

Internal Revenue Service

Number: **201418024**
Release Date: 5/2/2014
Index Number: 167.22-01

Third Party Communication: None
Date of Communication: Not Applicable

Person To Contact:
, ID No.

Telephone Number:

Refer Reply To:
CC:PSI:B06
PLR-133813-13
Date:
January 27, 2014

LEGEND:

- Taxpayer =
- Parent =
- State =
- Commission =
- Year A =
- Year B =
- Year C =
- Year D =
- Year E =
- X =
- Y =
- Date A =
- Date B =
- Date C =
- Date D =
- Date E =
- Case =
- Director =

Dear . :

This letter responds to the request, dated July 30, 2013, of Taxpayer for a ruling on whether the Commission's treatment of Taxpayer's Accumulated Deferred Income

PLR-133813-13

2

Tax (ADIT) account balance in the context of a rate case is consistent with the requirements of the normalization provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

The representations set out in your letter follow.

Taxpayer is a regulated public utility incorporated in State. It is wholly owned by Parent. Taxpayer distributes and sells natural gas to customers in State. Taxpayer is subject to the regulatory jurisdiction of Commission with respect to terms and conditions of service and particularly the rates it may charge for the provision of service. Taxpayer takes accelerated depreciation where available and, for the period beginning in Year A and ending in Year E, Taxpayer has, in the aggregate, produced more net operating losses (NOL) than taxable income. After application of the carryback and carryforward rules, Taxpayer represents that it has net operating loss carryforward (NOLC), produced in Year C and Year E, of \$X as of the end of Year E. The amount of claimed accelerated depreciation in Year C and Year E exceeded the amount of the NOLCs for those years. In Year D, Taxpayer produced regular taxable income as well as alternative minimum taxable income (AMTI); the regular taxable income was offset by the NOLCs from Year B and year C but could not offset the entire alternative minimum tax (AMT) liability due to the limitation in § 56(d). Taxpayer paid \$Y of AMT in Year D and had a minimum tax credit carryforward (MTCC) as of the end of year E of \$Y.

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 and also maintains an offsetting series of entries 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. With respect to the \$Y AMT liability from Year D, Taxpayer carried that amount as an offset to the ADIT because the AMT increased the payment of tax.

Taxpayer filed a general rate case on Date A (Case). The test year used in the Case was the 12 month period ending on Date B. In establishing the income tax expense element of its cost of service, the tax benefits attributable to accelerated depreciation were normalized in accordance with Commission policy and were not flowed thru to ratepayers. In establishing the rate base on which Taxpayer was to be allowed to earn a return Commission generally offsets rate base by Taxpayer’s plant based ADIT balance, using a 13-month average of the month-end balances of the relevant accounts. Taxpayer argued that the ADIT balance should be reduced by the amounts that Taxpayer calculates did not actually defer tax due to the presence of

PLR-133813-13

3

NOLCs or the AMT. Commission, in an order issued on Date C, did not use the amounts that Taxpayer calculates did not defer tax due to NOLCs or AMT but only the amount in the ADIT account. Taxpayer filed a petition for reconsideration based on the normalization implications of the order. On Date D, Commission rejected Taxpayer's request. Taxpayer again requested reconsideration and the Commission denied that request on Date E. Commission asserts that, in setting rates it includes a provision for deferred taxes based on the entire difference between accelerated tax and regulatory depreciation, including situations in which a utility has, such as in this case, an NOLC or AMT. Thus, Commission asserts that it has already recognized the effects of the NOCL in setting rates and there is no need to reduce the ADIT by the other amounts due to NOLCs or AMT.

Taxpayer requests that we rule as follows:

Under the circumstances described above, the reduction of Taxpayer's rate base by the full amount of its ADIT account without regard to the balances in its NOLC-related account and its MTCC-related account was consistent with the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1 of the Income Tax regulations.

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

PLR-133813-13

4

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(1)-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(1)-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(1)-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

PLR-133813-13

5

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(1)-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(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(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(1)-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 55 of the Code imposes an alternative minimum tax on certain taxpayers, including corporations. Adjustments in computing alternative minimum taxable income are provided in § 56. Section 56(a)(1) provides for the treatment of depreciation in computing alternative minimum taxable income. 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.

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(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

PLR-133813-13

6

that, with respect to public utility property the Secretary shall prescribe the requirements of a normalization method of accounting for that section.

In the rate case at issue, Commission has excluded from the base to which the Taxpayer's rate of return is applied the reserve for deferred taxes, unmodified by the accounts which Taxpayer has designed to calculate the effects of the NOLCs and MTCC. There is little guidance on exactly how an NOLC or MTCC must be taken into account in calculating the reserve for deferred taxes under §§ 1.167(1)-1(h)(1)(iii) and 56(a)(1)(D). However, it is clear that both must be taken into account in calculating the amount of the reserve for deferred taxes (ADIT) for the period used in determining the taxpayer's expense in computing cost of service in such ratemaking.

Both Commission and Taxpayer have intended, at all relevant times, to comply with the normalization requirements. Commission has stated that, in setting rates it includes a provision for deferred taxes based on the entire difference between accelerated tax and regulatory depreciation, including situations in which a utility has an NOLC or MTCC. Such a provision allows a utility to collect amounts from ratepayers equal to income taxes that would have been due absent the NOLC and MTCC. Thus, Commission has already taken the NOLC and MTCC into account in setting rates. Because the NOLC and MTCC have been taken into account, Commission's decision to not reduce the amount of the reserve for deferred taxes by these amounts does not result in the amount of that reserve for the period being used in determining the taxpayer's expense in computing cost of service exceeding the proper amount of the reserve and violate the normalization requirements. We therefore conclude that the reduction of Taxpayer's rate base by the full amount of its ADIT account without regard to the balances in its NOLC-related account and its MTCC-related account was consistent with the requirements of § 168(i)(9) and § 1.167(l)-1 of the Income Tax regulations.

This ruling is based on the representations submitted by Taxpayer and is only valid if those representations are accurate.

Except as specifically determined above, no opinion is expressed or implied concerning the Federal income tax consequences of the matters described above. In particular, while we accept as true for purposes of this ruling Commission's assertions that it includes a provision for deferred taxes based on the entire difference between accelerated tax and regulatory depreciation, including situations in which a utility has an NOLC or AMT, we do not conclude that it has done so and those assertions are subject to verification on audit.

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

PLR-133813-13

7

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: