

May 10, 2024

Electronically Filed in TPUC Docket Room on May 10, 2024 at 12:27 p.m.

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Hon. Herbert H. Hilliard, Chairman c/o Ectory Lawless, Docket Room Manager Tennessee Public Utility Commission 502 Deaderick Street, 4th Floor Nashville, TN 37243 TPUC.DocketRoom@tn.gov

RE: Tennessee-American Water Company's 2024 Incremental Capital Recovery Rider Tariff Petition, Docket No. 24-00011

Dear Chairman Hilliard:

Attached for filing please find the *Rebuttal Testimony of Robert C. Lane* in the above-captioned matter.

As required, the original plus four (4) hard copies will be mailed to your office. Should you have any questions concerning this filing, or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

BUTLER SNOW LLP

Melvin J. Malone

clw

Attachments

cc: Bob Lane, TAWC

Victoria Glover, Consumer Advocate Division Vance Broemel, Consumer Advocate Division

TENNESSEE-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, INC. DOCKET NO. 24-00011

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ROBERT C. LANE

ON

2024 ANNUAL INCREMENTAL CAPITAL RECOVERY RIDER TARIFF FILING, CHANGES TO THE QUALIFIED INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PROGRAM RIDER, THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT RIDER AND THE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE RIDER AND IN SUPPORT OF THE CALCULATION OF THE INCREMENTAL CAPITAL RIDER REVENUE REQUIREMENT

SPONSORING PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

Amended Petitioner's Exhibit – Annual Approved Tariffs

- 1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
- 2 A. My name is Robert (Bob) C. Lane, and my business address is 109 Wiehl Street,
- 3 Chattanooga, Tennessee 37403.
- 4 Q. DID YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMIT PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN
- 5 SUPPORT OF THIS PETITION BEFORE THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY
- 6 **COMMISSION?**
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 9 A. The purpose of my Rebuttal Testimony is to address and respond to the Pre-filed Testimony
- of David Dittemore filed on behalf of the Consumer Advocate Division of the Tennessee
- 11 Attorney General's Office.
- 12 Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING ANY EXHIBITS WITH YOUR REBUTTAL
- 13 **TESTIMONY?**
- 14 A. Yes. I am sponsoring Amended Petitioner's Exhibit Annual Approved Tariffs.
- 15 Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY MR. DITTEMORE
- 16 THAT YOU ARE RESPONDING TO.
- 17 A. Mr. Dittemore made the five following recommendations in his testimony: 1) that the
- commission should continue to monitor the earnings of TAWC to determine whether it
- may require a show-cause proceeding in the future; 2) that the commission should accept
- TAWC's calculation of any ICRR over-collections and the collection of ICRR under-
- 21 collections, irrespective of the results of the ICRR calculation; 3) that the Commission
- should explicitly confirm that the appropriate TCJA credit is -3.82%; and, 4) that the

¹ Pre-filed Testimony of Consumer Advocate Division Witness David N. Dittemore, p. 3, TPUC Docket No. 24-00011 (April 26, 2024).

1	commission should require the Company to submit its Balance Sheet and Income
2	Statement supporting its ICRR and Return on Equity Test calculations in future ICRR

filings. I will address each of these recommendations in turn.

- 4 Q. TURNING TO THE FIRST RECOMMENDATION OF MR. DITTEMORE, DOES
 5 THE COMPANY HAVE A RESPONSE REGARDING THE
- 6 RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD CONTINUE TO
- 7 MONITOR TAWC'S EARNINGS TO DETERMINE WHETHER A SHOW CAUSE
- 8 PROCEEDING IS REQUIRED IN THE FUTURE?
- 9 A. Yes. The Commission has long monitored the earnings of regulated public utilities, 10 including TAWC. Further, the Commission has the discretion to consider a show-cause 11 proceeding when it believes such an action is warranted. So, this recommendation merely 12 restates what the Commission already does and what the Commission has the authority to do. The Company files "ROE Test" calculations as part of its annual ICRR filing as 13 14 outlined in the Incremental Capital Rider Tariff approved by the Commission on 15 December 10, 2023, in TPUC Docket No. 19-00103, and the Company has not proposed to discontinue or modify this filing. Finally, Mr. Dittemore's recommendation here appears 16 17 less likely an issue for the Company to formally respond to and more likely is merely a 18 statement outlining the going forward opinion of the CAD. This is consistent with the 19 statement in Mr. Dittemore's testimony on page 5, lines 22-23, "I recommend that the 20 commission continue to monitor the Companies earnings for reasonableness."
- Q. DOES THE COMPANY AGREE WITH MR. DITTEMORE'S SECOND RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD ACCEPT THE

COMPANY'S PROPOSED VALUE OF ZERO FOR THE ICRR WITHIN THIS PROCEEDING?

- A. Yes. The Company supports Mr. Dittemore's recommendation that the Commission should accept the Company's proposed value of zero for the ICRR.² This amount was calculated in accordance with the Company's tariffs and is supported by the record in this case. As discussed below, the zero value is the result of the tariff-mandated ROE Test.
- Q. DOES THE COMPANY AGREE WITH MR. DITTEMORE'S THIRD

 RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD REQUIRE A

 MODIFICATION TO THE COMPANY'S TARIFF TO EXPLICITLY REQUIRE A

 REFUND OF ANY ICRR OVER-COLLECTIONS AND THE COLLECTION OF

 ICRR UNDER-COLLECTIONS, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE RESULTS OF THE

 ICRR CALCULATION?³
 - No. TAWC does not believe it is necessary to change the ICR tariff at this time. There are two tariff provisions at issue here. First, the over- or under-collection reconciliation. The tariff adopted in TPUC Docket No. 19-00103 requires the reduction of the ICRRR by the amount of any over collection of revenues during the year in question, in this instance 2023, at line 43 of the Calculation. (*See*, Petitioner's Exhibit TAWC 2024 Incremental Capital Rider, submitted in TPUC Docket No. 24-00011 as an exhibit to my Direct Testimony.) In 2023, TAWC over-collected Legacy Rider authorized revenue by \$362,155. That amount is subtracted from the after-tax revenue requirement, \$862,936, leaving the remaining after tax revenue requirement to be \$500,782. The second tariff provision at issue here is the ROE Test. Notwithstanding the over collection adjustment, because the ROE Test yielded

A.

² *Dittemore* at p. 6.

³ *Dittemore* at pp. 7-9.

an Adjusted ROE above authorized, the Company is also not permitted to seek any ICRRR recovery. Conversely, if there had been an under collection of revenues during 2023, the operation of the ICR Tariff adopted in Docket No. 19-00103 would have increased the ICRRR but still, because of the ROE Test outcome referenced above, the Company would not be able to seek recovery of that increased ICRRR either. In sum, the ICR Tariff governs this result. The ICR Tariff works to reduce the ICRRR by any overcollections, reducing the amount of ICRRR the Company can request. (See, line 42 of the ICRRR Calculation -TPUC No. 19 Original Sheet No. 12-ICR-8.) Conversely, under the Tariff, any under collection has the effect of increasing the ICRRR. The over- or under-collection provision is secondary and because the Company's Adjusted ROE as calculated under the Tariff exceeds the currently authorized ROE of 10%, that makes this issue moot. Under the Tariff, there will be "no ICRRR for that single year." Absent earnings above authorized as measured in the earnings test, the Company would have submitted an ICRRR of \$500,782, reduced from \$862,936 by the adjustment for the over-collection. However, due to the earnings above authorized defined by the ROE Test, none of the \$500,782 is eligible for recovery by TAWC. Hence, the ICRRR amount is zero rather than \$500,782.

When the ICRR is calculated it was \$832,936. The over collection was then applied, reducing the amount of the ICRR to \$500,782. The results of the earnings test then further reduced the amount eligible for recovery to zero. This is the way the Commission-authorized Tariff functions. Further, as the Tariff functions symmetrically to both over and under collections, this outcome is fair and reasonable.

Q. DOES MR. DITTEMORE MAKE A PROPOSAL ABOUT HOW THE TARIFF SHOULD BE CHANGED TO REQUIRE A REFUND OF ANY ICRR OVER-

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COLLECTIONS AND THE COLLECTION OF ICRR UNDER-COLLECTIONS,

IRRESPECTIVE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ICRR CALCULATION?

- A. No. Mr. Dittemore does not propose specific adjustments to the existing ICR tariff or the ROE Test for the Commission, the Company and Parties to TPUC Docket No. 19-00103 to review and consider.⁴
- Q. DOES TAWC BELIEVE THAT IT IS NECESSARY FOR THE COMMISSION TO
 CONSIDER MAKING SUCH A CHANGE AT THIS TIME?
 - No. The Company thinks that the Commission should not make any changes at this time to see if the issue raised by CAD is systematic to the new tariff or more an issue related to the transition from the old Capital Riders to the new Incremental Capital Riders tariff adopted by the Commission just 5 months ago. Since the Company does not anticipate a recurrence of these circumstances, any reaction at this stage would be premature. The Company recommends that the Commission review this issue at a later time, which will be based on investment and earnings in 2024 and thereafter, before considering whether this tariff recently agreed to by the parties to TPUC Docket No. 19-00103 needs to be modified. The Company will continue to make significant capital investment in needed infrastructure in 2024 without any incremental revenues associated with that investment under the ICRRR. The Company did not increase its Capital Riders in 2023 and is not seeking to in 2024, despite making significant investment both years. The Company believes this will align the ROE calculated by the earning test for 2024 and beyond. Furthermore, the Legacy Riders, referenced by Mr. Dittemore that must be reconciled, will be rolled into base rates at the conclusion of TPUC Docket No. 24-00032, the TAWC's General Rate Case filed

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Α.

⁴ *Dittemore* at p. 9, 1. 1-9.

May, 1 2024. At the conclusion of the rate case, there will be no Legacy Rider revenues
authorized of collected so over and under collection of these revenues compared to
authorized no longer exists.

CAN YOU RESPOND TO MR. DITTEMORE'S TESTIMONY ON WHETHER
THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ADDRESSED THIS TOPIC OF OVER AND
UNDER-COLLECTION OF, A RECONCILIATION, OF THE LEGACY CAPITAL
RIDER" IS AN ISSUE THAT THE COMMISSION NEEDS TO ADDRESS?⁵

First, on May 1, 2024 (six days after Mr. Dittemore filed his testimony in this proceeding) the Company filed a General Rate Case with the Commission. (See, TPUC Docket No. 24-00032.) As a result, with the adopting of new rates in Docket No. 24-00032 legacy rates will cease to exist, as new base rates will be established that include all of the Capital Rider investments into rate base and the cost of that investment into base rates, any change made to the ICR tariff would only apply to the 2025 Capital Riders case filed in March of 2025. As noted above, the issue identified by Mr. Dittemore only exists if there is an over or under collection of legacy rider review and the Company earnings as measured by the ROE set for TAWC by the Commission. Moving forward, as Mr. Dittemore's recommendation would require the expenditure of significant resources by the Commission, CAD and the Company for a temporary fix to a speculative issue, as the Company believes a reoccurrence of this issue is unlikely. Second, the new ICR tariff, which was jointly filed by the parties to TPUC Docket No. 19-00103, currently addresses the topic of the over collection or under collection. The tariff on line 43 of the Calculation of the ICRR specifically calls for an adjustment to the ICRRR. TAWC correctly made that adjustment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

O.

A.

⁵ *Dittemore* at pp. 7-8.

1 per the tariffs. Thus, Mr. Dittemore is not correct that the tariff does not address the over 2 and under collection of legacy riders.

IF THE COMMISSION DECIDES TO CONSIDER ANY SUCH PROPOSED 3 O. 4 TARIFF CHANGES, SHOULD THE COMMISSION HAVE SPECIFIC 5

PRINCIPLES IN MIND?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Α.

- Yes. First the adjustment must remain symmetrical with the Company allowed to collect from customers an under-collection as well as reduce rates to customers in the case of an over-collection. Second, the Commission should ensure that the adjustment made to account for an over collection or under collection be properly taken into consideration in the Calculation of the earning test. This is why it is necessary for the Commission and the Parties to have a specific proposal as to how the tariff is proposed to be changed in order to ensure that these two principles are maintained. The current tariff, as approved by the Commission just last December is symmetrical for the treatment of both under-collections and over-collections. The current tariff does not require any adjustment to how the ROE Test is calculated and applied but the proposal of Mr. Dittemore would need to make adjustments to the ROE Test to account for Revenues included in the earnings test for one year, that must be returned to ratepayers in the second year. The needed modifications to the ROE Test are not included in Mr. Dittemore's proposal.
- Q. DOES THE COMPANY AGREE WITH MR. DITTEMORE'S FOURTH RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COMMISSION EXPLICITLY CONFIRM THAT THE APPROPRIATE TCJA CREDIT IS - 3.82%?6

⁶ *Dittemore* at p. 9, l. 11-16.

- 1 A. Yes, as set forth in its response to CAD's discovery requests the appropriate TCJA
- adjustment is -3.82%. inclusive of the adjustment for ADIT. Attached is a correction to
- Petitioner's Exhibit Annual Approved Tariffs (see, Amended Petitioner's Exhibit –
- 4 Annual Approved Tariffs) clarifying that the correct TCJA credit is -3.82%. TAWC has no
- 5 objection to the Commission explicitly confirming this.
- 6 Q. FINALLY, DOES THE COMPANY AGREE WITH MR. DITTEMORE
- 7 RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COMMISSION SHOULD REQUIRE THE
- 8 COMPANY'S BALANCE SHEET AND INCOME STATEMENT SUPPORTING
- 9 THE ICRR TO BE SUBMITTED WITH THE ICR FILING EACH YEAR?⁷
- 10 A. The Company does not object to the Commission requiring the Company to submit this
- supporting Balance Sheet and Income statement when the Company files for ICRR in the
- future.
- 13 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 14 A. Yes, it does.

⁷ *Dittemore* at pp. 9-10.

Amended Petitioner's Exhibit – Annual Approved Tariffs

Authorization of Tennessee American Water Capital Recovery Riders Since Last Rate Case (Docket No. 12-00049)

			Since Last Rate C	ase (Docket No	. 12-00049)				
TPUC Docket No.	Effective Date	Rider	Authorized Annual Change	Total Cumulative Rider	Reconciliation Authorized	Individual Authorized Rider Total	Capital Riders Cumulative Total	TCJA Offset	Impact to Bill
13-00130	4/15/2014	QIIP	0.790%	0.790%	0.000%	0.790%			
		EDI	0.180%	0.180%	0.000%	0.180%			
		SEC Total	0.110% 1.080%	0.110%	0.000% 0.000%	0.110%	1.080%	0.00%	1.080%
14-00121	6/30/2015	QIIP	1.340%	2.130% 0.050%	0.000%	2.130% 0.050%			
		SEC	3.430%	3.540%	0.000%	3.540%			
		Total	4.640%		0.000%		5.720%	0.00%	5.720%
15-00029*	11/1/2015	QIIP	0.000%	2.130%	0.254%	2.384%			
		EDI	0.000%	0.050%	-0.150%	-0.100%			
		SEC Total	0.000%	3.540% 5.720%	0.064% 0.168%	3.604%	5.888%	0.00%	5.888%
15-00111	3/15/2016	QIIP EDI	2.430% 0.050%	4.560% 0.100%	0.000% 0.000%	4.560% 0.100%			
		SEC	2.180%	5.720%	0.000%	5.720%			
		Total	4.660%		0.000%		10.380%	0.00%	10.380%
16-00022*	10/11/2016		0.000%	4.560%	1.166%	5.726%			
		EDI SEC	0.000% 0.000%	0.100% 5.720%	-0.178% -0.118%	-0.078% 5.602%			
		Total	0.000%	3.72070	0.870%	3.00270	11.250%	0.00%	11.250%
16-00126	3/14/2017	OUD	2.960%	7.520%	0.000%	7.520%			
10-00120	3/14/2017	EDI	0.240%	0.340%	0.000%	0.340%			
		SEC	0.370%	6.090%	0.000%	6.090%			
		Total	3.570%		0.000%		13.950%	0.00%	13.950%
17-00020*	8/16/2017		0.000%	7.520%	1.763%	9.283%			
		EDI SEC	0.000%	0.340% 6.090%	-0.031% -0.826%	0.309% 5.264%			
		Total	0.000%		0.906%		14.856%	0.00%	14.856%
17-00124	4/10/2018	OIIP	2.530%	10.050%	0.000%	10.050%			
	.,,	EDI	0.070%	0.410%	0.000%	0.410%			
		SEC Total	-0.120% 2.480%	5.970%	0.000%	5.970%	16.430%	0.00%	16.430%
18-00022*	12/17/2018	QIIP	0.000% 0.000%	10.050% 0.410%	1.542% -0.081%	11.592% 0.329%			
		SEC	0.000%	5.970%	-0.628%	5.342%			
		Total	0.000%		0.833%		17.263%	0.00%	17.263%
18-00120	9/1/2019	QIIP	1.600%	11.650%	0.000%	11.650%			
		EDI	0.240%	0.650%	0.000%	0.650%			
		SEC Total	0.910% 2.750%	6.880%	0.000% 0.000%	6.880%	19.180%	-6.62%	12.560%
19-00031*	12/9/2019	EDI	0.000% 0.000%	11.650% 0.650%	-1.140% -0.320%	10.510% 0.330%			
		SEC	0.000%	6.880%	-0.920%	5.960%			
		Total	0.000%		-2.380%		16.800%	-6.62%	10.180%
19-00105	1/1/2020		2.630%	14.280%	0.000%	14.280%			
		EDI SEC	0.490% 1.910%	1.140% 8.790%	0.000%	1.140% 8.790%			
		Total	5.030%		0.000%		24.210%	-6.62%	17.590%
20-00028*	4/1/2020	QIIP	0.000%	14.280%	-2.310%	11.970%			
		EDI	0.000%	1.140%	-0.510%	0.630%			
		SEC Total	0.000%	8.790%	-1.260% -4.080%	7.530%	20.130%	-6.62%	13.510%
							20125070	0.02/0	13.51070
20-00128	1/1/2021	QIIP	4.860% 0.110%	19.140% 1.250%	0.000% 0.000%	19.140% 1.250%			
		SEC	0.910%	9.700%	0.000%	9.700%			
		Total	5.880%		0.000%		30.090%	-11.16%	18.930%
21-00030*	4/1/2021	QIIP	0.000%	19.140%	2.650%	21.790%			
		EDI SEC	0.000%	1.250%	-0.500% 0.790%	0.750%			
		Total	0.000% 0.000%	9.700%	2.940%	10.490%	33.030%	-11.16%	21.870%
21-00030*	8/9/2021	OUD	0.000%	19.140%	2.390%	21.530%			
21-00030	8/9/2021	EDI	0.000%	1.250%	-0.510%	0.740%			
		SEC	0.000%		0.620%	10.320%			
		Total	0.000%		2.500%		32.590%	-11.16%	21.430%
21-00030	2/1/2022		0.000%			19.140%			
		EDI SEC	0.000%		0.000%				
		Total	0.000%		0.000%		30.090%	-11.16%	18.930%
22-00021*	4/1/2022	OUP	0.000%	19.140%	-0.250%	18.890%			
	,, _,	EDI	0.000%	1.250%	0.560%	1.810%			
		SEC Total	0.000%		-1.250% -0.940%		29.150%	-11 16%	17.990%
22-00072*	8/1/2022	QIIP	5.080% 0.660%						
		SEC	0.270%	9.970%	-1.250%	8.720%			
		Total	6.010%		-0.940%		35.160%	-11.16%	24.000%
22-00072*	9/1/2023		0.000%			23.970%			
		EDI SEC	0.000% 0.000%						
		Total	0.000%		-0.940%		35.160%	-4.55%	30.610%
23,00010*	10/6/2023	OUP	0.000%	24.280%	0.840%	25.120%			
23.00019.	10/0/2023	EDI	0.000%	1.930%	0.550%	2.480%			
		SEC Total	0.000%		-1.420%		36.270%	-4.55%	31.720%
		rotar	0.000%				30.2/0%	-4.35%	31.720%
23-00018*	1/1/2024	QIIP EDI	0.000%		0.000%				
		SEC	0.000%	10.090%	0.000%	10.090%			
		Total	0.000%		0.000%	36.300%	36.300%	-3.82%	32.480%

 $[\]ensuremath{^{\bullet}}$ Reconciliations are only effective until December 31 of the year authorized by the TPUC.

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

VERIF	ICATIO	ON		
PETITION)			
CAPITAL RECOVERY RIDER TARIFF)))	DOCKET NO. 24-00011		
COMPANY'S 2024 INCREMENTAL				
TENNESSEE-AMERICAN WATER				
)			
IN RE:)			

STATE OF <u>Tennessee</u>)
COUNTY OF <u>Hamilton</u>)

I, ROBERT C. LANE, being duly sworn, state that I am authorized to testify on behalf of Tennessee-American Water Company in the above-referenced docket, that if present before the Commission and duly sworn, my testimony would be as set forth in my pre-filed testimony in this matter, and that my testimony herein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

ROBERT C. LANE

Sworn to and subscribed before me

My Commission Expires: 2-28-28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via U.S. Mail or electronic mail upon:

Victoria B. Glover, Esq.
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Tennessee Attorney General
Consumer Advocate Division
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202-0207
Victoria.Glover@ag.tn.gov

Vance L. Broemel, Esq.
Managing Attorney
Office of the Tennessee Attorney General
Consumer Advocate Division
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202-0207
Vance.Broemel@ag.tn.gov

This the 10th day of May 2024.

87498505.v1