

EXHIBIT DD

AQUA PENNSYLVANIA, INC.
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA

Docket No. A-2024-3049015

DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
HAROLD WALKER, III

FAIR MARKET VALUE APPRAISAL

GREENVILLE WATER AUTHORITY
WATER SYSTEM ASSETS

April 2025

Prepared by:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 2

QUALIFICATION AS UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT..... 4

FEES PAID FOR UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT SERVICES..... 8

FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF WATER SYSTEM ASSETS 10

Cost Approach..... 17

Income Approach..... 19

Market Approach..... 24

CONCLUSION 27

APPENDIX HW-1 1

1 **INTRODUCTION**

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

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

5
6 **Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?**

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

9
10 **Q. WOULD YOU DESCRIBE BRIEFLY GANNETT FLEMING?**

11 **A.** Yes. Since 1915, Gannett Fleming and its predecessors have been helping clients in public
12 pricing policy and related financial matters for managerial purposes, before regulatory
13 commissions and courts of law. Gannett Fleming is registered as a Utility Valuation Expert
14 (“UVE”) in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Gannett Fleming is a subsidiary of
15 Gannett Fleming, Inc.

16
17 **Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS MANAGER, FINANCIAL STUDIES
18 OF GANNETT FLEMING?**

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

1 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS AND YOUR EDUCATIONAL**
2 **BACKGROUND AND EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE?**

3 **A.** My educational background, business experience and qualifications are provided in a
4 Curriculum Vitae included as **Appendix HW-1**.

5
6 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA**
7 **PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION?**

8 **A.** Yes. I have testified before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”
9 or “PUC”), as well as other state regulatory commissions, on many occasions, as shown on
10 **Appendix HW-1**.

11
12 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

13 **A.** My Direct Testimony describes and explains the fair market value appraisal of the
14 Greenville Water Authority (“GWA”) water system assets (“Water System”) that I and
15 staff, working under my direction, performed. Gannett Fleming was engaged by Aqua
16 Pennsylvania, Inc. (“Aqua”) to perform this appraisal. Our report is entitled “Greenville
17 Water Authority Water System Assets Fair Market Value Appraisal at March 31, 2024”
18 (“Appraisal Report”). The appraisal and its report were developed to meet the criteria
19 established in Section 1329 of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Code (“Code”), 66 Pa. C.S.
20 § 1329 (“Determination of the fair market value of water and wastewater assets”).

21 In its 2015-2016 legislative session, the Pennsylvania Legislature passed Act 12 of
22 2016 and Governor Wolf signed Act 12 into law adding Section 1329 of the Code which
23 established the legislative requirements facilitating the acquisition of municipal and

1 authority water and wastewater systems by private investor-owned utilities and other
2 entities which are rate-regulated by the Commission. This legislation was intended to
3 facilitate the acquisition of water and wastewater systems in order to facilitate capital
4 improvements to the water and wastewater properties.

5
6 **QUALIFICATION AS UTILITY VALUATION EXPERT**

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

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

11
12 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH GANNETT FLEMING WAS**
13 **PLACED ON THE COMMISSION’S REGISTRY OF UTILITY VALUATION**
14 **EXPERTS.**

15 **A.** After passage of Section 1329 of the Code, the Commission established an application
16 process by which the Commission would approve and designate firms to be placed on the
17 Commission’s “Registry of Utility Valuation Experts.” To be included on the registry, the
18 UVEs must establish their qualifications. Gannett Fleming submitted its original
19 application and the required proof of experience in September of 2016 and received
20 confirmation and approval from the Commission of Gannett Fleming’s placement on the
21 Commission’s UVE Registry in December of 2016. Renewal of inclusion on the
22 Commission’s UVE Registry must be done annually. Gannett Fleming has timely
23 submitted annual renewal applications since its initial inclusion and has been confirmed

1 for continued placement on the Commission's UVE Registry each year since 2016,
2 including most recently in February of 2025.

3
4 **Q. HAVE YOU EVER HAD YOUR PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS REVOKED**
5 **OR SUSPENDED?**

6 **A.** No.

7
8 **Q. DO YOU HAVE SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE WITH THE VALUATION AND**
9 **APPRAISAL OF UTILITY ASSETS?**

10 **A.** Yes. In addition to serving as an expert witness on various financial and economic matters
11 before utility regulatory commissions for over 35 years, I have also provided valuations of
12 utility asset services for more than 20 years. In that capacity I have testified on valuation
13 matters before the Commission and sponsored or adopted Gannett Fleming's UVE
14 appraisals under Section 1329 of the Code in the New Garden Township proceeding, the
15 Limerick Township proceeding, the East Bradford Township proceeding, the Mahoning
16 Township (water) proceeding, the Mahoning Township (wastewater) proceeding, the
17 Exeter Township proceeding, the Cheltenham Township proceeding, the East Norriton
18 Township proceeding, the Kane Borough proceeding, the Delaware County Regional
19 Water Quality Control Authority proceeding, the Borough of Royersford proceeding, the
20 Valley Township (water) proceeding, the Valley Township (wastewater) proceeding, the
21 Upper Pottsgrove proceeding, the Lower Makefield Township proceeding, the East
22 Whiteland Township proceeding, the Willistown Township proceeding, the Shenandoah
23 Borough proceeding, the City of Beaver Falls proceeding, the Butler Area Sewer Authority

1 proceeding, the Borough of Brentwood proceeding, the Greenville Sanitary Authority
2 proceeding, and the Elizabeth Borough Municipal Authority proceeding.

3 In addition to testifying in Section 1329 proceedings, I have also testified and filed reports
4 on valuation matters in California, Illinois, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania in courts of
5 law and regulatory commissions.¹

6
7 **Q. HAVE YOU OR GANNETT FLEMING OR ANY OF ITS STAFF DERIVED ANY**
8 **MATERIAL FINANCIAL BENEFIT FROM THE SALE OF THE WATER**
9 **SYSTEM'S ASSETS OTHER THAN FEES FOR YOUR SERVICES RENDERED?**

10 **A.** No.

11
12 **Q. ARE YOU OR GANNETT FLEMING OR ANY OF ITS STAFF AN IMMEDIATE**
13 **FAMILY MEMBER OF A DIRECTOR, OFFICER, OR EMPLOYEE OF EITHER**
14 **AQUA OR THE GWA?**

15 **A.** No.

16
17 **Q. IS GANNETT FLEMING IN COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE**
18 **PENNSYLVANIA LAWS?**

19 **A.** Yes.
20

¹ 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 Request 15-d. All other testimony relating to valuation is more than two years old and, therefore, is not provided.

1 **Q. DOES GANNETT FLEMING HAVE THE FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL**
2 **FITNESS, INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL LICENSES AND TECHNICAL**
3 **CERTIFICATIONS, TO PERFORM A FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF THE**
4 **WATER ASSETS OF THE GWA?**

5 **A.** Yes, to be placed on the Commission’s “Registry of Utility Valuation Experts” Gannett
6 Fleming had to establish its qualifications.
7

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

12 **A.** No.
13

14 **Q. HAVE YOU CORRESPONDED WITH SELLER’S UVE WITH REGARD TO ITS**
15 **RESPECTIVE FAIR MARKET VALUE APPRAISAL OF THE ASSETS AT ISSUE**
16 **IN THIS CASE?**

17 **A.** No.
18

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

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

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

2 **Q. WHAT IS THE GANNETT FLEMING FEE ARRANGEMENT TO DELIVER THE**
3 **APPRAISAL?**

4 **A.** Gannett Fleming is being compensated on an hourly basis. Our fee arrangement is included
5 as Appendix T1 to Aqua's Application. True, correct, and complete copies of Gannett
6 Fleming's invoices to Aqua for this matter, as of the date of Aqua's Application filing, are
7 also included in Appendix T1.

8
9 **Q. WHAT IS THE ESTIMATED TOTAL COMPENSATION THAT GANNETT**
10 **FLEMING WILL RECEIVE FOR ITS SERVICES IN THIS MATTER?**

11 **A.** The estimated total compensation that Gannett Fleming will receive for its services in this
12 matter as of the date of Aqua's Application filing is approximately \$30,000, which
13 represents approximately 0.09% of the fair market valuation. I estimate our fee will total
14 \$75,000 if this proceeding is fully litigated, which represents approximately 0.23% of the
15 fair market valuation.

16
17 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH THIS COMPENSATION WAS**
18 **NEGOTIATED?**

19 **A.** Gannett Fleming submitted a proposal to provide the required services in April 2024, which
20 the Aqua accepted in April 2024.

21

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

3 **A.** Yes.

4
5 **Q. WILL GANNETT FLEMING RECEIVE ITS FEE REGARDLESS OF WHETHER**
6 **THE COMMISSION APPROVES THE PROPOSED TRANSACTION OR**
7 **WHETHER IT CLOSES?**

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

12
13 **Q. ARE YOU ADVOCATING FOR ANY PARTY OR OUTCOME?**

14 **A.** No. The Ethics Rule of the USPAP, applicable here pursuant to 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329(a)(3),
15 requires that I perform the appraisal with impartiality, objectivity, and independence, and
16 without accommodation of personal interests. I have not performed this appraisal
17 assignment with bias, and I am not advocating the cause or interest of any party or issue.
18 Further, I have not accepted this or any assignment that includes the reporting of
19 predetermined opinions and conclusions.

20

1 **FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF WATER SYSTEM ASSETS**

2 **Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY EXHIBIT Q TO AQUA’S APPLICATION IN THIS**
3 **PROCEEDING?**

4 **A.** Exhibit Q of Aqua’s application includes Gannett Fleming’s Appraisal Report.
5

6 **Q. HOW DO YOU RECOGNIZE IT?**

7 **A.** I personally prepared, and also directed and supervised Gannett Fleming personnel in
8 preparing, the Appraisal Report, and recognize it as Gannett Fleming’s work product.
9

10 **Q. IS EXHIBIT Q A TRUE, COMPLETE, AND ACCURATE COPY OF THE**
11 **GANNETT FLEMING APPRAISAL REPORT?**

12 **A.** Yes, and I incorporate it into my Direct Testimony as if set forth in its entirety.
13

14 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH YOU PREPARED THE**
15 **GANNETT FLEMING APPRAISAL REPORT.**

16 **A.** In accordance with Section 1329 of the Code, Aqua engaged Gannett Fleming to prepare
17 the Appraisal Report of the Water System. The GWA/Aqua provided financial statements
18 and budget statements regarding the Water System and a copy of the Engineering
19 Assessment² as required by Section 1329(a)(4). In addition, Gannett Fleming reviewed
20 the assets, reviewed additional information provided by the GWA/Aqua, and conducted

² “The Municipal Authority of The Borough of Greenville, Greenville Borough, Pennsylvania, Engineering Assessment, Rev.1” dated April 26, 2024, and related files prepared by Entech Engineering, Inc. *See* Application, Exhibit D.

1 additional research regarding the GWA and the Water System, including a site visit. After
2 those activities and data gathering, we developed the Appraisal Report.

3 The Appraisal Report contains a letter of transmittal; a table of contents detailing
4 all the sections of the report and work papers; and a narrative report explaining our
5 methodology and conclusions.

6 The intent of the Appraisal Report is to provide the appraisal results, as well as the
7 entire appraisal work file, in sufficient detail to satisfy the parties' and Commission's
8 review requirements of Section 1329 and the Commission's Final Implementation Order,
9 *In re: Implementation of Section 1329 of the Public Utility Code*, Docket No. M-2016-
10 2543193 (Order Entered October 27, 2016) (*2016 FIO*); Final Supplemental
11 Implementation Order, *In re: Implementation of Section 1329 of the Public Utility Code*,
12 Docket No. M-2016-2543193 (Order Entered February 28, 2019) (*2019 FSIO*); and Final
13 Supplemental Implementation Order, *In re: Implementation of Section 1329 of the Public*
14 *Utility Code*, Docket No. M-2016-2543193 (Order Entered July 2, 2024) (*2024 FSIO*). In
15 addition to a copy of the Appraisal Report, I have provided supporting work papers for the
16 appraisal in Exhibit Q of Aqua's Application, which have been submitted to the
17 Commission and provided to the public advocates in **CONFIDENTIAL** live electronic
18 format.

19
20 **Q. IS THERE ANYTHING THAT YOU WOULD CHANGE IN THE GANNETT**
21 **FLEMING APPRAISAL REPORT SINCE ITS PREPARATION?**

22 **A.** No.
23

1 **Q. WAS THE FAIR MARKET VALUATION OF THE WATER SYSTEM ASSETS**
2 **DETERMINED IN COMPLIANCE WITH USPAP?**

3 **A.** Yes. Our fair market valuation was determined in compliance with USPAP 2024 Edition.
4

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

7 **A.** Yes.
8

9 **Q. DID YOU INCLUDE ANY EXTRAORDINARY ASSUMPTIONS OR**
10 **HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONS IN DEVELOPING YOUR VALUATION?**

11 **A.** No.
12

13 **Q. DID YOU INCLUDE ANY LIMITING CONDITIONS IN DEVELOPING YOUR**
14 **VALUATION?**

15 **A.** Yes. We accepted all information and data provided by the GWA/Aqua as it pertains to
16 this assignment “as is” after a limited review. That is, we neither audited nor verified any
17 data, engineering assessment, financial record or operating data provided for this
18 assignment. We assumed all title to all assets included in the appraisal is good and
19 marketable and no hazardous conditions or materials exist which could affect the assets.
20 We have not made a specific compliance survey or analysis of the subject property to
21 determine whether it is subject to, or in compliance with, the American Disabilities Act of
22 1990, and this valuation does not consider the effect, if any, of noncompliance.

1 The economic and industry information and data included in our Appraisal Report
2 have been obtained from various printed or electronic reference sources that we believe to
3 be reliable. We have not performed any corroborating procedures to substantiate that
4 information and data.

5
6 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RESULTS OF THE APPLICATION OF THE**
7 **COST, MARKET, AND INCOME APPROACHES.**

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

Approach	Indicated Value	Weight	Weighted Value
Cost Approach	\$45,693,057	33.33%	\$15,231,019
Market Approach	28,004,110	33.33%	9,334,703
Income Approach	26,043,333	33.33%	8,681,111
		100%	\$33,246,833
Conclusion			\$33,246,833

9
10
11 **Q. DID YOU USE THE DEFAULT VALUATION WEIGHTS OF ONE-THIRD EACH**
12 **FOR COST, MARKET, AND INCOME, AS PRESCRIBED BY THE**
13 **COMMISSION IN THE 2024 FSIO?**

14 **A.** Yes.

15
16 **Q. PLEASE FURTHER DESCRIBE EACH APPROACH IN THE DEVELOPMENT**
17 **OF YOUR APPRAISAL.**

18 **A.** We developed our appraisal utilizing the cost, income, and market approaches as required
19 by USPAP and Section 1329 of the Code. We used seven methods under the Cost, Market,
20 and Income Approaches to valuation: Original Cost Method, Replacement Cost Method,

1 Capitalization of Earnings Method, Market Multiple Discounted Cash Flow Method,
2 Capitalization Discounted Cash Flow Method, Market Multiples Method, and the Selected
3 Transactions Method.

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

10 *Cost Approach.* The cost approach utilized the original cost method and
11 replacement cost method. The original cost method determined the original cost of the
12 assets when “new” or first constructed based on the information contained in the
13 Engineering Assessment. The original cost new inventory was then trended using the
14 Handy Whitman Index of Public Utility Construction Costs for the water industry to
15 produce the trended cost, or reproduction cost, and was converted to replacement cost new
16 after obsolescence was factored. The calculated accrued depreciation was determined for
17 the original cost new and for the replacement cost new as of March 31, 2024. The
18 calculated accrued depreciation was based on the assets’ attained ages, and the service life
19 of the assets. The cost basis of depreciable assets was reduced annually by the accumulated
20 depreciation to reflect the loss in the service value of the assets since being constructed.
21 All land and land rights were valued at original cost.

22 *Income Approach.* The income approach utilized the capitalization of earning (cash
23 flow) method and two discounted cash flow methods. The capitalization of earning method

1 converted a single base economic income number to a value by dividing it by a
2 capitalization rate. The discounted cash flow methods used estimates of future debt free
3 net cash flow and discounted them to arrive at a present value or price of the cash flows.
4 The capitalization rate and the discount rate were developed based on market debt and
5 equity rates at the appraisal date. The discounted cash flow methods reflected two types
6 of discounted cash flow analyses, the EBIT and EBITDA terminal value model (market
7 multiple discounted cash flow method) and a capitalization of terminal value model
8 (capitalization discounted cash flow method).³

9 *Market Approach.* The market approach was developed based on the market
10 multiples method and the selected transaction method. The market multiples method was
11 based on the market price data of publicly traded corporations engaged in the same or a
12 similar line of business as the Water System. The market price data of these comparable
13 publicly traded corporations was used to calculate the market multiples for the comparable
14 publicly traded corporations at the appraisal date. The selected transactions method used
15 certain public information relating to the purchase or sale of businesses involved in the
16 same or a similar business line as the Water System to calculate market multiples at the
17 time of transaction (sale/purchase). The calculated market multiples determined by the
18 market multiples method and the selected transaction method were then multiplied by the
19 corresponding Water System financial and operating statistic to produce an indicated value
20 for the Water System.

³ EBIT is earnings before interest and taxes and EBITDA is earnings before interest, tax, depreciation, and amortization.

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE THE NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS YOU USED IN DEVELOPING**
2 **YOUR APPRAISAL AND THE SOURCE OF THAT NUMBER.**

3 **A.** The number of customers I used was 2,951. This customer count number was provided by
4 the GWA/Aqua.

5
6 **Q. DID YOU MAKE ANY UPDATES TO YOUR APPRAISAL REPORT AFTER IT**
7 **WAS SUBMITTED TO AQUA, AND IF SO, WHAT WAS THE UPDATE, WHEN**
8 **WAS IT MADE, AND WHY WAS IT NECESSARY?**

9 **A.** No.

10

11 **Q. DID YOU PERFORM AN ON-SITE INSPECTION OF THE WATER SYSTEM?**

12 **A.** Yes. Gannett Fleming viewed the Water System assets on July 2, 2024.

13

14 **Q. DID YOU RELY UPON A LICENSED ENGINEER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE**
15 **TANGIBLE ASSETS OF THE WATER SYSTEM IN PERFORMING YOUR**
16 **VALUATION?**

17 **A.** Yes. The GWA/Aqua provided a copy of the Engineering Assessment and this information
18 was incorporated into our Cost Approach in our valuation.

19

1 **Cost Approach**

2 **Q. DID YOU USE THE REPRODUCTION COST OR THE REPLACEMENT COST**
3 **IN YOUR COST APPROACH?**

4 **A.** We utilized the original cost new (“OCN”) to calculate the trended original cost (“TOC”) measures, or the reproduction cost of the depreciable assets by multiplying the OCN by
5 specific cost indices. We converted reproduction cost new to replacement cost new after
6 factoring in obsolescence. We used the TOC method because the mandated use of the
7 Engineering Assessment’s original cost essentially dictates the use of TOC over the
8 reproduction cost or the replacement cost methods.
9

10

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

12 **A.** The OCN inventory was trended using the Handy Whitman Index of Public Utility
13 Construction Costs for the water industry to produce the reproduction cost new.
14

14

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

18 **A.** We did not trend land and land rights. That is, all land and land rights were valued at
19 original costs. Plant accounts were trended mainly using the Handy Whitman plant account
20 indices. In limited instances, when Handy Whitman plant account indices were not
21 available, we used the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Producer Price Index which best
22 matches the assets being trended.⁴

⁴ The plant accounts for which Handy Whitman indices were not available included: 341.00 Transportation Equipment; and 346.00 Communication Equipment.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

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

A. We used the date of March 31, 2024.

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

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

Q. WHY ARE THOSE PARAMETERS APPROPRIATE?

A. We believe our average service lives of depreciable assets are appropriate based on our experience of having determined average service lives for numerous other water and wastewater utilities and given the fact they resemble those used by other Pennsylvania water companies.

Q. IF YOU DID NOT USE THE ORIGINAL COST METHOD, WHAT IS THE SYSTEM'S ORIGINAL COST AND ORIGINAL COST LESS DEPRECIATION?

A. The OCN of the Water System's utility plant in service as of March 31, 2024 was not less than \$27.0 million (\$26,980,448 rounded). The theoretical calculated accrued depreciation reserve of the utility plant in service was determined to be \$6.8 million (\$6,832,182 rounded) as of March 31, 2024. After factoring in the accrued depreciation reserve, the

1 Original Cost New Less Depreciation (“OCNLD”) of the Water System’s utility plant in
2 service as of March 31, 2024, was determined to be \$20.1 million (\$26,980,448 -
3 \$6,832,182 = \$20,148,266).

4
5 **Income Approach**

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

9 **A.** We used the Market Multiple Discounted Cash Flow Method (“Market Multiple DCF”),
10 and Capitalization Discounted Cash Flow Method (“Capitalization DCF”) to determine the
11 Income Approach result. We refer to the Market Multiple DCF and the Capitalization DCF
12 collectively as the DCF method. We used the capitalization of earning method to estimate
13 value under current ownership and operations. The capitalization of earning method was
14 not used to determine the Income Approach result.

15
16 **Q. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS DID YOU EMPLOY TO DEVELOP YOUR INCOME**
17 **APPROACH RESULT?**

18 **A.** All general assumptions are listed on page 3 of Exhibit 12, and page 6 of Exhibits 13, 14,
19 15 and 16 of the Appraisal Report.⁵

20
21 **Q. DID YOU USE AQUA’S CAPITALIZATION RATE OR THEIR DISCOUNT RATE**
22 **IN YOUR INCOME APPROACH TO VALUATION?**

⁵ Exhibit references herein are to the Exhibits in the Appraisal Report.

1 A. No. Use of Aqua’s capitalization rate or its discount rate in an income approach to
2 valuation is not consistent with the standard of value of fair market value because the
3 “buyer” under the standard of value of fair market value is not a specific entity (i.e., Aqua),
4 but rather a hypothetical buyer. Use of Aqua’s capitalization rate or its discount rate in an
5 income approach to valuation is only used under the standard of value of investment value.⁶
6 In accordance with Section 1329 of the Code, the standard of value is fair market value,
7 not investment value.

8
9 **Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CAPITALIZATION RATE AND THE DISCOUNT RATE**
10 **USED IN YOUR INCOME APPROACH TO VALUATION.**

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

16 As explained previously, under the standard of value of fair market value the
17 “buyer” is not a specific entity (i.e., Aqua), but rather a hypothetical buyer. Accordingly,
18 the hypothetical bidder/buyer may range from large regional municipal authorities
19 (“MUNI”) to investor-owned utilities (“IOU”). For a MUNI, the appropriate discount rate
20 is the current municipal revenue bond yield on March 31, 2024, of 4.26%. The appropriate

⁶ 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>.

1 IOU discount rate is the current net of tax overall cost of capital (weighted average cost of
2 capital) on March 31, 2024, and ranges from 8.25% to 11.00%.⁷

3 For a MUNI, the appropriate discount rate is the current municipal revenue bond
4 yield, 4.26%, because debt is the only major source of capital available to finance an
5 acquisition (developed on Exhibit 23, pages 2-5). Although a MUNI likely carries equity
6 on their books (balance sheet), all existing equity is already invested in other assets and
7 therefore, cannot be used to finance an acquisition.⁸ For valuation purposes, an embedded
8 cost of debt, or the historical cost of all debt issuances outstanding is not used because this
9 capital is already invested in assets. Whereas the marginal cost of debt, 4.26%, at the
10 valuation date is used in accordance with accepted valuation practice and used for market
11 valuation purposes.

12 As discussed previously, for an IOU, the appropriate discount rate is the net of tax
13 overall cost of capital (weighted average cost of capital), 8.25% to 11.00% (Exhibit 23,
14 pages 2-8). In this instance, the net of tax overall cost of capital (weighted average cost of
15 capital) is based on the Comparable Group's market value capital structure of 30.4% debt
16 and 69.6% equity, a market cost of debt of 5.50% and a range of market cost of equity of
17 10.12% to 14.07%.⁹ The Comparable Group's net of tax overall cost of capital (weighted
18 average cost of capital) is used as a proxy to conform to the "hypothetical buyer" or

⁷ 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) is determined by the weighted average, at market values, of the cost of all financing sources in the business enterprise's capital structure."

⁸ 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).

⁹ 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 “hypothetical seller” of fair market valuation. Use of the buyer’s net of tax overall cost of
2 capital (weighted average cost of capital) would produce an investment valuation, not a
3 fair market valuation. The supporting documentation for the development of the MUNI
4 and IOU discount rates is shown on pages 2 to 8 of Exhibit 23.

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

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

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

19 **A.** The growth rate used to calculate the capitalization rate reflects the growth in the Debt Free
20 Net Cash Flow after the terminal value year. For the GWA, no growth was used based on
21 the demographics, current level of cash flow, and rates. Under both MUNI and IOU
22 ownership no growth was used based on the demographics of the service area.

23

1 **Q. WHAT UTILITY EARNINGS REPORT WAS USED TO CREATE THE CAPITAL**
2 **STRUCTURE USED IN YOUR APPRAISAL?**

3 **A.** As documented previously in footnotes 6 and 8, book value capitalization is not used in
4 fair market valuation determination. Therefore, we did not use the 6.79% Comparable
5 Group's DSIC (distribution system improvement charge) related net of tax overall cost of
6 capital in our valuation because a "hypothetical buyer" cannot finance an acquisition at
7 such a rate and, therefore, its use would provide a meaningless result. The Comparable
8 Group's 6.79% DSIC related cost was determined based the Comparable Group's book
9 value capital structure of 50.3% debt and 49.6% equity, a cost of debt of 5.50% and a DSIC
10 cost of equity of 9.65% based on the September 2023 Earnings Report (public meeting
11 January 18, 2024). However, we note the 6.79% Comparable Group's DSIC related net of
12 tax overall cost of capital falls below the 8.25% to 11.00% range of discount rates used in
13 our Income Approach.

14 If we used the 6.79% Comparable Group's DSIC related net of tax overall cost of
15 capital in our valuation shown on Exhibit 16, the results of the Capitalization DCF would
16 show a value for the Water System of \$30.4 million. Further, the results of the Market
17 Multiple DCF would show a value of \$37.3 million and collectively, the DCF method
18 based on the IOU ownership scenario and a no growth assumption indicates a value of
19 \$33.8 million for the Water System. The DCF method based on the MUNI ownership
20 scenario indicates a value of \$28.9 million and the DCF method based on the IOU
21 ownership scenario using DSIC indicates a value of \$33.8 million. Collectively, the DCF
22 method indicates a value of \$31.4 million when DSIC is considered.

23

1 **Q. IF YOU USED A TERMINAL VALUE IN YOUR DCF ANALYSIS, WHAT IS THE**
2 **NUMBER OF YEARS OVER WHICH THE CASH FLOWS ARE CONSIDERED?**

3 **A.** The use of a “terminal value” in a DCF analysis is reasonable and is in accordance with
4 accepted valuation practice. Simply put, the “terminal value” is a mathematical shortcut
5 to avoid having to show and/or calculate annual Debt Free Net Cash Flows for hundreds
6 of time periods, or hundreds of years. Within the DCF analysis, the “terminal value” is
7 simply a point in time in which the growth in annual Debt Free Net Cash Flows changes
8 from multiple growth rates to a constant growth rate. For example, in our DCF analysis,
9 the growth rate of annual Debt Free Net Cash Flows during time periods 1 through 20
10 changes multiple times due to the various general assumptions listed in the Appraisal
11 Report. After time period 20, the growth in annual Debt Free Net Cash Flows is a constant
12 growth rate. Accordingly, period 20, or year 20, is the “terminal value” year in our DCF
13 method.

14

15 **Market Approach**

16 **Q. REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION OF THE MARKET APPROACH, WHAT**
17 **METHODS DID YOU USE TO DETERMINE THE MARKET APPROACH**
18 **RESULT?**

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

20

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

1 A. The general assumptions used for the market multiples method are listed on page 1 of
2 Exhibit 18. No assumptions were made under the selected transaction method.

3
4 **Q. REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION OF THE MARKET MULTIPLES**
5 **METHOD, DID YOU LIMIT YOUR PROXY GROUP USED FOR CALCULATING**
6 **MARKET VALUE TO ONLY COMPANIES WHICH ENGAGE IN**
7 **PENNSYLVANIA FAIR MARKET VALUE ACQUISITIONS?**

8 A. No.

9
10 **Q. REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION OF THE COMPARABLE SALES USED TO**
11 **ESTABLISH THE VALUATION, DID YOU LIMIT THE TRANSACTIONS**
12 **SELECTED TO THOSE THAT YOU PREVIOUSLY APPRAISED?**

13 A. No.

14
15 **Q. PLEASE STATE THE COMPARABLE TRANSACTIONS YOU USED IN**
16 **DEVELOPING YOUR MARKET APPROACH.**

17 A. Please see Exhibit 19, pages 2 and 3, of the Appraisal Report, which shows that we
18 reviewed the following transactions¹⁰ in developing the selected transactions method:

- 19
- 20 • Sale of the City of McKeesport Wastewater system to Pennsylvania-American
Water Company (“PAWC”) in 2017.
 - 21 • Sale of New Garden Township Sewer Authority to Aqua Pennsylvania
22 Wastewater, Inc. (“APW”) in 2017.
 - 23 • Sale of Limerick Township Wastewater system to APW in 2017.

¹⁰ The years listed indicate when the applicant sought approval or when the Commission approved each of the transactions.

- 1 • Sale of East Bradford Township Wastewater system to APW in 2018.
- 2 • Sale of Mahoning Township Water system to Suez Water Pennsylvania
- 3 (“Veolia”) in 2018.
- 4 • Sale of Mahoning Township Wastewater system to Veolia in 2018.
- 5 • Sale of Sadsbury Township Wastewater system to PAWC in 2018.
- 6 • Sale of Exeter Township Wastewater system to PAWC in 2019.
- 7 • Sale of Steelton Borough Authority Water system to PAWC in 2019.
- 8 • Sale of Cheltenham Township Wastewater system to APW in 2019.
- 9 • Sale of East Norriton Township Wastewater system to APW in 2019.
- 10 • Sale of Kane Borough Authority Wastewater system to PAWC in 2020.
- 11 • Sale of Royersford Borough Authority Wastewater system to PAWC in 2021.
- 12 • Sale of Valley Township Wastewater system to PAWC in 2021.
- 13 • Sale of Valley Township Water system to PAWC in 2021.
- 14 • Sale of Upper Pottsgrove Township Wastewater system to PAWC in 2020.
- 15 • Sale of York City Sewer Authority Wastewater system to PAWC in 2021.
- 16 • Sale of Lower Makefield Township Wastewater system to APW in 2021.
- 17 • Sale of Willistown Township Wastewater system to APW in 2021.
- 18 • Sale of East Whiteland Township Wastewater system to APW in 2021.
- 19 • Sale of Municipal Authority of the Borough of Shenandoah Water system to
- 20 Aqua in 2022.
- 21 • Sale of Butler Area Sewer Authority Wastewater system to PAWC in 2022.

22 As a check on the transactions I studied, that are listed above, I also reviewed the
23 purchase of Connecticut Water Service, Inc. by SJW Group (Exhibit 20 page 2), which was
24 approved in 2019; the purchase of New England Service Company, Inc. (“NESC”) by
25 Aquarion Company, parent of Aquarion Water Company (Exhibit 20 page 3), approved in

1 2021; and the purchase of The Torrington Water Company, Inc. by Aquarion Company,
2 parent of Aquarion Water Company (Exhibit 20 page 4), approved in 2022.¹¹

3
4 **Q. WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE MARKET APPROACH ANALYSIS YOU**
5 **PERFORMED?**

6 **A.** The results of the market multiples method are shown on Exhibit 18, and the results of the
7 selected transactions method are shown on Exhibit 19. The conclusion regarding the
8 Market Approach analysis is explained on pages 48 and 49 of the Appraisal Report.

9
10 **CONCLUSION**

11 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR CONCLUSION REGARDING THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF**
12 **THE WATER SYSTEM’S ASSETS TO BE PURCHASED BY AQUA?**

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

18 Based on our analysis, as described in our Appraisal Report, we are of the opinion
19 that the fair market value of GWA’s Water System assets is \$33.2 million (\$33,246,833
20 rounded), as of March 31, 2024. The results of the analyses and calculations are
21 summarized in Table 1 for the Water System as follows:

¹¹ NESC was the sole stockholder of four regulated water companies operating in three separate states.

¹² National Association of Certified Valuers and Analysts, s.v. “Fair Market Value,” *The International Glossary of Business Valuation Terms*

<u>Valuation Approach</u>	<u>Indicated Value</u>
Cost Approach	\$45,693,057
Income Approach	26,043,333
Market Approach	28,004,110

Table 1

We considered the results of each approach as an indicator of value individually, or as independent indicators of value. Therefore, all three approaches to valuation were given consideration in arriving at our opinion of the fair market value. And, pursuant to the 2024 FSIO, all three approaches were weighted equally in our analysis. Based on these facts, our opinion regarding the fair market value is \$33.2 million. Our conclusion regarding the fair market value can be described by the weights and the specific results of the three approaches to valuation that are shown on Exhibit 22. The results of our analyses, shown on Exhibit 22, show a range of value of \$26.0 million to \$45.7 million and collectively support our opinion of a fair market value for the Water System of \$33.2 million (\$33,246,833 rounded), as of March 31, 2024.

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

A. Yes. I do not think the underlying results of the models employed for valuation purposes are ever the same from one appraiser to another appraiser. Further, the conclusion of value from one appraiser to another appraiser usually differs as well. I believe these are some of

1 the reasons the results of the conclusion of value from two different UVEs are averaged
2 under Section 1329, 66 Pa. C.S. § 1329.

3

4 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

5 **A. Yes. However, I reserve the right to supplement my Direct Testimony as additional issues**
6 or facts arise during the course of this proceeding.

APPENDIX HW-1
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" (CRRRA) 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 obtained a license as a 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.

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. He also previously served 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 27 states including: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, 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, benchmarking, 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.

<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	07 0620/07 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 Illinois, Inc.	24-0044	
Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc	A-2022-3034143	*
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 Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2021-3024267	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2021-3026132	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2021-3027268	*
Aqua Pennsylvania Wastewater Inc	A-2023-3041695	*
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	

<u>Client</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	
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	
Atlantic City Sewerage Company	WR21071006	
Berkshire Gas Company	18-40	
Berkshire Gas Company	22-20	
Bermuda Water Company, Inc	W-01812A-22-0256	
Borough of Brentwood	A-2021-3024058	*
Borough of Hanover	R-2009-2106908	
Borough of Hanover	R-2012-2311725	
Borough of Hanover	R-2014-242830	
Borough of Hanover	R-2021-3026116	
Borough of Hanover	P-2021-3026854	
Borough of Royersford	A-2020-3019634	*
Butler Area Sewer Authority	A-2020-3019634	*
Chaparral City Water Company	W 02113a 04 0616	
California-American Water Company	CIVCV156413	*
Citizens Utilities Company		
Colorado Gas Division	-	

<u>Client</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	
Citizens Utilities Company Vermont Electric Division	5426	
Citizens Utilities Home Water Company	R 901664	
Citizens Utilities Water Company of Pennsylvania	R 901663	
City of Beaver Falls	A-2022-3033138	*
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 Bethlehem - Bureau of Water	R-2020-3020256	
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	
City of Lancaster Water Fund	R-2021-3026682	
City of Lancaster Water Fund	P-2022-3035591	
Coastland Corporation	15-cvs-216	
Commonwealth Edison Company	23-0728	
Commonwealth Edison Company	24-0087	
Community Utilities of Pennsylvania-Water	R-2023-3042804	
Community Utilities of Pennsylvania-Wastewater	R-2023-3042805	
Connecticut-American Water Company	99-08-32	
Connecticut Water Company	06 07 08	
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	

<u>Client</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	
East Resources, Inc. - West Virginia Utility	06 0445 G 42T	
Elizabeth Borough Municipal Authority	A-2025-3052983	*
Elizabethtown Water Company	WR06030257	
ENSTAR Natural Gas Company	U-22-081	
Falls Water Company, Inc.	FLS-W-23-01	
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	
Illinois American Water Company	22-0210	
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	
Kentucky American Water Company, Inc.	2023-00191	
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	
Missouri-American Water Company	WR-2022-0303	
Missouri-American Water Company	SR-2022-0304	
Mount Holly Water Company	WR06030257	
Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy	20-06003	
Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy	23-06007	
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	

<u>Client</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	
New Jersey American Water Company	WR22010019	
New Jersey Natural Gas Company	GR19030420	
New Jersey Natural Gas Company	GR21030679	
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 Utilities, Inc.	2020-281-S	
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-American Water Company	A-2023-3039900	*
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	
Philadelphia Gas Works	R-2020-3017206	
Philadelphia Gas Works	R-2023-3037933	
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	
Presque Isle Harbor Water Company	U-9702	
Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy	19-06002	
Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy	22-06014	
Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy	24-02026	
Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy	24-02027	
St. Louis County Water Company	WR-2000-844	
Suez Water Delaware, Inc.	19-0615	

<u>Client</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>	
Suez Water Idaho, Inc.	SUZ-W-20-02	
Suez Water New Jersey, Inc.	WR18050593	
Suez Water New Jersey, Inc.	WR20110729	
Suez Water Owego-Nichols, Inc.	17-W-0528	
Suez Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	R-2018-3000834	
Suez Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	A-2018-3003519	*
Suez Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	A-2018-3003517	*
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	
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	
Upper Pottsgrove Township	A-2020-3021460	*
Valley Township (water)	A-2020-3019859	*
Valley Township (wastewater)	A-2020-3020178	*
Valley Water Systems, Inc.	06 10 07	
Veolia Water Idaho, Inc.	VEO-W-22-02	
Veolia Water Delaware, Inc.	23-0598	
Veolia Water New Jersey, Inc.	WR23110790	
Veolia Water New York, Inc.	23-W-0111	
Veolia Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	R-2024-3045192	
Veolia Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	R-2024-3045193	
Virginia American Water Company	PUR-2018-00175	
Virginia American Water Company	PUR-2021-00255	
Virginia American Water Company	PUR-2023-00194	
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	

<u>Client</u>	<u>Docket No.</u>
York Water Company	R-00016236
Young Brothers, LLC	2019-0117

* - Testimony related to valuation