### BEFORE THE

# TENNESSEE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

### **DOCKET NO. 05-00258**

# PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

### JAMES C. CAGLE

#### On Behalf of

# ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Position and Qualifications	Page I
II.	Purpose of Testimony	Page 2
III.	Atmos' Corporation and Division Structure	Page 2
IV.	Common Cost Allocations	Page 4
Exhib	oits:	
JCC-1	I	Page 12
JCC-2	2	Page 13

# TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY DOCKET NO. 05-00258

# PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY

**OF** 

## JAMES C. CAGLE

# On Behalf of ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

1		I. POSITION AND QUALIFICATIONS
2	Q.	Please state your name, title and business address.
3	A.	My name is James C. Cagle. I am the Manager of Rates and Revenue Requirements for
4		Atmos Energy Corporation ("Atmos" or the "Company"). My business address is 5430
5		LBJ Freeway, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75240.
6	Q.	Please summarize your educational background and professional experience.
7	A.	I received a Bachelor of Accountancy degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1987. I
8		am a Certified Public Accountant licensed in the state of Texas. I have been employed by
9		Atmos since 1989. I was initially employed in Atmos' financial reporting department.
10		For the past thirteen years, except for the period from September 1997 through February
11		1998 when I was employed by GTE in its Costing department, I have worked in Atmos'
12		rates department.
13	Q.	Please describe your current responsibilities and qualifications.
14	A.	As Manager of Rates and Revenue Requirements, I am primarily responsible for rate
15		studies of and assisting in the design and implementation of rates for Atmos' regulated
16		utility operations. I am also responsible for oversight of certain rate related compliance

1		and reporting requirements prescribed by Atmos' various regulatory commissions. Part
2		of my responsibilities also include participation in the preparation, updating and
3		implementation of the Company's Cost Allocation Manual (CAM), which is attached as
4		Schedule DMM-1 to the testimony of Company witness Daniel M. Meziere. For a
5		significant portion of the past thirteen years, I have performed rate studies or portions of
6		rate studies for the design and implementation of rates for a majority of the Company's
7		regulated utility operations.
8	Q.	Have you previously provided testimony before the Tennessee Regulatory
9		Authority?
10	A.	No. However, I have provided testimony before several state regulatory commissions.
11		Exhibit JCC-1 lists the various states and dockets in which I have testified.
12		II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY
13 14	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
15	A.	I am sponsoring the cost allocations factors and methodologies made for ratemaking
16		purposes.
17	Q.	Are you sponsoring any Exhibits in connection with your testimony?
18	A.	Attached to my testimony are Exhibits JCC-1 and JCC-2.
19		III. ATMOS' CORPORATE AND DIVISION STRUCTURE
20	Q.	Are you familiar with the Company's corporate structure?
21	A.	Yes. Atmos Energy Corporation consists of the utility and various subsidiaries. The
22		utility is the parent company. The Company conducts its unregulated operations
23		through its subsidiaries. A chart showing the corporate structure is included as
24		Appendix A to the CAM (Exhibit DMM-1 to the direct testimony of Mr. Meziere).

- 1 Q In the top box of the referenced chart representing Atmos Energy Corporation,
  2 what do the various divisions represent?
- A. The various divisions are a part of the Company's management control structure that is utilized in the Company's shared costs allocation processes. Section 1a of the CAM describes the corporate structure in detail. There are currently eight such divisions seven of which are regulated gas local distribution operations and one of which is a regulated intrastate pipeline operation. We commonly refer to these divisions as "Operating Divisions" or "Business Units". The Operating Division/Business Unit which is the subject of this rate filing is referred to as the Mid-States Division.
- 10 Q. Do these operating divisions constitute separate legal entities?
- 11 A. No. They are merely unincorporated operating divisions within the Company's organizational structure. None of the divisions are subsidiary entities that have a separate legal existence apart from the Company, they are not distinct legal entities, and they do not have separate equity or debt. Nor do the divisions keep separate books and records.
- Q. Are you familiar with the organizational structure of the Company's Mid-States
  Operating Division?
- 17 A. Yes. As more particularly described in the direct testimony of Company witness Mr.

  18 John Paris, the Mid-States Division comprises the Company's regulated gas utility

  19 operations in the States of Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri (except for a small system of

  20 a few hundred customers operated through the Company's Colorado-Kansas Division),

  21 Tennessee and Virginia.

1	Q.	Are there any organizational changes which will be made within the Company's
2		Mid-States Operating Division which impact the subject matter of your testimony
3		regarding common cost allocations?
4	A.	Yes. Also as more particularly described in Mr. Paris' and Mr. Waller's testimony, and
5		effective October 1, 2006, the management and operation of the Company's Mid-States
6		and Kentucky Divisions will be consolidated. This consolidation will impact the
7		allocation of common costs for the office rate division (more particularly discussed
8		below) which are included in the Company's cost of service schedules filed in this
9		proceeding for the attrition period.
10	Q.	What is the attrition period to which you refer?
11	A.	In this proceeding, the Tennessee Regulatory Authority ("TRA") has established a
12		prospective ratemaking period (which has been referred to in this proceeding and will be
13		hereinafter referred to in my testimony as the "attrition period") which encompasses the
14		Company's 2007 fiscal year, beginning October 1, 2006 and ending September 30, 2007.
15		My discussion of common cost allocation is based upon cost allocation methodologies
16		which will be effective during the attrition period.
17		
18		IV. COMMON COST ALLOCATIONS
19	O.	What are common cost allocations?

- A. Basically, common cost allocation is the process of allocating various common costs which are incurred for the benefit of two or more of the Company's rate divisions and are therefore allocable to those rate divisions.
- 23 Q. What are the common costs to which you refer?

20

21

- A. One portion of common costs include costs related to services that are provided to the
  Company's operating rate divisions by Shared Services. Shared Services General
  Office includes, for example, accounting, human resources, legal, rates, risk management
  and numerous others. Shared Services Customer Support includes billing, customer
  call center functions and customer support related services. The costs for these Shared
  Services are allocated to the Company's operating rate divisions that utilize those
  services.
- Q. Does the Tennessee rate division utilize the services provided by both Shared

  Services General Office and Shared Services Customer Support?
- 10 A. Yes. These services are utilized by all of the Company's regulated local distribution operations, including Tennessee.
- 12 Q. Are there additional cost allocations other than Shared Services?
  - A. Yes. If an office rate division encompasses more than one jurisdiction, such as the Company's Mid-States rate division (which provides services to the Company's utility operations in Georgia, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee and Virginia), then the costs from that office rate division are allocated to separate rate divisions to which it provides services. As stated above, effective October 1, 2006, the Mid-States office rate division will also include and provide services and allocate costs to the Company's operations in Kentucky. Because the Company's divisional office in Kentucky will provide services to the Company's utility operations in Georgia, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee and Virginia as well as to Kentucky, costs from the total office rate division will be allocated to these states in addition to Kentucky. In addition the Mid-States divisional offices, the central and eastern region offices, will also be consolidated for accounting and allocation

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	purposes with the Mid-States office rate divisions.	The offices located in Tennessee and
2	Kentucky will be accounted for and allocated as on	e general office rate division.

- Q. For purposes of cost allocation, what is an "operating rate division" and an "office rate division"?
- A. Rate division is the Company's terminology representing an accumulation of accounting data which is applicable to an area in which rates have been set by a regulatory authority such as the TRA, and which the Company commonly refers to as an "operating rate division." In addition to operating rate divisions, the Company has certain "office rate divisions" from which the Company's Tennessee utility operations receive (and will receive) allocations of common costs including Shared Services, and the Mid-States divisional offices (described above).
- Q. Does the Company have any methodology for allocating common costs to a rate division?
- 14 A. Yes. The rate division designation is incorporated into the Company's account coding string. As such, costs are accumulated for various operating areas or office rate divisions within the Company's general ledger. This could represent the Company's operations in a particular state or a particular area within a state and/or various office rate divisions which would appropriately allocate costs to operating rate divisions.
- 19 Q. Are cost allocations necessary in the Company's rate filing?
- 20 A. Yes. It is appropriate and necessary to allocate the common costs incurred for the benefit 21 of ratepayers in multiple regulatory jurisdictions to the various jurisdictions which 22 receive those services. For example, the company's Shared Services provide various 23 services including accounting, billing and customer support, legal, finance, etc., to each

of the Company's utility operations in the twelve states in which Atmos operates. The Mid-states division offices provide Operating Division management, regulatory, certain accounting and other services to Tennessee, Virginia, Kentucky, Iowa, Georgia, Illinois, Tennessee customers receive the benefits of these services and the allocation of these costs ensures that Tennessee customers receive a reasonable portion of the costs of these services.

#### Please describe the Company's cost allocation methodology. 7 O.

1

2

3

4

5

6

- The Company allocates certain types of common costs to its operating rate divisions for A. management purposes as well as for reporting and ratemaking purposes. Operations and 9 Maintenance ("O&M") expense, depreciation expense, and taxes, other than income 10 taxes, expense that represent common costs are allocated on the books of the Company. 11 Other common costs such as commonly utilized plant in service and other ratebase items 12 are not allocated on the books of the Company but are allocated for ratemaking purposes. 13 These costs are allocated based on accepted methodologies which are further outlined 14 below in order to fully show the costs of providing utility service in each of the 15 regulatory jurisdictions within which the Company serves customers. 16
- In your answer, you differentiate between common costs which are allocated on the 17 Q. books of the Company and those that are allocated for ratemaking purposes. Can 18 you explain the difference? 19
- Yes. Operations and Maintenance (O&M) expense, depreciation expense, and taxes, 20 Α. other than income taxes, expense related to Shared Services, the Mid-States divisional 21 offices are currently allocated on the Company's books and records utilizing the 22 allocation methodologies described in detail in the CAM attached to Mr. Meziere's 23

testimony. The Company allocates these expenses within its books and records as a part
of its normal accounting cycle. The allocation factors used are generally calculated once
per year, updated at the beginning of the Company's fiscal year (October 1), and utilized
for the entire year unless a material event occurs which would significantly change the
factors. For the attrition period, the Composite and Customer factors used to allocate
Shared Services common costs to Tennessee are those currently in effect for the
Company's Fiscal 2006 adjusted to reflect the operational changes discussed in Mr.
Waller's testimony. No material change in the factors is expected to occur for the
attrition period. These factors are shown in Attachment JCC-2.
With respect to the allocation of common costs relating to the Mid-States office divisions,
the composite factor also shown in Attachment JCC-2 is to be used to allocate costs from

For those Shared Services costs which are not allocated on the Company's books and records, Composite Factors or a Customer Factor are used to allocate costs. Some examples of Shared Services costs for which Composite Factors or a Customer Factor are used for allocating such expenses for ratemaking purposes would include plant in service and accumulated deferred income taxes, as well as other rate base items. For the attrition period, Composite Factors are also to be used to allocate costs for the Mid-States office rate division's plant in service, accumulated deferred income taxes and other rate base items.

# Q. What is the difference between Composite Factors and a Customer Factor?

the consolidated Mid-states general offices (described above).

Composite Factors are used to allocate costs relating to rate base items for Shared Services – General Office and the Mid-States office rate division. The Customer Factor is used to allocate costs relating to rate base items for Shared Services – Customer Support. The Customer Factor is used for the latter because this office rate division provides services exclusively to the Company's regulated utility customers and does not perform any function for the Company's subsidiaries or pipeline division. As a result, Shared Services – Customer Support costs are allocated only to the seven local distribution Operating Divisions of the Company. The use of the Customer Factor to allocate the costs of this office rate division, instead of the Composite Factors, is reasonable and appropriate because the need for and level of the services required are primarily driven by the number of customers within an Operating Division.

# Q. How are the Composite and Customer Factors derived?

A.

The Composite Factors are derived based upon a three-factor formula comprised of the simple average of the relative percentage of gross plant in service, the relative percentages of the average number of customers and the relative percentages of direct O&M for each of the Company's Operating Divisions, which is further described in the CAM. The Customer Factor is derived based on the average number of customers of the Operating Divisions that receive allocable costs for the services provided. Shared Services allocations to the business unit are then added to the business unit's general office costs and then further allocated to the applicable office rate divisions using Composite Factors (based upon the three-factor formula) specific as to the Operating Division. For the Mid-States business unit, the Composite Factors utilized for further allocating applicable Shared Services —General Office and Mid-States general offices

A. O&M expense, depreciation expense, and taxes, other than income taxes, are allocated in the Company's filing utilizing the methodologies set forth in the CAM. As previously stated, the Company does not allocate ratebase items for Shared Services (such as plant in service or accumulated deferred income taxes) within its books and records. Instead, these items are allocated in the context of rate proceedings such as this one and for certain reporting purposes. In this filing, ratebase items and ratemaking adjustments were allocated utilizing the composite factors set forth and described in Schedule JCC-2 attached to my testimony and described above. General office costs have been allocated in the filing utilizing the Mid-states Operating Division composite factors also set forth in Schedule JCC-2 utilizing the methodology described above.

# 11 Q. Does that conclude your testimony?

12 A. Yes.

	TESTIMONY		
DOCKET	STYLED AS	TYPE	DATE
Virginia Corporation Com	mission		
PUE 000171	Atmos Energy Corporation for an increase in rates.	Direct	March-00
PUE 2003-00507	Atmos Energy Corporation for an increase in rates.	Direct	February-04
Colorado Public Utility Co	ommission		
00S-668G	In the matter of the tariff sheets filed by Greeley Gas Company, a Division of Atmos Energy Corp with Advice Letter No. 419 regarding comprehensive changes to the rates, terms and conditions for natural gas sales, and transportation services	Direct	November-00
Kansas Corporation Com	nission		
03-ATMG-1036-RTS	In the Matter of the Application of Atmos Energy for Adjustment of its Natural Gas Rates in the States of Kansas	Direct and Rebuttal	June-03
Railroad Commission of	Texas		
9002 – 9135	Statement of Intent Filed by Energas Company to Increase Rates Charged in the 67 West Texas Cities: Petition by Energas for Review of 67 Municipal Rate Decisions	Direct and Rebuttal	March-00
9670, 9676	Petition for de novo review of the reduction of the gas utility rates of Atmos Energy Corp, Mid-Tex Division	Direct	May-06
Louisiana Public Service	Commission		
U-21922, U-23508 Consolidated	Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte, Consolidated Docket U-21922 and U-23508, In re: Docket No. U-21922, In re: Investigation of the Rates and Charges of Trans Louisiana Gas Company, A Division of Atmos Energy Corp. (formerly styled: Trans Louisiana Gas Company (Dallas, Texas) ex parte, Request to continue Rate Stabilization Clause (RSC) beyond the three year trial period, which expired September 3, 1995)_and now Consolidated with Docket U-23508, Trans Louisiana Gas Company, A Division of Atmos Energy Corp. ex parte, In re: Request for approval of Commodity Performance Mechanism.	Direct and Rebuttal	March-99
U-28814	Petition of Trans Louisiana Gas Company, a regulatory division of Atmos Energy Corporation, requesting approval of a Conservation and Consumer Cost Stabilization rider.	Direct	May-05
Georgia Public Utility Co 20298-U	mmission Filing of Increased Rates for Natural Gas Service	Direct	May-05
Missouri Public Service	e Commission		
GR-2006-0387	Atmos Energy Corporation's tariff revision designed to consolidate rates and implement a general rate increase for natural gas service	Direct	April-06

ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION
Allocation of Atmos Corporate (Co. # 10) Cost Based on 12 Month Period Ended 9/30/05

Atmos P/L Mid Tex	#######################################	336	56,847,368	15.10%	0.01%	17.13%	10.75%		10.30%	0.00%	0.00%	10.75%	2.69%	5.38%	8.06%	%00'0	100.00%	9.32%	0.00%
Atmos Energy Marketing	A CAMBERT OF THE PARTY OF THE P		The same of the sa	0.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		2.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.69%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%00'0	0.54%	0.00%
Atmos Energy Holdings				%00'0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%00`0	0.00%	%00'0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%00'0
Atmos Energy Power Systems				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%00:0	0.00%	0.00%	%00.0	%00'0	0.03%	0.00%
Atmos P/L & Storage				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.51%	%00.0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.16%	0.00%
AESI				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.03%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00% #	0.00% #	0.01%	0.00%
Mid-Tex Div	************	1,486,911	111,777,400	37.13%	48.49%	33.68%	39.77%		38.84%	0.00%	48.50%	39.77%	9.94%	19.89%	29.83%	100.00%	0.00%	42.03%	0.00%
MVG	312,132,570	250,221	42,542,084	6.19%	8.16%	12.82%	9.06%		8.74%	18.31%	8.16%	%90.6	16.00%	13.69%	11.37%	0.00%	0.00%	8.62%	22.86%
KY Div				0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	%00'0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MidStates Div	875,877,763	465,611	45,099,510	17.38%	15.18%	13.59%	15.38%		15.00%	31.08%	15.19%	15.38%	27.16%	23.23%	19.31%	0.00%	0.00%	14.62%	39.45%
LA Div 077	361,551,027	259,748	23,356,143	7.17%	8.47%	7.04%	7.56%	A	7.37%	15.28%	8,47%	7.56%	13.35%	11.42%	9.49%	0.00%	0.00%	7.66%	0.00%
LA Div 007	149,148,351	73,997	7,096,213	7.96%	7.617	2.14%	2.50%		2.44%	5.05%	2.41%	2.50%	4.41%	3.78%	3.14%	0.00%	0.00%	2.37%	0.00%
CO/KS Div	333,416,585	231,753	21,821,530	969%	7 56.9%	%85.9	6.92%		6.74%	13.99%	7.56%	6.97%	12.22%	10.45%	8.69%	0.00%	0 00%	6.59%	17.26%
West Tex Div	375,655,076	297,819	23,341,950	7.45%	0.779%	7.02%	× 116%	Acceptance   100	7.88%	16.79%	917.6	%90 8	14.23%	12.17%	10.12%	%000	%00'0	%50%	20.43%
Total	5,040,181,361	3.066.396	331,882,198	1000 000	100.00078	100.00%	100 09%		100.00%	100 00%	100.00%	100.00%	100 00%	100 00%	100.001	100.001	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
	6/	) #2	· s	•	2	s s	! : 'a'	•	% 		ı	¥ 150	X 20 25	1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	X X		ı	1	LA- GAS
A. Composite Allocation Factor:	Grose Direct PD&F	Average Number of Customers	Total O&M Expense *	(* w/o Allocation and CapGernini Billings)  Total Composite Factor	Gross Direct Frace	Average Number of Customers	Total Court Leptons	total Composite Partor for F. 2000	Manage w/ all TX11 Plus Non-Ren (full 2 %	Old Atmos & Hillity Only	Atmos w/ Mid To Cocio	Atmos w/ Mid 1X - CSCS	Atmos w/ all TXII Bea Only (1/4 alloc to TX	Atmos w/ all TXII Bea Only (1/2 alloc to TX	Atmos w/ all TXII Dea Only (3/4 alloc to TX	Allegate to Mid Toy Oak	Allocate to Mid-Tex Oilly	Allocate to 1A FL of ity	Old Atmos 6, Utility Only - exclude LA- GAS

Attachment JCC-2 Page 2 of 2

ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION
MidStates General Office (Div091) Composite Allocation Factors
Based on 12 Month Period Ended 9/30/05

				Based on 1	2 Month Ferio	a Enaea 9/30/05 099DIV		070DIV	VIOI70	072DIV			
Composite Allocation Data		MidStates	092DIV IL	093DIV TN	095DIV GA	Ft.Benning	096DIV VA	Kirksville	Butler	SEMO	097DIV MO	098DIV IA	09Div KY
Gross Direct PP&E Average Number of Customers Total O&M Expense * (* w/o Allocations)	ss # ss	869,564,446 465,548 33,091,343	42,004,481 23,125 1,629,109	42,004,481 284,731,266 23,125 122,120 1,629,109 7,872,426	115,803,132 64,758 5,815,285	448,074 1 55,713	52,813,254 21,563 1,943,732	6,830,944 5,964 385,348		41,574,408 35,191 2,184,186	34,562,065 14,453 2,397,676	12,884,308 4,329 581,883	277,912,514 174,044 10,225,985
Gross Direct PP&E Average Number of Customers Total O&M Expense	% % %	100.00% 100.00% 100.00%	4.83% 4.97% 4.92%	32.75% 26.24% 23.80%	13.32% 13.91% 17.57%	0.05% 0.00% 0.17%	6.07% 4.63% 5.87%	0.79% 1.28% 1.16%	0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	4.78% 7.56% 6.60%	3.97% 3.10% 7.25%	1.48% 0.93% 1.76%	31.96% 37.38% 30.90%
Total Composite Factor for FY 2006 %	   %   9	66.59%	4.91%	27.60%	14.93%	0.07%	5.52%	1.08%	0.00%	6.31%	4.77%	1.39%	33.41%
SS Composite SS Customer		15.38% 15.19%	0.75% 0.75%	4.24% 3.98%	2.30%	0.01%	0.85% 0.70%	0.17%	0.00%	0.97%	0.73%	0.21% 0.14%	5.14%