Exhibit No.: Issue(s):

Rate Design/

Witness/Type of Exhibit:

Cost of Service Meisenheimer/Direct

Sponsoring Party:

Public Counsel

Case No.:

WR-2007-0216

#### **DIRECT TESTIMONY**

#### OF

#### BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

Missouri-American Water Company
Case No. WR-2007-0216

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

01 1112 5	TATE OF MISSOURI
In the Matter of Missouri-American Water Company's request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Water Service provided in Missouri Service Areas	) ) ) WR-2007-0216 )
AFFIDAVIT OF BA	RBARA A. MEISENHEIMER
STATE OF MISSOURI ) COUNTY OF COLE )	SS
Barbara A. Meisenheimer, of lawful age and	being first duly sworn, deposes and states:
	heimer. I am the Chief Utility Economist for the Office
2. Attached hereto and made a par	t hereof for all purposes is my direct testimony.

I hereby swear and affirm that my statements contained in the attached testimony are

Barbara A. Meisenheimer

Kendelle R. Stratton, Notary Public

Subscribed and sworn to me this 12th day of June 2007.

KENDELLE R. STRATTON My Commission Expires February 4, 2011 Cole County

true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

My commission expires February 4, 2011.

3.

### OF

#### BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

#### MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

#### **CASE NO. WR-2007-0216**

O. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS ADDRES	Ο.	P	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 Instructor for William Woods University.

#### Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT BACKGROUND.

A. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics from the University of Missouri-Columbia (UMC) and have completed the comprehensive exams for a Ph.D. in Economics from the same institution. My two fields of study were Quantitative Economics and Industrial Organization. My outside field of study was Statistics. I have taught Economics courses for the following institutions: University of Missouri-Columbia, William Woods University, and Lincoln University. I have taught courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

#### Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?

A. Yes, I have testified on numerous issues before the Missouri Public Service Commission. (PSC or Commission)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

A.

Cost of Service (CCOS) studies and to present Public Counsel's position on how

The purpose of my testimony is to present Public Counsel's preliminary Class

the results of these studies should affect rate design.

#### I. RATE DESIGN

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

A. A CCOS study provides the Commission with a general guide as to the just and reasonable rate for the provision of service that corresponds to costs. In addition, other factors are also relevant considerations when determining the appropriate rate for a service including the value of a service, affordability, rate impact, and rate continuity, etc. The determination as to the manner in which the results of a cost of service study and all the other factors are balanced in setting rates can only be determined on a case-by-case basis.

- Q. HOW DOES PUBLIC COUNSEL ACCOMMODATE OTHER FACTORS SUCH AS AFFORDABILITY, RATE IMPACT, AND RATE CONTINUITY IN THE RATE DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS THAT IT MAKES TO THE COMMISSION?
- A. Generally, Public Counsel has recommended that the Commission adopt a rate design that balances movement toward cost of service with rate impact and affordability considerations. To reach this balance, OPC believes that in cases where the existing revenue structure within a district departures greatly from the class cost of service, the Commission should impose, at a maximum, class revenue shifts within the district equal to one half of the revenue neutral shifts

- 2 -

indicated by Public Counsel's class cost of service study. In addition, if the Commission determines that an increase in district revenue requirement is necessary, then no customer class within the district should receive a net decrease as the combined result of: (1) the revenue neutral shift that is applied to that class, and (2) the share of the total revenue increase that is applied to that class. If the Commission determines that a decrease in district revenue requirement is necessary, then no customer class within the district should receive a net increase as the combined result of: (1) the revenue neutral shift that is applied to that class, and (2) the share of the total revenue decrease that is applied to that class.

With respect to shifts between districts, the Commission decided in its Report and Order in WR-2000-281 to move away from single tariff pricing (a single company-wide tariff that would apply to each class) and toward district specific pricing. The Commission approved additional movement toward cost in WR-2003-0500. I believe that the Commissions decision has merit from both an economic and public policy perspective. Moving rates closer to cost reduces market distortions that might otherwise arise. However, while the Commission appeared to want to move toward district specific pricing, it did not mandate that district specific cost be achieved in all cases or within a specific timeframe. This flexability allows for deviation from strict district specific pricing when reasonably necessary based on consideration of all relevant factors.

#### Q. HAVE YOU PERFORMED A CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY FOR THIS CASE?

A. Yes. I performed a cost of service study.

#### Q. WHAT IS THE RESULT OF PUBLIC COUNSEL'S CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY?

A. Schedule BAM 1-1 through 1-9 illustrate the preliminary results of my studies. It appears that the district costs shifts and intra-district class shifts that occurred following the last rate case have brought classes closer to cost. While the Commission might decide it is appropriate to focus on aligning certain classes in certain districts, I do not believe a comprehensive adjustment is necessary in this case. For example, my studies indicate that for most districts, the Residential Class is reasonably close to its cost of service. This is also generally true for the business classes in many districts. An exception is that there appears to be significant variation in the business classes in the St. Louis District, based on my participation in the last case, I believe the differences arise primarily from incorrectly matching class costs with class revenues.

#### II. COST OF SERVICE STUDY

#### Q. WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY STEPS IN PERFORMING A COS STUDY?

A. There are three primary steps in performing a class cost of service study. These steps are functionalization, classification, and allocation of costs. Functionalization of costs means categorizing accounts by the type of function with which an account is associated. These functional categories include Source of Supply, Pumping, Water Treatment, Transmission and Distribution, Customer Accounts, and Administrative and General.

Costs are classified in a manner that allows them to be allocated based on the water industry's commonly used "Base-Extra Capacity Method." Under this method, depending on the classification with which the accounts are most closely

- 4

that are related to the number of customers (customer costs), costs that are related to the total quantity of water used (base costs), costs that are related to various peak water usage such as peak day usage (extra capacity costs), and costs that are related to fire-protection water usage (fire costs). For example, the cost of a meter is generally considered a customer-related cost because the cost is incurred in direct relationship to the number of customers. An example of base-related costs is the chemicals cost. The amount of chemicals used in water treatment is directly related to the total quantity of water used. Many plant accounts are partially base load related and partially peak usage related since the plant included in many accounts is sized to meet the needs of both annual water consumption and peak water usage requirements.

associated, costs of service are separated into four primary classes of costs: costs

Allocation factors are then developed to distribute a reasonable share of costs to each customer class. These allocation factors are ratios that reflect the proportion of total units (total number of customers, total annual throughput, etc.) attributable to a certain customer class. Applying these ratios to the appropriate cost categories produces an estimated cost for which each class is responsible.

#### Q. FOR WHICH DISTRICTS DID YOU PERFORM A CCOS?

A. I prepared a CCOS Study for each water district except Warren County Water.

The CCOS Study Results are attached as Schedule BAM 1-1 to BAM 1-9.

- 5 -

#### Q. WHAT CUSTOMER CLASSES DID YOU USE?

3

2

A.

A.

For most of the Districts, consistent with the CCOS studies performed in the last case, I used a Residential Class, Commercial Class, an Industrial Class, an Other Public Authority Class a Resale Class and a Private Fire Class.

4

#### Q. WHAT DATA IS USED AS THE BASIS FOR YOUR COS STUDY?

6

5

Data used for this study includes MAWC workpapers filed in support of its direct case, MAWC responses to Staff's data requests, Staff Accounting data and

7

materials from the OPC studies performed in the past 3 rate cases.

#### Q. HOW DID YOU DEVELOP THE ALLOCATORS?

9

A. The allocators were developed in order to reflect the differences in costs of

11

furnishing service to the different classes. Customer-related allocators were developed using various weights to reflect the fact that there are generally greater

12

costs associated with serving a bigger customer than a smaller customer. The

13 14

base-related allocator was developed using the base amount of water used by each

15

class. The allocator for the fire districts was based on the number of hydrants or

16

fire taps in each of the public and private fire districts.

17

#### Q. DID YOU USE AN ECONOMIES OF SCALE FACTOR TO ALLOCATE MAINS COST?

18 19 A. No. Although I did rely on base use, daily use and peak use from previous OPC studies, in developing the allocation factors, I did not use the square root factor

that produced the economies of scale effect.

20

- 6 -

A.

Q. WHAT WAS YOUR PRIMARY INTEREST IN PERFORMING THE STUDIES?

3

4

2

readjustment so soon after the past rate case and in light of the significant class

shifts that occurred as the result of that case.

6 7

5

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU ALLOCATED VARIOUS PLANT ACCOUNTS.

A. Investment in source of supply was allocated based on annual water consumption by rate class. This recognizes the fact that such facilities are sized to meet the

annual supply requirement in total, whether or not variations in daily needs are

My primary interest was to evaluate if costs differ sufficiently to warrant a

experienced.

Pumping facilities and water treatment plant were allocated based on the capacity

allocators.

Distribution reservoir and standpipes serve principally to assist in meeting the peak requirements of the system and to provide some element of system reliability. These items were allocated based on regular system load and peak load, with a greater weight given to the peak load. Fire mains and hydrants were allocated directly to private and public fire protection services. Meters were allocated based on a weighted number of meters. The weights were chosen recognizing that bigger customers generally use larger size meters, and that it generally costs more to buy and install a larger size meter. Other transmission

General plant includes office buildings, furniture and equipment, vehicles, and other related items. General plant was allocated to all customer classes based on

and distribution plant accounts were allocated utilizing the capacity allocator.

7

the overall allocation resulting from the allocation of all other non-general plant facilities.

#### Q. HOW WERE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES ALLOCATED?

A. Source of supply, pumping, water treatment, and transmission and distribution expenses were allocated using the "expenses follow plant" principle for most accounts in this category. "Expenses follow plant" basically means that for any expense related to a particular rate base component, the expense should be allocated in the same manner as the rate base account. For accounts 602, 623, and 641, the base allocator was used because the costs in these accounts tend to vary with the total amount of water consumed.

### Q. ARE THERE OTHER OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES TO WHICH THE "EXPENSES FOLLOW PLANT" PRINCIPLE DOES NOT APPLY?

A. Yes. Customer account expenses were allocated based on the weighted number of meters and the number of customers in each class.

Property insurance expenses were allocated based on the resulting allocation of total plant since this expense is linked to the amount of plant that the Company requires in order to serve each customer class.

Injuries and damages and employee pensions and benefits are payrollrelated expenses so they were allocated on the basis of the amount of labor expense that I had previously allocated to each class.

2

1

3

4

56

7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

The remaining administrative and general expenses accounts represent expenditures that support the Company's overall operation, so they were allocated on the basis of each customer class' share of total cost of service.

#### Q. HOW DID YOU ALLOCATE TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME TAXES?

A. Property taxes were allocated on the basis of the amount of total plant that I had previously allocated to each class. Other taxes in this category were allocated on the basis of the amount of total cost of service.

#### Q. HOW DID YOU ALLOCATE STATE AND FEDERAL INCOME TAXES?

A. These taxes were allocated on the basis of rate base since a utility company's income taxes are a function of the size of its rate base and associated earnings. Thus a class should contribute revenues for income taxes in accordance with the proportion of rate base that is necessary to serve it.

#### Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE TRADITIONAL WATER COST ALLOCATION METHOD.

A. Traditionally for water utilities, the allocation of the mains cost has been accomplished through a method called the base-extra capacity method. In the base-extra capacity method, costs of service are usually separated into different categories that are associated with different functions of a water company's system. This method attempts to recognize the fact that a water system must satisfy multiple functions such as providing its customers annual water usage, meeting customers' rate of use requirements and ensuring the need for public fire protection. Specifically, the base-extra capacity method separates costs of service

- 9 -

into four primary cost components: (1) base costs, (2) extra capacity costs, (3) customer costs, (4) direct fire-protection costs.

### Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE FOUR COMPONENTS OF THE BASE-EXTRA CAPACITY METHOD.

A. Base costs are costs that tend to vary with the total quantity of water used, plus those operation-and-maintenance expenses and capital costs associated with service to customers under average load conditions, without the elements of cost incurred to meet water use variations and resulting peaks in demand. In other words, these costs are costs that would be incurred in supplying water at a perfect load factor (that is, at a continuous, uniform rate), excluding costs incurred in providing extra plant capacity for variation in the rate of use beyond a uniform usage rate. The resulting distribution of cost responsibility for base costs is simply a function of the volume of water used by each class.

The base-extra capacity method defines extra capacity costs as the costs associated with meeting rate of use requirements in excess of average and include operation-and-maintenance expenses and capital costs for system capacity beyond that required for average rate of use. In other words, extra capacity costs for maximum-day and maximum-hour service are incurred in providing facilities to furnish water at varying rates above the average.

According to the base-extra capacity method, customer costs comprise those costs associated with serving customers, irrespective of the amount or rate of water use. Direct fire-protection costs are those costs that are applicable solely to the fire-protection function.

A:

When applying the base-extra capacity method, some of the costs can be easily determined and directly assigned to a single function. For example, the cost of fire hydrants can be determined to be 100% fire-protection costs. Also, chemical costs tend to vary directly with total water usage and can be assigned directly to the base cost component. Most costs of a water company's system, however, can not be easily separated into the four categories, because the same facility may satisfy multiple functions at the same time. Transmission and distribution mains costs are a primary example of costs that can't be directly assigned.

### Q. HOW IS THE BASE-EXTRA CAPACITY METHOD APPLIED TO MAINS COST ALLOCATION?

The first step of the base-extra capacity method is to separate costs into the four primary cost components that are discussed above. Traditionally, mains costs are allocated to base and maximum-hour extra capacity cost components in recognition of the fact that mains provide annual water usage as well as maximum-hour service to all customers. Selection of the appropriate factors for allocating costs between base and extra capacity varies from analyst to analyst and involves some judgement. Because mains cost is a joint cost, there is no clear separation between these two cost categories. One method of determining cost responsibility is to utilize the system capacity factor. Capacity factor is defined as the average load in a particular period as a ratio or percentage of the maximum capacity. The capacity factor is one indication of how the system load is spread and whether there is a great difference between the average demand on the system and the demand at peak. A small capacity factor indicates a small average usage relative to the maximum demand and thus less cost should be allocated to the base

7

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

cost component and more cost should be allocated to the extra capacity cost component.

#### Q. ACCORDING TO THE BASE-EXTRA CAPACITY METHOD, WHAT IS THE SECOND STEP OF ALLOCATING MAINS COST?

A. The second step of the base-extra capacity method is to distribute costs among customer classes. Class cost responsibilities are determined based on different usage characteristics or proportions of total system usage for each cost component. Generally, the base cost component is distributed to different classes based on each class's share of the total water usage. The extra-capacity cost component is distributed to each class based on peaking requirements on the system.

#### Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

## Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

## **Brunswick District**

51 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue 52 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	48 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 49 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	44 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 45 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR 46 Revenue Increase Decrease % of Current Revenue 47	41 Class COS with Equalized ROR 42 Class COS Percentage 43	38 Current Revenue 39 Class Percentage 40	34 Class COS Percentage 35 36		29 Staff Midpoint ROR	26 Class COS with Equalized ROR 27 Class COS Percentage	24 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR	22 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR) 23	19 Spread public fire rate base to others 20 TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	17 TOTAL Rate Base	15 Net OPERATING INCOME	12 TOTAL Current Revenues 13 Current Revenue Percentage 14	9 Current Revenue 10 Rate Revenue 11 Other Revenue		6 Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others		<ul><li>2 Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp</li><li>3 Current Income Taxes</li></ul>	1 O & M Expenses	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:
						25					15				25		12	ı			
133,872 100.00%	(0) 0.00%	(235,880) (0) 0.00%	529,023 100.00%	133,872 100.00%	100.00% <b>549,116</b>	99,606 213,630	6.40%	529,023 100.00%	(235,880)	-15.16%	88,108 1,556,347	1,556,347	(235,880)	133,872 100.00%	133,662 210	369,752	909	369,752	80,606 (159,271)	448,417	TOTAL
71,159 53.15%	(28,824) -28.83%	(129,407) (57,649) -57.66%	244,438 46.21%	99,983 74.69%	332,614 48.70% 232,631	54,645 106,227	6.40%	244,438 46.21%	(129,407)	-8.40%	72,106 853,835	781,729	(71,759)	99,983 74.69%	99,879 104	171,742	744	170,998	40,203 (79,999)	210,795	RESIDENTIAL
20,648 15.42%	(4,192) -16.88%	(29,899) (8,384) -33.75%	64,110 12.12%	24,839 18.55%	63,878 12.57% 61,039	12,626 26,898	6.40%	64,110 12.12%	(29,899)	-10.91%	14,460 197,275	182,816	(21,515)	24,839 18.55%	24,813 26	46,355	149	46,206	9,569 (18,709)	55,345	COMMERCIAL
525 0.39%	2 0.34%	(559) 4 0.69%	1,787 0.34%	524 0.39%	1,302 0.28% 1,378	236 580	6.40%	1,787 0.34%	(559)	-15.25%	386 3.687	3,301	(562)	524 0.39%	523 1	1,086	4	1,082	179 (338)	1,241	INDUSTRIAL
3,523 2.63%	(163) -4.41%	(3,599) (325) -8.83%	8,725 1.65%	3,686 2.75%	1.79% 1.79% 8,519	1,520 3,725	6.40%	8,725 1.65%	(3.599)	-13.79%	1,157 23,749	22,592	(3,274)	3,686 2.75%	3,682 4	6,960	12	6,948	1,205 (2,312)	8,055	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY
36,230 27.06%	36,155 48383.30%	(70,120) 72,310 96766.60%	214,815 40.61%	75 0.06%	247,113 36.18% 247,040	29,610 75,001	6.40%	214,815 40.61%	(70,120)	-30.79%	0 462,652	462,652	(142,430)	75 0.06%	1 74	142,504	0	142,504	24,717 (47,346)	165,134	SALES FOR RESALE
1,787 1.33%	(2,978) -62.50%	(2,296) (5,956) -124,99%	(4,851) -0.92%	4,765 3.56%	0.48% (1.491)	970 1,200	6.40%	(4,851) -0.92%	(2,296)	24.16%	0 15,149	15,149	3,660	4,765 3.56%	4,764 1	1,105	0	1,105	698 (1,550)	1,957	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE
											(88,108)	88,108	0	0.00%	0	1	•	909	4,036 (9,017)	5,890	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE

Schedule BAM DIR 1-1

## Office Of Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

## Jefferson City District

	,,,	4 4 4 4 4	41 40	37 38	35 35 36	კ <u>ა</u> გ	29	26	23	21 22	19	17 17	15 14	12	10	× 100	4	u r	<b>,</b> –		
50 51 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue 52 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	<ul> <li>47</li> <li>48 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift</li> <li>49 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage</li> </ul>	43 44 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 45 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR 46 Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	0 1 Class COS with Equalized ROR 2 Class COS Percentage	7 8 Current Revenue 9 Class Percentage	•	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR Thie-un plus add!! taxes	Staff Midpoint ROR	Plus Current 1 axes Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage		Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)	Spread public fire rate base to others TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	TOTAL Rate Base	NET OPERATING INCOME	TOTAL Current Revenues Current Revenue Percentage	Current Revenue Rate Revenue Other Bevenue	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	Depreciation Expenses For	O & M Expenses  Doministical Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:	T. M City Dietrict
						25					15				25	15		1		,	
4,151,299 100.00%	(0) 0.00%	346,590 (0) 0.00%	3,818,370 100.00%	4,151,299 100.00%	5,069,544 100.00% 918,245	788,924 475,911	6.40%	3,818,370 100.00%	346,590 13,661	2.81%	821,061 12,326,935	12,326,935	346,590	4,151,299 100.00%	4,123,965 27,334	113,397 3,804,709	3,804,709	(13,661)	3,018,341 800,029	TOTAL	
% %	%9	%90	% )	, -			•			Ţ				ļ						RES	
2,145,607 51.69%	(92,359) 4.13%	158,773 (184,718) -8.25%	1,709,757 44.78%	2,237,966 53.91%	2,499,329 49.30% 261,363	361,407 243,447	6.40%	1,709,757 44.78%	158,773 0	6.08%	5,646,985	5,646,985	343,491	2,237,966 53.91%	2,223,984 13,982	1,894,475	1,894,473	(6,258)	1,529,778 370,955	RESIDENTIAL	
% 7	%3	83 -	•	<b>•</b> `																СОМ	
1,460,970 35.19%	236,333 19.30%	156,577 472,666 38.60%	2,026,618 53.08%	1,224,637 29.50%	41.08% 857,972	356,407 185,476	6.40%	2,026,618 53.08%	156,577 13,227	-5.68%	5,568,864	4,773,912	(316,089)	1,224,637 29.50%	1,213,984 10,653	1,540,726	1,400,000	(5,291)	305,795	COMMERCIAL	
% 0	% 3	% 5 7	%~	<b>6</b>	•		•	•		•										IND	
219.074 5.28%	10,097 4.83%	19,874 20,195 9.66%	229,600 6.01%	208,976 5.03%	5.55% 72,583	45,238 27,024	6.40%	229,600 6.01%	19,874 109	-0.05%	706,843	700,315	(321)	208,976 5.03%	207,424 1,552	209,297	1000	208, 395	44,771		
% +-	• •	•	•`	•	·															OTHEI	
254,163 6.12%	(111,316) -30.46%	7,322 (222,631) -60.91%	(86,780) -2.27%	365,479 8.80%	3.33% (196,726)	16,561	6.40%	(86,780) -2.27%	7,322 326	88.30%	260,415	19 582	229,953	8.80%	364,528 951	135,526	2	132,821	17,526	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	
•																				SALE RES	
0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	· 0 '	6.40%	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	0 '	c	0.00%		,	<b>-</b>	,	000	i	
• -	•`	•	•	·																PRIVA SEI	
/1,485 1.72%	(42,756) -37.43%	4,044 (85,511) -74.85%	(00,820) -1.59%	114,240 2.75%	0.74% (76,947)	3,403 37,293	9.705	-1.59%	4,044	62.26%	143,829	0	89,555	2.75%	114,045 195	24,685	o	24,685	9,388	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	
% 0	. *3		o^ C	•	2 0	ı														PUBL SER	
									0		,	(821,061)	821.061	0.00%	000	,	(113,397)	113,397	51,593 (910)	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE 62,714	

## Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

### Joplin District

50 S1 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue S2 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	4/ 48 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 49 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	43 44 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 45 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR 46 Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	40 41 Class COS with Equalized ROR 42 Class COS Percentage	38 Current Revenue 39 Class Percentage	<ul> <li>33 Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR</li> <li>34 Class COS Percentage</li> <li>35</li> </ul>	31 Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR 32 True-up plus add'l taxes 25	29 Staff Midpoint ROR 30		24 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 25 Plus Current Taxes 15	21 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR) 23	19 Spread public fire rate base to others 20 TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	TOTAL Rate Base	15 NET OPERATING INCOME	12 TOTAL Current Revenues 13 Current Revenue Percentage	9 Current Revenue 10 Rate Revenue 11 Other Revenue 25	6 Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others 7 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread 8	4 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes 5	<ol> <li>O &amp; M Expenses</li> <li>Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp</li> <li>Taxes</li> </ol>	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:
7.8. 11		38	7,79 10	7,84 10	10,01 10 2,22	2,		7,79 10				w	38	7,84 10	7,		7,46	5,52 2,26 (33	TOTAL
7.841.670 100.00%	5 0.00%	380,341 10 0.00%	7,793,884 100.00%	7,841,675 100.00%	10,016,177 100.00% 2,222,293	2,167,944 386,899	6.40%	7,793,884 100.00%	<b>380,341</b> 332,540	1.12%	2,534,213 33,874,132	33,874,132	380,341	7,841,675 100.00%	7,598.527 243,148	331.022 7,461,334	7,461,334	5,526,037 2,267,837 (332,540)	1
3,957,671 50.47%	(88,301) -2.18%	193,183 (176,603) -4.36%	3,784,489 48.56%	4,045,973 51.60%	4,961,507 49,53% 1,177,017	1,101,146 184,174	6.40%	3,784,489 48.56%	193,183 284,905	2.15%	2,171,197 17,205,403	15,034,206	369,786	4,045,973 51.60%	3,930,228 115,745	283,604 3,676,187	3,392,582	2,467,007 1,073,165 (147,590)	RESIDENTIAL
1,662,864 21.21%	(89,378) -5.10%	75,092 (178,756) -10.20%	1,363,801 17.50%	1,752,242 22.35%	2,005,312 20.02% 641,512	428,026 78,892	6.40%	1,363,801 17.50%	75,092 44,163	3.80%	6,687,904	6,351,351	253,848	1,752,242 22.35%	1,702,662 49,580	43,961 1,498,394	1,454,433	1,100,940 415,844 (62,351)	COMMERCIAL
1,535,886 19.59%	119,987 8,47%	75,162 239,974 16.95%	1,821,983 23.38%	1,415,898 18.06%	2,094,673 20.91% 272,689	428,423 85,539	6.40%	1,821,983 23.38%	75,162 1,298	-2.46%	6,694,103	6,684,207	(164,812)	1,415,898 18.06%	1,362,141 53,757	1,293	1,579,418	1,223,179 421,858 (65,618)	INDUSTRIAL
195,779 2.50%	408 0.21%	8,250 816 0.42%	190,927 2.45%	195,371 2.49%	244,986 2.45% 54,059	47,025 10,023	6.40%	190,927 2.45%	8,250 2,174	1.01%	734,773	718,207	7,434	195,371 2.49%	189,072 6,299	2,164 187,937	185,773	146,354 46,470 (7,051)	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY
351,296 4.48%	132,222 60.36%	23,574 264,445 120,71%	724.389 9.29%	219,074 2.79%	6.18% (105,070)	25,000	6.40%	724,389 9.29%	23,574	-11.47%	2,099,603	2.099.603	(240,870)	2.79%	203,363 15,711	459,944	459,944	349,523 131,033 (20,612)	SALES FOR RESALE
138,173 1.76%	(74,933) -35.16%	5,079 (149,866) -70.32%	(91,705) -1.18%	213,106 2.72%	0.90% 182,087	3,270	6.40%	(917/05) -1.18%	5,079	34.25%	452,346	452,346	154,945	2.72%	211,051 2,055	58,161	58,161	33,752 28,849 (4,441)	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE
											(2,334,213)	2.534,213	10	0.00%	00	(331,022)	331,022	205,282 150,618 (24,878)	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE

# Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

### Mexico District

51 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue 52 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	48 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 49 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	<ul> <li>44 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR</li> <li>45 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR</li> <li>46 Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue</li> </ul>	41 Class COS with Equalized ROR 42 Class COS Percentage 43	38 Current Revenue 39 Class Percentage 40	35 36 36 37	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR	31 Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR 32 True-up plus add'l taxes 25	29 Staff Midpoint ROR 30	26 Class COS with Equalized ROR 27 Class COS Percentage 28		<ul><li>22 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)</li><li>23</li></ul>	TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	17 TOTAL Rate Base 18 19 Spread public fire rate base to others		12 IOTAL Current Revenues 13 Current Revenue Percentage 14	Current	o spread public fire expenses & taxes to others TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread 8	The state of the s	2 Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp 3 Taxes 4 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:
2,584,290 100.00%	0.00%	506,673 0 0.00%	1,987,059 100.00%	2,584,290 100.00%	1,443,370	3,430,429	<b>808,569</b> 544,243	6.40%	1,987.059 100.00%	<b>506,673</b> (90,558)	4.01%	12,633,884	12,633,884	506,673	2,584,290 100.00%	2,535,447 48,843	2,077,617	2,077,017	1,434,079 552,980 90,558	TOTAL
1,272,755 49.25%	26,701 2.14%	262,926 53,401 4.29%	1,010,378 50.85%	1,246,055 48.22%	50.14% 709,562	1,719,941	419,587 263,824	6.40%	1,010,378 50.85%	262,926 (79,553)	3.20%	6,556,044	5,979,111	209,524	1,246,055 48.22%	1,222,378 23,677	81,279 1,036,530	999,291	267,006 42,857	RESIDENTIAL
347.926 13.46%	245 0.07%	67,239 491 0.14%	272,637 13.72%	347,680 13.45%	13.48% 189,909	462,546	107,303 74,311	6.40%	272,637 13.72%	67,239 (8,785)	3.98%	1,676,615	1,612,902	66,749	347,680 13.45%	341.011 6,669	8,976 280,932	2/1,930	70,013 11,561	COMMERCIAL
371,645 14.38%	(10,225) -2.68%	68,376 (20,450) -5.36%	272,184 13.70%	381,869 14.78%	14.05% 209,628	481,812	109,117 79,651	6.40%	272,184 13.70%	68,376 (410)	5.21%	1,704,952	1,701,976	88,825	381,869 14.78%	374,721 7,148	419 293,044	292,023	207,606 72,819 12,200	INDUSTRIAL
205.716 7.96%	6,876 3.46%	37,793 13,751 6.92%	186.741 9.40%	198,840 7.69%	8.21% 94,782	281,522	60,311 46,413	6.40%	186,741 9.40%	37,793 (1,809)	2.55%	942,358	929,237	24,042	198,840 7.69%	194,675 4,165	1,849 174,799	1/2,950	126,167 40,122 6,661	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY
330,662 12.80%	9,828 3.06%	65,459 19,656 6.13%	294,688 14.83%	320,835 12.41%	13.25% 159,958	454,646	104,461 75 153	6.40%	294,688 14.83%	65,459 0	2.81%	1,632,207	1,632,207	45,803	320,835 12.41%	314,090 6,745	275,032	275,032	194,041 69,291 11,699	SALES FOR RESALE
55,586 2.15%	(33,425) -37.55%	4,881 (66,849) -75.10%	(49,568) -2.49%	89,011 3.44%	0.87% 79,530	29,962	7,789 4 800	6.40%	(49,568) -2.49%	4,881 0	58.94%	121,708	121,708	71,730	89,011 3,44%	88,572 439	17,281	17,281	10,922 5,487 872	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE
												(656,743)	656,743	0	0.00%	0 0	(92,523)	92,523	59,574 28,242 4,707	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE

# Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

### Parkville District

51 52	48 50	4444	43 44	38 39	32 34 35 36	29 30	24 25 26 27 28	22 23	19 20 21	15 16 17	9 110 112 113	8 7 6	5432-	
Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Current Revenue Class Percentage	True-up plus add'l taxes Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR Class COS Percentage	Staff Midpoint ROR  Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Plus Current Taxes Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)	Spread public fire rate base to others TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	NET OPERATING INCOME (305,465) 35,615 TOTAL Rate Base	Current Revenue Rate Revenue Other Revenue TOTAL Current Revenues Current Revenue Percentage	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread	O & M Expenses Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp Taxes TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:
					25		15		15		25 _	15 I	ı	<b>!</b>
3,199,666 100.00%	12 0.00%	812,136 25 0.00%	2,387,567 100.00%	3,199,678 100.00%	746,530 3,913,359 100.00% 1,525,792	6.40% 779.787	812,136 (271,698) 2,387,567 100.00%	6.67%	1,163,432 12,176,352	812,136 12,176,352	3,161,898 37,780 3,199,678 100.00%	167,764 2,387,542	1,232,581 883,263 271,698 2,387,542	TOTAL
2,225,751 69.56%	(69,884) -3.04%	537,563 (139,769) -6.09%	1,478,535 61.93%	2,295,636 71.75%	487,890 2,622,013 67.00% 1,143,478	6.40% \$15.820	537,563 1,478,535 61.93%	8.40%	1,072,165 8,059,683	677,332 6,987,519	2,270,945 24,691 2,295,636 71.75%	154,603 1,618,304	803,310 504,474 155,917 1,463,701	RESIDENTIAL
602,133 18.82%	15,973 2.73%	167,016 31,946 5.45%	483,036 20.23%	586,161 18.32%	152,064 763,415 19.51% 280,379	6.40%	167,016 483,036 20.23%	5.39%	74,213 2,504,070	135,070 2,429,857	578,465 7,696 586,161 18.32%	10,701 451,090	200,902 185,268 54,219 440,389	COMMERCIAL
19,415 0.61%	(2,169) -10.05%	3,768 (4,339) -20.10%	9,138 0.38%	21,584 0.67%	4,209 21,301 0.54% 12,163	6.40%	3,768 9,138 0.38%	14.35%	2,766 56,496	8,107 53,730	21,371 213 21,584 0.67%	399 13,477	8,015 3,865 1,199 13,078	INDUSTRIAL
73,329 2.29%	24,934 51.52%	22,544 49,869 103.05%	125,587 5.26%	48,394 1.51%	24,057 121,408 3.10% (4,179)	6.40%	22,544 125,587 5.26%	-8.08%	14,289 338,005	(27,324) 323,716	47,177 1,217 48,394 1.51%	2,060 75,719	43,489 22,946 7,223 73,658	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY
215,221 6.73%	52,509 32.27%	68,474 105,019 64.54%	304,275 12.74%	162,712 5.09%	67,596 332,557 8.50% 28,282	6.40%	68,474 304,275 12.74%	-3.56%	1,026,631	(36,545) 1,026,631	159,291 3,421 162,712 5.09%	0 199,257	105,359 70,990 22,908 199,257	SALES FOR RESALE
63,816 1.99%⊜c	(21,350) -25.07%	12,770 (42,700) -50.14%	(13,005) -0.54%	85,166 2.66%	10,715 52,664 1.35% 65,669	6.40%	12,770 (13,005) -0.54%	28.97%	0 191,467	55,471 191,467	84,624 542 85,166 2.66%	29,695	11,065 14,358 4,272 29,695	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE
3,816 1.99% Schedule BAM 1-5									(1,163,432)	25 1,163,432	25 0 25 0.00%	(167,764)	60,442 81,362 25,960 167,764	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE

## Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

## St Charles District

	48 49 50	44 45 47			33 33 33	31 32	29 30	26 27 28	24 25	22 23	19 20 21	17	16 IS :	13 17	10	× 7 0	t 12 1	<b>.</b> ω	2	
Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Current Revenue Class Percentage	Class COS Percentage	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR True-up plus add'l taxes	Staff Midpoint ROR 163	Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Plus Current Taxes	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR) 163	Spread public fire rate base to others TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		NET OPERATING INCOME (2.225.813) 35.615	OTAL Current Revenues Current Revenue Percentage	Current Kevenue Rate Revenue Other Revenue	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread	Corrod mubilis for superises and taxes	Taxes	O & M Expenses Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:
						25		ı	35		15 _				25 _	5	• 1	1		
9,440,462 100.00%	0.00%	2,732,484 0 0.00%	6,707,978 100.00%	9,440,462 100.00%	10,337,574 100.00% 3,629,596	<b>2,481,619</b> 1,147,977	6.40%	6,707,978 100.00%	2,732,484 (1.073,713)	7.05%	4,855,476 38,775,303	38,775,303	2,732,484	9,440,462 100.00%	9,148,141 292,321	6,707,978	6,707,978	1,073,713	3,632,934 2,001,331	TOTAL
8,243,735 87.32%	92,985 1.14%	2,403,950 185,971 2.28%	6,118,741 91.22%	8,150,750 86.34%	9,118,630 88.21% 2,999,889	2,183,247 1,002,612	6.40%	6,118,741 91.22%	2,403,950	6.50%	4,688,720 34,113,241	29,424,522	2,217,979	8,150,750 86.34%	7,895,445 255,305	5,932,771	5,295,373	814,784	2,945,554 1,535,034	RESIDENTIAL
915,963 9.70%	(63,466) -6.48%	253,049 (126,931) -12.96%	472,517 7.04%	979,428 10.37%	940,788 9.10% 468,271	229,817 111,523	6.40%	472,517 7.04%	253,049	10.58%	155,419 3,590,893	3,435,475	379,980	979,428 10.37%	951,030 28,398	599,448	578,320	95,131	319,685 163.504	COMMERCIAL
2,797 0.03%	267 10.53%	851 533 21.07%	2,746 0.04%	2,531 0.03%	3,392 0.03% 647	773 407	6.40%	2,746 0.04%	851	2.63%	349 12,078	11,729	318	2,531 0.03%	2,427 104	2,213	2,165	325	1,293 548	INDUSTRIAL
148,722 1.58%	(21,527) -12.64%	35,087 (43,054) -25.29%	49,054 0.73%	170,249 1.80%	140,969 1.36% 91,915	31,866 16,995	6.40%	49,054 0.73%	35,087	15.69%	10,989 497,905	486,916	78,141	170,249 1.80%	165,921 4,328	1,494 92,108	90,614	13,483	54,137 22 994	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY
0.00%	0	,	0.00%	0 0.00%	0.00%	ı	6.40%	0.00%	ı			•	0		0		0	0	<b>&gt; 0</b>	SALES FOR RESALE
129,245 1.37% sch	(8,259) -6.01%	39,547 (16,519) -12.01%	64,920 0.97%	137,504 1.46%	133,795 1.29% 68,875	35,916 16,440	6.40%	64,920 0.97%	39,547	9.99%	561,186	561,186	56,065	137,504 1.46%	133,318 4,186	81,439	81,439	15,540	37,506 28,393	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE
45 7% Schedule BAM 1-6											(4,855,476)	4,855,476	0	0.00%	0	(660,067)	660,067	134,451	274,758	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE

# Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

St Joseph District

51 52	48 49 50	44 45 46	41 42 43	38 39 40	34 35 36 37	31 32	29 30	26 27 28	24 25	22 23	19 20 21	17 18	15 16	14	17 10 9	8 7 6	4 2	. w ~ =	
Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Current Revenue Class Percentage	Class COS Percentage	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR True-up plus add'I taxes	Staff Midpoint ROR	Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Plus Current Taxes	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)	Spread public fire rate base to others TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		NET OPERATING INCOME (2,807,994) 35,615	Current Revenue Percentage	Current	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	O & M Expenses  Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp  Taxes	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:
						25		1	15		15_				25 _	15			
15,434,971 100.00%	0.00%	3,314,665 1 0.00%	12,120,307 100.00%	15,434,971 100.00%	19,116,611 100.00% 6,996,304	5,136,004 1,860,301	6.40%	12,120,307 100.00%	3,314,665 (433,466)	4.13%	4,026,108 80,250,069	80,250,069	3,314,665	15,434,971	15,142,852 292,119	460,540 12,120,306	12,120,306	7,789,711 3,897,129 433,466	TOTAL
7,560,892 48.99%	(151,527) -1.96%	1,538,741 (303,055) -3,93%	5,567,569 45.94%	7,712,420 49.97%	9,115,913 47.69% 3,548,343	2,384,247 861,042	6.40%	5,567,569 45.94%	1,538,741	4.94%	3,584,507 37,253,857	33,669,350	1,841,795	7,712,420 49.97%	7,577,212 135,208	410,026 5,870,624	5,460,598	3,595,398 1,683,337 181,863	RESIDENTIAL
2,865,288 18.56%	36,394 1.29%	632,249 72,788 2.57%	2,342,221 19.32%	2,828,894 18.33%	3,605,746 18.86% 1,263,525	979,657 356,656	6.40%	2,342,221 19.32%	632,249	3.65%	398,862 15,307,141	14,908,280	559,461	2,828,894 18.33%	2,772,889 56,005	45,625 2,269,433	2,223,808	1,430,546 712,735 80,526	COMMERCIAL
2,374,088 15.38%	117,273 5.20%	554,474 234,546 10.39%	2,171,434 17.92%	2,256,815 14.62%	3,108,509 16.26% 937,076	859,145 312,477	6.40%	2,171,434 17.92%	554,474	2.38%	18,171 13,424,146	13,405,975	319,927	2,256,815 14.62%	2,207,747 49,068	2,079 1,936,887	1,934,809	1,229,834 632,563 72,412	INDUSTRIAL
630,342 4.08%	34,206 5.74%	140,019 68,413 11.48%	592,942 4.89%	596,135 3.86%	824,479 4.31% 231,537	216,957 82,993	6.40%	592,942 4.89%	140,019	2.11%	24,569 3,389,954	3,365,385	71,606	596,135 3.86%	583,103 13,032	2,810 524,529	521,718	343,620 159,920 18 178	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY
1,870,821 12.12%	6,589 0.35%	425,078 13,179 0.71%	1,465,512 12.09%	1,864,232 12.08%	2,346,730 12.28% 881,218	658,649 235,748	6.40%	1,465,512 12.09%	425,078	4.00%	10,291,393	10,291,393	411,899	1,864,232 12.08%	1,827,213 37,019	0 1,452,333	1,452,333	912,544 484,200 55,588	SALES FOR RESALE
133,539 0.87%	(42,935) -24.33%	24,104 (85,871) -48.66%	(19,371) -0.16%	176,475 1.14%	115,234 0.60% 134,605	37,349 11.385	6.40%	(19,371) -0.16%	24,104	18.84%	0 583,578	583,578	109,975	176,475 1.14%	174,687 1,788	66,500	66,500	34,806 28,541	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE
											(4,026,108)	4,026,108	-	0.00%	o <b>–</b>	(460,540)	460,540	242,962 195,831	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE

## Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary WR-2003-0500

## St. Louis District

51 52	49 49	4 2 4 4 4	42 41	38 39	35 36 37	34 34	31	29 30	26 27 28	24 25	22 23	20	18	16	13 14	110 9	× 7 6	4 2	3 2 1	
Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Current Revenue Class Percentage		Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR Class COS Percentage	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR True-up plus add'l taxes 25	Staff Midpoint ROR	Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Plus Current Taxes 15	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)	Spread public fire rate base to others  TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		NET OPERATING INCOME	OTAL Current Revenues Current Revenue Percentage	Current Revenue Rate Revenue Other Revenue 25	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to 15	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	O & M Expenses Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp Taxes	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:
121,420,229 100.00%	0.00%	25,555,382 0 0.00%	95,86 <b>4,</b> 847 100.00%	121,420,229 100.00%	33,062,348	128,927,195 100.00%	23,083,498 9,978,850	6.40%	95,864,847 100.00%	25,555,382 (8,167,020 <u>)</u>	7.09%	360,679,658	360,679,658	25,555,382	121,420,229 100.00%	113,812,590 7,607,639	95,864,847	95,864,847	63,871,328 23,826,499 8,167,020	TOTAL
89,520,443 73.73%	5,919,169 7.08%	19,533,336 11,838,339 14.16%	87,744,615 91.53%	83,601,273 68.85%	13,649,890	101,394,505 78.64%	17,643,944 7,844,285	6.40%	87,744,615 91.53%	19,533,336	2.79%	275,686,623	275,686,623	7,694,997	83,601,273 68.85%	98,414,824 77,620,976 5,980,297	75,906,276	75,906,276	51,388,870 18,274,919 6,242,487	RESIDENTIAL
13,955,511 11.49%	(9,607,274) -40.77%	827,587 (19,214,548) -81.55%	(15,693,898) -16.37%	23,562,785 19.41%	20,319,601	4,625,703 3.59%	747,537 357,516	6.40%	(15,693,898) -16.37%	827,587	171.59%	11,680,265	11,680,265	20,042,135	23,562,785 19.41%	2,158,918 23,290,224 272,561	3,520,650	3,520,650	2,467,572 788,598 264,481	COMMERCIAL
10,268,587 8.46%	3,205,578 45.39%	2,836,866 6,411,156 90.77%	17,048,454 17.78%	7,063,009 5.82%	(2,741,837)	14,306,616 11.10%	2,562,466 1,106,852	6.40%	17,048,454 17.78%	2,836,866	-8.93%	40,038,533	40,038,533	(3,574,289)	7,063,009 5.82%	8,245,315 6,219,171 843,838	10,637,298	10,637,298	7,131,868 2,598,821 906,609	INDUSTRIAL
682,235 0.56%	(68,224) -9.09%	142,192 (136,448) -18.18%	335,370 0.35%	750,459 0.62%	315,362	650,732 0.50%	128,439 50,475	6.40%	335,370 0.35%	142,192	13.88%	2,006,854	2,006,854	278,641	750,459 0.62%	1,212,727 711,978 38,481	471,818	471,818	305,349 121,027 45,442	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY
6,993,454 5.76%	550,751 8.55%	2,215,401 1,101,502 17,10%	6,430,306 6.71%	6,442,703 5.31%	1,519,333	7,949,639	2,001,113 619,722	6.40%	6,430,306 6.71%	2,215,401	3.56%	31,267,384	31,267,384	1,113,898	6,442,703 5.31%	5,928,672 5,970,241 472,462	5,328,804	5,328,804	2,577,670 2,043,134 708,000	SALES FOR RESALE

## Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Warrensburg District

COMMINATION CANADA TERRATE TO THE COMMINATION OF TH	Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue  2,567.304  1,4  1,00.00%	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 0 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage 0.00%	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR  Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR  Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue  0.00%	Class COS with Equalized ROR 1,972,476 1,1 Class COS Percentage 100.00%	Current Revenue       2.567,304       1,3         Class Percentage       100.00%	1,220,6//	•	3,193,153	/ith Recommended ROR 55,467	Staff Midpoint ROR 6.40%	1,972,476 1, 1ge 100.00%		50,4 60,6	5.80%	Spread public fire rate base to others         15         977.390         86           TOTAL Rate Base after Spread         10,257,301         6.00	10,600,000	10.257.301	NET ODED ATING INCOME 594,828 28	11 Revenues ————————————————————————————————————	Rate Revenue 2,493,343 1,75	2 402 542	1,972,476	15 142,609		ciation Expenses I OII Def Tax Exp 577,500	1,214,741 579 500	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY: TOTAL RESIDENTIAL
	1,433,843 466,427 55.85% 18.17%	34,026 (49,161) 2.43% -9.53%	348,250       94,000         68,052       (98,321)         4.86%       -19,07%	1,187,672 224,945 60.21% 11.40%	1,399,817 515,588 54,52% 20.08%	624,089 277,010	•		384,337 103,741 307,804 94,956	6.40% 6.40%	1.187,672 224,945 60.21% 11.40%			4.67% 11.86%	6,005,267 1,620,949	-	5 143.710 1.528.158	280,197 192,321	1,399,817 515,588 54.52% 20.08%		1 350 577 503.174	(4)	125,708 13,539	993,912 309,728		599,882 198,403 304,651 84,771	COMMERCIAL
	67.537 347.948 2.63% 13.55%	8,679 3,201 14.74% 0.93%	17.065 74.817 17.357 6,401 29.49% 1.86%	76,508 282,733 3.88% 14.33%	58,858 344,747 2.29% 13.43%		3.01% 13.83% 19.539 158.882	4	18,833 82.569 18,063 82,714	6.40% 6.40%	3.88% 14.33%		17.065 74.817	-0.10% 5.30%	294,273 1,290,147		292,263 1,269,115	(292) 68,415	58,858 344,747 2.29% 13.43%		56,497 333,934	59,150 276,332		58,857 273,263		37,864 182,185 15,915 69,025	OTHER AUTH
	948 204,432 55% 7.96%	3,201 20,697 0.93% 11.26%	4,817 52,704 6,401 41,394 1.86% 22.53%				3% 8.90% 82 70,383	28		0% 6.40%	_ !		17 52,704	)% 1.24%	908,8	0	5 908,833	5 11,310	% 7.16%		4 176,726	2 172,425		3 172,425		_	RESALE
S.	47,117 1.84%	(17,441) -27.02%	7,993 (34,883) -54.03%	(13,201) -0.67%	64,558 2.51%		50,766	3 ,366	8,821 7,062	6.40%	-0.67%	(13,201)	7,993	31.11%	137,832	0	137,832	42,876	2.51%	923	63,635	21,682	0	21,082	2,395	7,233	
schedule BAM															ı	(977,390)	977,390	0	0.00%	0	0		(142,609)	142,009	16,984	49,533	SERVICE 76.092