

Exhibit No.:  
Issue: Cost of Removal  
Witness: Melissa K. Hardesty  
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony  
Sponsoring Party: Kansas City Power & Light Company  
Case No.: ER-2007-0291  
Date Testimony Prepared: August 30, 2007

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**CASE NO.: ER-2007-0291**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**MELISSA K. HARDESTY**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

**Kansas City, Missouri**  
**August 2007**

Exhibit No. 15  
Case No(s) ER-2007-0291  
Date 10/11/07 Rptr UV

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**MELISSA K. HARDESTY**

**Case No. ER-2007-0291**

1   **Q:   Please state your name and business address.**

2   A:   My name is Melissa K. Hardesty. My business address is 1201 Walnut, Kansas City,  
3       Missouri 64106.

4   **Q:   By whom and in what capacity are you employed?**

5   A:   I am employed by Kansas City Power & Light Company ("KCPL" or the "Company") as  
6       Director of Taxes. KCPL is a direct, wholly-owned subsidiary of Great Plains Energy  
7       Incorporated ("Great Plains Energy").

8   **Q:   What are your responsibilities?**

9   A:   My responsibilities include management of KCPL's taxes, including income, property,  
10      sales and use, and transactional taxes.

11  **Q:   Please describe your education, experience and employment history.**

12  A:   I graduated from the University of Kansas in 1996 with a Bachelor of Science in  
13      Accounting. I am a Certified Public Accountant with a permit to practice in the State of  
14      Kansas. After completion of my degree, I worked at the public accounting firm Marks,  
15      Stallings & Campbell, P.A. as a staff accountant from 1996 to 1999. In 1999, I went to  
16      work for Sprint Corporation as a Tax Specialist in the company's federal income tax  
17      department. I held various positions from 1999 to 2006. When I left Sprint to join KCPL

1 in December 2006, I was Manager of Income Taxes for Sprint's Wireless Division.

2 Since December of 2006, I have been Director of Taxes for KCPL.

3 **Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?**

4 A: The purpose of my testimony is to discuss KCPL's flow-through treatment for taxes  
5 related to cost of removal ("COR") deductions for assets placed in service before 1981  
6 ("Pre-81 COR").

7 **Q: What concerns do you have with Mr. Traxler's handling of COR in Staff's income**  
8 **tax schedule (Schedule 11 of the Staff Accounting Schedules)?**

9 A: The Staff has chosen to exclude KCPL's flow-through adjustments for Pre-81 COR in its  
10 calculation of income tax expense. By excluding the adjustments, the Staff has reflected  
11 the tax benefits related to Pre-81 COR expenses as if they are being normalized for  
12 regulatory purposes.

13 **Q: Do you agree with the exclusion of the flow-through adjustments for Pre-COR?**

14 A: No, I do not. KCPL believes that the tax benefits related to Pre-81 COR should continue  
15 to be flowed-through for regulatory purposes.

16 **Q: What is normalization vs. flow-through?**

17 A: Normalization and flow-through refer to accounting methods used to account for timing  
18 differences between deductions recorded on the financial/regulatory books and those  
19 taken on the income tax return.

20 **Q: When is flow-through used and how does it work?**

21 A: In the past, utilities were often required to "flow-through" tax benefits to ratepayers  
22 immediately to reduce current rates. This occurred as a result of reflecting a higher level  
23 of expense deductions when calculating the income tax expense for regulatory purposes

1 than the level of expense deductions reflected in cost of service for regulatory purposes.  
2 When the tax became due in the future, higher rates would be provided to cover the tax  
3 liability. Flow-through can still be used for tax timing differences not covered by the tax  
4 code's mandatory normalization requirements. Under flow-through accounting, taxes are  
5 computed based on the income tax return deduction instead of the book deduction. The  
6 tax due based on the tax deduction is then recorded for book purposes and is used when  
7 calculating tax expense for regulatory purposes. Deferred taxes are not recorded for  
8 regulatory reporting purposes on the difference between the book deduction and the tax  
9 deduction.

10 **Q: What is normalization and how does it work?**

11 **A:** Normalization is a process whereby taxes are calculated and recorded for book and  
12 regulatory purposes based on all taxes expected to be paid, without regard to when the  
13 taxes will be paid. Under normalization, revenues and deductions used to calculate book  
14 and regulatory income tax expense are the same as those used to record book and  
15 regulatory net income before income taxes. Any differences between the tax calculated  
16 per the books and the tax payment due based on the filed income tax return for the same  
17 period are provided for by recording a deferred tax liability. All timing differences  
18 between book income or deductions and tax income or deductions must have a deferred  
19 tax liability recognized that will be available in the future to satisfy the tax liability when  
20 the tax payment becomes due. Under normalization, a utility is allowed to recover taxes  
21 from the ratepayers based on the tax expense calculated for book purposes. The resulting  
22 deferred tax on the Balance Sheet, generally a liability, is reflected for ratemaking as a  
23 rate base offset.

1 Q: Is COR a timing difference that is required to be normalized?

2 A: No, normalization is not required for COR deductions.

3 Q: Has KCPL been authorized to flow-through the tax benefits related to Pre-81 COR?

4 A: Yes, it has. KCPL was required to flow-through the tax benefits related to COR in an  
5 agreement made with the Staff in Case No. ER-78-252. As part of that agreement, the  
6 existing deferred tax liability related to normalized COR was amortized to \$0 over a five-  
7 year period. COR tax benefits for assets placed in service before 1981 have continued to  
8 be flowed-through since that time.

9 Q: Has KCPL consistently applied flow-through for Pre-81 COR for regulatory  
10 purposes since 1978?

11 A: Yes, it has. KCPL has flowed-through the tax benefits for Pre-81 COR in the annual  
12 surveillance reports filed with the Staff since 1979, and in its financial records. That is,  
13 the Company has included a COR component in its depreciation expense for both  
14 regulatory reporting and financial reporting. When the tax expense is computed for  
15 regulatory and financial reporting, the depreciation expense is reduced for the COR  
16 component and the actual COR incurred during the year is included as a deduction.

17 Q: What is the effect on revenue requirements if the tax benefits for Pre-81 COR are  
18 no longer allowed to be flowed-through?

19 A: If KCPL is not allowed to continue to flow-through taxes for Pre-81 COR, the cumulative  
20 accelerated tax benefits flowed-through to the ratepayers subsequent to Case ER-78-252  
21 would not be recovered by KCPL when the timing differences reverse and the tax is paid.

22 Q: If the Commission should agree with Mr. Traxler's approach, i.e., reflect Pre-81  
23 COR on a normalized basis, what effect would that have on KCPL?

1 A: KCPL currently has a regulatory asset recorded on its balance sheet for the future  
2 recovery of the cumulative accelerated tax benefits provided to ratepayers related to Pre-  
3 81 COR. The impact to KCPL of requiring normalization going forward would depend  
4 on the approach the Commission adopted. The Commission could require Pre-81 COR to  
5 be normalized and authorize amortization of the regulatory asset over a defined period, or  
6 the Commission could require KCPL to normalize the Pre-81 COR without any  
7 amortization of the regulatory asset. If KCPL is authorized to amortize the regulatory  
8 asset, it will recover the accelerated tax benefits over the time period agreed to by the  
9 Commission. If KCPL is required to normalize Pre-81 COR without any amortization, it  
10 will have to write-off the regulatory assets recorded on the balance sheet.

11 **Q: What impact would such a write-off entail?**

12 A. The income statement impact would be an increase to income tax expense of \$17,078,526  
13 (total Company effect), based on the COR regulatory asset balance at June 30, 2007.

14 **Q: How was this impact computed?**

15 A: KCPL has realized income tax deductions of \$45,421,611 Pre-81 COR (total Company)  
16 in excess of the expense that was accrued for book/regulatory purposes through the  
17 depreciation provision as of June 30, 2007. If normalized, the deferred tax liability,  
18 calculated at 37.6%, would be \$17,078,526. Under financial reporting requirements,  
19 KCPL has recorded the deferred tax liability offset by a regulatory asset that has been  
20 grossed up for the deferred taxes on its balance sheet. If normalization is required  
21 without amortization, the deferred tax liability will remain but the regulatory asset and  
22 the tax gross up would be written-off. This would result in an expense of \$17,078,526  
23 (total Company).

1 Q: If the Commission should require normalization and authorize an amortization of  
2 the regulatory asset, what amortization period would be appropriate?

3 A: Similar to the amortization authorized in Case No. ER-78-252 discussed earlier in my  
4 testimony, a five-year amortization would be appropriate.

5 Q: Does that conclude your testimony?

6 A: Yes, it does.

In the Matter of the Application of Kansas City )  
Power & Light Company to Modify Its Tariff to ) Case No. ER-2007-0291  
Continue the Implementation of Its Regulatory Plan )

**STATE OF MISSOURI           )**  
   **) ss**  
**COUNTY OF JACKSON       )**

1. My name is Melissa K. Hardesty. I work in Kansas City, Missouri, and I am employed by Great Plains Energy Incorporated as Director of Taxes.

3. I have knowledge of the matters set forth therein. I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded, including any attachments thereto, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Melissa K. Hardesty  
Melissa K. Hardesty

Subscribed and sworn before me this 30<sup>th</sup> day of August 2007.

Nicole A. Wiley  
Notary Public

My commission expires: Feb. 4 2011

