

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

333 UNION STREET
SUITE 300
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37201

TELEPHONE (615) 254-9146 TELECOPIER (615) 254-7123 www.lunalawNashville.com

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

J.W. Luna jwluna@LunaLawNashville.com

May 1, 2018

Chairman David Jones c/o Sharla Dillon Tennessee Public Utility Commission 502 Deaderick Street, 4th Floor Nashville, TN 37243

Re: Chattanooga Gas Company; TPUC Docket No. 18-00017

Dear Chairman Jones:

Chattanooga Gas Company's ("CGC") is hereby filing revised testimony for John Cogburn and Archie Hickerson, along with two revised exhibits for Mr. Hickerson, ARH-1 and ARH-2. Also being included with this filing for the convenience of the Commission and parties are track changes copies of both Mr. Cogburn's revised testimony and Mr. Hickerson's revised testimony that compares the version being filed today to the original testimony filed in February. Attached hereto are electronic versions of each document. We will be hand delivering an original and four copies of each document along with a CD.

On April 10, 2018, CGC filed its Notice of Withdrawal ("Notice") to permanently withdraw from any further consideration in this docket CGC's requests for adoption of certain alternative regulatory methods ("ARM"), including its annual rate review request and proposed ARM Tariff as well as its proposed infrastructure economic development proposal and SEED Tariff (collectively, the "ARM Requests"). In that filing, CGC indicated that it would separately submit the appropriate revised testimony for Mr. Cogburn and Mr. Hickerson reflecting the withdrawal of its ARM Requests. The attached testimony accomplishes this change. Mr. Hickerson's two exhibits also reflect the elimination of the SEED Tariff provisions from CGC's rate case tariff. In the Notice, CGC also advised that in withdrawing its ARM Requests it was also withdrawing Mr. Cogburn's Exhibit JCM-1, so this exhibit is no longer a part of CGC's case in this matter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

J.W. Luna

Enclosures

cc: Monica Smith-Ashford, Esq.

Vance Broemel, Esq. Wayne Irvin, Esq. Henry Walker, Esq. Floyd Self, Esq.

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

| | May 1, 2018 | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|
| IN RE: |) | |
| |) | |
| CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY |) | |
| PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF AN |) | |
| ADJUSTMENT IN RATES AND |) | Docket No. |
| TARIFF; THE TERMINATION OF |) | 18-00017 |
| THE AUA MECHANISM AND THE |) | |
| RELATED TARIFF CHANGES AND |) | |
| REVENUE DEFICIENCY | j | |
| RECOVERY; AND AN ANNUAL | j | |
| RATE REVIEW MECHANISM | ĺ | |

REVISED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JOHN M. COGBURN ON BEHALF OF CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY

I. WITNESS INTRODUCTION

- 2 Q. Please state your name, title, and business address.
- 3 A. I am John Cogburn, Director of Regulatory Reporting and Strategic Planning for
- 4 Southern Company Gas. My business address is Ten Peachtree Place NE,
- 5 Atlanta, GA 30309.

1

- 6 Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this case?
- 7 A. I am testifying on behalf of Chattanooga Gas Company ("Company" or "CGC").
- 8 Q. Please describe your duties as they relate to CGC.
- 9 A. I am responsible for management and regulatory planning and internal
- management and regulatory reporting for all of the Southern Company Gas
- distribution utilities, including CGC.
- 12 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- 13 A. My testimony supports the identification of the methodology adopted in this case
- that will form the basis for the annual rate review tariff under the alternative
- regulatory methods ("ARM") statute that the Company will be filing with the
- 16 Commission after the conclusion of this rate case. While the Company originally
- intended to have its annual rate review tariff approved as a part of this rate case,
- the Company has formally withdrawn that request so that a new annual rate
- review tariff can be addressed after the conclusion of this docket.
- 20 Q. Please describe your duties that are relevant to the Company's proposed
- 21 **ARM Tariff.**
- 22 A. I am responsible for the regulatory filings and business planning associated with
- 23 the Atlanta Gas Light Company annual rate review tariff, known as the Georgia

- 1 Rate Adjustment Mechanism ("GRAM"). Atlanta Gas Light is another natural 2 gas distribution utility of Southern Company Gas. The GRAM annual review 3 tariff shares certain similarities with the annual rate review process we anticipate
- 5 Section 65-5-103(6)(A) states, "A public utility may opt to file for an annual Q. 6 review of its rates based upon the methodology adopted in its most recent 7 rate case pursuant to section 65-5-101 and subsection (a), if applicable." 8 What is the methodology CGC is seeking to be adopted in this case?
- A. In simple terms, the methodology CGC has relied upon in setting new rates in this 10 case is based upon the fundamental rate making components identified below that are generally utilized throughout the industry by rate base, rate of return utilities. 12 To that end, in this proceeding the Company specifically requests that the 13 Commission approve the Company's methodology and confirm that its revenue 14 requirement and rates are based upon the ratemaking elements enumerated below. 15 To the extent that the Commission applies a methodology or ratemaking elements 16 other than those identified below, the Company requests that the Commission describe its methodology/elements in its Final Order in a manner sufficient for the 18 Company to apply the same methodology/elements in future ARM filings.
 - Rate of Return calculation, including the allowed return on equity, equity a. to debt capitalization ratios, and cost of debt.
 - Determination of normalized billing units and revenues to be used in the b. proof of revenue for the Historic Base Period.
 - Billing unit and revenue forecast for the Forward Looking Rate Year. c.
 - Weather normalization factors. d.
- 25 Forecast other revenues. e.

using for Tennessee.

4

9

11

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

Forecast for O&M expenses including labor and non-labor expense, 26 f. 27 including pension and other benefit related expenses.

- 1 Identification and calculation of any disallowed expenses and other g. 2 regulatory adjustments. 3
 - Identification of debt expense. h.
- 4 i. Amortization schedule for rate case expenses.
- Determination and calculation for taxes including taxes other than income 5 i. 6 taxes and income taxes.
 - k. Identification and calculation of depreciation and amortization expenses.
 - 1 Determination and calculations for rate base and the components of rate base including: gross plant in service, accumulated depreciation and amortization, construction work in progress, stored gas inventory, cash working capital, materials and supplies, regulatory assets, deferred pension regulatory asset balance, accumulated deferred income tax, customer contributions in aid of construction, customer deposits, accumulated interest on customer deposits, operating reserves, and any other components included by the Commission in the calculation of rate base applicable to the Commission Final Order.
 - Any other requirements related to establishing the revenue requirement or m. rates of the Company in this proceeding.

19 How soon do you anticipate CGC filing its annual rate review request Q. 20 following the conclusion of this case?

The actual timing is a function of several things. Hopefully, while this rate case is progressing, we can work with the Commission and Consumer Advocate to develop an annual rate review mechanism that fulfills the statutory intent and provides a streamlined and efficient process for the filing, review, and approval of the annual rate adjustments, up or down as circumstances require. Based upon the Company's decision to completely withdraw the annual rate review from this case and resubmit it after the conclusion of the rate case, we hope for a collaborative process with the Commission and Consumer Advocate and a timely filing sometime in the fall of 2018.

30 Does this conclude your direct testimony? 0.

31 A. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

A.

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

May 1, 2018

| IN RE: |) | |
|-----------------------------|----------|------------|
| |) | |
| CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY |) | |
| PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF AN |) | |
| ADJUSTMENT IN RATES AND |) | Docket No. |
| TARIFF; THE TERMINATION OF |) | 18-00017 |
| THE AUA MECHANISM AND THE |) | |
| RELATED TARIFF CHANGES AND |) | |
| REVENUE DEFICIENCY |) | |
| RECOVERY; AND AN ANNUAL |) | |
| RATE REVIEW MECHANISM | <u> </u> | |

REDLINE VERSION OF REVISED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JOHN M. COGBURN COMPARED TO ORIGINAL VERSION OF DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JOHN M. COGBURN FILED ON BEHALF OF CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY

I. WITNESS INTRODUCTION

- 2 Q. Please state your name, title, and business address.
- 3 A. I am John Cogburn, Director of Regulatory Reporting and Strategic Planning for
- 4 Southern Company Gas. My business address is Ten Peachtree Place NE,
- 5 Atlanta, GA 30309.

1

- 6 Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this case?
- 7 A. I am testifying on behalf of Chattanooga Gas Company ("Company" or "CGC").
- 8 Q. Please describe your duties as they relate to CGC.
- 9 A. I am responsible for management and regulatory planning and internal
- management and regulatory reporting for all of the Southern Company Gas
- distribution utilities, including CGC.
- 12 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- 13 A. My testimony provides supports the identification of the methodology
- adopted in this case that will form the basis for the annual rate review tariff CGC
- is submitting pursuant tounder the alternative regulatory methods ("ARM")
- statute. I am also sponsoring the Company's proposed ARM Tariff that will
- 17 implement our that the Company will be filing with the Commission after the
- conclusion of this rate case. While the Company originally intended to have its
- annual rate review process, which is attached tariff approved as Exhibit JMC-1a
- 20 part of this rate case, the Company has formally withdrawn that request so that a
- 21 new annual rate review tariff can be addressed after the conclusion of this docket.
- 22 Q. Please describe your duties that are relevant to the Company's proposed
- 23 **ARM Tariff.**

| A. | I am responsible for the regulatory filings and business planning associated with |
|----------------|--|
| | the Atlanta Gas Light Company annual rate review tariff, known as the Georgia |
| | Rate Adjustment Mechanism ("GRAM"). Atlanta Gas Light is another natural |
| | gas distribution utility of Southern Company Gas. The GRAM annual review |
| | tariff shares certain similarities with the proposed CGC ARM Tariffannual rate |
| | review process we anticipate using for Tennessee. |
| II. | PROPOSED ARM TARIFF |
| Q. | Please describe the CGC ARM Tariff. |
| Section | on 65-5-103(6)(A. The Company's proposed ARM Tariff is) states, "A |
| | public utility may opt to file for an annual review of its rates based upon the |
| | annual rate review tariff methodology adopted by this Commission in Docket |
| | No. 14-00146, Atmos Energy Corporation General Rate Casein its most recent |
| | rate case pursuant to section 65-5-101 and Petition to Adopt Annual Review |
| | Mechanism and ARM Tariff. Similar to the Atmos tariff, CGC's ARM Tariff |
| | will use the methodologies subsection (a), if applicable." What is the |
| | methodology CGC is seeking to be adopted in this proceeding for calculating |
| | an annual case? |
| <u>A</u> . | In simple terms, the methodology CGC has relied upon in setting new rates in this |
| | case is based upon the fundamental rate making components identified below that |
| | are generally utilized throughout the industry by rate base, rate of return utilities. |
| | To that end, in this proceeding the Company specifically requests that the |
| | Q. Section |

Commission approve the Company's methodology and confirm that its revenue

22

| 1 | | requirement and new customer offing rates to be made effective pursuant to the |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | tariff. |
| 3 | Q. | When does the Company propose to begin its ARM program? |
| 4 | A | The Company requests that the Commission adopt the ARM Tariff in the current |
| 5 | | proceeding. The first annual review and new rates under the ARM Tariff will |
| 6 | | become effective approximately one year after the rates established in this docket. |
| 7 | | The Company proposes the Commission set rates in accordance with a traditional |
| 8 | | revenue requirement approach in this proceeding in order to establish a clear |
| 9 | | record regarding the appropriate rate making methodologies to be used in future |
| 10 | | annual ARM filings. By setting rates pursuant to the ARM Tariff in the year |
| 11 | | following the conclusion of this rate case, we can ensure that we are compliant |
| 12 | | with the legislative direction for an annual review utilizing the rate making |
| 13 | | methodologies established within the last five years. |
| 14 | Q. | What will the Company file pursuant to the ARM Tariff? |
| 15 | A | On an annual basis, the Company will make an Annual Rate Filing ("ARF") |
| 16 | | utilizing the following methodologies to be established in this docket: |
| 17 | | 1. Historic Base Period. The Historic Base Year is the source of actual |
| 18 | | historic financial and rate making information. It shall consist of the |
| 19 | | depreciation, capital structure and cost of capital, rate of return, sales and |
| 20 | | transportation volumes, bills, and billing demand units. |
| 21 | | 2. Forward Looking Test Period, Billing Determinants. Adjustments will |
| 22 | | be made to the Historic Base Year billing determinants for normal |
| 23 | | weather, annualized customer usage, and projected customer growth to |
| | | |

CGC Direct Testimony, John Cogburn

Page Cogburn (Revised 4-30-5-01-2018)
Page 3 of 13

| 1 | | arrive at the Forward Looking Test Year Billing Determinants. For |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | industrial and transportation customers the Company shall analyze the |
| 3 | | sales volumes and adjust volumes accordingly based on any known and |
| 4 | | measurable changes expected for each Forward Looking Test Year. For |
| 5 | | residential and commercial customers the Company shall use a two year |
| 6 | | average, with the last year being the Historic Base Period, to calculate |
| 7 | | customer growth adjustments. The customer change shall then be |
| 8 | | multiplied by annualized normal usage per customer to arrive at the |
| 9 | | adjustment to volumes consistent with the applicable tariffs, rules and |
| 10 | | regulations. |
| 11 | 3. | Forward Looking Test Year Revenues. The Forward Looking Test |
| 12 | | Year Revenues shall be calculated by multiplying the Forward Looking |
| 13 | | Test Year Billing Determinants by the rates effective at the end of the |
| 14 | | Historic Base Period that are set in this docket. |
| 15 | 4. | Other Revenues. The Company shall calculate Other Revenues, |
| 16 | | consisting primarily of forfeited discounts and miscellaneous service |
| 17 | | charges, by calculating a two year average of these amounts up to the end |
| 18 | | of each Historic Base Period. |
| 19 | 5. | Cost of Gas. The Company shall calculate Cost of Gas by using the |
| 20 | | Historic Base Period per books cost of gas to arrive at the Forward |
| 21 | | Looking Test Year Cost of Gas. |
| 22 | 6. | Rate Design and Rates. Utilizing these factors, the Company shall |
| 23 | | calculate new rates utilizing the Rate Design approved in this case. In |

| 1 | other words, the Forward Looking Test Year Revenues shall be allocated |
|----|---|
| 2 | to customer classes utilizing the same rate design and allocation |
| 3 | methodology used to establish rates in this case. Rates will become |
| 4 | effective on the first day of the Forward Looking Rate Year for a period of |
| 5 | twelve months. |
| 6 | Q. Since rates shall be set based upon Forward Looking Test Year Revenues, will |
| 7 | there be any reconciliation or true up? |
| 8 | A. Yes. In addition to the ARF filing, each year following the conclusion of the Rate |
| 9 | Effective Period, the Company will file the Annual Reconciliation Filing in which |
| 10 | the Company will demonstrate using the same rate setting methodologies |
| 11 | established in this case whether or not the Company achieved its allowed rate of |
| 12 | return on equity during the Rate Effective Period. To the extent that the Company |
| 13 | achieved a return different than the allowed rate of return a Reconciliation Rate |
| 14 | will be proposed to collect or refund the difference in the allowed recoveries and |
| 15 | the actual recoveries. |
| 16 | |

| 1 (|) | Diogeo | describe | tho | filing | schodula | under | tha | ADM | Toriff |
|-----|---|---------|----------|-----|---------|----------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 1 | | I ICASC | HUSCHIDE | UII | Tilling | Schoule | unuci | THE I | TISIA | H CAN INTO |

A. As described above, the Company proposes to initiate the first ARF under the ARM Tariff approximately one year after rates become effective in the current rate case. Operating under the assumption that rates become effective September 1, 2018, the Company would adhere to the schedule set forth in Table 1 below.

| TABLE 1 | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Action | Date | |
| 1 st Annual ARF Filing | May 1, 2019 | |
| 1 st Annual ARM Rate Effective Date | September 1, 2019 | |
| 1 st Rate Effective Period | September 1, 2019 August 31, 2020 | |
| 1 st Annual Reconciliation Filing | December 1, 2020 | |
| 1 st Annual Reconciliation Rate Effective | September 1, 2021 | |

Subsequent years will follow the same pattern. Additionally, if the first anniversary of the Rate Effective Date from the instant rate case is some date other than September 1, the Company would propose to use the first day of the anniversary month of the rate becoming effective as the ARM's first rate implementation date. The ARF would be filed not less than 120 days prior to the rate implementation date and the first Annual Reconciliation Filing would be filed approximately 120 days following the conclusion of the Rate Effective Period with the Reconciliation Rate itself being applied in the following annual rate implementation.

Q. What Historic Base Period and Forward Looking Rate Year are proposed for the ARM?

A. Based on a May 1, 2019, ARF filing, the Company proposes to use the twelve months ending December 31, 2018, as its Historic Base Period and September 1, 2019, through August 31, 2020, as its Forward Looking Rate Year. As described

| 1 | above, if the rate implementation date is changed, then the Forward Looking Rate |
|----|---|
| 2 | Year would be the twelve months following the rate implementation date. The |
| 3 | Historic Base Period would be set to the quarter ending at least 60 days prior to |
| 4 | the filing of the ARF. |
| 5 | Q. Please describe the specific schedules that will be filed with the ARF. |
| 6 | A. Pursuant to the ARM Tariff, the Company will file the following schedules with |
| 7 | each ARF filing: |
| 8 | Schedule-1: Cost of Service |
| 9 | Summarizes thethe ratemaking elements of the cost of service, including |
| 10 | gas cost expense, operation and maintenance expense, depreciation |
| 11 | expense, tax other than income tax, return on rate base, income tax, |
| 12 | allowance for funds used during construction ("AFUDC"), and interest on |
| 13 | customer deposits. This compares the total cost of service to revenues at |
| 14 | present rates in order to calculate a net revenue deficiency or sufficiency. |
| 15 | Schedule-2: Summary of Revenue at Present Rates |
| 16 | Presents per book revenue for the Historic Base Period and projected |
| 17 | Forward Looking Test year Revenue. |
| 18 | Schedule-3: Cost of Gas |
| 19 | Presents Historic Base Period per books gas cost and the projected |
| 20 | Forward Looking Test Year cost of gas. This includes rate making |
| 21 | adjustments consistent with the Approved Methodologies. |
| 22 | |

| 1 | Schedule-4: Operation and Maintenance Expense |
|-----|---|
| 2 | Presents Historic Base Period per books operation and maintenance |
| 3 | expenses, and the projected Forward Looking Test Year operations and |
| 4 | maintenance expense. This includes rate making adjustments consistent |
| 5 | with the Approved Methodologies. |
| 6 | Schedule-5: Taxes Other than Income |
| 7 | Presents Historic Base Period per books taxes other than income tax |
| 3 | expense, and the projected Forward Looking Test Year taxes other than |
| 9 | income tax expense. This includes the rate making adjustments consistent |
|) | with the Approved Methodologies. |
| 1 | Schedule-6: Depreciation Expense and Amortization Expense |
| 2 | Presents Historic Base Period per books depreciation and amortization |
| 3 | expense, and the projected Forward Looking Test Year depreciation and |
| ļ | amortization expense. This includes rate making adjustments consistent |
| 5 | with the Approved Methodologies and adjustments to reflect the impact of |
| 5 | proposed depreciation rates, if any. |
| ! | Schedule-7: Rate Base and Return |
| ; | Presents the calculation of the Historic Base Period rate base, and |
|) | projected Forward Looking Test Year rate base. The rate base includes |
| | the projected thirteen month average of the original cost of plant, |
| | accumulated depreciation, construction work in progress ("CWIP"), stored |
| | gas investment, materials and supplies, cash working capital, accumulated |
| | deferred income tax ("ADIT"), customer advances, customer deposits, and |
| CGC | Direct Testimony, John Cogburn Page Cogburn (Revised 4-30-5-01-2018) Page 8 of 13 |

| 1 | accumulated interest on customer deposits. This includes rate making |
|--|--|
| 2 | adjustments consistent with the Approved Methodologies. |
| 3 | Schedule-8: Computation of State Excise and Income Tax |
| 4 | Presents the calculation of state excise tax and Federal income taxes on the |
| 5 | required return on rate base for the Historic Base Period and Forward |
| 6 | Looking Test Year. |
| 7 | Schedule-9: Overall Cost of Capital |
| 8 | Presents the calculation of the overall cost of capital based on the capital |
| 9 | structure, debt cost rates, and the required rate of return on equity. |
| 10 | Schedule-10: Rate of Return |
| 11 | Presents the calculation of a rate of return on rate base and a return on the |
| 12 | equity financed portion of the rate base for the Base Period and the |
| 13 | Forward Looking Test Year, utilizing costs and revenues as presented in |
| 14 | Schedules 2 through 9. |
| 15 | Schedule-11: Proof of Revenues and Calculation of Rates |
| 16 | Presents the forecasted billing determinants and the calculation of new |
| 17 | tariff rates for customer class and schedules for the Forward Looking Test |
| 18 | Year consistent with the cost of service and net revenue deficiency or |
| 19 | sufficiency presented in Schedule 1. |
| 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 | Schedule 11-1: Proof of Revenues and Calculation of Rates, Historic Period Margin at Present Rates. Schedule 11-2: Proof of Revenues and Calculation of Rates, Forward Looking Test Year Margin at Present Rates. Schedule 11-3: Proof of Revenues and Calculation of Rates, Rate Design. Schedule 11-4: Proof of Revenues and Calculation of Rates, Summary of Present and Proposed Rates. |
| | CGC Direct Testimony, John Cogburn Page Cogburn (Revised 4-30-5-01-2018) Page 9 of 13 |

| 1 | Schedule-12: Calculation of Annual Reconciliation Revenue Requirement |
|---|---|
| 2 | Calculates the Annual Reconciliation Revenue Requirements. |
| 3 | Q. Will the Company provide additional information as needed by the |
| 4 | Commission, its staff, or interveners? |
| 5 | A. Yes, the Company will provide the following additional documentation at the |
| 6 | time of filing: |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 | a. ADIT Projections work papers. b. Cash Working Capital work papers. c. Depreciation work papers. d. Ad Valorem Budget work papers. e. Gas Storage Forecast work papers. f. Income Statement. g. Inflation adjustment work papers. h. Plant Balances. i. Forward Looking Test Period Taxes Other than Income Forecast work papers. j. Taxes Other than Income historical. k. Depreciation rates. l. Customer Deposit Rate. m. Historic Base Period and Forward Looking Test Period Billing Determinants. n. Weather Normalization, including 30 Year Smoothed Normal Chattanooga Weather. o. Minimum Filing Guideline 38. p. Trial Balance. q. General Ledger. |
| 27 | In addition to the items listed above, nothing with respect to the Company's |
| 28 | request alters the rights of participants for discovery and access to the books and |
| 29 | records of the Company as provided for under existing Tennessee law. |
| 30 | Q. As a part of each annual filing will the Company also file a Variance Report? |
| 31 | A. Yes. The Variance Report will identify and explain each and every CGC revenue |
| 32 | and operating expense account and/or subaccount for which the amount either |
| 33 | exceeded the prior year's amounts (based on amounts either as filed by the |
| | CGC Direct Testimony, John Cogburn Page Cogburn (Revised 4-30-5-01-2018) Page 10 of 13 |

| 1 | Company in the Annual ARM Filing or as adjusted by the Commission under |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 2 | Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-5-103(d)(6)(C)) by 5% and \$30,000; or exceeds the |
| 3 | amount (based on amounts either filed by the Company in the Annual ARM |
| 4 | Filing or as adjusted by the Commission under Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-5- |
| 5 | 103(d)(6)(C)) in the third preceding year by 10% or \$60,000; or has been added |
| 6 | or deleted or modified in form or substance in any way. |
| 7 | Q. You have mentioned several times that the Company will use the rate |
| 8 | calculation methodologies established by the Commission in this proceeding |
| 9 | in the calculation of the ARM rate. Will you please expand on that? |
| 10 | A. Yes. The Company is obligated to use the methodologies established by the |
| 11 | Commission in its most recent rate proceeding in calculating its annual rate |
| 12 | adjustment. To that end, in the instant proceeding the Company requests that the |
| 13 | Commission confirm that it has applied the Company's described methodology as |
| 14 | it relates to rendering the approved revenue requirement and rates related to the |
| 15 | items enumerated below. To the extent that the Commission applies a |
| 16 | methodology or ratemaking elements other than that proposed by the |
| 17 | Companythose identified below, the Company requests that the Commission |
| 18 | describe it'sits methodology/elements in its Final Order in a manner sufficient for |
| 19 | the Company to apply the same methodology/elements in future ARM filings. |
| 20 21 | a. Rate of Return_calculation, including the allowed return on equity—and methodology for establishing, equity to debt capitalization ratios, and cost |
| 22 | of debt. b. Normalized Determination of normalized billing units and revenues to be |
| 21 22 23 24 25 26 | used in the proof of revenue for the Historic Base Period. c. Billing unit and revenue forecast methodology for the Forward Looking |
| 26 27 | Rate Year. d. Weather normalization methodologyfactors. |
| , | CGC Direct Testimony, John Cogburn Page Cogburn (Revised 4-30-5-01-2018) Page 11 of 13 |

| 1 | | e. Method for forecasting forecast other revenues. |
|----|-----------|--|
| 2 | | f. MethodForecast for forecasting O&M expenses including labor and non- |
| 3 | | labor expense, including pension and other benefit related expenses. |
| 4 | | g. Methodology for calculatingIdentification and calculation of any |
| 5 | | disallowed expenses and other regulatory adjustments. |
| 6 | | h. Methodology for calculating bad Identification of debt expense. |
| 7 | | i. Methodology Amortization schedule for amortizing rate case expenses. |
| 8 | | j. Methodologies Determination and calculation for calculating taxes |
| 9 | | including taxes other than income taxes and income taxes. |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | k. Methodologies for calculating Identification and calculation of depreciation and amortization expenses. |
| 11 | | |
| | | |
| 13 | | and the components of rate base including: gross plant in service, |
| 14 | | accumulated depreciation and amortization, construction work in progress, |
| 15 | | stored gas inventory, cash working capital, materials and supplies, |
| 16 | | regulatory assets, deferred pension regulatory asset balance, accumulated |
| 17 | | deferred income tax, customer contributions in aid of construction, |
| 18 | | customer deposits, accumulated interest on customer deposits, operating |
| 19 | | reserves, and any other components included by the Commission in the |
| 20 | | calculation of rate base applicable to the Commission Final Order. |
| 21 | | m. Any other methodologies requirements related to establishing the revenue |
| 22 | | requirement or rates of the Company in the instantthis proceeding. |
| 22 | 0 | |
| 23 | Q. | Do the rate calculation methodologies used in the ARM filings apply to both |
| 24 | | the ARF and Annual Reconciliation Filing? |
| 25 | A | Yes. Both filings will be completed using the approved methodologies. |
| 26 | Q. | How soon do you anticipate CGC filing its annual rate review request |
| 27 | | following the conclusion of this case? |
| 28 | <u>A.</u> | The actual timing is a function of several things. Hopefully, while this rate case is |
| 29 | | progressing, we can work with the Commission and Consumer Advocate to |
| 30 | | develop an annual rate review mechanism that fulfills the statutory intent and |
| 31 | | provides a streamlined and efficient process for the filing, review, and approval of |
| 32 | | the annual rate adjustments, up or down as circumstances require. Based upon the |
| 33 | | Company's decision to completely withdraw the annual rate review from this case |
| 34 | | and resubmit it after the conclusion of the rate case, we hope for a collaborative |
| | CGC I | Direct Testimony, John Cogburn Page Cogburn (Revised 4-30-5-01-2018) Page 12 of 13 |

- x - 1

- 1 process with the Commission and Consumer Advocate and a timely filing
- 2 sometime in the fall of 2018.
- 3 Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- 4 A. Yes.