BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

| IN RE: |) | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| |) | Andrew was a series of the ser |
| PETITION OF CHATTANOOGA GAS |) | |
| COMPANY, NASHVILLE GAS |) | |
| COMPANY, A DIVISION OF PIEDMONT |) | |
| NATURAL GAS COMPANY, INC. AND |) | |
| UNITED CITIES GAS COMPANY, A |) | Docket No. 03-00209 |
| DIVISION OF ATMOS ENERGY |) | |
| CORPORATION, FOR A DECLARATORY |) | |
| RULING REGARDING THE |) | |
| UNCOLLECTIBILE ACCOUNTS UNDER |) | |
| THE PURCHASE GAS ADJUSTMENT |) | |
| ("PGA") RULES |) | |
| | | |

JOINT COMMENTS OF CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY, NASHVILLE GAS COMPANY, A DIVISION OF PIEDMONT NATURAL GAS COMPANY, INC., AND ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION TO PROPOSED PROCEDURES AND MOTION TO CONVENE RULEMAKING

At the June 26, 2006 agenda conference, Director Jones presented a motion to convene a rulemaking for the purpose of adopting proposed procedures entitled "Procedures for Uncollected Gas Cost Recovery in the Annual ACA Filing" and the "Uncollectible Gas Cost Recovery Reporting Forms and Instructions." The presiding panel deferred action on the motion and asked for comments from the interested parties. This filing contains the joint comments of Chattanooga Gas Company, Nashville Gas Company, a Division of Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc., and Atmos Energy Corp. ("the Companies") in response to the panel's request.

In its February 2005 Order in this docket, the Authority made the following findings:

- (a) The intent of the PGA Rules is to permit the gas companies to recover their total gas costs;
- (b) A waiver of the PGA Rules is not necessary to allow recovery of the gas cost portion of uncollectible accounts; [and]

(c) The interpretation of the PGA Rules sought by the Petitioners [to permit recovery of gas costs portions of uncollectible accounts] does not require a rulemaking procedure.¹

In its February 2005 Order, the Authority found a rulemaking was unnecessary because a specific provision within the PGA Rule, Tenn. Rules & Regs. § 1220-4-7-.03(1)(b)3, permits the Authority to modify formulas from time to time to carry out the intent of the PGA Rule. The February Order modified the PGA recovery formula pursuant to that provision to include a mechanism to capture the recovery of the gas costs portion of uncollectible accounts.

In light of the specific findings of the February 2005 Order, it would appear that a rulemaking is not technically necessary in order to continue the collection of the gas costs portion of uncollectible accounts through the mechanism approved in that Order. Should the Authority, nonetheless, decide to exercise its discretion and initiate a rulemaking in this proceeding for the purpose of incorporating into its rules the procedures for the collection of these costs, it is the Companies' understanding that such a rulemaking would be limited to a determination of the procedures for accounting and reporting the recovery of the gas costs portion of uncollectible accounts through the PGA. The Companies' position in this regard is based upon the scope of Director Jones' Motion, as well as the fact that the Authority has already determined that the intent of the PGA mechanism is to permit full recovery of gas costs and it is only the form of implementation of that conclusion – formula modification or formal rules — that is now under discussion.²

¹ Order Denying Consumer Advocate's Motion for Summary Judgment, Granting, in Part, and Denying, in Part, Petitioners' Motion for Summary Judgment, Denying Petition for a Declaratory Ruling and Modifying Refund Adjustment Formula, TRA Docket. No. 03-00209 (Feb. 9, 2005), p. 9.

² The Companies would note that there has been no evidence presented to the Authority that would support a contrary conclusion regarding the intent of the PGA mechanism and, therefore, no basis upon which the Authority could reasonably reverse its prior conclusion.

The Companies have reviewed the proposed accounting and reporting procedures and have discussed them with Authority Staff. While the Companies are generally supportive of the proposed procedures in their current form, the Companies would like to reserve their rights to review the actual language of any proposed rule that the Authority notices for rulemaking and to submit any specific comments about the proposed rule at that time. The Companies welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the Staff to develop procedures that are clear and that can be efficiently implemented.

Respectfully submitted,

FARMER & LUNA, PLLC

By: J.W. Lung, TN BPR #005780

Jennifer Brundige, TN BPR #020673

333 Union Street, Suite 300

Nashville, TN 37201

Telephone (615) 254-9146

Facsimile (615) 254-7123

Attorneys for Chattanooga Gas Company

BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN, **CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ**

By: Misty Smith Kelley, TN BPR #019450

1800 Republic Centre, 633 Chestnut Street

Chattanooga, TN 37450-1800

Telephone (423) 209-4148

Facsimile (423) 752-9549

Attorney for Atmos Energy Corporation

MOORE & VAN ALLEN

By: James H. Jeffries IV Wommson & gra

100 North Tryon Street, Suite 4700

Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-4003

Telephone (704) 331-1079

Facsimile (704) 339-5879

Attorney for Nashville Gas Company, a Division of

Piedmont Natural Gas Company, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served on the following this 21st day of July, 2006, via U.S. mail.

Timothy Phillips
Vance Broemel
Office of the Attorney General
Consumer Advocate & Protection Division
425 Fifth Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37202-0207

Richard Collier Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37243

Jary & Brundy

4