BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:	
PETITION OF ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION)
FOR APPROVAL OF ITS 2018 ANNUAL RATE) DOCKET NO. 18-XXXXX
REVIEW FILING PURSUANT TO TENN.)
CODE ANN. § 65-5-103(d)(6))

PRE-FILED TESTIMONY OF GREGORY K. WALLER ON BEHALF OF ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

	I. INTRODUCTION OF WITNESS						
Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.						
A.	My name is Gregory K. Waller. I am Manager, Rates and Regulatory Affairs with						
	Atmos Energy Corporation ("Atmos Energy" or "Company"). My business address						
	is 5420 LBJ Freeway, Ste. 1600, Dallas, Texas 75240.						
Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL						
	BACKGROUND.						
A.	I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in economics from Dartmouth College in 1994						
	and an MBA degree from the University of Texas in 2000. I worked as a						
	management consultant from 1994 to 2003, at Harbor Research in Boston, MA						
	(1994-1996) and at Towers Perrin in Dallas, TX (1997-2003). I joined Atmos Energy						
	in 2003 in the Planning and Budgeting Department in Dallas. In November of 2005 I						
	became Vice President of Finance for the Kentucky/Mid-States Division, which						
	includes the Company's regulated Tennessee operations. I assumed my current role						
	in Dallas, TX in July 2012.						
	A. Q.						

Ο.	WHAT ARE	YOUR	RESP	ONSIBIL	ITIES A	AT ATMOS	ENERG	Υ?
----	----------	------	------	---------	---------	----------	-------	----

- A. I am responsible for managing rate proceedings filed primarily with state regulatory bodies on behalf of the Company. My responsibilities include execution of applications for changes to rates and tariffs as part of traditional rate cases, tariff language change proposals, and annual rate making mechanisms that the Company
- files in the eight states in which it has regulated operations.

7 Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS OR ANY OTHER REGULATORY

8 COMMISSION?

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A.

Yes. I testified before the Tennessee Public Utility Commission ("Commission") in Docket Nos. 05-00258, 16-00105, 17-00012 and 17-00091. I also submitted testimony in Docket Nos. 07-00105, 08-00197, 12-00064, 14-00081, 14-00146 and 16-00013. I testified before the Kentucky Public Service Commission in 2014 and 2018, and the Georgia Public Service Commission in 2008, 2009 and 2011. I submitted direct testimony in the Company's rate proceedings in Kentucky (2006, 2009, 2013, 2015 and 2017) and Virginia (2008, 2013, 2014, 2016 and 2018).

II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

17 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to calculate the Company's Annual Revenue Requirement for the Forward Looking Test Year that ends May 31, 2019, as prescribed in Section IV of the Company's Annual Review Mechanism ("ARM") tariff. The resulting revenue requirement is the amount of additional revenue or reduction in rates required for the Company to earn its authorized return on equity for the Forward Looking Test Year ending May 31, 2019, in accordance with the approved methodologies ("Approved Methodologies") as defined in the Company's

approved ARM tariff. In addition, in accordance with Section V of the appro-	the approved	on v or un	section v	accordance with	in addition, ii	approved AKIVI tariii.	Į.
--	--------------	------------	-----------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------------	----

- 2 ARM Tariff, I will also discuss the disclosed proposed deviations from the Approved
- 3 Methodologies, which the Company has included on Schedule 7 in its filing.

4 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO YOUR TESTIMONY?

- 5 A. No. While I have no exhibits attached directly to my testimony, I am sponsoring the
- 6 revenue requirement schedules, relied-upon files, and other contents of the
- 7 Company's ARM Filing required by Section IV of the ARM tariff.
- 8 Q. WERE THE CONTENTS OF THE ARM FILING PREPARED BY YOU OR
- 9 UNDER YOUR DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. WHAT CALCULATIONS HAVE YOU PERFORMED FOR YOUR
- 12 TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
- 13 A. I have calculated the Company's projected cost of service, or revenue requirement,
- for the Test Year ended May 31, 2019, that is needed for the Company to earn its
- authorized return on equity. The results and supporting calculations are shown in the
- Revenue Requirement Model, Schedules 1-11. Except as discussed below in
- 17 connection with the disclosed proposed deviations, all of the calculations were made
- in accordance with the Approved Methodologies.

19 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RESULTS.

- 20 A. The Company's total cost of service for the Test Year ended May 31, 2019 is
- 21 \$127,853,476. The Company's projected revenue at present rates is \$132,279,331,
- resulting in a revenue sufficiency for the Forward Looking Test Year ending May 31,
- 23 2019 of \$4,425,855. In addition to that sufficiency, I have added the Annual
- 24 Reconciliation Revenue Requirement deficiency of \$382,182 that was approved by
- 25 the Commission in Docket No. 17-00091. I have also included an expense credit of

¹ See also In re: Petition of Atmos Energy Corporation for a General Rate Increase Under T.C.A 65-5-103(a) and Adoption of an Annual Rate Review Mechanism Under T.C.A. 65-5-103(d)(6), Docket No. 14-00146, Order Approving Settlement, p. 10 (November 4, 2015).

\$988,324 as a result of the amortization of excess deferred income tax, which is further discussed in the testimony of Company witness Jennifer K. Story. The resulting total revenue sufficiency is \$5,031,996. I have included in the ARM filing proposed tariffs with proposed rates that produce that amount of revenue and that were calculated using the Approved Methodologies.

III. HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF THE ANNUAL REVIEW MECHANISM

8 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF THE COMPANY'S ANNUAL REVIEW MECHANISM.

The ARM is designed to provide the Company a reasonable and timely means of recovering its cost of service for each projected Forward Looking Test Year. The ARM is a comprehensive mechanism that includes all components of cost of service. This includes, among other things, capital investment and depreciation expense, O&M expenses, and revenues as detailed in the Revenue Requirement Model. The ARM, created pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated Section 65-5-103(d)(6), is a reasonable and effective solution that allows the Company timely recovery of its cost of service while avoiding costly and litigious general rate cases. An Annual Reconciliation ensures that the Company does not earn in excess of its authorized return on equity while simultaneously ensuring that the Company is not financially injured as it invests the capital necessary to continue to provide safe and reliable service to its Tennessee customers. In approving the ARM in November 2015, the Commission properly found the mechanism to be in the public interest.²

A.

² Id. at 9.

- 1 Q. WHEN AND HOW WAS THE ANNUAL REVIEW MECHANISM
- 2 APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION?
- 3 A. The ARM was initially approved by the Commission in Docket No. 14-00146 by
- 4 Order issued on November 4, 2015.³
- 5 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE ANNUAL
- 6 REVIEW MECHANISM AND HOW IT WORKS.
- 7 A. Under the ARM, as set forth in the Company's Tariff Sheets 34.1 through 34.7, the
- 8 Company calculates an annual revenue requirement for its Tennessee jurisdiction for
- 9 each Forward Looking Test Year and then allocates that revenue requirement across
- the Company's customer classes using Approved Methodologies established in the
- 11 Company's most recent rate case. Through the annual ARM filing, which is filed no
- later than February 1 of each year, the Company updates both the customer and
- volumetric charges of its base rates in accordance with the Approved Methodologies
- to reflect the forecasted revenue requirement. In addition to the ARM filing each
- 15 February 1, the Company also files an Annual Reconciliation on or before September
- 16 1 of each year which provides a reconciliation of actual results to the authorized
- return on equity for the Test Year immediately completed. The resulting revenue
- 18 requirement from the Annual Reconciliation is then incorporated into the Company's
- subsequent February 1 ARM filing. This filing incorporates the Annual
- 20 Reconciliation approved by the Commission in Docket No. 17-00091.⁴ Per
- 21 Commission Order, the current forward looking filing was held in abeyance pending
- 22 the outcome of Docket No. 17-00091 and is therefore being made approximately 4 ½
- 23 months later than the February 1st date prescribed by the ARM tariff.

³ *Id.*

⁴ In re: Atmos Energy Corporation Annual Reconciliation of Annual Review Mechanism, Docket No. 17-00091 (May 14, 2018) (The True-Up Amount was approved by the Commission at its conference hearing on May 14, 2018. A written Final Order is pending).

1		IV. REVENUE REQUIREMENT MODEL SCHEDULES
2	Q.	PLEASE LIST THE SCHEDULES THAT COMPRISE THE COMPANY'S
3		REVENUE REQUIREMENT MODEL.
4	A.	The Revenue Requirement Model is comprised of:
5		Schedule 1: Cost of Service
6		Schedule 2: Summary of Revenues at Present Rates
7		Schedule 3: Cost of Gas
8		Schedule 4: Operation and Maintenance Expenses
9		Schedule 5: Taxes Other than Income
10		Schedule 6: Depreciation and Amortization Expenses
11		Schedule 7: Rate Base and Return
12		Schedule 8: Computation of State Excise and Income Taxes
13		Schedule 9: Overall Cost of Capital
14		Schedule 10: Rate of Return
15		Schedule 11: Proof of Revenues and Calculation of Rates
16		These Schedules are included in each February 1 ARM filing per the approved ARM
17		tariff. Pursuant to the ARM tariff, I have also included the schedules traditionally
18		used by Commission Staff to illustrate that the Company's Revenue Requirement
19		Model and Staff's model reconcile.
20	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 1.
21	A.	Schedule 1 summarizes the elements of the cost of service, including gas cos
22		expense, O&M expense, depreciation expense, taxes other than income taxes, return
23		on rate base, income tax, allowance for funds used during construction ("AFUDC")
24		and interest on customer deposits. Schedule 1 forecasts cost of service for the
25		Forward Looking Test Year from the Historic Base Period, as defined in the ARM
26		Tariff, in order to calculate the revenue requirement that is the amount of additional

- revenue or reduction in rates required for the Company to earn its authorized rate of return. Schedule 1 sources data from each of the other schedules.
- 3 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULES 2 AND 3.
- 4 A. Schedule 2 shows per book revenues for the Historic Base Period ended September
- 5 30, 2017 and the projected revenues for the Forward Looking Test Year. Schedule 3
- shows the Historic Base Period per books gas cost and the projected Forward
- 7 Looking Test Year cost of gas. The Forward Looking Test Year cost of gas is
- 8 adjusted to remove rent for inter-company leased storage property that is booked to
- gas cost per the Approved Methodologies.
- 10 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 4.
- 11 A. Schedule 4 shows the Historic Base Period per books O&M expense, and the
- forecasted Forward Looking Test Year O&M expense with adjustments made in
- accordance with the Approved Methodologies, including an adjustment to the Test
- Year O&M expense to remove rent that was budgeted on inter-company leased
- property prior to the sale of Atmos Energy Marketing ("AEM") and include
- operating expenses for the Barnsley storage asset.
- 17 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE MORE DETAIL ON THE VARIANCE BETWEEN THE
- 18 ACTUAL HISTORIC BASE PERIOD OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
- 19 EXPENSE COMPARED TO THE FORECASTED FORWARD LOOKING
- 20 TEST YEAR AMOUNT.
- 21 A. The Company forecasted Forward Looking Test Year O&M expenses of \$21,369,012
- 22 compared to Base Period O&M expenses of \$22,359,003, resulting in a decrease of
- \$989,991. The forecasted O&M includes the removal of specified subaccounts, most
- 24 notably related to the pension accrual and incentive compensation, per the Approved
- 25 Methodologies. The disallowed items are itemized on WP 4-1.

1	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ADJUSTMENT IN O&M EXPENDITURES FOR
2		PENSION CONTRIBUTION.
3	A.	As required by the Approved Methodologies, the Company removed the budgeted
4		accrual for FAS 87 expenses. In years when the Company makes actual cash
5		contributions to its pension fund, the allocable amount will be included in the Annual
6		Reconciliation Revenue Requirement as it was in Docket No. 17-00091 and utilizing
7		the allocation methodology per the Approved Methodologies.
8	Q.	DID YOU MAKE ANY ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE AMORTIZATION OF
9		RATE CASE EXPENSE?
10	A.	No. Actually-incurred rate case expenses for Docket No. 14-00146 were \$260,222.
11		The Company amortized that expense at \$14,583.33 per month and the amortization
12		was completed in November 2016. Therefore, no amounts are included in the
13		Forward Looking Test Year of this filing.
14	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 5.
15	A.	Schedule 5 shows Historic Base Period per books taxes other than income taxes and
16		forecasted Forward Looking Test Year taxes other than income taxes. Forecasted
17		Forward Looking Test Year taxes other than income taxes have been adjusted to
18		include taxes for intercompany leased property per the Approved Methodologies.
19	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE VARIANCE BETWEEN HISTORIC BASE PERIOD
20		PER BOOK TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME TAXES COMPARED TO THE
21		AMOUNT FORECASTED BY THE COMPANY.
22	A.	The Company forecasted \$7,645,406 in Taxes Other Than Income Taxes during the
23		Forward Looking Test Year, whereas the Historic Base Period amount was
24		\$7,616,970 for an overall increase of \$28,436. The primary drivers of the difference
25		are increases in Ad Valorem taxes at the Tennessee and Shared Services levels.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 6.

1

2 Schedule 6 shows the Historic Base Period per books depreciation and amortization A. 3 expense, and the forecasted Forward Looking Test Year depreciation and 4 amortization expense. I removed the \$649,245 adjustment for the amortization of the 5 pension regulatory asset that was approved in Docket No. 14-00146 as that asset became fully amortized on May 31, 2017. In addition, I have adjusted the forecasted 6 7 Forward Looking Test Year depreciation expense to include expense for 8 intercompany leased storage property per the Approved Methodologies, as well as to 9 adjust for the removal of depreciation expense on capitalized incentive 10 compensation.

11 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 7.

- 12 A. Schedule 7 shows the calculation of the Historic Base Period per books rate base and
 13 forecasted Forward Looking Test Year rate base. The rate base includes the actual
 14 thirteen-month averages of the original cost of plant, accumulated depreciation,
 15 storage gas investment, materials and supplies, accumulated deferred income tax
 16 ("ADIT"), customer advances, customer deposits and accumulated interest on
 17 customer deposits per the Approved Methodologies.
- 18 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS VARIANCES IN RATE BASE ITEMS BETWEEN THE
 19 HISTORIC BASE PERIOD AND THE FORECASTED FORWARD
 20 LOOKING TEST YEAR.
- A. Schedule 7 compares Historic Base Period rate base items to forecasted Forward
 Looking Test Year items on a line by line basis in accordance with the Approved
 Methodologies. The primary contributor to the growth in rate base is capital
 investment (plant additions) as the Company continues to invest in the safety and
 reliability of its system.

Q. WHAT ADJUSTMENTS ARE MADE TO THE HISTORICAL BASE PERIOD

2 AND FORWARD LOOKING TEST YEAR RATE BASE?

1

- 3 I have included deviations to the Approved Methodologies in accordance with the A. ARM Tariff which are included on Schedule 7. These adjustments include the 4 recognition of a regulatory liability for excess deferred income taxes and a deferred 5 6 tax asset for the tax gross-up of same as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act 7 ("TCJA"). Additionally, and necessarily to properly reflect the impact of the TCJA 8 in revenue requirement, ADIT balances in addition to those related to fixed assets 9 must be projected beyond the end of the Historic Base Period. In addition to those 10 deviations and consistent with prior ARM filings, Schedule 7 also includes 11 adjustments for cash working capital and the net book value of inter-company leased storage property. The revenue and expense lag factors from the Company's lead/lag 12 study prepared in Docket No. 14-00146 were applied to actual results in order to 13 14 calculate the Company's actual cash working capital requirement consistent with the Approved Methodologies. 15
- 16 Q. WERE THE DEVIATIONS MENTIONED ABOVE PROPERLY DISCLOSED

 17 ON THE CERTIFICATION INCLUDED WITH THE COMPANY'S FILING
- 18 AS REQUIRED BY THE ARM TARIFF?
- Yes. The deviations are briefly described in Attachment A to the Certification and more completely discussed and supported in the testimony of Company witness Ms.

 Jennifer Story.
- 22 O. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 8.
- A. Schedule 8 shows the calculation of state excise taxes and income taxes on the required return on rate base for both the Historic Base Period and the Forward Looking Test Year, adjusted with costs and revenues as presented in Schedules 2-7.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 9.

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- A. Schedule 9 shows the calculation of the overall cost of capital based on the capital structure, debt cost rates, and the required rate of return on equity required for the Forward Looking Test Year. It is comprised of the actual equity balance and actual long-term debt balance at the end of September 30, 2017, and a twelve-month average short-term debt balance for the twelve months ending September 30, 2017. The authorized return on equity is 9.80% and the actual cost of debt is calculated on WP 9-2 and WP 9-3 of the filing, per the Approved Methodologies.
- 9 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 10.
- 10 A. Schedule 10 shows the calculation of a rate of return on rate base and a rate of return
 11 on the equity financed portion of rate base for the Historic Base Period and the
 12 Forward Looking Test Year, adjusted with costs and revenues as presented in
 13 Schedules 2 through 9, per the Approved Methodologies.
- 14 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN SCHEDULE 11.
 - A. Schedule 11 presents the forecasted billing determinants and calculation of new tariff rates by customer class and rate schedule for the Forward Looking Test Year consistent with the cost of service and net revenue deficiency/sufficiency presented in Schedule 1. In accordance with the ARM tariff, the approved Annual Reconciliation Revenue Requirement from Docket No. 17-00091 is added to the revenue sufficiency that the Company has filed in this ARM filing. The revenue requirement also includes the amortization of the excess deferred income tax liability discussed hereinabove, in the testimony of Jennifer Story and referenced on Schedule 1. The net revenue requirement (comprised of the sufficiency for the Forward Looking Test Year ending May 31, 2019 plus the Annual Reconciliation Revenue Requirement from Docket No. 17-00091 minus the amortization of the excess deferred tax liability) is distributed across the billing determinants (customer classes

1	and rate	schedules)	forecasted	in	this	filing,	consistent	with	the	ARM	tariff	and

2 Approved Methodologies.

3 Q. HAVE THE COST OF SERVICE ITEMS FOR WHICH THE COMPANY

4 SEEKS RECOVERY BEEN PRUDENTLY INCURRED?

- 5 A. Yes. The budgeting and forecasting methodologies used as the basis for the
- forecasted cost of service in this filing are consistent with those documented in my
- 7 pre-filed direct testimony in Docket No. 14-00146. These are the same
- 8 methodologies, policies and procedures that are the basis for the Approved
- 9 Methodologies as defined by the ARM tariff. The cost of service items for which the
- 10 Company seeks recovery, particularly but not limited to capital investments and
- operating expenses, have been prudently incurred and/or have been prudently
- forecasted to be incurred.

13 <u>V. CONCLUSION</u>

14 Q. WHAT ARE YOU ASKING THE COMMISSION TO DO IN THIS

15 **PROCEEDING?**

- 16 A. I respectfully request that the Commission approve the Company's 2018 ARM filing
- and the 2018 ARM Revenue Requirement, which have been prepared in accordance
- with the Approved Methodologies approved and adopted by the Commission in
- 19 Docket No. 14-00146.

20 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

21 A. Yes.

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:		
ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION ANNUAL RECONCILIATION OF ANNUAL REVIEW MECHANISM)	Docket No. 18-XXXXX
VE	RIFICATION	
STATE OF TEXAS)		
COUNTY OF DALLAS)		
I, Gregory K. Waller, being first d	luly sworn, sta	te that I am the Manager of Rates and
Regulatory Affairs for Atmos Energy Cor	poration, that	I am authorized to testify on behalf of
Atmos Energy Corporation in the above re-	ferenced docke	et, that the Direct Testimony of Gregory
K. Waller in support of Atmos Energy Co.	rporation's fili	ng is true and correct to the best of my
knowledge, information and belief.		
a th		Gregory K. Waller
Sworn and subscribed before me this 8	_ day of June, 2	Notary Public
My Commission Expires: $\frac{9/01/202}{}$	20	
		GISELLE R HEROY Notary Public, State of Texas Comm. Expires 09-01-2020 Notary ID 13080484-2