Exhibit No.:

Issue(s): District Cost of Service/
Class Cost of Service/

Rate Design

Witness/Type of Exhibit: Meisenheimer/Rebuttal Sponsoring Party: Public Counsel

Case No.: WR-2007-0216

REBUTTAL 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

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)
	RBARA A. MEISENHEIMER
STATE OF MISSOURI) COUNTY OF COLE)	SS
Barbara A. Meisenheimer, of lawful age and	d being first duly sworn, deposes and states:
1. My name is Barbara A. Meiser of the Public Counsel.	hheimer. I am the Chief Utility Economist for the Office
2. Attached hereto and made a pa	rt hereof for all purposes is my rebuttal testimony.
3. I hereby swear and affirm that true and correct to the best of n	my statements contained in the attached testimony are my knowledge and belief.
	Barbara A. Meisenheimer
Subscribed and sworn to me this 13th day of the NOTARY My Commission Expires NOTARY MY Commission Expires February 4, 2011 Cole County Commission #07004782 My commission expires February 4, 2011.	Kendelle R. Stratton, Notary Public

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

CASE NO. WR-2007-0216

- Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
- A. Barbara Meisenheimer, Chief Economist, Office of the Public Counsel, P. O. Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
- Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED PREVIOUSLY IN THIS CASE?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- A. Yes, I submitted direct testimony on the issues of district rate design for the Missouri American Water Company (MAWC or the Company) on June 12, 2007.
- Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
- A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is: (1) to update Office of the Public Counsel (OPC or Public Counsel)'s rate design recommendation based on the revised and updated Class Cost of Service (CCOS) studies prepared by Public Counsel and the Public Service Commission Staff (Staff); and (2) to respond to certain rate design proposals made by the Company, Michael Gorman on behalf of Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers (MIEC) and Donald Johnstone on behalf of the City of Parkville and AG Processing, Inc.

17

15

I. Updated Rate Design

- Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF YOUR UPDATE TO THE RATE DESIGN RECOMMENDATION.
- A. The OPC CCOS study that was filed in the direct testimony was based on Company and Staff provided accounting data, demand data and billing determinants. After the filing of OPC's direct testimony, updated information I have revised OPC's CCOS study with the updated became available. information.
- Q. HOW HAVE THE RESULTS OF YOUR STUDIES CHANGED SINCE DIRECT **TESTIMONY?**
- A. In most cases, the changes to the OPC studies caused only minimal change in the class cost allocation percentages and my rate design recommendation. I have adjusted St. Louis County costs and revenues to reflect rate groups "A and Others", J&D, B, Private Fire and Public Fire. A summary of OPC's CCOS study results and the workpapers for individual districts are provided in Schedule BAM REB-1 through Schedule BAM REB-9. I also need to clarify that I did not prepare a CCOS for the Warren County Water because the district has such a small number of customers, only two rate groups and uniform rates.

II. Responses to other parties

Q. PLEASE COMPARE THE RESULTS OF THE CCOS STUDIES FILED BY OPC, THE STAFF.

A. Table R1 summarizes the Staff and Public Counsel CCOS and Current Revenue Percentages by customer class.

- 3 -

Table R1 - Class Cost Of Service and Revenue Percentage

Ta	able R1 - Cl	ass Cost Of S	Service and R	evenue Perc	entage		
		RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE
Brunswick	OPC Cost OPC Revenue	43.29% 55.08%	11.67% 13.52%	0.18% 0.29%	2.37% 1.99%	42.48% 29.13%	NA NA
District	Staff Cost Staff Revenue	76.80% 75.10%	19.40% 18.70%	0.20% 0.40%	2.10% 2.30%	0.00% 0.00%	1.50% 3.60%
Jefferson City	OPC Cost OPC Revenue	50.74% 55.75%	28.97% 29.88%	6.11% 5.06%	14.19% 9.31%	0.00% 0.00%	NA NA
District	Staff Cost Staff Revenue	53.50% 54.80%	25.70% 29.90%	4.10% 5.70%	15.60% 6.70%	0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	1.00% 3.00%
	OPC Cost	48.43%	17.72%	26.98%	2.27%	4.60%	NA
Joplin District	OPC Revenue Staff Cost	54.01% 49.50%	22.67% 22.30%	18.11% 20.10%	2.50% 2.50%	2.71% 3.90%	NA 1.50%
	Staff Revenue	54.10%	23.40%	17.10%	2.60%	2.80%	0.00%
Mexico	OPC Cost OPC Revenue	44.26% 51.20%	14.25% 13.78%	15.45% 14.82%	9.56% 7.77%	16.48% 12.44%	NA NA
District	Staff Cost Staff Revenue	50.30% 47.50%	13.60% 13.30%	14.20% 15.50%	7.80% 7.60%	13.00% 12.10%	1.20% 4.00%
Parkville	OPC Cost OPC Revenue	48.70% 73.04%	38.42% 19.70%	0.93% 0.68%	1.66% 1.50%	10.29% 5.07%	NA NA
District	Staff Cost Staff Revenue	72.60% 73.50%	17.40% 18.80%	0.60% 0.70%	1.30% 1.50%	6.60% 5.20%	1.50%
	OPC Cost	93.61%	5.61%	0.01%	0.77%	0.00%	NA
St Charles District	OPC Revenue Staff Cost	87.77% 88.20%	10.40% 8.90%	0.03% 0.00%	1.81% 1.40%	0.00% 0.00%	NA 1.60%
	Staff Revenue	86.70%	10.40%	0.00%	1.40%	0.00%	1.50%
St Joseph	OPC Cost OPC Revenue	43.35% 50.97%	15.33% 18.40%	21.58% 14.66%	4.06% 3.86%	15.68% 12.11%	NA NA
District	Staff Cost Staff Revenue	50.90% 49.80%	16.60% 18.20%	14.40% 14.10%	3.80% 3.90%	13.30% 12.70%	1.00% 1.30%
Warrensburg	OPC Cost OPC Revenue	60.60% 56.89%	10.69% 20.22%	3.87% 2.30%	13.99% 13.43%	10.84% 7.16%	NA NA
District	Staff Cost Staff Revenue	61.00% 54.70%	16.90% 20.30%	2.00% 2.30%	12.00% 13.00%	6.80% 7.10%	1.30% 2.70%
	OPC Cost	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Warren County Water	OPC Revenue Staff Cost	NA 61.00% 54.70%	NA 16.90% 20.30%	NA 2.00% 2.30%	NA 12.00% 13.00%	NA 6.80% 7.10%	NA 1.30% 2.70%
	Staff Revenue	34.70% RATE A, K, H	RATE J&D	RATE B	RATE F&E	7.10%	2.70%
St. Louis	OPC Cost OPC Revenue	82.26% 89.79%	17.10% 9.32%	0.64% 0.89%	0.00% 0.00%		
District	Staff Cost Staff Revenue	88.40% 89.90%	8.60% 7.30%	2.50% 1.70%	0.40% 1.10%		

2

Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON THE CCOS RESULTS.

A. The Public Counsel and Staff CCOS studies indicate that the Residential Class revenue percentage is close to cost of service percentage for almost all districts. While the other classes tend to show greater differences between revenue and cost percentage, I hesitate to rely to heavily on the results for these other classes due in part to greater sensitivity to small changes in allocations that they tend to exhibit and due to lingering questions related to the quality of data available.

Q. BASED ON THE CCOS RESULTS DO YOU RECOMMEND SIGNIFICANT SHIFTS IN CLASS REVENUE RESPONSIBILITY?

A. No. Since the Residential Class appears to be fairly well aligned with cost of service I do not recommend significant changes in this case. While Public Counsel may agree to limited adjustments based on other parties' rebuttal testimony, we can support equal percentage class revenue adjustments within each district as a reasonable outcome in this case.

Q. ARE THERE STILL UNRESOLVED ISSUES WITH YOUR CCOS STUDIES?

A. Yes. Although Public Counsel is not proposing to use the CCOS study results in setting specific rates, the studies are helpful as a guide. I anticipate making additional adjustments as better information is available or as corrections are needed.

13

18

Q. YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY INDICATED THAT PUBLIC COUNSEL GENERALLY SUPPORTS DISTRICT SPECIFIC PRICING. ARE THER EXCEPTIONS IN THIS CASE?

A. Customers in the Brunswick and Warren County Water Districts may experience rates that more than double if full movement to district cost of service were ordered in this case. In Case WR-2003-0500 (prior to the acquisition of Warren County Water) Staff proposed that to make meaningful movement toward cost of service for the Brunswick district, the customer charge and commodity charges for Brunswick should be set at the level of the related rate in the next highest district. I believe that a similar proposal should be implemented in this case because such a proposal for Brunswick and Warren County would help to mitigate potentially detrimental rate shock while reducing the subsidy burden of other districts. I recommend that the subsidy needed to cover Brunswick's undercollection be collected in St. Louis rates and that the subsidy needed to cover St. Charles under-collection be collected in St. Charles rates. Schedule BAM REB-2 illustrates my proposal for each district based on the Staff's updated revenue requirement.

Q. HOW DO YOU RECOMMEND THAT CLASS RATES BE SET?

A. Generally, I believe it would be reasonable to increase the customer charge and volumetric rate elements by an equal percent. There is a proposal to develop uniform rates for the classes in the St. Joseph district which I address later in this testimony.

A.

Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THE DISTRICT REVENUE ADJUSTMENTS AND CLASS RATE
DESIGN YOU HAVE DESCRIBED ABOVE IS PREFERABLE TO THE THOSE
ADVOCATED BY OTHER PARTIES?

Yes. The Company proposes to adjust the revenue requirement of all districts by an equal percent. This proposal does not reflect cost causation and makes no meaningful movement toward district cost of service. The Company's districts are not interconnected and in many cases have significant differences in the type of plant and the cost of plant used to provide service. It is reasonable that to the extent possible, while mitigating potential rate shock, districts should pay the district cost of service.

With respect to class rate design, the Staff appears to propose to take all classes to the level of cost recovery suggested by the Staff CCOS studies for each district. I am concerned that a number of considerations make equal percentage changes in class rates preferable. These considerations include the proximity of the Residental revenue percentage to the Residental cost percentages, the quality of information that both the Staff and Public Counsel relied on in order to perform CCOS studies and the potentially significant overall increase that may be approved in this case.

- Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON THE CONSOLIDATED BILLING PROPOSAL DESCRIBED ON PAGE 4 OF MR. GORMAN'S DIRECT TESTIMONY.
- A. MIEC does not state the number of customers that would qualify for consolidated billing or the class revenue impacts of such a proposal. Since the proposal would allow qualified customers to aggregate volumetric use from multiple meters for

billing purposes, I expect that the impact would be to shift billing units from the higher cost lower block levels into lower cost higher block levels resulting in bill reductions for those customers. Without evidence of corresponding cost savings to support the bill reductions, the Company will likely look to other customers to assume greater cost responsibility. At this time, Public Counsel opposes the proposal unless it can be designed and implemented in a manner that avoids shifts in cost recovery between classes.

- Q. PLEASE COMMENT ON THE UNIFORM BLOCK RATE PROPOSAL DESCRIBED ON PAGE S 4-7 OF MR. JOHNSTONE'S DIRECT TESTIMONY.
- A. In general, Public Counsel does not oppose designing uniform block rates across customer classes. Currently, the Parkville and Warren County Water Districts have uniform rates for all classes and the Jefferson City District has uniform rates for all classes except the interruptible classes.

I do not agree entirely with the method of developing uniform rates that Mr. Johnstone proposes because his method of developing rates for the highest two blocks shifts the proportion of revenue collected between blocks creating significant benefits for large use customers at the expense of smaller customers. Instead, to accomplish a uniform block rate design that also maintains the proportion of revenue collected from each block, I would propose to simply divide the combined revenue from all classes use in a block by the combined use from all classes in the block. This averaging within a block is the same method Mr. Johnstone used to calculate a uniform rate for the first two blocks and will produce uniformity in the higher blocks without adversely shifting revenue responsibility between blocks. Schedule BAM REB-3 illustrates my proposal.

PLEASE COMMENT ON THE STRAIGHT FIXED VARIABLE RATE DESIGN DISCUSSION Q. INCLUDED ON PAGE 7 OF MR. JOHNSTONE'S DIRECT TESTIMONY.

A. Public Counsel opposes implementing a straight fixed variable (SFV) rate design for many reasons.

First, Public Counsel strongly opposed the Commission's decision to implement a SFV rate design for the Atmos and MGE gas distribution rates based on evidence that a SFV rate design was not representative of cost causation. Application of a SFV method in designing water rates is likewise inappropriate based on cost causation for distribution plant and introduces the additional complexity of how to handle water production costs and treatment costs. Mr. Johnstone offers no recommendations on these issues.

Second, as was true for Atmos, MAWC has many districts and implementing a SFV rate design will likely have tremendously differing impacts on customers within each district. Mr. Johnstone has not attempted to quantify these impacts on a revenue neutral basis let alone in conjunction with the substantial increases in total revenue requirement proposed for the districts.

Third, in the Atmos and MGE cases, the Commission conditioned approval of the SFV rate design on implementation of efficiency initiatives. Mr. Johnstone offers no such recommendations in this case.

WR-2007-0216 Rebuttal Testimony of Barbara A. Meisenheimer

10

11

decisions, the parties to both the AmerenUE Gas and Laclede Gas Stipulations agreed to more traditional rate designs. While the parties committed to a more traditional rate design solely for purpose of settling those cases, it does demonstrate that a more traditional rate design can be considered a reasonable outcome. Public Counsel urges the Commission to reject extending the SFV rate design beyond the cases in which it has already approved such a rate design and before being presented with reasonable justification for applying the SFV rate design to water rates.

Finally, it is important to note that following the Atmos and MGE

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

Table of Contents

I.	UPDATED RATE DESIGN	2
II.	RESPONSES TO OTHER PARTIES	3

Rebuttal Testimony Barbara Meisenheimer WR-2007-0216

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Brunswick District

CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:	TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE
O & M Expenses Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp	448,417	224.549	54,189 9,298	869	8.960	149,814	1.210	8,826
Current Income Taxes	(159,271)		(18.080)	(233)	(2.519)	(41.979)	(1.486)	(12,168)
TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	369,752	183,639	45,407	092	7.765	129,941	345	1.896
Spread of fire expenses & taxes to others	2,241	1.858	321	10	29	24	(345)	(1.896)
TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread	369,752	185,496	45,728	692	7,794	129.965	ı	,
Current Revenue								
	188.514	628'66	24.813	523	3.682	54.853	4.764	0
Other Revenue 25	210	111	26	0 9	4 ;	89	0	0
	4.764	3.950	682	20	19	51	(4.764)	0
OTAL Current Revenues Current Revenue Percentage	188.724 100.00%	103,940 55.08%	25.521 13.52%	544 0.29%	3.747 1.99%	54.9/2 29.13%	0 4.764	0.00%
Nel OPERATING INCOME	(181.028)	(81.556)	(20,207)	(226)	(4.047)	(74.993)	0	0
TOTAL Rate Base	1,556,347	809,146	176,672	2.278	24,616	410.205	14.524	118,905
Spread of fire rate base to others	133,430	110,625	19,099	570	1,710	1,425	(14.524)	(118.905)
TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	1.556,347	919,771	195,770	2.848	26.327	411,630	1	1
Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)	-11.63%	-8.87%	-10.32%	-7.92%	-15.37%	-18.22%		
Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR	(181.028)	(106,984)	(22.771)	(331)	(3,062)	(47.879)		
Class COS with Equalized ROR	369,752	160.068	43.163	664	8,779	157,079		
Class COS Percentage	100.00%	43.29%	11.67%	0.18%	7.3/%	42.48%		
Staff Midpoint ROR	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%		
ith Recommended ROR	909.66	58.865	12,529	182	1.685	26,344		
Frue-up plus add'l taxes	213,630	113,444	26.568	427	4,211	68.980		
Class COS with Stall Recommended ROR Class COS Percentage	100.00%	52.39%	12.42%	0.20%	2.00%	32.99%		
	494,264	253,865	59,304	835	9,942	170,317		
Current Revenue	188 774	103 940	1555	544	3 747	54 977		
Class Percentage	100.00%		13.52%	0.29%	1.99%	29.13%		
Class COS with Equalized ROR	369,752		43,163	664	8.779	157.079		
Class COS Percentage	100.00%	43.29%	11.67%	0.18%	2.37%	42.48%		
Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR	(181.028)	(106,984)	(22,771)	(331)	(3.062)	(47.879) 27.114		
Revenue Increase Decrease % of Current Revenue	0.00%		1	-19.42%	26.27%	49.32%		
1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift Revenue Increase Decrease Percentage	0.00%	(12.714)	(1.282)	(53)	49 <u>2</u> 13.14%	13,557 24.66%		
Revenue Neutral Margin Revenuc Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	188,724 100.00%	91.226 48.34%	24.239 12.84%	491 0.26%	4.239 2.25%	68.529 36.31%		

Schedule BAM REB 1-1

Office Of Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Jefferson City District

CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL.	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE
O & M Expenses		3.018.341	1.555.570	869.227	168,610	339,478	0	21,109	64,347
Depreciation Expenses I OI I Def Tax Exp		800.029	382,063	73.950)	42.777	80,635	o c	12,355	52,468
TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	1	3.804.709	1.931,158	1.095.008	210,663	418,749	,	33.244	115.887
Spread of fire expenses & taxes to others	15	149,131	99,499	23,827	1,139	24.665	0	(33,244)	(115,887)
IOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread		3,804,709	2.0.50,658	1.118.855	211,802	44,5,414		•	,
Current Revenue		270 000	200 500 5		200	003.676	<	214 045	c
Kate Kevenue	3.0	4,123,963	7,723,984	1,213,984	474707	504,528		114,043	
Other Revenue Carand of fire revenue to others	G Z	114 309	14,280	0.142	873	680.8 80.8 81	00	1114 309)	
Spread of the revenue to omers TOTAL Current Revenues	1	4.151.299	2.314.530	1.240.389	209.857	386.523	0	0	0
Current Revenue Percentage		%00:001	55.75%	29.88%	5.06%	9.31%	0.00%	114.309	0.00%
NET OPERATING INCOME		346.590	283.872	121.554	(1.945)	(56,891)	0	0	0
TOTAL Rate Basc		12,326,935	5,841,894	3,564,600	653,679	1,231,286	ı	198.325	837.151
Spread of fire rate base to others	15	1.035.476	690.862	165,443	7.909	171,261	0	(198,325)	(837.151)
TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		12.326,935	6,532,757	3,730,043	661.588	1,402,547	. 1		1
Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		2.81%	4.35%	3.26%	-0.29%	4.06%	0.00%		
Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		346,590	183,678	104,876	18.602	39,435	•		
Class COS with Equalized ROR		3.804.709	1,930,463	1,102,157	232,349	539.740	- 6		
Class COS Percentage		100.00%	50.74%	0//6.87	6.11%	14.19%	0.00%		
Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%		
Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		788,924	418.096	238.723	42,342	89.763			
True-up plus add"l taxes	25	475.911	248.623	141.751	27,159	53,777	0		
Class COS Percentage		100.00%	53.21% 382.847	29.57% 258.920	5.55%	11.58% 200,431	0.00%		
Current Revenue Class Percentage		4,151,299	2,314,530 55.75%	1.240.389	209,857 5.06%	386.523 9.31%	0.00%		
Class COS with Equalized ROR Class COS Percentage		3,804.709 100.00%	1,930,463 50.74%	1,102,157 28.97%	232,349 6.11%	539.740 14.19%	0.00%		
Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		346,590 (0) 0.00%	183.678 (100.194) -4.33%	104,876 (16,678) -1.34%	18.602 20.547 9.79%	39,435 96,326 24,92%	0.00%		
1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		(0) 0.00%	(50,097) -2.16%	(8.339)	10.273	48.163 12.46%	0.00%		
Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue Reconnnended Class Revenue Percentage		4,151,299	2,264,433 54,55%	1.232.050	220,130 5.30%	434,686 10.47%	0.00%		

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Joplin District

CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE
	İ								
		5.526.037	2.534.870	1,109.672	1,297,093	139,403	205.965	33.752	205.282
		2.267,837	1.100.371	419.304	447,822	43,870	77,003	28.849	150.618
laxes		(332,540)	(151.904)	(62.898)	(0/9,69)	(0,642)	(12.107)	(4,441)	(74.8/8)
4 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes		7,461,334	3,483,336	1.466.077	1.675.245	176,632	270,861	58.161	351.022
6 Spread of fire expenses & taxes to others	15	389.183	339,409	46.035	1,316	2.324	100	(58.161)	(331.022)
7 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread s	j	7,461,334	3.822.746	1,512,112	1.676.561	178,956	270,960	1	,
Current		1000	00000	C77 COL 1	17.676	100.042	696 606	130 110	9
10 rate revenue	25	243.148	118.854	49.979	57.022	5.987	9.251	2.055	0
Spread o	15	213,106	185.851	25.207	720	1,273	55	(213.106)	(10)
13 TOTAL Current Revenues 14 Current Revenue Percentage		7,841.675	4,234,934	1,777,848	1,419,883	196.331	212,669	213.106	0.00%
TIME OF		100 141	413 100	761 376	(027 730)	716 11	(106 95)	¢	c
16 NEI OPERATING INCOME 17		380,341	417,188	702,730	(220.678)	0/5"/1	(167.80)	n	0
18 TOTAL Rate Base		33,874,132	15.473.703	6,407,143	7.096.887	676,537	1.233,303	452.346	2.534,213
19 20 Spread of fire rate base to others	15	2,986.558	2,604,599	353,266	10.095	17.834	764	(452,346)	(2.534.213)
TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		33.874.132	18.078.302	6,760,409	7,106,983	694.371	1.234.067	ı	,
23 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		1.12%	2.28%	3.93%	-3.61%	2.50%	-4.72%		
25 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		380,341	202.984	75.906	79,798	7.796	13.856		
20 Class COS with Equalized ROR		7,461,344	3.613.542	1,322,282	2.013.036	169,377	343.108		
		100.00%	48.43%	17.72%	26.98%		4.60%		
2.9 30 Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%		
_		2,167,944	1.157,011	432,666	454.847	44,440	78,980		
	25	386.899	189.122	79,527	90.733	9,526	14,721		
34 Class COS with Staff Recommended KOK 35 Class COS Percentage		10,016,1//	51.65.879	2024,303	22.19%	2.33%	3.64%		
36		2,554.833	1.555.337	702,023	209,105	63,545	21,553		
38		7 841 675	A 22.4 02.4	972 648	1 410 993	106 331	717 660		
		100.00%	54.01%	22.67%	18.11%	2.50%	2.71%		
42 Class COS with Equalized ROR 43 Class COS Percentage		7.461.344	3.613.542 48.43 %	1,322,282	2,013,036 26.98 %	169.377	343.108 4.60%		
		6			() () () () () () () () () ()	i	6		
45 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR46 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR		380,341	202.984 (209.204)	75,906 (189,830)	336,475	7,796 (9,579)	13.856 72.148		
47 Revenue Increase Decrease % of Current Revenue		0.00%	-4.94%		23.70%		33.92%		
49 1.2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 50 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		5 0.00%	(104,602)	(94.915)	168.238	(4,790)	36.074 16.96%		
51 52 - Revenus Neutral Marcin Revenue		7 841 670	4 130 332	1 682 933	1 588 121	191 542	248.743		
53 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%			20.25%		3.17%		

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Mexico District

CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:	TOTAL		RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE
		04.040	670 807	007 201	270 666	109 001	050 000	10.022	P 20 574
1 O & M Expenses	14.	1.4.44.079	260,400	196./88	76 367	129.691	209.070	10,922	29,5/4
2 Depreciation Expenses FOLL Det Tax Exp	66	00.550	40.200	055.27	13.134	41,401	12 622	7,40/	247.07 7 TOT V
laxes		70,338	40.388	11,936	15,134	0.0/0	12,022	2/0	4,707
4 IOIAL Expenses and Taxes	7.07	7.07/.617	897,766	781.080	514.574	0/67/1	730.477	17.281	97.525
6 Spread of fire expenses & taxes to others	15 10	109,804	96.832	10.095	563	2.165	148	(17,281)	(92,523)
		2.077.617	994,599	291.175	315,137	180.135	296.570	i	i
8 9 Current Revenue									
10 Rate Revenue		2,535,447	1.222.378	341.011	374.721	194,675	314.090	88.572	0 (
	25 4	18.843	22.264	6.894	7.686	4,289	0/7/	439	~
12 Spread of fire revenue to others	c	89,011	1 273 128	95,000	43/	017.000	321 480	(110,26)	
13 1OTAL Current Revenues 14 Current Revenue Percentage	SC'7	584.290 100.00%	51.20%	13.78%	14.82%	7.77%	12.44%	89.011	0.00%
16 NET OPERATING INCOME 25 615	30	506,673	328,539	64,913	67.727	20,583	24,910	0	0
	12,63	12,633,884	5.634,550	1,668,024	1.832.317	959,627	1,760,915	121.708	656.743
19 20 Spread of fire rate base to others	15 77	778,450	686.489	17.571	3,993	15,349	1,048	(121.708)	(656.743)
21 TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	12.63	12,633,884	6,321,039	1.739,595	1.836.310	974.976	1,761,963	ř	ı
23 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		4.01%	5.20%	3.73%	3.69%	2.11%	1.41%		
24 25 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR)K	506,673	253,501	69.765	73.644	39.101	70,662		
20 27 Class COS with Equalized ROR	2.07	2.077.617	095,919	296.027	321.055	198,653	342,322		
)[100.00%	44.26%	14.25%	15.45%	6.56%	16.48%		
29 30 Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%		
31 Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR	∞	808,569	404,546	111.334	117.524	62,398	112,766		
	25 54	544,243	248.086	76,813	85,649	47,790	81.013		
	3.43	3,430,429	1.647.231	479.322	518,310	290,324	490,349		
33 Class CO5 rerentage 36 37	1,35	1,352,812	46.02 /# 727.671	183,295	197.256		148.027		
						:			
39 Current Revenue 40 Class Percentage	2,58	2,584,290 100.00%	1,323,138 51.20%	356.089 13.78%	382.864 14.82%	200.719 7.77%	321.480 12.44%		
41 Class COS with Equalized ROR 43 Class COS Percentage	2.07	2.077.617	919.560	296.027 14.25 %	321.055 15.45 %	198.653	342,322 16.48%		
 45 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 46 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR 	5(506,673 0	253,501 (75,039)	69,765	73,644 5,917	39,101	70,662 45,752		
		%00.0	-5.67%	1.36%	1.55%		14.23%		
49 1.2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 50 Revenue Increase Decrentage		0.00%	(37.519)	2,426 0.68%	2,959	9,259 4,61%	22.876 7.12%		
52 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue53 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	2.58	2.584,290 100.00%	1,285,619 49,75%	358,515 13.87%	385.823 14.93%	209,978 8.13%	344.356 13.32%		

Rebuttal Testimony Barbara Meisenheimer WR-2007-0216

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Parkville District

																														1-5	
PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE	62.856	86.907	27.662	177.425	(177 475)			25	0 ((57)	0.00%	0	1.239.691	(1.239,691)	ı															Schedule BAM REB 1-5	
PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	11.403	15.140	4.512	31.055	(31 055)	(22002)		84.624	572	(85.196)	85.196	0	202.213	(202.213)																Sch	
SALES FOR RESALE	92.295	61.763	19,943	174.000	5.1	174,125		159,291	3.000	15.531	5.07%	(11.783)	893,747	861	894.608	-1.32%	29.668	245.577 10.29%	6.40%	57.255	290 656	7.43% 45.079		162.342 5.07%	245,577 10.29%	59,668	71,45 <i>2</i> 44.01%	35,726	22.01%	198,068 6.19%	
OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	24.934	10.383	3.162	38.479	498	38.977		47.177	616	204	1.50%	610.6	141,704	3,445	145.149	6.21%	9.681	39,639	6.40%	9,290	60 437	1.54% 20.798		47.996 1.50%	39,639 1.66%	189.6	662 1.38%	331	0.69%	48,327 1.51%	
O INDUSTRIAL	11.361	5 922	1.857	19.140	73	19.213		21.371	317	30	017.17	2.505	83,231	505	83.735	2.99%	5.585	22.294 0.93%	6.40%	5.359	30.839	0.79% 8.546		21.718 0.68%	22.294 0.93%	5.585	5.080 14.18%	1.540	7.09%	23,258 0.73%	
COMMERCIAL	257.441	216 (((66 474	546.783	103 892	650,675		578.465	9.569	42.456	19.70%	(20.185)	2.976.860	718,547	3.695,406	-0.55%	246.476	917.336 38.42%	6.40%	236.506	10.651	27.50% 158.920		630.490 19.70%	917.336 38.42%	246,476	266.661 42.29%	133.330	21.15%	763.820 23.87%	
RESIDENTIAL	060 022	480 232	148 138	1,400,660	103 802	1,504,552		2.270.945	23.707	42.456	73.04%	832.556	6.638.906	718.547	7,357,453	11.32%	490.726	1.162,722 48.70%	6.40%	470.877	7 443 876	62.45% 1.281.154		2.337.108 73.04%	1,162,722 48,70%	490,726	(341.830) -14.63%	(170,915)	-7.31%	2.166.193 67.70%	
TOTAL	132 581	883 763	271 698	2.387.542	208 480	2.387.542		3.161.898	37.780	85.196	3,199,678 100.00%	812.136	12.176.352	1,441,904	12.176.352	6.67%	812.136	2.387.567 100.00%	6.40%	779.287	3 913 359	100.00% 1.525.792		3,199,678 100.00%	2.387.567 100.00%	812,136	0.00%	12	0.00%	3.199.666	
					7	<u>}</u>			25	5.				15	1			1		ć	5										
CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:	O & M Expenses	Demestation Expenses TOIT Def Tay Exp	Tayes	4 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	, postar S	o spical of the expenses at faxes of the Spread	8 9 Current Revenue	10 Rate Revenue		12 Spread of fire revenue to others	13 IOTAL Current Revenues 14 Current Revenue Percentage	NET OPERATING INCOME	17 (305.463) 35.615 18 TOTAL Rate Base	19 20 Spread of fire rate base to others		223 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)	24 25 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR	220 Class COS with Equalized ROR 28 Class COS Percentage	29 30 Staff Midpoint ROR	31 32 Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR	33 True-up plus add'I taxes 34 Class COS with Staff Recommended ROP		37 38	39 Current Revenue 40 Class Percentage	42 Class COS with Equalized ROR 43 Class COS Percentage		46 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR 47 Revenue Increase: Decrease % of Current Revenue		50 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage 51	52 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue53 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	

Rebuttal Testimony Barbara Meisenheimer WR-2007-0216

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

St Charles District

CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE
1 O & M Expenses		3,632,934	2,967.469	297,739	773	54,689	0	37,506	274,758
2 Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp		2,001,331	1,546,858	151,642	295	23,285	0	28,393	250,858
3 Taxes		1.073,713	821.956	87.935	172	13,660	0	15,540	134,451
4 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes		6.707,978	5,336,283	537,316	1,239	91.633	0	81,439	660,067
5 6 Spread of fire expenses & taxes to others	5	741.506	716.061	23.685	36	1.735		(81,439)	(660.067)
		6,707,978	6,052.345	\$61.000	1.265	93,368		•	,
8 9 Current Revenue									
10 Rate Revenue		9,148,141	7,895,445	951,030	2,427	165,921	0	133,318	0
	25	292,321	257,352	26,346	58	4.378		4,186	0
Spreado	5	137,504	132,786	4.392	5	322		(137,504)	0
13 TOTAL Current Revenues 14 Current Revenue Percentage		9,440,463 100.00%	8,285,583 87.77%	981,769 10,40%	2.490 0.03%	170,621 1.81%	0	137.504	0 00:00%
NET OPERATING INCOME		2,732,485	2,233,238	420,768	1,225	77,253	0	0	0
17 (2,225,814) 55,015 18 TOTAL Rate Base		38,775,303	29,683,540	3.175.610	6,197	493.294	•	561.186	4.855,476
19 20 Spread of fire rate base to others	15	5.416,662	5,230,788	173,016	186	12,671		(561.186)	(4.855,476)
		38,775,303	34,914,328	3,348,627	6.384	505,965		•	,
23 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		7.05%	6.40%	12.57%	19.19%	15.27%			
24 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		2,732,485	2,460,403	235.977	450	35.655	•		
		6,707,978	6,279,509	37	489		- 0		
28 Class COS Percentage		100.00%	93.61%	5.61%	0.01%	0.77%	0.00%		
30 Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%		
Net Operating Income with Recommende		2,481,619	2,234.517	214,312	409	32.382	•		
	25	1.147,977	1,010,649	103,465	228	17,195			
34 Class COS with Staff Recommended KUK 35 Class COS Percentage 36		10,337,374 100.00% 3,629,596	9,297,311 89,94% 3,018,001	8.50% 8.50% 802,568	0.02% 1,412	1.38% 1.38% 91,174	0.00%		
37 38									
39 Current Revenue 40 Class Percentage		9,440,463 100.00%	8,285,583 87.77%	981,769 10.40%	2,490 0.03%	170.621	0.00%		
42 Class COS with Equalized ROR 43 Class COS Percentage		6,707,978 100.00%	6,279,509 93.61%	376,209 5.61%	489 0.01%	51,770 0.77%	0.00%		
44 45 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 46 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR 47 Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		2,732,485 0 0.00%	2,460,403 227,165 2.74%	235,977 (184,791) -18.82%	450 (775) -31.14%	35.655 (41,598) -24.38%	ı		
48 49 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 50 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	113,582 1.37%	(92,396) -9.41%	(388) -15.57%	(20,799)	0		
51 52 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue 53 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		9,440,463 100.00%	8,399,165 88.97%	889,373 9,42%	2,102 0.02%	149.822	0.00%	Schedul	Schedule BAM REB 1-6

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

St Joseph District

CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:	ļ	TOTAI.	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE
1 O & M Expenses		7,789,711	3.512.092	1.298.682	1.353.324	315.544	1,032,301	34.806	242.962
2 Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp		3,897,129	1.638.911	642.799	697.686	145.023	548.338	28.541	195.831
3 Taxes		433.466	176,761	72,497	79.883	16.468	65679	3.152	21,747
4 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes		12.120.306	5.327,764	2,013,977	2.130.893	477.035	1.643.598	99.500	460.540
5 6 Spread of fire expenses & taxes to others	15	527.040	471.965	49.278	2.133	3.333	330	(66.500)	(460,540)
		12.120.306	5.799.730	2.063.255	2.133.025	480.368	1.643.928	1	1
9 Current Revenue		C 50 C 1 3 1	010 753 5	099 (77 (747 TOC C	583 103	1 827 213	774 687	-
	35	262-1161	131.819	50.657	54.060	11.893	41.902	1.788	. 0
Spread o	12	176,475	158.034	16.500	714	1.116	111	(176,475)	(1)
13 TOTAL Current Revenues14 Current Revenue Percentage		15,434,972 100.00%	7.867.065 50.97%	2.840.047 18.40%	2.262.521 14.66%	596,112 3.86%	1.869.225	0 176,475	0 00:00%
NET OPERATING INCOME		3.314.666	2.067,335	776.792	129,496	115.744	225.298	0	0
17 (2.807.995) 53.615 18 TOTAL Rate Base		80.250.069	32,724.837	13,421,719	14.789.164	3.048.738	11.655.925	583.578	4,026.108
19 20 Spread of fire rate base to others	15	4.609.686	4,127,984	431.007	18.652	29,153	2.889	(583.578)	(4.026.108)
21 TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		80.250.069	36.852.821	13.852.726	14.807.816	3.077.892	11.658.814	,	
23 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		4.13%	5.61%	5.61%	0.87%	3.76%	1.93%		
25 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		3.314,666	1.522.177	572,176	611.625	127,130	481.558		
20 27 Class COS with Equalized ROR		12.120.307	5.254,571	1.858.640	2.615.154	491,753	1,900.188		
28 Class COS Percentage		100.00%	43.35%	15.33%	21.58%		15.68%		
30 Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%		
		5.136.004	2,358,581	886.574	947,700	196.985	746,164		
	25	1.860.301	839.463	322.599	344,271	75,740	266.843		
34 Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR 35 Class COS Percentage		19,116,611 100.00%	8.997.774 47.07%	3.272.429 17.1 2 %	3,424,996 17.92%	753.093	2.656.955 13.90%		
		6.996.304	3.743.203	1.413.789	809,842	261,340	756.746		
			1	6			6		
39 Current Revenue 40 Class Percentage		15,434,972 100.00%	7.867.065 50.97%	2.840.047 18.40%	2.262.521 14.66%	3.86%	1.869,225		
4.1 Class COS with Equalized ROR 4.3 Class COS Percentage		12.120.307 100.00%	5.254,571 43.35 %	1.858.640 15.33%	2,615.154 21.58%	491,753 4.06%	1,900,188 15.68%		
		3.314,666	1.522.177 (545.159)	\$ (2)	611.625	51	481.558		
47 Revenue Increase Decrease % of Current Revenue48		0.00%	-6.93%	-7.20%	21.31%	1.91%	13.71%		
49 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 50 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	(272.579) -3.46%	(102.308) -3.60%	241.065 10.65%	5.693 0.95%	128.130 6.85%		
52 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue 53 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		15,434.971 100.00%	7.594.485 49.20%	2,737,739 17,74%	2,503,586 16.22%	601,805 3,90%	1,997.356 12.94%		

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

St. Louis District CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:	TOTAL	A and Others	J&D	B&C	Private Fire	Public Fire
1 O & M Expenses 2 Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp	63,871,328 23,826,499	46,117,554 17,709,757	8,252,685 2,958,203	484.730 176.616	542,688 210,363	8,473.672 2,771,560
3 Taxes TOTAL Expenses and Taxes TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	8.167,020 95.864,847	69.882.905	1,022,724	61,110	78.972 832.023	948,620
5 6 Spread of fire expenses & taxes to othe 15 7 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread	13,025,874	12,974,657	24,649	26,568	(832,023)	(12,193,851)
8 8 Current Revenue						
Current Revenue Rate Revenue	119,752,167	100,936,971	11,079,403	1,053,559	711,978	5,970,256
Other Revenue	1,302,091	1,099,765	191,018	11,309	0	0
12 Spread of fire revenue to others 15	6,682,234	6,655,960	12,645	13,629	0 (8/6,117)	(5.970,256)
Curr	100.00%	89.79%	9.32%	0.89%	0.00%	0.00%
15 16 NET OPERATING INCOME	25,189,412	25,835,134	(975,196)	329,473	0	0
17 18 TOTAL Rate Base	360,679,658	267,432,849	45.166,509	2.698,812	3,487,639	41,893,850
20 Spread of fire rate base to others 21 TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	45.381,489	45,203,051	85,876 45,252,385	92,562	(3.487,639)	(41.893.850)
22 Janplicit Rate of Retum (ROR)	6.98%	8.26%	-2.16%	11.80%		
24 25 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR	25.189,412	21.834,096	3,160,369	194,946		
24 Class COS with Equalized ROR 28 Class COS Percentage	95,864,847	78,856,524 82.26%	16,393,826 17.10%	614,497 0.64%		
33 Staff Midpoint ROR	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%		
32 Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR 33 True-up plus addi't taxes 34 Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR 35 Class COS Percentage	23,083,498 9,978,850 128,927,195 100.00%	20.008,698 8,428,278 111,294,538 86,32%	2,896,153 1,463,905 16,618,319	178.648 86,666 1,014,338 0.79%		
	33,062.348	32,438,014	5.44.45.5	198,841		
39 Current Revenue 40 Class Percentage	121,054,259 100.00%	108,692,696 89.79%	11,283,066 9,32%	1.078,497 0.89%		
41 Class COS with Equalized ROR 43 Class COS Percentage	95,864,847 100.00%	78.856,524 82.26%	16,393,826 17.10%	614,497 0.64%		
5 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 46 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR 47 Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	25,189,412 0 0.00%	21,834,096 (4,001,038) -3.68%	3.160,369 4,135,565 36.65%	194,946 (134,527) -12.47%		
49 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift 50 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage	%00°0 0	(2.000,519)	2,067,782 18.33%	(67,264) -6.24%		
52 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue 53 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage	121,054,259 100.00%	106,692,177 88.14%	13,350,848 11.03%	1,011,233		

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Warrensburg District

PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE	76.092	49.533	16.984	142,609	(142,609)	ı		0	0 0	0	0.00%	0	977.390	(977.390)	1																	
PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	12.055	7,233	2,395	21.682	(21.682)	ı		63.635	923	(64.558)	64.558	0	137.832	(137.832)	1																	
SALES FOR RESALE	108,259	48.373	15.792	172.425	О	172.425		176.726	7.009	0 183 735	7.16%	11,310	908.833	0	908.833	1.24%	52,704	213.818	10.84%	6.40%	58.165	53.611	284,201	5.90% 70,383		183,735 7.1 6%	213.818	52,704	22.53%	20.697 11.26%	CCA 433	7:96%
OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	182.185	69.025	22.053	273.263	335	273.598		333.934	10.813	132	13.43%	71.281	1,269,115	2.275	1.271.389	5.61%	73.729	276.046	13.99%	6.40%	81.369	82.714	437.681	13.71%		344.879 13.43%	276.046 13.99%	73.729	0.71%	1,224 0.35%	344 103	346,103 13.48%
INDUSTRIAL	37.864	15.915	5.078	58.857	311	59.168		56.497	2.361	58 981	2.30%	(187)	292.263	2.110	294.373	%90'0-	17.071	76.426	3.87%	6.40%	18.840	18,063	96.071	5.01% 19.644		58,981 2.30%	76.426 3.87%	17.071	29.26%	8.629 14.63%	01212	0/210 2.63%
COMMERCIAL	198.403	84.771	26.554	309.728	6.190	318.918		503,174	12.414	3.611	20.22%	200,281	1,528.158	62.383	1.590.542	12.59%	92.236	210.874	10.69%	6.40%	101.795	94.956	515.668	304,794		519,199 20.22%	210,874 10.69%	92.236 (108.044)	-20.81%	(54.022)	0.00	18.12%
RESIDENTIAL	599.882	304.651	89.379	993.912	154.455	1.148.367		1.359,577	40.240	1 460 510	56.89%	312,143	5.143.710	1.048,454	6.192.164	5.04%	359,087	1.195.311	%09'09	6.40%	396.299	307.804	1.852,470	58.01% 657.159		1,460,510 56.89 %	1,195,311 60.60%	359,087	3.21%	23.472 1.61%	1 403 003	1,483,982 57.80%
TOTAL	1,214,741	579.500	178.235	1.972.476	164.291	1.972.476		2,493,543	73,761	64.558	100.00%	594.827	10,257,301	1.115.222	10.257.301	2.80%	594.827	1.972.476	100.00%	6.40%	656.467	564.210	3.193,153	100.00% 1.220.677		2.567.303 100.00%	1.972.476 100.00%	594.827	%00:0	0.00%	0000000	100.00%
1				1	15	i			25	51				15	ı			!				25										
CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:	1 O & M Expenses	2 Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp	3 Taxes	4 TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	5 6 Spread of fire expenses & taxes to others		8 9 Current Revenue			12 Spread of fire revenue to others TOTAL Current Bayoning		15 16 NET OPERATING INCOME	18 TOTAL Rate Base	1920 Spread of fire rate base to others		23 Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)	25 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR	27 Class COS with Equalized ROR		2.3 Staff Midpoint ROR	32 Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR			55 Class COS Percentage 36	3.7 3.8	39 Current Revenue 40 Class Percentage 41	42 Class COS with Equalized ROR Glass COS Percentage 44 Class COS Percentage	45 Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR 46 Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR		49 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift50 Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		 52 Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue 53 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage

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

	В	runswick	Je	efferson City		Joplin		Mexico		Parkville	S	St. Charles
Revenue Requirement Increase (COS)	\$	541,325	\$	1,030,978	\$	4,177,354	\$	608,862	\$	375,688	\$	(206,956)
Current Revenue	\$	188,724	\$	4,151,299	\$	7,841,675	\$	2,584,290	\$	3,199,678	\$	9,440,463
COS District % Increase/Decrease		286.83%		24.84%		53.27%		23.56%		11.74%		-2.19%
Proposed District Revenue Requirement												
Capped \$ Increase Capped \$ Increase	\$	53.27% 100,536										
Subsidy Contribution		(440,789)									\$	157,816
District Increase/Decrease	\$	100,536	\$	1,030,978	\$	4,177,354	\$	608,862	\$	375,688	\$	(49,140)
Proposed Percent increase		53.27%		24.84%		53.27%		23.56%		11.74%		-0.52%
Proposed Class Revenues based on equal percentage increas Current Class Revenues excluding Tax Adjustment and ISR												
Residential	\$	99,879	\$	2,223,984	\$	3,930,228	\$	1,222,378	\$	2,270,945	\$	7,895,445
Commercial	\$	24,813	\$	1,213,984	\$	1,702,662	\$	341,011	\$	578,465	\$	951,030
Industrial	\$	523	\$	207,424	\$	1,362,141	\$	374,721	\$	21,371	\$	2,427
Public Authorities	\$	3,682	\$	364,528	\$	189,072	\$	194,675	\$	47,177	\$	165,921
Sales For Resale	\$	54,853	\$	-	\$	203,363	\$	314,090		159,291	\$	20,977
Private Fire	\$	4,764	\$	114,045	\$	211,051	\$	88,572		84,624	\$	133,318
Public Fire	\$	-	\$		\$	10	\$		\$	25	\$	-
Total Revenue	\$	188,514	\$	4,123,965	\$	7,598,527	\$	2,535,447	\$	3,161,898	\$	9,169,118
Share of Current Class Revenue												
Residential		52.98%		53.93%		51.72%		48.21%		71.82%		86.11%
Commercial		13.16%		29.44%		22.41%		13.45%		18.29%		10.37%
Industrial		0.28%		5.03%		17.93%		14.78%		0.68%		0.03%
Public Authorities		1.95%		8.84%		2.49%		7.68%		1.49%		1.81%
Sales For Resale		29.10%		0.00%		2.68%		12.39%		5.04%		0.23%
Private Fire		2.53%		2.77%		2.78%		3.49%		2.68%		1.45%
Public Fire		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%
Equal Percent Class Revenue Increase/Decrease												
Residential	\$	53,266	\$	555,989	\$	2,160,676	\$	293,542	\$	269,827	\$	(42,314)
Commercial	\$	13,233	\$	303,492		936,053	\$	81,890		68,732	\$	(5,097)
Industrial	\$	279	\$	51,855		748,849	\$	89,985	\$	2,539	\$	(13)
Public Authorities	\$	1,964	\$	91,131	\$	103,944	\$	46,749	\$	5,605	\$	(889)
Sales For Resale	\$	29,253	\$	- 20.511	\$	111,801	\$		\$	18,927	\$	(112)
Private Fire Public Fire	\$	2,541	\$	28,511	\$	116,027	\$	21,270	\$	10,055	\$	(714)
Total	\$ \$	100,536	\$	1.020.079	<u>\$</u> \$	4 177 254	\$	608,862	\$	275 699	<u>\$</u>	(40.140)
1 Otal	Ф	100,536	Ф	1,030,978	Ф	4,177,354	Ф	008,802	Ф	375,688	Ф	(49,140)

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

		St. Joseph	V	Warren County		Warrensburg			St. Louis	Total
Revenue Requirement Increase (COS)	\$	3,401,655	\$	214,537	\$	355,353		\$	2,239,173	\$ 12,737,969
Current Revenue	\$	15,434,972	\$	106,477	\$	2,567,303		\$	121,039,838	\$ 166,554,719
COS District % Increase/Decrease		22.04%		201.49%		13.84%			1.85%	7.65%
Proposed District Revenue Requirement										
Capped \$ Increase			\$	53.27% 56,722						
Subsidy Contribution			\$	(157,816)				\$	440,789	
District Increase/Decrease	\$	3,401,655	\$	56,722	\$	355,353		\$	2,679,962	\$ 12,737,969
Proposed Percent increase		22.04%		53.27%		13.84%			2.21%	7.65%
Proposed Class Revenues based on equal percentage increase Current Class Revenues excluding Tax Adjustment and ISRS Residential Commercial Industrial Public Authorities Sales For Resale Private Fire Public Fire Total Revenue Share of Current Class Revenue Residential Commercial Industrial Public Authorities Sales For Resale Private Fire	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	7,577,212 2,772,889 2,207,747 583,103 1,827,213 174,687 15,142,852 50.04% 18.31% 14.58% 3.85% 12.07% 1.15%	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	104,949 1,360 - - - - - 106,309 98.72% 1.28% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	503,174 56,497 333,934 176,726 63,635	A and Others J&D B&C Private Fire Public Fire A and Others J&D B&C Private Fire Public Fire	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	100,936,971 11,079,403 1,053,559 711,978 5,970,256 - 119,752,167 84.29% 9.25% 0.88% 0.59% 4,99%	
Public Fire Equal Percent Class Revenue Increase/Decrease		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%				
Residential Commercial Industrial Public Authorities Sales For Resale Private Fire Public Fire Total	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	1,702,127 622,895 495,943 130,987 410,461 39,241 0 3,401,655	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	55,996 726 - - - - - - - - 56,722	\$ \$ \$ \$	71,707 8,051 47,589 5 25,185 9,069	A and Others J&D B&C Private Fire Public Fire	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$	2,258,892 247,949 23,578 15,934 133,610 - 2,679,962	\$ 12,737,969

St. Joseph District Uniform Block Rate Proposal

					Revenue
			<u>Usage</u>	Present Rates	<u>Amount</u>
Residential					
	For the first	100,000	1,626,028	\$3.1010	\$ 5,042,314
	For the next	1,900,000	15,823	1.7373	\$ 27,490
	For the next	3,000,000	1,319	1.3406	\$ 1,768
	For all over	5,000,000	5,274	0.9028	\$ 4,762
					\$ 5,076,333
Commercial					
	For the first	100,000	467,941	3.5681	\$ 1,669,660
	For the next	1,900,000	319,073	1.9989	\$ 637,796
	For the next	3,000,000	35,453	1.5427	\$ 54,693
	For all over	5,000,000	7,805	1.0388	\$ 8,107
					\$ 2,370,256
<u>Industrial</u>					
	For the first	100,000	50,727	5.0756	\$ 257,470
	For the next	1,900,000	350,557	2.8433	\$ 996,740
	For the next	3,000,000	189,316	1.715	\$ 324,676
	For all over	5,000,000	403,401	1.401	\$ 565,164
					\$ 2,144,051
Public Authority					
	For the first	100,000	62,292	3.9599	\$ 246,671
	For the next	1,900,000	79,094	2,2148	\$ 175,178
	For the next	3,000,000	41,220	1.712	\$ 70,569
	For all over	5,000,000	26,089	1.1528	\$ 30,075
					\$ 522,494
Sale for Resale					
-	For the first	100,000	10,873	5.6592	\$ 61,530
	For the next	1,900,000	175,331	3.1703	\$ 555,851
	For the next	3,000,000	237,473	2.4466	\$ 581,001
	For all over	5,000,000	372,395	1.6495	\$ 614,265
					\$ 1,812,648

Uniform Block Rate Development

		Total Usage	Revenue Amount	<u>Uni</u>	<u>Uniform Block</u> <u>Rate</u>			
For the first	100,000	2,217,861	\$ 7,439,574	\$	3.35			
For the next	1,900,000	939,879	\$ 2,349,844	\$	2.50			
For the next	3,000,000	504,780	\$ 964,009	\$	1.91			
For all over	5,000,000	814,963	\$ 1,269,291	\$	1.56			