Emergency facilities – Depreciation, amortization, and income taxes; Accounting Research Bulletin, no. 42

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Committee on Accounting Procedure

Accounting Research BULLETINS

★

Issued by the
Committee on Accounting Procedure,
American Institute of Accountants,
270 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

November, 1952 **No. 42**

Emergency Facilities — Depreciation, Amortization, and Income Taxes

CERTIFICATES OF NECESSITY

1. Section 124A of the Internal Revenue Code, which was added by the Revenue Act of 1950, provides for the issuance of certificates of necessity under which all or part of the cost of so-called *emergency facilities* may be amortized over a period of 60 months for income tax purposes. In many cases, the amounts involved are material, and companies are faced with the problem of deciding whether to adopt the 60-month period over which the portions of the cost of the facilities covered by certificates of necessity may be amortized for income tax purposes as the period over which they are to be depreciated in the accounts.

2. Thinking on this question apparently has become confused because many so-called *percentage certificates* have been issued covering less than the entire cost of the facility. This fact, together with the fact that the probable economic usefulness of the facility after the close of the five-year amortization period is considered by the certifying authority in determining the percentage covered by these certificates, has led many to believe that the percentage used represents the Government's conclusion as to the proportion of the cost of the facility that is not expected to have usefulness at the end of five years.

3. In some cases, it is apparent that the probable lack of economic usefulness of the facility after the close of the amortization period must constitute the principal if not the sole basis for determining the percentage to be included in the certificate. However, it must be recognized that the certifying authority has acted under orders to give consideration also to a variety of other factors to the end that the amount certified may be the minimum amount necessary to secure expansion of industrial capacity in the interest of national defense during the emergency period. Among the factors required to be considered in the issuance of these certificates, in addition to loss of useful value, are (a) character of business, (b) extent of risk assumed (including the amount and source of capital employed, and the potentiality of recovering capital or retiring debt through tax savings or pricing),

(c) assistance to small business and promotion of competition, (d) compliance with Government policies (e.g., dispersal for security), and (e) other types of incentives provided by Government, such as direct Government loans, guaranties and contractual arrangements.

DEPRECIATION CONSIDERATIONS

4. The argument has been advanced from time to time that, since the portion of the cost of properties covered by certificates of necessity is amortized over a five-year period for income tax purposes, it is necessary to follow the same procedure in the accounts. Sound financial accounting procedures do not necessarily coincide with the rules as to what shall be included in "gross income," or allowed as a deduction therefrom, in arriving at taxable net income. It is well recognized that such rules should not be followed for financial accounting purposes if they do not conform to generally accepted accounting principles. However, where the results obtained from following income tax procedures do not materially differ from those obtained where generally accepted accounting principles are followed, there are practical advantages in keeping the accounts in agreement with the income tax returns.

5. The cost of a productive facility is one of the costs of the services it renders during its useful economic life. Generally accepted accounting principles require that this cost be spread over the expected useful life of the facility in such a way as to allocate it as equitably as possible to the periods during which services are obtained from the use of the facility. This procedure is known as depreciation accounting, "a system of accounting which aims to distribute the cost or other basic value of tangible capital assets, less salvage (if any), over the estimated useful life of the unit (which may be a group of assets) in a systematic and rational manner. It is a process of allocation, not of valuation."[1]

6. The committee is of the opinion that from an accounting standpoint there is nothing inherent in the nature of emergency facilities which requires the depreciation or amortization of their cost for financial accounting purposes over either a shorter or a longer period than would be proper if no certificate of necessity had been issued. Estimates of the probable useful life of a facility by those best informed in the matter may indicate either a shorter or a longer life than the statutory 60-month period over which the certified portion of its cost is deductible for income tax purposes.

7. In determining the proper amount of annual depreciation with respect to emergency facilities for financial accounting purposes, it must be recognized that a great many of these facilities are being

[1] *Accounting Research Bulletins* Nos. 16, 20, and 22.

acquired primarily for what they can produce during the emergency period. To whatever extent it is reasonable to expect the useful economic life of a facility to end with the close of the amortization period the cost of the facility is a proper cost of operation during that period.

8. In determining the prospective usefulness of such facilities it will be necessary to consider their adaptability to post-emergency use, the effect of their use upon economic utilization of other facilities, the possibility of excessive costs due to expedited construction or emergency conditions, and the fact that no deductions for depreciation of the certified portion will be allowable for income tax purposes in the post-amortization years if the company elects to claim the amortization deduction. The purposes for which emergency facilities are acquired in a great many cases are such as to leave major uncertainties as to the extent of their use during the amortization period and as to their subsequent usefulness—uncertainties which are not normally encountered in the acquisition and use of operating facilities.

9. Consideration of these factors, the committee believes, will in many cases result in the determination of depreciation charges during the amortization period in excess of the depreciation that would be appropriate if these factors were not involved. Frequently they will be so compelling as to indicate the need for recording depreciation of the cost of emergency facilities in the accounts in conformity with the amortization deductions allowable for income tax purposes. However, the committee believes that when the amount allowed as amortization for income tax purposes is materially different from the amount of the estimated depreciation, the latter should be used for financial accounting purposes.

10. In some cases, certificates of necessity cover facilities which the owner expects to use after the emergency period in lieu of older facilities. As a result the older facilities may become unproductive and obsolete before they are fully depreciated on the basis of their previously expected life. In such situations, the committee believes depreciation charges to income should be determined in relation to the total properties, to the end that sound depreciation accounting may be applied to the property accounts as a whole.

RECOGNITION OF INCOME TAX EFFECTS

11. In those cases in which the amount of depreciation charged in the accounts on that portion of the cost of the facilities for which certificates of necessity have been obtained is materially less than the amount of amortization deducted for income tax purposes, the amount of income taxes payable annually during the amortization period may be significantly less than it would be on the basis of the income reflected in the financial statements. In such cases, after the

close of the amortization period the income taxes will exceed the amount that would be appropriate on the basis of the income reported in the statements. Accordingly, the committee believes that during the amortization period, where this difference is material, a charge should be made in the income statement to recognize the income tax to be paid in the future on the amount by which amortization for income tax purposes exceeds the depreciation that would be allowable if certificates of necessity had not been issued. The amount of the charge should be equal to the estimated amount by which the income tax expected to be payable after the amortization period exceeds what would be so expected if amortization had not been claimed for income tax purposes in the amortization period. The estimated amount should be based upon normal and surtax rates in effect during the period covered by the income statement with such changes therein as can be reasonably anticipated at the time the estimate is made.

12. In accounting for this deferment of income taxes, the committee believes it desirable to treat the charge as being for additional income taxes. The related credit in such cases would properly be made to an account for deferred income taxes. Under this method, during the life of the facility following the amortization period the annual charges for income taxes will be reduced by charging to the account for deferred income taxes that part of the income tax in excess of what would have been payable had the amortization deduction not been claimed for income tax purposes in the amortization period. By this procedure the net income will more nearly reflect the results of a proper matching of costs and revenues.

13. There are those who similarly recognize the necessity for giving effect to the amount of the deferred income taxes but who believe this should be accomplished by making a charge in the income account for additional amortization or depreciation. They would carry the related credit to an accumulated amortization or depreciation account as a practical means of recognizing the loss of future deductibility of the cost of the facility for income tax purposes. If this procedure is followed the annual charges for depreciation will be correspondingly reduced throughout the useful life of the facility following the amortization period. Although this procedure will result in the same amount of net income as the procedure outlined in paragraph 12, and therefore may be considered as acceptable, the committee regards the paragraph 12 procedure as preferable. In any circumstances, there should be disclosure of the procedures followed

The statement entitled "Emergency Facilities—Depreciation, Amortization, and Income Taxes" was adopted unanimously by the twenty members of the committee.

NOTES

1. Accounting Research Bulletins represent the considered opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the committee on accounting procedure, reached on a formal vote after examination of the subject matter by the committee and the research department. Except in cases in which formal adoption by the Institute membership has been asked and secured, the authority of the bulletins rests upon the general acceptability of opinions so reached. (See Report of Committee on Accounting Procedure to Council, dated September 18, 1939.)

2. Opinions of the committee are not intended to be retroactive unless they contain a statement of such intention. They should not be considered applicable to the accounting for transactions arising prior to the publication of the opinions. However, the committee does not wish to discourage the revision of past accounts in an individual case if the accountant thinks it desirable in the circumstances. Opinions of the committee should be considered as applicable only to items which are material and significant in the relative circumstances.

3. It is recognized also that any general rules may be subject to exception; it is felt, however, that the burden of justifying departure from accepted procedures must be assumed by those who adopt other treatment. (See Bulletin No. 1, page 3.)

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE (1952-1953)

PAUL K. KNIGHT, *Chairman*
FREDERICK B. ANDREWS
FRANK S. CALKINS
H. A. FINNEY
ROY GODFREY
THOMAS G. HIGGINS
JOHN A. LINDQUIST
PERRY MASON
EDWARD F. McCORMACK
JOHN PEOPLES
MAURICE E. PELOUBET
JOHN W. QUEENAN
WALTER L. SCHAFFER
C. AUBREY SMITH
C. OLIVER WELLINGTON
WILLIAM W. WERNTZ
EDWARD B. WILCOX
RAYMOND D. WILLARD
ROBERT W. WILLIAMS
KARL R. ZIMMERMANN

CARMAN G. BLOUGH
Director of Research