EXHIBIT

Exhibit No.:

Issue(s):
Witness/Type of Exhibit:
Sponsoring Party:
Case No.:

Cost of Service Study Busch/Direct Public Counsel GR-2001-292

# OF JAMES A. BUSCH

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

Missouri Gas Energy Case No. GR-2001-292

April 26, 2001

Date Case No. 68-3001 083

Reporter Security

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

| In the matter of tariff revisions of Missouri Gas<br>Energy, a division of Southern Union Company,<br>designed to increase rates for natural gas service<br>to customers in the Missouri service area of the<br>company. | ) ) Case No. GR-2001-292 )  |
|--|---|
| AFFIDAVIT OF J.  | AMES A. BUSCH   |
| STATE OF MISSOURI ) COUNTY OF COLE )   | SS  |
| James A. Busch, of lawful age and being first duly   | sworn, deposes and states:  |
| <ol> <li>My name is James A. Busch. I am the<br/>Public Counsel.</li> </ol>  | he Public Utility Economist for the Office of the                             |
| <ol> <li>Attached hereto and made a part h<br/>consisting of pages 1 through 11 and 9</li> </ol>   | nereof for all purposes is my direct testimony Schedules JAB-RD1 and JAB-RD2. |
| 3. I hereby swear and affirm that my statue and correct to the best of my known  | atements contained in the attached testimony are wledge and belief.           |
| Subscribed and sworn to me this 26th day of Apr  | James A. Busch  il, 2001  Bonnie S. Howard, Notary Public                     |

My Commission expires May 3, 2001.

| 1  |    | DIRECT TESTIMONY  |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | OF  |
| 3  |    | JAMES A. BUSCH  |
| 4  |    | CASE NO. GR-2001-292  |
| 5  |    | MISSOURI GAS ENERGY   |
| 6  |    |   |
| 7  | Q. | Please state your name and business address.  |
| 8  | A. | My name is James A. Busch and my business address is P. O. Box 7800,                |
| 9  |    | Jefferson City, MO 65102.   |
| 10 | Q. | Are you the same James A. Busch who filed testimony previously in Case No.          |
| 11 |    | GR-2001-292?  |
| 12 | Α. | Yes I am.   |
| 13 | Q. | What is the purpose of your testimony in the rate design portion of Case No. GR-    |
| 14 |    | 2001-292?   |
| 15 | A. | The purpose of my testimony is to explain the allocators Public Counsel utilized    |
| 16 |    | to allocate services, meters, and regulators, and present Public Counsel's cost of  |
| 17 |    | service study (COS). Public Counsel witness Hong Hu will provide the mains          |
| 18 |    | allocator and provide Public Counsel's rate design testimony.                       |
| 19 |    | CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY   |
| 20 | Q. | What is the primary purpose of a cost of service study?                             |
| 21 | A. | The primary purpose of a COS study is to provide an estimate of the cost of         |
| 22 |    | providing service to each of the customer classes, and is to be used as a guide for |

til en er ekkernereken elke til ette ette kommer en kellere en eller

setting rates to the extent allowed by other rate design objectives of the Commission.

2

3

4

Q. What are the primary steps in a COS study?

.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

A. There are three primary steps in performing a class cost of service study. These steps include the functionalization, classification, and allocation of costs. Functionalization of costs means categorizing accounts according to the type of function with which an account is associated. Accounts are categorized as being related to Production, Transmission, Distribution, Customer Accounts, Administrative and General, etc., depending on the natural gas local distribution company (LDC) functions that they are a part.

Once costs have been functionalized, they are classified as being customer

(related to the number of customers), demand (related to the portion of peak

usage), or "other" costs, depending on the function with which they are

associated. For example, customer records and collection expense, meter plant,

and meter reading expense are considered customer-related, since company

expenditures in these areas are related to the number of customers that it serves.

These expenses, although dependent to some extent on a customer's size, will be

incurred for each customer whether or not the customer uses any natural gas so it

would not be reasonable to classify them as being commodity-related.

Allocation factors are then developed to distribute a reasonable share of

jurisdictional costs to each customer class. Allocation factors are based on 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.

4

5

3

Q. Which customer classes have you used?

6

A. I have used the following customer rate classes: Residential, Small General Service (SGS), Large General Service (LGS), Large Volume (LV), and Unmetered Gas Lights (UMGL). These are MGE's current rate classes.

8

9

7

Q. On what data is your class COS study based?

10

.. I utilized the Missouri Public Service Commission Staff (Staff) Accounting Schedules that Staff filed in its non-rate design testimony for the source of most

11

of the financial data that I utilized in my COS study. I also used data received

12

from MGE in response to Public Counsel Data Requests. My use of this data is

13 14

not an endorsement of either Staff's or MGE's methods. I used this information

15

because it was readily available and contains the level of detail necessary to

16

17

perform a COS study.

O. What is a meter?

18 19

A. A meter is a device designed to provide accurate measurement of customer

METERS, REGULATORS, AND SERVICES

20

consumption of natural gas. The natural gas industry depends primarily on two

21

classes of meters, positive displacement meters and orifice meters, to measure the volumes of gas delivered. Typically, at a single family dwelling where the

2223

volumes are small and at low pressure, positive displacement diaphragm meters

are used. Rotary, turbine, and large size diaphragm positive displacement meters are used to measure the larger volumes delivered to many industrial and commercial customers. At the city gate, and at other locations where large volumes of high-pressure natural gas must be metered, the industry uses the orifice meter, sometimes in conjunction with a diaphragm or rotary meter. The proper size of meters being installed to a customer is determined primarily on the system pressure, the customer's maximum expected load, load profile, and growth possibilities.

- Q. What is a regulator?
- A. A regulator is a device used to control the pressures in a natural gas distribution system. Generally, service regulators are installed ahead of the gas meter in the meter loop piping. They are used in all service lines to residential and small-volume commercial and industrial customers that connect to medium and high-pressure distribution systems. If delivery pressures are greater than 60 psig, then either a pressure-relief device or two regulators in series must be used. Regulators for industrial services range from slightly larger versions of those used for residential services to large installations similar to district regulator stations. Their choice is designed to meet the needs of an individual customer's load and distribution pressure at a particular customer location.
- O. What is a service?
- A. A service is a pipe laid from a gas main into or near a building to be served, and connected to the customer's gas meter. Different customers use different sizes of services depending on their demand for natural gas. Service line size is

determined by considering the minimum inlet pressure, the customer's maximum expected load, and the length of the proposed service line. As in the case of meters and regulators, calculations of service size are only necessary for larger customers. The standard service line size of ½" will adequately serve all residential customers.

Q. Please explain the costs being allocated by the meter, regulator, and service allocators.

A. MGE's FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) account 381 includes the material cost of meters and FERC account 382 includes the installation cost of meters. MGE's FERC account 383 includes both the material cost and installation cost of regulators. MGE's FERC account 380 includes both the material cost and installation cost of services.

Q. Please state the factors that affect the allocation of material and installation costs of meters, regulators, and services.

A. In deriving the meter, regulator, and service allocators, I tried to allocate costs to the actual cost causers by considering three factors: customer counts for each rate class; average costs for each type of meter, regulator, and service; and the number of meters, regulators, or services used by a customer for each customer class.

Q. Please explain the first factor that affects the allocation of material and installation costs for meters, regulators, and services.

A. The first factor that affects the allocation of meters, regulators, and services is the customer count for each rate class. Meter costs are basically customer-related costs. Peak demand of a customer does not directly affect the meter cost except

that larger meters were generally designed for larger customers. If a residential customer adds a natural gas appliance and thus increases his peak demand, it will not directly affect his meter cost.

Q. Please explain the second factor that affects the allocation of material and installation costs for meters, regulators, and services.

- A. The second factor that affects the allocation of meters, regulators, and services costs is the average cost for each type of meters, regulators, and services. Different customer classes use different sizes of meters, regulators, and services to accommodate their different capacity needs. For example, the standard small sizes of meters, regulators, and services can be used by most of the residential customers. On the other hand, LGS and LV customers, often use rotary, turbine, and large diaphragm meters, as well as larger sizes of regulators and services. Some variations exist in SGS customers' size of meters, regulators, and services. They range from the same size as residential customers to slightly larger ones. Both the size and length of the services affect the cost of service lines.
- Q. Please explain the third factor that affects the allocation of material and installation costs of meters, regulators, and services.
  - The third factor that affects the allocation of meters, regulators, and services costs is the number of meters, regulators, or services used by a customer in each customer class. Generally, each customer has one service line, one meter, and one regulator. However, some customers are served by multiple services, regulators, and meters due to the physical nature of their facilities. For example, a large percent of LGS and LV customers use multiple meters. Also, there are

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

instances where multiple residential or SGS customers are served through one service line. For instance, it is possible that one service line serves a bank of meters in an apartment building or a strip mall. In this case, it is also possible to use only one regulator to serve multiple meters.

- Q. Please describe the method used to derive the meter, regulator, and service allocators.
- The class meter, regulator, and service allocators are based on the typical meter, service, regulator, and installation costs provided by the Company in Case No. GR-98-140, and the updated prorated customer count calculated by Staff in this case. The reason I used costs from Case No. GR-98-140 is that in response to Public Counsel data request asking for average costs for meters, regulators, and services for each class, MGE indicated that only partial data was available and only provided average costs for meters and regulators less than 2 inches. This did not provide sufficient data to use in this case. A meter/customer ratio is then calculated to reflect the number of meters used by a customer in each rate class. In deriving the meter/customer ratio, the total MGE meters in December 2000, adjusted to reflect differences between Staff and MGE customer counts, and the average number of billable meters in the year 2000, were compared. meter/customer ratio was thus developed by spreading the unaccounted meters to all non-residential customers. A regulator/customer ratio and a service/customer ratio were also calculated using the same methodology.

testimony.

Finally, the derivation of the meter allocator involves determining the meter counts by multiplying the prorated customer number with the meter/customer ratio; and determining the weighted count by using the typical meter cost for each customer class. The class meter allocators are residential, 76.7%; SGS, 17.4%; LGS, 1.4%; and LV, 4.5%.

The regulator and service allocators were derived in the same manner as the meter and meter installation allocator. The final class regulator allocators are residential, 34.6%; SGS, 60.9%; LGS, 1.3%; and LV, 3.2%. The final service allocators are residential, 83.7%; SGS, 13.4%; LGS, 0.8%; and LV, 2.1%. The results of each step are shown in Schedule JAB-RD1, an attachment to my direct

#### **OTHER ALLOCATORS**

- Q. How did you allocate Land and Land Rights, Structures and Improvements, and Mains Plant (accounts 374, 375, and 376)?
- A. For these accounts, I utilized the mains allocator that was developed by Ms. Hu.
- Q. Please describe the allocators that you applied to the remaining distribution accounts.
- A. I used total throughput to allocate Measuring and Regulating Station Equipment (accounts 378 and 379). I allocated Other Equipment (account 387) based on the allocation of all other previously allocated distribution plant.
- Q. How did you allocate General Plant?

4

I allocated the General Plant accounts on the basis of each class's proportion of

total company COS. In this way, the costs allocated to each class from these

accounts correspond to the extent to which each class is responsible for the

Company's overall costs.

5

Q. Within Operation and Maintenance expense, how did you allocate gas distribution

6 expense?

7

8

9

A. I used the "expenses follow plant principle" for allocating most of the accounts in

this category. For example, the allocator that I applied to Mains plant (account

376) was also applied to Mains maintenance (account 887).

10

Q. How did you allocate customer accounts expense?

11

I allocated meter reading expenses with the weighted customer allocator that the

12

Staff developed in Case No. GR-93-240. These weights are 1.44 for SGS, 5.3 for

13

LGS, and 8.76 for LV. Uncollectibles (account 904) are allocated based on COS.

14

All of the remaining Customer Accounts Expenses were allocated based on the

15

weighted-customer allocator that I used for meters.

16

Q. How were Customer Service and Sales Promotion expense allocated?

17

Customer Service accounts were allocated on the basis of unweighted customer

18

numbers and Sales Promotion expenses were allocated based on my COS

19 20 allocator. I chose to use my COS allocator for Sales Promotion expenses since

21

these cost are incurred for the purpose of lowering the average margin cost (by increasing sales) of providing service to customers in each of the customer

22

classes. The amount by which customers in each class benefit from a lower

average cost will be proportional to the share of overall costs of service per customer that they are responsible for incurring.

3

Q. How did you allocate Administrative and General (A & G) expenses?

5

4

expense (account 924) on the basis of net plant since this expense is linked to the

I divide these expenses into three categories. I allocated Property Insurance

6

amount of plant that the Company requires in order to serve each customer class.

7

Injuries and Damages and Employee Pensions and Benefits (accounts 925 and

8

926) are both payroll related expenses so they were allocated on the basis of the

9

amount of payroll expense that I had previously allocated to each class. I believe

10

all remaining A & G accounts represent expenditures that support the Company's

11

overall operation, so I have allocated them on the basis of each class's share of

12

How did you allocate property and payroll taxes?

total Company COS.

14

13

Property taxes were allocated on the basis of the amount of total plant that I had

15

previously allocated to each class. Payroll taxes were allocated on the basis of the

16

amount of payroll expenses that I had previously allocated to each class.

17

Q. How did you allocate state and federal income taxes?

18

. These taxes are allocated on the basis of rate base since a utility company's

19

income taxes are a function of the size of its rate base, and thus a class should

20

contribute revenues for income taxes in accordance with the proportion of rate

21

base that is necessary to serve it.

22

Q. Please describe the results of Public Counsel's COS study.

3

4

5

6

7

- A. Public Counsel's COS study shows that the residential class is nearly at its cost of service. SGS and LGS customers are paying more than their cost of service and LV customers are paying less. Public Counsel witness Hong Hu will take the results of this study and discuss the appropriate rate design treatment. Schedule JAB-RD2 shows the results of Public Counsel's COS study.
- Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- A. Yes it does.

## OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

Meter, Regulator, and Service Allocators MGE Case No. GR-2001-292

#### Meters and Meters Installations

|                            | Re | sidential | <br>SGS LGS  |    |          | LV              | Total   |  |
|----------------------------|----|-----------|--------------|----|----------|-----------------|---------|--|
| Number of Customers        |    | 441,144   | <br>62,779   |    | 482      | <br>466         | 504,870 |  |
| Meter/Customer Ratio       |    | 1.00      | 0.86         |    | 0.86     | 1.00            |         |  |
| Estimated Number of Meters |    | 441,144   | 53,755       |    | 412      | 466             | 495,778 |  |
| Meter Cost                 | \$ | 55.00     | \$<br>243.00 | \$ | 2,275.00 | \$<br>5,617.25  |         |  |
| Inst Cost                  | \$ | 162.84    | \$<br>162.84 | \$ | 2,104.89 | \$<br>6,472.08  |         |  |
| Average Meter Cost         | \$ | 217.84    | \$<br>405.84 | \$ | 4,379.89 | \$<br>12,089.33 |         |  |
| Weight                     |    | 1.00      | 1.86         |    | 20.11    | 55.50           |         |  |
| Weighted Meter Count       |    | 441,144   | 100,147      |    | 8,292    | 25,843          | 575,427 |  |
| Meter Allocation Factor    |    | 76.7%     | 17.4%        |    | 1.4%     | 4.5%            | 100%    |  |

# Regulators and Regulator Installations

|                                | Re      | esidential |        | SGS LGS |    |        | LV | Total    |           |  |
|--------------------------------|---------|------------|--------|---------|----|--------|----|----------|-----------|--|
| Number of Customers            | 441,144 |            | 62,779 |         |    | 482    |    | 466      | 504,870   |  |
| Regulator/Customer Ratio       |         | 0.99       |        | 0.99    |    | 1.00   |    | 1.00     |           |  |
| Estimated Number of Regulators |         | 435,037    |        | 61,910  |    | 482    |    | 466      |           |  |
| Average Regulator Cost         | \$      | 23.40      | \$     | 290.00  | \$ | 817.37 | \$ | 2,009.53 |           |  |
| Weight                         |         | 1.00       |        | 12.39   |    | 34.93  |    | 85.88    |           |  |
| Weighted Regulator Count       |         | 435,037    |        | 767,257 |    | 16,825 |    | 39,990   | 1,259,110 |  |
| Regulator Allocation Factor    |         | 34.6%      |        | 60.9%   |    | 1.3%   |    | 3.2%     | 100%      |  |

## Services and Service Installations

|                              | Re | sidential | SGS          | SLGS |          | <br>LV          | Total   |  |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|--------------|------|----------|-----------------|---------|--|
| Number of Customers          |    | 441,144   | <br>62,779   |      | 482      | <br>466         | 504,870 |  |
| Service/Customer Ratio       |    | 0.99      | 0.99         |      | 1.00     | 1.00            | •       |  |
| Estimated Number of Services |    | 435,037   | 61,910       |      | 482      | 466             | 402448  |  |
| Average Services Cost        | \$ | 624.42    | \$<br>701.82 | \$   | 5,341.81 | \$<br>14,524.80 |         |  |
| Weight                       |    | 1.00      | 1.12         | •    | 8.55     | 23.26           |         |  |
| Weighted Service Count       |    | 435,037   | 69,583       |      | 4,121    | 10,832          | 519,573 |  |
| Services Allocation Factor   |    | 83.7%     | 13.4%        |      | 0.8%     | 2.1%            | 100%    |  |

<sup>\*</sup> Average Services Cost for SGS are calculated based on an estimated distribution of 95% less than 2" pipes and 5% 2" pipes.

# OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL

Cost of Service Study MGE Case No. GR-2001-292

|    | TOTAL COST OF SERVICE SUMMARY:                          |    | TOTAL                                   | RESIDENTIAL | SMALL<br>GS           | LARGE<br>GS | LARGE<br>VOLUME | UMGL   |
|----|---|----|---|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|
| 1  | O & M Expenses  | _  | 59,926,439                              | 41,627,533  | 11,374,833            | 982,684     | 5,938,580       | 2,809  |
| 2  | •   |    | 19,608,427                              | 13,834,960  | 3,552,855             | 323,906     | 1,896,617       | 88     |
| 3  |   |    | 17,895,135                              | 12,184,816  | 3,391,451             | 320,453     | 1,998,358       | 57     |
| 4  |   | _  |   |             |                       |             |                 |        |
| 5  |   |    | 97,430,001                              | 67,647,308  | 18,319,140            | 1,627,043   | 9,833,556       | 2,954  |
| 6  | 10,112 Enpended and Tanto                               |    | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | 0.,0,500    | 10,012,110            |             | ,,000,000       | 2,501  |
| 7  | Current Revenue (non-gas)                               |    |   |             |                       |             |                 |        |
| 8  |   |    | 137,312,799                             | 94,228,285  | 28,515,452            | 2,992,701   | 11,573,361      | 3,000  |
| 9  |   | 17 | 3,063,968                               | 2,108,790   | 579,206               | 52,699      | 323,207         | 66     |
| 10 |   | 1, | 5,005,500                               | 2,100,770   | 577,200               | J2,077      | 525,207         |        |
| 11 | TOTAL - Current Revenues                                |    | 140,376,767                             | 96,337,075  | 29,094,658            | 3,045,400   | 11,896,568      | 3,066  |
| 12 |   |    | 100.00%                                 | 68.63%      | 20.73%                | 2.17%       | 8.47%           | 0.00%  |
| 13 |   |    | 100.0070                                | 00.0370     | 20.7570               | 2.1770      | 0.4770          | 0.0076 |
| 14 |   |    | 42,946,766                              | 28,689,767  | 10,775,518            | 1,418,357   | 2,063,013       | 112    |
| 15 |   |    | 12,510,700                              | 20,000,707  | 10,775,510            | 1,410,557   | 2,005,015       | 112    |
| 16 |   |    | 486,933,326                             | 328,778,107 | 93,203,306            | 8,893,805   | 56,056,452      | 1,656  |
| 17 |   |    | 400,555,520                             | 520,770,107 | 75,205,500            | 0,025,005   | 30,030,432      | 1,050  |
| 18 |   |    | 8.82%                                   | 8.73%       | 11.56%                | 15.95%      | 3.68%           | 6.78%  |
| 19 | improve tuto or rectain (1001)                          |    | 0.0270                                  | 0.7570      | 11.5070               | 13.7370     | 5.0070          | 0.7678 |
| 20 | OPC Recommended Rate of Return                          |    | 8.75%                                   | 8.75%       | 8.75%                 | 8.75%       | 8.75%           | 8.75%  |
| 21 | or o recommended rate or resum                          |    | 0.7570                                  | 0.7570      | 0.7570                | 0.7570      | 6.7570          | 0.7376 |
| 22 | Recommended Operating Income With                       |    |   |             |                       |             |                 |        |
| 23 | Equalized (OPC) Rates of Return                         |    | 42,606,666                              | 28,768,084  | 8,155,289             | 778,208     | 4,904,940       | 145    |
| 24 | Equalition (57.5) fullow of feetalli                    |    | 12,000,000                              | 20,700,001  | 0,155,207             | 770,200     | 7,207,270       | Z#3    |
| 25 | Class COS at OPC's Recommended Rate of Return           |    | 140,036,667                             | 96,415,393  | 26,474,429            | 2,405,251   | 14,738,495      | 3,099  |
| 26 | Revenue Percentage                                      |    | 100.00%                                 | 68.85%      | 18.91%                | 1.72%       | 10.52%          | 0.00%  |
| 27 | Terodiae i orositago                                    |    | 100.0070                                | 00.0570     | 10.7170               | 1.7270      | 10.3270         | 0.0076 |
| 28 | Allocation of Difference Between Current                |    |   |             |                       |             |                 |        |
| 29 | Revenue and Recommended Revenue                         | 17 | (340,100)                               | (234,075)   | (64,292)              | (5,850)     | (35,876)        | (7)    |
| 30 | Revenue and Recommended Revenue                         | 17 | (540,100)                               | (234,073)   | (07,272)              | (3,630)     | (33,870)        | (7)    |
| 31 | Margin Revenue Required to Equalize                     |    |   |             |                       |             |                 |        |
| 32 | Class ROR - Revenue Neutral                             |    | 140,376,767                             | 96,649,468  | 26,538,721            | 2,411,101   | 14 774 271      | 2.106  |
|    | Revenue Percentage                                      |    | 100.00%                                 | 68.85%      | 18.91%                | 1.72%       | 14,774,371      | 3,106  |
| 34 | 10 venue i crocinage                                    |    | 100.0076                                | 06.6576     | 10.7170               | 1.7270      | 10.52%          | 0.00%  |
|    | Rev. Neutral Shift to Equalize Class ROR                |    | (0)                                     | 312,393     | (2,555,937)           | (624 200)   | 2 933 900       | 40     |
|    | Rev. Neutral Shift PERCENTAGE to Equalize Class RO      | D  | (0)                                     | 0.33%       | -8.96%                | (634,299)   | 2,877,803       | 40     |
| 37 | Nev. Neutral Sint LENCENTAGE to Equalize Class NO       | IX |   | 0.33%       | -0.90%                | -21.19%     | 24.87%          | 1.33%  |
|    | Recommended Revenue Neutral Shift = 1/2 indicated shift | Δ  | (0)                                     | 156 106     | (1 277 049)           | (217.150)   | 1 439 001       | 20     |
|    |   |    | (0)                                     | 156,196     | (1,277,968)<br>-4.48% | (317,150)   | 1,438,901       | 20     |
| 39 | - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                 |    | 100 000                                 | 0.17%       |                       | -10.60%     | 12.43%          | 0.67%  |
| 40 | Class Revenue Percentages After Rec. Rev. Neutral Shift |    | 100.00%                                 | 68.74%      | 19.82%                | 1.94%       | 9.50%           | 0.00%  |
|    |   |    |   |             |                       |             |                 |        |