BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

)

)

)

)

)

)

Investigation of Revenue Requirement Impacts of the New Federal Tax Legislation Titled: "An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution of the budget for fiscal year 2018" Docket No. 17-035-69

Direct Testimony of Cheryl Murray For the Office of Consumer Services

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

CHERYL MURRAY

FOR THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES

AUGUST 28, 2018

1	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION AND BUSINESS	
2		ADDRESS.	
3	A.	My name is Cheryl Murray; I am a Utility Analyst for the Office of Consumer	
4		Services (Office). My business address is 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah	
5		84111.	
6	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?	
7	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to introduce the other witness testifying on behalf of	
8		the Office in this docket, as well as to provide a summary of the Office's position and	
9		recommendations.	
10	Q.	PLEASE IDENTIFY THE OTHER WITNESS TESTIFYING ON BEHALF OF	
11		THE OFFICE.	
12	A.	The Office retained Ms. Donna Ramas of Ramas Regulatory Consulting, LLC to	
13		review the impacts on Rocky Mountain Power's (Company) revenue requirement	
14		resulting from the federal legislation titled "An act to provide for reconciliation	
15		pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution of the budget for fiscal year	
16		2018" (Tax Reform Act). Ms. Ramas is a revenue requirement expert and CPA. Ms.	
17		Ramas will testify on behalf of the Office regarding her analysis, which is the basis	
18		for the Office's recommendations to the Commission on how the impacts of tax	
19		reform changes should be implemented to benefit Utah customers of the Company.	
20		This includes reducing the amount of federal income taxes being collected in current	
21		rates and returning to customers the past over-collection of deferred income taxes that	
22		will no longer be paid to the federal government.	

	OCS -	 1 Direct Murray 	17-035-69	Page 2 of 4
23	Q.	WHAT IS THE PRIMAR	RY GOAL OF THE OFFICE	REGARDING THE TAX
24		REFORM ACT?		
25	A.	The Office asserts that cust	tomers should receive the full be	enefits that result from the
26		Tax Reform Act.		
27	Q.	IS THE COMPANY IN AGREEMENT WITH THE OFFICE'S PRIMARY		
28		OBJECTIVE?		
29	A.	Yes. Based on the Compar	ny's April 16, 2018 reply comm	ents and the Direct
30		Testimony of Nikki L. Kob	oliha ¹ , it appears that the Compa	ny does agree that the
31		benefits of tax reform shou	ld be passed on to customers.	
32		However, the Offic	e and Company do not agree on	the method and timing by
33		which the benefits should b	be passed on to Utah rate payers	. Ms. Ramas more fully
34		explains those differences i	n her direct testimony.	
35	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE	THE OFFICE'S RECOMME	NDATIONS
36		REGARDING PASSING	THE BENEFITS OF THE TA	AX REFORM ACT ON
37		TO UTAH CUSTOMERS	5.	
38	A.	First and foremost the Offic	ce recommends that the full revo	enue requirement impacts
39		associated with the impact	of the Tax Reform Act be passe	d to the Company's
40		customers. Regarding the	treatment of the impacts of the r	eduction in the federal
41		corporate income tax rate,	the Office makes the following	recommendations.
42		1) Beginning Janua	ry 1, 2019, the current annual ra	te reduction of \$61 million
43		approved by the Public Ser	vice Commission (Commission) on April 27, 2018, be
44		increased to \$99,884,000.	This \$99,884,000 reduction incl	ludes: a) the impact on

¹ Direct Testimony of Nikki L. Kobliha, July 10, 2018, lines 30 – 31.

	OCS – 1 Direct Murray	17-035-69	Page 3 of 4
45	current taxes resulting	g from the Tax Reform Act, calculated	d by RMP as \$65.89
46	million; and b) the am	nortization of non-protected Excess D	eferred Income Tax
47	(EDIT) balances over	a five-year period, grossed up for the	e revenue requirement
48	impacts. This amour	nt should continue until rates from the	e next general rate case go
49	into effect.		
50	2) The reducti	on in revenue requirement associated	with current taxes for
51	2018 that will not be	fully refunded to customers during 20)18 under the current \$61M
52	interim rate reduction	, should continue to be deferred. (Th	is amount is the difference
53	between the current \$	61M rate reduction approved by the 0	Commission and \$65.89M
54	calculated by the Con	npany as the impact on Utah revenue	requirement prior to
55	consideration of the E	DIT balances).	
56	3) The amortiz	zation of the protected property relate	ed EDIT under the Average
57	Rate Assumption Met	thod (ARAM) required under the IRS	normalization rules should
58	be deferred as a regul	atory liability. As Ms. Ramas explain	ns in her testimony, the
59	amount of amortization	on or flow-back of the protected prope	erty related EDIT
60	fluctuates each year; t	thus, the amount deferred as a regulat	ory liability should be
61	based on the actual an	nnual ARAM amortization amounts u	ntil the next rate case. At
62	that time the resulting	amount could be amortized or used t	to offset regulatory assets.
63	The Company and par	rties could present their recommendat	tions for appropriate
64	treatment as part of th	e rate case.	
65	Ms. Ramas' te	estimony more fully describes these re	ecommendations and
66	explains her analysis,	which is the basis for the Office's red	commendations.

67 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS?

68	А.	Yes. While the Office has presented specific recommendations for the return to
69		customers of the full impact of the Tax Reform Act, we have been informed of
70		potentially significant additional costs that customers may be required to bear in the
71		near future, such as impacts from the Company's new depreciation study. If we are
72		provided with credible, verifiable information related to these potential costs prior to
73		submission of our rebuttal testimony in this docket we may modify our
74		recommendation.
75		As we noted in our April 9, 2018 comments in an earlier phase of this docket:
76 77 78 79 80 81 82	Q.	"Ultimately, the Commission must evaluate the relative value of competing goals. Returning as much of the refund as soon as possible best matches the benefit to the appropriate set of ratepayers. However, depending on the nature of future costs, it may be appropriate to consider competing goals of rate stability and mitigation of a potential future rate shock." DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
83	A.	Yes.