| 1 | Q. | CA 29.0 NP | |
|----|----|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | Reference: | Evidence of JT Browne, page 15. |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | Preamble: | Mr Browne states "If NP were to seek the \$9.6 million through an |
| 6 | | | increase in rates, it would require an additional \$15 million in |
| 7 | | | revenues. The difference between the \$9.6 million and the \$15 million |
| 8 | | | (\$5.4 million) would represent the increase in taxes associated with the |
| 9 | | | revenues necessary to provide \$9.6 million. However, since the \$9.6 |
| 10 | | | million will be covered by recognizing a portion of the UUR, there wil |
| 11 | | | be no additional taxes. NP must pay the tax on the UUR at December |
| 12 | | | 31, 2005 over three years, whether or not it recognizes any of the UUR |
| 13 | | | for rate setting purposes." |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | m that this difference arises because NP uses the flow through method |
| 16 | | for recognizi | ng corporate income taxes for rate-setting purposes. |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | A. | Confirmed. | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | e arises due to the use of the modified flow through method approved by the |
| 21 | | Newfoundlan | d and Labrador Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities. |
| | | | |