

Bond Case Briefs

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

IRS LTR: Utility's Rate Base Reduction Inconsistent with ACRS Rules.

The IRS ruled that the reduction of a public utility company's rate base by the full amount of its accumulated deferred income tax account balance unreduced by the balance of its account balance relating to net operating loss carryovers would be inconsistent with the requirements of section 168(i)(9) for use of the accelerated cost recovery system.

Citations: LTR 201438003

Third Party Communication: None
Date of Communication: Not Applicable
Person To Contact: ***, ID No. ***
Telephone Number: ***

Index Number: 167.22-01
Release Date: 9/19/2014
Date: June 12, 2014

Refer Reply To: CC:PSI:B06 - PLR-104157-14

LEGEND:

Taxpayer = ***
Parent = ***
State A = ***
Commission A = ***
Commission B = ***
Year A = ***
Year B = ***
Year C = ***
Year D = ***
Date A = ***
Date B = ***
Date C = ***
Date D = ***
Case = ***
Director = ***

Dear ***:

This letter responds to the request, dated January 24, 2014, and additional submission dated May 19, 2014, submitted on behalf of Taxpayer for a ruling on the application of the normalization rules of the Internal Revenue Code to certain accounting and regulatory procedures, described below.

The representations set out in your letter follow.

Taxpayer is a regulated, investor-owned public utility incorporated under the laws of State A primarily engaged in the business of supplying electricity in State A. Taxpayer is subject to the regulatory jurisdiction of Commission A and Commission B with respect to terms and conditions of service and particularly the rates it may charge for the provision of service. Taxpayer's rates are established on a rate of return basis.

Taxpayer is wholly owned by Parent, and Taxpayer is included in a consolidated federal income tax return of which Parent is the common parent. Taxpayer employs the accrual method of accounting and reports on a calendar year basis.

Taxpayer filed a rate case application on Date A (Case). In its filing, Taxpayer used as its starting point actual data from the historic test period, calendar Year A. It then projected data for Year B through Year C. Taxpayer updated, amended, and supplemented its data several times during the course of the proceedings. Rates in this proceeding were intended to, and did, go into effect for the period Date B through Date C.

In computing its income tax expense element of cost of service, the tax benefits attributable to accelerated depreciation were normalized and were not flowed thru to ratepayers.

In its rate case filing, Taxpayer anticipated that it would claim accelerated depreciation, including "bonus depreciation" on its tax returns to the extent that such depreciation was available in all years for which data was provided. Additionally, Taxpayer forecasted that it would incur a net operating loss (NOL) in Year D. Taxpayer anticipated that it had the capacity to carry back a portion of this NOL with the remainder producing a net operating loss carryover (NOLC) as of the end of Year D.

On its regulatory books of account, Taxpayer "normalizes" the differences between regulatory depreciation and tax depreciation. This means that, where accelerated depreciation reduces taxable income, the taxes that a taxpayer would have paid if regulatory depreciation (instead of accelerated tax depreciation) were claimed constitute "cost-free capital" to the taxpayer. A taxpayer that normalizes these differences, like Taxpayer, maintains a reserve account showing the amount of tax liability that is deferred as a result of the accelerated depreciation. This reserve is the accumulated deferred income tax (ADIT) account. Taxpayer maintains an ADIT account. In addition, Taxpayer maintains an offsetting series of entries — a "deferred tax asset" and a "deferred tax expense" — that reflect that portion of those 'tax losses' which, while due to accelerated depreciation, did not actually defer tax because of the existence of an NOLC.

In the setting of utility rates in State, a utility's rate base is offset by its ADIT balance. In its rate case filing and throughout the proceeding, Taxpayer maintained that the ADIT balance should be reduced by the amounts that Taxpayer calculates did not actually defer tax due to the presence of the NOLC, as represented in the deferred tax asset account. Thus, Taxpayer argued that the rate base should be reduced as of the end of Year D by its federal ADIT balance net of the deferred tax asset account attributable to the federal NOLC. It based this position on its determination that this net amount represented the true measure of federal income taxes deferred on account of its claiming accelerated tax depreciation deductions and, consequently, the actual quantity of "cost-free" capital available to it. It also asserted that the failure to reduce its rate base offset by the deferred tax asset attributable to the federal NOLC would be inconsistent with the normalization rules. Testimony by another participant in Case argued against Taxpayer's proposed calculation of ADIT.

Commission A, in an order issued on Date D, held that it is inappropriate to include the NOL in rate

base for ratemaking purposes. Commission A further stated that it is the intent of the Commission that Taxpayer comply with the normalization method of accounting and tax normalization regulations. Commission noted that if Taxpayer later obtains a ruling from the IRS which affirms Taxpayer's position, Taxpayer may file seeking an adjustment. Commission A also held that to the extent tax normalization rules require recording the NOL to rate base in the specified years, no rate of return is authorized.

Taxpayer requests that we rule as follows:

1. Under the circumstances described above, the reduction of Taxpayer's rate base by the full amount of its ADIT account balance unreduced by the balance of its NOLC-related account balance would be inconsistent with (and, hence, violative of) the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1 of the Income Tax regulations.
2. For purposes of Ruling 1 above, the use of a balance of Taxpayer's NOLC-related account balance that is less than the amount attributable to accelerated depreciation computed on a "with and without" basis would be inconsistent with (and, hence, violative of) the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1 of the Income Tax regulations.
3. Under the circumstances described above, the assignment of a zero rate of return to the balance of Taxpayer's NOLC-related account balance would be inconsistent with (and, hence, violative of) the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

Section 168(f)(2) of the Code provides that the depreciation deduction determined under section 168 shall not apply to any public utility property (within the meaning of section 168(i)(10)) if the taxpayer does not use a normalization method of accounting.

In order to use a normalization method of accounting, section 168(i)(9)(A)(i) of the Code requires the taxpayer, in computing its tax expense for establishing its cost of service for ratemaking purposes and reflecting operating results in its regulated books of account, to use a method of depreciation with respect to public utility property that is the same as, and a depreciation period for such property that is not shorter than, the method and period used to compute its depreciation expense for such purposes. Under section 168(i)(9)(A)(ii), if the amount allowable as a deduction under section 168 differs from the amount that would be allowable as a deduction under section 167 using the method, period, first and last year convention, and salvage value used to compute regulated tax expense under section 168(i)(9)(A)(i), the taxpayer must make adjustments to a reserve to reflect the deferral of taxes resulting from such difference.

Section 168(i)(9)(B)(i) of the Code provides that one way the requirements of section 168(i)(9)(A) will not be satisfied is if the taxpayer, for ratemaking purposes, uses a procedure or adjustment which is inconsistent with such requirements. Under section 168(i)(9)(B)(ii), such inconsistent procedures and adjustments include the use of an estimate or projection of the taxpayer's tax expense, depreciation expense, or reserve for deferred taxes under section 168(i)(9)(A)(ii), unless such estimate or projection is also used, for ratemaking purposes, with respect to all three of these items and with respect to the rate base.

Former section 167(l) of the Code generally provided that public utilities were entitled to use accelerated methods for depreciation if they used a "normalization method of accounting." A normalization method of accounting was defined in former section 167(l)(3)(G) in a manner consistent with that found in section 168(i)(9)(A). Section 1.167(l)-1(a)(1) of the Income Tax

Regulations provides that the normalization requirements for public utility property pertain only to the deferral of federal income tax liability resulting from the use of an accelerated method of depreciation for computing the allowance for depreciation under section 167 and the use of straight-line depreciation for computing tax expense and depreciation expense for purposes of establishing cost of services and for reflecting operating results in regulated books of account. These regulations do not pertain to other book-tax timing differences with respect to state income taxes, F.I.C.A. taxes, construction costs, or any other taxes and items.

Section 1.167(l)-1(h)(1)(i) provides that the reserve established for public utility property should reflect the total amount of the deferral of federal income tax liability resulting from the taxpayer's use of different depreciation methods for tax and ratemaking purposes.

Section 1.167(l)-1(h)(1)(iii) provides that the amount of federal income tax liability deferred as a result of the use of different depreciation methods for tax and ratemaking purposes is the excess (computed without regard to credits) of the amount the tax liability would have been had the depreciation method for ratemaking purposes been used over the amount of the actual tax liability. This amount shall be taken into account for the taxable year in which the different methods of depreciation are used. If, however, in respect of any taxable year the use of a method of depreciation other than a subsection (1) method for purposes of determining the taxpayer's reasonable allowance under section 167(a) results in a net operating loss carryover to a year succeeding such taxable year which would not have arisen (or an increase in such carryover which would not have arisen) had the taxpayer determined his reasonable allowance under section 167(a) using a subsection (1) method, then the amount and time of the deferral of tax liability shall be taken into account in such appropriate time and manner as is satisfactory to the district director.

Section 1.167(l)-1(h)(2)(i) provides that the taxpayer must credit this amount of deferred taxes to a reserve for deferred taxes, a depreciation reserve, or other reserve account. This regulation further provides that, with respect to any account, the aggregate amount allocable to deferred tax under section 167(1) shall not be reduced except to reflect the amount for any taxable year by which Federal income taxes are greater by reason of the prior use of different methods of depreciation. That section also notes that the aggregate amount allocable to deferred taxes may be reduced to reflect the amount for any taxable year by which federal income taxes are greater by reason of the prior use of different methods of depreciation under section 1.167(l)-1(h)(1)(i) or to reflect asset retirements or the expiration of the period for depreciation used for determining the allowance for depreciation under section 167(a).

Section 1.167(l)-1(h)(6)(i) provides that, notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (1) of that paragraph, a taxpayer does not use a normalization method of regulated accounting if, for ratemaking purposes, the amount of the reserve for deferred taxes under section 167(l) which is excluded from the base to which the taxpayer's rate of return is applied, or which is treated as no-cost capital in those rate cases in which the rate of return is based upon the cost of capital, exceeds the amount of such reserve for deferred taxes for the period used in determining the taxpayer's expense in computing cost of service in such ratemaking.

Section 1.167(l)-1(h)(6)(ii) provides that, for the purpose of determining the maximum amount of the reserve to be excluded from the rate base (or to be included as no-cost capital) under subdivision (i), above, if solely an historical period is used to determine depreciation for Federal income tax expense for ratemaking purposes, then the amount of the reserve account for that period is the amount of the reserve (determined under section 1.167(l)-1(h)(2)(i)) at the end of the historical period. If such determination is made by reference both to an historical portion and to a future portion of a period, the amount of the reserve account for the period is the amount of the reserve at the end of the historical portion of the period and a pro rata portion of the amount of any projected increase to be

credited or decrease to be charged to the account during the future portion of the period.

Section 1.167(l)-1(h) requires that a utility must maintain a reserve reflecting the total amount of the deferral of federal income tax liability resulting from the taxpayer's use of different depreciation methods for tax and ratemaking purposes. Taxpayer has done so. Section 1.167(l)-1(h)(6)(i) provides that a taxpayer does not use a normalization method of regulated accounting if, for ratemaking purposes, the amount of the reserve for deferred taxes which is excluded from the base to which the taxpayer's rate of return is applied, or which is treated as no-cost capital in those rate cases in which the rate of return is based upon the cost of capital, exceeds the amount of such reserve for deferred taxes for the period used in determining the taxpayer's expense in computing cost of service in such ratemaking. Section 56(a)(1)(D) provides that, with respect to public utility property the Secretary shall prescribe the requirements of a normalization method of accounting for that section.

Regarding the first issue, § 1.167(l)-1(h)(6)(i) provides that a taxpayer does not use a normalization method of regulated accounting if, for ratemaking purposes, the amount of the reserve for deferred taxes which is excluded from the base to which the taxpayer's rate of return is applied, or which is treated as no-cost capital in those rate cases in which the rate of return is based upon the cost of capital, exceeds the amount of such reserve for deferred taxes for the period used in determining the taxpayer's expense in computing cost of service in such ratemaking. Because the ADIT account, the reserve account for deferred taxes, reduces rate base, it is clear that the portion of an NOLC that is attributable to accelerated depreciation must be taken into account in calculating the amount of the reserve for deferred taxes (ADIT). Thus, the order by Commission A is not in accord with the normalization requirements.

Regarding the second issue, § 1.167(l)-1(h)(1)(iii) makes clear that the effects of an NOLC must be taken into account for normalization purposes. Section 1.167(l)-1(h)(1)(iii) provides generally that, if, in respect of any year, the use of other than regulatory depreciation for tax purposes results in an NOLC carryover (or an increase in an NOLC which would not have arisen had the taxpayer claimed only regulatory depreciation for tax purposes), then the amount and time of the deferral of tax liability shall be taken into account in such appropriate time and manner as is satisfactory to the district director. While that section provides no specific mandate on methods, it does provide that the Service has discretion to determine whether a particular method satisfies the normalization requirements. The "with or without" methodology employed by Taxpayer is specifically designed to ensure that the portion of the NOLC attributable to accelerated depreciation is correctly taken into account by maximizing the amount of the NOLC attributable to accelerated depreciation. This methodology provides certainty and prevents the possibility of "flow through" of the benefits of accelerated depreciation to ratepayers. Under these facts, any method other than the "with and without" method would not provide the same level of certainty and therefore the use of any other methodology is inconsistent with the normalization rules.

Regarding the third issue, assignment of a zero rate of return to the balance of Taxpayer's NOLC-related account balance would, in effect, flow the tax benefits of accelerated depreciation deductions through to rate payers. This would violate the normalization provisions.

We rule as follows:

1. Under the circumstances described above, the reduction of Taxpayer's rate base by the full amount of its ADIT account balance unreduced by the balance of its NOLC-related account balance would be inconsistent with the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1 of the Income Tax regulations.
2. For purposes of Ruling 1 above, the use of a balance of Taxpayer's NOLC-related account balance

that is less than the amount attributable to accelerated depreciation computed on a “with and without” basis would be inconsistent with the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1 of the Income Tax regulations.

3. Under the circumstances described above, the assignment of a zero rate of return to the balance of Taxpayer’s NOLC-related account balance would be inconsistent with the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1.

This ruling is based on the representations submitted by Taxpayer and is only valid if those representations are accurate. The accuracy of these representations is subject to verification on audit.

Except as specifically determined above, no opinion is expressed or implied concerning the Federal income tax consequences of the matters described above.

This ruling is directed only to the taxpayer who requested it. Section 6110(k)(3) of the Code provides it may not be used or cited as precedent. In accordance with the power of attorney on file with this office, a copy of this letter is being sent to your authorized representative. We are also sending a copy of this letter ruling to the Director.

Sincerely,

Peter C. Friedman
Senior Technician Reviewer,
Branch 6
(Passthroughs & Special Industries)

cc:

* * *