

EXHIBIT

Exhibit No.:

Issue(s):

Witness/Type of Exhibit:

Sponsoring Party:

Case No.:

#200

Cost of Service/
Rate Design

Meisenheimer/Direct

Public Counsel

GR-2006-0387

FILED³

DEC 20 2006

Missouri Public
Service Commission

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

CASE NO. GR-2006-0387

September 26, 2006

OPC Exhibit No. 200
Case No(s). GR-2006-0387
Date 11-30-06 Rptr PF

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Atmos Energy)	
Corporation's Tariff Revision Designed)	
to Consolidate Rates and Implement a)	Case No. GR-2006-0387
General Rate Increase for Natural Gas)	
Service in the Missouri Service Area)	
of the Company.)	

AFFIDAVIT OF BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) ss
COUNTY OF COLE)

Barbara A. Meisenheimer, of lawful age and being first duly sworn, deposes and states:


1. My name is Barbara A. Meisenheimer. I am Chief Utility Economist for the Office of the Public Counsel.
2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my direct testimony consisting of pages 1 through 20 and Schedules 1-8.
3. I hereby swear and affirm that my statements contained in the attached testimony are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.


Barbara A. Meisenheimer

Subscribed and sworn to me this 30th day of June 2006.



JERENE A. BUCKMAN
My Commission Expires
August 10, 2009
Cole County
Commission #05754036


Jerene A. Buckman
Notary Public

My Commission expires August 10, 2009.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER**

ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

(RATE DESIGN)

CASE NO. GR-2006-0387

Introduction and Summary

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. Barbara A. Meisenheimer, Chief Utility Economist, Office of the Public Counsel (OPC or Public Counsel), P. O. Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. I am also employed as an adjunct Economics and Statistics Instructor for William Woods University.

Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY IN THIS CASE?

A. No.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. In this testimony I will present Public Counsel's recommendations regarding rate design and class cost of service. I will also discuss the economic basis and development of the allocation factor for transmission and distribution mains that I used in the class cost of service study.

1 Q. DID THE COMPANY PREPARE A CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY (CCOS) IN THIS
2 CASE OR DEVELOP REASONABLY COMPREHENSIVE DISTRICT SPECIFIC COST
3 MEASURES?

4 A. No. The Company has requested substantial changes to both intraclass and
5 interclass rates with little, if any, cost support for its proposals. In response to a
6 number of data requests that I sent to the Company requesting district and class
7 specific cost and cost causative information, I received numerous responses
8 stating that the information was "not readily available."

9 Q. WHAT IS THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF CCOS STUDY RESULTS IN RATE DESIGN?

10 A. A CCOS study provides the Commission with a general guide for a service based
11 on costs to determine the just and reasonable rate. Other relevant factors must
12 also be considered when setting rates, such as the value of a service, the
13 affordability of service, the rate impact, and rate continuity, to highlight a few.
14 The Commission must on a case by case basis balance the results of a cost of
15 service study with other relevant factors that go into the rate making decision
16 process. The company has failed to affirmatively address this vital factor or its
17 rate case. It failed to conduct a CCOS or show sufficient data to support its rate
18 proposals.

19 Rate Design

20 Q. WHAT IS YOUR PRIMARY RECOMMENDATION WITH RESPECT TO RATE DESIGN IN
21 THIS CASE?

1 A. Without district specific class cost of service information it is difficult to evaluate
2 if the changes in the relative class revenue responsibility (either within or across
3 districts) are reasonable. Atmos controls properties previously owned by at least
4 three different gas companies. The service area previously served by Greeley Gas
5 has never had a Missouri rate review. The service areas previously owned by
6 United Cities Gas have not had the rates reviewed since about 1994. The
7 properties previously owned by Associated Natural Gas have not had rates review
8 since about 1997. The Commission should reject the Company's proposal and
9 any other proposals to realign base rates among classes within a district or to
10 blend district rates without an adequate cost based showing that such changes are
11 warranted. Issues of class shifts within a district or potential district
12 consolidations should be addressed in a separate rate design case in which the
13 Company should develop and present comprehensive cost support and customer
14 impact analyses.

15 **Q. DO YOU PROPOSE ANY CHANGE IN THE RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER CHARGE?**

16 A. No. The lack of district specific information such as the actual cost of meters by
17 customer type and district specific actual service cost by customer type provide
18 insufficient support for altering the existing customer charge rates.

1 Q. IN ABSENSE OF THIS DISTRIC SPECIFIC INFORMATION, WOULD IT BE
2 REASONABLE TO IMPLEMENT ANY CHANGES IN DISTRICT REVENUE
3 REQUIREMENTS AS AN EQUAL PERCENTAGE CHANGE TO ALL OTHER RATE
4 ELEMENTS?

5 A. Yes. Because the Company provided inadequate support for its proposed rate
6 design so an across the board adjustment by district seems reasonable as the best
7 option.

8 Class Cost of Service Studies

9 Q. IF THE COMMISSION DECIDES TO IMPLEMENT CLASS COST OF SERVICE
10 ADJUSTMENTS IN THIS CASE, DO YOU HAVE CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDIES
11 AND A RATE DESIGN RECOMMENDATION FOR THE COMMISSION TO CONSIDER?

12 A. Yes, I have prepared CCOS studies and formulated a rate designed
13 recommendation. Although I think that a greater level of cost detail is needed
14 prior to realigning class rates, I developed class cost of service studies for the
15 districts using the information that is currently available. With respect to rate
16 design, these studies should be used as a guide and must be weighed against
17 considerations of customer rate impact and affordability.

18 Q. WHAT CONCLUSIONS ARE SUGGESTED BY PUBLIC COUNSEL'S COST OF SERVICE
19 STUDY?

20 A. Based on the results of my class cost of service studies, (BAM DIRECT Schedule
21 1 through BAM DIRECT Schedule 7), the following conclusions can be drawn,

1 the Residential class ranges from about 2.79% above cost of service in the United
2 Cities district to about 17% below cost of service in the Greeley district.

3 The Small General Service class ranges from about 4 ½ % above cost of service
4 in the Kirksville district to about 35% above cost of service in the Greeley
5 district.

6 Large customers, including the Large General Service and Large Volume classes,
7 range from about 50% below cost of service in the Palmyra district to 40% above
8 cost of service in the Greeley district.

9 Special Contract customers in the SEMO and United Cities districts appear to be
10 paying substantially below cost of service.

11 The percent above or below cost of service is shown for each class, by district on
12 Line 27 in schedules BAM DIRECT Schedule 1 through BAM DIRECT Schedule
13 7.

14 **Q. WHAT RATE DESIGN WOULD YOU PROPOSE BASED ON YOU CCOS STUDY**
15 **RESULTS?**

16 **A.** Where the existing revenue structure departs greatly from the class cost of
17 service, the Commission should impose, at a maximum, class revenue shifts equal
18 to one half of the "revenue neutral shifts" indicated by Public Counsel's class cost
19 of service study. Revenue neutral shifts are shifts that hold overall company
20 revenue at the existing level but allow for the share attributed to each class to be
21 adjusted to reflect the cost responsibility of the class. In addition to moving half
22 way to the revenue neutral shifts, I recommend that if the Commission determines

1 that an overall increase in revenue requirement is necessary, then no customer
2 class should receive a net decrease as the combined result of: (1) the revenue
3 neutral shift that is applied to that class, and (2) the share of the total revenue
4 increase that is applied to that class. Likewise, if the Commission determines that
5 an overall decrease in revenue requirement is necessary, then no customer class
6 should receive a net increase as the combined result of: (1) the revenue neutral
7 shift that is applied to that class, and (2) the share of the total revenue decrease
8 that is applied to that class.

9 **Q. IF THE COMMISSION DETERMINES IT REASONABLE IN THIS CASE, CAN YOUR**
10 **RATE DESIGN METHODOLOGY BE APPLIED TO DIFFERENT REVENUE**
11 **REQUIREMENTS?**

12 **A. Yes, it can. This method could be utilized to calculate class revenue requirements**
13 **for any practical level of overall revenue requirement.**

14 **Class Cost of Service Studies**

15 **Q. WHAT IS THE REGULATORY PURPOSE OF A CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY?**

16 **A. A Class COS Study is a tool used by regulators to aid in determining an**
17 **appropriate rate structure. A class cost of service study can be used as a guide in**
18 **identifying, on a cost causative basis, the cost of serving a particular group of**
19 **customers. A Class COS Study can also be used to evaluate the relative cost of**
20 **service among classes. This comparison of relative cost is the focus of Public**
21 **Counsel's study and is reflected in the study assumption that the company's**
22 **revenue requirement is equal to the level of current revenue.**

1

2 **Q. WHAT ARE THE REPRESENTATIVE CLASSES INCLUDED IN PUBLIC COUNSEL'S**
3 **CLASS COS STUDY?**

4 A. In performing a Class COS Study, customers are grouped into "classes" based on
5 type of customer and utilization patterns. Public Counsel's Class COS Study
6 identifies five distinct classes of customers: Residential, Small General Services,
7 Large General Services, Large Volume and Special Contract. These are the same
8 classes identified by Staff in its Class COS Study with the exception of the
9 Special Contract class.

10 **Q. WHAT DISTRICTS ARE USED IN YOUR STUDIES?**

11 A. I prepared a class cost of service study for the Butler, Greeley, Kirksville,
12 Neelyville, Southeast MO (SEMO), Palmyra, and United Cities Districts.

13 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ASSIGNMENT OF COST TO THE CUSTOMER CLASSES.**

14 A. The assignment of costs to customer classes is a three-step process in which costs
15 are first functionalized, then classified, and finally allocated. Public Counsel's
16 Class COS Study primarily reflects the booked cost incurred through the test year.

17 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE FUNCTIONALIZATION OF COSTS.**

18 A. Functionalization is achieved by categorizing cost accounts by associated
19 function. Functional categories include; Production, Storage, Transmission,
20 Distribution, Customer Accounts and Administrative and General (A&G). Some

1 functional categories contain accounts that are identifiable as being directly or
2 jointly caused by particular customer classes. Other functional categories contain
3 costs associated with common facilities or common overheads.

4 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CLASSIFICATION OF COSTS.**

5 A. Classification is achieved by further categorizing costs into customer related,
6 commodity related, demand related or "other related" costs.

7 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE CUSTOMER RELATED COSTS.**

8 A. Customer related costs vary directly with the number of customers served.
9 Examples of customer related costs include: expenses associated with metering,
10 reading, billing, and the costs associated with metering equipment and service
11 connections

12 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE COMMODITY RELATED COSTS.**

13 A. Commodity related costs vary with the quantity of gas purchased. Historically,
14 commodity related costs primarily have included purchased gas cost. Today local
15 distribution companies recover purchased gas cost through the PGA but other
16 plant accounts may still be categorized as commodity related.

17 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE DEMAND RELATED COSTS.**

18 A. Demand related costs vary with the capacity requirement of plant or equipment.
19 They are related to the maximum system requirements that reflect the capacity
20 necessary to serve demand during peak periods. Demand related costs include:

1 production, transmission and storage costs and expenses associated with these
2 types of plant. In addition, some distribution plant and related expenses are
3 demand related costs.

4 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ALLOCATION PROCESS.**

5 A. Following functionalization and classification, allocation factors are applied to
6 distribute a reasonable share of jurisdictional costs to each customer class. Some
7 allocation factors are based on a simple ratio of a particular class' share of total
8 costs. Other allocation factors are based on usage, sales, or weighted share of
9 customers. Allocation factors are designed to reflect the appropriate classification
10 in allocating costs.

11 **Q. ARE PURCHASED GAS COSTS TREATED DIFFERENTLY THAN OTHER COSTS?**

12 A. Yes. The Company's base tariff rates recover only its non-gas or margin costs. A
13 purchased gas adjustment cost factor is used to recover gas costs. The cost of
14 service study will develop the non-gas or margin costs incurred by the LDC in
15 delivering gas from the city-gate to its customers.

16 **Q. ON WHAT DATA IS YOUR CLASS COS STUDY BASED?**

17 A. The Missouri Public Service Commission Staff (Staff) Accounting Schedules that
18 were filed with the Staff's non-rate design testimony were the source of most of
19 the financial data that I utilized in preparing my studies. Most of the billing
20 determinant information that I utilized was also provided by the Commission
21 Staff. This data is from the year ending Sept, 30, 2005. I have also utilized data

1 received from Atmos in response to Public Counsel's Data Requests. My use of
2 this information should not be viewed as an endorsement of either Staff's or the
3 Company's methods for calculating accounting costs, billing determinants or peak
4 demands. I have used this information because it contained the best level of detail
5 available to perform my studies.

6 **Q. IS THERE IS POSSIBILITY THAT SOME INFORMATION USED IN YOUR STUDY WILL**
7 **BE UPDATED AND REVISED AS THIS CASE PROGRESSES?**

8 A. Yes. I will update my studies to reflect any significant changes.

9 **Q. HOW ARE INTANGIBLE PLANT ACCOUNTS ALLOCATED?**

10 A. Intangible plant accounts include expenses related to organizing the enterprise,
11 obtaining franchise and consent and other miscellaneous items. These costs are
12 not attributable to a particular subset of customer classes, instead they are
13 considered to be common costs and are allocated on the basis of the portion of
14 total non-general plant cost assigned to each customer class.

15 **Q. HOW ARE GAS STORAGE COSTS ALLOCATED?**

16 A. Gas storage costs are allocated on the basis of weather normalized sales volumes.

17 **Q. HOW ARE TRANSMISSION PLANT ACCOUNTS ALLOCATED?**

18 A. Transmission plant is allocated on the basis of the modified RSUM allocation
19 factor discussed in this testimony.

Direct Testimony of
Barbara A. Meisenheimer
Case No. GR-2006-0387

1 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES ARE
2 ALLOCATED?

3 A. For allocating most of the accounts in this category, I used the "expenses follow
4 plant principle".

5 Q. HOW ARE CUSTOMER ACCOUNTS, CUSTOMER SERVICE, AND SALES PROMOTION
6 EXPENSES ALLOCATED?

7 A. Customer service expenses are customer related and are allocated on the basis of
8 number of customer bills. Sales promotion expenses are allocated on the basis of
9 the overall class cost of service and the following summary outlines the allocation
10 of customer accounts expenses.

11 Table 2.

<u>Account</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Allocator</u>
901	Supervision	Meter Weighted Customers Allocator
902	Meter Reading Expenses	Meter Reading Weighted Customers
903	Customer Records and Collections	Meter Weighted Customers Allocator
904	Uncollectible Accounts	Class Cost of Service
905	Misc. Customer Accounts	Meter Weighted Customer Allocator

1 **Q. HOW ARE ADMINISTRATIVE AND GENERAL (A & G) EXPENSES ALLOCATED?**

2 A. Property insurance (Account 924) is allocated on the basis of gross non-general
3 plant. Injuries and damages and employee pensions and benefits (Accounts 925
4 and 926) are allocated on the basis of payroll. The remainder of A & G expenses
5 are allocated on the basis of the overall class cost of service.

6 **Q. HOW ARE TAXES ALLOCATED?**

7 A. Property taxes are allocated on the basis of the total plant previously allocated to
8 each class. Franchise taxes are allocated on the basis of rate base. Payroll taxes
9 are allocated as a function of payroll expense. Income taxes are allocated
10 according to the rate base attributable to each class.

11 **Mains Cost Economies of Scale Factor**

12 **Q. WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF MAINS COST?**

13 A. Mains are "shared" in the sense that they are facilities generally available and
14 used to provide service to multiple customers and customer classes. Therefore,
15 from an economic perspective, they should be treated as a shared cost recovered
16 from all customers and classes that benefit from the facilities availability. Local
17 distribution companies (LDCs) are generally believed to be natural monopolies.
18 For natural monopolies, operation of fewer producers tends to result in the most
19 cost effective market structure for providing service. One such cost reducing
20 characteristic typical to natural monopolies such as LDCs is called "economies of

1 scope". The term "economies of scope" refers to the ability to achieve cost
2 savings by utilizing the same equipment, facilities and/or expertise to provide
3 multiple products at lower cost than if the products were produced on a stand-
4 alone basis. In this case, the Company's investment in transmission and
5 distribution mains provides the Company with the means to deliver natural gas to
6 the locations of all customer classes in response to its customers' year-round
7 demands for natural gas or have it available as a back-up fuel sources.

8 Another such cost reducing characteristic typical to natural monopolies such as
9 LDCs is the presence of "economies of scale." The term "economies of scale"
10 describes the phenomenon where larger scale production can achieve cost
11 savings. In this case, the average cost of producing goods or services declines as
12 the output level increases. According to various flow formulas, with other factors
13 held constant, a 4" pipe has a flow capacity of about 6 times of that of a 2" pipe
14 while, the per foot cost to install the 4" pipe may be less than 2 times the cost to
15 install the 2" pipe. This means that the cost of the incremental capacity needed to
16 serve during higher demand periods (peak periods) is less expensive than the
17 average cost of capacity. Taking advantage of economies of scale benefits the
18 utility by increasing use of facilities and in turn increasing revenues. It benefits
19 those who do not use the system as much in peak periods because any revenue
20 generated above incremental cost helps offset costs that would otherwise have to
21 be recovered during normal use periods. It can also benefit the peak period user if
22 some of the cost savings are reflected as per unit rate reductions. The cost study
23 OPC has prepared and submitted includes an adjustment to allocating mains cost

1 to reflect the economies of scale inherent in providing service during peak
2 periods.

3 Since all customers benefit from the existence of the system, all customers should
4 contribute to the recovery of the cost of the system. Economic theory suggests
5 that if each customer or class of customers is responsible for at least the
6 incremental cost that this customer brings to the system, and that if no customer
7 or class of customers is responsible for more than the stand alone cost that would
8 be needed to serve this customer individually, then there is no cross-subsidy and
9 the allocation of cost can be acceptable. However, both the incremental cost and
10 the stand-alone cost of each customer class are hard to measure or determine. To
11 accurately pinpoint the cost responsibility of each specific customer class is
12 inherently impossible.

13 **Q. HOW SHOULD ECONOMIES OF SCOPE RELATED TO THE COST OF MAINS BE**
14 **REFLECTED IN THE ALLOCATION OF MAINS?**

15 **A.** When economies of scope are present, the total cost of the transmission and
16 distribution system for delivering gas to the residential, commercial and industrial
17 classes would be less than the sum of the stand-alone costs of the separate
18 distribution systems for delivering gas to each of the customer classes. Generally,
19 when allocating the shared cost of joint production, the general principle is that no
20 cross subsidization should be present. The term cross subsidization, in this
21 context, describes a situation where the revenue earned on part of the total output
22 of the industry is more than the stand-alone production cost of that part. This
23 general principle attempts to ensure that no group of customers should pay more
24 than they would have paid if they were to provide their own products and services

1 using the best available production technique. Similarly, for utilities that are
2 "one-way" in nature, the revenue requirement for any customer class should be at
3 least as large as the incremental cost to provide services to this class because
4 otherwise somebody else will be forced to pay for more than its stand-alone cost.

5 The implication of this characteristic is that a just and reasonable cost allocation
6 to a customer class ranges from the incremental cost to the stand-alone cost of
7 providing services to that class. A judgment call is required to determine which
8 point along this range is the most appropriate cost allocation. In fact, different
9 viewpoints about whether the stand alone cost, the incremental cost, or a cost that
10 is somewhere in the middle should be allocated to a product or a customer is one
11 of the main reasons why different parties have different cost of service study
12 results and different rate designs to recover the costs. However, absent other
13 policy considerations, a just and reasonable solution should ask each customer
14 class to pay for more than their respective incremental cost. The total cost will
15 not be covered if each class only pays for its incremental cost.

16 **Q. HOW SHOULD ECONOMIES OF SCALE RELATED TO THE COST OF MAINS BE**
17 **REFLECTED IN THE ALLOCATION OF MAINS?**

18 **A:** When economies of scale are present, there is not a one-to-one relationship
19 between the incremental cost burden that the system peak load imposes upon the
20 transmission and distribution system and that imposed by the average load.
21 Therefore, we should not allocate cost corresponding to demand as if there is a
22 direct one to one relationship between costs and the level of demand. Instead, we
23 need to develop an allocation of mains costs that reflects an appropriate non-linear
24 relationship. For example, if the peak demand is twice the average demand,

1 simply allocating half of the total cost of mains to customers who use natural gas
2 at the peak period and half to customers who use at the base period does not
3 reasonably apportion the per unit savings associated with production levels that
4 achieve economies of scale. A better method would be to estimate the cost that
5 are incurred to satisfy the increment of peak demand over average demand and
6 allocate that portion of cost to those customers who use natural gas in the peak
7 period. In this manner they receive an offsetting cost benefit associated with
8 driving the system to higher use where economies of scale are achieved.

9 **Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE ORIGIN AND OF OPC'S NON-LINEAR ECONOMIES OF SCALE**
10 **FACTOR USED IN THE ALLOCATION OF MAINS?**

11 A. Barry Hall, an engineer that worked for our office during the 1990s, initially
12 developed the basis for OPC's non-linear allocator. Using Company data, and
13 mathematical and engineering relationships, he identified a nonlinear relationship
14 between capacities and cost which he attributed to economies of scale.

15 **Q. HAVE YOU UPDATED OPC'S NON-LINEAR ECONOMIES OF SCALE FACTOR FOR USE**
16 **IN THIS CASE?**

17 A. Yes, I have. For this case, I have performed a study to update OPC's economies
18 of scale factor using information provided by the Staff and Company. The result
19 of my study is an economies of scale factor of .24, which I used in OPC's cost of
20 service study. Appendix 1 contains a description of the methods used to estimate
21 this factor. Plots of the data points illustrating the declining cost per capacity unit
22 and the functional form of the cost equation related to Appendix 1 are provided in
23 BAM DIRECT Schedule 8.

Appendix 1

Q. Please describe the mathematical and engineering relationships relied upon to develop the economies of scale factor.

A. Based on page 6 of the direct testimony of Barry Hall in Case No. GR-97-393, the flow capacity (Q) of a pipe is related to the diameter (d) according to the equation;

$$(1) \quad Q = 28.05[(p_i^2 - p_o^2)d^{5.33}/sL]^{-.5}$$

where L is the pipe length, p_i and p_o are the inlet and outlet pressures respectively and s is the gravity of the gas. Assuming the inlet and outlet pressures, and the length and gravity of the gas are constants the flow capacity in (1) can be expressed as;

$$(2) \quad Q = \alpha d^{2.665}$$

where α is a constant.

Based on review of data plots of the general relationship between capacity and cost, I relied on an equation of the following form to fit a curve to express cost as a function of capacity;

$$(3) \quad C(Q_o) = \beta * Q_o^r;$$

β is a constant.

From (2) we know $Q_o = \alpha d^{2.665}$. Since α is a constant, it is the exponent r that causes differences in the relative costs at different diameters and in turn causes different capacity levels. Therefore, the exponent r embodies the "economies of

Direct Testimony of
Barbara A. Meisenheimer
Case No. GR-2006-0387

1 scale" effect that causes cost to increase at a decreasing rate. In order to
2 determine r it is acceptable to use the simplifying assumption $d^{2.665} = Q$.¹ This
3 yields the equation;

4
$$(4) C(Q) = bQ^r$$

5 where $Q = d^{2.665}$.

6 In order to estimate r , since equation (4) is non-linear, I applied the natural log
7 (\ln), which allows for estimation of r based on a linear regression;

8
$$(5) \quad \ln C(Q) = \ln\{bQ^r\} \text{ or } \ln C(Q) = \ln b + r \ln Q.$$

9 This is a linear equation of the form;

10
$$(6) \quad y = a + mx$$

11 where a is a constant and $m=r$.

12 I performed two regressions utilizing data on steel and PE mains. I n averaged the
13 two r values to obtain $r=.24$ which is the factor I used in my class cost of service
14 study.

¹ $C(d) = a \alpha^r * (d^{2.665})^r = b_1 * (d^{2.665})^r$. A constant b exists such that $C(d) = C(Q)$ when $Q = d^{2.665}$.

Direct Testimony of
Barbara A. Meisenheimer
Case No. GR-2006-0387

1 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

2 **A. Yes.**

BARB MEISENHEIMER'S DIRECT
GR-2006-0387

PUBLIC COUNSEL COS SUMMARY
ATMOS ENERGY CORP.
BUTLER DISTRICT

Line		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	SMALL GS	LARGE GS
1	O & M Expenses	567,416	388,269	121,662	57,485
2	Depreciation Expense	101,368	71,911	22,346	7,111
3	Taxes	184,091	117,582	42,413	24,096
4	TOTAL EXPENSES AND TAXES	\$852,875	\$577,762	\$186,421	\$88,691
5					
6	TOTAL RATE BASE	\$3,728,560	\$2,326,841	\$889,485	\$512,234
7					
8	IMPLICIT RATE OF RETURN	8.33%	6.38%	13.93%	7.48%
9					
10	OPERATING INCOME WITH				
11	EQUALIZED RATES OF RETURN	310,566	\$193,811	\$74,089	\$42,666
12					
13	TOTAL COST OF SERVICE	1,163,441	771,574	260,510	131,357
14	LESS OTHER REVENUE	6,427	4,011	1,714	702
15	REQUIRED RATE REVENUE	\$1,157,014	\$767,563	\$258,795	\$130,656
16					
17	CURRENT NON-GAS RATE REVENUES				
18	Purchased Gas	0	0	0	0
19	Non-gas margin	1,157,014	722,109	308,618	126,287
20	TOTAL RATE REVENUE	\$1,157,014	\$722,109	\$308,618	\$126,287
21					
22	REVENUE SHIFTS TO EQUALIZE				
23	CLASS RATES OF RETURN				
24	(assuming constant revenues)	\$0	\$45,454	(\$49,823)	\$4,369
25					
26	PERCENTAGE MARGIN REVENUE CHANGE				
27	TO EQUALIZE RATES OF RETURN	0.00%	6.29%	-16.14%	3.46%
28					
29	CURRENT REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	62.41%	26.67%	10.91%
30					
31	COS INDICATED REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	66.34%	22.37%	11.29%

BARB MEISENHEIMER'S DIRECT
GR-2006-0387

PUBLIC COUNSEL COS SUMMARY
ATMOS ENERGY CORP.
GREELY DISTRICT

Line		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	SMALL GS
1	O & M Expenses	75,173	60,259	14,914
2	Depreciation Expense	26,131	20,318	5,813
3	Taxes	27,985	21,710	6,274
4	TOTAL EXPENSES AND TAXES	\$129,289	\$102,288	\$27,002
5				
6	TOTAL RATE BASE	\$667,034	\$522,724	\$144,310
7				
8	IMPLICIT RATE OF RETURN	8.93%	4.78%	23.98%
9				
10	OPERATING INCOME WITH			
11	EQUALIZED RATES OF RETURN	59,598	\$46,704	\$12,894
12				
13	TOTAL COST OF SERVICE	188,887	148,992	39,895
14	LESS OTHER REVENUE	1,352	911	441
15	REQUIRED RATE REVENUE	\$187,535	\$148,081	\$39,454
16				
17	CURRENT NON-GAS RATE REVENUES			
18	Purchased Gas	0	0	0
19	Non-gas margin	187,535	126,374	61,161
20	TOTAL RATE REVENUE	\$187,535	\$126,374	\$61,161
21				
22	REVENUE SHIFTS TO EQUALIZE			
23	CLASS RATES OF RETURN			
24	(assuming constant revenues)	\$0	\$21,707	(\$21,707)
25				
26	PERCENTAGE MARGIN REVENUE CHANGE			
27	TO EQUALIZE RATES OF RETURN	0.00%	17.18%	-35.49%
28				
29	CURRENT REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	67.39%	32.61%
30				
31	COS INDICATED REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	78.96%	21.04%

PUBLIC COUNSEL COS SUMMARY
ATMOS ENERGY CORP.
KIRKSVILLE DISTRICT

Line		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	SMALL GS	LARGE GS	LARGE VOLUME
1	O & M Expenses	623,194	392,135	139,671	29,797	61,591
2	Depreciation Expense	131,828	88,136	30,320	4,607	8,766
3	Taxes	235,787	131,705	56,818	15,045	32,219
4	TOTAL EXPENSES AND TAXES	\$990,809	\$611,976	\$226,809	\$49,448	\$102,575
5						
6	TOTAL RATE BASE	\$5,079,532	\$2,661,471	\$1,274,929	\$362,656	\$780,476
7						
8	IMPLICIT RATE OF RETURN	7.67%	4.58%	8.90%	16.08%	12.32%
9						
10	OPERATING INCOME WITH					
11	EQUALIZED RATES OF RETURN	389,766	\$204,222	\$97,829	\$27,828	\$59,888
12						
13	TOTAL COST OF SERVICE	1,380,575	816,198	324,638	77,276	162,463
14	LESS OTHER REVENUE	9,497	5,048	2,341	741	1,367
15	REQUIRED RATE REVENUE	\$1,371,078	\$811,150	\$322,297	\$76,535	\$161,096
16						
17	CURRENT NON-GAS RATE REVENUES					
18	Purchased Gas	0	0	0	0	0
19	Non-gas margin	1,371,078	728,728	337,966	107,026	197,359
20	TOTAL RATE REVENUE	\$1,371,078	\$728,728	\$337,966	\$107,026	\$197,359
21						
22	REVENUE SHIFTS TO EQUALIZE					
23	CLASS RATES OF RETURN					
24	(assuming constant revenues)	\$0	\$82,422	(\$15,669)	(\$30,491)	(\$36,262)
25						
26	PERCENTAGE MARGIN REVENUE CHANGE					
27	TO EQUALIZE RATES OF RETURN	0.00%	11.31%	-4.64%	-28.49%	-18.37%
28						
29	CURRENT REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	53.15%	24.65%	7.81%	14.39%
30						
31	COS INDICATED REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	59.16%	23.51%	5.58%	11.75%

BARB MEISENHEIMER'S DIRECT
GR-2006-0387

PUBLIC COUNSEL COS SUMMARY
ATMOS ENERGY CORP.
NEELYVILLE DISTRICT

Line		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	SMALL GS
1	O & M Expenses	77,873	56,854	21,019
2	Depreciation Expense	36,685	26,509	10,176
3	Taxes	2,857	1,938	919
4	TOTAL EXPENSES AND TAXES	\$117,414	\$85,301	\$32,113
5				
6	TOTAL RATE BASE	\$619,221	\$426,325	\$192,896
7				
8	IMPLICIT RATE OF RETURN	1.75%	0.76%	3.94%
9				
10	OPERATING INCOME WITH			
11	EQUALIZED RATES OF RETURN	10,824	\$7,452	\$3,372
12				
13	TOTAL COST OF SERVICE	128,238	92,753	35,485
14	LESS OTHER REVENUE	0	0	0
15	REQUIRED RATE REVENUE	\$128,238	\$92,753	\$35,485
16				
17	CURRENT NON-GAS RATE REVENUES			
18	Purchased Gas	0	0	0
19	Non-gas margin	128,238	88,528	39,710
20	TOTAL RATE REVENUE	\$128,238	\$88,528	\$39,710
21				
22	REVENUE SHIFTS TO EQUALIZE			
23	CLASS RATES OF RETURN			
24	(assuming constant revenues)	\$0	\$4,225	(\$4,225)
25				
26	PERCENTAGE MARGIN REVENUE CHANGE			
27	TO EQUALIZE RATES OF RETURN	0.00%	4.77%	-10.64%
28				
29	CURRENT REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	69.03%	30.97%
30				
31	COS INDICATED REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	72.33%	27.67%

BAM DIRECT SCHEDULE 4

BARB MEISENHEIMER'S DIRECT
GR-2006-0387

PUBLIC COUNSEL COS SUMMARY
ATMOS ENERGY CORP.
PALMYRA DISTRICT

Line		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	SMALL GS	LARGE VOLUME
1	O & M Expenses	222,414	152,597	47,151	22,666
2	Depreciation Expense	92,899	61,294	20,735	10,871
3	Taxes	(10,873)	(9,549)	(1,670)	346
4	TOTAL EXPENSES AND TAXES	\$304,440	\$204,342	\$66,216	\$33,883
5					
6	TOTAL RATE BASE	\$1,438,435	\$1,045,427	\$290,769	\$102,240
7					
8	IMPLICIT RATE OF RETURN	5.22%	4.40%	12.08%	-5.88%
9					
10	OPERATING INCOME WITH				
11	EQUALIZED RATES OF RETURN	75,142	\$54,611	\$15,189	\$5,341
12					
13	TOTAL COST OF SERVICE	379,582	258,954	81,405	39,224
14	LESS OTHER REVENUE	63,877	42,135	17,053	4,690
15	REQUIRED RATE REVENUE	\$315,705	\$216,819	\$64,352	\$34,534
16					
17	CURRENT NON-GAS RATE REVENUES				
18	Purchased Gas	0	0	0	0
19	Non-gas margin	315,705	208,246	84,282	23,178
20	TOTAL RATE REVENUE	\$315,705	\$208,246	\$84,282	\$23,178
21					
22	REVENUE SHIFTS TO EQUALIZE				
23	CLASS RATES OF RETURN				
24	(assuming constant revenues)	\$0	\$8,573	(\$19,929)	\$11,356
25					
26	PERCENTAGE MARGIN REVENUE CHANGE				
27	TO EQUALIZE RATES OF RETURN	0.00%	4.12%	-23.65%	49.00%
28					
29	CURRENT REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	65.96%	26.70%	7.34%
30					
31	COS INDICATED REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	68.68%	20.38%	10.94%

BARB MEISENHEIMER'S DIRECT
GR-2006-0387

PUBLIC COUNSEL COS SUMMARY
ATMOS ENERGY CORP.
SEMO DISTRICT

Line		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	SMALL GS	LARGE GS	LARGE VOLUME	SPECIAL CONTRACT
1	O & M Expenses	3,893,051	2,525,492	655,655	65,970	303,272	342,662
2	Depreciation Expense	1,882,151	1,154,690	335,972	35,509	166,850	189,130
3	Taxes	1,674,433	979,833	291,613	34,238	172,123	196,625
4	TOTAL EXPENSES AND TAXES	\$7,449,635	\$4,660,015	\$1,283,239	\$135,717	\$642,246	\$728,417
5							
6	TOTAL RATE BASE	\$25,759,184	\$14,393,849	\$4,620,841	\$572,347	\$2,880,842	#####
7							
8	IMPLICIT RATE OF RETURN	6.49%	3.59%	14.87%	19.86%	13.26%	-0.86%
9							
10	OPERATING INCOME WITH						
11	EQUALIZED RATES OF RETURN	1,670,618	\$933,517	\$299,686	\$37,120	\$186,838	\$213,458
12							
13	TOTAL COST OF SERVICE	9,120,253	5,593,532	1,582,925	172,837	829,083	941,876
14	LESS OTHER REVENUE	63,877	36,253	13,800	1,747	7,174	4,903
15	REQUIRED RATE REVENUE	\$9,056,376	\$5,557,279	\$1,569,126	\$171,090	\$821,909	\$936,973
16							
17	CURRENT NON-GAS RATE REVENUES						
18	Purchased Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	Non-gas margin	9,056,376	5,139,948	1,956,489	247,643	1,017,176	695,120
20	TOTAL RATE REVENUE	\$9,056,376	\$5,139,948	\$1,956,489	\$247,643	\$1,017,176	\$695,120
21							
22	REVENUE SHIFTS TO EQUALIZE						
23	CLASS RATES OF RETURN						
24	(assuming constant revenues)	\$0	\$417,331	(\$387,363)	(\$76,553)	(\$195,267)	\$241,853
25							
26	PERCENTAGE MARGIN REVENUE CHANGE						
27	TO EQUALIZE RATES OF RETURN	0.00%	8.12%	-19.80%	-30.91%	-19.20%	34.79%
28							
29	CURRENT REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	56.76%	21.60%	2.73%	11.23%	7.68%
30							
31	COS INDICATED REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	61.36%	17.33%	1.89%	9.08%	10.35%

BAM DIRECT SCHEDULE 6

BARB MEISENHEIMER'S DIRECT
GR-2006-0387

PUBLIC COUNSEL COS SUMMARY
ATMOS ENERGY CORP.
UNITED CITIES DISTRICT

Line		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	SMALL GS	LARGE GS	LARGE VOLUME	SPECIAL CONTRACT
1	O & M Expenses	1,917,175	1,278,397	390,878	68,112	46,797	132,992
2	Depreciation Expense	1,606,712	1,032,384	342,185	63,101	43,798	125,244
3	Taxes	757,504	476,658	163,455	31,547	22,150	63,694
4	TOTAL EXPENSES AND TAXES	\$4,281,391	\$2,787,439	\$896,518	\$162,760	\$112,745	\$321,929
5							
6	TOTAL RATE BASE	\$17,143,785	\$10,647,372	\$3,757,837	\$737,009	\$516,617	\$1,484,949
7							
8	IMPLICIT RATE OF RETURN	4.89%	5.77%	11.39%	-3.13%	-8.85%	-9.11%
9							
10	OPERATING INCOME WITH						
11	EQUALIZED RATES OF RETURN	838,436	\$520,722	\$183,781	\$36,044	\$25,266	\$72,623
12							
13	TOTAL COST OF SERVICE	5,119,827	3,308,161	1,080,299	198,804	138,011	394,552
14	LESS OTHER REVENUE	62,464	41,504	16,161	1,705	818	2,276
15	REQUIRED RATE REVENUE	\$5,057,363	\$3,266,657	\$1,064,138	\$197,099	\$137,193	\$392,276
16							
17	CURRENT NON-GAS RATE REVENUES						
18	Purchased Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	Non-gas margin	5,057,363	3,360,356	1,308,482	138,022	66,203	184,300
20	TOTAL RATE REVENUE	\$5,057,363	\$3,360,356	\$1,308,482	\$138,022	\$66,203	\$184,300
21							
22	REVENUE SHIFTS TO EQUALIZE						
23	CLASS RATES OF RETURN						
24	(assuming constant revenues)	\$0	(\$93,699)	(\$244,344)	\$59,077	\$70,990	\$207,976
25							
26	PERCENTAGE MARGIN REVENUE CHANGE						
27	TO EQUALIZE RATES OF RETURN	0.00%	-2.79%	-18.67%	42.80%	107.23%	112.85%
28							
29	CURRENT REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	66.44%	25.87%	2.73%	1.31%	3.64%
30							
31	COS INDICATED REVENUE PERCENTAGES	100.00%	64.59%	21.04%	3.90%	2.71%	7.76%

BAM DIRECT SCHEDULE 7

Cost of Mains vs. Units of Flow Capacity

