

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

In re: Application of Pennsylvania-American Water :  
Company under Section 1102(a) of the Pennsylvania :  
Public Utility Code, 66 Pa C.S. § 1102(a), for approval :  
of (1) the transfer, by sale, of substantially all of Valley :  
Township’s assets, properties and rights related to its :  
wastewater collection and conveyance : Docket No. A-2020-3020178  
system to Pennsylvania-American Water :  
Company, and (2) the rights of Pennsylvania-American :  
Water Company to begin to offer or furnish wastewater :  
service to the public in Valley Township, and limited :  
portions of East Fallowfield Township, :  
Sadsbury Township and West Caln Township, :  
Chester County, Pennsylvania :

VALLEY TOWNSHIP  
STATEMENT NO. 2WW  
DIRECT TESTIMONY  
OF  
HAROLD WALKER, III  
FAIR MARKET VALUE APPRAISAL  
October 9, 2020

Prepared by:  
**GANNETT FLEMING**  
VALUATION AND RATE CONSULTANTS, LLC



Valley Forge, Pennsylvania

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>QUALIFICATION AS UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>FEEES PAID FOR UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT SERVICES.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF WASTEWATER SYSTEM'S ASSETS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Cost Approach.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Income Approach.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Market Approach.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX A .....</b>	<b>1</b>

**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.**

A. My name is Harold Walker III and my business address is 1010 Adams Avenue, Audubon, Pennsylvania.

**Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?**

A. I am employed by Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC (“Gannett Fleming”) as Manager, Financial Studies.

**Q. WOULD YOU DESCRIBE BRIEFLY GANNETT FLEMING?**

A. Yes. Since 1915, Gannett Fleming and its predecessors have been helping clients in public pricing policy and related financial matters for managerial purposes, before regulatory commissions and courts of law. Gannett Fleming is registered as a Utility Valuation Expert (“UVE”) in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Gannett Fleming is also a registered Municipal Advisor with the SEC and I am a licensed Municipal Advisor Representative (Series 50) with the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (“MSRB”) and the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (“FINRA”). Gannett Fleming is a subsidiary of Gannett Fleming, Inc.

**Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS MANAGER, FINANCIAL STUDIES OF GANNETT FLEMING?**

1    **A.**    I supervise and develop financial and economic studies on behalf of investor-owned and  
2           municipally-owned water, wastewater, electric, natural gas distribution and transmission,  
3           oil pipeline, and telephone utilities, as well as resource-recovery companies.

4  
5    **Q.    PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS AND YOUR EDUCATIONAL**  
6           **BACKGROUND AND EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE?**

7    **A.**    My educational background, business experience and qualifications are provided in a  
8           Curriculum Vitae included as **Appendix A.**

9  
10   **Q.    HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA**  
11           **PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION?**

12   **A.**    Yes. I have testified before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”  
13           or “PUC”), as well as other state regulatory commissions, on many occasions, as shown on  
14           **Appendix A.**

15  
16   **Q.    WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

17   **A.**    My testimony describes and explains the fair market value appraisal of the Valley  
18           Township (“Township”) wastewater system assets (“Wastewater System”) that I and staff,  
19           working under my direction, performed. Gannett Fleming was engaged by the Township  
20           to perform this appraisal. Our report is entitled “Valley Township Wastewater System  
21           Assets Fair Market Value Appraisal at April 30, 2020” (“Gannett Fleming Appraisal  
22           Report”). The appraisal and its report was developed to meet the criteria established in

1 Section 1329 of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Code (“Code”), 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329  
2 (“Determination of the fair market value of water and wastewater assets”).

3 In its 2015-2016 legislative session, the Pennsylvania Legislature passed Act 12 of  
4 2016 and Governor Wolf signed Act 12 into law adding Section 1329 of the Code which  
5 established the legislative requirements facilitating the acquisition of municipal and  
6 authority water and wastewater systems by private investor-owned utilities and other  
7 entities which are rate-regulated by the Commission. This legislation was intended to  
8 facilitate the acquisition of water and wastewater systems in order to facilitate capital  
9 improvements to the water and wastewater properties.

10 **QUALIFICATION AS UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT**

11 **Q. IS GANNETT FLEMING ON THE COMMISSION’S REGISTRY OF UTILITY**  
12 **VALUATION EXPERTS?**

13 **A.** Yes. Gannett Fleming is a UVE in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania approved by the  
14 PUC (Utility Code 9919244).

15  
16 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH GANNETT FLEMING WAS**  
17 **PLACED ON THE COMMISSION’S REGISTRY OF UTILITY VALUATION**  
18 **EXPERTS.**

19 **A.** After passage of Section 1329 of the Code, the Commission established an application  
20 process by which the Commission would approve and designate firms to be placed on the  
21 Commission’s “Registry of Utility Valuation Experts.” To be included on the registry, the  
22 UVEs must establish their qualifications. Gannett Fleming submitted its original  
23 application and the required proof of experience in September of 2016 and received

1 confirmation and approval from the Commission of Gannett Fleming's placement on the  
2 Commission's UVE Registry in December of 2016. Renewal of inclusion on the  
3 Commission's UVE Registry must be done annually. Gannett Fleming submitted its 2018  
4 renewal application and the required proof of experience in December of 2017 and received  
5 confirmation and approval from the Commission of Gannett Fleming's placement on the  
6 Commission's UVE Registry in January of 2018. In 2018, Gannett Fleming submitted its  
7 2019 renewal application and the required proof of experience in December of 2018 and  
8 received confirmation and approval from the Commission of Gannett Fleming's placement  
9 on the Commission's UVE Registry in January of 2019. Again in 2019, Gannett Fleming  
10 submitted its 2020 renewal application and the required proof of experience in December  
11 of 2019 and received confirmation and approval from the Commission of Gannett  
12 Fleming's placement on the Commission's UVE Registry in January of 2020.

13  
14 **Q. HAVE YOU EVER HAD YOUR PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS REVOKED**  
15 **OR SUSPENDED?**

16 **A.** No.

17  
18 **Q. DO YOU HAVE SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE WITH THE VALUATION AND**  
19 **APPRAISAL OF UTILITY ASSETS?**

20 **A.** Yes. In addition to serving as an expert witness on various financial and economic matters  
21 before utility regulatory commissions for over 30 years, I have also provided valuations of  
22 utility assets services for more than 20 years. In that capacity I have testified on valuation  
23 matters before the Commission and sponsored or adopted Gannett Fleming's UVE

1 appraisals in Section 1329 of the Code in the New Garden Township proceeding, the  
2 Limerick Township proceeding, the East Bradford Township proceeding, the Mahoning  
3 Township (water) proceeding, the Mahoning Township (wastewater) proceeding, the  
4 Exeter Township proceeding, the Cheltenham Township proceeding, the East Norriton  
5 Township proceeding, the Kane Borough proceeding, the Delaware County Regional  
6 Water Quality Control Authority proceeding, the Borough of Royersford proceeding and  
7 the Valley Township (water) proceeding. In addition to testifying in Section 1329  
8 proceedings, I have also testified and filed reports on valuation matters in California,  
9 Illinois, New Hampshire and Pennsylvania in courts of law and regulatory commissions.<sup>1</sup>

10  
11 **Q. HAVE YOU OR GANNETT FLEMING OR ANY OF ITS STAFF DERIVED ANY**  
12 **MATERIAL FINANCIAL BENEFIT FROM THE SALE OF THE WASTEWATER**  
13 **SYSTEM'S ASSETS OTHER THAN FEES FOR YOUR SERVICES RENDERED?**

14 **A.** No.

15  
16 **Q. ARE YOU OR GANNETT FLEMING OR ANY OF ITS STAFF AN IMMEDIATE**  
17 **FAMILY MEMBER OF A DIRECTOR, OFFICER, OR EMPLOYEE OF EITHER**  
18 **PENNSYLVANIA-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY ("PAWC") OR THE**  
19 **TOWNSHIP?**

20 **A.** No.

---

<sup>1</sup> An electronic link to the PA PUC Dockets where I have testified in the last two years is provided in response to Section 1329 Application Standard Data Requests 15-d. All other testimony relating to valuation is more than two years old and therefore, is not provided.

1 **Q. IS GANNETT FLEMING IN COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE**  
2 **PENNSYLVANIA LAWS?**

3 **A. Yes.**

4

5 **Q. DOES GANNETT FLEMING HAVE THE FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL**  
6 **FITNESS, INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL LICENSES AND TECHNICAL**  
7 **CERTIFICATIONS, TO PERFORM A FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF THE**  
8 **WASTEWATER ASSETS OF THE TOWNSHIP?**

9 **A. Yes, to be placed on the Commission’s “Registry of Utility Valuation Experts” Gannett**  
10 **Fleming had to establish its qualifications.**

11

12 **Q. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY FACT, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY**  
13 **POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST THAT WOULD CAST DOUBT UPON**  
14 **YOUR ABILITY TO PROVIDE A THOROUGH, OBJECTIVE, UNBIASED, AND**  
15 **FAIR VALUATION IN THIS PROCEEDING?**

16 **A. No.**

17

18 **Q. HAVE YOU CORRESPONDED WITH BUYER’S UVE WITH REGARD TO ITS**  
19 **RESPECTIVE FAIR MARKET VALUE APPRAISAL OF THE ASSETS AT ISSUE**  
20 **IN THIS CASE?**

21 **A. No.**



1 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY AFFILIATION WITH EITHER THE SELLING UTILITY**  
2 **OR THE ACQUIRING PUBLIC UTILITY?**

3 **A.** No. Other than the current assignment to provide the subject appraisal, and similar  
4 assignments to provide appraisals of other utility systems, I have no business or personal  
5 relationships with any party to the proposed acquisition.

6

7 **FEES PAID FOR UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT SERVICES**

8 **Q. WHAT IS THE GANNETT FLEMING FEE ARRANGEMENT TO DELIVER THE**  
9 **APPRAISAL?**

10 **A.** Gannett Fleming is being compensated on an hourly basis. Our fee arrangement is included  
11 as **Appendix A-7.2** to PAWC's Application. True, correct, and complete copies of  
12 Gannett Fleming's invoices to the Township for this matter, as of the date of PAWC's  
13 Application filing, are also included in **Appendix A-7.2**.

14

15 **Q. WHAT IS THE ESTIMATED TOTAL COMPENSATION THAT GANNETT**  
16 **FLEMING WILL RECEIVE FOR ITS SERVICES IN THIS MATTER?**

17 **A.** The estimated total compensation that Gannett Fleming will receive for its services in this  
18 matter as of the date of PAWC's Application filing is \$30,000, which represents  
19 approximately 0.15% of the fair market valuation. I estimate our fee will total \$75,000 if  
20 this proceeding is fully litigated, which represents approximately 0.38% of the fair market  
21 valuation.

1 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH THIS COMPENSATION WAS**  
2 **NEGOTIATED?**

3 **A.** Gannett Fleming submitted a proposal to provide the required services in May 2020, which  
4 the Township accepted.

5

6 **Q. ARE THESE FEES CONSISTENT WITH COMPENSATION RECEIVED FOR**  
7 **SIMILAR SERVICES PROVIDED TO OTHER CLIENTS?**

8 **A.** Yes.

9

10 **Q. WILL GANNETT FLEMING RECEIVE ITS FEE REGARDLESS OF WHETHER**  
11 **THE COMMISSION APPROVES THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION OR**  
12 **WHETHER IT CLOSES?**

13 **A.** Yes. 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329(a)(3) mandates that I comply with the Uniform Standards of  
14 Professional Appraisal Practice (“USPAP”) when developing an appraisal. Under the  
15 USPAP, I cannot perform the appraisal with bias, and acceptance of a fee contingent on a  
16 particular outcome, like closing or Commission approval, would violate the Ethics Rule.

17

18 **Q. ARE YOU ADVOCATING FOR ANY PARTY OR OUTCOME?**

19 **A.** 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. I have not performed this appraisal  
22 assignment with bias and I am not advocating the cause or interest of any party or issue.

1 Further, I have not accepted this or any assignment that includes the reporting of  
2 predetermined opinions and conclusions.

3  
4 **FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF WASTEWATER SYSTEM ASSETS**

5 **Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY APPENDIX A-5.2 TO PAWC'S APPLICATION IN THIS**  
6 **PROCEEDING?**

7 **A. Appendix A-5.2** of PAWC's application includes Gannett Fleming's appraisal report dated  
8 August 3, 2020.

9  
10 **Q. HOW DO YOU RECOGNIZE IT?**

11 **A.** I personally prepared, and also directed and supervised Gannett Fleming personnel in  
12 preparing, the report, and recognize it as Gannett Fleming's work product.

13  
14 **Q. IS APPENDIX A-5.2 A TRUE, COMPLETE, AND ACCURATE COPY OF**  
15 **THE GANNETT FLEMING APPRAISAL REPORT?**

16 **A.** Yes, and I incorporate it into my direct testimony as if set forth in its entirety.

17  
18 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH YOU PREPARED THE**  
19 **GANNETT FLEMING APPRAISAL REPORT.**

20 **A.** In accordance with Section 1329 of the Code, the Township engaged Gannett Fleming to  
21 prepare the fair market valuation report of the Wastewater System. The Township  
22 provided financial statements and budget statements regarding the Wastewater System and

1 a copy of the Engineering Assessment<sup>2</sup> as required by Section 1329(a)(4). In addition,  
2 Gannett Fleming reviewed the assets, reviewed additional information provided by the  
3 Township and conducted additional research regarding the Township and the Wastewater  
4 System, including a site visit. After those activities and data gathering, we developed the  
5 appraisal.

6 The appraisal contains a letter of transmittal; a table of contents detailing all the  
7 sections of the report and work papers; and a narrative report explaining our methodology  
8 and conclusions.

9 The intent of the valuation report is to provide the appraisal results, as well as the  
10 entire appraisal work file, in sufficient detail to satisfy the parties' and Commission's  
11 review requirements of Section 1329 and the Commission's Final Implementation Order,  
12 *In re: Implementation of Section 1329 of the Public Utility Code*, Docket No. M-2016-  
13 2543193 (Order Entered October 27, 2016) and Final Supplemental Implementation Order  
14 *In re: Implementation of Section 1329 of the Public Utility Code*, Docket No. M-2016-  
15 2543193 (Order Entered February 28, 2019). In addition to a copy of the appraisal report,  
16 I have provided supporting work papers for the appraisal report in **Appendix A-4.3** of  
17 PAWC's Application. The relevant work papers have also been submitted to the  
18 Commission and provided to the public advocates in **CONFIDENTIAL** live electronic  
19 format.  
20

21 **Q. IS THERE ANYTHING THAT YOU WOULD CHANGE IN THE GANNETT**  
22 **FLEMING APPRAISAL REPORT SINCE ITS PREPARATION?**

---

<sup>2</sup> "Valley Township Sewerage Facilities Engineering Assessment and Original Cost" and related files prepared by Pennoni Associates Inc.

1 A. No.

2

3 **Q. WAS THE FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF THE WASTEWATER SYSTEM**  
4 **ASSETS DETERMINED IN COMPLIANCE WITH USPAP?**

5 A. Yes. Our fair market valuation was determined in compliance with USPAP 2020-2021  
6 Edition.

7

8 **Q. DID YOU EMPLOY THE COST, MARKET AND INCOME APPROACHES IN**  
9 **PREPARING YOUR VALUATION?**

10 A. Yes.

11

12 **Q. DID YOU INCLUDE ANY EXTRAORDINARY ASSUMPTIONS OR**  
13 **HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONS IN DEVELOPING YOUR APPRAISAL?**

14 A. No.

15

16 **Q. DID YOU INCLUDE ANY LIMITING CONDITIONS IN DEVELOPING YOUR**  
17 **APPRAISAL?**

18 A. Yes. We accepted all information and data provided by the Township as it pertains to this  
19 assignment “as is” after a limited review. That is, we neither audited nor verified any data,  
20 engineering assessment, financial record or operating data provided for this assignment.  
21 We assumed all title to all assets included in the appraisal is good and marketable and no  
22 hazardous conditions or materials exist which could affect the assets.

1 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RESULTS OF THE APPLICATION OF THE**  
2 **COST, MARKET AND INCOME APPROACHES.**

3 **A.** Please see the below table:

<b>Approach</b>	<b>Indicated Value</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Value</b>
Cost Approach	\$21,165,301	33.30%	\$7,048,045
Market Approach	17,780,741	33.40%	5,938,767
Income Approach	20,599,324	33.30%	6,859,575
		100%	\$19,846,387
<b>Conclusion</b>			<b>\$19,846,000</b>

4  
5 **Q. PLEASE FURTHER DESCRIBE EACH APPROACH IN THE DEVELOPMENT**  
6 **OF YOUR APPRAISAL.**

7 **A.** We developed our appraisal utilizing the cost, income, and market approaches as required  
8 by USPAP and Section 1329 of the Code. We used seven methods under the Cost, Market  
9 and Income Approaches to valuation: Original Cost Method, Replacement Cost Method,  
10 Capitalization of Earnings Method, Market Multiple Discounted Cash Flow Method,  
11 Capitalization Discounted Cash Flow Method, Market Multiples Method, and the Selected  
12 Transactions Method.

13 The results from the capitalization of earnings method, market multiple discounted  
14 cash flow method and the capitalization discounted cash flow method form the basis for  
15 our Income Approach. Our Market Approach is supported by the market multiples method  
16 and selected transactions method. The results from the original cost method form the basis  
17 for our replacement cost method, and both methods form the basis for our Cost Approach.  
18 These approaches are summarized below.

19 *Cost Approach.* The cost approach utilized the original cost method, reproduction  
20 cost method and replacement cost method. The replacement cost method was calculated

1 by trending (trended cost method) the asset inventory from the original cost new method.  
2 The original cost method determined the original cost new measure of the cost of the assets  
3 when first constructed based on the information contained in the Engineering Assessment.  
4 The original cost new inventory was trended using the Handy Whitman Index of Public  
5 Utility Construction Costs for the water industry to produce the reproduction cost new and  
6 was converted to replacement cost new after obsolescence was factored. The calculated  
7 accrued depreciation was determined for the original cost new and for the replacement cost  
8 new as of April 30, 2020. The calculated accrued depreciation was based on the assets'  
9 attained ages, and the service life of the assets. The cost basis of depreciable assets was  
10 reduced annually by the accumulated depreciation to reflect the loss in the service value of  
11 the assets since being constructed. All land and land rights were valued at original cost.

12 *Income Approach.* The income approach utilized the capitalization of earning (cash  
13 flow) method and the discounted cash flow method. The capitalization of earning method  
14 converted a single base economic income number to a value by dividing it by a  
15 capitalization rate. The discounted cash flow method used estimates of future debt free net  
16 cash flow and discounted them to arrive at a present value or price of the cash flows. The  
17 capitalization rate and the discount rate were developed based on market debt and equity  
18 rates at the appraisal date. The discounted cash flow method reflected two types of  
19 discounted cash flow analyses, the EBIT and EBITDA terminal value model and a  
20 capitalization of terminal value model.<sup>3</sup>

21 *Market Approach.* The market approach was developed based on the market  
22 multiples method and the selected transaction method. The market multiples method was

---

<sup>3</sup> EBIT is earnings before interest and taxes and EBITDA is earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortization.

1 based on the market price data of publicly traded corporations engaged in the same or a  
2 similar line of business as the Wastewater System. The market price data of these  
3 comparable publicly traded corporations was used to calculate the market multiples for the  
4 comparable publicly traded corporations at the appraisal date. The selected transactions  
5 method used certain public information relating to the purchase or sales of businesses  
6 involved in the same or a similar business line as the Wastewater System to calculated  
7 market multiples at the time of transaction (sale/purchase). The calculated market  
8 multiples determined by the market multiples method and the selected transaction method  
9 were then multiplied by the corresponding Wastewater System financial and operating  
10 statistic to produce an indicated value for the Wastewater System.

11  
12 **Q. PLEASE STATE THE NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS YOU USED IN DEVELOPING**  
13 **YOUR APPRAISAL AND THE SOURCE OF THAT NUMBER.**

14 **A.** The number of customers I used was 3,125. This customer count number was provided by  
15 the Township.

16  
17 **Q. DID YOU MAKE ANY UPDATES TO YOUR APPRAISAL AFTER IT WAS**  
18 **SUBMITTED TO THE SELLER/BUYER, AND IF SO, WHAT WAS THE**  
19 **UPDATE, WHEN WAS IT MADE, AND WHY WAS IT NECESSARY?**

20 **A.** No.

21  
22 **Q. DID YOU PERFORM AN ON-SITE INSPECTION OF THE WASTEWATER**  
23 **SYSTEM?**



1 A. Yes. Gannett Fleming viewed the wastewater system assets on June 17, 2020.

2

3 **Q. DID YOU RELY UPON A LICENSED ENGINEER’S ASSESSMENT OF THE**  
4 **TANGIBLE ASSETS OF THE WASTEWATER SYSTEM IN PERFORMING**  
5 **YOUR VALUATION?**

6 A. Yes. The Township provided a copy of the Engineering Assessment and this information  
7 was incorporated into our Cost Approach in our appraisal.

8 **Cost Approach**

9 **Q. DID YOU USE THE REPRODUCTION COST OR THE REPLACEMENT COST**  
10 **IN YOUR COST APPROACH?**

11 A. We utilized the original cost new (“OCN”) to calculate the trended original cost (“TOC”)  
12 measures, or the reproduction cost of the depreciable assets by multiplying the OCN by  
13 specific cost indices. We converted reproduction cost new to replacement cost new after  
14 factoring in obsolescence. We used the TOC method because the mandated use of the  
15 Engineering Assessment’s original cost essentially dictates the use of TOC over the  
16 reproduction cost or the replacement cost methods.

17

18 **Q. WHAT INDEX, IF ANY, DID YOU USE FOR THAT METHOD?**

19 A. The original cost new inventory was trended using the Handy Whitman Index of Public  
20 Utility Construction Costs for the water industry to produce the reproduction cost new.

1 **Q. UNDER YOUR APPLICATION OF THE COST APPROACH WHAT ASSETS DID**  
2 **YOU VALUE OR TREND DIFFERENTLY FROM OTHER ASSETS AND WHY**  
3 **WAS THAT NECESSARY?**

4 **A.** Handy Whitman does not publish indices for all plant accounts. Accordingly, in limited  
5 instances when Handy Whitman plant account indices are not available, we use the U.S.  
6 Bureau of Labor Statistics, Producer Price Index which best matches the assets being  
7 trended. However, in this instance, only Handy Whitman plant account indices were used  
8 for the Wastewater System.

9  
10 **Q. UNDER YOUR APPLICATION OF THE COST APPROACH, WHAT YEAR-END**  
11 **DATE DID YOU USE FOR CALCULATING THE DEPRECIATION RESERVE?**

12 **A.** We used the date of April 30, 2020.

13  
14 **Q. HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE DEPRECIATION PARAMETERS OF**  
15 **SURVIVAL/RETIREMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND SERVICE LIVES FOR**  
16 **THE UTILITY PROPERTY UNDER THE COST APPROACH?**

17 **A.** We determined the average service lives of depreciable assets based on the materials used  
18 for construction and how long the depreciable assets are likely to meet service demands.

19  
20 **Q. WHY ARE THOSE PARAMETERS APPROPRIATE?**

21 **A.** We believe our average service lives of depreciable assets are appropriate based on our  
22 experience of having determined average service lives for numerous other water and

1 wastewater utilities and given the fact they resemble those used by other Pennsylvania  
2 wastewater companies.

3  
4 **Income Approach**

5 **Q. REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION OF THE INCOME APPROACH, WHAT**  
6 **METHOD DID YOU USE TO DETERMINE THE INCOME APPROACH**  
7 **RESULT?**

8 **A.** I used the Capitalization of Earnings Method, Market Multiple Discounted Cash Flow  
9 Method (“Market Multiple DCF”), and Capitalization Discounted Cash Flow Method  
10 (“Capitalization DCF”). I refer to the Market Multiple DCF and the Capitalization DCF  
11 collectively as the DCF method.

12  
13 **Q. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS DID YOU EMPLOY TO DEVELOP YOUR INCOME**  
14 **APPROACH RESULT?**

15 **A.** All general assumptions are listed on page 3 of Exhibit 12, and page 7 of Exhibits 13, 14,  
16 15 and 16.<sup>4</sup>

17  
18 **Q. DID YOU USE PAWC’S CAPITALIZATION RATE OR THEIR DISCOUNT**  
19 **RATE IN YOUR INCOME APPROACH TO VALUATION?**

20 **A.** No. Use of PAWC’S capitalization rate or their discount rate in an income approach to  
21 valuation is not consistent with the standard of value of fair market value because the  
22 “buyer” under the standard of value of fair market value is not a specific entity (i.e.,

---

<sup>4</sup> Exhibit references herein are to the Exhibits in the Gannett Fleming Appraisal Report.

1 PAWC), but rather a hypothetical buyer. Use of PAWC'S capitalization rate or their  
2 discount rate in an income approach to valuation is only used under the standard of value  
3 of investment value.<sup>5</sup> In accordance with Section 1329 of the Code, the standard of value  
4 is fair market value, not investment value.

5  
6 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CAPITALIZATION RATE AND THE DISCOUNT RATE**  
7 **USED IN YOUR INCOME APPROACH TO VALUATION.**

8 **A.** The capitalization rate used in the capitalization of earnings method and the discount rate  
9 used in the DCF method are related. The discount rate is the opportunity cost rate related  
10 to the risk of the cash flows. The capitalization rate is simply the discount rate minus the  
11 expected growth rate. If no growth is assumed, the capitalization rate is equal to the  
12 discount rate.

13 As explained previously, under the standard of value of fair market value the  
14 "buyer" is not a specific entity (i.e., PAWC), but rather a hypothetical buyer. Accordingly,  
15 the hypothetical bidder/buyer may range from large regional municipal authorities  
16 ("MUNI") to investor owned utilities ("IOU"). For a MUNI, the appropriate discount rate  
17 is the current municipal revenue bond yield on April 30, 2020 of 3.88%. The appropriate  
18 IOU discount rate is the current net of tax overall cost of capital (weighted average cost of  
19 capital) on April 30, 2020 and ranges from 4.98% to 6.18%.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Pratt, Shannon P. "Defining Standards of Value." Valuation 34, no. 2, June 1989.  
<http://www.appraisers.org/docs/default-source/college-of-fellows-articles/defining-standards-of-value.pdf> .

<sup>6</sup> Both the American Society of Appraisers, ASA Business Valuation Standards, 2009, and the National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts, Professional Standards, 2007, use the same definition: "Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC). The cost of capital (discount rate) determined by the weighted average, at market values, of the cost of all financing sources in the business enterprise's capital structure."

1 For a MUNI, the appropriate discount rate is the current municipal revenue bond  
2 yield, 3.88%, because debt is the only major source of capital available to finance an  
3 acquisition (developed on Exhibit 20, pages 2-6). Although a MUNI likely carries equity  
4 on their books (balance sheet), all existing equity is already invested in other assets and  
5 therefore, cannot be used to finance an acquisition.<sup>7</sup> For valuation purposes, an embedded  
6 cost of debt, or the historical cost of all debt issuances outstanding is not used because this  
7 capital is already invested in assets. Whereas the marginal cost of debt, 3.88%, at the  
8 valuation date is used in accordance with accepted valuation practice and used for market  
9 valuation purposes.

10 As discussed previously, for an IOU, the appropriate discount rate is the net of tax  
11 overall cost of capital (weighted average cost of capital), 4.98% to 6.18% (Exhibit 20,  
12 pages 2-9). In this instance, the net of tax overall cost of capital (weighted average cost of  
13 capital) is based on the Comparable Group's market value capital structure of 25.2% debt  
14 and 74.8% equity, a market cost of debt of 2.96% and a range of market cost of equity of  
15 5.94% to 7.54% based on the Comparable Group's market value CAPM on April 30, 2020.<sup>8</sup>  
16 The Comparable Group's net of tax overall cost of capital (weighted average cost of  
17 capital) is used as a proxy to conform to the "hypothetical buyer" or "hypothetical seller"  
18 of fair market valuation. Use of the buyer's net of tax overall cost of capital (weighted  
19 average cost of capital) would produce an investment valuation, not a fair market valuation.

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, when a municipal or government entity, such as the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, finances construction of a road or bridge, they only consider the marginal debt cost despite having "equity" reflected on their books (balance sheet).

<sup>8</sup> For an example of the net of tax overall cost of capital, see <http://www.investinganswers.com/financial-dictionary/financial-statement-analysis/weighted-average-cost-capital-wacc-2905>. Also see <http://www.wallstreetmojo.com/weighted-average-cost-capital-wacc/>, or <http://accountingexplained.com/misc/corporate-finance/wacc>.

1 The supporting documentation for the development of the MUNI and IOU discount rates  
2 are shown on pages 2 to 9 of Exhibit 20.

3  
4 **Q. WHY IS THE NET OF TAX OVERALL COST OF CAPITAL APPROPRIATE TO**  
5 **USE?**

6 **A.** The net of tax overall cost of capital is appropriate because the cash flows being discounted  
7 are after tax, or net of tax. The income approach uses estimates of future free cash flow  
8 and discounts them to arrive at a present value or price of the cash flows. Generally, this  
9 analysis begins with an estimate of the Debt Free Net Cash Flow over the next five to  
10 twenty years along with a terminal value. In each year, the Debt Free Net Cash Flow is  
11 comprised of projected EBIT, minus income taxes, plus projected depreciation and  
12 amortization, plus or minus projected changes in net cash working capital, less projected  
13 capital expenditures.

14  
15 **Q. WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR THE GROWTH RATE USED TO CALCULATE THE**  
16 **CAPITALIZATION RATE USED IN THE INCOME APPROACH?**

17 **A.** The growth rate used to calculate the capitalization rate reflects the growth in the Debt Free  
18 Net Cash Flow subsequent to the terminal value year. For the Township, the growth rate  
19 of 0.0% was used based on current level of rates. Under both MUNI and IOU ownership  
20 a growth rate of 0.4% was used based on the projected growth in population (1.1%),  
21 projected inflation (2.0%) and the actual growth in the Debt Free Net Cash Flow in the  
22 years prior to the terminal value year. Under MUNI ownership the average growth in the  
23 Debt Free Net Cash Flow for the last two years prior to the terminal value year was 0.8%

1 and 0.3% under IOU ownership. A growth of 0.4% was deemed reasonable based on the  
2 aforesaid.

3  
4 **Q. WHAT UTILITY EARNINGS REPORT WAS USED TO CREATE THE CAPITAL**  
5 **STRUCTURE USED IN YOUR APPRAISAL?**

6 **A.** As documented previously in footnotes 6 and 9, book value capitalization is not used in  
7 fair market valuation determination. Therefore, we did not use the 6.31% Comparable  
8 Group's DSIC (distribution system improvement charge) related net of tax overall cost of  
9 capital in our valuation because a "hypothetical buyer" cannot finance an acquisition at  
10 such a rate and therefore, its use would provide a meaningless result. The Comparable  
11 Group's 6.31% DSIC related cost was determined based on the Comparable Group's book  
12 value capital structure of 46.6% debt and 53.4% equity, a cost of debt of 2.96% and a DSIC  
13 cost of equity of 9.95% based on the February 2020 Earnings Report. However, we note  
14 the 6.31% Comparable Group's DSIC related net of tax overall cost of capital is just above  
15 the 4.98% to 6.18% range of discount rates used in our Income Approach.

16 If we used the 6.31% Comparable Group's DSIC related net of tax overall cost of  
17 capital in our valuation shown on Exhibit 16, the results of the Capitalization DCF would  
18 show a value for the Wastewater System of \$13.5 million. Further, the results of the Market  
19 Multiple DCF would show a value of \$18.2 million and collectively, the DCF method  
20 based on the IOU ownership scenario and a 0.4% growth assumption would indicate a  
21 value of \$16.0 million for the Wastewater System. The DCF method based on the MUNI  
22 ownership scenario indicates a value of \$23.1 million and the DCF method based on the

1 IOU ownership scenario using DSIC indicates a value of \$16.0 million. Collectively, the  
2 DCF method indicates a value of \$19.5 million when DSIC is considered.

3  
4 **Q. IF YOU USED A TERMINAL VALUE IN YOUR DISCOUNTED CASH FLOW**  
5 **ANALYSIS WHAT IS THE NUMBER OF YEARS OVER WHICH THE CASH**  
6 **FLOWS ARE CONSIDERED?**

7 **A.** The use of a “terminal value” in a Discounted Cash Flow analysis is reasonable and is in  
8 accordance with accepted valuation practice. Simply put, the “terminal value” is a  
9 mathematical shortcut to avoid having to show and/or calculate annual Debt Free Net Cash  
10 Flows for hundreds of time periods, or hundreds of years. Within the Discounted Cash  
11 Flow analysis, the “terminal value” is simply a point in time in which the growth in annual  
12 Debt Free Net Cash Flows changes from multiple growth rates to a constant growth rate.  
13 For example, in our Discounted Cash Flow analysis, the growth rate of annual Debt Free  
14 Net Cash Flows during time periods 1 through 24 changes multiple times due to the various  
15 general assumptions listed in the Gannett Fleming Appraisal Report. Subsequent to time  
16 period 24, the growth in annual Debt Free Net Cash Flows is a constant growth rate.  
17 Accordingly, period 24, or year 24, is the “terminal value” year in our DCF method.

18  
19 **Market Approach**

20 **Q. REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION OF THE MARKET APPROACH, WHAT**  
21 **METHODS DID YOU USE TO DETERMINE THE MARKET APPROACH**  
22 **RESULT?**

23 **A.** I used the market multiples method and the selected transaction method.



1 **Q. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS, ANALYSES, AND/OR ADJUSTMENTS DID YOU**  
2 **MAKE UNDER EACH METHOD?**

3 **A.** The general assumptions used for the market multiples method are listed on page 1 of  
4 Exhibit 17. No assumptions were made under the selected transaction method.

5  
6 **Q. REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION OF THE MARKET MULTIPLES**  
7 **METHOD, DID YOU LIMIT YOUR PROXY GROUP USED FOR CALCULATING**  
8 **MARKET VALUE TO ONLY COMPANIES WHICH ENGAGE IN**  
9 **PENNSYLVANIA FAIR MARKET VALUE ACQUISITIONS?**

10 **A.** No.

11  
12 **Q. REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION OF THE COMPARABLE SALES USED TO**  
13 **ESTABLISH THE VALUATION, DID YOU LIMIT THE TRANSACTIONS**  
14 **SELECTED TO THOSE THAT YOU PREVIOUSLY APPRAISED?**

15 **A.** No.

16  
17 **Q. PLEASE STATE THE COMPARABLE TRANSACTIONS YOU USED IN**  
18 **DEVELOPING YOUR MARKET APPROACH.**

19 **A.** Please see PAWC's Application **Appendix A-5.2** (the Gannett Fleming Appraisal Report),  
20 Exhibit 18, pages 2 and 3, which shows that we reviewed the following transactions<sup>9</sup> in  
21 developing the selected transactions method:

---

<sup>9</sup> The years listed indicate when the applicant sought approval or when the Commission approved each of the transactions.

- 1           • Sale of the City of McKeesport to Pennsylvania American Water Company in  
2           2017.
- 3           • Sale of New Garden Township Sewer Authority to Aqua Pennsylvania in 2017.
- 4           • Sale of Limerick Township Wastewater to Aqua Pennsylvania in 2017.
- 5           • Sale of East Bradford Township Wastewater to Aqua Pennsylvania in 2018.
- 6           • Sale of Mahoning Township Water system to Suez Water Pennsylvania in 2018.
- 7           • Sale of Mahoning Township Wastewater system to Suez Water Pennsylvania  
8           in 2018.
- 9           • Sale of Sadsbury Township Wastewater to Pennsylvania American Water  
10          Company in 2018.
- 11          • Sale of Exeter Township Wastewater to Pennsylvania American Water  
12          Company in 2019.
- 13          • Sale of Steelton Borough Authority Water to Pennsylvania American Water  
14          Company in 2019.
- 15          • Sale of Cheltenham Township Wastewater to Aqua Pennsylvania in 2019.
- 16          • Sale of East Norriton Township Wastewater to Aqua Pennsylvania in 2019.
- 17          • Sale of Kane Borough Authority Water to Pennsylvania American Water  
18          Company in 2020.

19           As a check on the transactions I studied, that are listed above, I also reviewed the  
20           purchase of Connecticut Water Service, Inc by SJW Group (Exhibit 18 page 4) which was  
21           announced in 2018 and approved in 2019.

1 **Q. WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF MARKET APPROACH ANALYSIS YOU**  
2 **PERFORMED?**

3 **A.** The results of the market multiples method are shown on page 1 of Exhibit 17 and the  
4 results of the selected transactions method are shown on page 1 of Exhibit 18. The  
5 conclusion regarding the Market Approach analysis is explained on pages 41 and 42 of our  
6 appraisal.

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR CONCLUSION REGARDING THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF**  
9 **THE WASTEWATER SYSTEM’S ASSETS TO BE PURCHASED BY PAWC?**

10 **A.** Fair market value is defined as “the price, expressed in terms of cash equivalents, at which  
11 property would change hands between a hypothetical willing and able buyer and a  
12 hypothetical willing and able seller, acting at arm’s length in an open and unrestricted  
13 market, when neither is under compulsion to buy or sell and when both have reasonable  
14 knowledge of the relevant facts.”

15 Based on our analysis, as described in our appraisal report, the estimate of the fair  
16 market value of the Wastewater System as of April 30, 2020 is \$19,846,000 (rounded).  
17 The results of the analyses and calculations are summarized in Table 1 for the Wastewater  
18 System as follows:

<u>Valuation Approach</u>	<u>Indicated Value</u>
Cost Approach	\$21,165,301
Income Approach	20,599,324
Market Approach	17,780,741

19 **Table 1**

1           We used seven methods under the Cost, Market and Income Approaches to  
2 valuation: Original Cost Method, Replacement Cost Method, Capitalization of Earnings  
3 Method, Market Multiple Discounted Cash Flow Method, Capitalization Discounted Cash  
4 Flow Method, Market Multiples Method, and the Selected Transactions Method.

5           The results from the capitalization of earnings method, market multiple discounted  
6 cash flow method and the capitalization discounted cash flow method form the basis for  
7 our Income Approach. Our Market Approach is supported by the market multiples method  
8 and selected transactions method. The results from the original cost method form the basis  
9 for our replacement cost method, and both methods form the basis for our Cost Approach.

10           We considered the results of each approach as an indicator of value individually, or  
11 as independent indicators of value. Therefore, all three approaches to valuation were given  
12 consideration in arriving at our estimate of the fair market value conclusion. In our opinion,  
13 each of the valuation approaches utilized in our appraisal is relevant. Accordingly, we  
14 assign an equal weight to the result of each approach. Our conclusion regarding the fair  
15 market value can be described by the weightings given the specific results of the three  
16 approaches to valuation. The results of our analyses, shown on Exhibit 19, indicate a range  
17 of value for the Wastewater System of \$17.8 million to \$21.2 million and collectively  
18 indicate a fair market value of \$19,846,000 for the Wastewater System.

19  
20 **Q.   GENERALLY SPEAKING, IS IT COMMON FOR DIFFERENT APPRAISERS TO**  
21 **REACH VARYING OPINIONS OF FAIR MARKET VALUE?**

22 **A.**   Yes. I do not think the underlying results of the models employed for valuation purposes  
23 are ever the same from one appraiser to another appraiser. Further, the conclusion of value

1 from one appraiser to another appraiser usually differs as well. I believe these are some of  
2 the reasons the results of the conclusion of value from two different UVEs are averaged  
3 under Section 1329, 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329.

4

5 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

6 **A. Yes.**

**APPENDIX A**  
Professional Qualifications  
of  
Harold Walker, III  
Manager, Financial Studies  
Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC.

**EDUCATION**

Mr. Walker graduated from Pennsylvania State University in 1984 with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Finance. His studies concentrated on securities analysis and portfolio management with an emphasis on economics and quantitative business analysis. He has also completed the regulation and the rate-making process courses presented by the College of Business Administration and Economics Center for Public Utilities at New Mexico State University. Additionally, he has attended programs presented by The Institute of Chartered Financial Analysts (CFA).

Mr. Walker was awarded the professional designation "Certified Rate of Return Analyst" (CRRA) by the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts. This designation is based upon education, experience and the successful completion of a comprehensive examination. He is also a member of the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts (SURFA) and has attended numerous financial forums sponsored by the Society. The SURFA forums are recognized by the Association for Investment Management and Research (AIMR) and the National Association of State Boards of Accountancy for continuing education credits.

Mr. Walker is also a licensed Municipal Advisor Representative (Series 50) by Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB) and Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA).

**BUSINESS EXPERIENCE**

Prior to joining Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC., Mr. Walker was employed by AUS Consultants - Utility Services. He held various positions during his eleven years with AUS, concluding his employment there as a Vice President. His duties included providing and supervising financial and economic studies on behalf of investor owned and municipally owned water, wastewater, electric, natural gas distribution and transmission, oil pipeline and telephone utilities as well as resource recovery companies.

In 1996, Mr. Walker joined Gannett Fleming Valuation and Rate Consultants, LLC. In his capacity as Manager, Financial Studies and for the past twenty years, he has continuously studied rates of return requirements for regulated firms. In this regard, he supervised the preparation of rate of return studies in connection with his testimony and in the past, for other individuals. He also assisted and/or developed dividend policy studies, nuclear prudence studies, calculated fixed charge rates for avoided costs involving cogeneration projects, financial decision studies for capital budgeting purposes and developed financial models for determining future capital requirements and the effect of those requirements on investors and ratepayers, valued utility property and common stock for acquisition and divestiture, and assisted in the private placement of fixed capital securities for public utilities.

Head, Gannett Fleming GASB 34 Task Force responsible for developing Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) 34 services, and educating Gannett Fleming personnel and Gannett Fleming clients on GASB 34 and how it may affect them. The GASB 34 related services include inventory of assets, valuation of assets, salvage estimation, annual depreciation rate determination, estimation of depreciation reserve, asset service life determination, asset condition assessment, condition assessment documentation, maintenance estimate for asset preservation, establishment of condition level index, geographic information system (GIS) and data management services, management discussion and analysis (MD&A) reporting, required supplemental information (RSI) reporting, auditor interface, and GASB 34 compliance review.

Mr. Walker was also the Publisher of C.A. Turner Utility Reports from 1988 to 1996. C.A. Turner Utility Reports is a financial publication which provides financial data and related ratios and forecasts covering the utility industry. From 1993 to 1994, he became a contributing author for the Fortnightly, a utility trade journal. His column was the Financial News column and focused mainly on the natural gas industry.

In 2004, Mr. Walker was elected to serve on the Board of Directors of SURFA. Previously, he served as an ex-officio directors as an advisor to SURFA's existing President. In 2000, Mr. Walker was elected President of SURFA for the 2001-2002 term. Prior to that, he was elected to serve on the Board of Directors of SURFA during the period 1997-1998 and 1999-2000. Currently, he also serves on the Pennsylvania Municipal Authorities Association, Electric Deregulation Committee.

## **EXPERT TESTIMONY**

Mr. Walker has submitted testimony or been deposed on various topics before regulatory commissions and courts in 25 states including: Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. His testimonies covered various subjects including: fair market value, the taking of natural resources, appropriate capital structure and fixed capital cost rates, depreciation, fair rate of return, purchased water adjustments, synchronization of interest charges for income tax purposes, valuation, cash working capital, lead-lag studies, financial analyses of investment alternatives, and fair value. The following tabulation provides a listing of the electric power, natural gas distribution, telephone, wastewater, and water

service utility cases in which he has been involved as a witness. Additionally, he has been involved in a number of rate proceedings involving small public utilities which were resolved by Option Orders and therefore, are not listed below.

<u>Client</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	
Alpena Power Company	U-10020	
Armstrong Telephone Company - Northern Division	92-0884-T-42T	
Armstrong Telephone Company - Northern Division	95-0571-T-42T	
Artesian Water Company, Inc.	90 10	
Artesian Water Company, Inc.	06 158	
Aqua Illinois Consolidated Water Divisions and Consolidated Sewer Divisions	11-0436	
Aqua Illinois Hawthorn Woods Wastewater Division	00620/07 0621/08 0067	
Aqua Illinois Hawthorn Woods Water Division	07 0620/07 0621/08 0067	
Aqua Illinois Kankakee Water Division	10-0194	
Aqua Illinois Kankakee Water Division	14-0419	
Aqua Illinois Vermilion Division	07 0620/07 0621/08 0067	
Aqua Illinois Willowbrook Wastewater Division	07 0620/07 0621/08 0067	
Aqua Illinois Willowbrook Water Division	07 0620/07 0621/08 0067	
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2016-2580061	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2017-2605434	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2018-3001582	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2019-3008491	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2019-3009052	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2019-3015173	*
Aqua Virginia - Alpha Water Corporation	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Blue Ridge Utility Company, Inc.	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Caroline Utilities, Inc. (Wastewater)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Caroline Utilities, Inc. (Water)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Earlysville Forest Water Company	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Heritage Homes of Virginia	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Indian River Water Company	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - James River Service Corp.	Pue-2009-00059	



Aqua Virginia - Lake Holiday Utilities, Inc. (Wastewater)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Lake Holiday Utilities, Inc. (Water)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Lake Monticello Services Co. (Wastewater)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Lake Monticello Services Co. (Water)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Lake Shawnee	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Land'or Utility Company (Wastewater)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Land'or Utility Company (Water)	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Mountainview Water Company, Inc.	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Powhatan Water Works, Inc.	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Rainbow Forest Water Corporation	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Shawnee Land	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Sydnor Water Corporation	Pue-2009-00059	
Aqua Virginia - Water Distributors, Inc.	Pue-2009-00059	
Berkshire Gas Company	18-40	
Borough of Hanover	R-2009-2106908	
Borough of Hanover	R-2012-2311725	
Borough of Hanover	R-2014-242830	
Borough of Royersford	A-2020-3019634	*
Chaparral City Water Company	W 02113a 04 0616	
California-American Water Company	CIVCV156413	*
Connecticut-American Water Company	99-08-32	
Connecticut Water Company	06 07 08	
Citizens Utilities Company Colorado Gas Division	-	
Citizens Utilities Company Vermont Electric Division	5426	
Citizens Utilities Home Water Company	R 901664	
Citizens Utilities Water Company of Pennsylvania	R 901663	
City of Bethlehem - Bureau of Water	R-00984375	
City of Bethlehem - Bureau of Water	R 00072492	
City of Bethlehem - Bureau of Water	R-2013-2390244	
City of Dubois – Bureau of Water	R-2013-2350509	
City of Dubois – Bureau of Water	R-2016-2554150	

City of Lancaster Sewer Fund	R-00005109	
City of Lancaster Sewer Fund	R-00049862	
City of Lancaster Sewer Fund	R-2012-2310366	
City of Lancaster Sewer Fund	R-2019-3010955	
City of Lancaster Sewer Fund	R-2019-3010955	
City of Lancaster Water Fund	R-00984567	
City of Lancaster Water Fund	R-00016114	
City of Lancaster Water Fund	R 00051167	
City of Lancaster Water Fund	R-2010-2179103	
City of Lancaster Water Fund	R-2014-2418872	
Coastland Corporation	15-cvs-216	
Consumers Pennsylvania Water Company Roaring Creek Division	R-00973869	
Consumers Pennsylvania Water Company Shenango Valley Division	R-00973972	
Country Knolls Water Works, Inc.	90 W 0458	
East Resources, Inc. - West Virginia Utility	06 0445 G 42T	
Elizabethtown Water Company	WR06030257	
Forest Park, Inc.	19-W-0168 & 19-W-0269	
Hampton Water Works Company	DW 99-057	
Hidden Valley Utility Services, LP	R-2018-3001306	
Hidden Valley Utility Services, LP	R-2018-3001307	
Illinois American Water Company	16-0093	
Indian Rock Water Company	R-911971	
Indiana Natural Gas Corporation	38891	
Jamaica Water Supply Company	-	
Kane Borough Authority	A-2019-3014248	*
Kentucky American Water Company, Inc.	2007 00134	
Middlesex Water Company	WR 89030266J	
Millcreek Township Water Authority	55 198 Y 00021 11	*
Missouri-American Water Company	WR 2000-281	
Missouri-American Water Company	SR 2000-282	
Mount Holly Water Company	WR06030257	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR 89080702J	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR 90090950J	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR 03070511	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR-06030257	

New Jersey American Water Company	WR08010020	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR10040260	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR11070460	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR15010035	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR17090985	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR19121516	
New Jersey Natural Gas Company	GR19030420	
Newtown Artesian Water Company	R-911977	
Newtown Artesian Water Company	R-00943157	
Newtown Artesian Water Company	R-2009-2117550	
Newtown Artesian Water Company	R-2011-2230259	
Newtown Artesian Water Company	R-2017-2624240	
Newtown Artesian Water Company	R-2019-3006904	
North Maine Utilities	14-0396	*
Northern Indiana Fuel & Light Company	38770	
Oklahoma Natural Gas Company	PUD-940000477	
Palmetto Wastewater Reclamation, LLC	2018-82-S	
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.	DW 04 048	*
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.	DW 06 073	
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.	DW 08 073	
Pennsylvania Gas & Water Company (Gas)	R-891261	
Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co. (Water)	R 901726	
Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co. (Water)	R-911966	
Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co. (Water)	R-22404	
Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co. (Water)	R-00922482	
Pennsylvania Gas & Water Co. (Water)	R-00932667	
Public Service Company of North Carolina, Inc.	G-5, Sub 565	
Public Service Electric and Gas Company	ER181010029	
Public Service Electric and Gas Company	GR18010030	
Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy	19-06002	
Presque Isle Harbor Water Company	U-9702	
St. Louis County Water Company	WR-2000-844	
Suez Water Delaware, Inc.	19-0615	
Suez Water New Jersey, Inc.	WR18050593	
Suez Water Owego-Nichols, Inc.	17-W-0528	
Suez Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	R-2018-3000834	
Suez Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	A-2018-3003519	*

Suez Water Rhode Island, Inc.	Docket No. 4800	
Suez Water Owego-Nichols, Inc.	19-W-0168 & 19-W-0269	
Suez Water New York, Inc.	19-W-0168 & 19-W-0269	
Suez Westchester, Inc.	19-W-0168 & 19-W-0269	
Suez Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	A-2018-3003517	*
Town of North East Water Fund	9190	
Township of Exeter	A-2018-3004933	*
United Water New Rochelle	W-95-W-1168	
United Water Toms River	WR-95050219	
Valley Township (water)	A-2020-3019859	*
Valley Water Systems, Inc.	06 10 07	
Virginia American Water Company	PUR-2018-00175	
West Virginia-American Water Company	15-0676-W-42T	
West Virginia-American Water Company	15-0675-S-42T	
Wilmington Suburban Water Corporation	94-149	
York Water Company	R-901813	
York Water Company	R-922168	
York Water Company	R-943053	
York Water Company	R-963619	
York Water Company	R-994605	
York Water Company	R-00016236	
Young Brothers, LLC	2019-0117	

\* - Testimony related to valuation

## VERIFICATION

I, Harold Walker, III hereby state that the facts above set forth above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements made herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. Cons. Stat. §4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.



---

Harold Walker III, Manager, Financial Services  
Gannett Fleming

Dated: October 7, 2020