FILED
August 28, 2007
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No.: Issue(s):

Rate Design/ Cost of Service

Witness/Type of Exhibit: Sponsoring Party:

Meisenheimer/Direct
Public Counsel
WR-2007-0216

Case No.:

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

June 12, 2007

Case No(s). WR-2007-07/L

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Water Cor to Implem	tter of Missouri-A mpany's request fi ent a General Rat Service provided reas	or Authority e Increase))))	WR-2007-0216
	<u>AFFIDAV</u>	TT OF BA	RBARA A.	MEISENHEIMER
	F MISSOURI OF COLE)))	ss	
Barbara A.	Meisenheimer, of	f lawful age an	d being first duly	sworn, deposes and states:
1.	My name is Bar of the Public Co		nheimer. I am th	e Chief Utility Economist for the Office
2.	Attached hereto	and made a pa	art hereof for all	purposes is my direct testimony.
3.	I hereby swear a			contained in the attached testimony are debelief.
Subscribed	MOTARY My Com	this 12th day E.R. STRATTON mission Expires		Barbara A. Meisenheimer Marbara A. Meisenheimer Marbara A. Meisenheimer Marbara A. Meisenheimer

February 4, 2011 Cole County

Commission #07004782

My commission expires February 4, 2011.

DIRECT 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 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)

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to present Public Counsel's preliminary Class Cost of Service (CCOS) studies and to present Public Counsel's position on how the results of these studies should affect rate design.

I. RATE DESIGN

- Q. WHAT IS THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF COS 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

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.

O. 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

.

_ -

2
 3

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

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.

O. WHAT CUSTOMER CLASSES DID YOU USE?

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.

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

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

Q. HOW DID YOU DEVELOP THE ALLOCATORS?

A. The allocators were developed in order to reflect the differences in costs of furnishing service to the different classes. Customer-related allocators were developed using various weights to reflect the fact that there are generally greater costs associated with serving a bigger customer than a smaller customer. The base-related allocator was developed using the base amount of water used by each class. The allocator for the fire districts was based on the number of hydrants or fire taps in each of the public and private fire districts.

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

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.

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

A. My primary interest was to evaluate if costs differ sufficiently to warrant a readjustment so soon after the past rate case and in light of the significant class shifts that occurred as the result of that case.

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 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 and distribution plant accounts were allocated utilizing the capacity allocator.

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

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 payroll-related expenses so they were allocated on the basis of the amount of labor expense that I had previously allocated to each class.

1 2

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 -

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

into four primary cost components: (1) base costs, (2) extra capacity costs, (3)

customer costs, (4) direct fire-protection costs.

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

Base costs are costs that tend to vary with the total quantity of water used, plus Α. 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.

22 23

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

1

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

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

component.

system.

Yes.

Q. ACCORDING TO THE BASE-EXTRA CAPACITY METHOD, WHAT IS THE SECOND

4

3

5

A.

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

A.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

STEP OF ALLOCATING MAINS COST?

12 -

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		448,417	210,795	55,345	1,241	8.055	165,134	1,957	5,890
	Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp		80,606	40,203	9.569	179	1.205	24,717	698	4,036
3	· . •		(159,271)	(79,999)	(18,709)	(338)	(2,312)	(47,346)	(1,550)	(9,017)
4	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes		369,752	1 70,9 98	46,206	1,082	6,948	142,504	1,105	909
6	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others	15	909	744	149	4	12	0	0	•
7	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread		369,752	171,742	46,355	1,086	6.960	142,504	1,105	-
9	Current Revenue									
10	Rate Revenue		133,662	99,879	24,813	523	3,682	1	4,764	0
11	Other Revenue	25	210	104	26	1	4	74	1	0
12	TOTAL Current Revenues		133,872	99,983	24,839	524	3,686	75	4,765	0
13	Current Revenue Percentage		100.00%	74.69%	18.55%	0.39%	2.75%	0.06%	3.56%	0.00%
	Net OPERATING INCOME		(235,880)	(71,759)	(21,515)	(562)	(3.274)	(142,430)	3,660	0
17	TOTAL Rate Base		1,556,347	781,729	182,816	3,301	22.592	462,652	15,149	88.108
18 19	Spread public fire rate base to others	15	88,108	72,106	14,460	386	1,157	0	0	(88,108)
20	TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		1,556,347	853,835	197,275	3.687	23,749	462,652	15,149	-
21 22 23	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		-15.16%	-8.40%	-10.91%	-15.25%	-13.79%	-30.79%	24.16%	
	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		(235,880)	(129,407)	(29,899)	(559)	(3,599)	(70,120)	(2,296)	
	Class COS with Equalized ROR		529.023	244,438	64,110	1,787	8,725	214,815	(4.851)	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	46.21%	12.12%	0.34%	1.65%	40.61%	-0.92%	
29	Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	
30	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		99,606	54,645	12,626	236	1.520	29,610	970	
	True-up plus add'l taxes	25	213,630	106,227	26,898	580	3,725	75,001	1,200	
33	• •		682,988	332.614	85,878	1,902	12.204	247,115	3,274	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	48.70%	12.57%	0.28%	1.79%	36.18%	0.48%	
35 36	-		549,116	232,631	61,039	1,378	8.519	247,040	(1,491)	
37	Current Revenue		133,872	99,983	24,839	524	3,686	75	4,765	
39			100.00%	74.69%	18.55%	0.39%		0.06%	3.56%	
40 41	Class COS with Equalized ROR		529,023	244,438	64,110	1,787	8,725	214,815	(4,851)	
42	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	46.21%	12.12%	0.34%		40.61%	-0.92%	
43 44	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		(235,880)	(129,407)	(29,899)	(559)	(3.599)	(70,120)	(2,296)	
45			(0)	(57.649)	(8,384)	4	(325)	72,310	(5,956)	
46 47	Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		0.00%	-57.66%	-33.75%	0.69%	-8.83%	96766.60%	-124.99%	
48	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift		(0)	(28,824)	(4,192)	2	(163)	36,155	(2,978)	
49 50	Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	-28.83%	-16.88%	0.34%	-4.41%	48383.30%	-62.50%	
	Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue		133.872	71,159	20,648	525	3,523	36,230	1,787	
	Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%	53.15%	15.42%	0.39%	2.63%	27.06%	1.33%	

Schedule BAM DIR 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
ı	O & M Expenses		3,018,341	1,529,778	1,130,430	164,400	115,562	0	15,456	62,714
	Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp		800.029	370,955	305,795	44.771	17,526	0	9,388	51.593
	Taxes		(13,661)	(6,258)	(5,291)	(776)	(267)	0	(159)	(910)
4	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	_	3,804,709	1,894,475	1,430,935	208.395	132,821		24,685	113,397
5 6	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others	15	113,397	0	109,791	902	2,705	0	0	(113,397)
7	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread		3,804,709	1,894,475	1,540.726	209,297	135,526		24.685	- (
9	Current Revenue									
10	Rate Revenue		4,123,965	2.223,984	1,213,984	207.424	364,528	0	114,045	0
11	Other Revenue	25	27,334	13,982	10,653	1,552	951	0	195	0
12	TOTAL Current Revenues		4,151,299	2,237,966	1,224,637	208,976	365,479	0	114,240	Û
13 14	Current Revenue Percentage		100.00%	53.91%	29.50%	5.03%	8.80%	0.00%	2.75%	0.00%
	NET OPERATING INCOME		346,590	343,491	(316,089)	(321)	229,953	0	89,555	O
	TOTAL Rate Base		12,326,935	5.646.985	4,773,912	700,315	240,833	-	143,829	821.061
19	Spread public fire rate base to others	-15-	821-,061-	0-	794,951_	6.527_	19,582	0	0	(821,061)
20 21	TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	_	12,326,935	3,646,985	5,568.864	706,84,3	260,415	-	143,829	•
22 23	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		2.81%	6.08%	-5.68%	-0.05%	88.30%	0.00%	62.26%	
	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		346,590	158.773	156,577	19,874	7,322	-	4,044	
25	Plus Current Taxes		13,661	0	13,227	109	326	0	0	0
26	Class COS with Equalized ROR		3,818,370	1,709,757	2,026,618	229,600	(86,780)		(60,826)	
27 28	Class COS Percentage		100,00%	44.78%	53.08%	6.01%	-2.27%	0.00%	-1.59%	
29 30	Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6,40%	6.40%	6.40%	
31	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		788,924	361,407	356,407	45.238	16,667	•	9,205	
32	True-up plus add't taxes	25	475,911	243,447	185,476	27,024	16,561	0	3.403	
33	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR		5,069,544	2,499,329	2,082,609	281.559	168,753	-	37,293	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	49.30%		5.55%	3,33%	0.00%		
35			918,245	261,363	857,972	72.583	(196,726)	-	(76,947)	
36										
37						200.45	2/0/=2		414.540	
	Current Revenue		4,151,299	2,237.966	1.224.637	208.976	365,479	0	114,240	
	Class Percentage		100.00%	53.91%	29.50%	5.03%	8.80%	0.00%	2.75%	
40			3,818,370	1,709,757	2,026,618	229.600	(86,780)		(60,826)	
	Class COS with Equalized ROR		100,00%			6.01%	. ,	0.00%		
4.								0.00%		
	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		346,590	158.773	156.577	19,874	7.322	-	4,044	
4:			(0)			20.195	(222.631)	0	(85,511)	
40			0.00%	-8.25%	38.60%	9.66%	-60.91%	0.00%	-74.85%	
4			(0)	(02.250)	236 332	10.003	(111.216)	0	(42,756)	
4:			0.00%			10.097	(111,316) -30,46%	_		
49 50			0.00%	-4.1.3%	19.30%	4.83%	-30.46%	0.00%	-31.4370	
5			4,151,299	2,145,607	1.460.970	219.074	254,163	0	71,485	
	2 Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%					0.00%		
٠.	Contournement Class to retine terremage		. 00.0070	21.0778	. 32.1976	2.2070	0.12.70	V.VV /0	,270	

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
	O & M Expenses	-	5,526,037	2,467,007	1,100,940	1,223,179	146,354	349,523	33,752	205,282
	Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp		2,267,837	1,073,165	415,844	421.858	46,470	131.033	28,849	150,618
			(332,540)	(147,590)	(62,351)	(65,618)	(7,051)	(20.612)	(4.441)	(24,878)
3 4	Taxes TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	-	7,461,334	3,392,582	1,454,433	1,579,418	185,773	459.944	58,161	331,022
5	•		·				2 1/4	n	0	(331.022)
6		15 _	331.022	283.604	43,961	1,293	2,164		58,161	(331,022)
7 8	•		7,461.334	3,676,187	1,498,394	1,580,711	187,937	459,944	36,101	- -
9	Current Revenue								011.051	10
10	Rate Revenue		7,598.527	3,930,228	1,702,662	1,362,141	189,072	203,363	211,051	10 0
11	Other Revenue	25	243,148	115,745	49,580	53,757	6,299	15,711	2,055	10
12	TOTAL Current Revenues		7.841,675	4,045,973	1.752,242	1,415,898	195,371	219,074	213,106	0.00%
13 14			100.00%	51.60%	22.35%	18.06%	2.49%	2.79%	2.72%	
15	NET OPERATING INCOME		380,341	369,786	253,848	(164,812)	7,434	(240,870)	154,945	10
	TOTAL Rate Base		33,874,132	15,034,206	6,351,351	6,684,207	718,207	2.099.603	452.346	2,534,213
18		15	2,534,213	2,171,197	336,553	9,895	16,566	0	0	(2,534,213)
20		., –	33,874.132	17,205,403	6,687,904	6.694,103	734,773	2,099,603	452,346	•
	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		1.12%	2.15%	3.80%	-2.46%	1.01%	-11.47%	34.25%	
23	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		380,341	193,183	75,092	75,162	8,250	23,574	5,079	
	Plus Current Taxes	15	332.540	284,905	44,163	1,298	2,174	0	0	
26			7,793,884	3,784,489	1,363,801	1.821.983	190,927	724,389	(91.705)	
27	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	48.56%	17.50%	23.38%	2,45%	9.29%	-1.18%	
28 29 30	Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	
	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		2,167,944	1,101,146	428,026	428.423	47,025	134,375	28,950	
	True-up plus add'l taxes	25	386,899	184,174	78,892	85.539	10,023	25,000	3,270	
	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR		10,016,177	4.961,507	2,005,312	2.094,673	244,986	619,319	90,381	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	49.53%	20.02%	20.91%	2.45%	6.18%		
35			2,222,293	1,177,917	641,512	272,689	54,059	(105.070)	182,087	
26	Current Revenue		7,841,675	4.045.973	1,752,242	1,415,898	195,371	219,074	213,106	
39	Class Percentage		100.00%	51.60%	22.35%	18.06%	2.49%	2.79%	2.72%	
40	Class COS with Equalized ROR		7,793,884	3,784,489	1,363,801	1,821,983	190.927	724,389	(91,705)	
42	Class COS Percentage		100.00%		17.50%	23.38%	2.45%	9.29%	-1.18%	
43	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		380.341	193,183	75,092	75,162	8,250	23,574	5,079	
	Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR		10	(176,603)	(178,756)	239,974	816	264,445	(149,866)	
46	Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		0.00%	-4.36%	-10.20%	16.95%	0.42%	120.71%	-70.32%	
47	3 1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift		5	(88,301)	(89,378)	119,987	408	132,222	(74,933)	
49	Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	-2.18%	-5,10%		0.21%	60.36%	-35.16%	
50) Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue		7,841,670	3,957,671	1,662.864	1,535.886	195.779	351,296	138,173	
	Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%		21.21%	19.59%	2.50%	4.48%	1.76%	

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
- 1	O & M Expenses		1,434,079	645,387	190,381	207,606	126,167	194,041	10,922	59,574
2	Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp		552,980	267,006	70,013	72,819	40,122	69,291	5,487	28,242
3	Taxes		90.558	42,857	11,561	12,200	6.661	11,699	872	4,707
4 5		_	2,077,617	955,251	271,956	292,625	172,950	275,032	17,281	92,523
6	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others	15	92,523	81,279	8,976	419	1,849	0	0	(02.522)
7 8		_	2,077,617	1,036,530	280,932	293,044	174,799	275,032	17,281	(92,523)
9										
10			2,535,447	1,222,378	341.011	374.721	104 476	214 000	00 675	
11		25	48,843	23,677	6,669	7,148	194,675 4,165	314,090 6,745	88.572 439	0
12			2,584,290	1,246,055	347,680	381.869	198,840	320,835		0
13			100,00%	48.22%	13.45%	14.78%		12.41%	89,011 3,44%	0
14			***************************************	40,2270	13.4370	14.7079	7.0974	12.4170	3.44%	0.00%
15 16	NET OPERATING INCOME (2) 35,615		506,673	209,524	66,749	88,825	24,042	45,803	71,730	0
17 	TOTAL Rate Base		12,633,884	5,979,111	1.612,902	1,701,976	929,237	1,632.207_	121,708_	656,743
19		15	656,743	576,933	63,713	2,976	12 121	0	0	//#/ D.S.
20			12,633,884	6,556,044	1,676,615	1,704,952	13,121 942,358	1,632,207	121,708	(656,743)
21				0.0.00,077	1,0,0,015	1,704.752	742,336	1,032,207	121.708	-
22 23	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		4.01%	3.20%	3.98%	5.21%	2.55%	2.81%	58.94%	
24	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		506,673	262,926	67,239	68.376	37,793	65,459	4,881	
25	Plus Current Taxes	15	(90,558)	(79,553)	(8,785)	(410)	(1,809)	0	0	
	Class COS with Equalized ROR	_	1,987,059	1,010,378	272.637	272,184	186,741	294.688	(49,568)	
27 28	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	50.85%	13.72%	13.70%		14.83%	-2.49%	
29 30	Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6,40%	6.40%	6.40%	
31	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		808,569	419.587	107,303	109,117	60,311	104,461	7 790	
	True-up plus add'l taxes	25	544,243	263,824	74.311	79,651	46,413	75,153	7,789 4,892	
33	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR	_	3,430,429	1,719,941	462,546	481,812	281,522	454,646	29,962	
34	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	50.14%	13.48%	14.05%		13.25%	0.87%	
35			1,443,370	709,562	189.909	209,628	94.782	159,958	79,530	
36 37							7 11.02	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	77,050	
38	Current Revenue		2.584,290	1,246,055	347,680	381,869	198,840	320,835	110,68	
39 40	Class Percentage		100.00%	48.22%	13.45%	14.78%		12.41%	3.44%	
41	Class COS with Equalized ROR		1,987,059	1,010,378	272,637	272,184	186,741	294,688	(49,568)	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	50.85%	13.72%	13.70%	9.40%	14.83%	-2.49%	
43	Not Consider the second St. F. 12 1202		• • • • •							
	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		506,673	262,926	67,239	68.376	37,793	65,459	4,881	
	Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR		0	53,401	491	(20,450)	13,751	19.656	(66,849)	
46 47			0.00%	4.29%	0.14%	-5.36%	6.92%	6.13%	-75.10%	
48			0	26,701	245	(10,225)	6,876	9,828	(33,425)	
49 50	Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	2.14%	0.07%	-2.68%	3.46%	3.06%	-37.55%	
	Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue		2.584.290	1,272,755	347,926	371,645	205,716	330,662	55,586	
52	Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%	49.25%	13.46%	14 38%	7.96%	12.80%	2.15%	

Direct Testimony Barbara Meisenheimer WR-2007-0216

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Parkville 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		1,232,581	803,310	200,902	8,015	43,489	105,359	11,065	60,442
2	Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp		883,263	504,474	185,268	3,865	22,946	70,990	14,358	81,362
3	Taxes		271,698	155,917	54,219	1,199	7,223	22,908	4,272	25,960
4			2,387,542	1,463,701	440,389	13,078	73,658	199,257	29,695	167,764
6	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others	15 _	167,764	154,603	10,701	399	2,060	0	0	(167,764)
7	TO THE Expenses and Taxes after Spread		2,387,542	1,618,304	451,090	13,477	75,719	199,257	29,695	-
9	Current Revenue									
10	Rate Revenue		3,161,898	2,270,945	578,465	21,371	47,177	159,291	84,624	25
11	Other Revenue	25	37,780	24,691	7,696	213	1,217	3,421	542	0
12			3,199,678	2,295,636	586,161	21,584	48,394	162,712	85,166	25
13 14			100.00%	71.75%	18.32%	0.67%	1.51%	5.09%	2.66%	0.00%
15 16	NET OPERATING INCOME (305,465) 35,615		812,136	677,332	135,070	8,107	(27,324)	(36,545)	55,471	25
	TOTAL Rate Base		12,176,352	6,987,519	2,429,857	53,730	323,716	1,026,631	191,467	1,163,432
19	Spread public fire rate base to others	15	1,163,432	1,072,165	74,213	2,766	14,289	0	0	(1,163,432)
20 21			12,176,352	8,059,683	2,504,070	56,496	338,005	1,026,631	191,467	•
	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		6.67%	8.40%	5.39%	14.35%	-8.08%	-3.56%	28.97%	
	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Plus Current Taxes	15	812,136 (271,698)	537,563	167,016	3,768	22,544	68,474	12,770	
	Class COS with Equalized ROR		2,387,567	1,478,535	483,036	9,138	125,587	304,275	(13,005)	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	61.93%	20.23%	0.38%	5.26%	12.74%	-0.54%	
	Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	
	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		779,287	515,820	160,260	3,616	21,632	65,704	12,254	
	True-up plus add'l taxes	25	746,530	487,890	152,064	4,209	24,057	67,596	10,715	
33	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR	-	3,913,359	2,622,013	763,415	21,301	121,408	332,557	52,664	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	67.00%	19.51%	0.54%	3.10%	8.50%	1.35%	
35 36	•		1,525,792	1,143,478	280,379	12,163	(4,179)	28,282	65,669	
37 38	Current Revenue		3,199,678	2,295,636	586,161	21,584	48,394	162,712	85,166	
	Class Percentage		100.00%	71.75%	18.32%	0.67%	1.51%	5.09%	2.66%	
40	· ·					0.0770	1.5170	3.0770	2.0070	
41	Class COS with Equalized ROR		2,387,567	1,478,535	483,036	9,138	125,587	304,275	(13,005)	
42 43	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	61.93%	20.23%	0.38%	5.26%	12.74%	-0.54%	
44	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		812,136	537,563	167,016	3,768	22,544	68,474	12,770	
	Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR		25	(139,769)	31,946	(4,339)	49,869	105,019	(42,700)	
46 47	Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		0.00%	-6.09%	5.45%	-20.10%	103.05%	64.54%	-50.14%	
	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift		12	(69,884)	15,973	(2,169)	24,934	52,509	(21,350)	
49 50	Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	-3.04%	2.73%	-10.05%	51.52%	32.27%	-25.07%	
	Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue		3,199,666	2,225,751	602,133	19,415	73,329	215,221	63,816	
	Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%	69.56%	18.82%	0.61%	2.29%	6.73%		hedule BAM 1-5

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	2,945,554	319,685	1,293	54,137	0	37,506	274,758
2	Depreciation Expenses TOIT Def Tax Exp		2,001,331	1,535,034	163,504	548	22,994	ő	28,393	250,858
3	Taxes		1,073,713	814,784	95,131	325	13,483	ő	15,540	134,451
4 5		_	6,707,978	5,295,373	578,320	2,165	90,614	0	81,439	660,067
6	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others	15	660,067	637,398	21,128	47	1,494		0	(660,067)
7 8	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread		6,707,978	5,932,771	599,448	2.213	92,108		81,439	- (
9	Current Revenue									
10	Rate Revenue		9,148,141	7,895,445	951,030	2,427	165,921	0	133,318	0
11	Other Revenue	25	292,321	255,305	28,398	104	4,328	v	4,186	0
12	TOTAL Current Revenues	_	9,440,462	8,150,750	979,428	2,531	170,249		137,504	- 0
13 14			100.00%	86.34%	10.37%	0.03%	1.80%		1.46%	0.00%
15 16			2,732,484	2,217,979	379,980	318	78,141	0	56,065	0
	TOTAL Rate Base		38,775,303	29;424;522	3;435;475	11,729	486,916	· · · · · ·	561,186	4,855,476
19	Spread public fire rate base to others	15	4,855,476	4,688,720	155,419	349	10,989		0	(4,855,476)
20 21	TOTAL Rate Base after Spread	_	38,775,303	34,113,241	3,590,893	12,078	497,905		561,186	- (4,835,470)
22 23	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR) 163		7.05%	6.50%	10.58%	2.63%	15.69%		9.99%	
	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Plus Current Taxes	15	2,732,484 (1,073,713)	2.403,950	253,049	851	35,087	-	39,547	
26	Class COS with Equalized ROR	_	6,707,978	6.118.741	472,517	2,746	49.054		64,920	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	91.22%	7.04%	0.04%	0.73%	0.00%	0.97%	
29 30	Staff Midpoint ROR 163		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	
	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		2,481,619	2,183,247	229,817	773	31,866		35,916	
	True-up plus add'l taxes	25	1,147,977	1,002,612	111,523	407	16,995	·	16.440	
33	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR		10,337,574	9,118,630	940,788	3,392	140,969		133,795	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	88.21%	9.10%	0.03%	1.36%	0.00%	1,29%	
35 36	·		3,629,596	2,999,889	468,271	647	91,915	-	68,875	
37 38	Current Revenue		9,440,462	8,150,750	979,428	2,531	170,249	0	137,504	
39 40			100.00%	86.34%	10.37%	0.03%	1.80%	0.00%	1.46%	
41	Class COS with Equalized ROR		6,707,978	6,118,741	472,517	2,746	49,054		64,920	
42 43			100.00%	91.22%	7.04%	0.04%	0.73%	0.00%	0.97%	
44	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		2,732,484	2,403,950	253,049	851	35,087	-	39,547	
45			0	185,971	(126,931)	533	(43,054)		(16,519)	
46 47	Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		0.00%	2.28%	-12.96%	21.07%	-25.29%		-12.01%	
48			0	92,985	(63,466)	267	(21,527)	0	(8,259)	
49 50	Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	1.14%	-6.48%	10.53%	-12.64%		-6.01%	
51	Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		9,440,462 100.00%	8,243,735 87,32%	915,963 9,70%	2,797 0.03%	148,722 1.58%	0 0.00%	129,245 1,37%	

Schedule BAM 1-6

Direct Testimony Barbara Meisenheimer WR-2007-0216

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

St Joseph District

c	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE	PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE	PUBLIC FIRE SERVICE
1 C) & M Expenses		7,789,711	3,595,398	1,430,546	1,229,834	343,620	912,544	34,806	242,962
2 D	Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp		3,897,129	1,683,337	712,735	632,563	159,920	484,200	28,541	195,831
3 T	axes		433,466	181,863	80,526	72,412	18,178	55,588	3,152	21,747
4 5	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	_	12,120,306	5,460,598	2,223,808	1,934,809	521,718	1,452,333	66,500	460,540
-	pread public fire expenses & taxes to others	15	460,540	410,026	45,625	2,079	2,810	0	0	(460,540)
7 8	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread		12,120,306	5,870,624	2,269,433	1,936,887	524,529	1,452,333	66,500	
_	Current Revenue									
10	Rate Revenue		15,142,852	7,577,212	2,772,889	2,207,747	583,103	1,827,213	174,687	1
11	Other Revenue	25	292,119	135,208	56,005	49,068	13,032	37,019	1,788	0
12	TOTAL Current Revenues	_	15,434,971	7,712,420	2,828,894	2,256,815	596,135	1,864,232	176,475	1
13	Current Revenue Percentage		100.00%	49.97%	18.33%	14.62%	3.86%	12.08%	1.14%	0.00%
14 15 N 16	NET OPERATING INCOME (2,807,994) 35,615		3,314,665	1,841,795	559,461	319,927	71,606	411,899	109,975	l
17 T	OTAL Rate Base		80,250,069	33,669,350	14,908,280	13,405,975	3,365,385	10,291,393	583,578	4,026,108
18 19 S	pread public fire rate base to others	15	4,026,108	3,584,507	398,862	18,171	24,569	0	0	(4,026,108)
20 21	TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		80,250,069	37,253,857	15,307,141	13,424,146	3,389,954	10,291,393	583,578	-
	implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		4.13%	4.94%	3.65%	2.38%	2.11%	4.00%	18.84%	
24 N	let Operating Income with Equalized ROR lus Current Taxes	15	3,314,665 (433,466)	1,538,741	632,249	554,474	140,019	425,078	24,104	
	Class COS with Equalized ROR	_	12,120,307	5,567,569	2,342,221	2,171,434	592,942	1,465,512	(19,371)	
	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	45.94%	19.32%	17.92%	4.89%	12.09%	-0.16%	
28 29 S 30	taff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	
	let Operating Income with Recommended ROR		5,136,004	2,384,247	979,657	859,145	216,957	658,649	37,349	
32 T	rue-up plus add'l taxes	25	1,860,301	861,042	356,656	312,477	82,993	235,748	11,385	
33 C	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR		19,116,611	9,115,913	3,605,746	3,108,509	824,479	2,346,730	115,234	
34 C	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	47.69%	18.86%	16.26%	4.31%	12.28%	0.60%	
35 36 37			6,996,304	3,548,343	1,263,525	937,076	231,537	881,218	134,605	
-	Current Revenue		15,434,971	7,712,420	2,828,894	2,256,815	596,135	1,864,232	176,475	
	Class Percentage		100.00%	49.97%	18.33%	14.62%	3.86%	12.08%	1.14%	
	Class COS with Equalized ROR		12,120,307	5,567,569	2,342,221	2,171,434	592,942	1,465,512	(19,371)	
42 C 43	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	45.94%	19.32%	17.92%	4.89%	12.09%	-0.16%	
44 N	let Operating Income with Equalized ROR		3,314,665	1,538,741	632,249	554,474	140,019	425,078	24,104	
45 R	levenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR		t	(303,055)	72,788	234,546	68,413	13,179	(85,871)	
46 R	tevenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		0.00%	-3.93%	2,57%	10.39%	11.48%	0.71%	-48.66%	
	/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift		1	(151,527)	36,394	117,273	34,206	6,589	(42,935)	
49 R	tevenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	-1.96%	1.29%	5.20%	5.74%	0.35%	-24.33%	
	levenue Neutral Margin Revenue		15,434,971	7,560,892	2,865,288	2,374,088	630,342	1,870,821	133,539	
52 R	ecommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%	48.99%	18.56%	15.38%	4.08%	12.12%	0.87%	

Schedule BAM 1-7

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

	St. Louis District							
	CLASS COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:		TOTAL	RESIDENTIAL.	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	OTHER PUBLIC AUTHORITY	SALES FOR RESALE
1	O & M Expenses		63,871,328	51,388,870	2,467,572	7,131,868	305,349	2,577,670
2	Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp		23,826,499	18,274,919	788,598	2,598,821	121,027	2,043,134
3	Taxes		8,167,020	6,242,487	264,481	906,609	45.442	708,000
4	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes		95,864,847	75,906,276	3,520,650	10,637,298	471,818	5,328,804
5	,		7010011011	751760,276	5,520,050	10,037,276	471,010	3,328,004
6	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after S		95,864,847	75,906,276	3,520,650	10,637,298	471.818	5,328,804
8		, p. 104.0	22,00,4011	75,700,270	3.520,050	10,037,236	4/1,010	3,328,804
9	Current Revenue			98,414,824	2,158,918	8,245,315	1,212,727	5,928,672
10	Rate Revenue		113,812,590	77,620,976	23,290,224	6,219,171	711,978	5,970,241
11	Other Revenue	25	7,607,639	5,980,297	272,561	843,838	38,481	472,462
12	TOTAL Current Revenues		121,420,229	83,601,273	23,562,785	7,063,009	750.459	6,442,703
13	Current Revenue Percentage		100.00%	68.85%	19.41%	5.82%	0.62%	5.31%
14				55.5576	17.7170	J.827 q	0.0276	3.31%
15 16	NET OPERATING INCOME		25,555,382	7,694,997	20,042,135	(3,574,289)	278,641	1,113,898
17 18	TOTAL Rate Base		360,679,658	275,686,623_	11,680,265	40,038,533	2,006,854	31,267,384
19	Spread public fire rate base to others	15	0	0	0	0		
20	TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		360,679,658	275,686,623	11,680,265	40,038,533	0	11.247.204
21				275,080,025	11,000,203	40,038,333	2,006,854	31,267,384
22	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		7.09%	2,79%	171.59%	-8.93%	13.88%	3.56%
23	•			21.370	17(.57/10	-0.9374	13.007	3.3076
24	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		25,555,382	19,533,336	827,587	2,836,866	142,192	2,215,401
25	Plus Current Taxes	15	(8,167,020)	.,,,,,,,,,,	021,507	2,030,000	172,172	2,210,401
26	Class COS with Equalized ROR		95,864,847	87,744,615	(15,693,898)	17,048,454	335,370	6,430,306
27	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	91.53%	-16.37%	17,78%	0.35%	6.71%
28					10.5.10	171.070	0.5570	0.1175
29	Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%
30								0,10,0
31	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		23,083,498	17,643,944	747,537	2,562,466	128,439	2,001,113
32	True-up plus add'! taxes	25	9,978,850	7,844,285	357,516	1,106,852	50,475	619,722
33	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR		128,927,195	101,394,505	4,625,703	14,306,616	650,732	7,949,639
34	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	78.64%	3.59%	11.10%	0.50%	6.17%
35			33,062,348	13,649,890	20,319,601	(2,741,837)	315,362	1,519,333
36								
37								
38	Current Revenue		121,420,229	83,601,273	22 562 705	7.041.000	250 450	c 440
39	Class Percentage		190.00%	68.85%	23,562,785 19,41%	7,063,009	750,459	6,442,703
40	- ···· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		100.0070	00.0376	19.41%	5.82%	0.62%	5.31%
41	Class COS with Equalized ROR		95,864,847	87,744,615	(15,693,898)	17 0 tp 464	225.250	
42	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	91.53%	-16.37%	17,048,454	335,370	6,430,306
43			100.0074	21.2370	-10.3/76	17.78%	0.35%	6.71%
44	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		25,555,382	19,533,336	827,587	2,836,866	142,192	2.216.421
45	Revenue Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR		0	11,838,339	(19,214,548)	6,411,156	. ,	2,215,401
46	Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue	e	0.00%	14.16%	-81.55%	90,77%	(136,448)	1,101,502
47			V.5070	17.10/0	-01.33%	70.77%	-18.18%	17.10%
48	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift		0	5,919,169	(9,607,274)	3,205,578	(40 224)	550.751
49	Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	7.08%	-40.77%	45.39%	(68,224) -9.09%	550,751
50			V.0070	7.0070	-4U.1170	43.37%	- サ.ロソプ ₀	8.55%
51	Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue		121,420,229	89,520,443	13,955,511	10,268,587	(47.215	6.000.454
	Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%	73,73%	11.49%	8,46%	682,235 0.56%	6,993,454
	· ·			13.1370	11.7770	0.4076	0.30%	5.76%

Direct Testimony Barbara Meisenheimer WR-2007-0216

Office of the Public Counsel MAWC Class Cost of Service Summary

Warrensburg 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		1,214,741	599,882	198,403	37,864	182.185	108,259	12,055	76.092
	Depreciation ExpensesTOIT Def Tax Exp		579,500	304,651	84,771	15,915	69,025	48,373	7,233	49,533
3	Taxes		178,235	89,379	26,554	5.078	22.053	15.792	2.395	16.984
4	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes	_	1,972,476	993,912	309.728	58,857	273,263	172.425	21,682	142,609
5 6	Spread public fire expenses & taxes to others	15	142,609	125,708	13,539	293	3,069	0	0	(142,609)
7 8	TOTAL Expenses and Taxes after Spread	_	1,972,476	1.119.620	323,267	59,150	276,332	172,425	21,682	
9	Current Revenue									
10	Rate Revenue		2,493,543	1,359,577	503,174	56,497	333,934	176,726	63,635	0
11	Other Revenue	25	73,761	40,240	12,414	2,361	10.813	7,009	923	0_
12	TO ['AL Current Revenues	-	2,567,304	1,399,817	515,588	58.858	344,747	183,735	64,558	
13 14	Current Revenue Percentage		100.00%	54.52%	20.08%	2.29%	13.43%	7.16%	2.51%	0.00%
	NET OPERATING INCOME		594,828	280,197	192.321	(292)	68,415	11,310	42.876	0
17 18	TOTAL Rate Base		10,257,301	5.143.710	1,528,158	292,263	1,269,115	908,833	137,832	977.390
19	Spread public fire rate base to others	15	977,390	861,557	92,790	2.010	21,032	0	0	(977,390)
20 21	TOTAL Rate Base after Spread		10,257,301	6,005,267	1,620,949	294,273	1,290,147	908.833	137,832	
22 23	Implicit Rate of Return (ROR)		5.80%	4.67%	11.86%	-0.10%	5.30%	1.24%	31.11%	
24	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR Plus Current Taxes	15	594,828 (178,235)	348,250	94.000	17,065	74.817	52.704	7,993	
	Class COS with Equalized ROR	., _	1,972,476	1.187,672	224,945	76,508	282,733	213.818	(13,201)	
27	Class COS Percentage		100.00%	60.21%	11.40%	3.88%		10.84%	-0.67%	
28 29 30	Staff Midpoint ROR		6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	6.40%	
	Net Operating Income with Recommended ROR		656,467	384,337	103,741	18.833	82,569	58.165	8,821	
32		25	564,210	307,804	94,956	18,063	82,714	53.611	7,062	
_	Class COS with Staff Recommended ROR		3,193,153	1,811,761	521,963	96,047	441,616	284.201	37,566	
34			100.00%	56.74%	16.35%	3.01%		8.90%	1.18%	
35	Class COS I ciccinage		1,220,677	624,089	297,018	19,539	158.882	70,383	50,766	
36 37			•••							
	Current Revenue		2,567,304	1,399,817	515,588	58,858	344,747	183,735	64,558	
39	Class Percentage		100.00%	54.52%	20.08%	2.29%		7.16%	2.51%	
40 41	Class COS with Equalized ROR		1,972,476	1,187,672	224,945	76,508	282,733	213.818	(13,201)	
42			100,00%	60.21%	11.40%	3.88%		10,84%	-0.67%	
43 44	Net Operating Income with Equalized ROR		594,828	348,250	94.000	17.065	74,817	52,704	7,993	
45			0	68,052	(98,321)	17.357	6,401	41,394	(34.883)	
46 47	Revenue Increase/Decrease % of Current Revenue		0.00%	4.86%	-19.07%	29.49%	1.86%	22.53%	-54.03%	
48	1/2 of Revenue Neutral Shift		0	34.026	(49,161)	8,679	3,201	20,697	(17,441)	
49 50	Revenue Increase/Decrease Percentage		0.00%	2.43%	-9.53%	14,74%		11.26%	-27.02%	
5U	Revenue Neutral Margin Revenue		2,567.304	1,433,843	466,427	67,537	347,948	204,432	47,117	
-	Recommended Class Revenue Percentage		100.00%	55.85%	18.17%	2.63%	13.55%	7.96%	1.84%	