BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

In the Matter of a General Investigation Regarding the Effect of Federal Income Tax Reform on the Revenue Requirements of Kansas Public Utilities and Request to Issue an Accounting Authority Order Requiring Certain Regulated Public Utilities to Defer Effects of Tax Reform to a Deferred Revenue Account.

Docket No. 18-GIMX-248-GIV

TESTIMONY OF CHARLOTTE T. NORTH

IN SUPPORT OF THE

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

ON BEHALF OF

THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY



1 I. INTRODUCTION

2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
3	A.	My name is Charlotte T. North, and my business address is 602 South Joplin Avenue in
4		Joplin, Missouri.
5	Q.	WHO IS YOUR EMPLOYER AND WHAT POSITION DO YOU HOLD?
6	A.	My employer is Liberty Utilities Services Corp., and I serve as a Supervisor in the Rates and
7		Regulatory Affairs Department for Liberty Utilities Central Region, which includes The
8		Empire District Electric Company ("Empire" or "Company").
9	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL
10		BACKGROUND.
11	A.	I graduated from College of the Ozarks, Point Lookout, Missouri, in 2000 with a Bachelor of
12		Science degree with a major in Accounting. I have been a Certified Public Accountant
13		("CPA") in the State of Missouri since 2006. I was hired by Empire in July 2016 as a Rates
14		Analyst and promoted to my current position as a Supervisor in the Rates and Regulatory
15		Affairs Department in May 2017. Prior to joining Empire, I worked for six years in the
16		regulated insurance industry in Springfield, Missouri as a Director of Accounting. In
17		addition, I have nine years of public accounting experience working for both a national and
18		big four accounting firm. My primary roles at these organizations included serving as a
19		supervisor for financial statement audits and a tax consultant.
20	Q.	HAVE YOU TESTIFIED BEFORE ANY STATE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?
21	A.	Yes. I testified on behalf of Liberty Utilities (Midstates Natural Gas) Corp. and Empire
22		before the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") in File No. GR-2018-0013

1		and ER-2018-0366 respectfully. I also submitted an affidavit in Case No. EO-2018-0092 on
2		behalf of Empire. In addition, I have testified before the Arkansas Public Service
3		Commission in Docket No. 18-006-U and Docket No. 16-053-U.
4	Q.	WAS THIS TESTIMONY PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR DIRECT
5		SUPERVISION?
6	A.	Yes, it was.
7	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
8	A.	I am providing testimony in support of the Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") between
9		Empire, the Staff of the Kansas Corporation Commission ("Staff") and the Citizens' Utility
10		Ratepayer Board ("CURB") (collectively, the "Parties"), which is being submitted to the
11		Commission for approval.
12		I will also be providing background information regarding this matter, summarizing
13		the terms of the Agreement, and addressing and applying the Commission standards for
14		review of settlements to the Agreement in this case.
15	Π.	BACKGROUND
16	Q.	CAN YOU PROVIDE SOME BACKGROUND INFORMATION REGARDING
17		THIS MATTER?
18	A.	Yes. On December 14, 2017, Staff filed a Motion to Open a General Investigation and
19		Issue Accounting Authority Order Regarding Federal Tax Reform ("Staff Motion"). ¹

On December 22, 2017, CURB filed a Petition to Intervene and a Response in

¹Staff Motion to Open General Investigation and Issue Accounting Authority Order Regarding Federal Tax Reform filed December 14, 2017, in Docket No. 18-GIMX-248-GIV ("248 Docket") ("Staff Motion").

Support of Staff's Motion.²

2 On January 18, 2018, the Commission issued its Order Opening General Investigation and Issuing Accounting Authority Order Regarding Federal Tax Reform 3 ("Order").³ 4

5 On February 7, 2018 and again on May 14, 2018, the parties conducted conference 6 calls to discuss and attempt to reach an agreement to establish a procedure to be used in 7 Empire's upcoming general rate case filing to quantify the economic impacts of the new lower tax rates on Empire's operations based upon the instructions provided by the 8 9 Commission in its Order and how savings related to the lower tax rates should be passed on 10 to Empire's Kansas customers with interest. The Parties also discussed how Empire should capture excess accumulated deferred income taxes ("EADIT") for the benefit of its 11 12 customers using a method that is consistent with the tax normalization requirements specified in the tax legislation or IRS Normalization Rules, as applicable. As a result of 13 14 those discussions, the Parties were able to reach the Agreement attached to the Joint Motion as Exhibit A, which was filed with the Commission for approval.⁴

15

16

111. **TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT**

17 Q. **ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT?**

18 A. Yes, I am. I was personally involved in negotiating the terms of the Agreement which 19 address the following:

³Order issued January 18, 2018, in the 248 Docket.

⁴See, Exhibit A to the Joint Motion, Settlement Agreement dated June 21, 2018 ("Agreement").

²CURB's Petition to Intervene and a Response in Support of Staff's Motion filed December 22, 2017, in the 248 Docket.

- Empire to Establish a Regulatory Liability to Account for the TCJA's Lowering of (1)the Federal Income Tax Rate from 35% to 21%
 - (2)Empire Shall Establish a Regulatory Liability to Account for the Impact of the TCJA on the Utility's Excess ADIT
 - (3) **General Provisions**

1

2 3 4

5

6

9

Q.

PLEASE DISCUSS THE TERM OF THE AGREEMENT REQUIRING EMPIRE TO

10 ESTABLISH A REGULATORY LIABILITY TO ACCOUNT FOR THE TCJA'S

11 LOWERING OF THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX RATE FROM 35% TO 21%. 12 The Commission stated that in order to quantify the economic impacts of the new lower tax A.

13 rates on Kansas utilities the calculation should be based upon the difference between: (1) the cost of service approved by the Commission in the utility's most recent rate case; and (2) the 14 cost of service that would have resulted had the provision for federal income taxes been 15 16 based upon the corporate income tax rate approved in the TCJA and said amount should be accrued monthly.⁵ Under the Agreement, the Parties agreed that for the period of time 17 between January 1, 2018, and through the date on which the Commission issues a final order 18 19 in Empire's next general rate case (the timing of which is discussed in the terms of the 20 Agreement) Empire agrees to accrue monthly, as a regulatory liability on its general ledger 21 and to stand ready to credit its customers the amount determined due to customers at the 22 conclusion of that general rate case, that portion of its revenue representing the difference 23 between: (1) the cost of service as approved by the Commission in Empire's most recent rate 24 case, Docket No. 11-EPDE-856-RTS ("856 Docket"); and (2) the cost of service that would have resulted in the 856 Docket had the provision for federal income taxes been based upon

25

⁵Order, page 5, $\P7$.

the corporate income tax rate approved in the TCJA, including the impact the TCJA would have on Empire's Asbury Environmental Riverton Rider ("AERR") and interest. The Parties also agreed that based solely upon items one and two above, the monthly amount to be accrued as a regulatory liability exclusive of any calculated interest shall be as set forth in Appendix 1 to the Agreement. The interest rate applied to the amount shall be calculated at the rate being used for interest paid on customer deposits, which is currently 1.62%.

7 The disposition of the amount accrued as a regulatory liability shall be determined by 8 the Commission in its final order issued at the completion of the Company's next general rate 9 case filing. Empire's agreement to accrue as a regulatory liability the amount calculated in 10 Appendix 1 to the Agreement shall not be considered as any type of concession on the part of 11 Empire. Nor shall the Agreement be interpreted as a concession of the Company's position 12 that other components of its cost of service (such as the return on and of its capital 13 investments) should be considered and applied to reduce or offset the decrease in its income 14 tax expenses. Empire's intention (as captured in the terms of the Agreement) to utilize the 15 provision in the Order that allows the utility the ability to file information and supporting 16 data with the Commission in the upcoming rate case to prove the tax savings amount accrued 17 as a regulatory liability should be reduced or offset by other components of its cost of service 18 before determining the amount to be credited to customers. Likewise, Staff and CURB 19 reserved their rights to challenge Empire's position that other components of its cost of 20 service should be used to offset the decrease in Empire's income tax expenses.

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE TERM OF THE AGREEMENT REQUIRING EMPIRE TO ACCOUNT FOR THE IMPACT OF THE TCJA ON THE UTILITY'S EADIT.

A. The Commission, in its Order, also stated its intent was to capture the impact of the TCJA on

23

1 the utility's EADIT for the benefit of customers using a methodology that is consistent with 2 the tax normalization requirements specified in the tax legislation or IRS Normalization Under the Agreement, Empire agrees it will establish a regulatory liability to 3 Rules. 4 account for and capture the impact of the TCJA on the utility's EADIT and will provide 5 evidence of such to Staff and CURB. The Parties have agreed to defer any issues regarding 6 the impact of the TCJA on the utility's EADIT to Empire's next general rate case filing with 7 the understanding and concurrence by the Parties that Empire's customers are entitled to the 8 benefits of the tax savings relating to the utility's EADIT.

9 Empire has agreed it will not start amortizing the EADIT as of December 31, 2017 10 until the treatment of EADIT is approved by the Commission in Empire's next general rate 11 case filing.

12 Empire has agreed to file a general rate case no later than 150 days from the date of a Commission order approving this Agreement. It is further agreed that Empire will include 13 14 in the general rate case filing the: (1) impact of the TCJA on the utility's EADIT, if any, and 15 the treatment of EADIT; (2) calculation of tax savings relating to the reduced tax expense 16 resulting from the lower corporate tax rate in the TCJA that should be included in new base 17 rates following the general rate case decision; and (3) proposed plan to account for any 18 portion of the amount being accrued as a regulatory liability, subject to the provisions and 19 reservation of rights discussed in paragraph 8 in the Agreement.

Finally, the Parties agreed in the event the IRS asserts that the terms of this Agreement create a violation of normalization requirements all Parties will promptly reform the terms of the Agreement to cure and prevent any normalization violation.

23 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE GENERAL PROVISIONS SECTION OF THE

TESTIMONY OF CHARLOTTE T. NORTH IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

AGREEMENT.

A. Staff and CURB specifically reserved their respective rights to make all arguments and to
 take positions that are different than what they have agreed to in their Agreement with
 Empire with respect to proposals relating to the TCJA submitted by other public utilities for
 approval by the Commission.

Nothing in the Agreement is intended to impinge or restrict, in any manner, the
exercise by the Commission of any statutory right, including the right of access to
information, and any statutory obligation, including the obligation to ensure that Empire is
providing efficient and sufficient service at just and reasonable rates.

10 The Agreement includes a provision stating it represents a negotiated settlement that 11 resolves the issues in this docket as it relates to Empire only. The Parties represented that 12 the terms of the Agreement constitute a fair and reasonable procedure to be used by the Parties in Empire's upcoming rate case to address the issues raised in the Commission's 13 14 Order as they relate to Empire only. Except as specified in the Agreement, the Parties shall 15 not be prejudiced, bound by, or in any way affected by the terms of the Agreement (a) in any 16 future proceeding; (b) in any proceeding currently pending under a separate docket; and/or 17 (c) in this proceeding should the Commission decide not to approve the Agreement in the 18 agreement as proposed. If the Commission accepts the Agreement in its entirety and 19 incorporates the same into a final order without material modification, the Parties have 20 agreed to be bound by its terms and the Commission's order incorporating its terms as to all 21 issues addressed in the Agreement and in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, and 22 will not appeal the Commission's order on these issues.

23

The Agreement also includes a statement that the provisions contained in the

TESTIMONY OF CHARLOTTE T. NORTH IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Agreement have resulted from negotiations among the Parties and are interdependent. In the event the Commission does not approve and adopt the terms of the Agreement in total, it shall be voidable and none of the Parties shall be bound, prejudiced, or in any way affected by any of the agreements or provisions hereof. Further, in such event, the Agreement shall be considered privileged and not admissible in evidence and shall be withdrawn from the record in this proceeding and not made a part of the record in any other proceeding.

Finally, the Parties agreed to file testimony in support of the Agreement within seven
(7) days after the Motion is filed with the Commission.

9 IV. COMMISSION STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF AGREEMENT

10 Q. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE FACTORS THE COMMISSION CONSIDERS 11 WHEN REVIEWING A PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT?

A. Yes, I am. I understand there are five factors the Commission considers when reviewing a
 proposed settlement agreement, and I have reviewed several of the Commission's orders
 since the Commission adopted its five-factor test in 2008.

15 Q. CAN YOU IDENTIFY THOSE FIVE FACTORS?

- A. The five factors the Commission considers when reviewing proposed settlement agreements
 are as follows:
- 18 (1) Whether there was an opportunity for the opposing party to be heard on their
 reasons for opposition to the Agreement;
- 20 (2) Whether the Agreement is supported by substantial competent evidence;
- 21 (3) Whether the Agreement conforms with applicable law;
- 22 (4) Whether the Agreement results in just and reasonable rates; and

(5) Whether the results of the Agreement are in the public interest.

2 Q. WHO ARE THE PARTIES TO THIS DOCKET?

A. The parties to this general investigation docket included all investor owned utilities, CURB
and Staff. However, because the Agreement only pertains to Empire and only impacts
Empire's customers, only the relevant parties are signatories to the Agreement.

6 Q. ARE THERE ANY ISSUES NOT ADDRESSED IN THE AGREEMENT THAT ANY 7 OF THE PARTIES WISH TO LITIGATE?

8 A. No. The Agreement either addresses or defers the issues between Empire, Staff and CURB
9 to Empire's next general rate case.

10 Q. WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS IN THIS 11 DOCKET?

- 12 A. Representatives from Empire, Staff, and CURB participated in the settlement negotiations as
- it related to Empire. Empire originally discussed with the parties the issues in this docketand the possibility for settlement of some or all of the issues. The Parties continued
- 15 discussions through June 20, 2018. A settlement of all issues was reached by Empire, Staff
- and CURB resulting in the Agreement filed with the Commission on June 21, 2018.

17 Q. DID ALL PARTIES WHO WILL BE IMPACTED BY THE PROPOSED TAX

- 18 SAVINGS REFUND PLAN HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD WITH
- 19**RESPECT TO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT?**
- A. Yes. All parties impacted by the terms contained in the Agreement participated in thesettlement discussions.

22 Q. IS THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AMONG THE PARTIES IN

23 CONFORMITY WITH THE FACTORS THE COMMISSION USES TO REVIEW

1 SETTLEMENTS?

2 Yes. While I am not a lawyer, it is my understanding all the parties agree that the A. established standards have been met. A legal analysis in the Joint Motion addresses these 3 4 points. The final settlement agreement conforms to the instructions included by the 5 Commission in its Order, and is consistent with the intent set forth by the Commission in its 6 Order. The Agreement establishes a reasonable process and procedure to account for the impact of the TCJA in Empire's rates in its upcoming general rate case filing. 7 **DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?** 8 **Q**.

9 A. Yes.

VERIFICATION OF CHARLOTTE T. NORTH

STATE OF MISSOURI, COUNTY OF JASPER, ss:

I, Charlotte T. North, being first duly sworn on oath, depose and state that I am the witness identified in the foregoing Testimony in Support of the Settlement Agreement; that I have read the testimony and am familiar with its contents; and that the facts set forth therein are true and correct.

<u>Charlette</u> T. North Charlotte T. North

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 27 day of June, 2018.

n Ca M CC Notary Public

Appointment/Commission Expires:

ANGELA M. CLOVEN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Jasper County My Commission Expires: November 01, 2019 Commission Number: 15262659

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the above and foregoing Testimony of Charlotte T. North in Support of the Settlement Agreement was sent via electronic mail, this 27th day of June, 2018, addressed to:

Monte Price <u>mwprice@anginc.net</u>

Barry Considine barry@americanenergies.com

Dawn Graff dawn.graff@anadarko.com

Shelly M. Bass shelly.bass@atmosenergy.com

Kevin C. Frank kevin.frank@atmosenergy.com

Jennifer G. Ries jennifer.ries@atmosenergy.com

James Lloyd bartonrwd@ruraltel.net

Robert J. Amdor robert.amdor@blackhillscorp.com

Ann L. Stichler ann.stichler@blackhillscorp.com

Glenda Cafer glenda@caferlaw.com

Terri Pemberton terri@caferlaw.com

Thomas J. Connors tj.connors@curb.kansas.gov

Todd E. Love <u>t.love@curb.kansas.gov</u>

David W. Nickel <u>d.nickel@curb.kansas.gov</u>

Shonda Rabb s.rabb@curb.kansas.gov

Della Smith d.smith@curb.kansas.gov Brent Cunningham brent@ctctelephony.tv

Trent Boaldin tdboaldin@epictouch.com

John R. Idoux john.idoux@centurylink.com

Angela M. Cloven acloven@empiredistrict.com

Christopher D. Krygier Chris.Krygier@LibertyUtilities.com

Charlotte North Charlotte.North@LibertyUtilities.com

Mark Doty doty.mark@gmail.com

Thomas E. Gleason gleason@sunflower.com

Michael J. Murphy mmurphy@gorhamtel.com

Tonya M. Murphy <u>tmurphy@gorhamtel.com</u>

Robert A. Koch robkoch@hbcomm.net

Richard Baldwin rbaldwin@homecomminc.com

Mark Wade mark@havilandtelco.com

Colleen R. Jamison colleen@caplinger.net

Robert J. Hack rob.hack@kcpl.com Ronald A. Klote ronald.klote@kcpl.com

Tim Rush <u>tim.rush@kcpl.com</u>

Roger W. Steiner roger.steiner@kcpl.com

Anthony Westenkirchner anthony.westenkirchner@kcpl.com

Samuel Feather s.feather@kcc.ks.gov

Michael R. Neeley m.neeley@kcc.ks.gov

Janet Buchanan janet.buchanan@onegas.com

Judy Y. Jenkins judy.jenkins@onegas.com

Harry Lee <u>harry.lee@laharpetel.com</u>

Diantha Stutesman mtn.diantha@gmail.com

Mark E. Caplinger mark@caplingerlaw.net

Kathy Billinger kathy@peoplestelecom.net

Janet Bathurst jbathurst@satelephone.com

Kendall S. Mikesell kendall.mikesell@sktcompanies.com

Lindsay Campbell lcampbell@pioneerelectric.coop Randy Magnison rmagnison@pioneerelectric.coop

Chantry Scott cscott@pioneerelectric.coop

Mike Breuer mike@suburbanwaterinc.com

Mike McEvers mike@tkogas.com

Mark M. Gailey mmgailey@totelcsi.com

Benjamin Foster ben.foster@tvtinc.net

Jeff Wick jwick@wtcks.com

Cathryn J. Dinges cathy.dinges@westarenergy.com

Jeffrey L. Martin jeff.martin@westarenergy.com

Larry Wilkus larry.wilkus@westarenergy.com

Gregory Reed greg.reed@ensignal.com

Brian Boisvert boisvert@wilsoncom.us

Scott Grauer scott@wilsoncommunications.co

Kathy Price <u>kprice@zendatelephone.com</u>

6. the James G. Flaherty