# EXHIBIT Y TESTIMONY OF JEROME C. WEINERT

# BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

# AQUA PENNSYLVANIA WASTEWATER, INC. DOCKET NO. A-2019-3009052

AQUA STATEMENT NO. 5
DIRECT TESTIMONY

**OF** 

JEROME C. WEINERT, PE, ASA, CDP

UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT

SELECTED BY EAST NORRITON TOWNSHIP

July 30, 2019

1	Q.	Please state your name, business address, and occupation.
2	A.	My name is Jerome C. Weinert. My business address is 8555 West Forest Home Avenue,
3		Suite 201, Greenfield, WI 53228. I am a Principal and Director of AUS Consultants. This
4		testimony was prepared by me.
5		
6	Q.	Please describe your qualifications and indicate if you are registered as a Utility
7		Valuation Expert with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission.
8	A.	A CV for Jerome C. Weinert is attached to my report and this testimony. I am a registered
9		Utility Valuation Expert with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission. I obtained that
10		registration in 2016 and was informed of our renewal by the Pennsylvania PUC Secretary
11		on January 24, 2019.
12		
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
14	<b>A.</b>	This direct testimony provides clarification and explanation of the appraisal I provided to
15		East Norriton Township, the Selling Utility pursuant to 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329(a)(5) and in
16		accordance with Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice 2018-2019 Edition.
17		
18	Q.	Are you advocating for any party or outcome?
19	<b>A.</b>	No. The Ethics Rule of the USPAP, applicable here pursuant to 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329(a)(3),
20		requires that I perform the appraisal with impartiality, objectivity, and independence, and
21		without accommodation of personal interests. In addition, the USPAP Ethics Rule requires
22		that I not perform the assignment with bias, that I must not advocate the cause or interest

1		of any party or issue and that I must not accept an assignment that includes the reporting
2		of predetermined opinions and conclusions.
3		
4	Q.	Do you have any affiliation with either the Selling Utility or the Acquiring Public
5		Utility or Entity?
6	A.	No. Other than the current assignment to provide the subject appraisal, I have no business
7		or personal relationships with any party to the proposed acquisition.
8		
9	Q.	What is your fee arrangement to deliver the appraisal?
10	A.	A copy of the fee arrangement is included with the Application as Exhibit S2. In summary,
11		I am to receive \$24,000 plus expenses in compensation for our appraisal, which represents
12		approximately 0.17% of the proposed valuation.
13		
14	Q.	Will you receive that fee regardless of whether the Commission approves the
15		proposed transaction or whether it closes?
16	<b>A.</b>	Yes. 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329(a)(3) mandates that I comply with the USPAP when developing
17		my appraisal. Under the USPAP I cannot perform the appraisal with bias and acceptance
18		of a fee contingent on a particular outcome like closing or Commission approval would
19		violate that Ethics Rule.
20		
21	Q.	Have you prepared any exhibits, schedules, or appendices to accompany your direct
22		testimony?

Yes. The appraisal I submitted to the Seller pursuant to Section 1329(a)(5) is included in the Application as Exhibit R. The appraisal includes a narrative and supporting exhibits in sections. All were prepared under my supervision and control. Also, as stated above, attached to this testimony as Appendix A is my CV.

5

- Q. Please summarize your results of the application of the cost, market, and income
   approaches to valuation.
- 8 **A.** The summary results of the cost, income, and market approaches is presented below.

9

Approach	Indicated Value	Weight	Weighted Value
Cost Approach	\$27,461,356	50%	\$13,730,678
Income Approach	\$21,729,647	40%	\$8,691,859
Market Approach	\$26,420,570	10%	\$2,642,057
		100%	\$25,064,594
Conclusion			\$25,064,594

10

11

# 12 Q. Describe any assumptions, extraordinary assumptions, hypothetical conditions, 13 and/or limiting conditions that you applied to the valuation

14 **A.** The major assumptions and limiting conditions used in preparing our appraisal of East
15 Norriton Township's Sanitary Wastewater Collection System are described in our appraisal
16 report "Fair Market Appraisal Report of the East Norriton Township, Pennsylvania's
17 Sanitary Wastewater Collection System, as of October 29, 2018." Beyond the above

described assumptions there are no extraordinary	or hypothetical <sup>2</sup>	assumptions (a	as defined
in the 2018-2019 Uniform Standards of Profession	on Appraisal Prac	etice (USPAP).	

#### Q. How was each assumption used and what was its result?

**A.** The assumptions are detailed in my appraisal report and are discussed further in this testimony.

Q.

why are the individual weights you chose appropriate for this proposed transaction?

A. For the cost approach I chose a weighting of 50%. It is my opinion that this weighting is appropriate for the cost approach because the major purpose of this appraisal is to be an input to the Commission's establishment of cost for future ratemaking and the cost

How did you develop the weighting applied to each approach in your appraisal and

approach conclusion is directly reflective of the property cost.

For the market approach I chose a weighting of 10%. It is my opinion that this weighting is appropriate for the market approach because while the market approach provides some information as to the value of the property, establishing comparability between the individual sales to the subject property is difficult and uncertain therefore requiring less weight of the market approach and the 10% weight accomplishes that objective.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Extraordinary assumption: an assignment-specific assumption as of the effective date regarding uncertain information used in an analysis which, if found to be false, could alter the appraiser's opinions or conclusions. 2018-2019 USPAP page 4)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Hypothetical condition: a condition, directly related to a specific assignment, which is contrary to what is known by the appraiser to exist on the effective date of the assignment results, but used for the purpose of analysis. (2018-2019 USPAP page 4)

1		For the income approach I chose a weighting of 40%. It is my opinion that this
2		weighting is appropriate for the income approach because the income approach reflects the
3		value of the property's return to the property's owner. And the 40% weight accomplishes
4		that objective.
5		
6	Q.	Did you conduct an on-site inspection of the Selling Utility assets, and if so, what was
7		its result on the appraisal?
8	A.	Yes. I conducted an on-site inspection of East Norriton Township wastewater assets on
9		November 30, 2016. The on-site inspection was mainly used to provide an overview of
10		the collection system and verify its condition.
11		
12	Q.	What Utility Earnings Report was used to create the capital structure used in your
12 13	Q.	What Utility Earnings Report was used to create the capital structure used in your appraisal?
	Q.	
13		appraisal?
13 14		appraisal?  I used a market required capital structure based on an analysis of the market capital
13 14 15		appraisal?  I used a market required capital structure based on an analysis of the market capital structure analysis (detailed in the Cost of Capital / Required Return portion of our appraisal
13 14 15		appraisal?  I used a market required capital structure based on an analysis of the market capital structure analysis (detailed in the Cost of Capital / Required Return portion of our appraisal report). Information used in developing the market capital structure was obtained from
113 114 115 116 117		appraisal?  I used a market required capital structure based on an analysis of the market capital structure analysis (detailed in the Cost of Capital / Required Return portion of our appraisal report). Information used in developing the market capital structure was obtained from financial statistics reported in Value Line Investment Survey for the water / wastewater
113 114 115 116 117 118		appraisal?  I used a market required capital structure based on an analysis of the market capital structure analysis (detailed in the Cost of Capital / Required Return portion of our appraisal report). Information used in developing the market capital structure was obtained from financial statistics reported in Value Line Investment Survey for the water / wastewater
13 14 15 16	<b>A.</b>	appraisal?  I used a market required capital structure based on an analysis of the market capital structure analysis (detailed in the Cost of Capital / Required Return portion of our appraisal report). Information used in developing the market capital structure was obtained from financial statistics reported in Value Line Investment Survey for the water / wastewater industry published in their October 12, 2018 issue.
113 114 115 116 117 118 119	A. Q.	appraisal?  I used a market required capital structure based on an analysis of the market capital structure analysis (detailed in the Cost of Capital / Required Return portion of our appraisal report). Information used in developing the market capital structure was obtained from financial statistics reported in Value Line Investment Survey for the water / wastewater industry published in their October 12, 2018 issue.  What capital structure was used in your appraisal?

1

Type of Capital	Capital Ratio	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost
Debt	30%	4.45%	1.34%
Preferred	0%	NA%	NA%
Common Equity	70%	9.95%	6.97%
Total	100%		8.31%

2

3

4

#### Cost Approach

- Regarding your application of the cost approach, what method did you use to determine the cost approach result (e.g. original cost, replacement cost, reproduction cost)?
- 8 **A.** I used the replacement cost method.

9

10 Q. Please explain why you chose the replacement cost method.

I chose the replacement cost method because it is considered the proper starting point for a cost approach. Replacement cost reflects the appraisal date cost of providing the property's functionality and capacity at the appraisal date cost using recognized materials and labor costs.

15

16

#### Q. What index did you use for that method?

I used the Handy Whitman Index of Public Utility Construction Costs for the Water
Industry (North Eastern US Region), AUS Telephone Index (General Plant), and various
United States Bureau of Labor Statistics cost index series.

20

1	Q.	Under your application of the cost approach what assets did you value or trend
2		differently from other assets and why was that necessary?
3	A.	I costed each property account with cost trends appropriate for the property contained in
4		the account. As such, the costing of each property account may differ from account to
5		account. It is my opinion that an accurate appraisal requires each property account be
6		costed with cost trends reflective of the property contained in the account.
7		
8	Q.	Under your application of the cost approach, what year-end date did you use for
9		calculating the depreciation reserve?
10	A.	I used the date of October 29, 2018.
11		
12	Q.	How did you determine the depreciation parameters of survival/retirement
13		characteristics and service lives for the utility property under the cost approach?
14	A.	I determined those parameters based on AUS Consultants' experience in preparing
15		depreciation studies for the water and wastewater industry and our experience appraising
16		water and wastewater properties.
17		
18	Q.	Why are those parameters appropriate?
19	A.	Those parameters are appropriate because the parameters used in AUS Consultants'
20		experience reflect the survival / retirement characteristics of normal and functional service
21		lives of water and wastewater properties.
22		
23		

2	Q.	Regarding your application of the market approach, what methods did you use to
3		determine the market approach result?

**A.** I used the comparable sales of water and wastewater properties in the Commonwealth of
5 Pennsylvania subsequent to the passage of Section 1329 and financial market value ratios
6 of publicly traded water and wastewater companies as reported in the October 12, 2018
7 issue of Value Line Investment Survey.

Α.

#### Q. What assumptions, analyses, and/or adjustments did you make under each method?

Under the comparable sales method, it is my opinion that sales amount to depreciated replacement cost is the best indicator in arriving at the appraised value of physical assets operating as a wastewater collection system. Under the financial ratios method, I believe that an accurate result depends on using the weighted mean of the ratio of the market debt and equity to book debt and equity.

#### Q. What were the results of each analysis you performed?

**A.** The comparable sales analysis produced a result of \$26,420,570. The financial market analysis produced a result of \$15,973,314.

#### Q. Which results were used to determine your market approach result?

I used the results of \$26,420,570 because I believe those results represent an accurate assessment and it was based on the relationship of market comparable sales to the replacement cost less depreciation of those properties.

1

- 2 Q. What was that calculation you used to determine your overall market approach
- 3 results?
- 4 A. The calculation I used consisted of the ratio of the market sales to their replacement cost
- 5 new applied to the replacement cost new less depreciation of the East Norriton property.

6

- 7 Q. What comparable transactions or comparable sales did you evaluate to develop your
- 8 market approach?
- 9 **A.** I examined the following transactions to develop the result of my market approach:

10

Investor-Owned Utility													
As of October 29, 2018													
Comparable Sales Approach													
Market Sales Basis													
Market Sales basis  Description	New Garden Wastewater System	McKeesport Wastewater System	Limerick Wastewater System	East Bradford Wastewater Collection System	Sadsbury Wastewater Collection System	Exeter Wastwater Collection System	Steelton Water System	Cheltenham Wastewarer Collection System	Simple Average / Standard Deviation	Remove Outliers Simple Average / Standard Deviation	Weighted Average	Remove Outliers Weighted Average / Standard Deviation	Use
·	i i		•	T '		T .	i	· ·					
System Description													
Type of System	Wastewater	Wastewater	Wastewater	Wastewater	Wastewater	Wastewater	Water	Wastewater					
System Attributes	Collection & Treatment	Collection & Treatment	Collection & Treatment	Collection Only	Collection Only	Collection & Treatment	Treatment & Distribution	Collection Only					
Purchase Price	29,500,000	159,000,000	75,100,000	5,000,000	9,250,000	96,000,000	22,500,000	50,250,000			446,600,000	441,600,000	
Proportion of Purchase Price to Total	7%	36%	17%	1%	2%	21%	5%	11%			100%	99%	
Proportion of Purchase Price to Outlier Adjusted Total	7%	36%	17%		2%	22%	5%	11%				100%	
Acquirer	Aqua-PA	PA-American	Aqua-PA	Aqua-PA	PA-American	PA-American	PA-American	Aqua-PA					
Date	Aug-16	Sep-16		20-Dec-17		29-May-18	14-Nov-18	Jun-18					
Customers													
Original Cost												295,350,000	
Depreciated Original Cost (AUS Consultants) OCLD	18,567,728	101,915,080	46,153,867	5,383,591	6,128,876	40,057,634	14,433,435	15,784,463			248,424,674	243,041,083	
Purchase Price to OCLD	1.5888	1.5601	1.6272	0.9287	1.5092	2.3965	1.5589	3.1835	1.7941	1.5688	1.7977	1.817	1.817
Variance to Simple Mean	-0.2053	-0.234	-0.1669	-0.8654	-0.2849	0.6024	-0.2352	1.3894	0.6426	0.5913			
Variance to Wtd Mean	-0.2089	-0.2376	-0.1705	-0.869	-0.2885	0.5988	-0.2388	1.3858				0.2148	
Replacement Cost New less Depreciation RCNLD	30,615,410	160,301,491	86,086,756	9,236,581	8,517,587	99,589,819	23,921,473	49,940,486			468,209,603		
Purchase Price to RCNLD	0.9636	0.9919	0.8724	0.5413	1.086	0.964	0.9406		0.9208	0.975	0.9538	0.9621	0.9621
Variance to Simple Mean	0.0428	0.0711	-0.0484	-0.3795	0.1652	0.0432	0.0198	0.0854	0.1541	0.0604			
Variance to Wtd Mean	0.0098	0.0381	-0.0814	-0.4125	0.1322	0.0102	-0.0132	0.0524				0.0183	

12

13

11

#### **Income Approach**

- 14 Q. Regarding your application of the income approach, what method did you use to
- determine the income approach result?
- 16 **A.** I used the discounted cash flow method.

17

- 1 Q. What assumptions did you employ to develop your income approach result?
- 2 **A.** Under the income approach, it is my opinion that the results of the future operations of the East Norriton Sanitary Wastewater Collection System must be considered. I believe that

an accurate result depends on adjusting recent results of the systems operation to better

- reflect how those result will migrate over future periods under the operation as a rate
- regulated wastewater collection system regulated by the Pennsylvania PUC.

7

4

- 8 Q. What discount rate did you use to calculate your income approach?
- 9 **A.** I used a discount rate of 7.92% and 6.31% capitalization rate.

10

- 11 Q. Please explain how you developed the discount rate.
- A. In each case the discount rate was a market discount rate at the appraisal date and was 12 determined using the weighted market cost of capital (WACC) of both debt and equity. 13 14 The inputs to the WACC determination, capital structure, cost of debt, cost of equity, and income tax rate (state and federal) were determined based analysis of Value Line 15 Investment Surveys, Mergent Bond Record (formerly Moody's Bond Record), Standard 16 17 and Poor's Bond Guide (no longer published), Ibbotson Stock, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation (Ibbotson SBBI) 2019 Edition (SBBI activity over the period 1926 through 2018). The 18 cost of debt was determined at October 29, 2018 based on the Mergent Bond Record, and 19 20 the Bureau of Technical Utility Services' Report on Quarterly Earnings of Jurisdictional Utilities for Year Ended September 30, 2018. The cost of equity was based on the capital 21 22 asset pricing model (CAPM) and the Dividend Growth Model (DGM), two recognized cost 23 of equity estimating models. The above described data for the East Norriton appraisal can

1		be found in the exhibits to my appraisal report in the section entitled Cost of Capital /
2		Required Return.
3		
4	Q.	What capital structure inputs differ from those identified in capital structure set forth
5		earlier in your testimony?
6	<b>A.</b>	None. As described in the previous discussion of the capital structure, we utilized a market
7		required capital structure based on analysis of the water / wastewater industry's market
8		capital structure as defined by analysis of market financials as published in Value Line
9		Investment Survey (October 12, 2018). The theory in appraisal is to estimate the value of
10		a property in an arm's length transaction wherein the purchaser finances the purchase with
11		capital (debt and equity) available in the financial markets at the appraisal date. Those are
12		the current (appraisal date) financial markets.
13		
14	Q.	What is the source and basis of the alternative input you propose in the income
15		approach?
16	<b>A.</b>	As discussed above, we had used Value Line Investment Survey to develop a market
17		required capital structure. Please see Application Exhibit R (AUS Appraisal) Income
18		Approach section, pages 6 of 38 for the cost of capital of the Income Approach and Cost
19		of Capital / Required Return pages 1 of 72 through 72 of 72 for the basis of the Cost of
20		Capital / Required Return.
21		
22	Q.	If you used a terminal value in your discounted cash flow analysis what is the number
23		of years over which the cash flows are considered?

1	<b>A.</b>	I considered those cash flows over 19 periods with period 20 representing all future periods.
2		
3	Q.	What is the basis for using this number of years?
4	A.	It is my opinion that the use of 19 period is a reasonable number of periods for the forecast
5		revenues and expenses to stabilize.
6		
7	Q.	What number of Selling Utility customers or equivalent dwelling units did you use to
8		value the Seller's system and how did you develop that number?
9	A.	I did not use customers/EDUs in developing the forecasted revenues and expense forecast.
10		Instead, I used past and budgeted results from operations to establish forecasted operating
11		results.
12		
13	Q.	Did you make any updates to your appraisal after it was submitted to the Seller, and
14		if so, what was the update, when was it made, and why was it necessary?
15	A.	I did update my initial appraisal due to a revised Engineers' Assessment which I received
16		on June 6, 2019.
17		
18	Q.	Does this conclude your direct testimony?
19	A.	It does. However, by filing this direct testimony I understand that I may have the
20		opportunity to submit additional testimony responsive to challenges to my appraisal.

#### Curriculum Vitae (CV) of Jerome C. Weinert, P.E., CDP, ASA

Mr. Weinert is currently Principal and Director of AUS Consultants, Depreciation and Valuation. He has forty-seven (2019-1972) years experience in valuation and depreciation consulting and management. AUS, with offices across the country, has provided consulting services to the regulated utility industry nationally for over thirty two years. A partial list of services provided includes: valuations depreciation studies, rate of return studies, cost of service studies, and rate design.

Prior to joining AUS in 1987, Mr. Weinert was employed by American Appraisal Associates, Inc. (American) for sixteen years in their Regulated Industries Group. He held various positions at American, the last being supervising appraiser. Among his other valuation responsibilities, he directed the firm's utility industry capital recovery studies and AUS Consultant's valuation of communication company assets and businesses.

Mr. Weinert graduated from the Milwaukee School of Engineering with a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering and received a Masters in Business Administration from Marquette University. He is a registered professional engineer (1976) (by examination) in the state of Wisconsin as well as a senior member (1982) of the American Society of Appraisers in the public utility valuation field. This latter designation is obtained by written examination primarily in the areas of utility valuation, depreciation, and the economics of regulated firms. He is also a Certified Depreciation Professional (1997) (CDP) and founding member of the Society of Depreciation Professionals and the Society's 1995 President and sponsor of the Society's Certification and re-certification program; as such Mr. Weinert developed these programs and oversaw their initial introduction into the Society. He also worked in conjunction with Society members in the development of the Society's training programs which as of 2003 has become the only such formalized depreciation training program in the North America and is an instructor in several of its courses.

During his professional career related to valuations and depreciation matters Mr. Weinert has testified before various courts and public service commissions on these subjects. He has also assisted numerous utilities in preparing capital recovery plans which specifically address the issues of plant replacement. Mr. Weinert has also presented expert testimony on valuation matters. On matters related to eminent domain issues. Mr. Weinert has presented expert testimony in the Massachusetts Superior Court, the Court of Common Pleas, Fayette County, Ohio, the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, the Twentieth Judicial Court (deposition only) in Charlotte County, Florida, the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit Court in St. Lucie County, Florida (deposition only). In regards to ad valorem taxation, Mr. Weinert has presented study results to the New York State Board of Equalization and Assessment (now the New York Office of Real Property Services (NY ORPS)), pertaining to useful life and net salvage values for all types of utility property subject to the Board's mass appraisal model. Mr. Weinert has appeared before the Valuation Adjustment Board in Florida for Duval, Hillsborough, Okeechobee, and Palm Beach counties, the Twelfth Judicial Circuit Sarasota County, Florida, the California Board of Equalization and Assessment, the Arizona Board of Assessment, the Missouri Board of Taxation, the Colorado and Texas Departments of Review, the Massachusetts Tax Appeal Court, the Superior Court of the State of Arizona in the County of Maricopa, the State Tax Appeal Board of the State of Montana and the New York City Tax Commission.

Mr. Weinert has appeared before regulatory bodies in Alaska, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, Nevada, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina in support of rate-base valuation determination and capital recovery. He has presented testimony on depreciation matters before the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) and the United States Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). In terms of water and wastewater acquisitions and applications for regulatory approval of rate base Mr. Weinert has testified for two investor-owned

acquisitions of municipal wastewater authorities one representing the municipality and secondly for the acquiring investor-owned utility. He has submitted study results to the State Commissions of Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin, and the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Weinert has presented papers on valuation and depreciation topics to professional and utility industry trade organizations. He also directed AUS Consultants' semi-annual week-long depreciation training programs (1988-1997). These specialized training courses, offered at basic and advanced levels, teach depreciation study techniques to public utility and public service commission staff specialists. The training includes depreciation theory and concepts and hands-on experience with personal computer-based analytical depreciation programs.

#### Page 3

Company	Property		Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	<u>Activity</u>
2018					
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	North America California Florida	2017 2017 2017		2018 2018 2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company Embarq Florida, Inc. Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	Indiana Florida North America	2017 2017 2017		2018 2018 2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications, LLC Level 3 Communications, LLC CenturyLink Communications, LLC	North America California North America	2017 2017 2017		2018 2018 2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
CenturyLink Communications, LLC East Bradford Township, PA Pennsylvania American Water Company Pennsylvania American Water Company	California East Bradford Wastewater Sadsbury Wastewater Kane Wastewater	2017 2018 2017 2017		2018 2018 2018 2018	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Fair Market Value 1329 Fair Market Value Appraisal Appraisal for Planning
Pennsylvania American Water Company Pennsylvania American Water Company	Exeter Wastewater Steelton Water	2017 2017 2017		2018 2018	Fair Market Value Fair Market Value
2017					
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	North America California Florida	2016 2016 2016		2017 2017 2017	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company Embarq Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications	Indiana Florida Florida	2016 2016 2016		2017 2017 2017	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI) Level 3 Communications Level 3 Communications	North America North America California	2016 2016 2016		2017 2017 2017	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Whitpain Township, PA Plymouth Township, PA East NorittonTownship, PA	Whitpain Wastewater Plymouth Wastewater East Norittian Wastewater	2016 2016 2016		2017 2017 2017	Appraisal for Planning Appraisal for Planning Appraisal for Planning
Pennsylvania American Water Company Pennsylvania American Water Company	Sadsbury Wastewater McKeesport Wastewater	2016 2016		2017 2017	Fair Market Value Appraisal Fair Market Value Appraisal
2016	North Association	0045		0040	A 11/61 To . A
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	North America California Florida Indiana	2015 2015 2015 2015		2016 2016 2016 2016	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	Florida Florida North America	2015 2015 2015 2015		2016 2016 2016 2016	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications Level 3 Communications New Garden Township, PA	North America, California New Garden Wastewater	2015 2015 2015 2016		2016 2016 2016 2016	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Fair Market Value Appraisal
		-			
2015					
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	North America California Florida	2014 2014 2014		2015 2015 2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2014		2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal QUALIFICATIONS 3

#### **CV** of Weinert

#### Page 4

#### **Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List**

Company	Property	Study Year	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
Company	Troperty	i cai	<u>r errormeu</u>	Activity
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2014	2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2014	2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2014	2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2014	2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	California	2014	2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Nationwide	2014	2015	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2014				
AT&T Communications	North America	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarg Florida, Inc.	Florida	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	California	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Cascade Natural Gas Corporation	Oregon & Washington	2013	2014	Depreciation Study
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2013	2014	Depreciation Study
Virgin Islands Telephone Corporation	US Virgin Islands	2013	2014	Depreciation Study
Verizon Wireless	Nationwide	2013	2014	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2013				
AT&T Communications	North America	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	California			
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Palm Beach, Florida	2012	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England Mass	2002-2007	2013	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2012				
	North America	2011	2012	Ad Volorom Toy Approisal
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	North America California	2011	2012 2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	Florida	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company  AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America.	2011	2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	California			,

#### Page 5

0	Duamanta		Study	Year	A nativitary
Company	Property		Year	<u>Performed</u>	Activity
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2011		2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Palm Beach, Florida	2011		2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
MetroPCS	Palm Beach, Florida	2011		2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida - revised	2008		2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Palm Beach, Florida	2012		2012	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2011					
AT&T Communications	North America	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America, California	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2010		2011	Depreciation Study
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless	Palm Beach, Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
MetroPCS	Palm Beach, Florida	2010		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida - revised	2008		2011	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2010		2011	Depreciation Study
Virgin Islands Telephone Corporation	US Virgin Islands	2010		2011	Technical Update of Depreciation
viigii iolanao rolopilono corporation	oo viigiii lolalido	2010		Study	Toolinical Opacio of Doprosiation
2010					
AT&T Communications	North America	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Southwestern Bell Telephone Compar		2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklaho	ma, Texas				
Embarq Florida, Inc.	Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	California				
Global Crossing	North America	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
MetroPCS	Palm Beach, Florida	2009		2010	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
2009					
AT&T Communications	North America	2008		2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
					QUALIFICATIONS 5

#### **CV** of Weinert

#### Page 6

Company	Property	Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
AT&T Communications	Colifornia	2009	2000	Ad Valorom Toy Approisal
AT&T Communications	California Florida	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications		2008 2008	2009 2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana Michigan			Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Wisconsin Bell Telephone Company	Wisconsin	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Southwestern Bell Telephone Compan		2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahor Embarg Florida, Inc.	Florida	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Florida, Inc. Embarq Texas, Inc.	Texas	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarg Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Northwest	Washington	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Virginia	Virginia	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications  Verizon Communications	Northwest	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications  Verizon Communications	New England - Mass	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	California, Michigan & Ariz		2003	Au valorem rax Appraisar
Global Crossing	North America	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AboveNet, Inc	North America/California	2003	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Wireless		2003	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	Ohio Properties US Virgin Islands	2004-2005	2009	Depreciation Study
Virgin Islands Telephone Corporation	North America	2008	2009	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Nextel Corporation	North America	2006	2009	Au valorem Tax Appraisar
2008				
	North America	0007	0000	A - 1 \ / -   T A
AT&T Communications	North America	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Wisconsin Bell Telephone Company	Wisconsin	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Southwestern Bell Telephone Compan	Arkansas, Kansas, Missou	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embara Elorida Ina				Ad Volorom Toy Approinal
Embarg Florida, Inc.	Florida Texas	2007 2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarg Missouri Inc			2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarg Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarg Northwest	Washington	2007 2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Virginia	Virginia Florida		2008 2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications		2007		Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
	California	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	New England Mass	2002-2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2007	2008	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Clabal Crassing	California, Michigan & Ariz		2007	Ad Valaram Tay Annyaisal
Global Crossing	North America	2007	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2007	2008	Depreciation Study
2007				
AT&T Communications	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Indiana Bell Telephone Company	Indiana	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
				<b>QUALIFICATIONS 6</b>

#### **CV** of Weinert

#### Page 7

Company	Property	Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
AT&T - Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Michigan	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T - Wisconsin Bell Telephone Company	Michigan Wisconsin	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarg Florida, Inc.	Florida	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Texas, Inc.	Texas,	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq North Carolina	North Carolina	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Virginia	Virginia	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications	California	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications Verizon Communications	Northwest	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Qwest Communications Corporation	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
·	California			
Level 3 Communications	North America,	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 2 Communications	California, Michigan, & A		2007	Ad Valaram Tay Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	Arizona	2002 - 2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2006	2007	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Alaska Communications System, Inc.	ACS of Alaska	2006	2007	Depreciation Studies
(ACS)	ACS of Anchorage			
	ACS of Fairbanks			
	ACS of the Northland			
Internation Con Community	ACS Holdings	0000	0007	Danna siatian Otrodo
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2006	2007	Depreciation Study
2006 AT&T Communications	Palm Beach Florida	2000 - 2003	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	North America	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Florida	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Texas, Inc.	Texas,	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Missouri, Inc.	Missouri	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint North Carolina	North Carolina	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Virginia	Virginia	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Embarq Nevada	Nevada	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Business (formerly MCI)	Massachusetts	2002-25	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	North America	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Level 3 Communications	Arizona	2002-2006	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Global Crossing	North America	2005	2006	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Indianapolis Power & Light	IPL	2005	2006	Depreciation Study
3				.,,
2005				
AT&T Communications	North America	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
AT&T Communications	California	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Florida, Inc.	Florida, .	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint PCS	North America	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Florida	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	California	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Verizon Communications	Northwest	2004	2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
				<b>QUALIFICATIONS 7</b>

#### Page 8

Company	Property	Stud Year		Activity
Sprint Communications, LP Level 3 Communications Global Crossing Global Crossing	North America North America North America New York Special	2004 2004 2004	2005 2005 2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Indianapolis Power & Light	Franchise Property	2003 & 2004 2004	2005 2005	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Depreciation Study
2004				
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Verizon Communications Verizon Communications Sprint Communications, LP Level 3 Communications Global Crossing Sprint PCS AT&T Communications AT&T Communications	Florida California Northwest New England North America North America North America Cost Indexes North America California	2003 2003 2003 2003 2003 2003 2003 2003	2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004 2004	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Intermountain Gas Company	Idaho	2003	2004	Depreciation Study
2003 Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Verizon Communications Sprint Communications, LP Level 3 Communications Sprint PCS AT&T Communications AT&T Communications Global Crossing Verizon Wireless  2002 Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Verizon Communications Sprint Communications Sprint Communications Sprint Communications Sprint Communications Global Crossing AT&T Wireless	Florida California Northwest North America North America Cost Indexes North America California North America Broward County, FL  Florida California Northwest North America North America North America North America North America North America Plymouth, MI	2002 2002 2002 2002 2002 2002 2002 200	2003 2003 2003 2003 2003 2003 2003 2003	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint PCS AT&T Communications Intermountain Gas Company AT&T Communications  2001 Verizon	Cost Indexes North America Idaho California  Verizon - New York	2001 2001 2001 2001 2001	2002 2002 2002 2002 2001-2	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Depreciation Study Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal  Functional Obsolescence & Useful Life studies for valuation
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications	Sprint Florida, Inc. California	2000 2000	2001 2001	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal QUALIFICATIONS 8
				QUALII ICATIONS 0

#### **CV** of Weinert

#### Page 9

Company	Property	Study Year	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
Sprint Communications, LP Global Crossing Sprint PCS Sprint Corporation Alaska Communications System, Inc. (ACS)	North America 2000 North America 2000 Cost Indexes 2000 Centel - Nevada 2000 ACS of Alaska 2000 ACS of Anchorage ACS of Fairbanks ACS of the Northland ACS Holdings			Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal iation Study iation Study
2000				
Sprint PCS Telus Communications	BTS Equipment Telus - Alberta & British Columbia	2000 2000	2000 2000	Economic Life Study Depreciation study Phase III Price Caps
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications	Florida California North America	1999 1999 1999	2000 2000 2000	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Communications, LP	North America	1999	2000	Au valorem rax Appraisai
1999 Sprint Corporation	Centel - Nevada	1998	1999	Depreciation Study
Intermountain Gas Company Sprint Florida, Inc. Sprint Communications, LP	Intermountain Gas Company Florida North America	1998 1998 1998	1999 1999 1999	Depreciation Study Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
1998				
Frontier Corporation	Frontier Telephone of Rochester	1998	1997	Valuation depreciation Lives and Net Salvage Parameters
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of Washington	1997	1998	Depreciation Study
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications Sprint Communications, LP	Florida Florida North America	1997 1997 1997	1998 1998 1998	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Sprint Corporation	United Telephone Company of South Carolina	1998	1998	Depreciation Expense Universal Service Fund
Sprint Corporation	Carolina Telephone and Telegraph and Central Telephone of North Carolina	1998	1998	Depreciation Expense Universal Service Fund
Telus Communications	Telus - Edmonton (TCE)	1997	1998	Depreciation Study Phase II Price Caps
1997				•
Sprint Corporation	Centel - Nevada	1997	1997	Unbundling/ Inter-connection Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1996	1997	Depreciation Study
				<b>QUALIFICATIONS 9</b>

#### **CV** of Weinert

#### Page 10

Company	<u>Property</u>	Study Year	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of Alaska 1996 And the Northland	6	1997	Depreciation Study
Telus Communications	Telus - TCI formerly AGT	1996	1997	Depreciation Study Phase II Price Caps
Indianapolis Power & Light	IPL	1996	1997	Depreciation Study
Sprint Florida, Inc. Verizon Communications	Florida Florida	1996 1996	1997 1997	Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Eagle Telephone (Colorado) 1996	6	1997	Depreciation Study
1996				
Intermountain Gas Company Sprint Florida, Inc.	Intermountain Gas Company Florida	1995 1995	1996 1996	Depreciation Study Ad Valorem Tax Appraisal
Century Telephone	Century Telephone of Ohio, Inc.	1995	1996	Depreciation Study
Telus Communications	AGT Limited (Alberta Government Telephones	1995 s)	1996	Depreciation Study
Johnson County Kansas Office of the Assessor	Useful Life of Computer Equipment	1995	1995	Useful/Market Life Analysis
Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District	1995	1996	Depreciation Study
Sprint Corporation	Long Distance Division 1998	5	1995 Depred	iation/Recovery Status Study
Sprint Corporation	Cellular Division 1999	5	1995 Depred	iation/Recovery Status Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Alascom, Inc. 1994	4	1995 Depred	iation Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Telephone Utilities of the Northland 1993	3	1994 Depred	ciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Alaska 1993	3	1994 Depre	ciation Study
Indiana Energy	Indiana Gas Company 1993	3	1994 Depre	eciation Study
Columbia Gas Transmission	Gas Pipeline Property in Sullivan County, NY 1993	3	1993 Usefu	ıl Life Study
United Telephone - Midwest Group	United Telephone Company of Missouri 1993	3	1993 Depre	Modernization/ eciation Study
Intermountain Gas Co.	Intermountain Gas Co. 1992	2	1993 Depre	ciation Study
Pacific Telecom, Inc.	Alascom, Inc. 1992	2	1993 Depre	eciation Study  QUALIFICATIONS 10

Page 11

Company	Property	Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
	Telephone Utilities Oregon, Inc.	s of 1991	1992	Depreciation Study
	Telephone Utilities Washington, Inc.	s of 1991	1992	Depreciation Study
Small Telephone Company Coalition	Oregon Small Tele Companies	ephone 1991	1992	Depreciation Support
United Telephone Systems	United Telephone Pennsylvania	Co. of 1991	1992	Instructional Depreciation Study
New York State Division of Equalization and Assessment	Electric, Gas, Wat Telephone, Pipelir Steam, CATV		1992	Useful Lives and Net Salvage Values
Rochester Telephone Company	Enterprise Telepho	one 1991	1992	Study Review
Indiana Energy	Indiana Gas/Richr Terre Haute Gas	nond Gas/ 1990	1991	Depreciation Study
American Electric Power	Indiana/Michigan I	Power Co. 1990	1991	Depreciation Study
Rochester Telephone Company	Rochester Telepho	one Co. 1990	1991	Study Review
United Telephone Systems	United Telephone Co. of Florida	1990	1991	Instructional Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems	United Telephone of Oregon	Co. 1989	1990	Study Review
Telephone and Data Systems, Inc.	Quincy Telephone Company	1990	1991	Depreciation Study
Telephone and Data Systems, Inc.	Wolverine Telephone Company	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Indiana Energy	Indiana Gas Comp Inc.	oany, 1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Intermountain Gas Co.	Intermountain Gas	s Co. 1989	1990	Remaining Life/Net Salvage Support
North-West Telephone Company	North-West Telepl Company	none 1989	1990	Study Review
United Telephone System	United of Texas	1989	1990	Instructional Depreciation Study
	United of Missouri	1989	1990	Instructional QUALIFICATIONS 11

Page 12

# **Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List**

Company	Property	<u>Year</u>	Study Ye <u>Performed</u>	ear <u>Activity</u>
				Depreciation Study
Milwaukee Water	Milwaukee Water	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Indiana Natural Gas Corp.	Indiana Natural Gas Corp.	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of the Northland	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Alaska	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
	Alascom	1989	1990	Depreciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Washington, Inc.	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
WICOR	Wisconsin Gas Company	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
ALLTEL	ALLTEL - Kentucky, Inc.	1987	1989	Depreciation Study
	ALLTEL - Ohio, Inc.	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
	Western Reserve Telephone Company	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewer District	Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewer District	1988	1989	Depreciation Study
United Telephone	United of Ohio	1988 1988	1989 1989	ELG Support ELG Support
Telephone Company	Telephone Company	1500	1000	LLO Cupport
United Telecom	U.S. Sprint	1988	1988	Useful Life Study
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
	Telephone Utilities of Eastern Oregon	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
	Rose Valley Telephone Company	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
United Telephone	United of Minnesota	1987	1988	Capital Planning Support
Wisconsin Southern Gas	Wisconsin Southern Gas	1987	1988	Depreciation Study
Pacific Telecom	Glacier State Telephone Company	1986	1987	Depreciation Study

Page 13

# **Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List**

				Study Year		
Company	<b>Property</b>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Performed</u>	<u>Activity</u>		
	Sitka Telephone Co.	1986	1987	Depreciation Study		
	Juneau-Douglas Tel Company	1986	1987	Depreciation Study		
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Alaska	1986	1987	Depreciation Study		
	Alascom	1986	1987	Depreciation Study		
Lincoln Telecommunications	Lincoln Telephone and Telegraph Company	1986	1987	Digital Switching Service Life		
Northwest Natural Gas Corporation	Northwest Natural Gas Corporation	1985	1986	Depreciation Study		
ALLTEL	Western Reserve Telephone Company	1984	1985	Depreciation Study		
	ALLTEL - Ohio	1984	1985	Depreciation Study		
	ALLTEL - Alabama	1984	1985	Depreciation Study		
Gulf Telephone Co.	Gulf Telephone Company	1984	1985	Depreciation Study		
United Telephone	United of Iowa	1984	1985	Depreciation Study		
Systems, Inc.	United of Arkansas	1984	1985	Depreciation Study		
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Washington	1983	1984	Depreciation Study		
	Telephone Utilities of Eastern Oregon	1983	1984	Depreciation Study		
Pacific Telecom	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1983	1984	Depreciation Study		
	Northwestern Telephone Systems, Inc., Oregon	1983	1984	Depreciation Study		
	Rose Valley Telephone Company	1983	1984	Depreciation Study		
United Telecommunications	All United Telephone Companies	1983	1984	Capital Recovery Strategy		
Lincoln Telecommunications	Lincoln Telephone & Telegraph Company	1983	1984	Depreciation Study		
ALLTEL	ALLTEL - Mississippi	1982	1983	Depreciation Study		

Page 14

Appraisal & Capital Recovery Activities Client List

Company	Property	Study <u>Year</u>	Year <u>Performed</u>	Activity
	ALLTEL - Michigan	1982	1983	Depreciation Study
North Carolina Natural Gas Corp.	North Carolina Natural Gas Corporation	1982	1983	Depreciation Study
Mid Continent Telephone (Currently ALLTEL)	Western Reserve Telephone	1982	1983	Depreciation Study
(Currently ALLTEL)	Mid Ohio Telephone	1982	1982	Depreciation Study
	Florence Telephone Company	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
	Leeds Telephone Co.	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
	Elmore Coosa Tel Company	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
	Brookville Telephone Company	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
	Mid Pennsylvania Telegraph	1980	1981	Depreciation Study
Telephone Utilities (Currently Pacific	Telephone Utilities of Oregon	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
Telecom)	Telephone Utilities of Eastern Oregon	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
	Northwestern Telephone Systems, IncOregon	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
	Rose Valley Telephone Company	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems, Inc.	United of Ohio	1979	1980	Depreciation Study
Telephone Utilities	Telephone Utilities of Washington	1978	1979	Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems, Inc.	United of Ohio	1978	1979	Depreciation Study
Rochester Telephone	Rochester Telephone (Indiana)	1977	1978	Depreciation Study
United Telephone Systems, Inc.	United of Ohio	1977	1978	Depreciation Study
Princeton Telephone	Princeton Telephone	1976	1977	Depreciation Study
Northwestern Telephone	(Indiana) Northwestern Telephone (Illinois)	1975	1976	Depreciation Study

2011 Training Instructor Depreciation Basics Sessions A & B and Life and Salvage Analysis

Society of Depreciation Professionals 25th Annual Meeting

Atlanta, GA September, 20-22, 2011

2010 Will the Real Cost Approach Please Stand Up?

National Association of Property Tax Representatives Transportation, Energy, & Communications (NAPTR-TEC)

Scottsdale, Arizona October 25-27, 2010

<u>Issues Affecting Assessment of Regulated Industries</u>

Institute for Professionals in Taxation (IPT) Property Tax Symposium

Austin, Texas October 31 - November 3, 2010

2009 (Valuing) Intangibles

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas July 28, 2009

Fair Value Accounting (Appraisal Panelist)

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas July 29, 2009

2008 Valuation Issues Valuation of Assets and the Impact of Depreciation

Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting

Greenville, SC September 21-26, 2008

Obsolescence in the Long-Distance and Local Transport Networks

Technology Futures Inc. Asset Valuation Conference

Austin Texas February 8, 2008

2007 Communications Industry Issues

National Association of Property Tax Representative – Transportation, Energy, & Communications

New Orleans, LA October 30, 2007

2006 Appraisal Procedures & Issues in a Changing communications Industry

Florida Chapter International Association of Assessing Officers' Tangible Personal Property Conference

Ocala, Florida January 12, 2006

Valuation of Intangibles

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas July 25, 2006

SDP 20 years of History and Beyond

Society of Depreciation Professionals 20th Annual Meeting

Long Beach, CA September, 18, 2006

2005 Valuation in a World with Asset Impairments

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas August 1, 2005

2004 Depreciation in the Valuation of Assets

Society of Depreciation Professionals' Eighteenth Annual Meeting

Washington, D.C., September 13, 2004

2003 Cost Approach and the Use of Appraisal Guidelines

Institute for Professionals in Taxation - Property Tax Symposium

Fort Lauderdale, FL, September 17, 2003

<u>Cost Approach – Obsolescence and Depreciation</u>

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas, July 28, 2003

2000 Appraisal Issues Associated with Technological Change in the Wireline Telecommunications Industry

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas, July 31, 2000

The Impact of Advancing Technology and the Changing Regulatory Environment on Obsolescence

<u>Calculations for Ad Valorem Valuation Purposes</u>
Journal of Property Tax Management, Spring 2000

1996 How to Develop a Reproduction/Replacement Cost New Less Depreciation Approach to Value

Appraisal for Ad Valorem Taxation, Wichita State University

Wichita, Kansas, August 4, 1996

1995 <u>Valuation Method, Techniques and Strategies (How to Quantify Stranded Investment) (Market, Income, </u>

& Cost Approach

AGA Depreciation Committee Meeting

Denver, Colorado, August 6-9, 1995, jointly presented with Earl Robinson of AUS Consultants

1994 Integrating Future Expectations for the Telephone Industry into Historical Depreciation Analysis

United States Telephone Association (USTA's 1994 Capital Recovery Seminar)

Scottsdale, Arizona, September 12-13, 1994

1994 Capital Recovery: United States versus Canada

Canadian Telephone Industry's Annual Capital Recovery Seminar

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada June 14-15, 1994

1990 Capital Recovery: Methods, Terminology, Procedures, and Record Keeping

United States Telephone Association (USTA)'s

1990 Non-FCC Subject and Small Company Capital Recovery Seminar

Minneapolis, Minnesota April 10 11, 1990

Integration of Technology Forecasting Into Historical Life Studies

29th Iowa State Regulatory Conference

Ames, Iowa May 15\_17, 1990

The 1990's and the Second Wave of Major Plant Retirements in the Communications Industry

NARUC's Seventh Biennial Information Conference

Columbus, Ohio September 12\_14, 1990

How Do We Incorporate Change Into the Study Filing Procedures?

USTA's 1990 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois October 16\_17, 1990

1989 Plant Modernization: Capital Planning and Capital Recovery

Midwest Utilities Conference

Chicago, Illinois September 11\_14, 1989

Price Indexes Today: Procedures, Uses, and Misuses

Society of Depreciation Professionals' Third Annual Meeting

New Orleans, Louisiana December 6\_7, 1989

1988 Plant Modernization: Capital Planning and Capital Recovery

National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)'s

Sixth Biennial Regulatory Information Conference

Columbus, Ohio September 14\_16, 1988

1997	Sprint Corporation - West Finance Center Overland Park, Kansas, August 1997
1997	Rochester Telephone Corporation Rochester, New York, April 1997
1996	Sprint-Florida-Vista United Telecommunications Altamonte Springs, Florida August 27-29, 1996
1994	Saskatchewan Telecommunications Regina, Saskatchewan, Canada, June 1994
1994	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1994 Capital Recovery Seminar May 1994
1993	Manitoba Telephone System, Winnipeg, Manitoba, December 1993
1993	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting Charleston, South Carolina September 30, 1993
1993	SPRINT - Local Telephone Division Atlanta, Georgia August 11-12, 1993
1993	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1993 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois May 11 - 13, 1993
1993	Canadian Telephone Capital Recovery Seminar Halifax, Nova Scotia April 20 - 22, 1993
1993	United Telephone, Midwest Group Overland Park, Kansas January 20, 1993
1992	BellSouth Corporation Birmingham, Alabama November 23, 1992
1992	Sprint - Local Telephone Division Kansas City, Kansas November 18 - 20, 1992
1992	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting San Antonio, Texas September 9 - 10, 1992
1992	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1992 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois October 6 - 8, 1992
1991	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Meeting Nashville, Tennessee November 20-22, 1991
1991	ALLTEL Corporation Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Hudson, Ohio October 14-16, 1991

Page 19

#### **Capital Recovery Training**

2016	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Charleston, South Carolina, September 18-23, 2016
2015	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Austin TX September 2015
2014	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training New Orleans, LA September 2014
2013	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Salt Lake city, UT September 2013
2012	Society of Depreciation Professionals Annual Training Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 16-18, 2012
1991	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Kansas City, Kansas September 23-25, 1991
1991	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1991 Capital Recovery Seminar Lake Geneva, Wisconsin September 17_19, 1991
1991	Rochester Telephone Corporation, Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training, Rochester, New York September 3-7, 1991
1991	Ameritech Services, Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Chicago, Illinois May 16-17, 1991
1991	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1991 Capital Recovery Seminar Washington, D.C. April 9_11, 1991
1990	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery Seminar Overland Park, Kansas December 1990
1990	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1990 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois September 24_27, 1990
1990	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1990 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois January 29-February 1, 1990
1990	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training, Chicago, Illinois July 1990
1989	United Telecommunications, Inc., Capital Recovery/Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training, Chicago, Illinois July 1989

#### **Capital Recovery Training**

1989	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1989 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois March 6_9, 1989
1988	AUS Consultants/Leroy J. Murphy and Associates 1988 Capital Recovery Seminar Chicago, Illinois July 25_28, 1988
1988	United Telecommunications, Inc., Microcomputer Depreciation Studies System Training Kansas City, Kansas January 1988