Corporation's Response to February 6, 1997 Staff Memorandum has been furnished by hand delivery (*) or by U.S. Mail to the following individuals, on this 19th day of February, 1997:

Beth Culpepper, Esq.*
Division of Legal Services
Florida Public Service
Commission
Gunter Bldg., Room 370
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Stuart L. Shoaf St. Joe Natural Gas Company, Inc. P.O. Box 549 Port St. Joe, FL 32457-0549

Sebring Gas System, Inc. 3515 Highway 27 South Sebring, FL 33870-5452

Colette M. Powers Indiantown Gas Company P.O. Box 8 Indiantown, FL 34956-0008

Ansley Watson, Jr., Esq.
Macfarlane, Ferguson & McMullen
P.O. Box 1531
Tampa, FL 33601-1531

Michael A. Palecki, Esq. City Gas Company of Florida 955 East 25th Street Hialeah, FL 33013-3498

Patrick K. Wiggins Wiggins & Villacorta, P.A. P.O. Drawer 1657 Tallahassee, FL 32302 David Rogers, Esq. P.O. Box 11026 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Norman H. Horton, Jr.
Messer, Caparello, Metz,
Maida & Self, P.A.
P.O. Box 1876
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

Barnett G. Johnson, Esq. Johnson and Associates, P.A. P.O. Box 1308 Tallahassee, FL 32302

Vicki Gordon Kaufman, Esq. McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Rief & Bakas, P.A. 117 S. Gadsden Street Tallahassee, FL 32301

John W. McWhirter, Jr., Esq. McWhirter, Reeves, McGlothlin, Davidson, Rief & Bakas, P.A. P.O. Box 3350
Tampa, FL 33601-3350

Robert Cooper U.S. Gypsum Company 125 South Franklin Ave. Chicago, IL 60606-4678

Robert Scheffel Wright, Esq. Landers & Parsons , P.A. P.O. Box 271 Tallahassee, FL 32302 Stephen S. Mathues, Esq.
O. Earl Black, Jr., Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Department of Management
Services
4050 Esplanade Way, Suite 260
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0950

Peter G. Esposito, Esq. Gregory K. Lawrence, Esq. John, Hengerer & Esposito 1200 17th St., N. W. Suite 600 Washington, D. C. 20036

Terry Callender Natural Gas Clearinghouse 13430 Northwest Freeway Suite 1200 Houston, TX 77040 CH2M Hill c/o Langer Energy Consulting Jack Langer 4995 Ponce de Leon Blvd. Coral Gables, FL 33146

Peter J. Thompson, Esq. Andrews & Kurth L.L.P. 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20006

Wayne L. Schiefelbein & Cowdery 1709-D Mahan Drive Tallahassee, FL 32308 (904) 877-5609

Attorneys for Chesapeake Utilities Corporation