

Writer's Direct Dial Number: (850) 521-1706
Writer's E-Mail Address: bkeating@gunster.com

June 1, 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 Florida Public Utilities Company – Indiantown's Petition for Approval of Tax Benefit Adjustment Amounts and Recovery Mechanism, along with the direct testimony and exhibits of Michael Cassel, Michael Reno, and Matthew Dewey 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

BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

| | |
|---|---|
| In re: Consideration of the tax impacts associated with Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 for Florida Public Utilities Company - Indiantown Division. | DOCKET NO. 20180052-GU FILED: June 1, 2018 |
|---|---|

PETITION OF FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMPANY-INDIANTOWN DIVISION FOR APPROVAL OF TAX BENEFIT ADJUSTMENT AMOUNTS AND RECOVERY MECHANISM

Florida Public Utilities Company-Indiantown Division (“Indiantown” or “Company”), by and through its undersigned counsel, pursuant to Sections 366.04(1) and 366.06(1), Florida Statutes, and consistent with Order No. PSC-2018-0214-PCO-GU, issued in Docket No. 20180052-GU, and Order No. PSC-2018-0104-PCO-PU, issued in Docket No. 20180013-PU, hereby files this Petition asking the Florida Public Service Commission (“FPSC” or “Commission”) for approval of Indiantown's calculation of tax impacts arising from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, along with the means of addressing that impact on Indiantown and its customers. Indiantown also offers a recovery mechanism, (“Proposal”), for consideration. With this Petition, Indiantown is also submitting the Direct Testimony of witnesses Michael Cassel, Michael Reno, and Matthew Dewey on behalf of Indiantown, consistent with Order No. PSC-2018-0214-PCO-GU, issued in this proceeding on April 25, 2018, and Order No. PSC-2018-0275-PCO-GU, issued May 31, 2018.

In support of this request, the Company hereby states:

- 1) Indiantown is a natural gas utility subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. Its principal business address is:

Florida Public Utilities Company-Indiantown Division
1750 S 14th Street, Suite 200
Fernandina Beach FL 32034

2) The name and mailing address of the persons authorized to receive notices are:

Beth Keating, Esq.
Gregory Munson, Esq.
Lila A. Jaber, Esq.
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
215 South Monroe Street, Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301-1839
bkeating@gunster.com
gmunson@gunster.com
ljaber@gunster.com
(850) 521-1706

Mike Cassel
Director, Regulatory and Governmental
Affairs
Florida Public Utilities Company
1750 S 14th Street, Suite 200
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034
mcassel@fpuc.com

3) The Company is unaware of any material facts in dispute at this time, but the proceeding may involve disputed issues of material fact. The Company's request set forth herein does not involve reversal or modification of a Commission decision or proposed agency action. The Commission is the affected agency located at 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399.

I. BACKGROUND

4) The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017¹ ("Act") was signed into law by President Trump on December 22, 2017, and applies to the taxable year beginning after December 31, 2017. Thereafter, the Commission established generic Docket No. 20180013-PU to address the Office of Public Counsel's ("OPC") Petition to Establish Generic Docket to Investigate and Adjust Rates for 2018 Tax Savings. By Order No. PSC-2018-0104-PCO-PU, the Commission asserted jurisdiction over the subject matter of responsive tax adjustments effective on the date of the Commission's vote, February 6, 2018.

5) This docket was opened on February 23, 2018, to provide a vehicle for the Commission to consider the tax impacts associated with the passage of the Act on Florida

¹ HR-1, Pub. L. No. 115-97, December 22, 2017, 131 Stat 2054.

Public Utilities Company – Indiantown Division. The Order Establishing Procedure for this proceeding, Order No. PSC-2018-0214-PCO-GU, was issued April 25, 2018. A subsequent First Order Revising Procedure, Order No. PSC-2018-0275-PCO-GU, was issued May 31, 2018. Indiantown hereby submits this Petition and the testimonies of its witnesses consistent with the schedule established by the Prehearing Officer.

II. TAX ADJUSTMENT AMOUNTS

6) As explained in greater detail in the testimony of Indiantown witness Cassel, the tax impact for Indiantown associated with the corporate income tax rate change from 35% to 21% is a detriment of approximately \$54,096, which will accrue to the Company on an annual basis until appropriately accounted for in the Company's base rates.

7) As for deferred taxes, which are recorded on the Company's balance sheet as a regulatory liability, the amount on the Company's books was calculated at the prior 35% rate, but the actual taxes paid to the government will be paid at the 21% rate, resulting in a net benefit for customers. For protected deferred taxes, the grossed-up balance for Indiantown is approximately \$188,337, which is recorded as a Deferred Regulatory Tax Liability. This amount will be amortized over 26 years at approximately \$7,244 per year, in accordance with the prescribed Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") methodology.

8) The grossed-up Deferred Regulatory Tax Liability balance related to the Unprotected Deferred Tax is approximately \$26,449, which the Company requests approval to amortize over 10 years at approximately \$2,645 per year.

9) Indiantown notes that the tax benefit amounts identified herein, as well as in the testimony of its witnesses, are not considered to be final amounts, but are instead approximates. As noted by Company witness Dewey, the staff of the US Securities and

Exchange Commission (“SEC”), recognizing the complexity of reflecting the impacts of the Act, has issued guidance in Staff Accounting Bulletin 118 (“SAB 118”), which clarifies that the required analyses and accounting for income taxes can be completed within up to one year if information is not yet available or complete. As further explained by witness Dewey, certain information pertaining to Indiantown’s calculation of the full tax benefits remains to be determined, including the portions of deferred taxes that can be normalized using the IRS’ preferred normalization methodology known as “ARAM”; thus, the amounts are currently reflected as approximates and may be revised until December 22, 2018.

III. TAX RECOVERY PROPOSAL

10) Indiantown proposes to recover the \$54,096 annual amount of tax detriment associated with the 2017 Tax Act through the Energy Conservation Cost Recovery Clause (“ECCR”) for purposes of addressing incremental, ongoing costs since the Company’s last rate case in 2003. Currently, the Company is earning below its Commission-approved allowable range and is projected to continue to do so for the foreseeable future. As such, allowing the Company to recover the tax detriment will provide the Company with a better opportunity to earn within its range - or closer to its range - and may enable the Company to defer a rate case, thus ensuring extended rate stability.

11) As for the \$7,244 annual amortized amount associated with the Protected Deferred Tax benefit and the \$2,645 annual amortized amount associated with the Unprotected Deferred Tax benefit, the Company proposes that the two be retained by the

Company for a total net benefit of \$9,889. In light of the Company's earnings posture, as noted above, this amount will provide the Company with further opportunity to earn within its range, while also enabling the Company to extend service at present rates for a longer period.

12) If the Commission accepts Indiantown's proposal to recover through the ECCR the tax detriment associated with the 2017 Tax Act, while retaining the annual amortized benefit associated with the Protected and Unprotected Deferred Taxes, FPUC's customers would see a minimal impact on the ECCR clause, but extended rate stability. Furthermore, recovery of the tax detriment through the ECCR is less likely to cause customer confusion, as the ECCR rate changes annually, as opposed to the Company's base rates, which have not changed in over 15 years. The Company would likewise benefit from an improved earnings posture and a healthier fiscal outlook, which ultimately inures to the benefit of Indiantown's shareholders and customers alike.

IV. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

13) Indiantown asks that the Commission determine that the tax detriment inuring to Indiantown as a result of the corporate income tax rate change implemented by the Act has an annual detrimental impact in the amount of \$54,096, and that Indiantown should be allowed to include this amount for recovery through the ECCR clause.

14) Indiantown also requests that it be allowed to retain the total annual benefit associated with the Protected and Unprotected Deferred Tax liabilities and that it be allowed to amortize these amounts as described herein.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of June, 2018.



Beth Keating
Florida Bar No. 0022756
Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
215 South Monroe St., Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(850) 521-1706
bkeating@gunster.com

Gregory Munson
Florida Bar No. 188344
Gunster Law Firm
215 South Monroe Street
Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Lila A. Jaber
Florida Bar No. 0881661
Gunster Law Firm
215 South Monroe St., Suite 601
Tallahassee, FL 32301

*Attorneys for Florida Public Utilities Company
(Indiantown Division)*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing Petition for Approval of Tax Benefit Adjustment Amounts and Flow Through Mechanism, along with the direct testimony and exhibits of Michael Cassel, Michael Reno, and Matthew Dewey on behalf of FPUC-Indiantown Division in the referenced docket have been served by Electronic Mail this 1st day of June, 2018, upon the following:

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Suzanne Brownless Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 sbrownle@psc.state.fl.us</p> | <p>J.R. Kelly/E. Sayler/Virginia Ponder Office of Public Counsel c/o The Florida Legislature 111 W. Madison Street, Room 812 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400 kelly.jr@leg.state.fl.us Sayler.Erik@leg.state.fl.us Ponder.Virginia@leg.state.fl.us</p> |
|---|--|

By: _____


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

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

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Michael Cassel. My business address is 1750 South 14th
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 with responsibility for all
of the Florida regulated divisions.

**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 Exhibits FIMC-1 which provides a summary of
14 FPUC-Indiantown’s natural gas proposed treatments of the impacts
15 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 savings/(detriment) amount
11 associated with the tax rate change, based on the 2018 proforma
12 surveillance report, is estimated to be a detriment of approximately
13 \$54,096.

14

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

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

9 The Unprotected Deferred Tax Liability is an estimated balance of
10 \$26,449. The Company requests this Deferred Tax Liability be
11 amortized over 10 years or \$2,645 per year. This annual amortization
12 could be combined with the annual Protected benefit, as discussed
13 below on page 5, and the Company requests that the total of these
14 amounts be retained by the 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 \$188,337. This deferred balance will

1 be amortized using the Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) prescribed
2 methodology and is estimated to flow back over 26 years at
3 approximately \$7,244 per year. Exhibit FIMC-1 provides the calculation
4 of this amount. 2018 final amounts will not be available until late 2018,
5 as further explained by FPUC-Indiantown’s witness Matthew Dewey.
6 FPUC-Indiantown proposes retaining the estimated annual amount of
7 \$7,244 plus the Unprotected Deferred Tax Amortization, as discussed
8 above, of \$2,645 for a total benefit of \$9,889. 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. 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
Page 1 of 1

ANNUAL TAX SAVINGS FROM RATE CHANGE:

| | FI | FC Allocated | Total FI | ANNUAL |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| 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) |

REGULATORY TAX LIABILITY:

| | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|-------------|----------|
| ESTIMATED PROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY | \$ 186,581 | \$ 1,756 | \$ 188,337 | \$ 7,244 | 26 YEARS |
| ESTIMATED UNPROTECTED GROSSED UP REG TAX LIABILITY | \$ 29,622 | \$ (3,173) | \$ 26,449 | \$ 2,645 | 10 YEARS |
| NET ESTIMATED REGULATORY TAX LIABILITY | \$ 216,203 | \$ (1,417) | \$ 214,786 | \$ 9,889 | |
| TOTAL | | | | \$ (44,207) | |

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

Prepared Direct Testimony of Matthew Dewey

Date of Filing: June 1, 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”) as an
Accounting Director. CUC is the corporate parent of Florida Public
Utilities Company.

**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 and exhibit FIMD-2. Exhibit FIMD-
19 1 shows the Company's calculations to support the estimated regulatory
20 liabilities of \$216,203 as of March 31, 2018. This amount resulted from
21 implementing the reduction in federal tax rate from 35% to 21% per the
22 2017 Tax Act. The worksheet lists the estimated Accumulated Deferred
23 Income Tax ("ADIT") account balances as of December 31, 2017 at the
24 blended tax rate, which includes the federal tax rate at 35%. The

1 worksheet also calculates the Company's estimated ADIT account
2 balances as of December 31, 2017, at the blended tax rate, which
3 adjusts for reduced federal tax rate of 21% per the 2017 Tax Act. The
4 worksheet shows the classification of each estimated excess or deficient
5 deferred income taxes into one of the following classification: 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 ("IRS") normalization guidelines. To
9 record the regulatory liability we are required at add back the income tax
10 gross-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 supports the same calculation described
19 above for the Florida Corporate general ledger. The result is an
20 estimated regulatory asset of \$354,178 of which \$1,417 or 0.4% is
21 allocated to FPUC- Indiantown.

22
23

1 **Q. Could you clarify the meaning of a “gross-up” as it pertains to**
2 **deferred taxes?**

3 A. Yes. The deferred tax impact as a result of the tax rate change is
4 increased, or “grossed up” for the current tax rate. This balance will then
5 be amortized and subject to income taxes at the current rate so that the
6 net income impact equals the amortized tax benefit or detriment.

7
8 **Q. The total estimated regulatory liability balance of \$214,786 as noted**
9 **above related to the federal rate change from 35% to 21% per the**
10 **2017 Tax Act, is described as an estimated, why?**

11 A. The staff of the US Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) has
12 recognized the complexity of reflecting the impacts of the 2017 Tax Act,
13 and on December 22, 2017 issued guidance in Staff Accounting Bulletin
14 118 (“SAB 118”), which clarifies accounting for income taxes under ASC
15 740 if information is not yet available or complete and provides for up to
16 a one year period in which to complete the required analyses and
17 accounting. Therefore, we will complete our measurement and
18 accounting for the impact of the tax law changes on or before December
19 22, 2018.

20
21 **Q. Does the Company know of any expected changes which could**
22 **adjust the regulatory liability?**

23 A. Not at this time. However, once the 2017 federal and state tax returns
24 are filed, the Company will be adjusting entries based on the differences

1 between the tax returns as filed and the 2017 tax provision. These
2 adjustments could affect the ADIT balances as of December 31, 2017.

3

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

5 **A. Yes.**

FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES-INDIANTOWN DIVISION
Computation of Regulatory Liability (FI)

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

| FL | 5.50% | Fed | Blended | BEFORE | | AFTER | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| | | | | 35.00% | 21.00% | 21.00% | 25.35% | Allocation | 3/31/18 | Q1 | 03/31/2018 | | | |
| Seg 3 | FERC | Code | Name | 38.58% | 25.35% | Protected | UnProtected | UnProtected | OTP Adj | 12/31/2017 | from Parent | NetAdjust to | Entries | Balance |
| | | | | Beginning | Rate | | Plant | NonPlant | | Balance | UnProtected | LT Bonus | | |
| 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 | \$ - | \$ - |
| 25CN | 283 | UNNP 25CN | Conservation | \$ 3,563 | \$ (1,222) | | | \$ (1,222) | | \$ 2,341 | | | \$ 644 | \$ 2,985 |
| 25DP | 282 | P 25DP.01 | Depreciation | \$ (376,710) | \$ 129,200 | \$ 129,200 | | \$ - | \$ (28) | \$ (247,538) | | | \$ 4,410 | \$ (243,128) |
| 25DP | 282 | P 25DP.02 | Contribution in Aid of Construction | \$ - | \$ - | | | \$ - | | \$ - | | | \$ - | \$ - |
| 25DP | 282 | P 25DP.03 | Cost of Removal | \$ (2,313) | \$ 793 | \$ 793 | | \$ - | | \$ (1,520) | | | \$ (80) | \$ (1,600) |
| 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 | \$ (3,135) | \$ 1,075 | | \$ 1,075 | \$ - | \$ (1) | \$ (2,061) | | | \$ 38 | \$ (2,023) |
| 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 |
| Total | | | | \$ (468,139) | \$ 162,284 | \$ 139,292 | \$ 1,075 | \$ 21,917 | \$ 39,927 | \$ (265,928) | \$ 7,361 | \$ 1,158 | \$ 4,490 | \$ (252,919) |
| Protected Gross-up | | | | \$ - | \$ (1) | \$ 47,289 | | | | \$ 47,289 | | | | \$ 47,289 |
| UnProtected Plant Gross-up | | | | | | | \$ 365 | | | \$ 365 | | | | \$ 365 |
| 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 | | Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up | | | \$ 47,289 | \$ 365 | \$ 12,219 | | \$ 59,873 | \$ (1,304) | \$ (205) | | \$ 58,364 |
| Total with Gross-up | | | | | | \$ 186,581 | \$ 1,440 | \$ 34,136 | | \$ (206,055) | \$ 6,057 | \$ 953 | \$ 4,490 | \$ (194,555) |
| Excess Deferred Tax Liability before gross up | | | | | | a | b | c | | | | | | |
| Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Protected | | | | | | \$ (139,292) | | | | | | | | \$ (139,292) |
| Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Plant | | | | | | \$ (1,075) | | | | | | | | \$ (1,762) |
| Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Unprotected Non Plant | | | | | | \$ (21,917) | | | | \$ (7,361) | \$ (1,158) | | | \$ (30,436) |
| Excess Deferred Tax Liability - Total | | | | | | \$ (162,284) | | | | | | | | \$ (171,490) |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$ (206,055) | | | | \$ (194,555) |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$ (0) | | | | \$ (0) |
| 25TX | 25TX | | Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up | | | | | | | \$ 59,873 | | | | \$ 58,364 |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$ 59,873 | | | | \$ 58,364 |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$ (0) | | | | \$ (0) |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 280R-254P | | | Reg Liability - Protected | | | | | | | \$ (186,581) | | | | \$ (186,581) |
| 280R-254N | | | Reg Liability -UnProtected | | | | | | | \$ (35,576) | \$ 5,146 | \$ 809 | | \$ (29,621) |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$ (222,157) | | | | \$ (216,202) |
| Reg Liability -UnProtected Plant | | | | | | | | | | \$ (1,440) | | | | \$ (1,440) |
| Reg Liability -UnProtected Non Plant | | | | | | | | | | \$ (34,136) | \$ 5,146 | \$ 809 | | \$ (28,181) |
| | | | | | | | | | | \$ (35,576) | | | | \$ (29,621) |

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

Docket No.:
 Exhibit No.:

20180052-GU
 FIMD-2

| | | | BEFORE | | AFTER | | | | | Allocation from Parent | | 3/31/18 | | |
|----------------------------|------|---------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | | | 35.00% | 21.00% | | | | | | 21.00% | | | | |
| | | | 38.58% | 25.35% | | | | | | 25.35% | | | | |
| Seg 3 | FERC | Code | Name | Beginning Balance | 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 | \$ (937,944) | \$ 321,685 | \$ 321,685 | | \$ - | | \$ (616,259) | | | \$ (43,664) | \$ (659,923) |
| 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 Reacquired Debt | \$ (397,679) | \$ 136,391 | | | \$ 136,391 | \$ 33,873 | \$ (227,415) | | | \$ 7,208 | \$ (220,207) |
| 25RE | 282 | UNNP 25RE | Repairs Deduction | \$ 55,515 | \$ (19,040) | | \$ (19,040) | \$ - | \$ 5 | \$ 36,480 | | | \$ (420) | \$ 36,060 |
| 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 |
| Total | | | | \$ 781,956 | \$ (266,453) | \$ 327,697 | \$ (19,040) | \$ (575,110) | \$ 27,293 | \$ 542,796 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (31,584) | \$ 511,212 |
| | | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 111,251 | \$ (6,464) | \$ (195,247) | \$ 2,735 | \$ 111,251 | \$ (6,464) | \$ (195,247) | \$ 2,735 | \$ 111,251 |
| | | | | | | | \$ (6,464) | \$ (195,247) | \$ 2,735 | \$ 111,251 | \$ (6,464) | \$ (195,247) | \$ 2,735 | \$ 111,251 |
| | | | | | | | | \$ (195,247) | \$ 2,735 | \$ 111,251 | \$ (6,464) | \$ (195,247) | \$ 2,735 | \$ 111,251 |
| | | | | | | | | \$ 2,735 | \$ 2,735 | \$ 2,735 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 2,735 | \$ 2,735 |
| 25TX | 25TX | | Tax Reform 2017 Reg Asset Gross Up | | | \$ 111,251 | \$ (6,464) | \$ (192,512) | | \$ (87,724) | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (87,724) |
| Total with Gross-up | | | | | | \$ 438,948 | \$ (25,504) | \$ (767,622) | | \$ 455,072 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ (31,584) | \$ 423,488 |
| | | | | | | a | b | c | | | | | | |

**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**

Direct Testimony

of

**Michael J. Reno,
Ernst & Young, LLP**

On Behalf of

**FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMPANY
Indiantown Division**

1 I. **Introduction**

2 Q. **Please state your name, business address and by whom you are**
3 **employed, and in what capacity.**

4 A. My name is Michael Reno. My business address is 1101 New York
5 Avenue, NW, Washington, District of Columbia, 20005-4213. I am an
6 executive director in Ernst & Young LLP's National Energy Practice.

7
8 Q. **On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?**

9 A. I am testifying on behalf of Florida Public Utilities Company – Indiantown
10 Division ("FPUC").

11
12 Q. **What is your educational and professional background?**

13 A. I graduated from Kansas State University with a Bachelor of Science
14 degree in Business Administration, with an emphasis in accounting, in
15 1987, and a Masters of Science, with an emphasis in accounting, in
16 1988. After completion of my Masters of Science in Accounting, I joined
17 Deloitte Tax LLP, formerly Deloitte Haskins & Sells. In 2012, I joined
18 Ernst & Young LLP as an executive director in the National Energy
19 Practice. I am a Certified Public Accountant, licensed in the District of
20 Columbia and in the Commonwealth of Virginia. I have practiced public
21 accounting for over 29 years. In my practice, I provide tax services to
22 regulated water, electric and gas utilities. I regularly assist clients with
23 tax planning, supporting and explaining tax reporting positions, and tax
24 return reviews. My experience includes providing advice on accounting
25 for income taxes and performing tax provision reviews. I also regularly

1 consult with companies regarding tax accounting and its impact on the
2 rate setting process as well as compliance with the normalization rules.
3 Additionally, I am a frequent speaker at industry seminars and
4 conferences on the topic of tax accounting for rate-regulated utilities. I
5 have spoken at the Edison Electric Institute tax committee meetings and
6 the American Gas Association tax committee meetings in addition to
7 other industry meetings.
8

9 **Q. Have you testified in any regulatory proceedings?**

10 A. Yes, I have provided expert testimony on multiple occasions over the
11 last 10 years on tax, tax accounting and regulatory tax matters before
12 the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, the California Public Utilities
13 Commission, the Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority and
14 the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
15

16 **II. Purpose of Testimony**

17 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?**

18 A. The purpose of my testimony is to explain how the 2017 tax law
19 changes, commonly known as the “the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act” (the
20 TCJA), impact FPUC’s revenue requirement.
21

22 **III. Overview of the TCJA**

23 **Q. Can you describe what specifically is meant by the term TCJA?**

24 A. The TCJA was signed into law by President Trump on December 22,
25 2017 and is the first major overhaul of federal income tax in more than

1 30 years. The stated purpose of the TCJA is to deliver historic tax relief
2 for workers, families and job creators, and revitalize the US economy.

3
4 **Q. How broad are the changes to the tax law?**

5 A. All taxpayer groups, including corporations, pass-through entities and
6 individuals, are affected, although the effects of the law change will vary
7 widely based on each taxpayer's situation. Key domestic business
8 provisions of the TCJA include: (i) permanently reducing the 35%
9 corporate income tax rate to 21%, (ii) repeal of the corporate alternative
10 minimum tax (AMT), (iii) change in the taxability of contributions to the
11 capital of a corporation, (iv) interest expense limitation, (v) immediate
12 expensing of qualified property, (vi) limiting net operating loss (NOL)
13 usage to 80%, and (vii) repeal of domestic production activities
14 deduction.

15
16 **Q. What impact does the TCJA have on utilities?**

17 A. The TCJA has many provisions that will impact the tax liability of utilities.
18 The two most significant of those business provisions include the
19 reduction in the corporate income tax rate and the disallowance of
20 immediate expensing of property acquired.

21
22 Corporate taxpayers were previously subject to a top corporate rate of
23 35% under a graduated rate structure. Under the TCJA, corporate
24 taxpayers are subject to a 21% corporate tax rate with no graduated rate
25 structure, effective January 1, 2018.

1

2 Under prior law, utilities were allowed to claim bonus depreciation during
3 the year in which qualified property was placed in service. The TCJA
4 extended the bonus depreciation provisions and increased it to 100%
5 expensing of qualified property. However, regulated utilities are no
6 longer eligible to claim bonus depreciation. Under the TCJA, utilities
7 engaged in a certain trade or business as described in clause (iv) of
8 section 163(j)(7)(A) are precluded from immediate expensing while other
9 taxpayers are eligible for immediately expensing certain qualified
10 property. For purposes of the exception (i.e., the inability to claim
11 immediate expensing), clause (iv) of section 163(j)(7)(A) defines the
12 trade or business to include the furnishing or sale of – electrical energy,
13 water, or sewage disposal services, gas or steam through a local
14 distribution system, or transportation of gas or steam by pipeline.
15 Consequently, utilities such as FPU will see some reduction in the
16 savings associated with the reduction from 35% to 21% because of the
17 elimination of this bonus depreciation.

18

19 **Q. Does the TCJA have any provisions impacting how utility rates may**
20 **be set?**

21 A. Yes. The corporate income tax rate change has specific provisions
22 requiring that a normalization method of accounting be applied to the
23 rate change. The corporate taxpayer must normalize the excess tax
24 reserves resulting from the reduction of the corporate income tax rates

1 with respect to prior depreciation or recovery allowances taken on assets
2 placed in service prior to when the corporate rate reduction takes effect.

3

4 **Q. What is meant by the term “normalization” or “normalize”?**

5 A. “Normalization” requirements apply to section 167 or 168 of the Internal
6 Revenue Code. Compliance with the normalization rules involves: (1)
7 setting up a deferred tax reserve for the difference between depreciation
8 expense used by regulators to determine cost of service (normally the
9 straight line method) and the accelerated method used for calculating tax
10 expense on income tax returns and then (2) drawing down that reserve
11 in later years as the accelerated depreciation benefits reverse. With
12 respect to the TCJA and the change in tax rates, the law states a public
13 utility is not in compliance with the normalization rules if the utility
14 “reduces the excess tax reserve more rapidly or to a greater extent than
15 such reserve would be reduced under the average rate assumption
16 method.”

17

18 **Q. What is the term “excess tax reserve”?**

19 A. The term tax reserve represents the amount of tax depreciation in
20 excess of book depreciation multiplied by the tax rate, also known as the
21 deferred tax liability. The excess tax reserve is the portion of such a
22 reserve for deferred taxes (as of the day before the corporate rate
23 reduction takes effect) that is greater than what the reserve for deferred
24 taxes would be had the corporate rate reduction been in effect for all
25 prior periods. The reserve for deferred taxes arising through the use of a

1 normalization method of accounting represents a liability for federal
2 income taxes payable at a future date. Accordingly, the reserve for
3 deferred taxes is usually considered a form of interest-free financing in
4 the ratemaking process. This treatment typically is achieved by treating
5 the reserve as either a reduction to the rate base or, less frequently, as a
6 zero-cost source of capital.

7
8 **Q. How is compliance with the normalization requirements met?**

9 A. There are two methods for normalization computation, (1) average rate
10 assumption method (ARAM), and (2) Reverse South Georgia Method
11 (RSGM).

12
13 ARAM is the required method and reduces the excess tax reserve over
14 the remaining regulatory lives of the property that gave rise to the
15 reserve for deferred taxes. Under this method, the excess tax reserve is
16 reduced as the timing differences (i.e., differences between tax
17 depreciation and regulatory depreciation with respect to the property)
18 reverse over the remaining life of the asset. The reversal of timing
19 differences generally occurs when the amount of the tax depreciation
20 taken with respect to an asset is less than the amount of the regulatory
21 depreciation taken with respect to the same asset. To ensure that the
22 deferred tax reserve, including the excess tax reserve, is reduced to zero
23 at the end of the regulatory life of the asset that generated the reserve,
24 the amount of the timing difference which reverses during a taxable year
25 is multiplied by the ratio of (1) the aggregate deferred taxes as of the

1 beginning of the period in question to (2) the aggregate timing
2 differences for the property as of the beginning of the period in question.

3
4 An alternative method, the RSGM, requires that the excess tax reserve
5 on all public utility property in the plant account is computed based on
6 the weighted average life or composite rate used to calculate
7 depreciation for regulatory purposes. The excess tax reserve is then
8 reduced ratably over the regulatory life of the property.

9
10 **Q. Does the TCJA mandate a method for flowing back the excess**
11 **reserve?**

12 A. The TCJA specifically provides the method of flowing back the excess
13 reserve solely as it relates to accelerated depreciation. It states that the
14 excess amount in the reserve for deferred taxes is to be reversed using
15 ARAM to be in compliance with the normalization rules. The alternative
16 RSGM is available to certain taxpayers where the utilities books and
17 records do not have sufficient vintage account data records to make the
18 required computations under ARAM. In other words, the use of RSGM
19 in lieu of ARAM is an alternative where the utility is unable to utilize
20 ARAM with their existing books and records.

21
22 **Q. Does TCJA mandate treatment of excess deferred taxes to deferred**
23 **items other than section 167/168?**

24 A. No. As mentioned above, normalization provisions only apply to the
25 accelerated depreciation under section 167 and 168, which is commonly

1 referred to as “protected” excess deferred tax reserves. The balance of
2 the excess reserves outside of section 167 and 168 are “unprotected”
3 and may be handled at the discretion of the utility and commission.
4

5 **Q. What are the consequences of not complying with the**
6 **normalization rules?**

7 A. Failure to use a normalization method may result in the loss of
8 accelerated depreciation deductions. If an excess tax reserve is
9 reduced more rapidly or to a greater extent than such reserve would be
10 reduced under ARAM or RSGM, if applicable, the taxpayer will not be
11 treated as having used a normalization method with respect to the
12 corporate rate reduction. If the taxpayer has not used a normalization
13 method of accounting for the corporate rate reduction, the taxpayer’s tax
14 for the taxable year shall be increased by the amount by which it
15 reduced its excess tax reserve more rapidly than permitted under a
16 normalization method of accounting and the taxpayer will not be treated
17 as using a normalization method of accounting for purposes of section
18 168(f)(2) and (i)(9)(C). The penalty for noncompliance includes an
19 immediate tax for the amount improperly amortized as well as the
20 inability to claim accelerated depreciation (including any eligible bonus
21 depreciation) for the current and future years.
22

23 **IV. FPUC calculation of effects of TCJA**

24 **Q. How has FPUC computed the excess deferred taxes?**

1 A. FPUC computed excess deferred taxes in two categories, those related
2 to plant and those related to non-plant. The plant related excess
3 deferred taxes includes those that are associated with accelerated
4 depreciation and subject to the normalization rules as well as other
5 book/tax differences associated with plant. The non-plant related excess
6 deferred taxes include all other book/tax differences that are not
7 associated with plant. The normalization rules only require excess
8 deferred income taxes associated with accelerated depreciation to be
9 amortized under the average rate assumption method or reverse South
10 Georgia method, if applicable. All other excess deferred income taxes
11 are not subject to the normalization rules and may be amortized at the
12 discretion of the utility and commission.

13

14 **Q. Over what period are the excess deferred taxes to be amortized?**

15 A. The excess deferred taxes related to plant are anticipated to be
16 amortized utilizing the ARAM method, assuming the books and records
17 allow for that calculation. The excess deferred taxes related to non-plant
18 are anticipated to be amortized over a 10-year period.

19

20 **Q. Does FPU's approach to amortization of excess deferred taxes**
21 **comply with the normalization rules?**

22 A. Yes.

23

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

25 A. Yes.