

FILED 3/31/2025 DOCUMENT NO. 02375-2025 FPSC - COMMISSION CLERK

Attorneys and Counselors at Law 123 South Calhoun Street P.O. Box 391 32302 Tallahassee, FL 32301

P: (850) 224-9115 F: (850) 222-7560

ausley.com

March 31, 2025

ELECTRONIC FILING

Mr. Adam J. Teitzman, Commission Clerk Office of Commission Clerk Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket 20250029-GU, Petition for Rate Increase by Peoples Gas System, Inc.

Dear Mr. Teitzman:

Attached for filing on behalf of Peoples Gas System, Inc. in the above-referenced docket is the Direct Testimony of Dylan D'Ascendis and Exhibit No. DD-1.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

(Document 8 of 16)

Sincerely,

Jeffry Wahlen

cc: Major Thompson, OGC Jacob Imig, OGC Walt Trierweiler, Public Counsel Jon Moyle, FIPUG

JJW/dh Attachments

BEFORE THE

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU

IN RE: PETITION FOR RATE INCREASE BY PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM, INC.

PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF

DYLAN D'ASCENDIS

ON BEHALF OF

PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM, INC.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

DYLAN D'ASCENDIS

ON BEHALF OF PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM, INC.

I.	Introduction 1
II.	Summary 4
III.	General Principles 7
A.	Business Risk 12
Β.	Financial Risk 15
IV.	Peoples and the Utility Proxy Group 16
V.	Capital Structure 21
VI.	Common Equity Cost Rate Model 25
A.	Discounted Cash Flow 28
Β.	The Risk Premium Model 32
С.	The Capital Asset Pricing Model 45
D.	Common Equity Cost Rates For A Proxy Group Of Domestic,
	Non-Price Regulated Companies Based On The Dcf, Rpm, And
	Capm 52
VII.	Range of Common Equity Cost Rates Before Adjustments 57
VIII.	. Adjustments To The Common Equity Cost Rate

A.	Flotation Costs	58
Β.	Size Adjustment	62
IX.	Conclusion	69
EXHII	BIT	70

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS

1		BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2		PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY
3		OF
4		DYLAN D'ASCENDIS
5		ON BEHALF OF PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM, INC.
6		
7	I.	INTRODUCTION
8	Q.	Please state your name, address, occupation, and employer.
9		
10	A.	My name is Dylan D'Ascendis. My business address is 1820
11		Chapel Avenue W., Suite 300, Cherry Hill, NJ 08003. I am
12		employed by ScottMadden, Inc. as a Partner.
13		
14	Q.	Please provide a brief outline of your educational background
15		and relevant business experience.
16		
17	A.	I am a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, where I
18		received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economic History. I
19		also received a Master of Business Administration with high
20		honors and concentrations in Finance and International
21		Business from Rutgers University.
22		
23		I have offered expert testimony on behalf of investor-owned
24		utilities before more than 40 state regulatory commissions in
25		the United States, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,

the Alberta Utility Commission, an American Arbitration Association panel, and the Superior Court of Rhode Island on issues including, but not limited to, common equity cost rate, rate of return, valuation, capital structure, class cost of service, and rate design.

On behalf of the American Gas Association ("AGA"), I calculate the AGA Gas Index, which serves as the benchmark against which the performance of the American Gas Index Fund ("AGIF") is measured on a monthly basis. The AGA Gas Index and AGIF are a market capitalization weighted index and mutual fund, respectively, comprised of the common stocks of the publicly traded corporate members of the AGA.

I am a member of the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts ("SURFA"). In 2011, I was awarded the professional designation "Certified Rate of Return Analyst" by SURFA, which is based on education, experience, and the successful completion of a comprehensive written examination.

I am also a member of the National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts ("NACVA") and was awarded the professional designation "Certified Valuation Analyst" by the NACVA in 2015.

25

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

14

1		The details of my educational background and expert witness
2		appearances are provided in Document No. 12 to my direct
3		testimony.
4		
5	Q.	What is the purpose of your prepared direct testimony in this
б		proceeding?
7		
8	A.	The purpose of my direct testimony is to present evidence,
9		provide the Florida Public Service Commission ("Commission")
10		with a recommendation regarding Peoples Gas System, Inc.'s
11		("Peoples" or the "company") return on common equity ("ROE")
12		for its natural gas operations, and to provide an assessment
13		of the capital structure to be used for ratemaking purposes,
14		as proposed in the direct testimony of Peoples witness Andrew
15		Nichols.
16		
17	Q.	Did you prepare any exhibits in support of your prepared
18		direct testimony?
19		
20	A.	Yes. Exhibit No. DD-1 was prepared by me or under my
21		direction and supervision. My analyses and conclusions are
22		supported by the data presented in Document Nos. 1 through 12
23		of my exhibit, entitled:
24		
25		Document No. 1 Summary of Common Equity Cost Rate

ī.

1		Document No. 2	Financial Profile of the Utility Proxy
-			Group
2		Dequment No 2	Application of the Discounted Cash Flow
3		Document No. 3	Application of the Discounted Cash Flow
4			Model
5		Document No. 4	Application of the Risk Premium Model
6		Document No. 5	Application of the Capital Asset Pricing
7			Model
8		Document No. 6	Basis of Selection for the Non-Price
9			Regulated Companies Comparable in Total
10			Risk to the Utility Proxy Group
11		Document No. 7	Application of Cost of Common Equity Models
12			to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group
13		Document No. 8	Derivation of the Flotation Cost Adjustment
14			to the Cost of Common Equity
15		Document No. 9	Derivation of the Indicated Size Premium
16			for Peoples Relative to the Utility Proxy
17			Group
18		Document No. 10	Referenced Endnotes for the Prepared Direct
19			Testimony of Dylan W. D'Ascendis
20		Document No. 11	Fama & French - Figure 2
21		Document No. 12	Resume and Testimony Listing of Dylan W.
22			D'Ascendis
23			
24	II.	SUMMARY	
25	Q.	What is your re	commended common equity cost rate?

1	A.	I recommend that the Commission authorize Peoples the
2		opportunity to earn an ROE of 11.10 percent on its
3		jurisdictional rate base, based on its proposed ratemaking
4		capital structure. The company's requested ratemaking
5		capital structure consists of 41.69 percent long-term debt
б		and 54.70 percent common equity, to which my recommended ROE
7		of 11.10 percent would apply. That common equity ratio is
8		consistent with the company's historical equity ratios, and
9		the equity ratios maintained by the Utility Proxy Group
10		(discussed below) and their operating subsidiary utility
11		companies. The overall rate of return is summarized on page
12		1 of Document No. 1.
13		
14	Q.	Please summarize your recommended ROE.
14 15	Q.	Please summarize your recommended ROE.
14 15 16	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2
14 15 16 17	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common
14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not
14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Peoples. Using companies of
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Peoples. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Peoples. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the principles of fair rate of return established by the U.S.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Peoples. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the principles of fair rate of return established by the U.S. Supreme Court in two cases: (1) Federal Power Comm'n v. Hope
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Peoples. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the principles of fair rate of return established by the U.S. Supreme Court in two cases: (1) <i>Federal Power Comm'n v. Hope</i> <i>Natural Gas Co.</i> , 320 U.S. 591 (1944) ("Hope"); and (2)
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Peoples. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the principles of fair rate of return established by the U.S. Supreme Court in two cases: (1) Federal Power Comm'n v. Hope Natural Gas Co., 320 U.S. 591 (1944) ("Hope"); and (2) Bluefield Water Works Improvement Co. v. Public Serv. Comm'n,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Q. A.	Please summarize your recommended ROE. My recommended ROE of 11.10 percent is summarized on page 2 of Document No. 1. I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Peoples. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the principles of fair rate of return established by the U.S. Supreme Court in two cases: (1) Federal Power Comm'n v. Hope Natural Gas Co., 320 U.S. 591 (1944) ("Hope"); and (2) Bluefield Water Works Improvement Co. v. Public Serv. Comm'n, 262 U.S. 679 (1923) ("Bluefield"). No proxy group can be

I

<u>identical</u> in risk to any single company. Consequently, there must be an evaluation of relative risk between the company and the proxy group to determine if it is appropriate to adjust the proxy group's indicated rate of return.

My recommendation results from the application of several 6 cost of common equity models, specifically the Discounted 7 Cash Flow ("DCF") model, the Risk Premium Model ("RPM"), and 8 the Capital Asset Pricing Model ("CAPM"), to the market data 9 of a proxy group of seven natural gas distribution utilities 10 ("Utility Proxy Group") whose selection criteria will be 11 discussed below. In addition, I applied the DCF model, RPM, 12 and CAPM to a Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group similar in total 13 14 risk to the Utility Proxy Group. To be conservative, I did not consider the analytical results applied to my Non-Price 15 Regulated Proxy Group in the determination of my recommended 16 The results derived from each are summarized on page 17 range. 2 of Document No. 1. 18

19

1

2

3

4

5

As shown in Document No. 1, I adjusted the indicated common equity cost rate to reflect the effect of flotation costs, as well as Peoples' specific business risks. These adjustments resulted in a company-specific indicated range of common equity cost rates between 10.78 percent and 11.46 percent. The indicated range of ROEs applicable to the Utility Proxy

Group excluding the Predictive Risk Premium Model ("PRPM") from the calculation of the market risk premium is 10.78 percent to 11.45 percent. Given the Utility Proxy Group and company-specific ranges of common equity cost rates, I recommend the Commission adopt an ROE of 11.10 percent for ratemaking purposes in this case.

- 7
- 8

9

10

11

III. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Q. What general principles have you considered in arriving at your recommended common equity cost rate of 11.10 percent?

In unregulated industries, marketplace competition is the 12 Α. principal determinant of the price of products or services. 13 14 For regulated public utilities, regulation must act as a substitute for marketplace competition. Assuring that the 15 utility can fulfill its obligations to the public, while 16 providing safe and reliable service at all times, requires a 17 level of earnings sufficient to maintain the integrity of 18 presently invested capital. Sufficient earnings also permit 19 20 the attraction of needed new capital at a reasonable cost, for which the utility must compete with other companies of 21 comparable risk, consistent with the fair rate of return 22 standards established by the U.S. Supreme Court 23 in the previously cited Hope and Bluefield cases. 24

25

The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the fair rate of return 1 standards in *Hope* when it stated: 2 The rate-making process under the Act, i.e., the 3 fixing of 'just and reasonable' rates, involves a 4 balancing of the investor and the consumer 5 interests. 6 7 Thus we stated in the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. Case 8 that 'regulation does not insure that the business 9 shall produce net revenues.' 315 U.S. at page 590, 10 11 62 S.Ct. at page 745. But such considerations aside, the investor interest has a legitimate 12 concern with the financial integrity of the company 13 14 whose rates are being regulated. From the investor or company point of view it is important that there 15 be enough revenue not only for operating expenses 16 but also for the capital costs of the business. 17 These include service on the debt and dividends on 18 the stock. Cf. Chicago & Grand Trunk R. Co. v. 19 Wellman, 143 U.S. 339, 345, 346 12 S.Ct. 400,402. 20 By that standard the return to the equity owner 21 should be commensurate with returns on investments 22 in other enterprises having corresponding risks. 23 That return, moreover, should be sufficient to 24 assure confidence in the financial integrity of the 25

enterprise, so as to maintain its credit and to attract capital.¹

1

2

3

17

In summary, the U.S. Supreme Court has found a return that is 4 adequate to attract capital at reasonable terms enables the 5 utility to provide service while maintaining its financial 6 discussed above, integrity. and in keeping with 7 As established regulatory standards, that return should be 8 commensurate with the returns expected elsewhere for 9 investments of equivalent risk. The Commission's decision in 10 11 this proceeding, therefore, should provide the company with the opportunity to earn a return that is: (1) adequate to 12 attract capital at reasonable cost and terms; (2) sufficient 13 14 to ensure its financial integrity; and (3) commensurate with returns on investments in enterprises having corresponding 15 risks. 16

Lastly, the required return for a regulated public utility is 18 established on a stand-alone basis, i.e., for the utility 19 20 operating company at issue in a rate case. Parent entities, like other investors, have capital constraints and must look 21 at the attractiveness of the expected risk-adjusted return of 22 each investment alternative in their capital budgeting 23 That is, utility holding companies that own many 24 process. 25 utility operating companies have choices as to where they

will invest their capital within the holding company family. Therefore, the opportunity cost concept applies regardless of the source of the funding, public funding or corporate funding.

It therefore is important that the authorized ROE reflects 6 7 the risks and prospects of the utility's operations and supports the utility's financial integrity from a stand-alone 8 perspective, as measured by its combined business and 9 Consequently, the ROE authorized in this financial risks. 10 11 proceeding should be sufficient to support the operational (i.e., business risk) and financing (i.e., financial risk) of 12 the company's utility subsidiary on a stand-alone basis. 13

14

17

1

2

3

4

5

Q. Within that broad framework, how is the cost of capital
estimated in regulatory proceedings?

Regulated utilities primarily use common stock and long-term A. 18 debt to finance their permanent property, plant, and 19 20 equipment (i.e., rate base). The fair rate of return for a regulated utility is based on its weighted average cost of 21 capital, in which, as noted earlier, the costs of the 22 individual sources of capital are weighted by their 23 respective book values. 24

25

The cost of capital is the return investors require to make an investment in a company. Investors will provide funds to a firm only if the return that they *expect* is equal to, or greater than, the return that they *require* to accept the risk of providing funds to the firm.

1

2

3

4

5

6

18

The cost of capital (i.e., the combination of the costs of 7 debt and equity) is based on the economic principle of 8 "opportunity costs." Investing in any asset (whether debt or 9 equity securities) represents a forgone opportunity to invest 10 in alternative assets. For any investment to be sensible, 11 its expected return must be at least equal to the return 12 alternative, comparable risk investment 13 expected on Because investments with like risks should 14 opportunities. offer similar returns, the opportunity cost of an investment 15 should equal the return available on an investment 16 of comparable risk. 17

Whereas the cost of debt is contractually defined and can be directly observed as the interest rate or yield on debt securities, the cost of common equity must be estimated based on market data and various financial models. Because the cost of common equity is premised on opportunity costs, the models used to determine it are typically applied to a group of "comparable" or "proxy" companies.

In the end, the estimated cost of capital should reflect the return that investors require in light of the subject company's business and financial risks, and the returns available on comparable investments.

Q. Is the authorized return set in regulatory proceedings
guaranteed?

No, it is not. Consistent with the Hope and Bluefield 9 Α. standards, the ratemaking process should provide the utility 10 11 a reasonable opportunity to recover its return of, and return on, its reasonably incurred investments, but it does not 12 guarantee that return. While a utility may have control over 13 14 some factors that affect the ability to earn its authorized performance, 15 return (e.g., management operating and maintenance expenses, etc.), there are several factors beyond 16 a utility's control that affect its ability to earn its 17 authorized return. Those may include factors such as weather, 18 the economy, and the prevalence and magnitude of regulatory 19 20 lag.

21

1

2

3

4

5

8

22 A. BUSINESS RISK

Q. Please define business risk and explain why it is important
for determining a fair rate of return.

25

A. The investor-required return on common equity reflects
 investors' assessment of the total investment risk of the
 subject firm. Total investment risk is often discussed in
 the context of business and financial risk.²

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

Business risk reflects the uncertainty associated with owning a company's common stock without the company's use of debt and/or preferred stock financing. One way of considering the distinction between business and financial risk is to view the former as the uncertainty of the expected earned return on common equity, assuming the firm is financed with no debt.

Examples of business risks generally faced by utilities 13 14 include, but are not limited to, the regulatory environment, mandatory environmental compliance requirements, customer mix 15 and concentration of customers, service territory economic 16 growth, market demand, risks and uncertainties of supply, 17 operations, capital intensity, size, the degree of operating 18 leverage, emerging technologies, the vagaries of weather, and 19 the like, all of which have a direct bearing on earnings. 20

Although analysts, including ratings agencies, may categorize business risks individually, as a practical matter, such risks are interrelated and not wholly distinct from one another. When determining an appropriate return on common

equity, the relevant issue is where investors see the subject company in relation to other similarly situated utility companies (e.g., those in the Utility Proxy Group). To the extent investors view a company as being exposed to higher risk, the required return will increase, and vice versa.

1

2

3

4

5

6

22

For regulated utilities, business risks are both long-term 7 and near-term in nature. Whereas near-term business risks 8 are reflected in year-to-year variability in earnings and 9 cash flow brought about by economic or regulatory factors, 10 long-term business risks reflect the prospect of an impaired 11 ability of investors to obtain both a fair rate of return on, 12 and return of, their capital. Moreover, because utilities 13 14 accept the obligation to provide safe, adequate, and reliable service at all times (in exchange for a reasonable opportunity 15 to earn a fair return on their investment), they generally do 16 not have the option to delay, defer, or reject capital 17 investments. Since those investments are capital-intensive, 18 utilities generally do not have the option to avoid raising 19 external funds during periods of capital market distress, if 20 21 necessary.

Because utilities invest in long-lived assets, long-term business risks are of paramount concern to equity investors. That is, the risk of not recovering the return on their

investment extends far into the future. The timing and nature 1 of events that may lead to losses, however, also are uncertain 2 and, consequently, those risks and their implications for the 3 required return on equity tend to be difficult to quantify. 4 Regulatory commissions (like investors who commit their 5 capital) must review variety of quantitative 6 а and qualitative data and apply their reasoned 7 judgment to determine how long-term risks weigh in their assessment of 8 the market-required return on common equity. 9

10

11

B. FINANCIAL RISK

- 12 Q. Please define financial risk and explain why it is important
 13 for determining a fair rate of return.
- 14

Financial risk is additional risk created 15 Α. the by the introduction of debt and preferred stock into the capital 16 structure. The higher the proportion of debt and preferred 17 stock in the capital structure, the higher the financial risk 18 to common equity owners (i.e., failure to receive dividends 19 20 due to default or other covenants). Therefore, consistent with the basic financial principle of risk and return, common 21 equity investors require higher returns as compensation for 22 bearing higher financial risk. 23

- 24
- 25 **Q.** Can bond and credit ratings be a proxy for a firm's combined

1		business and financial risks to equity owners (i.e.,
2		investment risk)?
3		
4	A.	Yes, similar bond ratings/issuer credit ratings reflect, and
5		are representative of, similar combined business and
6		financial risks (i.e., total risk) faced by bond investors. ³
7		Although specific business or financial risks may differ
8		between companies, the same bond/credit rating indicates that
9		the combined risks are roughly similar from a debtholder
10		perspective. The caveat is that these debtholder risk
11		measures do not translate directly to risks for common equity.
12		
13	Q.	Do ratings agencies account for company size in their bond
14		ratings?
15		
16	A.	No. Neither Standard & Poor's Ratings Services ("S&P") nor
17		Moody's Investors Service ("Moody's") have minimum company
18		size requirements for any given rating level. This means,
19		all else being equal, a relative size analysis must be
20		conducted for equity investments in companies with similar
21		bond ratings.
22		
23	IV.	PEOPLES AND THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP
24	Q.	Are you familiar with Peoples' operations?
25		

A.	Yes. Peoples, a wholly owned subsidiary of TECO Gas
	Operations, Inc. whose ultimate parent is Emera Incorporated
	("Emera"), provides natural gas distribution service to
	approximately 508,000 residential, commercial, industrial and
	electric power generation customers in the state of Florida. 4
	Peoples has a long-term issuer rating of A- from Fitch
	Ratings; the company is not rated by Moody's or S&P. Emera
	has electric generation, transmission and distribution
	operations, natural gas transmission and distribution
	operations, and non-regulated energy marketing operations in
	the U.S., Canada, and Caribbean Islands. ⁵ Emera is publicly
	traded on the Toronto Stock Exchange under ticker symbol EMA.
Q.	Why is it necessary to develop a proxy group when estimating
	the ROE for the company?
A.	Because the company is not publicly traded and does not have
	publicly traded equity securities, it is necessary to develop
	groups of publicly traded, comparable companies to serve as
	"proxies" for the company. In addition to the analytical
	necessity of doing so, the use of proxy companies is
	consistent with the <i>Hope</i> and <i>Bluefield</i> comparable risk
	standards, as discussed above. I have selected two proxy
	groups that, in my view, are fundamentally risk-comparable to
	the company: a Utility Proxy Group, and a Non-Price Regulated
	А. Q. А.

Proxy Group that is comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group.⁶

Even when proxy groups are carefully selected, it is common 4 for analytical results to vary from company to company. 5 Despite the care taken to ensure comparability, because no 6 two companies are identical, market expectations regarding 7 future risks and prospects will vary within the proxy group. 8 It therefore is common for analytical results to reflect a 9 seemingly wide range, even for a group of similarly situated 10 11 companies. At issue is how to estimate the ROE from within That determination will be best informed by 12 that range. employing a variety of sound analyses that necessarily must 13 14 consider the sort of quantitative and qualitative information discussed throughout my direct testimony. 15 Additionally, a relative risk analysis between the company and the Utility 16 Proxy Group must be made to determine whether or not explicit 17 company-specific adjustments need to be made to the Utility 18 Proxy Group's indicated results. 19

20

1

2

3

21 Q. Please explain how you selected the companies in the Utility
22 Proxy Group.

23

A. The companies selected for the Utility Proxy Group met thefollowing criteria:

	I	
1		ullet They were included in the Natural Gas Utility Group of
2		Value Line's Standard Edition ("Value Line");
3		• They have 60 percent or greater of fiscal year 2023 total
4		operating income derived from, and 60 percent or greater
5		of fiscal year 2023 total assets attributable to,
6		regulated gas distribution operations;
7		• At the time of preparation of this testimony, they had
8		not publicly announced that they were involved in any
9		major merger or acquisition activity (i.e., one publicly-
10		traded utility merging with or acquiring another) or any
11		other major development;
12		• They have not cut or omitted their common dividends during
13		the five years ended 2023 or through the time of
14		preparation of this testimony;
15		• They have Value Line and Bloomberg Professional Services
16		("Bloomberg") adjusted Beta coefficients ("beta");
17		• They have positive Value Line five-year dividends per
18		share ("DPS") growth rate projections; and
19		• They have Value Line, Zacks, or S&P Capital IQ consensus
20		five-year earnings per share ("EPS") growth rate
21		projections.
22		
23	Q.	Please identify the companies that met the above-stated
24		criteria.
25		

The following seven companies met these criteria: Atmos Α. 1 2 Energy Corporation (Ticker: ATO); New Jersey Resources Corporation (Ticker: NJR); NiSource Inc. (Ticker: 3 NI); Northwest Natural Gas Company (Ticker: NWN); ONE Gas, Inc. 4 (Ticker: OGS); Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc. (Ticker: SWX) and 5 Spire Inc. (Ticker: SR). 6 7 Q. Please describe Document No. 2, page 1. 8 9 Page 1 of Document No. 2 contains comparative capitalization Α. 10 11 and financial statistics for the Utility Proxy Group for the five years from 2019 to 2023. 12 13 14 During the five-year period ending December 31, 2023, the historically achieved average earnings rate on book common 15 equity for the group was 8.41 percent, the average common 16 equity ratio based on total permanent capital (excluding 17 short-term debt) was 48.03 percent, and the average dividend 18 payout ratio was 67.03 percent. 19 20 Total debt to earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, 21 and amortization for the years 2019 to 2023 ranges between 22 4.81 and 5.72 times, with an average of 5.34 times. 23 Funds from operations to total debt range from 11.51 percent to 24 25 27.32 percent, with an average of 15.50 percent.

1 V. CAPITAL STRUCTURE

2	Q.	What is Peoples' requested capital structure?
3		
4	A.	Peoples' requested capital structure consists of 41.69
5		percent long-term debt and 54.70 percent common equity, as
6		shown in my Document No. 1 that is based on data included in
7		the company's MFR Schedule G-3, page 2.
8		
9	Q.	What are the typical sources of capital commonly considered
10		in establishing a utility's capital structure?
11		
12	A.	Common equity and long-term debt are commonly considered in
13		establishing a utility's capital structure, because they are
14		the typical sources of capital financing for a utility's rate
15		base.
16		
17	Q.	Please explain.
18		
19	A.	Long-lived assets are typically financed with long-lived
20		securities, so that the overall term structure of the
21		utility's long-term liabilities (both debt and equity)
22		closely match the life of the assets being financed. As
23		stated by Brigham and Houston:
24		In practice, firms don't finance each specific
25		asset with a type of capital that has a maturity

1		equal to the asset's life. However, academic
2		studies do show that most firms tend to finance
3		short-term assets from short-term sources and long-
4		term assets from long-term sources. ⁷
5		
6		Whereas short-term debt has a maturity of one year or less,
7		long-term debt may have maturities of 30 years or longer.
8		Although there are practical financing constraints, such as
9		the need to "stagger" long-term debt maturities, the general
10		objective is to extend the average life of long-term debt.
11		Still, long-term debt has a finite life, which is likely to
12		be less than the life of the assets included in rate base.
13		Common equity, on the other hand, is outstanding into
14		perpetuity. Thus, common equity more accurately matches the
15		life of the going concern of the utility, which is also
16		assumed to operate in perpetuity. Consequently, it is both
17		typical and important for utilities to have significant
18		proportions of common equity in their capital structures.
19		
20	Q.	Why is it important that the company's requested capital
21		structure, consisting of 41.69 percent long-term debt and
22		54.70 percent common equity, be authorized in this
23		proceeding?
24		
25	A.	In order to continue to provide safe and reliable service to

its customers, Peoples must meet the needs and serve the 1 interests of its various stakeholders, including its 2 customers, shareholders, and bondholders. The interests of 3 these stakeholder groups are aligned with maintaining a 4 healthy balance sheet, strong credit ratings, and 5 а supportive regulatory environment, so that the company has 6 7 access to capital on reasonable terms in order to make necessary investments. 8

Safe and reliable service cannot be maintained at a reasonable 10 11 cost if utilities do not have the financial flexibility and competitive 12 strength to access financing markets on reasonable terms. The authorization of a capital structure 13 14 that understates the company's actual common equity will the financial condition of its 15 weaken operations and adversely impact the company's ability to address expenses 16 investments, to the detriment of customers and 17 and shareholders. Safe and reliable service for customers cannot 18 be sustained over the long term if the interests 19 of shareholders and bondholders are minimized such that the 20 public interest is not optimized. 21

22

23

24

25

9

Q. How does the company's requested common equity ratio of 54.70 percent compare with the common equity ratios maintained by the Utility Proxy Group?

The company's requested ratemaking common equity ratio of Α. 1 2 54.70 percent is reasonable and consistent with the range of common equity ratios maintained by the Utility Proxy Group. 3 4 As shown on page 2 of Document No. 2, common equity ratios 5 for the Utility Proxy Group range from 40.23 percent to 62.38 6 7 percent for fiscal year 2023.⁸ I also considered Value Line projected capital structures for the Utility Proxy Group for 8 2027-2029. That analysis showed a range of projected common 9 equity ratios between 44.00 percent and 60.00 percent for the 10 Utility Proxy Group (see, pages 2 through 8 of Document No. 11 3). 12 13 14 In addition to comparing the company's proposed common equity ratio with common equity ratios currently and expected to be 15 maintained by the Utility Proxy Group, I also compared the 16 company's proposed common equity ratio with the equity ratios 17 maintained by the operating subsidiaries of the Utility Proxy 18 Group. As shown on page 3 of Document No. 2, common equity 19 20 ratios of the operating utility subsidiaries of the companies in the Utility Proxy Group range from 37.70 percent to 60.41 21 percent for fiscal year 2023. 22 23 Given the range of equity ratios present within the Utility 24 Q. 25 Proxy Group, is the equity ratio of 54.70 percent proposed by

1		Peoples appropriate for ratemaking purposes?
2		
3	A.	Yes, it is. The company's equity ratio of 54.70 percent is
4		appropriate for ratemaking purposes in the current proceeding
5		because it is within the range of the common equity ratios
6		currently maintained, and expected to be maintained, by the
7		Utility Proxy Group and their utility operating subsidiaries.
8		
9	VI.	COMMON EQUITY COST RATE MODEL
10	Q.	Is it important that cost of common equity models be market-
11		based?
12		
13	A.	Yes. While a public utility operates a regulated business
14		within the states in which it operates, it still must compete
15		for equity in capital markets along with all other companies
16		of comparable risk, which includes non-utilities. The cost
17		of common equity is thus determined based on equity market
18		expectations for the returns of those companies. If an
19		individual investor is choosing to invest their capital among
20		companies of comparable risk, they will choose a company
21		providing a higher return over a company providing a lower
22		return.
23		
24	Q.	Are your cost of common equity models market-based?
25		

The DCF model uses market prices in developing the Α. Yes. 1 2 model's dividend yield component. The RPM uses bond ratings and expected bond yields that reflect the market's assessment 3 of bond/credit risk. In addition, betas (β) , which reflect 4 the market/systematic risk component of equity risk premium, 5 are derived from regression analyses of market prices. 6 The Predictive Risk Premium Model ("PRPM") uses monthly market 7 returns in addition to expectations of the risk-free rate. 8 The CAPM is market-based for many of the same reasons that 9 the RPM is market-based (*i.e.*, the use of expected bond yields 10 and betas). Selection criteria for comparable risk, non-11 price regulated companies are based on regression analyses of 12 market prices and reflect the market's assessment of total 13 14 risk. 15 What analytical approaches did you use to determine 16 ο. the company's ROE? 17 18 As discussed earlier, I have relied on the DCF model, the Α. 19 20 RPM, and the CAPM, which I applied to the Utility Proxy Group described above. I also applied these same models to a Non-21 Price Regulated Proxy Group described later in this section. 22 23

I rely on these models because reasonable investors use a variety of tools and do not rely exclusively on a single

source of information or single model. Moreover, the models 1 2 which I rely focus on different aspects of return on requirements and provide different insights to investors' 3 views of risk and return. The DCF model, for example, 4 estimates the investor-required return assuming a constant 5 expected dividend yield and growth rate in perpetuity, while 6 Risk Premium-based methods (i.e., the RPM 7 and CAPM approaches) provide the ability to reflect investors' views 8 of risk, future market returns, and the relationship between 9 interest rates and the cost of common equity. Just as the 10 11 use of market data for the Utility Proxy Group adds the reliability necessary to inform expert judgment in arriving 12 at a recommended common equity cost rate, the use of multiple 13 14 generally accepted common equity cost rate models also adds reliability and accuracy when arriving at a recommended 15 common equity cost rate. 16

17

Has the Commission approved the use of multiple methods in 18 Q. determining the cost of equity during past rate cases of 19 20 Peoples?

21

24

25

22 Α. Yes. 23

In Docket No. 20080318-GU, the Commission stated that there are several models which satisfy the terms for determining a fair rate of return as laid out by Hope and Bluefield:

While the logic of the legal and economic concepts 1 of a fair rate of return are fairly straight 2 the actual implementation of 3 forward, these concepts is more controversial. Unlike the cost 4 rate on debt that is fixed and known due to its 5 contractual terms, the cost of equity must be 6 7 estimated. Financial models have been developed to estimate the investor-required ROE for a company. 8 Market-based approaches such as the Discounted Cash 9 Flow (DCF) model and the Capital Asset Pricing 10 Model (CAPM) are generally recognized as being 11 consistent with the market-based standards of a 12 fair return enunciated in Hope, 320 U.S. 591 and 13 14 Bluefield, 262 U.S. 679. [Emphasis added]⁹ 15 More recently, in Order No. PSC-2023-0388-FOF-GU, issued on 16 December 27, 2023, the Commission considered the results of 17 the witnesses DCF, CAPM, and RPM analyses to determine the 18 appropriate range of ROEs in which to set Peoples' authorized 19 return.¹⁰ 20 21 22 Α. DISCOUNTED CASH FLOW What is the theoretical basis of the DCF model? 23 Ο. 24 The theory underlying the DCF model is that the present value 25 Α.

of an expected future stream of net cash flows during the 1 investment holding period can be determined by discounting 2 those cash flows at the cost of capital, or the investors' 3 capitalization rate. DCF theory indicates that an investor 4 buys a stock for an expected total return rate, which is 5 derived from the cash flows received from dividends and market 6 price appreciation. Mathematically, the dividend yield on 7 market price plus a growth rate equals the capitalization 8 rate (i.e., the total common equity return rate expected by 9 investors), as depicted in the formula below: 10 $K_{\rm e} = (D_0 (1+q)) / P + q$ 11 Where: 12 K_e = the required return on common equity; 13 D_0 = the annualized dividend per share; 14 P = the current stock price; and 15 16 g = the growth rate. 17 Which version of the DCF model did you use? 18 Q. 19 I relied on the single-stage constant growth DCF model in my 20 Α. analyses. 21 22 23 Q. Please describe the dividend yield you used in applying the constant growth DCF model. 24 25

The unadjusted dividend yields are based on the proxy Α. 1 2 companies' dividends as of January 15, 2025, divided by the average closing market price for the 60 trading days ended 3 January 15, 2025 (see, Column 1, page 1 of Document No. 3). 4 5 Please explain your adjustment to the dividend yield. 6 Q. 7 Α. Because dividends are paid periodically (e.g., quarterly), as 8 opposed to continuously (daily), an adjustment must be made 9 to the dividend yield. This is often referred to as the 10 discrete, or the Gordon Periodic, version of the DCF model. 11 12 DCF theory calls for using the full growth rate, or D_1 , in 13 calculating the model's dividend yield component. Since the 14 companies in the Utility Proxy Group increase their quarterly 15 dividends at various times during the year, a reasonable 16 assumption is to reflect one-half the annual dividend growth 17 rate in the dividend yield component, or $D_{1/2}$. Because the 18 dividend should be representative of the next 12-month 19 period, this adjustment is a conservative approach that does 20 not overstate the dividend yield. Therefore, the actual 21 average dividend yields in Column 1, page 1 of Document No. 22 3 have been adjusted upward to reflect one-half the average 23 projected growth rate shown in Column 5. 24

25

Please explain the basis for the growth rates you apply to 1 0. 2 the Utility Proxy Group in your constant growth DCF model. 3 Investors are likely to rely on widely available financial Α. 4 5 information services, such as Value Line, Zacks, and S&P Capital IQ. Investors realize that analysts have significant 6 insight into the dynamics of the industries and individual 7 companies they analyze, as well as companies' abilities to 8 effectively manage the effects of changing laws 9 and regulations, and ever-changing economic and market 10 11 conditions. For these reasons, I used analysts' five-year forecasts of earnings per share growth in my DCF analysis. 12 13 14 Over the long run, there can be no growth in dividends per share without growth in earnings per share. 15 Security analysts' earnings expectations have a more significant 16 influence on market prices than dividend expectations. Thus, 17 using projected earnings growth rates in a DCF analysis 18 provides a better match between investors' market price 19 20 appreciation expectations and the growth rate component of the DCF. 21 22 Please summarize the constant growth DCF model results. 23 Q. 24 As shown on page 1 of Document No. 3, the application of the 25 Α.

constant growth DCF model to the Utility Proxy Group results in a range of indicated ROEs from 6.64 percent to 11.74 percent. The mean of those results is 10.49 percent, the median result is 10.50 percent, and the average of the two is 10.50 percent.

In arriving at a conclusion for the constant growth DCFindicated common equity cost rate for the Utility Proxy Group, I relied on an average of the mean and the median results of the DCF, specifically 10.50 percent, applicable to the Utility Proxy Group. This approach takes into consideration all proxy company results while mitigating high and low side outliers of those results.

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

15 B. THE RISK PREMIUM MODEL

16 Q. Please describe the theoretical basis of the Risk Premium
17 Model.

18

The RPM is based on the fundamental financial principle of 19 Α. 20 risk and return; namely, that investors require greater returns for bearing greater risk. The RPM recognizes that 21 common equity capital has greater investment risk than debt 22 capital, as common equity shareholders are behind debt 23 holders in any claim on a company's assets and earnings. 24 As 25 a result, investors require higher returns from common stocks
than from bonds to compensate them for bearing the additional risk.

While it is possible to directly observe bond returns and 4 yields, common equity returns required by investors cannot be 5 directly determined or observed. According to RPM theory, 6 7 one can estimate a common equity risk premium over bonds (either historically or prospectively) and use that premium 8 to derive a cost rate of common equity. The cost of common 9 equity equals the expected cost rate for long-term debt 10 11 capital, plus a risk premium over that cost rate, to compensate common shareholders for the added risk of being 12 unsecured and last-in-line for any claim on the corporation's 13 14 assets and earnings upon liquidation.

16 **Q.** Please explain the total market approach RPM.

17

15

1

2

3

18 A. The total market approach RPM adds a prospective public 19 utility bond yield to an average of: (1) an equity risk 20 premium that is derived from a beta-adjusted total market 21 equity risk premium, (2) an equity risk premium based on the 22 S&P Utilities Index, and (3) an equity risk premium based on 23 authorized ROEs for natural gas distribution utilities.

24

25 **Q.** Please explain how you determined the expected bond yield

2

15

applicable to the Utility Proxy Group.

The first step in the total market approach RPM analysis is 3 Α. to determine the expected bond yield. Because both 4 ratemaking and the cost of capital, including the common 5 equity cost rate, are prospective in nature, a prospective 6 yield on similarly rated long-term debt is essential. 7 Ι relied on a consensus forecast of about 50 economists of the 8 expected yield on Aaa-rated corporate bonds for the six 9 calendar guarters ending with the first calendar guarter of 10 11 2026, and Blue Chip's long-term projections for 2026 to 2030 and 2031 to 2035. As shown on line 1, page 1 of Document 12 No. 4, the average expected yield on Moody's Aaa-rated 13 14 corporate bonds is 5.18 percent.

Because that 5.18 percent estimate represents a corporate 16 bond yield and not a utility specific bond yield, I adjusted 17 the expected Aaa-rated corporate bond yield to an equivalent 18 A2-rated public utility bond yield, I made an upward 19 20 adjustment of 0.42 percent, which represents a recent spread between Aaa-rated corporate bonds and A2-rated public 21 utility bonds (as shown on line 2 and explained in note 2 22 on page 1 of Document No. 4). Adding that recent 0.42 23 percent spread to the expected Aaa-rated corporate bond 24 25 yield of 5.18 percent results in an expected A2-rated public

utility bond yield of 5.60 percent.

I then reviewed the average credit rating for the Utility 3 Proxy Group from Moody's to determine if an adjustment to 4 the estimated A2-rated public utility bond was necessary. 5 Since the Utility Proxy Group's average Moody's long-term 6 issuer rating is A3, another adjustment to the expected A2-7 rated public utility bond is needed to reflect this 8 difference in bond ratings. An upward adjustment of 0.06 9 percent, which represents one-third of a recent spread 10 between A2-rated and A3-rated public utility bond yields, 11 necessary to make the A2 prospective bond yield 12 is applicable to an A3-rated public utility bond (as shown on 13 14 line 4 and explained in note 3 on page 1 of Document No. 4). Adding the 0.06 percent to the 5.60 percent prospective A2-15 rated public utility bond yield results in a 5.66 percent 16 expected bond yield applicable to the Utility Proxy Group 17 as shown on page 1 of Document No. 4. 18

19

1

2

To develop the total market approach RPM estimate of the appropriate return on equity, this prospective bond yield is then added to the average of the three different equity risk premiums, which I now discuss, in turn.

24

25

Q. Please explain how the beta-derived equity risk premium is

2

determined.

The components of the beta-derived risk premium model are: 3 Α. (1) an expected market equity risk premium over corporate 4 bonds, and (2) the beta. The derivation of the beta-derived 5 equity risk premium that I applied to the Utility Proxy Group 6 is shown on lines 1 through 8, on page 6 of Document No. 4. 7 The total beta-derived equity risk premium I applied is based 8 on an average of three historical market data-based equity 9 risk premiums, two Value Line-based equity risk premiums, and 10 a Bloomberg-based equity risk premium. Each of these is 11 described below. 12

13

16

14 Q. How did you derive a market equity risk premium based on long15 term historical data?

Α. To derive an historical market equity risk premium, I used 17 the most recent holding period returns for the large company 18 common stocks less the average historical yield on Moody's 19 Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds for the period 1928 to 2023. 20 The use of holding period returns over a very long period of 21 time is appropriate because it is consistent with the long-22 term investment horizon presumed by investing in a going 23 concern, *i.e.*, a company expected to operate in perpetuity. 24

25

The long-term arithmetic mean monthly total return rate on large company common stocks was 12.05 percent and the longterm arithmetic mean monthly yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds was 5.95 percent. As shown on line 1, page 6 of Document No. 4, subtracting the mean monthly bond yield from the total return on large company stocks results in a long-term historical equity risk premium of 6.10 percent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

I used the arithmetic mean monthly total return rates for the 9 large company stocks and yields (income returns) for the 10 11 Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds, because they are appropriate for the purpose of estimating the cost of capital 12 as noted in Kroll's Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation 13 14 ("SBBI") Yearbook 2023 ("SBBI - 2023").¹¹ The use of the arithmetic mean return rates and yields is 15 appropriate because historical total returns and equity risk premiums 16 provide insight into the variance and standard deviation of 17 returns needed by investors in estimating future risk when 18 making a current investment. If investors relied on the 19 20 geometric mean of historical equity risk premiums, they would have no insight into the potential variance of future returns; 21 the geometric mean relates the change over many periods to a 22 constant rate of change, thereby obviating the year-to-year 23 is fluctuations, or variance, which critical to 24 risk 25 analysis.

Q. Please explain the derivation of the regression-based market
 equity risk premium.

3

To derive the regression-based market equity risk premium of Α. 4 5 7.03 percent shown on line 2, page 6 of Document No. 4, I used the same monthly annualized total returns on large 6 company common stocks relative to the monthly annualized 7 yields on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds as mentioned 8 above. I modeled the relationship between interest rates and 9 the market equity risk premium using the observed monthly 10 market equity risk premium as the dependent variable, and the 11 monthly yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds as the 12 independent variable. I then used a linear Ordinary Least 13 14 Squares ("OLS") regression, in which the market equity risk premium is expressed as a function of the Moody's Aaa/Aa-15 rated corporate bond yield: 16 $RP = \alpha + \beta (R_{Aaa/Aa})$ 17 Where: 18 RP = the market equity risk premium; 19 α = the regression intercept coefficient; 20 β = the regression slope coefficient; and 21 22 $R_{Aaa/Aa}$ = the Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bond 23 vield. 24 25 Q. Please explain the derivation of the PRPM equity risk premium.

The PRPM, published in the Journal of Regulatory Economics, 12 Α. 1 2 was developed from the work of Robert F. Engle, who shared the Nobel Prize in Economics in 2003 "for methods of analyzing 3 economic time series with time-varying volatility" or 4 autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity ("ARCH")¹³ 5 Engle found that volatility changes over time and is related 6 from one period to the next, especially in financial markets. 7 Engle discovered that volatility of prices and returns 8 clusters over time and is, therefore, highly predictable and 9 can be used to predict future levels of risk and risk 10 premiums. 11

The PRPM estimates the risk-return relationship directly, as the predicted equity risk premium is generated by predicting volatility or risk. The PRPM is not based on an estimate of investor behavior, but rather on an evaluation of the results of that behavior (i.e., the variance of historical equity risk premiums).

19

12

The inputs to the model are the historical returns on large company stocks minus the historical monthly yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds from January 1928 through December 2024. Using a generalized form of ARCH, known as generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity ("GARCH"), I calculated each of the projected equity risk

premium using Eviews© statistical software. When the GARCH model is applied to the historical return data, it produces a predicted GARCH variance series and a GARCH coefficient. Multiplying the predicted monthly variance by the GARCH coefficient and then annualizing it produces the predicted annual equity risk premium. The resulting PRPM predicted a market equity risk premium of 7.56%.¹⁴

9 Q. Please explain the derivation of projected equity risk
 10 premiums based on the Value Line Summary & Index for your RPM
 11 analysis.

8

12

As noted above, because both ratemaking and the cost of 13 Α. 14 capital are prospective, a prospective market equity risk The derivation of the forecasted or 15 premium is needed. prospective market equity risk premium can be found in note 16 4, page 6 of Document No. 4. Consistent with my calculation 17 of the dividend yield component in my DCF analysis, this 18 prospective market equity risk premium is derived from an 19 20 average of the three- to five-year median market price appreciation potential by Value Line for the 13 weeks ended 21 January 17, 2025, plus an average of the median estimated 22 dividend yield for the common stocks of the 1,700 firms 23 covered in Value Line (Standard Edition) (as explained in 24 25 detail in note 1, page 2 of Document No. 5).

The average median expected price appreciation is 40 percent, 1 which translates to a 8.78 percent annual appreciation, and 2 when added to the average of Value Line's median expected 3 dividend yields of 2.01 percent, equates to a forecasted 4 annual total return rate on the market of 10.79 percent. 5 The forecasted Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bond yield of 5.18 6 percent is deducted from the total market return of 10.79 7 percent, resulting in an equity risk premium of 5.61 percent, 8 as shown on line 4, page 6 of Document No. 4. 9 10 Q. Please explain the derivation of an equity risk premium based 11 on the S&P 500 companies. 12 13 14 Α. Using data from Value Line, Bloomberg, and S&P Capital IQ, I calculated an expected total return on the S&P 500 companies 15 using expected dividend yields and long-term growth estimates 16 as a proxy for capital appreciation. The expected total 17 return for the S&P 500 is 16.33 percent. Subtracting the 18 prospective yield on Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bonds of 19 20 5.18 percent results in a 11.15 percent projected equity risk premium. 21 22 What is your conclusion of a beta-derived equity risk premium 23 Q. for use in your RPM analysis? 24 25

A. I gave equal weight to all five equity risk premiums based on
each source (historical, Value Line Summary & Index, and
aggregate Value Line, Bloomberg, and S&P Capital IQ Market
DCF) in arriving at a 7.49 percent equity risk premium, as
shown on page 6 of Document No. 4.

After calculating the average market equity risk premium of 7 7.49 percent, I adjusted it by beta to account for the risk 8 of the Utility Proxy Group. As discussed below, beta is a 9 meaningful measure of prospective relative risk to the market 10 as a whole, and is a logical way to allocate a company's, or 11 proxy group's, share of the market's total equity risk premium 12 relative to corporate bond yields. As shown on page 1 of 13 14 Document No. 5, the average of the mean and median beta for the Utility Proxy Group is 0.79. Multiplying this beta by 15 the market equity risk premium of 7.49 percent results in a 16 beta-adjusted equity risk premium for the Utility Proxy Group 17 of 5.92 percent. 18

19

6

- 20
- 21

22

Q. How did you derive the equity risk premium based on the S&P Utility Index and Moody's A2-rated public utility bonds?

A. I estimated three equity risk premiums based on S&P Utility
 Index holding period returns, and one equity risk premiums
 based on the expected returns of the S&P Utilities Index,

using Value Line, Bloomberg, and S&P Capital IQ data. Turning 1 first to the S&P Utility Index holding period returns, I 2 derived a long-term monthly arithmetic mean equity risk 3 premium between the S&P Utility Index total returns of 10.59 4 percent and monthly Moody's A2-rated public utility bond 5 yields of 6.42 percent from 1928 to 2024, to arrive at an 6 equity risk premium of 4.16 percent (as shown on line 1, page 7 9 of Document No. 4). I then used the same historical data 8 to derive an equity risk premium of 4.91 percent based on a 9 regression of the monthly equity risk premiums. The final 10 S&P Utility Index holding period equity risk premium involved 11 applying the PRPM using the historical monthly equity risk 12 premiums from January 1928 to December 2024 to arrive at a 13 14 PRPM-derived equity risk premium of 4.72 percent for the S&P Utility Index. 15

I then derived an expected total return on the S&P Utilities 17 Index of 11.14 percent using data from Value Line, Bloomberg, 18 and S&P Capital IQ and subtracted the prospective Moody's A2-19 rated public utility bond yield of 5.60 percent (derived on 20 line 3, page 1 of Document No. 4). This resulted in equity 21 risk premium of 5.54 percent. As with the market equity risk 22 premiums, I averaged the four risk premiums to arrive at my 23 utility-specific equity risk premium of 4.83 percent, 24 as 25 shown on page 9 of Document No. 4.

16

How did you derive an equity risk premium of 4.79 percent 0. 1 2 based on authorized ROEs for gas utilities? 3 The equity risk premium of 4.79 percent shown on page 10 of Α. 4 5 Document No. 4 is the result of a regression analysis based on regulatory awarded ROEs related to the yields on Moody's 6 A2-rated public utility bonds, and contains the graphical 7 results of a regression analysis of 848 rate cases for 8 distribution natural gas utilities, which fully 9 were litigated during the period from January 1, 1980 through 10 January 15, 2025. It shows the implicit equity risk premium 11 relative to the yields on A2-rated public utility bonds 12 immediately prior to the issuance of each 13 regulatory 14 decision. It is readily discernible that there is an inverse relationship between the yield on A2-rated public utility 15 bonds and equity risk premiums. In other words, as interest 16 rates decline, the equity risk premium rises and vice versa, 17 result consistent with financial literature on the 18 а subject.¹⁵ I used the regression results to estimate the 19 equity risk premium applicable to the projected yield on 20 Moody's A2-rated public utility bonds. Given the expected 21 A2-rated utility bond yield of 5.60 percent, it can be 22 calculated that the indicated equity risk premium applicable 23 to that bond yield is 4.79 percent. 24

44

1	Q.	What is your conclusion of equity risk premium for use in
2		your total market approach RPM for the Utility Proxy Group?
3		
4	A.	The equity risk premium I applied to the Utility Proxy Group
5		is 5.18 percent, which is the average of the beta-adjusted
б		equity risk premium for the Utility Proxy Group, the S&P $% \left[{{\left[{{{\left[{{\left[{{\left[{{\left[{{\left[{{\left[$
7		Utilities Index, and the authorized return utility equity
8		risk premiums of 5.92 percent, 4.83 percent, and 4.79 percent,
9		respectively, as shown on page 5 of Document No. 4.
10		
11	Q.	What is the indicated RPM common equity cost rate based on
12		the total market approach?
13		
14	A.	As shown on line 7, page 1 of Document No. 4, I calculated a
15		common equity cost rate of 10.84 percent for the Utility Proxy
16		Group based on the total market approach RPM, or 10.85 percent
17		excluding the PRPM equity risk premium.
18		
19	С.	THE CAPITAL ASSET PRICING MODEL
20	Q.	Please explain the theoretical basis of the CAPM.
21		
22	A.	CAPM theory defines risk as the co-variability of a security's
23		returns with the market's returns as measured by the beta
24		(β). A beta less than 1.0 indicates lower variability than
25		the market as a whole, while a beta greater than 1.0 indicates

.

greater variability than the market. 1 2 The CAPM assumes that all non-market or unsystematic risk can 3 be eliminated through diversification. The risk that cannot 4 be eliminated through diversification is called market, or 5 systematic, risk. In addition, the CAPM presumes that 6 investors only require compensation for systematic risk, 7 which is the result of macroeconomic and other events that 8 affect the returns on all assets. The model is applied by 9 adding a risk-free rate of return to a market risk premium, 10 which is adjusted proportionately to reflect the systematic 11 risk of the individual security relative to the total market 12 as measured by the beta. The traditional CAPM model is 13 expressed as: 14 $R_f + \beta (R_m - R_f)$ R_s 15 16 Where: R_s = Return rate on the common stock; 17 R_f = Risk-free rate of return; 18 R_m = Return rate on the market as a whole; and 19 β = Adjusted beta (volatility of the security 20 relative to the market as a whole). 21 22 Numerous tests of the CAPM have measured the extent to which 23 security returns and beta are related as predicted by the 24 CAPM, confirming its validity. The empirical CAPM ("ECAPM") 25

reflects the reality that while the results of these tests support the notion that the beta is related to security returns, the empirical Security Market Line ("SML") described by the CAPM formula is not as steeply sloped as the predicted SML.¹⁶ The ECAPM reflects this empirical reality.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

The ECAPM is a well-established model that has been relied on in both academic and regulatory settings. Fama & French clearly state regarding the figure in Document No. 11, below, that "[t]he returns on the low beta portfolios are too high, and the returns on the high beta portfolios are too low."¹⁷

In addition, Morin observes that while the results of these 13 14 tests support the notion that beta is related to security returns, the empirical SML described by the CAPM formula is 15 not as steeply sloped as the predicted SML. Morin states: 16 With few exceptions, the empirical studies agree 17 that ... low-beta securities earn returns somewhat 18 higher than the CAPM would predict, and high-beta 19 20 securities earn less than predicted.¹⁸

* * *

Therefore, the empirical evidence suggests that the expected return on a security is related to its risk by the following approximation: $K = RF + x (RM - RF) + (1-x) \beta (RM - RF)$

1	where x is a fraction to be determined empirically.	
2	The value of x that best explains the observed	
3	relationship [is] Return = $0.0829 + 0.0520 \beta$ is	
4	between 0.25 and 0.30. If $x = 0.25$, the equation	
5	becomes:	
б	K = RF + 0.25 (RM - RF) + 0.75 β (RM - RF) ¹⁹	
7		
8	Fama & French provide similar support for the ECAPM when t	hey
9	state:	
10	The early tests firmly reject the Sharpe-Lintner	
11	version of the CAPM. There is a positive relation	
12	between beta and average return, but it is too	
13	'flat.' The regressions consistently find that the	
14	intercept is greater than the average risk-free	
15	rate and the coefficient on beta is less than the	
16	average excess market return This is true in the	
17	early tests as well as in more recent cross-	
18	section regressions tests, like Fama and French	
19	(1992). ²⁰	
20		
21	Finally, Fama & French further note:	
22	Confirming earlier evidence, the relation between	
23	beta and average return `for the ten portfolios is	
24	much flatter than the Sharpe-Linter CAPM predicts.	
25	The returns on low beta portfolios are too high,	

	1	
1		and the returns on the high beta portfolios are too
2		low. For example, the predicted return on the
3		portfolio with the lowest beta is 8.3 percent per
4		year; the actual return as 11.1 percent. The
5		predicted return on the portfolio with the t beta
6		is 16.8 percent per year; the actual is 13.7
7		percent. ²¹
8		
9		Clearly, the justification from Morin and Fama & French, along
10		with their reviews of other academic research on the CAPM,
11		validate the use of the ECAPM. In view of theory and
12		practical research, I have applied both the traditional CAPM
13		and the ECAPM to the companies in the Utility Proxy Group and
14		averaged the results.
15		
16	Q.	What betas did you use in your CAPM analysis?
17		
18	A.	With respect to beta, I considered two methods of calculation:
19		(1) the average of the betas of the respective proxy group
20		companies as reported by Bloomberg, and (2) the average of
21		the betas of the respective proxy group companies as reported
22		by Value Line. While both of those services adjust their
23		calculated (or "raw") betas to reflect the tendency of beta
24		to regress to the market mean of 1.00, Value Line calculates
25		beta over a five-year period, while Bloomberg's calculation

1		is based on two years of data.
2		
3	Q.	Please describe your selection of a risk-free rate of return.
4		
5	A.	As discussed previously, the risk-free rate adopted for both
6		applications of the CAPM is 4.44 percent. This risk-free
7		rate is based on the average of the Blue Chip consensus
8		forecast of the expected yields on 30-year U.S. Treasury bonds
9		for the six quarters ending with the second calendar quarter
10		of 2026, and long-term projections for the years 2026 to 2030
11		and 2031 to 2035.
12		
13	Q.	Please explain the estimation of the expected risk premium
14		for the market used in your CAPM analysis.
15		
16	A.	The basis of the market risk premium is explained in detail
17		in note 1 on page 2 of Document No. 5. As discussed above,
18		the market risk premium is derived from an average of three
19		historical data-based market risk premiums, one Value Line
20		data-based market risk premium, and one Value line,
21		Bloomberg, and S&P Capital IQ data-based market risk premium.
22		
23		The long-term income return on U.S. Government securities of
24		4.99 percent was deducted from the monthly historical total
25		market return of 12.29 percent, which results in an historical

market equity risk premium of 7.31 percent. I applied a 1 linear OLS regression to the monthly annualized historical 2 returns on the S&P 500 relative to historical yields on long-3 term U.S. Government securities. That regression analysis 4 yielded a market equity risk premium of 8.06 percent. 5 The PRPM market equity risk premium is 8.45 percent and is derived 6 using the PRPM relative to the yields on long-term U.S. 7 Treasury securities from January 1926 through December 2024, 8 as shown on page 2 of Document No. 5. 9

The Value Line-derived forecasted total market equity risk premium is derived by deducting the forecasted risk-free rate of 4.44 percent, discussed above, from the Value Line projected total annual market return of 10.79 percent, resulting in a forecasted total market equity risk premium of 6.35 percent.

10

17

23

The S&P 500 projected market equity risk premium using Value Line, Bloomberg, and S&P Capital IQ data is derived by subtracting the projected risk-free rate of 4.44 percent from the projected total return of the S&P 500 of 16.33 percent. The resulting market equity risk premium is 11.89 percent.

These five market risk premium measures, when averaged, result in an average total market equity risk premium of 8.41

1		percent. Excluding the PRPM from the calculation of the
2		market risk premium produces an 8.40 percent estimate.
3		
4	Q.	What are the results of your application of the traditional
5		and empirical CAPM to the Utility Proxy Group?
б		
7	A.	As shown on page 1 of Document No. 5, the mean result of my
8		CAPM/ECAPM applied to the Utility Proxy Group is 11.20
9		percent, the median is 11.16 percent, and the average of the
10		two is 11.18 percent. Excluding the PRPM from the calculation
11		of the market risk premium, the mean result of my CAPM/ECAPM
12		applied to the Utility Proxy Group is 11.19 percent, the
13		median is 11.15 percent, and the average of the two is 11.17
14		percent. Consistent with my reliance on the average of mean
15		and median DCF results discussed above, the indicated common
16		equity cost rate for each group using the CAPM/ECAPM is 11.18
17		percent and 11.17 percent excluding the PRPM.
18		
19	D.	COMMON EQUITY COST RATES FOR A PROXY GROUP OF DOMESTIC,
20		NON-PRICE REGULATED COMPANIES BASED ON THE DCF, RPM, AND
21		CAPM
22	Q.	Why do you also consider a proxy group of domestic, non-price
23		regulated companies?
24		
25	Α.	Although I am not an attorney, my interpretation of the Hope

and Bluefield cases is that they did not specify that 1 2 comparable risk companies had to be utilities. Since the purpose of rate regulation is to be a substitute 3 for marketplace competition, non-price regulated firms operating 4 in the competitive marketplace make an excellent proxy if 5 they are comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group 6 being used to estimate the cost of common equity. 7 The selection of such domestic, non-price regulated competitive 8 firms theoretically and empirically results in a proxy group 9 which is comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group, 10 11 since all of these companies compete for capital in the exact 12 same markets.

13

14 15

16

Q. How did you select non-price regulated companies that are comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group?

17 Α. In order to select a proxy group of domestic, non-price regulated companies similar in total risk to the Utility Proxy 18 Group, I relied on betas and related statistics derived from 19 20 Value Line regression analyses of weekly market prices over the most recent 260 weeks (i.e., five years). As shown on 21 Document No. 6, these selection criteria resulted in a proxy 22 group of 49 domestic, non-price regulated firms comparable in 23 total risk to the Utility Proxy Group. Total risk is the sum 24 25 of non-diversifiable market risk and diversifiable company-

specific risks. The criteria used in selecting the domestic, non-price regulated firms were:

- They must be covered by *Value Line* (Standard Edition);
 - They must be domestic, non-price regulated companies, i.e., not utilities;
- Their unadjusted betas must lie within plus or minus two
 standard deviations of the average unadjusted beta of the
 Utility Proxy Group; and
- The residual standard errors of the Value Line 9 regressions, which gave rise to the unadjusted betas, must 10 11 lie within plus or minus two standard deviations of the average residual standard error of the Utility Proxy 12 Group. 13

14

1

2

3

4

5

Betas measure market, or systematic, risk, which is 15 not diversifiable. The residual standard errors 16 of the regressions measure each firm's company-specific, 17 diversifiable risk. Companies that have similar betas and 18 similar residual standard errors resulting from the same 19 20 regression analyses have similar total investment risk.

21

Q. Did you calculate the common equity cost rate using the DCF model, the RPM, and the CAPM for the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group?

25

	I.	
1	A.	Yes. Because the DCF model, RPM, and CAPM have been applied
2		in an identical manner as described above, I will not repeat
3		the details of the rationale and application of each model.
4		One exception is in the application of the RPM, where I did
5		not use public utility-specific equity risk premiums.
6		
7		Page 2 of Document No. 7 derives the constant growth DCF model
8		common equity cost rate. As shown, the indicated common
9		equity cost rate, using the constant growth DCF for the Non-
10		Price Regulated Proxy Group comparable in total risk to the
11		Utility Proxy Group, is 11.37 percent.
12		
13		Pages 3 through 5 of Document No. 7 contain the data and
14		calculations that support the 12.44 percent RPM common equity
15		cost rates (12.42 percent excluding the PRPM). As shown on
16		line 1, page 3 of Document No. 7, the consensus prospective
17		yield on Moody's Baa2-rated corporate bonds for the six
18		quarters ending in the second quarter of 2026, and for the
19		years 2026 to 2030 and 2031 to 2035, is 6.01 percent. ²² Since
20		the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group has an average Moody's
21		long-term issuer rating of Baal, a downward adjustment of
22		0.09 percent to the projected Baa2-rated corporate bond yield
23		is necessary to reflect a difference in ratings which results
24		in a projected Baal-rated corporate bond yield of 5.92
25		percent.

When beta-adjusted risk premiums of 6.52 percent and 6.50 excluding the PRPM (as derived on page 5 of Document No. 7) relative to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group are added to the adjusted prospective Baal bond yield of 5.92 percent, the indicated RPM common equity cost rates are 12.44 percent and 12.42 percent, respectively.

Page 6 of Document No. 7 contains the inputs and calculations
that support my indicated CAPM/ECAPM common equity cost rate
of 11.86 percent. Page 7 of Document No. 7 contains the
inputs and calculations that support my indicated CAPM/ECAPM
common equity cost rate of 11.85 percent excluding the PRPM.

Q. What is the cost rate of common equity based on the Non-Price
 Regulated Proxy Group comparable in total risk to the Utility
 Proxy Group?

17

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

A. As shown on page 1 of Document No. 7, the results of the common equity models applied to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy
Group - which group is comparable in total risk to the Utility
Proxy Group - are as follows: 11.37 percent (DCF), 12.44
percent (RPM), and 11.86 percent (CAPM). Excluding the PRPM
the estimates are as follows: 11.37 percent (DCF), 12.42
percent (RPM), and 11.85 percent (CAPM).

25

	i	
1		The average of the mean and median of these models is 11.88
2		percent and 11.87 percent excluding the PRPM, which I used as
3		the indicated common equity cost rates for the Non-Price
4		Regulated Proxy Group. To be conservative, I do not consider
5		the results of this analysis directly in my determination of
6		the reasonable range of ROEs attributable to the Utility Proxy
7		Group.
8		
9	VII.	RANGE OF COMMON EQUITY COST RATES BEFORE ADJUSTMENTS
10	Q.	What is the range of indicated common equity cost rates
11		produced by your ROE models?
12		
13	A.	By applying multiple cost of common equity models to the
14		Utility Proxy Group and the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group,
15		the indicated range of common equity cost rates attributable
16		to the Utility Proxy Group before any relative risk
17		adjustments is between 10.50 percent and 11.18 percent, as
18		shown on Document No. 1, page 2 (between 10.50 percent and
19		11.17 percent excluding the PRPM). I used multiple cost of
20		common equity models as primary tools in arriving at my
21		recommended common equity cost rate, because no single model
22		is so inherently precise that it can be relied on to the
23		exclusion of other theoretically sound models. Using
24		multiple models adds reliability to the estimated common
25		equity cost rate, with the prudence of using multiple cost of

	I	
1		common equity models supported in both the financial
2		literature and regulatory precedent.
3		
4		As will be discussed below, Peoples has greater risk than the
5		Utility Proxy Group. Because of this, the indicated range of
6		model results based on the Utility Proxy Group must be
7		adjusted to reflect Peoples' greater relative risk.
8		
9	VIII	ADJUSTMENTS TO THE COMMON EQUITY COST RATE
10	Q.	What company-specific business risks did you consider for
11		your relative risk analysis?
12		
13	A.	As detailed below, I have considered flotation costs. I also
14		considered Peoples' smaller relative size.
15		
16	А.	FLOTATION COSTS
17	Q.	What are flotation costs?
18		
19	Α.	Flotation costs are those costs associated with the sale of
20		new issuances of common stock. They include market pressure
21		and the mandatory unavoidable costs of issuance $(e.q.,$
22		underwriting fees and out-of-pocket costs for printing.
22		legal registration etc.) For every dollar raised through
20		debt or equity offerings, the company receives loss than one
24		full deller in financial
25		iuii doilar in Einancing.

i.

1	Q.	Has the Commission supported the use of flotation cost
2		adjustments in past rate proceedings?
3		
4	A.	Yes. In Peoples' recent 2023 rate proceeding the Commission
5		noted:
6		In PGS's last rate case in 2008, we did not make a
7		specific adjustment for flotation costs, but in our
8		order we stated that we have traditionally recognized
9		a reasonable adjustment for flotation costs in the
10		determination of the investor required returnWe find
11		witness D'Ascendis's method to determine the flotation
12		cost is credible and provided persuasive evidence for
13		his recommendation to include a flotation cost of 9
14		basis points. ²³
15		
16	Q.	Why is it important to recognize flotation costs in the
17		allowed common equity cost rate?
18		
19	A.	It is important because there is no other mechanism in the
20		ratemaking paradigm through which such costs can be
21		recognized and recovered. Because these costs are real,
22		necessary, and legitimate, recovery of these costs should be
23		permitted. As noted by Morin:
24		The costs of issuing these securities are just as
25		real as operating and maintenance expenses or costs

.

	I	
1		incurred to build utility plants, and fair
2		regulatory treatment must permit the recovery of
3		these costs
4		The simple fact of the matter is that common equity
5		capital is not free[Flotation costs] must be
6		recovered through a rate of return adjustment.24
7		
8	Q.	Should flotation costs be recognized whether or not there is
9		a stock issuance of additional shares during the test year?
10		
11	A.	Yes. As noted above, there is no mechanism to recapture such
12		costs in the ratemaking paradigm other than an adjustment to
13		the allowed common equity cost rate. Flotation costs are
14		charged to capital accounts and are not expensed on a
15		utility's income statement. As such, flotation costs are
16		analogous to capital investments, albeit negative, reflected
17		on the balance sheet. Recovery of capital investments relates
18		to the expected useful lives of the investment. Since common
19		equity has a very long and indefinite life (assumed to be
20		infinity in the standard regulatory DCF model), flotation
21		costs should be recovered through an adjustment to common
22		equity cost rate, even when there has not been an issuance
23		during the test year, or in the absence of an expected
24		imminent issuance of additional shares of common stock.
25		

Historical flotation costs are a permanent loss of investment 1 to the utility and should be accounted for. When any company, 2 including a utility, issues common stock, flotation costs are 3 incurred for legal, accounting, printing fees and the like. 4 For each dollar of issuing market price, a small percentage 5 is expensed and is permanently unavailable for investment in 6 utility rate base. Since these expenses are charged to 7 capital accounts and not expensed on the income statement, 8 the only way to restore the full value of that dollar of 9 issuing price with an assumed investor required return of 10 10.00 percent is for the net investment, \$0.95, to earn more 11 than 10.00 percent to net back to the investor a fair return 12 on that dollar. In other words, if a company issues stock at 13 14 \$1.00 with 5.00 percent in flotation costs, it will net \$0.95 in investment. Assuming the investor in that stock requires 15 a 10.00 percent return on his or her invested \$1.00 (i.e., a 16 return of \$0.10), the company needs to earn approximately 17 10.5 percent on its invested \$0.95 to receive a \$0.10 return. 18 19 20 Q. Do the common equity cost rate models you have used already reflect investors' anticipation of flotation costs? 21 22 All of these models assume no transaction costs. 23 Α. No. The literature is guite clear that these costs are not reflected 24 25 in the market prices paid for common stocks. For example,

Brigham and Daves confirm this and provide the methodology 1 2 utilized to calculate the flotation adjustment.²⁵ In addition, Morin confirms the need for such an adjustment even 3 when no new equity issuance is imminent.²⁶ Consequently, it 4 is proper to include a flotation cost adjustment when using 5 cost of common equity models to estimate the common equity 6 cost rate. 7 8

9

10

Q.

How did you calculate the flotation cost allowance?

11 Α. I modified the DCF calculation to provide a dividend yield would reimburse investors for issuance costs 12 that in accordance with the method cited in literature by Brigham and 13 14 Daves, as well as by Morin. The flotation cost adjustment recognizes the actual costs of issuing equity that were 15 incurred by Peoples' parent, Emera, in its equity issuances 16 since 2016 when it acquired Peoples. Based on the issuance 17 costs shown on Document No. 8, an adjustment of 0.08 percent 18 is required to reflect the flotation costs applicable to the 19 20 Utility Proxy Group.

21

22 B. SIZE ADJUSTMENT

- Q. Does Peoples' smaller size relative to the Utility Proxy Group
 companies increase its business risk?
- 25

A. Yes. Peoples' smaller size relative to the Utility Proxy
 Group companies indicates greater relative business risk for
 the company because, all else being equal, size has a material
 bearing on risk.

5

14

Size affects business risk because smaller companies 6 7 generally are less able to cope with significant events that affect sales, revenues, and earnings. For example, smaller 8 companies face more risk exposure to business cycles and 9 economic conditions, both nationally and locally. 10 11 Additionally, the loss of revenues from a few larger customers would have a greater effect on a small company than on a 12 bigger company with a larger, more diverse, customer base. 13

As further evidence that smaller firms are riskier, investors 15 generally demand greater returns from smaller firms 16 to compensate for less marketability and liquidity of their 17 securities. Kroll's Cost of Capital Navigator: U.S. Cost of 18 Capital Module ("Kroll") discusses the nature of the small-19 20 size phenomenon, providing an indication of the magnitude of the size premium based on several measures of size. 21 Τn discussing "Size as a Predictor of Equity Returns," Kroll 22 states: 23

24The size effect is based on the empirical25observation that companies of smaller size are

associated with greater risk and, therefore, have 1 greater cost of capital [sic]. The "size" of a 2 company is one of the most important risk elements 3 to consider when developing cost of equity capital 4 estimates for use in valuing a business simply 5 because size has been shown to be a predictor of 6 7 equity returns. In other words, there is a significant (negative) relationship between size 8 and historical equity returns - as size decreases, 9 returns tend to *increase*, and vice versa. [Footnote 10 11 omitted] [Emphasis in original].²⁷ 12 Furthermore, in The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Theory and 13 14 Evidence, Fama & French note size is indeed a risk factor which must be reflected when estimating the cost of common 15 equity. On page 38, they note: 16 . . . the higher average returns on small stocks 17 and high book-to-market stocks reflect unidentified 18 state variables that produce undiversifiable risks 19 20 (covariances) in returns not captured in the market return and are priced separately from market 21 betas.²⁸ 22 23 Based on this evidence, Fama & French proposed their three-24

25

64

factor model which includes a size variable in recognition of

the effect size has on the cost of common equity. 1 2 Also, it is a basic financial principle that the use of funds 3 invested, and not the source of funds, is what gives rise to 4 the risk of any investment.²⁹ Eugene Brigham, a well-known 5 authority, states: 6 А number of researchers have observed 7 that portfolios of small-firms (sic) have earned 8 consistently higher average returns than those of 9 large-firm stocks; this is called the "small-firm 10 effect." On the surface, it would seem to be 11 advantageous to the small firms to provide average 12 returns in a stock market that are higher than those 13 14 of larger firms. In reality, it is bad news for the small firm; what the small-firm effect means is 15 that the capital market demands higher returns on 16 stocks of small firms than on otherwise similar 17 stocks of the large firms. [Emphasis added]³⁰ 18 19 Consistent with the financial principle of risk and return 20 discussed above, increased relative risk due to small size 21 must be considered in the allowed rate of return on common 22 equity. Therefore, the Commission's authorization of a cost 23 rate of common equity in this proceeding must appropriately 24

65

25

reflect the unique risks of Peoples, including its smaller

	I	
1		relative size, which is justified and supported above by
2		evidence in the financial literature.
3		
4	Q.	Is there a way to quantify a relative risk adjustment due to
5		Peoples' smaller size relative to the Utility Proxy Group?
6		
7	A.	Yes. Peoples has greater relative risk than the average
8		utility in the Utility Proxy Group because of its smaller
9		size compared with the utilities in those groups, as measured
10		by an estimated market capitalization of common equity for
11		the company.
12		
13		As shown in page 1 of Document No. 8, Peoples' estimated
14		market capitalization is approximately \$2.693 billion,
15		compared with the market capitalization of the average
16		companies in the Utility Proxy Group of approximately \$8.011
17		billion as of January 15, 2025. The average company in the
18		Utility Proxy Group have a market capitalization of 3.0 times
19		the size of Peoples' estimated market capitalization.
20		
21		As a result, it is necessary to upwardly adjust the indicated
22		range of common equity cost rates attributable to the Utility
23		Proxy Group to reflect the company's greater risk due to their
24		smaller relative size. The determination is based on the
25		size premiums for portfolios of New York Stock Exchange,

American Stock Exchange, and NASDAQ listed companies ranked 1 by deciles for the 1926 to 2024 period. The average size 2 Utility Proxy Group 3 premium for the with а market capitalization of \$8,011.11 million falls in the 3rd decile, 4 while the Company's estimated market capitalization 5 of \$2,692.85 million places it in the 6th decile. The size 6 premium spread between the 3rd decile and the 6th decile is 7 0.60 percent. Even though a 0.60 percent upward size 8 adjustment is indicated, I applied a size premium of 0.20 9 percent to the company's indicated common equity cost rate in 10 order to be conservative. 11

12

Q. Since Peoples is an indirectly owned operating subsidiary of Emera, why is the size of the total company not more appropriate to use when determining a business risk adjustment?

17

The return derived in this proceeding will not apply to 18 Α. Emera's operations as a whole, but only to Peoples. Emera is 19 20 the sum of its constituent parts, including those constituent parts' ROEs. Potential investors in Emera are aware that it 21 is a combination of operations in each state, and that each 22 state's operations experience the operating risks specific to 23 their jurisdiction. The market's expectation of Emera's 24 25 return is commensurate with the realities of Emera's

1		composite operations in each of the states in which it
2		operates.
3		
4	Q.	What is your conclusion regarding an adjustment for the
5		company's specific business risks?
6		
7	A.	Based on my analysis, a business risk adjustment of 0.20
8		percent is appropriate for Peoples to account for the
9		company's smaller size. Even though my analysis of the
10		company's smaller size relative to the Utility Proxy Group
11		indicates an upward size adjustment of 0.60 percent, I
12		conservatively applied an overall business risk adjustment of
13		0.20 percent to the results as shown on page 2 of Document
14		No. 1.
15		
16	Q.	Please summarize your adjustments to the indicated ranges of
17		ROEs applicable to the Utility Proxy Group.
18		
19	A.	The summary of my adjustments for the company-specific
20		business risks and flotation costs to the indicated ranges of
21		ROEs applicable to the Utility Proxy Group are summarized in
22		page 2 of Document No. 1. As shown, the range of ROEs
23		applicable to the company is between 10.78 percent and 11.46
24		percent, or 10.78 percent and 11.45 percent excluding the
25		PRPM.

i.

68
1	IX.	CONCLUSION
2	Q.	What is your recommended ROE for Peoples?
3		
4	A.	Given the indicated ROE range applicable to the company of
5		10.78 percent to 11.46 percent (10.78 percent to 11.45 percent
6		excluding the PRPM), I conclude that an appropriate ROE for
7		the company is 11.10 percent.
8		
9	Q.	In your opinion, is your proposed ROE of 11.10 percent fair
10		and reasonable to Peoples and its customers?
11		
12	A.	Yes, it is.
13		
14	Q.	In your opinion, is Peoples' proposed capital structure
15		consisting of 41.69 percent long-term debt and 54.70 percent
16		common equity fair and reasonable?
17		
18	A.	Yes, it is.
19		
20	Q.	Does this conclude your prepared direct testimony?
21		
22	Α.	Yes.
23		
24		
25		

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS

EXHIBIT

OF

DYLAN D'ASCENDIS

ON BEHALF OF PEOPLES GAS SYSTEM, INC.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS

Table of Contents

DOCUMENT NO.	TITLE	PAGE
1	Summary of Common Equity Cost Rate	73
2	Financial Profile of the Utility Proxy Group	75
3	Application of the Discounted Cash Flow Model	78
4	Application of the Risk Premium Model	86
5	Application of the Capital Asset Pricing Model	96
6	Basis of Selection for the Non-Price Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Utility Proxy Group	98
7	Application of Cost of Common Equity Models to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group	101
8	Derivation of the Flotation Cost Adjustment to the Cost of Common Equity	108
9	Derivation of the Indicated Size Premium for Peoples Relative to the Utility Proxy Group	110

DOCUMENT NO.	TITLE	PAGE				
1.0	Referenced Endnotes for the Prepared	1 1 1				
IO	Direct Testimony of Dylan W. D'Ascendis	111				
11	Fama & French - Figure 2	114				
12	Resume and Testimony Listing of Dylan W.	115				
	D'Ascendis					

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 1 PAGE 1 OF 2 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Recommended Capital Structure and Cost Rates for Ratemaking Purposes

Type of Capital	Ratios(1)	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost Rate	
Long-Term Debt Short-Term Debt Common Equity	41.69% 3.61% 54.70%	$5.64\%\ 4.55\%\ 11.10\%$	(1) (1) (2)	2.35% 0.16% 6.07%
Total	100.00%		:	8.58%

Notes:

(1) Per data included on Company MFR Schedule G-3, page 2.

(2) From page 2 of this Document.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 1 PAGE 2 OF 2 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Brief Summary of Common Equity Cost Rate

Line No.	Principal Methods	Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies (exc. PRPM)
1.	Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCF) (1)	10.50%	10.50%
2.	Risk Premium Model (RPM) (2)	10.84%	10.85%
3.	Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) (3)	11.18%	11.17%
4.	Market Models Applied to Comparable Risk, Non-Price Regulated Companies (4)	11.88%	11.87%
5.	Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate before Adjustment for Unique Risk	10.50% - 11.18%	10.50% - 11.17%
6.	Size Adjustment (5)	0.20%	0.20%
7.	Credit Risk Adjustment (6)	0.00%	0.00%
8.	Flotation Cost Adjustment (7)	0.08%	0.08%
9.	Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate after Adjustment	10.78% - 11.46%	10.78% - 11.45%
10.	Recommended Common Equity Cost Rate	11.10%	11.10%

Notes: (1) From page 1 of Document No. 3.

_

(2) From page 1 of Document No. 4.

(3) From page 1 of Document No. 5.

(4) From page 1 of Document No. 7.

(5) Size adjustment to reflect the Company's smaller size compared to the Utility Proxy Group's as detailed in the accompanying Direct Testimony.

(6) The company does not have a credit rating from Moody's. However, it's A- rating from Fitch Ratings is consistent with an A3 rating from Moody's. No credit risk adjustment is necessary as the bond rating of the company (A- from Fitch Ratings) is identical to the average credit rating of the utility proxy group (A3).

(7) From Document No. 9.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 2 PAGE 1 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies CAPITALIZATION AND FINANCIAL STATISTICS (1) 2019 - 2023, Inclusive

	<u>2023</u>	2022	(3411	2021		2020		2019		
Capitalization Statistics			(MIL	LIONS OF DOLLA	RSJ					
Amount of Capital Employed										
Total Permanent Capital	\$9,183.685	\$8,210.117		\$7,442.590		\$6,654.657		\$5,863.473		
Short-Term Debt	\$745.215	\$823.046		\$628.829		\$300.871		\$554.766		
Total Capital Employed	\$9,928.900	\$9,033.163		\$8,071.419		\$6,955.528		\$6,418.239		
Indicated Average Capital Cost Rates (2)										
Total Debt	4.10 %	3.17	%	2.90	%	3.39	%	3.74 %		
Preferred Stock	5.22 %	4.84	%	5.33	%	6.19	%	4.60 %		
									<u>5 YEAR</u>	
Based on Total Permanent Capital									AVERAG	Ē
Long Term Debt	52.23 06	51 17	0%	51 57	0%	50.16	0%	46.87 %	50.40	0%
Preferred Stock	0.86	1.84	70	1 98	70	153	70	165	157	70
Common Equity	46.90	46.99		46.45		48 31		51.48	48.03	
Total	100.00 %	100.00		100.00		100.00	- %	100.00 %	100.00	- %
Total	10000 //	100100	- " -	100100	- " =	100100	- ^ -	100.00 /0	100100	= '0
Based on Total Capital:										
Total Debt, Including Short-Term Debt	54.91 %	55.90	%	56.25	%	53.27	%	51.14 %	54.30	%
Preferred Stock	0.75	1.64		1.87		1.42		1.44	1.42	
Common Equity	44.34	42.46		41.89		45.30		47.41	44.28	_
Total	100.00 %	100.00	_% _	100.00	% =	100.00	%	100.00 %	100.00	= %
Financial Statistics										
Financial Ratios - Market Based										
Earnings / Price Ratio	5.42 %	4.18	%	5.24	%	3.85	%	3.97 %	4.53	%
Market / Average Book Ratio	156.78	180.83		170.62		184.68		219.63	182.51	
Dividend Yield	3.79	3.29		3.46		3.14		2.60	3.26	
Dividend Payout Ratio	70.31	58.56		61.19		78.10		67.01	67.03	
Rate of Return on Average Book Common Equity	8.63 %	8.06	%	9.49	%	7.11	%	8.74 %	8.41	%
<u>Total Debt / EBITDA (3)</u>	5.18 x	5.39	x	5.59	x	5.72	x	4.81 x	5.34	x
Funds from Operations / Total Debt (4)	27.32 %	11.51	%	9.24	%	14.20	%	15.23 %	15.50	%
<u>Total Debt / Total Capital</u>	54.91 %	55.90	%	56.25	%	53.27	%	51.14 %	54.29	%

Notes:

(1) All capitalization and financial statistics for the group are the arithmetic average of the achieved results for each individual company in the group, and are based upon financial statements as originally reported in each year.

(2) Computed by relating actual total debt interest or preferred stock dividends booked to average of beginning and ending total debt or preferred stock reported to be outstanding.

(3) Total debt relative to EBITDA (Earnings before Interest, Income Taxes, Depreciation and Amortization).

(4) Funds from operations (sum of net income, depreciation, amortization, net deferred income tax and investment tax credits, less total AFUDC) plus interest charges as a percentage of total debt.

Source of Information: Company Annual Forms 10-K

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 2 PAGE 2 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

Capital Structure Based upon Total Permanent Capital for the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

2019 - 2023, Inclusive

	<u>2023</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>5 YEAR</u> AVERAGE
Atmos Energy Corporation						
Long-Term Deht	37.62 %	37.96 %	39.35 %	40.02 %	38.03 %	38.60 %
Preferred Stock	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Common Equity	62.38	62.04	60.65	59.98	61.97	61.40
Total Capital	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %
New Jersey Resources Corporation						
Long-Term Debt	59.16 %	58.49 %	57.81 %	55.35 %	50.11 %	56.18 %
Preferred Stock	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Common Equity	40.84	41.51	42.19	44.65	49.89	43.82
Total Capital	<u> 100.00 </u> % :	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %
<u>NiSource Inc.</u>						
Long-Term Debt	57.26 %	55.77 %	57.09 %	61.64 %	56.79 %	57.71 %
Preferred Stock	2.51	9.03	9.55	5.87	6.35	6.66
Common Equity	40.23	35.20	33.36	32.49	36.85	35.63
Total Capital	$\frac{100.00}{100.00}$ %	100.00 %	<u> 100.00 </u> % .	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %
Northwest Natural Holding Company						
Long-Term Debt	55.11 %	53.21 %	52.12 %	51.81 %	50.43 %	52.54 %
Preferred Stock	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Common Equity	44.89	46.79	47.88	48.19	49.57	47.46
Total Capital	$\frac{100.00}{100.00}$ %	100.00 %	%	100.00 %	100.00 %	<u> 100.00 </u> %
ONE Gas, Inc.						
Long-Term Debt	44.05 %	42.10 %	41.74 %	41.76 %	37.65 %	41.46 %
Preferred Stock	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Common Equity	55.95	57.90	58.26	58.24	62.35	58.54
Total Capital	$\frac{100.00}{100.00}$ %	100.00 %	<u> 100.00 </u> %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %
Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc.						
Long-Term Debt	58.43 %	59.25 %	59.90 %	50.90 %	49.58 %	55.61 %
Preferred Stock	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Common Equity	41.57	40.75	40.10	49.10	50.42	44.39
l otal Capital	%	100.00 %	%	100.00 %	100.00 %	%
Spire Inc.						
Long-Term Debt	54.01 %	51.42 %	52.98 %	49.62 %	45.49 %	50.70 %
Preferred Stock	3.52	3.84	4.28	4.83	5.19	4.33
Common Equity	42.46	44.74	42.74	45.55	49.32	44.96
Total Capital	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %
Provy Croup of Seven Natural Cas Companies						
Long Torm Dobt	ED DD 0/	E1 17 0/	E1 E7 0/	E0 16 0/	46.97 0/	E0 40 94
Deng-renni Debu	52.23 %	51.17 % 194	51.57 % 109	50.10 % 1 E2	40.8/%	50.40 %
Common Fauity	0.00	1.04	1.70	1.33	1.00 51.40	1.57
Total Capital	100 00 %	100.00 %	100 00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100 00 %
roun capital		100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %

Source of Information Annual Forms 10-K

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 2 PAGE 3 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Operating Subsidiary Company Capital Structures of the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

			2023	
	Parent			
	Company	Common		Total
Company Name	Ticker	Equity	Total Debt	Capital
Atmos Energy Corporation	ATO	60.41%	39.59%	100.00%
New Jersey Natural Gas Company	NJR	37.70%	62.30%	100.00%
Northern Indiana Public Service Company	NI	59.26%	40.74%	100.00%
Northwest Natural Gas Company	NWN	45.77%	54.23%	100.00%
ONE Gas, Inc.	OGS	47.40%	52.60%	100.00%
Southwest Gas Corporation	SWX	47.62%	52.38%	100.00%
Spire Alabama Inc.	SR	50.89%	49.11%	100.00%
Spire Missouri Inc.	SR	44.21%	55.79%	100.00%
	Average	49.16%	50.84%	
	Maximum	60.41%	62.30%	
	Minimum	37.70%	39.59%	

Source: S&P Global Market Intelligence.

Company Financial Statements.

Northern Indiana Public Service Company is from FERC financial Report Form Form No. 1.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 1 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate Using the Discounted Cash Flow Model for the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

	[1]		[2]		[3]		[4]		[5]		[6]		[7]	
Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Avera, Dividend (1)	Value Line Projected Five Year Growth in EPS (2)		Zack's Five Year Projected Growth Rate in EPS		S&P Capital IQ Projected Five Year Growth in EPS		Average Projected Five Year Growth in EPS (3)		Adjusted Dividend Yield (4)		Indicat Comm Equity (Rate (ed on Cost 5)	
Atmos Energy Corporation	2.45	%	7.00	%	7.00	%	7.51	%	7.17	%	2.54	%	9.71	%
New Jersey Resources Corporation	3.79		5.00		NA		5.60		5.30		3.89		9.19	
NiSource Inc.	2.92		9.50		7.50		7.78		8.26		3.04		11.30	
Northwest Natural Holding Company	4.81		6.50		NA		4.83		5.66		4.95		10.61	
ONE Gas, Inc.	3.64		3.50		2.90		2.45		2.95		3.69		6.64	(6)
Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc.	3.36		10.00		6.50		8.21		8.24		3.50		11.74	
Spire Inc.	4.66		4.50		5.80		6.50		5.60		4.79		10.39	-
											Average		10.49	_%
											Median		10.50	_%

Average of Mean and Median 10.50 %

NA= Not Available

Notes:

- (1) Indicated dividend at 01/15/2025 divided by the average closing price of the last 60 trading days ending 01/15/2025 for each company.
 (2) From pages 2 through 8 of this Document No..
 (3) Average of columns 2 through 4 excluding negative growth rates.
- (4) This reflects a growth rate component equal to one-half the conclusion of growth rate (from column 5) x
 - rate for the periodic payment of dividends (Gordon Model) as opposed to the continuous payment. Thus, for Atmos Energy Corporation, 2.45% x $(1+(1/2 \times 7.17\%)) = 2.54\%$.
- (5) Column 5 + Column 6.
- (6) Results were excluded from the final average and median as they were more than two standard deviations from the proxy group's mean.

Source of Information:

Value Line Investment Survey www.zacks.com Downloaded on 01/15/2025 S&P Capital IQ

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 2 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

ATM	0S	ENE	ERG	Y CC	RP.	NYSE-	ATO P	ECENT A	46.1	1 P/E Rati	o 20 .	4 (Traili Medi	ng: 21.5) an: 20.0)	RELATIVI P/E RATI	5 1.0	8 DIV'D YLD	2.4	%	/ALU LINE		
TIMELINE	ss 4	Lowered	2/16/24	High:	47.4	58.2	64.8	82.0	93.6 72.5	100.8	115.2	121.1	105.3	123.0	125.3	146.9			Target	Price	Range
SAFETY	1	Raised 6	/6/14	LEGE	NDS	44.∠	0.6	60.0	72.0	/0.5	09.2	11.9	04.0	97.7	101.0	110.5			2027	2028	2029
TECHNIC	AL 3	Raised 1	0/25/24	Options:	elative Pric	e Strength															200
BETA .90	(1.00 =	Market)		Shaded	area indic	ates reces	sion							d. de u		ور - خارد اور					100
18-Mont	h Targ	et Price	Range				F		الىشى.	التعريق	Production of the		41		1111 111	444111					
Low-High	i Midi 5 ⊈13	point (%) 7 /-5%)	to Mid)				li	10100													60
2027	-29 PR	0.IFCTI0	ONS		19110	1. PULL	mpqn														50 40
Pr	ice	A	nn'i Total Return	<u>ս</u> ստղ																	30
High 16	5 (-	15%)	6% 1%					· · · · · .													_20
Instituti	onal E	Decisio	ns	••••	••••••								·			•••••		% TO	THIS N	N 10/24	
to Buy	402023 358	102024 367	202024 342	Percen	t 24 -													1 yr.	STOCK 32.9	INDEX 28.7	E
to Sell Hid's(000) 1	295 37294	292 137412	311 144146	traded	8			Hilling	uhtuul	hhut								3 yr. 5 yr.	63.3 39.6	10.7 73.6	-
2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	©VAL	ue line p	UB. LLC	27-29
79.52	53.69	53.12	48.15	38.10	42.88	49.22	40.82	32.23	26.01	28.00	24.32	22.41	25.73	29.82	28.79	26.55	27.55	Revenue "Cook F	es per sh	A	35.70
2.00	4.29	2.16	2.26	2.10	2.50	2.96	3.09	3.38	3.60	4.00	4.35	4.72	5.12	5.60	6.10	6.83	7.20	Earning	spersh	AB	8.35
1.30	1.32	1.34	1.36	1.38	1.40	1.48	1.56	1.68	1.80	1.94	2.10	2.30	2.50	2.72	2.96	3.22	3.48	Div'ds D	ecl'd per	sh ^c ∎	4.25
5.20	5.51 23.52	24.16	6.90 24.98	8.12	9.32	8.32	9.61	10.46	10.72	13.19	14.19 48.18	15.38	14.87	17.35	18.90	18.95	23.40	Cap1 Sp Book Va	ending p lue per sl	ersh h	21.75 89.15
90.81	92.55	90.16	90.30	90.24	90.64	100.39	101.48	103.93	106.10	111.27	119.34	125.88	132.42	140.90	148.49	155.00	158.00	Commo	n Shs Out	tst'g D	175.00
13.6	12.5	13.2	14.4	15.9	15.9	16.1	17.5	20.8	22.0	21.7	23.2	22.3	18.8	19.3	18.7	17.3		Avg Ani	n'I P/E Rat	tio	18.0
4.8%	.03 5.3%	4.7%	4.2%	4.1%	3.5%	3.1%	2.9%	2.4%	2.3%	2.2%	2.1%	2.2%	2.6%	2.5%	2.6%	2.7%		Avg Anr	i'l Div'd Y	ield	2.8%
CAPITAL	STRU	CTURE a	as of 6/30	/24		4940.9	4142.1	3349.9	2759.7	3115.5	2901.8	2821.1	3407.5	4201.7	4275.4	4115	4350	Revenu	es (\$mill)	A	6250
Total Deb	ot \$787 \$7866.5	6.1 mill. [5 mill. 	טע in 5 T Interes.	írs \$915. st \$135.0	0 mill. mill.	289.8	315.1	350.1	382.7	444.3	511.4	580.5	665.6	774.4	885.9	1043.0	1145	Net Prot	it (\$mill)		1475
(LT intere	st earn	ed: 8.3x;	total inter	rest		39.2% 5.9%	38.3%	36.4%	36.6% 13.9%	27.0%	21.4%	19.5%	18.8%	9.1%	20.7%	15.6% 25.3%	19.0% 26.3%	Net Prof	it Margin		25.0% 23.6%
Leases, I	Jncapi	talized A	nnual ren	tals \$41.3	3 mill.	44.3%	43.5%	38.7%	44.0%	34.3%	38.0%	40.0%	38.4%	37.9%	37.9%	39.0%	40.0%	Long-Te	rm Debt F	Ratio	40.0%
Pfd Stoc	k None					55.7%	56.5%	61.3%	56.0%	65.7% 7263.6	62.0%	60.0%	61.6%	62.1%	62.1%	61.0%	60.0%	Commo Total Ca	n Equity F nital (Smi	Ratio	60.0%
Dension		0/00 ¢5/	0.4			6725.9	7430.6	8280.5	9259.2	10371	11788	13355	15064	17240	19607	20000	23100	Net Plan	it (\$mill)	"/	28000
Pension	Assets	-9/23 \$50	02.4 mill. Oblig. \$43	31.6 mill.		6.4%	6.6%	7.2%	6.4%	6.9%	6.1%	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%	5.5%	6.5%	6.5%	Return o	n Total C	ap'l	7.0%
Common	Stock	155,232	,827 shs.			9.4% 9.4%	9.9% q.q%	10.1%	9.8% 9.8%	9.3%	8.9%	8.5%	8.4%	8.2%	8.1%	8.5% 8.5%	9.0%	Return o	on Shr. Eq In Com Er	uity	9.5% 9.5%
MADKET		000 7 L :II				4.7%	4.9%	5.1%	4.9%	4.8%	4.6%	4.4%	4.3%	4.2%	4.2%	4.5%	4.5%	Retaine	to Com	Eq	4.5%
CURREN	T POS	522.7 DII	100 (Larç 2022	ge Cap) 2023	6/30/24	50%	51%	50%	50%	48%	48%	49%	49%	49%	49%	48%	48%	All Div'c	s to Net F	Prof	50%
(\$MILL Cash As) sets		51.6	15.4	674.6	BUSIN	ESS: Atr	nos Ener sale of r	gy Corpo natural da	ration is s to ove	engaged r three n	l primarily nillion cus	/ in the	mercial; Energy	3.8%, in Marketin	dustrial; a 1/17	and 1.7% Officers	6 other. T and dire	he comp	any solo	l Atmos imately
Other	Accote	29	$\frac{996.1}{147.7}$	870.4	1034.0	through	n six regu	lated na	tural gas	utility op	erations	Louisiar	na Divi-	.5% of a	common	stock (12	2/23 Prox	y). Presid	lent and	Chief Ex	ecutive
Accts Pa	yable	2	196.0	336.1	319.4	Sion, V Colora	vest i ex do-Kansa	as Divisi s Divisio	on, Mid-i n, and Ki	ex Divisi entucky/ř	ion, Miss Mid-State	s Divisio	ivision, n. Gas	Officer: Centre,	Suite 18	kers. Inci 00, 5430	LBJ Fre	1: Texas. eway, Da	Address Illas, Tex	: Three as 7524	Lincoln D. Tele-
Other	9	23	720.2	253.4 763.1	<u>9.6</u> 655.9	sales t	oreakdow	n for fisc	al 2023:	66.5%,	residenti	al; 28.0%	, com-	phone: !	972-934-	9227. Int	ernet: wv	vw.atmos	energy.co	om.	
Current L	iab. Cov.	36	502.6 1 238% 1	352.6 059%	984.9 1075%	Atm	os E	nergy	Cor	pora	tion	ough	t to	throu	igh fis	scal 2	029 te	o be 1	oughl	y \$24	bil-
ANNUAL	RATES	S Past	Pa	st Est'd	21-23	onc	e ag	ain,	in fi	scal	2025 2	i (wl	hich	ment	s wil	l con	tinue	to to	be de	ploye	d to
of change (persh) s	10 Yrs. -4.0	. 5Yr 1% -,	rs. to 5% ∶	' 27-'29 4.0%	star	ted o	n Ócí	ober	1st).	We be	elieve	that	wher	e the	y are	prese	ently.	Assur	ning	that
Cash Fl	ow"	6.5 9.5	% 7. % 9.	0% (0%	6.5% 7.0%	tribi	be bro ition o	ougnt livisio	about n. sur	part: porte	d to a	oy the 1 large	e ex-	comp	balano	ce sn ought	eet re	emain have	s nea little	utny, e tro	uble
Dividend Book Va	s lue	7.0 9.5	% 8. % 12.	5% 0%	7.5% 5.0%	tent	by be	nefits	of hig	her r	ates p	lus a	n ex-	achie	ving t	those	goals.		4 1		
Fiscal	QUART	ERLY RE	VENUES (\$	mill.) A	Full	stor	ied cu age ui	istome nit sta	er bas ands t	se. Tr o hay	ne pip ve a b	beime	and per-	was	quar raise	teriy ed ar	comn ound	non s 8%.	tock to \$	aivia :0.87	per
Ends	Dec.31	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Year	form	ance,	too. I	Even t	hough	n the	compa	iny's	shar	e. W	haťs	more,	we a	inticip	ate a	uddi-
2021 1	914.5 012.8	1649.8	605.6 816.4	568.3 722.7	4201.7	effec	tive i ook fo	ncome r earr	e tax i nings i	rate r oer sh	nay v are to	vell cl a he ir	imb, the	tiona	1 stea 127-20	dy hil 129 T	kes m he na	n the -	distrit ratio	over	that
2023 14	484.0	1541.0	662.7	587.7	4275.4	neig	hborh	ood_of	\$7.20). Tha	t wou	ıld sh	ow a	span	shoul	d be 1	manag	geable	, in th	ie vic	inity
2024 1	250	1725	750	625	4350	5% i Con	ncrea	se fro g the	m fisc	al 202 ving fi	24's \$	6.83 t	ally.	of 50	%.	ton-a	nalite		haroc	. h	avo
Fiscal Year	EAR	NINGS PE	R SHARE	ABE	Full Fiscal	its r	night	advar	ice_at	a sin	ilar p	percen	tage	reac	hed f	resh	highs	s sinc	e our	last	full-
Ends L 2021	Jec.31	2 30	Jun.30 78	Sep.30	Year 5.12	rate	, to \$	7.55 a	ı shar	e, as	opera	ting	mar-	page	repe	ort in	Aug	gust.	It app	ears	that
2022	1.86	2.37	.92	.51	5.60	Cap	ital s	pend	ing fo	or fis	cal 20	025 is	s ex-	vesto	r op	timisr	n reg	is pai gardir	ig th	e en	ergy
2023	1.91 2.08	2.48 2.85	.94 1.08	.80 .86	6.10	pect	ted to	be r	ough	ly \$3.	7 bill	lion.	That	firm's	s nea	r-tern	1 pros	spects	But	3- t	0 5-
2025 223 2.92 1.15 .90 7.20 is some 26% higher than the prior level of around \$2.9 billion. Similar t											prior- ilar ta	year 5 fis-	year mal.	even	и арр after	raisi	ng or	nentia ir Tar	u is r get 1	nini- Price	
Cal- QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID C= Full cal 2024, a considerable port endar Mar.31 Jun.30 Sep.30 Dec.31 Year sources are being utilized to											ortion	of th	e re-	Rang	e. Too	, the	divide	end yi	eld is	not e	xcit-
2020	,575	.575	.575	.625	2.35	sour	ces ai	re bei d reli	ng uti ahility	llized 7 of 4	to en Atmos	nance Ene	the rgv's	ing v tv Tn	ersus dustr	Value v aver	e Line age	is Nat Mean	ural (while	the s	tili- stock
2021	.625	.625	.625	.68	2.56	natu	ral ga	is dis	tributi	ion ar	id tra	nsmis	sion	posse	esses	a 4 (Belov	v Ave	rage)	rank	for
2022 2023	.68 .74	.68 .74	.68 .74	.74 .805	3.03	syste	ems. l	Leade	rship henditi	adds	that :	it pro	jects 2025	Time Fred	liness	I. Har	rie I	II No	nomha	r 99	2094
(A) Fiscal	.805 vear 4	.805 ands Ser	.805 ot. 30th	.87 (B) Dilut	ed '17	13¢. Nev	teaming	s report o	ue early	Feb	(D) n mi	lions	5020	1.1600	I ICK I		npanv'e	Financia	Strend	, 22, th	Δ024
shrs. Excl.	hrs. Excl. nonrec. gains (loss): '10, 5¢; '11, (C) Dividends historically paid in early March, (E) Qtrs may not add due to change in shrs brs. Excl. nonrec. gains (loss): '10, 5¢; '11, (C) Dividends historically paid in early March, (E) Qtrs may not add due to change in shrs Div cancel and the second secon																				
ued opera	tions: '	20, 17¢. 11, 10¢;	12, 27¢	s uiscont s; '13, 14	4¢; Dire	ct stock p	and Dec. burchase	plan ava	ivestnen I.	r pian.	งงเธเสทติไ	ny.				Ear	nings Pr	redictabi	lity		100

(A) Fiscal year ends Sept. 30th. (B) Diluted	'17, 13¢. Next earnings report due early Feb.	(D) In millions.	Company's Financial Stre	ngth A
shrs. Excl. nonrec. gains (loss): '10, 5¢; '11,	(C) Dividends historically paid in early March,	(E) Qtrs may not add due to change in shrs	Stock's Price Stability	95
(1¢); '18, \$1.43; '20, 17¢. Excludes discontin-	June, Sept., and Dec. Div. reinvestment plan.	outstanding.	Price Growth Persistence	60
ued operations: '11, 10¢; '12, 27¢; '13, 14¢;	Direct stock purchase plan avail.		Earnings Predictability	100
© 2024 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual THE PUBLISHER IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERF of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any	material is obtained from sources believed to be reli ORS OR OMISSIONS HEREIN. This publication is strictly f printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or mar	able and is provided without warranties of any kind, or subscriber's own, non-commercial, internal use. No part keting any printed or electronic publication, service or product.	To subscribe call 1-80	00-VALUELINE

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 3 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

NE	N JE	RSE	Y R	ES. N	IYSE-N	IJR	R	ecent Rice	47.56	D P/E RATI	o 15 .9	9 (Traili Medi	ng: 20.2) an: 17.0)	RELATIVI P/E RATI	6 0.8	4 div'd Yld	3.8	8%	/ALUI LINE		
TIMELIN	IESS 4	Raised 3	/29/24	High:	23.8	32.1	34.1	38.9	45.4	51.8	51.2	44.7	44.4	51.4	55.8	48.7			Target	Price	Range
SAFETY	1 2	2 Lowered	4/17/20	LOW:	19.5 IDS	21.9	26.8	30.5	33.7	35.6	40.3	21.1	33.3	37.8	38.9	39.4			2027	2028	2029
TECHNI	CAL 2	2 Raised 1	0/25/24	0.4 div	ided by In	ends p sh terest Rate	-			_											80
BETA 1	.00 (1.00) = Market)		2-for-1 sp	liative Price lit 3/15	e strengtn						_			<u>л</u> ц	_	-				
18-Mor	nth Targ	get Price	Range	Shaded	area indica	ates recess	ion		phurul,	ր ^{վույլ}	1.46 P^{11}		11-1 mart	^{եսուսե} լ,	^η _{'ψ} ι	luull ^h					40
Low-Hig	gh Mid	lpoint (%	to Mid)		_		րհերևո	no dh													
\$40-\$60	\$50	(5%)		., ^{0060P}	հոյնու	ode				_		<u> </u>				í					20
202	7-29 PR	OJECTIC	JNS nn'i Total			-						-					-				15
High	Price 70 (·	Gain +45%)	Return 13%	· · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					æ									10
Low	50 `	(+5%)	5%		•••••											·		% TO1	Returi	N 10/24	7.5
insuu	402023	102024	202024	Percent	30 -														THIS V STOCK	L ARITH *	L
to Buy to Sell	161 143	167 140	167 139	shares traded	20 - 10 -		1	111		linn			nd	tuto alli	lm.	la des		1 yr. 3 yr.	17.6 35.1	28.7 10.7	-
Hid's(000)	70304	70181	71950	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	5 yr. © VAI	26.4	73.6	27.29
45.37	31.17	32.05	36.30	27.08	38.38	44.40	32.09	21.90	26.28	33.24	29.01	20.39	22.71	30.38	2023	19.00	21.00	Revenue	es per sh	A A	25.00
1.81	1.58	1.63	1.70	1.86	1.93	2.73	2.52	2.46	2.68	3.72	2.99	3.30	3.36	3.86	4.22	4.50	4.50	"Cash F	low" per	sh	5.25
1.35	1.20	1.23	1.29	1.36	1.37	2.08	1.78	1.61	1.73	2.72	1.96	2.07	2.16	2.50	2.70	2.90	2.90	Earning:	s per sh ^B	ah C=	3.50
.50	.02	1.05	1.13	1.26	1.33	1.52	3.76	4.15	3.80	4.39	5.83	4.65	5.42	6.50	5.13	5.00	5.50	Cap'l Sp	eci a per endina p	sn °∎ er sh	6.25
8.64	8.29	8.81	9.36	9.80	10.65	11.48	12.99	13.58	14.33	16.18	17.37	19.26	17.18	19.00	20.40	22.30	23.65	Book Va	lue per si	٦D	28.35
84.12	83.17	82.35	82.89	83.05	83.32	84.20	85.19	85.88	86.32	87.69	89.34	95.80	94.95	95.64	97.57	100.00	100.00	Commo	n Shs Out	st'g E	100.00
.74	.99	.95	1.05	1.07	.90	.62	.84	1.12	1.13	.84	1.29	.91	.94	.98	1.02	Bold figu Value	ires are Line	Relative	P/E Ratio		.95
3.3%	3.5%	3.7%	3.3%	3.4%	3.7%	3.5%	3.1%	2.9%	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	3.5%	3.6%	3.4%	3.3%	estim	ates	Avg Ann	'l Div'd Y	ield	4.0%
CAPITA	L STRU	CTURE a	s of 6/30	/24		3738.1	2734.0	1880.9	2268.6	2915.1	2592.0	1953.7	2156.6	2906.0	1963.0	1900	2100	Revenue	es (\$mill)	A	2500
LT Debi	ebt \$324 \$2793.7	6.0 mill. L 7 mill. L	Jue in 5 T Interes	rrs \$580 i st \$125 m	mill. ill.	176.9	153.7	138.1	149.4	240.5	175.0	196.2	207.7	240.3	261.8	290	290	Net Prof	it (\$mill)		350
Incl. \$9.	3 mill. ca	apitalized	leases.			4.7%	5.6%	7.3%	6.6%	8.2%	6.7%	10.0%	9.6%	8.3%	13.3%	15.3%	13.8%	Net Prof	it Margin		14.0%
Pensio	n Assets	5-9/23 \$40	, 05.0 mill.			38.2%	43.2%	47.7%	44.6%	45.4%	49.8%	55.1%	57.0%	57.8%	58.2%	57.5%	57.0%	Long-Te	rm Debt F	latio	55.0%
Pfd Sto	ck None		0	blig. \$493	3.7 mill.	61.8%	56.8%	52.3%	55.4%	54.6%	50.2%	44.9%	43.0%	42.2%	41.8%	42.5%	43.0%	Common Total Ca	n Equity F	tatio	45.0%
0	- 011		04-6-			1884.1	2128.3	2407.7	2609.7	2651.0	3041.2	3983.0	4213.5	4649.9	5022.1	5400	5750	Net Plan	t (\$mill)	"/	6500
as of 8/	on Stock 2/24	(99,167,5	64 shs.			12.1%	8.6%	6.9%	7.7%	10.1%	6.4%	5.6%	6.5%	5.6%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	Return a	n Total C	ap'l	5.5%
MADKE	TCAD	\$4.7 hilli	on (Mid (an)		18.3%	13.9%	11.8%	12.1%	16.9%	11.3%	10.6%	12.7%	13.2%	13.2%	13.0%	12.5%	Return o	n Shr. Eq	uity	12.5%
CURRE	NT POS	ITION	2022	2023 (6/30/24	11.0%	7.0%	4.8%	5.0%	10.3%	4.6%	4.3%	5.6%	6.2%	5.6%	5.5%	5.0%	Retained	to Com I	Eq	5.5%
(SMI Cash A	.L.) ssets		1.1	1.0	22.4	40%	50%	60%	59%	40%	59%	60%	56%	53%	58%	58%	61%	All Div'd	s to Net F	rof	56%
Other	Accote	-7	755.0	531.1	512.0	BUSIN	ESS: Ne	w Jersey	/ Resourc	es Corp	o.is a ho	olding co	ompany	vides u	nregulate	d retail/w	holesale	natural	gas and	related	energy
		,				states	from the	Gulf Coa	st to New	Englan	d, and Ca	anada. N	ew Jer-	than 1%	6 of com	mon; Bla	в‰. наs .ckRock,	15.9%; \	/anguard	, 11.4%	(12/23
Debt D	ayable ue	2	56.6 199.1	151.8 368.3	144.6 452.3	sey Na	tural Gas	had 576	6,000 cust.	. at 9/30)/23. Fisc	al 2023 y	volume:	Proxy).	CEO, P	resident	& Direc	tor: Stev	/en D. N	Nesthov	en. In-
Other	Liab.	11	48.5	286.5 806.6	297.4 894.3	firm tra	nsportati	(23% m on, 27%	other). N.	J. Natur	al Energy	subsidia	ary pro-	07719.	Telephon	e: 732-93	38-1480.	Web: ww	/w.njreso	Jrces.co	m.
Fix. Ch	g. Cov.	5	45%	520%	310%	New	Jer	sey]	Resou	rces	likel	y en	ded	to be	olster	resul	ts. H	loweve	er, co	re op	era-
ANNUA of change	L RATE: (ner sh)	S Past 10 Yrs	Pa 5 Y	st Estid s. to'	21-23	fisca	al 202	4 on	a goo	d no	te. (F	iscal	year	tions	are l	ikely	to ma	untair	n the	pace.	The
Revenu	ies Flow"	-3.0	% -6.	0%	2.5%	repo	a se rted e	ptemi	per 30 gs per	shai	The re of §	com 32.06	over	is pro	ing ba oceedi	se rat ng. ar	e case id cou	ld be	resolv	zed b	efore
Earning	IS do	5.0	% <u>2</u>	5%	5.0%	the t	irst r	ine m	ionths,	dow	n fron	n \$2.4	10 in	the s	tart o	f 2028	5, whi	ich wo	uld s	irely	help
Book V	alue	7.5	% 7.	0%	4.5%	the the	year t	before.	. The l volatil	broac	ler en er the	ergy :	mar-	resul	ts. Ui red si	ntortu	natel ant i	y, the	comj	pany of u	has n to
Fiscal Year	QUART	ERLY REV	ENUES (\$	mill.) A	Full Fiscal	plus	year	s, bu	t New	v Jei	rsey I	Resou	rces'	\$1.5	billio	on ov	er th	ie ne	xt tv	vo y	ears,
Ends 2021	Uec.31 454.3	Nar.31 802.2	367.6	532.5	Year 2156.6	dive:	rse bu	siness	s mix h	$ash_{\mathfrak{S}_{+;1}}$	elped	to sm	ooth	targe	ting t	he ut	ility i	nfrast	ructu	reas	well
2022	675.8	912.3	552.3	765.5	2906.0	out	some all cor	nparis	son fac	tors :	in mul	nega ltiple	ben-	these	newar plai	nned	inve	stmen	ts co	e iait	face
2023	723.6	644.0 657.0	264.1	331.3	1963.0	efits	uniq	ueto	2023,	incl	uding	a w	inter	head	winds	with	the _t	otent	ial for	· shif	ts in
2025	715	625	305	455	2100	lowa	n ev	ent a	und a	tax eratir	valu nor res	ults	al- have	renev	vable nor a d	energ	y pol	icies incert:	and 11 aintv	ncent and	ives, risk
Fiscal Year	EAF	RNINGS PE	R SHARE	A B	Full Fiscal	gene	rally	expa	nded	at a	ιstea	ıdy p	bace.	The	potent	tial fo	r tari	iffs m	ay als	so ele	vate
Ends 2021	46	1 77	d 15	07	Year 2 16	Simi	larly,	we ex	xpect a	a goo	d ope	rating	g re-	main	tenan	ce and	d othe	r oper	ating	costs	riec
2022	.69	1.36	d.04	.50	2.50	quar	ter. E	lowev	er, our	targ	et of	\$0.84	per	appr	reciat	ion r	oten	tial o	over	the l	ong
2023	1.14 .74	1.16 1.41	.10 d.09	.30 . 84	2.70 2.90	shar	e is b	olster	ed by t	he li	kely r	ecogn	ition	rūn,	att	he r	ecent	quo	tatio	n. To	its
2025	.75	1.40	.Nil	.75	2.90	of si men	gnific t agre	ant re emen	venue ts with	irom	n the Energy Serv- dividend by 7% to \$0.45 per share. In								e its ives-		
Cal-	QUAR	TERLY DIV	IDENDS P	AID C .	Full	ices	segm	ent. T	his sh	ould	bring	the y	/ear-	tors 1	may a	lso ap	precia	ate th	e stoc	k's Sa	lfety
2020	19187.31	3125	3125	3325	1 97	end	tally t	o \$2.9 ahee	0 per :	share). 6 0 700	wth .	mav	rank	of 2 (Above	Aver	age).	Howe	ver, o	ther
2021	.3325	.3325	.3325	.3625	1.36	stal	sor	newh	at in	the	abs	sence	of	bette	r pri	ce a	ppreci	iation	pote	ntial	for
2022	.3625	.3625	.3625	.3625	1.45	simi	lar l	enefi	icial i	item	s. The	e bot	tom-	those	looki	ng to'	gain e	exposi	ire to	regul	ated
2024	.42	.42	.42	.45		next.	vear	arison withe	. may out spe	be m ecific	finan	iailen cial it	ging tems	gas u <i>Earl</i>	B. Hu	s. mes		No	vembe	r 22.	2024
(A) Fisca	l I year er	nds Sept.	30th.		repo	rt due No	vember	25th.	-1.4		(D) Incluc	les regul	atory ass	ets in 202	23: \$585	Con	npany's	Financia	I Strengt	, h	A
(B) Dilute	ed earnir	nas. Otiv.	revenues	s and eas	. (Ċ) [Dividends	historica	illv paid i	n earlv Jar	n	million. \$6	5.00/sňa	re.			Sto	ck's Pric	e Stabili	tv Ž		85

Includes regulatory assets in 2023: \$585	Company's Financial Strength	A
on, \$6.00/share.	Stock's Price Stability	85
In millions, adjusted for 3/15 split.	Price Growth Persistence	40
	Earnings Predictability	65
and the second deal with and successful and the set		

 (B) Dituted earnings. Orly. revenues and egs. may not sum to total due to rounding and change in shares outstanding. Next earnings 0 2024 Value Line, inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be relable and is provided without warranties of any kind. THE PUBLISHER IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS HEREIN. This publication is strictly for subscriber's own, non-commercial, internal use. No part of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating any printed or electronic publication, service or produced.
 Stock's Price Stability botomercial price Growth Persistence 40 Earnings Predictability 65



DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 4 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

NIS	011	RCF	INC	NVCE	NII.		R	ECENT	36.2	2 P/E RATI	o 20	1 (Traili Medi	ng: 20.2)	RELATIVI P/F RATI	1.0	7 DIV'D	3.1	%		E	
	VVI			High	-INI 22.5	44.9	40.2	26.0	27.9	28.1	20.7	30.5	27.8	22.6	29.0	26.4				Daisa	D
IIMELI	VESS 4	Lowered	9/6/24	Low:	24.8	32.1	16.0	19.0	21.7	22.4	24.7	19.6	21.1	23.8	22.9	24.8			2027	2028	⊣ange ∣2029
SAFET	Y .	Z Raised 2	/23/24	LEGEI	NDS 50 x Divide	nds p_sh															00
TECHN	ICAL	A Raised 1	1/22/24	L Re	vided by In elative Pric	terest Rate e Strength															60
BETA .	95 (1.00	= Market}	Damas	Options: Shaded	Yes area indic	ates recess	ion					_									50
	nın Tarı	get Price	Range			յուղել	E					\wedge				1.10					- 40
EOW-HI	gn w⊪u ⊨ ¢≎⁄	10011L (%	to Mia)	THE THE	1. dillin.			ullin.	Para	ايتلكونى	1.1.1.1.1		. Mingert	1.1.111, ¹¹ ,	որոյին	1000				-	25
φ20*φ42 202	-00 DE		Me									Turant			- ;						- 20
202	Delee	A	nn'i Total				••••							1_							- 15
High	45 (Gain +25%)	9%			-															- 10
Low	35	(-5%)	3%									**						% TO1	. RETUR	N 10/24	- 7.5
Institu	4Q2023	102024	202024	Boroon	1 20 -		Ľ.			•••		· · · ·							THIS V STOCK	L ARITH.*	
to Buy to Sell	313	331 236	328	shares	20 -			ulalular	ulu			վերութ						1 yr. 3 yr.	45.0 58.5	28.7 10.7	-
Hid's(000)	413866	425705	439719											0000			0005	5 yr.	48.3	73.6	07.00
2008	2009	2010	2011	16.91	19.04	2014	14.59	12.00	2017	19.74	19.69	11.05	12.00	14.02	10.00	12.60	12 55	© VAL	UE LINE P	UB. LLC	15 15
3.32	24.02	3.19	21.55	3.13	3.41	3.60	2.27	2.71	2.07	2.86	3.17	3.15	3.26	3.47	3.64	3.95	4.05	"Cash F	low" per si	sh	4.45
1.34	.84	1.06	1.05	1.37	1.57	1.67	.63	1.00	.39	1.30	1.31	1.32	1.37	1.47	1.60	1.75	1.80	Earning	s per sh A		2.15
.92	.92	.92	.92	.94	.98	1.02	.83	.64	.70	.78	.80	.84	.88	.94	1.00	1.06	1.12	Div'ds D	ecl'd per	sh ^B ∎	1.20
3.54	2.81	2.88	3.99	4.83	5.99	6.42	4.26	4.57	5.03	4.88	4.72	4.49	4.53	6.32	5.93	5.30	6.50	Cap'l Sp Book Vo	ending p	er sh	7.00
274.26	276 79	279.30	282.18	310.28	313.68	316.04	319.11	323.16	337.02	372.36	382.14	391.76	404 30	411 10	446.38	465.00	465.00	Commo	n Shs Out	n ^D	475.00
12.1	14.3	15.3	19.4	17.9	18.9	22.7	37.3	23.2	NMF	19.3	21.3	18.7	18.0	19.6	16.8	Bold fig	ures are	Avg Ann	'I P/E Rat	tio	19.0
.73	.95	.97	1.22	1.14	1.06	1.19	1.88	1.22	NMF	1.04	1.13	.96	.99	11.8	.97	Value	Line	Relative	P/E Ratio)	1.05
5.7%	7.6%	5.7%	4.5%	3.8%	3.3%	2.7%	3.5%	2.8%	2.8%	3.1%	2.9%	3.4%	3.6%	3.3%	3.7%	esun	lates	Avg Ann	i'l Div'd Y	ield	3.0%
CAPITA	L STRU	JCTURE a	s of 9/30)/24 : Vro \$45	ac mill	6470.6	4651.8	4492.5	4874.6	5114.5	5208.9	4681.7	4899.6	5850.6	5505.4	5850	6300	Revenue	es (\$mill)		7200
LT Deb	t \$12086	5.3 mill. I	T Interes	st \$505 m	30 mili. III.	530.7	198.6	328.1	128.6	478.3	549.8	562.6	626.3	648.2	716.3	10.0%	835	Net Prof	it (\$mill)		1020
(Interes	t cov. ea	rned: 5.5	<) (54	% of Cap	'l)	30.9%	41.0%	30.7%	71.0%	19.7%	17.0%	10.3%	2.0%	2.3%	3.5%	3.0%	2.5%	AFUDC	% to Net F	Profit	2.5%
Leases	. Uncap	italized A	nnual ren	tals \$9.6	mill.	56.9%	60.7%	59.8%	63.5%	55.3%	56.8%	61.6%	56.9%	55.7%	52.2%	54.0%	55.0%	Long-Te	rm Debt F	Ratio	55.0%
Pensio	n Asset	s-12/23 \$	1.4 bill. O	blig. \$1.4	l bill.	43.1%	39.3%	40.2%	36.5%	37.9%	36.9%	32.5%	33.5%	31.6%	45.5%	46.0%	45.0%	Common	n Equity F	Ratio	45.0%
						14331	9792.0	10129	11832	12856	13843	14972	16131	17099	21192	22800	24000	Total Ca	pital (\$mi	II)	27500
						16017	12112	13068	14360	15543	16912	16620	1/882	19843	22275	25250	26000	Net Plan Return of	t (\$Mill) in Total Ci	an'l	28000
Commo	on Stoci 1/22/24	4 66,778	,943 shs.			8.6%	5.2%	8.1%	3.0%	8.3%	9.2%	9.8%	9.0%	9.3%	7.1%	8.0%	8.0%	Return o	n Shr. Eq	uitv	8.5%
						8.6%	5.2%	8.1%	3.0%	9.6%	9.7%	10.4%	10.6%	12.0%	7.4%	8.0%	8.0%	Return o	n Com Ec	quity	8.5%
MARKE	T CAP:	\$16.9 bil	lion (Lar	ge Cap)	0/20/24	3.4%	NMF	3.0%	NMF	4.0%	3.8%	3.8%	4.2%	4.0%	2.8%	3.0%	3.0%	Retained	I to Com I	Eq	3.5%
(\$MI	LL.)	SHON	2022	2023	9/30/24	61%	NMF	63%	NMF	60%	64%	6/%	64%	64%	63%	01%	62%	All DIV'O	S TO NET P	ror	50%
Cash A	ssets	25	40.8 2 543.5 2	245.4 254.0	126.2 1489.8	BUSIN ana Pu	ESS: NB Iblic Sen	Source In vice Corr	ic. is a ho inany (Nil	olding co	mpany to which su	or Northe	rn Indi-	1%. Ge	nerating	capacity, lenreciati	coal, 65	3.4%; pur	chased &	3 other, 3 2.4% day	30.6%. s Has
Curren	t Assets	25	84.3 4	499.4	1616.0	and ga	s to the	northern	third of Ir	ndiana. (Customer	s: 488,83	33 elec-	7,364 e	mployee	s. Chairr	nan: Rid	hard L.	Thompso	n. Presid	dent &
Accts H	'ayable ue	17	399.5 791.9 3	749.4 072.4	614.6 1528.2	tric in I	ndiana, :	3,200,000) gas in li	ndiana, (Ohio, Per	nsylvani	a, Ken-	Chief E	xecutive	Officer:	Lloyd Y	ates. Inc	orporated	d: Indian	a. Ad-
Other	Linh	19	069.1 1	443.3	1342.7	nue bre	eakdown	. 2023: 6	electrical.	32%: aa	mbia sub is. 67%:	other. les	ss than	phone: 1	301 Easi 377-647-	5990. Int	ernet: ww	werninville ww.nisour	e, mulana ce.com.	3 404 10.	l ele-
Fix. Ch	q. Cov.	40	55%	225%	445%	NiSe	nirce		sted	9	hette	r th	ird.	inflat	ion 1	We th	ink i	ts pro	hahle	that	the
ANNUA	L RATE	S Past	Pa	st Est'd	21-23	qua	rter	profit	than	we	expe	cted.	The	lower	· ener	gy cos	sts wi	ll sooi	n subs	side, l	eav-
of change Revenu	e (per sh) Jes	10 Yrs. -5 0	. 5¥ı % -3	rs. to 5%	27-29 5.5%	earn	ings f	igure	was st	teady	versu	s both	ı the	ing l	ugher	oper	ating	costs	that	will p	ores-
"Cash	Flow"	.5	% 6.	5%	5.5%	year	defor	e and	tne p	rior (uarte uld di	r.we nto\$	nad 0.13	sure	earn	ings i	growt	n. 10	wit,	mana full	age-
Divider	ids	5	% 15. % 3.	5%	3.5% 4.5%	per s	share	durin	g the	gas t	itilitv'	s low	sea-	2024	botto	m-line	e tare	et of	\$1.75	is at	the
Book V	alue	-3.0	1% .	5%	5.0%	son.	Inste	ad, hi	gher r	ate b	ase in	vestm	ents	top o	f thei	r guid	lance	range	. We'v	ve cut	our
Cal-	QUAI Mar 31	(TERLY RE	VENUES (Sep 30	\$ mill.) Dec 31	Full	brou	ght i	n an	additi	ional	\$61 : borof	millio	n in Idad	tull-y	ear 2	025 t	arget	by \$().05 a shere	s wel	I, to
2021	1545.6	986.0	959.4	1408.6	4899.6	\$26	millic	n to	the h	ottom	line	Taki	nga	pansi	ion of	roug	hlv 4°	ocent %. per	the e	end of	the
2022	1873.3	1183.2	1089.5	1704.6	5850.6	close	r loo	k, th	e con	npany	's pe	rform	ance	most	recen	t qua	rter.	, 101			
2023	1966.0	1090.0	1027.4	1422.0	5505.4	has	been	bolste	red by	y low	er ene	ergy c	osts,	NiSo	urce'	s cur	rent	capit	al inv	vestm	ent
2024	1840	1175	1160	2125	6300	Prov:	ding	a sig	nificai	nt bo	ost to	mar	gins.	cycle form	3 18 8 18 8	i key	dareb	er fo	or fut dated	ite i	per-
Cal-	E	ARNINGS F	PER SHAR	ΕA	Full	ing	rapid	ly, as	the c	ompa	ny is	curre	ently	year	capita	al pla	n to	\$19.3	billic	n, an	in-
endar	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Year	inves	sting	heavi	ly in	new	capita	l pro	jects	creas	e of	\$2.9 I	oillion	from	prior	· expe	ecta-
2021	.77	.13	.11	.39	1.37	aime	d at :	infras	tructu	re ha	rdenir	ig and	i ex-	tions	. This	focus	ses fu	rther	on inv	vestm	ents
2023	.73	.12	.10	.50	1.60	pano teres	ung u st exr	ipon (ense	nean-e is un	nergy too	/ prog as a	rams. result	. 111- . On	frast	wer ructur	gener: re har	auon, denin	gas g. and	compt mode	rniza	tion
2024	.85	.21	.20	.49	1.75	bala	nce,	the l	ottom	-line	has	expai	nded	of te	chnolo	ogy sy	ystem	s. The	e plar	ı aim	s to
2025	.85	.20 TEDLV DP	.20	.55 AID B -	1.80	nicel	y ove	r the i	irst n	ine m	onths.			drive	an 89	% to 1	0% ra	te bas	se gro	wth.	
Cal- endar	Mar.31	Jun 30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Full Year	The	good mer	a rec	ent o	pera	ung 1st b4	perfo	orm-	The	shar the	es ha	ive g	ained	over mor	r 45% the	o in and
2020	.21	.21	.21	.21	.84	in th	he ne	ar te	rm. A	s note	ed, the	e com	pany	curr	ently	trad	e wit	thin t	he b	ound	s of
2021	.22	.22	.22	.22	.88	has	benefi	ited fr	om en	nergy	prices	, due	to a	our	3- to	5-yea	ar pr	ojecti	ions.	Other	r in-
2022	235	.235	.235 25	.235 25	1.00	$ \cot_{1} $	pass-1	throug	gh meo	chanis	sm tha	at typ	ical-	vestn	nent (opport	tunitie	es she	ow gr	eater	up-
2024	.265	.265	.265	.265	1.00	uy la panv	gs two 7 has	had	to con	tend	erwise with	some	com-	Earl	B. Hu	hai at mes	ums j	No:	re. vemhe	r 22	2024
(A) Dil. F	PS, Fxr	l. gains /l	osses) or	ı disc. on	s.: (B)	Divids his	torically	paid in m	id-Feb. M	lav.	(D) In mil	 I.				Cor	npanv's	Financia	Strengt	, .	A
08 (\$1	1/1): 115	(30e) 18	(\$1 48)	Next en	s Lin	Nov	Div'd rein	w avail			(E) Soun	off Colur	mhia Pine	line Grou	in (7/15)	Sto	ck's Pric	e Stahili	tvg.		05

 (P) Dit Ers Studies (usses) for Uss. Op:...
 (B) Drug instantiant paid in interfer, way, (C) incl. instantiant paid (C) incl. instantiantequal (C) incl. instantiant paid (C) incl. instantiant

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 5 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

N.W	/. NA	\TUF	RAL I	NYSE-№	IWN	_	R	ecent Rice	41.44	1 P/E RATI	o 14 .	6 (Traili Medi	ng: 19.0) an: 24.0)	RELATIV P/E RATI	6 0.7	7 DIV'D YLD	4.7	%	ALUI		
TIMELIN	iess 3	Raised 8	/16/24	High:	46.6	52.6	52.3	66.2	69.5	71.8	74.1	77.3	56.8	57.6	52.4	41.9			Target	Price	Range
SAFETY	(2	Raised 2	/23/24	LOW	NDS	40.1	42.0	40.9	00.0	01.0	0/ 2	42.5	41.7	42.4	33.7	34.0			2027	2028	2029
TECHN	cal 4	Lowered	7/26/24		vided by In	terest Rate						\wedge									- 128
BETA .8	5 (1.00=	Market		Options: Shaded	Yes area indic	ates recess	ion			.11											-80
18-Mor	th Targ	et Price	Range					THE REAL	hunnin,	1 ¹¹¹¹¹¹¹¹		111,	100								-64
Low-Hig	jh Mid ¢ວດ	point (%	to Mid)		<u></u>	TITH HALL	, 111, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11, 11,			\checkmark		10	լի պ	11 11 1111	un un	inne.					40
\$20-\$49 202	დაფ 7.20 DD	(-5%)	NS											~	- '						24
202	Drico	A	nn'i Total		••••			· · ·													16
High	75 (-	+80%)	19%				*****					·.									12
Institu	tional D	Decisio	ns	· .									·	ł				% TOT	RETURI	N 10/24	
to Buy	4Q2023	1Q2024	2Q2024	Percen	t 15 -			ուս			<u> </u>	l l IIII. lu						1 yr.	sтоск 11.6	INDEX 28.7	-
to Sell	90 28414	105	104	traded	5	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++			111111111111		11-11-11-11							3 yr. 5 yr.	-1.2 -31.4	10.7 73.6	-
2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	© VALI	je line pu	JB. LLC	27-29
39.16	38.17	30.56	31.72	27.14	28.02	27.64	26.39	23.61	26.52	24.45	24.49	25.29	27.64	29.20	31.82	28.75	28.55	Revenue	s per sh	.	31.10
257	2.83	5.18 2.73	2.39	4.94	5.04 2.24	2 16	4.91	4.93	1.04 d1 94	5.28 2.33	5.15 2.19	2.30	2.56	2.54	2.59	2.30	6.55 3.00	"Cash Fi	low" per s s ner sh ^A	sh	7.15
1.52	1.60	1.68	1.75	1.79	1.83	1.85	1.86	1.87	1.88	1.89	1.90	1.91	1.92	1.93	1.94	1.95	1.96	Div'ds D	ecl'd per	sh ^B ∎	1.98
3.92	5.09	9.35	3.76	4.91	5.13	4.40	4.37	4.87	7.43	7.43	7.95	9.18	9.49	9.53	8.70	10.00	9.50	Cap'l Sp	ending pe	er sh	10.00
23.71	24.88	26.08	26.70	27.23	27.77	28.12	28.47	29.71	25.85	26.41	28.42	29.05	30.04	35.08	34.12	37.40	36.95	BOOK Va	ue per sr Shs Out	st'a C	39.00
18.1	15.2	17.0	19.0	21.1	19.4	20.7	23.7	26.9		26.6	30.9	25.0	19.5	19.6	16.6	Bold fig	ures are	Avg Ann	'I P/E Rat	io	20.0
1.09	1.01	1.08	1.19	1.34	1.09	1.09	1.19	1.41		1.44	1.65	1.28	1.06	1.13	.96	Value estin	Line tates	Relative	P/E Ratio		1.10
CADITA	3.7%	OTUDE 4	3.9%	3.0%	4.2%	4.1%	4.0%	5.5%	3.0%	706.1	2.0%	3.3% 779.7	960.4	0.9%	4.0%	1150	1200	Avy Ann	r Div a ri	elu	3.3%
Total D	ebt \$165	4.7 mill.	Due in 5	Yrs \$1415	5 mill.	58.7	53.7	58.9	d55.6	67.3	65.3	70.3	78.7	86.3	93.9	92.5	1200	Net Prof	it (\$mill)		1400
LT Debi	\$1574.8	8 mill. L	T Interes	s t \$80 mil	Ι.	41.5%	40.0%	40.9%		26.4%	16.2%	23.1%	25.8%	25.2%	25.7%	25.0%	25.0%	Income	Tax Rate		25.0%
(Total in	terest co	verage: 8	5.0x)			7.8%	7.4%	8.7%	NMF 47.0%	9.5%	8.8%	9.1%	9.1%	8.3%	7.8%	8.0%	10.5%	Net Profi	t Margin m Dobt P	latio	10.1%
Pensio	۱ Assets	-12/23 \$2	283.0 mill			44.0 % 55.2%	42.5%	44.4 % 55.6%	52.1%	40.1% 51.9%	40.2 % 51.8%	49.2% 50.8%	47.2%	48.5%	47.4%	47.5%	45.0%	Commor	n Equity R	atio	55.0% 45.0%
Dfd Sta	ek Nono		0	blig. \$42	5.5 mill.	1389.0	1357.7	1529.8	1426.0	1468.9	1672.0	1748.8	1979.7	2421.6	2709.2	3150	3450	Total Ca	pital (\$mi	I)	3900
FIU 310	CK NUTE					2121.6	2182.7	2260.9	2255.0	2421.4	2438.9	2654.8	2871.4	3114.4	3358.0	3750	3900	Net Plan	t (\$mill) n Total Cr	an'i	4200
Commo as of 7/	on Stock 26/24	38,670,2	272 share	S		7.6%	6.9%	6.9%	NMF	8.8%	7.5%	7.9%	8.4%	7.3%	7.3%	6.0%	8.0%	Return o	n Shr. Eq	uity	8.0%
MADKE	T.OAD 6	9 C - 111-		0)		7.6%	6.9%	6.9%	NMF	8.8%	7.5%	7.9%	8.4%	7.3%	7.3%	6.0%	8.0%	Return o	n Com Ec	uity	8.0%
CURRE	NT POS	TION	2022	2023	6/30/24	1.1%	.6%	.9% 87%	NMF	2.1%	1.4%	1.7%	2.4%	2.1%	1.7%	1.0%	2.5%	Retained All Div'd	l to Com I s to Net P	=q	2.5% 63%
(SMI Cash A	L.) ssets		29.3	32.9	65.2	BUSIN	ESS: No	rthwest I	Natural Ho	Idina Ci	n. distribu	ites natu	ral gas	Pipeline	system	Owns	local un	deraroun	d storage	Bev.	break-
Other	Acceta		14.9	568.5	357.9	to 1,00	0 commu	inities, 7	95,000 cu	stomers	in Oreg	on (88%	of cus-	down:	residentia	al, 38%;	commer	cial, 23%	; industr	ial, gas	trans-
Accts F	ayable	1	80.7	145.4	93.6	fomers Portlan) and in s d and Ei	southwes Jaene, (st Washing DR: Vanco	ton state uver. W	e. Princip /A. Servid	al cities	served: popula-	shares:	n, 39%. Vanguar	employs d. 12.4%	: 1,380. : Off./Dir.	BlackRoo 84% (4	ck inc. c 1/24 prox	wns 17. v), CEO:	.6% of David
Debt D	ue	33	348.9 369.1	240.7 310.8	79.9 262.0	tion: 3.	7 mill. (7	7% in Of	R). Compa	ny buys	gas sup	oly from	Canadi-	H. And	erson. In	c.: Orego	on. Addre	ss: 220	NW 2nd	Ave., Po	ortland,
Current	Liab.	8	398.7	696.9	435.5	an an	а U.S. р	roducers	; has trar	nsportat	ion rights	s on No	rthwest	OR 972	109. Tel.:	503-226-	4211. Int	ernet: ww	/w.nwnat	ural.com	
ANNUA	L RATES	S Past	Pa	st Est'd	21-23	in p	rice :	st ina	our l	s sto late 4	Augus	s up st rev	view.	expe	compl cted t	etion	or the	e Oreg earnir	gon ra 1gs ar	nd re	se 1s solve
of change Bevenu	(per sh)	10 Yrs -2 5	. 5 Yı %	rs. to	27-'29 4 5%	The	share	es rea	iched a	a two	elve-m	onth	high	the	regula	atory	lag.	Capit	al exp	pendi	tures
"Cash	Flow"	1.0	% 2.	5%	5.0%	on	Tuesd	ay, N postec	l earni	per :	l2th, result:	after	the oras	are l	ikely	to be	stabl	e or l es priv	ower. narilv	next	year
Dividen	ds	1.5	% <u>.</u>	5%	.5%	utili	ty not	ched	a loss o	of \$0.	71 pe	r sha	re, in	and	reliab	ility j	project	ts. Th	e acq	uisitio	on of
BOOK V			· 70 .	Śmill)	4.0%	line	with o	our fo	recast,	for t	he bu	siness	s' low	Putn	ian Ir	nfrasti Conit	ructur	e and	throu	ugh I	nfra-
endar	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Year	men	tary	helpe	er. M	imp	rove	inve	stors'	wate	r serv	vices	subsid	diary	shoul	d hel	p to
2021	315.9	148.9	101.5	294.1	860.4	sent	iment	as it	provid	led a	n upd	ate o	n the	expa	nd th	at nic	he. T	oo, th	e com	pleti	on of
2022	350.3 462.4	195.0 237.9	141.5	375.3 355.7	1037.4	Oreg	on ga	ıs utı rategi	hty ra c objec	te ca. tives	ise an	d det	ailed	two	landfi ibute	to goo	turai od resi	gas t ults er	aciliti mecte	es sr dahe	iould ad
2024	433.5	211.7	136.9	367.9	1150	The	thire	d qua	arter	was	most	ly in	line	Our	long	-tern	ı ear	nings	-grov	vth f	fore-
2025	450 FA	RNINGS	735 FR SHAR	395 F A	1200	with	n exp	pecta	tions.	The	e ear	nings	per	cast	is s	light	ly ab	ove	mana	geme	ent's
endar	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Year	a res	sult of	regu	latory	lag o	n cap	ital in	vest-	nomi	c fun	idame	ntals,	inclu	iding	a st	eady
2021	1.94	d.02	d.67	1.31	2.56	men	ts, as	well	as in	flatic	nary	press	ures.	regio	nal e	conom	ıy, a g	good c	ustom	er ex	pan-
2022	2.01	.05 .03	d.65	1.30	2.54	Oper	nating	expe se in	nses ro lahor	ose, i and	nciud mate	ing a rial <i>i</i>	\$1.3 costs	sion	rate, a ing pe	and a ermits	recen	t rise drive	in sin core i	gie-fa itility	mily per-
2024	1.69	d.07	d.71	1.39	2.30	and	a \$3.6	5 mill	ion inc	rease	e in de	epreci	ation	form	ance,	thoug	h, as	we've	seen	this	year,
2025	QUAP	.05 FRI V DIM		7.45 AID B =	3.00	and	gene	ral t	axes.	Othe	er ine	come	also	the	regula	atory	envi	ronme	ent r	emair	ns a
endar	Mar.31	<u>Jun.30</u>	Sep.30	Dec.31	Year	inco	eased me ar	.թ4.Ե ıd hi≘	ther pe	i iror ensio	n 10W n exp	er int ense.	Con-	nsk. share	wev e gro	wth.	comp	0.5% ared	to N	orthw	per vest's
2020	.4775	.4775	.4775	.48	1.91	solid	ated,	net	losses	wei	те \$З	.5 m	illion	guida	anceo	f 4% 1	o 6%.				
2021	.48 .483	.48 .483	.48 .483	.483	1.92	wors	e this	year,	or \$0.	05 pe	r shai	re. shar	e to	Thes	se sh term	ares	could estor	ibe	of in king	teres	t to
2023	.485	.485	.485	.488	1.94	bott	om o	ut th	is yea	ngs r, an	d be	snar gin to	im-	valu	e pos	ition	with	a uti	lity co	ompa	ny.
2024	.488	.488	.488	.49		prov	ve ma	arked	lly by	the	end	of	2025.	Earl	B. Hu	ımes		Nov	ember	· 22, 2	2024
(A) Dilute	ed earnin	ngs per s 08. (\$0 r	hare. Exc 3); '09	cludes no \$0.06° M	on- (B) av Mav	Dividends August	historica	lly paid i ember	n mid-Feb	ruary,	(D) Inclue \$4,33/sh:	des intan are.	g'bles. In	2023: \$	163 millio	on, Cor	npany's ck's Pric	Financia e Stabili	l Strengt	h	A 85
not sum due in la	due to ro	ounding.	Next earr	nings rep	ort Div	vidend re	investme	nt plan a	vailable.							Pric	ce Growt	h Persisi edictabil	ence itv		20

Ode in late Febraury. [10] In minutors. [10] In minutors. [10] In minutors. [10] Value Line, inc. all rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind. The PUBLISHER IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OF OMMSSIONS HEREIN. This publication is strictly for subscriber's own, non-commercial, internal use. No part of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmited in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication, service or product.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 6 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

ONE GAS, INC	NYSE-	OGS		R	ecent Rice	75.0	2 ^{P/E} RATI	• 18 .	8 (Traili Media	ng: 19.5) an: 21.0)	RELATIV P/E RATI	6 0.9	9 DIV'D YLD	3.6	%	/ALUI LINE		
TIMELINESS 4 Lowered 11/22/2		High:	44.3	51.8	67.4	79.5	87.8	96.7	97.0	81.9	92.3	84.3	75.4			Target	Price	Range
SAFETY 2 New 6/2/17	LEGE	NDS	319	30.9	46.0	01.4	02.2	/ 0.0	03.7	02.5	00.9	33.3	57.7			2027	2028	2029
TECHNICAL 2 Raised 11/8/24		5.00 x Divid Relative Pric	dends p sh e Strength															200
BETA .85 (1.00 = Market)	Options: Shadeo	Yes 1 area indic	ates recess	sion														- 160
18-Month Target Price Ran	je	-																_ 100
Low-High Midpoint (% to Mid	,					10 ¹⁰ 11	L.U.	dener la		Jil ^{uro} lal	n++++T	1 ¹ 1111111						80
\$47-\$87 \$67 (-10%)										. 10			իսիլ.					-60 50
2027-29 PROJECTIONS		-	10.9012	11 muntu														40
Price Gain Retu	n		r /												<u> </u>			30
High 105 (+40%) 12% Low 75 (Nil) 4%					•			· . · . · · · · · ·										_20
Institutional Decisions				••••••											% 101	THIS V	LARITH.*	
402023 102024 202 to Buy 159 170 1	Percer	nt 21 -							1						1 yr.	24.0	INDEX 28.7	-
to Sell 160 147 1	50 traded	7 -		httillin	Annah	nhihm	ilminil!		tt Hindida		11111111		••••••		3 yr. 5 yr.	18.6 -9.6	10.7 73.6	-
The shares of ONE Gas	Inc. bega	an trad-	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	©VAL	UE LINE PL	JB. LLC	27-29
ing "regular-way" on the	New York	< Stock	34.92	29.62	27.30	29.43	31.08	31.32	28.78	33.72	46.58	41.95	36.65	38.95	Revenue	es per sh		70.15
Exchange on February 3,	2014. Th	at hap-	4.52	4.82	5.43	5.96	6.32	6.96	7.36	7.71	8.13	9.04	9.10	9.45	"Cash F	low" per s	sh	13.95
ONEOK's natural das distr	e separa bution on	eration	2.07	2.24	2.65	3.02	3.25	2.00	2.68	3.85	2.08	4.14	3.85	4.05	Earning: Divide D	s per sn <i>*</i> Iecl'd ner	shB∎	5.00 2.85
Regarding the details of th	e spinoff, i	on Jan-	5.70	5.63	5.91	6.81	7.50	7.91	8.87	9.23	11.01	11.79	12.10	12.30	Cap'l Sp	ending pe	er sh	12.60
uary 31, 2014, ONEOK	distribute	ed one	34.45	35.24	36.12	37.47	38.86	40.35	42.01	43.81	46.69	48.91	51.75	55.95	Book Va	lue per sh	1	60.20
share of OGS common st	ck for eve	ery tour	52.08	52.26	52.28	52.31	52.57	52.77	53.17	53.63	55.35	56.55	56.50	56.50	Commo	n Shs Out	sťg ^c	57.00
ONEOK shareholders of	record as	of the	17.8	19.8	22.7	23.5	23.1	25.3	21.7	18.9	19.9	18.0	Bold figu Value	ures are Line	Avg Ann Relative	P/E Ratio		18.0
close of business on Jani	ary 21. It	should	2.3%	2.7%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%	2.3%	2.7%	3.2%	3.1%	3.5%	estim	ates	Avg Ann	i'l Div'd Yi	eld	3.2%
be mentioned that ONEC	K did no	t retain	1818.9	1547.7	1427.2	1539.6	1633.7	1652.7	1530.3	1808.6	2578.0	2372.0	2070	2200	Revenue	es (\$mill)		4000
any ownership interest in ti	e new cor	mpany.	109.8	119.0	140.1	159.9	172.2	186.7	196.4	206.4	221.7	231.2	220	230	Net Prof	it (\$mill)		285
CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of Total Debt \$3365.3 mill Due in	/30/24 5 Vrs \$890	0 mill	38.4%	38.0%	37.8%	36.4%	23.7%	18.7%	17.5%	16.3%	17.3%	14.9%	16.5%	16.5%	Income	Tax Rate		20.0%
LT Debt \$2384.9 mill. LT Inte	rest \$120.0) mill.	6.0% 40.1%	39.5%	9.8% 38.7%	37.8%	38.6%	37.7%	41.5%	61.1%	50.7%	9.7% 43.8%	46.0%	45.0%	I ong-Ter	rt Margin rm Deht B	atio	51.0%
(LT interest earned: 3.4x; total i	nterest		59.9%	60.5%	61.3%	62.2%	61.4%	62.3%	58.5%	38.9%	49.3%	56.2%	54.0%	55.0%	Common	n Equity R	atio	49.0%
Leases, Uncapitalized Annual	rentals \$6.7	' mill.	2995.3	3042.9	3080.7	3153.5	3328.1	3415.5	3815.7	6032.9	5246.2	4926.3	5415	5750	Total Ca	pital (\$mil	I)	7000
Prid Stock None Pension Assets-12/23 \$977.0	nill		3293.7	3511.9	3731.6	4007.6	4283.7	4565.2	4867.1	5190.8	5628.8	6135.2	6650	7025	Net Plan	it (\$mill) In Total Cr		8200
Oblig.	\$962.1 mill.		6.1%	4.7%	5.2% 7.4%	5.6%	5.9%	8.8%	8.8%	8.8%	5.0%	5.9%	5.5% 7.5%	5.5% 7.5%	Return o	in Total Ca in Shr. Eq	uitv	5.5% 8.5%
Common Stock 56,655,256 sh as of 10/28/24	3.		6.1%	6.5%	7.4%	8.2%	8.4%	8.8%	8.8%	8.8%	8.6%	8.4%	7.5%	7.5%	Return o	n Com Ec	uity	8.5%
MARKET CAP: \$4.3 billion (M	d Cap)		3.7%	3.1%	3.5%	3.7%	3.7%	3.8%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.2%	2.5%	2.5%	Retained	I to Com E	٩.	3.5%
CURRENT POSITION 2022	2023	9/30/24	40%	53%	52%	55%	56%	56%	58%	60%	60%	62%	68%	66%	All Div'd	s to Net P	rot	57%
Cash Assets 9.7	18.8	18.8	BUSIN	ESS: ON	NE Gas, an two m	inc. provid	des natu	iral gas c Thoro aro	listributio	n serv-	& indus	trial, 10.0 BlackBr	6%; othe	r, .4%. (14.5% /	ONE Gas	s has aro	und 3,9 The Va	00 em-
Current Assets 1207.9	765.2	690.5	Oklaho	ma Natu	ral Gas, I	Kansas G	as Servi	ce, and T	exas Ga	s Serv-	Group,	11.6%; /	American	Century	Investm	ient, 7.5%	6; office	rs and
Accts Payable 360.5	278.1	146.8	ice. Th	e compai	ny purcha 5 Ref in '	ised 160	Bcf of n	atural gas	supply i	n 2023,	director	s, 1.5% tod: Okla	(4/24 P	roxy). C	EO: Rol	bert S.	McAnnal	ly. In-
Other 256.2	310.2	260.4	(fiscal :	2023): tra	ansportati	on, 59.3%	5; reside	ntial, 29.3	7%; comr	mercial	homa 7	4103. Tel	I.: 918-94	7-7000.	Internet:	www.one	jas.com	, Onia-
Current Liab. 1189.4 Fix Cha Cov 540%	1477.2 390%	1387.6 405%	ONI	E Gas	app	ears t	o be	head	led f	or a	num	ber-th	ree po	ositior	ı in T	Texas.	Furt	her-
ANNUAL RATES Past	Past Est	d '21-'23	dow	n yea	ur. Înc	leed, t	hroug	gh the	first	nine	more	, we	belie	eve t	hese	mark	ets 1	nave
of change (per sh) 10 Yrs.	Firs. to	27-29	mon	ths, p	orofits	of \$2	2.57 figur	per sh	nare v	were	decer	nt gro	wth p	otenti	al and	d are .	locate	d m
"Cash Flow"	7.0%	9.0%	erate	ed for	the s	same	perio	1 in 2	023. '	That	Unit	ed St	ates.	Also,	sup	ported	by	the
Dividends	6.0% 8.5%	3.5% 2.5%	part	ly ref	lected	high	er e	mploy	ee-rel	ated	soun	d fina	nces,	<u>ONE</u>	Gasic	bught	to coi	ntin-
Book Value	4.5%	4.5%	costs	s, sten	nming	trom	planı rkfor	ied in	vestm	ents	ue to	satist	ty its (liture:	obliga	tions	(inclue	anitel	api-
Cal- QUARTERLY REVENU	:5 (\$ mill.) 30 Dec 31	Full	in-sc	ourcin	g e	forts.	De	precia	ation	onig &	quire	ements	s) with	n little	e trou	ble.	apital	16-
2021 625.3 315.6 273	9 593.8	1808.6	amo	rtizati	on ex	pense	incre	ased,	too, g	iven	The	e ar	e ris	k fa	ctors	to	onsi	der,
2022 971.5 428.9 359	4 818.2	2578.0	addi	tional	capit	al inv	estm	ents.	Morec	over,	thou	i gh. T	he con	mpany	y's lac	k of g	eogra	phic
2023 1032.1 398.1 335 2024 758.3 354.1 340	5 606.0 4 617.2	23/2.0	char	ges cl	imbed	l. But	new	rates	aideo	l re-	vulne	erable	to rea	zional	econd	mic d	ownti	irns
2025 800 375 350	675	2200	sults	s to a	certai	n degr	ee dı	uring t	he pe	riod.	and	regula	tions.	More	eover,	there	's con	npe-
Cal- EARNINGS PER SH	ARE A	Full	Alth	lorr	we d	lo not NNF	ant: Geo	icipate	e any	big	tition	1 from	other	r ener	gy su	ppliers	s, suc	h as
engar War.31 Jun.30 Sep.	DU DEC.31	Year 0 0F	guar	ter. tl	he bot	tom li	ine st	ands	to end	d up	Fina	lly, pir	beline	ruptu	ires. le	eaks.	and o	ther
2022 1.83 .59 .4	4 1.23	4.08	arou	nd \$3	.85 a	share	for	the w	hole y	year.	unfor	rtunat	e eve	nts ca	an tal	ke a i	najor	toll
2023 1.84 .58 .4	5 1.27	4.14	That	wou	14 ind	licate	a 7%	decr	ease 1	trom	on ea	arning	gs if r	not ad	iequat	tely co	overee	i by
2024 1.75 .48 .5 2025 1.84 .53 .4	+ 1.28 8 1.30	3.85	$\begin{bmatrix} 2023\\ 5\% \end{bmatrix}$	or so	reco	ту. Бu verv	ιcon to \$4	.05 r	g 202 er sl	o, a nare	Wha	t ance.	out t	he s	tock?	The	divid	lend
Cal- QUARTERLY DIVIDEND	S PAID B	Full	seen	ıs pla	usible	, assui	ning	that t	he ope	erat-	yield	look	ts re	specta	able	when	sta	cked
endar Mar.31 Jun.30 Sep.	30 Dec.31	Year	ing e	enviro	nmen	t is gei	neral	ly fave	rable		agair	ist oth	her eq	uities	in Va	lue Li	ne's l	Nat-
2020 .54 .54 .5	4 .54	2.16	loob	iness	pros	pects 1g. T	out	to 2 mpar	2027-2 v is	the	tal o	Gas I ains r	∪tility ossihi	lities	istry. over 1	пowe the 3-	ver, c to 5-	apı- vear
2021 .00 .08 .0 2022 .62 .62 .6	5 .58 2 .62	2.32	lead	ing	natur	al ga	as (listrib	utor,	as	span	are u	inspec	tacula	ir, at	the re	cent	quo-
2023 .65 .65 .6	5 .65	2.60	mea	sured	by nu	mber	of cu	stome	rs, in	both	tatio	n. The	se sha	ares a	re un	timely	; too.	0004
2024 .66 .66 .6	o .66	 		unoma	and	Kans	sas,	and	noias	tne	rred	erick I	L. Har	rıs, II	1 100	vembe	r ZZ,	2024

 (A) Diluted EPS. Excludes nonrecurring gain:
 (B) Dividends historically paid in early March, June, Sept., and Dec. = Dividend reinvestment Feb. Quarterly EPS figures for 2022 don't plan. Direct stock purchase plan.
 (B) Dividends historically paid in early March, June, Sept., and Dec. = Dividend reinvestment equal total due to rounding.
 Company's Financial Strength Stock's Price Stability
 B++ Stock's Price Stability
 B-+ Stock's Price Stability
 B--Stock's Price Stability
 B--Stock's Price Stability
 B--Stock's Price Stability
 B-+ Stock's Price Stability
 B--Stock's Pric

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 7 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

SO	UTH	WES	ST G		YSE-sv	VX	R	ecent Rice	77.1	D P/E Rati	o 20 .'	7 (Traili Medi	ng: 31.0) an: 21.0)	RELATIVI P/E RATI	1.1	O DIV'D	3.2	% V	ALUI LINE		
TIMELI	NESS E	- Suspend	led 11/17/23	High:	56.0	64.2	63.7	79.6	86.9	86.0	92.9	81.6	73.5	95.6	68.0	79.0			Target	Price	Range
SAFET	1	Raised 2	/23/24	LOW	NDS	47.2	0.5	00.0	12.0	02.5	13.5	40.7	57.0	39.3	00.0	07.0			2027	2028	2029
TECHN	CAL ^E	- Suspend	led 11/17/23	0.3	ided by In	ends p sh terest Rate	-				-	~									200
BETA .	95 (1.00	= Market)		Options:	Yes	e Strength						1									160
18-Moi	nth Targ	jet Price	Range	Shaded	area indica	ates recess	ion					_									100
Low-Hig	gh Mid	point (%	to Mid)							hhimme	1.	nilla a.				J ¹¹⁺ ITI+					
\$51-\$91	\$71	(-10%)		-	, and the second	hungh	4	1 ^{11.}		~			h de de	1	"H ^I ","H	ŧſ'					60 50
202	7-29 PR	OJECTIC	ONS pp?l Total	աղող	P		-														- 40
10.46	Price	Gain	Return	**********				*******	*******												30
Low	95 (70	+25%) (-10%)	8% 1%			•••				••••								* TOT	остно	10/04	_20
Institu	tional I	Decisio	ns									h .	·····		•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			[,] 101.	THIS V	L ARITH.*	
to Buy	402023	102024	202024	Percen shares	t 15 - 10 -		1.11	in line		hil I			1.100	th h				1 yr.	28.6	28.7	E
to Sell Hid's(000)	144 66489	149 65977	131 66812	traded	5	, (((()))										+++++ 		3 yr. 5 yr.	-2.7	73,6	-
2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	© VALU	e line pi	JB. LLC	27-29
48.53	42.00	40.18	41.07	41.77	42.08	45.61	52.00	51.82	53.00	54.31	56.72	57.68	60.91	73.90	76.22	71.55	73.95	Revenues	s per sh	.	76.65
5.76	6.16	6.46	6.81	2.86	8.24	8.47	8.62	9.29	8.83	8.14	9.40	9.87	9.46	3.91	8.29	8.75 2.80	9.85	"Cash Flo	ow" per s	sh	10.90
.90	.95	1.00	1.06	1.18	1.32	1.46	1.62	1.80	1.98	2.08	2.18	2.28	2.38	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.52	Div'ds De	cl'd per	sh ^B ∎†	2.60
6.79	4.81	4.73	8.29	8.57	7.86	8.53	10.30	11.15	12.97	14.44	17.06	14.43	11.84	12.80	12.19	13.15	12.50	Cap'l Spe	nding pe	er sh	14.00
23.49	24.44	25.62	26.66	28.35	30.47	31.95	33.61	35.03	37.74	42.47	45.56	46.77	48.89	47.95	47.72	51.70	54.25	Book Val	ue per sh	1 atia C	56.35
20.3	45.09	45.50	45.90	40.15	40.30	40.52	47.36	47.40	46.09	20.6	21.3	16.8	19.9	07.12	29.1	72.00 Bold tia	73.00	Ava Ann'	P/E Bat	io si g o	18.0
1.22	.81	.89	.98	.95	.89	.94	.98	1.13	1.12	1.11	1.13	.86	1.08		1.68	Value	Line	Relative I	P/E Ratio		.90
3.2%	4.0%	3.2%	2.8%	2.8%	2.7%	2.7%	2.9%	2.6%	2.5%	2.7%	2.6%	3.3%	3.5%	3.2%	4.0%	estim	ates	Avg Ann'	l Div'd Yi	eld	3.4%
CAPITA	LSTRU	CTURE a	as of 9/30	/24	الأمم 1	2121.7	2463.6	2460.5	2548.8	2880.0	3119.9	3298.9	3680.5	4960.0	5454.0	5150	5400	Revenue	s (\$mill)		5750
LT Deb	t \$4382.1	o. mill. L	T Interes	rts \$1000 st \$300 m	ill.	141.1	138.3	152.0	173.8	182.3	213.9	232.3	200.8	0203.3	150.9	200	265	Net Profit	(\$mill)		335
(Total in	terest co	overage: 2	2.6x)	(55% of (Cap'l)	6.7%	5.6%	6.2%	6.8%	6.3%	6.9%	7.0%	5.5%	NMF	2.8%	3.9%	4.9%	Net Profit	Margin		5.9%
Leases	, Uncapi	talized A	nnual ren	tals \$24.!	9 mill.	52.4%	49.3%	48.2%	49.8%	48.3%	47.9%	50.5%	58.2%	57.8%	57.4%	55.0%	55.0%	Long-Terr	n Debt F	latio	56.0%
Pensio	n Assets	-12/23 \$	1202.0 mi	II. 61250.0	mill	47.6%	50.7%	51.8%	50.2%	51.7%	52.1%	49.5%	41.8%	42.2%	42.6%	45.0%	45.0%	Common	Equity R	tatio	44.0%
Pfd Sto	ck None		oblig	, p1002.2		3123.9	3143.5	3213.5	3613.3	4359.3	4806.4	5407.2	7069.5	7024.5	8024.5	8200	8800	Not Plant	(\$mill) (\$mill)	1)	9600
Comme	on Stock	71 743 6	S66 shs			5.7%	5.5%	5.8%	5.8%	5.2%	5.4%	5.3%	3.5%	NMF	1.9%	2.5%	3.0%	Return or	n Total Ca	ap'l	3.5%
as of 10)/25/24	(71,7 4 0,0	00 3113.			9.5%	8.7%	9.1%	9.6%	8.1%	8.5%	8.7%	6.8%	NMF	4.4%	5.5%	6.5%	Return or	n Shr. Eq	uity	8.0%
MARKE	T CAP:	\$5.5 billi	on (Mid (Can)		9.5%	8.7%	9.1%	9.6%	8.1%	8.5%	8.7%	6.8%	NMF	4.4%	5.5%	6.5%	Return or Retained	to Com Ec	uity	8.0%
CURRE	NT POS	ITION	2022	2023	9/30/24	47%	4.0 %	55%	4.5%	55%	54%	4.0 %	69%	NMF	116%	.5 % 89%	70%	All Div'ds	to Net P	rof	58%
(\$MI Cash A	LL.) ssets	1	123.1	106.5	456.6	BUSIN	ESS: So	uthwest	Gas Hold	inas. In	c. is the	parent	holdina	therms.	Southwe	st has 2.	371 emp	ovees: Ce	enturi 12	.572. 0	f. & dir.
Other		35	584.6 1	774.6	998.8	compa	ny of S	outhwest	Gas. C	enturi (Group sp	un-off 4	/22/24.	own .4	% of co	mmon st	lock; Ca	rl C. Icał	nn, 15.4	%; Blac	kRock,
Accts F	ayable	6	62.1	346.9	227.0	Southv	est Gas ers in A	is a reg rizona N	julated gi levada a	as distril nd Calif	butor ser fornia 20	ving 2.2 23 maro	million i'n mix:	13.0%; Michael	The Va	nguard (kev Pres	Group, 1	0.1%; (3/ Karen S	24 Pro: Haller	ky). Cha Inc ⁻ DE	airman: Addr
Debt D Other	ue	15 11	587.4 173.5	671.1 666.8	663.0 812.7	resider	tial 68%	small co	ommercial	, 20%; I	arge con	mercial	and in-	8360 S	. Duranç	go Drive,	, P.O. E	Box 9851) Las \	/egas,	Nevada
Curren	Liab.	11	73.5 1	684.8	1702.7	dustria	, 8%; 1	ransporta	ition, 4%	. Total	through	out: 2.2	billion	89193.	Telephon	e: 702-87	76-7237.	Internet: v	ww.swg	as.com	
Fix. Ch	g. Cov.	2	265%	145%	225%	Sou	thwe	st Gas	s Hole	lings	deliv	vered	an-	We'v	e cu	t ou	r ne	ear-tei	rm e	earni	ings
of change	e (per sh)	5 Past 10 Yrs	. 5 Yi	si Esid s. to	27-23	perf	or we	aker- nce i	n the	Sept	embe	r per	iod.	The	utilit	v sho	uld o	continu	ie to	per	form
Revenu Cash	ies Flow"	3.5 4.0	% 3. % 1.	0% 5%	6.0% 8.5%	Follo	wing	the 2	$024 \mathrm{sp}$	oin-of	f of th	e Cer	nturi	well,	but	losses	at C	Centur	i are	like	y to
Earning	js de	5.5	% 4.	5% 1	0.0%	Grou	ip, t	he b	usines	s ha	ıs po	sted	two	subtr	act fi	om re	esults	. We'v	e low	vered	our
Book V	alue	6.5	% 7.	0%	7.5%	decli	nes.	To be	fair.	the	/ear Septei	earn nber	and	what	the 1	itility	⊿ק m busir	40 nn 1ess is	likel	v to	earn
Cal-	QUAF	TERLY RE	VENUES (\$ mill.)	Full	June	peri	ods b	oth re	flect	the lo	w se	ason	indep	pender	ntly)	to	\$200	milli	on.	The
endar	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Year	for g	gas u	sage,	so So	uthw	est's l	oreake	even	recen	tly r	refresh	ned r	ate s	tructi	ires	and
2021	1267.4	821.4 1146.1	1125.6	1420.9	4960.0	of th	e util	itv's n	not n erform	iecess	arny In fa	ct. So	auve auth-	empl	'кеу ifv tŀ	rate ie imi	cases petus	for s	ne no impli	fving	the
2023	1603.3	1293.6	1169.5	1387.6	5454.0	west	Gas	Corpo	ration	, the	regul	ated i	atili-	comp	any's	opera	tions	away	from	auxi	iary
2024	1581.0 1660	1182.2 1240	10/9.2 1225	1307.6 1275	5150 5400	ty b	usines	s, ach	nieved	a sig	nifica	nt ex	pan-	busin	lesses	. Hov	vever,	the	separ	ratior	1 of
Cal-	EA	RNINGS PI	ER SHARE	AD	Full	prev	ion of ions	vear	ng pro as a	nn ce resul	ompar t of 1	ectio rate r	elief	mark	uri re et co	nditio	ns the	at will	infl	ingen ience	the
endar	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Year	from	earli	er inv	restme	nts n	nade i	n Nev	vada	timin	ig and	l struc	cture	of a sa	ale. U	ntil t	hen,
2021	2.03	.43	d.19	1.15	3.39	and	Calife	ornia,	along	with	good	custo	mer	chall	enges	at t	the C	enturi	gro	upc	ould
2022	.50	.40	u. 10 .04	1.02	2.13	grow actu	un tr allv	ends. a res	ine pult of	oor c cha	ompa llenge	rison s af	was the	creat line	e nea We've	awind cut o	is for ur ea	South rnings	iwest -per-s	s boi share	tar-
2024	1.22	.25	Nil	1.33	2.80	Cent	uri G	roup,	of wh	ich S	Southv	vest H	Iold-	gets	from	\$3.25	in 202	24 and	\$3.9	0 in	2025
2025	1.75	.05 עום ע וסדי	.75 IDENDO 0	1.05	3.60	ings	mai	ntains	an	appr	oxima	tely	80%	to \$2	.80 ar	nd \$3.6	60, re	spectiv	rely.		• ·
Cal- endar	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Full Year	owne finer	ership	inter	est. A Tente	still ,	un, Su	outhw	est's soli-	The	stock	i nas st rev	riser view	19%i Desnit	n pr	ce s	ince
2020	.545	.570	.570	.570	2.26	date	d res	ults. (Centur	i, the	e infra	astruc	ture	at Ce	enturi	, inve	stors	are lil	cely i	mpre	ssed
2021	.570	.595	.595	.595	2.36	serv	ices s	ubsid	iary, i	faced	redu	ced v	vork	with	the g	gas ut	tility's	opera	ting	strer	ngth.
2022	.595 .62	.62 .62	.62 .62	.62 .62	2.46	volu high	mes a er cos	na op ts and	eration	nal is r mar	sues t	nat le Highe	ed to	the d	nınk o ivider	conser	vative	e accou r riek	ints r here	nay e	njoy
2024	.62	.62	.62			teres	st exp	ense i	s also	impa	cting e	arnin	igs.	Earl	B. Hu	imes	10 10	Nov	embe	r 22,	2024
(A) Dilute	ed earnir	igs. Excl.	nonrec.	gains	•† D	iv'd reinv	estment	and stocl	v purchas	e plan	the Centu	ıri Group				Con	npany's	Financial	Strengt	h	A

 (A) Dilled Ballings, Excl. homes, gains
 (A) Dilled Ballings, Excl. homes, g

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 3 PAGE 8 OF 8 FILED: 03/31/2025

SPI	re I	NC.	NYSE-	SR		_	RI	ecent Rice	66.0	8 P/E RATI	o 15 .:	5 (Traili Media	ng: 15.9) an: 19.0)	RELATIVE P/E RATIO	0.8	2 DIV'D YLD	4.8	% V			
TIMELIN	IESS 3	B Raised 2	/16/24	High:	48.5	55.2	61.0	71.2	82.9	81.1	88.0	88.0	77.9	79.2	75.8	68.0			Target	Price	Range
SAFETY		2 Raised 6.	/20/03	LOW:	NDS	44.0	49.1	57.1	62.3	60.1	/1./	50.6	59.3	61.5	53.8	56.4			2027	2028	2029
TECHN	CAL 2	2 Raised 1	1/15/24		elative Pric	iends p sn e Strength															160
BETA .9	0 (1.00	= Market}		Shaded	area indica	ates recess	ion					_				_					120 100
18-Mor	nth Targ	get Price	Range			-			anning	التنبيتي	hunnin ^h	ч н и	<u>, 1¹¹14</u>								80
Low-Hig	yh Mid	lpoint (%	to Mid)				0. <u></u> 111					+	dnn	<u>119</u>	- unit	houtility					60 50
\$47-\$76	\$62 7 00 DD	(-5%)	NO	"In The second s	1414747777	ATTO TO						_									40
202	7-29 PH	A	nn'i Total					····.													30
High 1	Price	Gain +50%)	15%			••••••	•••••	•••			• •										-20
Low	75 (· tional l	+15%) Decision	8% ne		1	1					1				•••••	_		% TOT	. RETURI	N 10/24	- 15
mouru	4Q2023	1Q2024	2Q2024	Percen	t 18 -											·····		1	THIS V STOCK	INDEX	L
to Buy to Sell	140 123	135 134	160 108	shares traded	12 - 6 +			Iboliuit										3 yr.	15.5	10.7	-
Hid's(000)	48459 2009	48507	49797 2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	© VALI	JE LINE PI	73.6 JB. LLC	27-29
100.44	85.49	77.83	71.48	49.90	31.10	37.68	45.59	33.68	36.07	38.78	38.30	35.96	43.24	41.88	50.12	45.15	45.25	Revenue	s per sh	A	57.25
4.22	4.56	4.11	4.62	4.58	3.12	3.87	6.15	6.16	6.54	7.55	7.12	5.25	9.09	8.44	8.60	8.90	9.25	"Cash F	low" per s	sh	11.00
2.64	2.92	2.43	2.86	2.79	2.02	2.35	3.16	3.24	3.43 2.10	4.33	2.52	1.44	4.96	3.95 2.74	3.85 2.88	4.30 3.02	4.55	Earnings Div'ds D	; per sh * ecl'd ner	sh C∎	5.50
2.57	2.36	2.56	3.02	4.83	4.00	3.96	6.68	6.42	9.08	9.86	16.15	12.37	12.09	10.52	12.45	14.30	11.25	Cap'l Sp	ending pe	er sh	14.50
22.12	23.32	24.02	25.56	26.67	32.00	34.93	36.30	38.73	41.26	44.51	45.14	44.19	46.74	49.08	50.29	52.75	55.50	Book Va	lue per sh	D -	66.05
21.99	22.17	22.29	22.43	22.55	32.70	43.18	43.36	45.65	48.26	50.67	22.8	51.60	51.70	52.50	53.20	58.00	60.00	Common Avg App	1 Shs Out	st′g ⊏ io	62.00
.86	.89	.87	.82	.92	1.20	1.04	.83	1.03	1.00	.90	1.21	2.62	.73	1.01	1.00	.79		Relative	P/E Ratio		.90
3.9%	3.9%	4.7%	4.3%	4.1%	4.0%	3.8%	3.5%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.0%	3.4%	3.8%	4.0%	4.3%	4.9%		Avg Ann	'l Div'd Yi	eld	4.1%
CAPITA	L STRU	CTURE a	is of 6/30)/24	0 mill	1627.2	1976.4	1537.3	1740.7	1965.0	1952.4	1855.4	2235.5	2198.5	2666.3	2620	2715	Revenue	es (\$mill)	A	3550
LT Deb	\$3422.3	3 mill.	T Interes	st \$140.0	mill.	27.6%	31.2%	32.5%	161.6 32.4%	214.2	184.6	12.3%	2/1./	220.8	217.5	240 19.5%	19.5%	Income	r (Smill) fax Bate		24.0%
(Total in	terest co	overage: 2	2.4x)			5.2%	6.9%	9.4%	9.3%	10.9%	9.5%	4.8%	12.2%	10.0%	8.2%	9.2%	9.6%	Net Profi	t Margin		9.6%
.						55.1%	53.0%	50.9%	50.0%	45.7%	45.0%	49.0%	52.5%	51.2%	54.9%	51.0%	51.0%	Long-Ter	m Debt R	atio	51.0%
Pensio	, Uncapi 1 Assets	talized A s-9/23 \$63	nnual ren 30.3 mill.	itals \$9.8	mill.	44.9% 3359.4	47.0%	49.1% 3601.9	50.0% 3986 3	54.3% 4155.5	49.7%	46.1%	43.2%	44.6% 5777.0	41.3%	45.0% 6800	45.0%	Commor Total Ca	i Equity R	latio	45.0%
Dial Cha	-l. (*040	0 mill	0	blig. \$832	2.5 mill.	2759.7	2941.2	3300.9	3665.2	3970.5	4352.0	4680.1	5055.7	5370.4	5778.9	6150	6530	Net Plan	t (\$mill)	",	7675
Commo	on Stock	.0 mili. : 57,750,4	74 shs.	1 1 1 5 1 4.0	s min.	3.1%	5.1%	4.9%	5.0%	6.3%	5.1%	2.9%	5.8%	4.9%	4.8%	5.0%	5.0%	Return o	n Total Ca	ap'i	5.5%
as of 7/	28/24					5.6%	8.7%	8.2%	8.1% 8.1%	9.5% 9.5%	7.3%	3.5%	10.2%	7.8%	7.5%	8.0%	8.0%	Return o	n Shr. Eq n Com Ec	uity	8.5% 8.5%
MARKE	T CAP:	\$3.8 billio	on (Mid C	Cap)		1.5%	3.7%	3.3%	3.3%	4.7%	2.7%	NMF	5.1%	2.5%	1.9%	2.0%	1.5%	Retained	to Com F	Eq	2.5%
CURRE	NT POS	ITION	2022	2023	6/30/24	73%	58%	59%	60%	51%	66%	NMF	54%	71%	76%	77%	79%	All Div'd	s to Net P	rof	70%
Cash A	ssets	15	6.5 85.5 1	5.6 071.3	7.4 818.4	BUSIN	ESS: Spi	re Inc., f	ormerly ki	nown as	the Lack	ede Grou	ip, Inc.,	lated op	erations:	resident	ial, 67%;	commer	cial and i	ndustria	l, 25%;
Current	Assets	15	92.0 1	076.9	825.8	ral gas	across N	lissouri, i	ncluding	the cities	s of St. L	ouis and	Kansas	commor	shares	; Americ	an Cen	tury Con	npanies,	15.4%	(12/23
Accts F	ayable	6	617.4	253.1	205.2	City, Al	abama, a	and Miss Iri Gae G	issippi. H V13 Alah	as rough Iama Ga	ly 1.7 mi	llion cust	omers.	proxy). Missouri	Chairmar Addros	n: Edwar	rd Glotzb Jarkot S	bach; CE	O: Steve	Lindse	y. Inc.: 63101
Debt D	ue	13	318.7 1 117.5	112.1 390.2	1078.0 426.6	sold an	id transpi	orted in t	iscal 202	3: 3.2 bi	I. Reven	ue mix fo	or regu-	Tel.: 314	1-342-050	0. Intern	net: www	spireene	rgy.com.	11330011	00101.
Current	Liab.	23	353.6 1	755.4	1709.8	It aj	ppear	s tha	t Spi	re ma	anage	ed to	post	and	equiv	alents	wer	e \$7.	4 mil	lion.	Too,
ANNUA	L RATE	S Past	Pa	∠947₀ st Est'd	'21-'23	heal	thy	botto biab	m-lin	e res	sults	in fi	iscal	there	was	\$1.3 wodit	billior facili	ı avai	lable	throu a in	igh a
of change	(per sh)	10 Yrs.	5 Ÿi	rs. to'	27-'29	30th	, (Ple	ase be	awai	re tha	t four	th-qu	arter	2027.	Also	$\frac{1}{100}$	g-tern	n deb	t resi	ided	at a
"Cash	Flow"	8.0	% 5.	0%	4.0%	figur	es w	ere n	ot dis	closed	d to	the_p	ublic	mana	ıgeabl	é 50	%_of	` tota	l cap	oital,	and
Dividen	ds	5.0 5.0	% 3. % 5.	5%	4.5% 4.5%	whei that	n this durir	s repo	ort we > first	ent to nine	pres	ss.) R ths 4	ecall	short	-term em	borr	owing	s wei	e not	aı	najor
BOOK V	alue	5.5	% 3. /FNUE®//	5%	5.5%	ings	per sl	are i	ncreas	sed 79	%, to \$	4.82,	com-	Pros	pects	out	to th	e end	of th	e de	cade
Year	Dec.31	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Fiscal	pare	d to i	the p	reviou	s-year	r tally	v of \$	4.51.	look	dece	ent.]	The g	as ut	ilities	curr	ently Mic
2021	512.6	1104.9	327.8	290.2	2235.5	Utili	ty div	vision,	whiel	h ben	efited	from	new	sissip	pi, A	labar	na, a	ind N	Iissou	ri. I	More-
2022	555.4 814.0	880.9	448.0 418.5	314.2 310.4	2198.5	rates	. Th	ie M	idstre	am	unit	and	Gas	over,	the	othe	r ope	eration	18, pa	articu	larly
2024	756.6	1128.5	414.1	320.8	2620	form	ances	for t	ment 1at pe	riod.	impr as we	ovea 11. If 1	per-	siona	nes, i rv p	noia j roject	promi s an	se. Ac d tee	chnolo	ai ez gical	en-
2025 Fiscal	795 EAD	1140 NINCE DEI	445 D CHADE	335 A B F	Z/15 Full	were	no bi	g set	acks	in the	e four	h qua	arter,	hance	ement	sin	custor	ner se	ervice	and	else-
Year	Dec.31	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Fiscal Year	we t	hink f	ull-ye	ar pro	ofits r	ebour	ided a	ibout	wher	e sho	uld h	be be	neficia	il to	Spir	e, as
2021	1.65	3.55	.03	d.26	4.96	$ \frac{12\%}{2023}$	s \$3.8	-4.30 35 tot:	a sua al.	ue, r	ciativ	5 10 1	inscar	able.	supp	orted.	of c	ourse.	, by t	the s	ound
2022	1.01 1.66	3.27 3.33	a.10 d.48	a.20 d.66	3.95	Con	cerni	ng fi	scal	2025,	earr	nings	per	balar	ice sh	eet.				٦.	<i>c</i> ·
2024	1.52	3.58	d.28	d.52	4.30	shar digi	re sta t ner	nd to cento	grov	v in f inge	tne m	1 a-si 1 4,55	ngle- Thie	The teres	good st to	quali	ity st ne-fo	ock n cused	night Linve	be c stor	ot in- s. Tri-
2025	1.50	3.45	d.16	d.24	4.55	is ba	ased,	to a	certai	n ext	ent, d	n ou	r as-	deed,	the	divide	end y	ield s	tacks	upr	nicely
Cal- endar	Mar.31	Jun.30	Sep.30	Dec.31	Full Year	sum	ption	that	the	busir	iess	elimat	e is	relati	ive to	those	e of of	her e	quitie	s in j	Value
2020	.6225	.6225	.6225	.6225	2.49	erati	rany ng ef	ficien	abie.	ught	to m	uts ir ovide	i op- fur-	What	s INE 's mo	uural re. w	e anti	s Ut icipate	iiiiy 9 furtl	indi ier si	teadv
2021	.65	.65	.65	.65	2.60	ther	assist	ance.			20 Pı			incre	ases i	n the	payo	it ove	r the	2027	2029
2022	.005	.005	.72	.72	2.88	Corj	porate	e fi	nance	es a	re s	suffic	ient.	span.	rich 1	H~	mie T	II Nov	ombo	. 99	2021
(A) Fisca	.755	.755	.755	.755	n loarb			ilv and (u qua	L Divi-	(F) in mil	lione (F)	Othy or	I reat	teum du		1 18, 11	Financia	Strengt	ے محم h	B±1
diluted sl	ares ou	tstanding	. Exclude	s gain fro	om den	reinvest	ment pla	n availab	le. (D) Ind	ol.	to round'i	ng or cha	inge in st	nares outs	standing.	Sto	ck's Pric	e Stabili	ty	••	90

diucto share's outstanding. Excludes gain from dend reinvestment plan available. (U) inc. discontinued operations: (08, 946, Next earn-ings report due late Jan. (C) Dividends paid in \$\$22.02/sh. © 2024 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind. THE PUBLISHER IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY EFRORMS OF OMMISSIONS OF MANY EFRORMS OF OMMISSIONS or maketing any printed or electronic publication, service or product. To subscribe call 1-800-VALUELINE

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 1 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate Through Use of a Risk Premium Model <u>Using an Adjusted Total Market Approach</u>

<u>Line No.</u>		Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies (excl. PRPM)
1.	Prospective Yield on Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds (1)	5.18 %	5.18 %
2.	Adjustment to Reflect Yield Spread Between Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds and A2 Rated Public		
	Utility Bonds (2)	0.42	0.42
3.	Adjusted Prospective Yield on A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds	5.60 %	5.60 %
4.	Adjustment to Reflect Bond Rating Difference of Proxy Group (3)	0.06	0.06
5.	Adjusted Bond Yield	5.66 %	5.66 %
6.	Equity Risk Premium (4)	5.18	5.19
7.	Risk Premium Derived Common Equity Cost Rate	10.84 %	10.85 %

- Notes: (1) Consensus forecast of Moody's Aaa Rated Corporate bonds from Blue Chip Financial Forecasts (see pages 7 and 8 of this Document).
 - (2) The average yield spread of A2 rated public utility bonds over Aaa rated corporate bonds of 0.42% from page 2 of this Document.
 - (3) Adjustment to reflect the A3 Moody's LT issuer rating of the Utility Proxy Group as shown on page 3 of this Document No.. The 0.06% upward adjustment is derived by taking 1/3 of the spread between A2 and Baa2 Public Utility Bonds (1/3 * 0.19% = 0.06%) as derived from page 2 of this Document.
 - (4) From page 5 of this Document.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 2 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Interest Rates and Bond Spreads for <u>Moody's Corporate and Public Utility Bonds</u>

Selected Bond Yields

	[1]	[2]	[3]
	Aaa Rated Corporate Bond	A2 Rated Public Utility Bond	Baa2 Rated Public Utility Bond
Dec-2024	5.20 %	5.58 %	5.77 %
Nov-2024	5.14	5.56	5.76
Oct-2024	4.95	5.41	5.61
Average	5.10 %	5.52 %	<u> </u>

Selected Bond Spreads

A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds Over Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds:

0.42 % (1)

Baa2 Rated Public Utility Bonds Over A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds:

0.19 % (2)

Notes:

(1) Column [2] - Column [1].
 (2) Column [3] - Column [2].

Source of Information: Bloomberg Professional Services

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 3 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Comparison of Long-Term Issuer Ratings for the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

	Mood Long-Term Iss January	y's suer Rating 2025	Standard & Long-Term Is January	& Poor's suer Rating 2025
Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Long-Term Issuer Rating (1)	Numerical Weighting (2)	Long-Term Issuer Rating (1)	Numerical Weighting (2)
Atmos Energy Corporation	A1	5.0	A-	7.0
New Jersey Resources Corporation	A1	5.0	NR	
NiSource Inc.	Baa1	8.0	BBB+	8.0
Northwest Natural Holding Company	Baa1	8.0	A+	5.0
ONE Gas, Inc.	A3	7.0	A-	7.0
Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc.	Baa1	8.0	BBB	9.0
Spire Inc.	A1/A2	5.5	BBB+	8.0
Average	A3	6.6	A-	7.3

Notes:

(1) Ratings are that of the average of each proxy company's utility operating subsidiaries.(2) From page 4 of this Document.

Source Information:

Moody's Investors Service Standard & Poor's Global Utilities Rating Service

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 4 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

Numerical Assignment for Moody's and Standard & Poor's Bond Ratings

	Numerical	Standard &
Moody's Bond	Bond	Poor's Bond
Rating	Weighting	Rating
Aaa	1	AAA
Aa1	2	AA+
Aa2	3	AA
Aa3	4	AA-
A1	5	A+
A2	6	А
A3	7	A-
	0	
Baal	8	BBB+
Baa2	9	BBB
Baa3	10	BBB-
D _o 1	11	DD
	11	DD+
Baz	12	BB
Ba3	13	BB-
B1	14	B+
B2	15	R
B3	16	B-
DO	10	D-

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 5 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Judgment of Equity Risk Premium for the <u>Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies</u>

Line No.		Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies (excl. PRPM)
1.	Calculated equity risk premium based on the total market using the beta approach (1)	5.92 %	5.90 %
2.	Mean equity risk premium based on a study using the holding period returns of public utilities with A2 rated bonds (2)	4.83	4.87
3.	Predicted Equity Risk Premium Based on Regression Analysis of 848 Fully-Litigated Natural Gas Cases (3)	4.79	4.79
4.	Average equity risk premium	5.18 %	5.19 %

Notes: (1) From page 6 of this Document.

(2) From page 9 of this Document.

(3) From page 10 of this Document.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 6 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach Using the Beta for the <u>Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies</u>

Line No.	Equity Risk Premium Measure	Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies (excl. PRPM)
1.	Kroll Equity Risk Premium (1)	6.10 %	6.10 %
2.	Regression on Kroll Risk Premium Data (2)	7.03	7.03
3.	Kroll Equity Risk Premium based on PRPM (3)	7.56	NA
4	Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line Summary and Index (4)	5.61	5.61
5.	Equity Risk Premium Based on Bloomberg, Value Line, and S&P Global Market Intelligence S&P 500 Companies (5)	11.15	11.15
6.	Conclusion of Equity Risk Premium	7.49 %	7.47 %
7.	Adjusted Beta (6)	0.79	0.79
8.	Forecasted Equity Risk Premium	5.92_%	5.90_%

Notes:

- (1) Based on the arithmetic mean historical monthly returns on large company common stocks from Kroll 2023 SBBI® Yearbook and Bloomberg Professional Services minus the arithmetic mean monthly yield of Moody's average Aaa and Aa2 corporate bonds from 1928-2024.
- (2) This equity risk premium is based on a regression of the monthly equity risk premiums of large company common stocks relative to Moody's average Aaa and Aa2 rated corporate bond yields from 1928-2024 referenced in Note 1 above. Using the equation generated from the regression, an expected equity risk premium is calculated using the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of 5.18% (from page 1 of this Document).
- (3) The Predictive Risk Premium Model (PRPM) is discussed in the accompanying direct testimony. The Ibbotson equity risk premium based on the PRPM is derived by applying the PRPM to the monthly risk premiums between Ibbotson large company common stock monthly returns and average Aaa and Aa corporate monthly bond yields, from January 1928 through December 2024.
- (4) The equity risk premium based on the Value Line Summary and Index is derived by subtracting the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of 5.18% (from page 1 of this Document No.) from the projected 3-5 year total annual market return of 10.79% (described fully in note 1 on page 2 of Document No. 5).
- (5) Using data from the Bloomberg Professional Services, Value Line, and S&P Global Market Intelligence for the S&P 500, an expected total return of 16.33% was derived based upon expected dividend yields as a proxy for income returns and long-term earnings growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation. Subtracting the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of 5.18% results in an expected equity risk premium of
- (6) Average of mean and median beta from Document No. 5.

Sources of Information:

Kroll 2023 SBBI® Yearbook Industrial Manual and Mergent Bond Record Monthly Update. Value Line Summary and Index Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, November 27, 2024 and December 30, 2024 S&P Capital IQ Bloomberg Professional Services

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 7 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

2 ■ BLUE CHIP FINANCIAL FORECASTS ■ DECEMBER 30, 2024

	History					Cons	ensus l	Forecas	sts-Qua	arterly	Avg.			
	Ave	erage For	Week End	ling	Ave	erage For	Month	Latest Qtr	1Q	2Q	3Q	4Q	1Q	2Q
Interest Rates	<u>Dec 20</u>	Dec 13	Dec 6	<u>Nov 29</u>	Nov	Oct	Sep	4Q 2024*	<u>2025</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2026</u>
Federal Funds Rate	4.48	4.58	4.58	4.58	4.64	4.83	5.13	4.69	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5
Prime Rate	7.75	7.75	7.75	7.75	7.81	8.00	8.30	7.86	7.4	7.2	7.0	6.9	6.8	6.7
SOFR	4.49	4.62	4.61	4.58	4.64	4.85	5.15	4.70	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5
Commercial Paper, 1-mo.	4.40	4.50	4.57	4.58	4.62	4.78	5.02	4.67	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5
Treasury bill, 3-mo.	4.36	4.38	4.47	4.60	4.62	4.72	4.92	4.59	4.2	4.0	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.5
Treasury bill, 6-mo.	4.30	4.33	4.39	4.44	4.43	4.44	4.55	4.41	4.2	4.0	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.5
Treasury bill, 1 yr.	4.27	4.22	4.24	4.35	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.26	4.2	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6
Treasury note, 2 yr.	4.29	4.17	4.14	4.19	4.26	3.97	3.62	4.14	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7
Treasury note, 5 yr.	4.34	4.14	4.07	4.13	4.23	3.91	3.50	4.10	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9
Treasury note, 10 yr.	4.48	4.28	4.19	4.25	4.36	4.10	3.72	4.25	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2
Treasury note, 30 yr.	4.66	4.49	4.36	4.43	4.54	4.38	4.04	4.47	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4
Corporate Aaa bond	5.37	5.19	5.09	5.15	5.23	5.07	4.81	5.17	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.1
Corporate Baa bond	5.78	5.61	5.51	5.57	5.66	5.52	5.31	5.61	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.1	6.1	6.0
State & Local bonds	4.17	4.03	3.98	4.01	4.08	4.05	3.99	4.07	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2
Home mortgage rate	6.72	6.60	6.69	6.81	6.81	6.43	6.18	6.61	6.7	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.3
				History	/				Co	onsensu	is Fore	casts-Q)uartei	rly
	1Q	2Q	3Q	4Q	1Q	2Q	3Q	4Q	1Q	2Q	3Q	4Q	1Q	2Q
Key Assumptions	<u>2023</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2023</u>	2023	<u>2024</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2024</u>	2024**	<u>2025</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>	<u>2026</u>
Fed's AFE \$ Index	115.5	114.6	115.0	116.6	115.5	117.3	114.9	117.2	118.8	118.9	118.2	117.6	117.2	117.3
Real GDP	2.8	2.4	4.4	3.2	1.6	3.0	3.1	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
GDP Price Index	3.6	1.9	3.2	1.5	3.0	2.5	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.1
Consumer Price Index	3.8	3.0	3.4	2.7	3.8	2.8	1.2	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.5
PCE Price Index	3.9	2.9	2.7	1.7	3.4	2.5	1.5	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.3

Consensus Forecasts of U.S. Interest Rates and Key Assumptions

Forecasts for interest rates and the Federal Reserve's Advanced Foreign Economies Index represent averages for the quarter. Forecasts for Real GDP, GDP Price Index, CPI and PCE Price Index are seasonally adjusted annual rates of change (saar). Individual panel members' forecasts are on pages 4 through 9. Historical data: Treasury rates from the Federal Reserve Board's H.15; AAA-AA and A-BBB corporate bond yields from Bank of America-Merrill Lynch and are 15+ years, yield to maturity; State and local bond yields from Bank of America-Merrill Lynch, A-rated, yield to maturity; Mortgage rates from Fredie Mac, 30-year, fixed; SOFR from the New York Fed. *Interest rate data for 4Q 2024 based on historical data through the week ended December 20. **Data for 4Q 2024 for the Fed's AFE \$ Index based on data through the week ended December 20. Figures for 4Q 2024 Real GDP, GDP Chained Price Index, consumer Price Index, and PCE Price Index are consensus forecasts from the December 2024 survey..



US 3-Mo T-Bills & 10-Yr T-Note Yield (Quarterly Average) History Forect





DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 8 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

14 ■ BLUE CHIP FINANCIAL FORECASTS ■ NOVEMBER 27, 2024

Long-Range Survey:

The table below contains the results of our twice-annual long-range CONSENSUS survey. There are also Top 10 and Bottom 10 averages for each variable. Shown are consensus estimates for the years 2026 through 2030 and averages for the five-year periods 2026-2030 and 2031-2035. Apply these projections cautiously. Few if any economic, demographic and political forces can be evaluated accurately over such long time spans.

			Ave	rage For The	Year		Five-Year	Averages
		2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2026-2030	2031-2035
1. Federal Funds Rate	CONSENSUS	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2
	Top 10 Average	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6
	Bottom 10 Average	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.9
2. Prime Rate	CONSENSUS	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.3	6.4	6.3
	Top 10 Average	6.8	6.8	6.7	6.8	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Bottom 10 Average	6.2	6.1	6.1	6.0	5.9	6.1	5.9
3. SOFR	CONSENSUS	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Top 10 Average	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
	Bottom 10 Average	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9
4. Commercial Paper, 1-Mo	CONSENSUS	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3
	Top 10 Average	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
	Bottom 10 Average	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0
5. Treasury Bill Yield, 3-Mo	CONSENSUS	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2
	Top 10 Average	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5
	Bottom 10 Average	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8
6. Treasury Bill Yield, 6-Mo	CONSENSUS	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.2
5	Top 10 Average	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
	Bottom 10 Average	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.9
7. Treasury Bill Yield, 1-Yr	CONSENSUS	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
······································	Top 10 Average	37	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
	Bottom 10 Average	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9
8 Treasury Note Yield 2-Vr	CONSENSUS	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	35	35
	Top 10 Average	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
	Pottom 10 Average	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.9
Transury Note Vield 5 Vr	CONCENCIE	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.0
9. Heasury Note Held, 3-H	Tan 10 A warman	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8
	Top 10 Average	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Bottom IO Average	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2
10. Treasury Note Yield, 10-Yr	CONSENSUS	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0
	Top 10 Average	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Bottom 10 Average	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4
11. Treasury Bond Yield, 30-Yr	CONSENSUS	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2
	Top 10 Average	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7
	Bottom 10 Average	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8
Corporate Aaa Bond Yield	CONSENSUS	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.1	5.2	5.1
	Top 10 Average	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.5
	Bottom 10 Average	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.6
13. Corporate Baa Bond Yield	CONSENSUS	6.0	6.1	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.9
	Top 10 Average	6.4	6.6	6.5	6.5	6.4	6.5	6.4
	Bottom 10 Average	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.5
14. State & Local Bonds Yield	CONSENSUS	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1
	Top 10 Average	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6
	Bottom 10 Average	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.6
Home Mortgage Rate	CONSENSUS	6.2	6.1	6.0	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.9
	Top 10 Average	6.6	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.5	6.4
	Bottom 10 Average	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.5	5.4	5.6	5.4
A. Fed's AFE Nominal \$ Index	CONSENSUS	115.5	115.0	114.5	113.9	113.2	114.4	112.6
	Top 10 Average	117.0	116.3	115.8	115.3	114.8	115.8	114.6
	Bottom 10 Average	113.9	113.6	113.1	112.5	111.8	3.0 2.9 3.3 3.3 3.6 3.6 3.0 2.9 3.5 3.5 3.9 3.9 3.1 3.0 3.8 3.8 4.3 4.3 4.3 4.2 4.0 4.0 4.5 4.5 3.5 3.4 3.3 3.2 4.0 4.0 4.5 4.5 3.5 3.4 4.3 4.2 4.8 4.7 3.8 3.8 5.2 5.1 5.6 5.5 4.7 4.6 6.0 5.9 6.5 6.4 5.6 5.5 4.2 4.1 4.6 4.6 3.9 3.6 6.0 5.9 6.5 6.4 5.6 5.4 114.4 112.6 113.0 110.9 Five-Year Averages 2026-2030	
			Year-C	over-Year.% (Change		Five-Year	Averages
		2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2026-2030	2031-2035
3 Real GDP	CONSENSUS	19	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	19
	Top 10 Average	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.2
	Bottom 10 Average	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	17	17
COP Chained Price Index	CONSENSUS	2.7	1.7	1.0	2.7	2.2	2.7	2.1
, GET Chamea Flice mucx	Top 10 Average	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	4.1 2 2
	Bottom 10 Average	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.5
Con autora Dri Tr. 4	CONSERVELS	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
J. Consumer Price Index	CUNSENSUS	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
	10p 10 Average	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.4
	D			2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Bottom 10 Average	2.1	2.0				~ -	
E. PCE Price Index	Bottom 10 Average CONSENSUS	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1
E. PCE Price Index	Bottom 10 Average CONSENSUS Top 10 Average	2.1 2.2 2.5	2.0 2.2 2.3	2.1 2.3	2.1 2.3	2.1 2.3	2.2 2.3	2.1 2.3

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 9 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Projected Market Appreciation of the S&P Utility Index</u> Derivation of Mean Equity Risk Premium Based Studies Using Holding Period Returns and <u>Projected Market Appreciation of the S&P Utility Index</u>

<u>Line No.</u>		Implied Equity Risk Premium	Implied Equity Risk Premium (excl. PRPM)
1.	Historical Equity Risk Premium (1)	4.16 %	4.16 %
2.	Regression of Historical Equity Risk Premium (2)	4.91	4.91
3	Forecasted Equity Risk Premium Based on PRPM (3)	4.72	NA
4.	Forecasted Equity Risk Premium based on Projected Total Return on the S&P Utilities Index (Bloomberg, Value Line, and S&P Capital IQ Data) (4)	5.54	5.54
5.	Average Equity Risk Premium (5)	4.83 %	4.87 %

- Notes: (1) Based on S&P Public Utility Index monthly total returns and Moody's Public Utility Bond average monthly yields from 1928-2024. Holding period returns are calculated based upon income received (dividends and interest) plus the relative change in the market value of a security over a one-year holding period.
 - (2) This equity risk premium is based on a regression of the monthly equity risk premiums of the S&P Utility Index relative to Moody's A2 rated public utility bond yields from 1928 2024 referenced in note 1 above. Using the equation generated from the regression, an expected equity risk premium is calculated using the prospective A2 rated public utility bond yield of 5.60% (from line 3, page 1 of this Document).
 - (3) The Predictive Risk Premium Model (PRPM) is applied to the risk premium of the monthly total returns of the S&P Utility Index and the monthly yields on Moody's A2 rated public utility bonds from January 1928 through December 2024.
 - (4) Using data from Bloomberg, Value Line, and S&P Capital IQ for the S&P Utilities Index, an expected return of 11.14% was derived based on expected dividend yields as a proxy for income returns and long-term growth estimates as a proxy for market appreciation. Subtracting the expected A2 rated public utility bond yield of 5.60%, calculated on line 3 of page 1 of this Document results in an equity risk premium of 5.54%. (11.14% 5.60% = 5.54%).
 - (5) Average of lines 1 through 4.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 4 PAGE 10 OF 10 FILED: 03/31/2025



Notes:

(1) From line 3 of page 1 of this Document.

Source of Information: Regulatory Research Associates.

		<u>Proxy Grou</u>	p of Seven Na	tural Gas Companie	2 <u>S</u>			
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Value Line Adjusted Beta	Bloomberg Adjusted Beta	Average Beta	Market Risk Premium (1)	Risk-Free Rate (2)	Traditional CAPM Cost Rate	ECAPM Cost Rate	Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate (3)
Atmos Energy Corporation New Jersey Resources Corporation NiSource Inc. Northwest Natural Holding Company ONE Gas, Inc. Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc. Spire Inc.	0.90 1.00 0.95 0.85 0.85 0.95 0.90	0.60 0.62 0.56 0.73 0.66 0.80 0.66	0.75 0.81 0.76 0.79 0.76 0.88 0.78	$\begin{array}{ccc} 8.41 & \% \\ 8.41 \\ 8.41 \\ 8.41 \\ 8.41 \\ 8.41 \\ 8.41 \\ 8.41 \\ 8.41 \end{array}$	4.44 % 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.4	10.75 % 11.25 10.83 10.09 10.83 11.84 11.00	11.27 % 11.65 11.34 11.53 11.34 12.09 11.46	11.01 % 11.45 11.09 11.31 11.09 11.97 (4) 11.23
Mean			0.79			11.09 %	11.53 %	11.20 %
Median			0.78			11.00 %	11.46 %	11.16 %
Average of Mean and Median			0.79			11.05 %	11.50 %	11.18 %
		Res	ults Excluding	<u>g PRPM MRP</u>				
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Value Line Adjusted Beta	Bloomberg Adjusted Beta	Average Beta	Market Risk Premium (1)	Risk-Free Rate (2)	Traditional CAPM Cost Rate	ECAPM Cost Rate	Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate (3)
Atmos Energy Corporation New Jersey Resources Corporation NiSource Inc. Northwest Natural Holding Company ONE Gas, Inc. Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc. Spire Inc.	0.90 1.00 0.95 0.85 0.85 0.95 0.90	0.60 0.62 0.56 0.73 0.66 0.80 0.66	0.75 0.81 0.76 0.79 0.76 0.88 0.78	8.40 % 8.40 8.40 8.40 8.40 8.40 8.40 8.40	4.44 % 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.44 4.4	10.74 % 11.24 10.82 10.82 11.08 10.82 11.83 10.99 10.99	$\begin{array}{c} 11.27 & \% \\ 11.64 \\ 11.33 \\ 11.52 \\ 11.33 \\ 12.08 \\ 11.45 \end{array}$	11.00 % 11.44 11.08 11.30 11.08 11.96 (4) 11.22
Mean			0.79			11.08 %	11.52 %	11.19 %
Median			0.78			10.99 %	11.45 %	11.15 %
Average of Mean and Median			0.79			%	11.49%	<u> </u>

Peoples Gas System Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate Through Use of the Traditional Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) and Empirical Capital Asset Pricing Model (ECAPM)

Notes on page 2 of this Document.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 5 PAGE 1 OF 2 FILED: 03/31/2025

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 5 PAGE 2 OF 2 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System

Notes to Accompany the Application of the CAPM and ECAPM

Notes:

(1) The market risk premium (MRP) is derived by using five different measures from four sources: Kroll, Value Line, Bloomberg, and S&P Capital IQ as illustrated below:

Measure 1: Kroll Arithmetic Mean MRP (1926-2024)		
Arithmetic Mean Monthly Returns for Large Stocks 1926-2024:	12.29	%
Arithmetic Mean Income Returns on Long-Term Government Bonds:	4.99	_
MRP based on Kroll Historical Data:	7.31	%
Measure 2: Application of a Regression Analysis to Kroll Historical Data		
(1926-2024)	8.06	-%
Measure 3: Application of the PRPM to Kroll Historical Data		
(January 1928 through December 2024)	8.45	- %
Measure 4: Value Line Projected MRP (Thirteen weeks ending January 17, 2025)		
Total projected return on the market 3-5 years hence*:	10.79	%
Risk-Free Rate (see note 2):	4.44	_
MRP based on Value Line Summary & Index:	6.35	_%
*Forcasted 3-5 year capital appreciation plus expected dividend yield		
Measure 5: Bloomberg, Value Line, and S&P Capital IQ Projected Return on the Market based on the S&P 500		
Total return on the Market based on the S&P 500:	16.33	%
Risk-Free Rate (see note 2):	4.44	_
MRP based on Bloomberg, Value Line, and S&P Capital IQ data	11.89	-%
Average of all MRP Measures:	8.41	_%
Average MRP Excluding the PRPM MRP:	8.40	_%
		-

(2) For reasons explained in the Direct Testimony, the appropriate risk-free rate for cost of capital purposes is the average forecast of 30 year Treasury Bonds per the consensus of nearly 50 economists reported in Blue Chip Financial Forecasts. (See pages 7 and 8 of Document No. 4.) The projection of the risk-free rate is illustrated below:

First Quarter 2025	4.60	%
Second Quarter 2025	4.50	
Third Quarter 2025	4.50	
Fourth Quarter 2025	4.50	
First Quarter 2026	4.50	
Second Quarter 2026	4.40	
2026-2030	4.30	
2031-2035	4.20	_
	4.44	-%

- (3) Average of Column 6 and Column 7.
- (4) Results were excluded from the final average and median as they were more than two standard deviations from the proxy group's mean.

Sources of Information: Value Line Summary and Index Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, November 27, 2024 and December 30, 2024 Kroll 2023 SBBI® Yearbook S&P Capital IQ Bloomberg Professional Services

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 6 PAGE 1 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System FILED: 03731 Basis of Selection of the Group of Non-Price Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

The criteria for selection of the proxy group of non-price regulated companies comparable in total risk to the proxy group of seven natural gas companies was that the non-price regulated companies be domestic and reported in Value Line Investment Survey (Standard Edition).

The proxy group of non-price regulated companies was selected based on the unadjusted beta range of 0.64 - 0.92 and residual standard error of the regression range of 2.8409 - 3.3885 of the proxy group of seven natural gas companies.

These ranges are based upon plus or minus two standard deviations of the unadjusted beta and standard error of the regression. Plus or minus three standard deviations captures 95.50% of the distribution of unadjusted betas and residual standard errors of the regression.

The standard deviation of the Utility Proxy Group's residual standard error of the regression is 0.1369. The standard deviation of the standard error of the regression is calculated as follows:

Standard Deviation of the Std. Err. of the Regr. = <u>Standard Error of the Regression</u> $\sqrt{2N}$

where: N = number of observations. Since Value Line betas are derived from weekly price change observations over a period of five years, N = 259

Thus,	0.1369	=	3.1147	=	3.1147
			$\sqrt{518}$		22.7596

Source of Information: Value Line Proprietary Database, December 2024. <u>Value Line Investment Survey (Standard Edition).</u>

	DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU
	EXHIBIT NO. DD-1
	WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS
	DOCUMENT NO. 6
	PAGE 2 OF 3
tem	FILED: 03/31/2025
parable Risk	

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Basis of Selection of Comparable Risk <u>Domestic Non-Price Regulated Companies</u>

[1]

[2]	[3]
-----	-----

[4]

Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	Value Line Adjusted Beta	Unadjusted Beta	Residual Standard Error of the Regression	Standard Deviation of Beta
Atmos Energy Corporation	0.85	0.75	2.8989	0.0647
New Jersey Resources Corporation	0.95	0.91	3.0464	0.0680
NiSource Inc.	0.90	0.83	2.6470	0.0591
Northwest Natural Holding Company	0.85	0.71	3.3761	0.0754
ONE Gas, Inc.	0.85	0.71	3.2540	0.0726
Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc.	0.90	0.80	3.4852	0.0778
Spire Inc.	0.85	0.74	3.0953	0.0691
Average	0.88	0.78	3.1147	0.0695
Beta Range (+/- 2 std. Devs. of Beta)	0.64	0.92		
2 std. Devs. of Beta	0.14			
Residual Std. Err. Range (+/- 2 std.				
Devs. of the Residual Std. Err.)	2.8409	3.3885		
Std. dev. of the Res. Std. Err.	0.1369			
2 std. devs. of the Res. Std. Err.	0.2738			
Source of Information:	Value Line Proprieta	ry Database, Decem	ber 2024.	

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 6 PAGE 3 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Proxy Group of Non-Price Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

[1]

[2]

[4]

[3]

Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated	Value Line	Unadjusted	Residual Standard	Standard Deviation of
Companies	Adjusted Beta	Beta	Error of the Regression	Beta
Abbott Labs	0.90	0.79	2.9573	0.0660
AbbVie Inc.	0.85	0.70	3.1365	0.0700
Air Products & Chem	0.90	0.83	3.0324	0.0677
Alphabet Inc	0.90	0.81	3 1907	0.0712
Altria Group	0.85	0.76	2 8948	0.0646
Apple Inc	0.95	0.91	3 21 27	0.0717
Assurant Inc	0.90	0.79	3.0394	0.0679
AutoZone Inc	0.95	0.88	3 2 3 9 9	0.0773
Booz Allen Hamilton	0.95	0.74	3 2930	0.0725
Brady Corp	0.05	0.90	2 8860	0.0644
BM/Y Technologies	0.95	0.50	3 2662	0.0729
CACLInt'	0.00	0.00	2.0259	0.0723
Casow's Con'l Stores	0.90	0.80	2 1 6 6 1	0.0078
Concorra	0.90	0.75	2 9646	0.0707
CSWInductrials	0.80	0.00	2.9040	0.0002
CVS Health	0.90	0.77	3.2779	0.0732
Develop Com	0.90	0.79	3.3040	0.0731
Dahaner Corp.	0.90	0.01	3.0266	0.0676
Europeant Inc.	0.95	0.87	2.9508	0.0659
Exponent, Inc.	0.95	0.00	3.3450	0.0747
Fastenai Co.	0.90	0.80	2.9255	0.0655
CATY Com	0.90	0.82	2.9333	0.0655
GAIX Corp.	0.95	0.90	2.9875	0.0667
Henry (Jack) & Assoc	0.85	0.74	3.1928	0.0713
Hunt (J.B.)	0.95	0.91	3.2647	0.0729
Huntington Ingalis	0.95	0.89	3.3736	0.0753
L'Harris Technologie	0.90	0.83	3.1556	0.0/11
Landstar System	0.80	0.65	2.8665	0.0640
Lockheed Martin	0.85	0.75	2.8741	0.0642
McKesson Corp.	0.85	0.70	3.1485	0.0703
Microsoft Corp.	0.90	0.78	2.8520	0.0637
MSC Industrial Direc	0.90	0.84	2.9545	0.0660
Oracle Corp.	0.85	0.70	3.0995	0.0692
O'Reilly Automotive	0.90	0.84	3.0259	0.0676
OSI Systems	0.90	0.81	3.2160	0.0718
Packaging Corp.	0.95	0.85	2.8607	0.0639
Pfizer, Inc.	0.80	0.67	3.1709	0.0708
Philip Morris Int'l	0.95	0.87	2.8750	0.0642
Prestige Consumer	0.85	0.75	3.3470	0.0747
Selective Ins. Group	0.85	0.74	2.9941	0.0668
Service Corp. Int'l	0.90	0.84	3.1842	0.0711
Sherwin-Williams	0.95	0.90	2.9254	0.0653
Smith (A.O.)	0.90	0.79	3.0828	0.0688
Thermo Fisher Sci.	0.85	0.77	2.8565	0.0638
UniFirst Corp.	0.90	0.81	3.0115	0.0672
UnitedHealth Group	0.95	0.90	3.1445	0.0702
Universal Corp.	0.80	0.68	3.2233	0.0720
VeriSign Inc.	0.90	0.80	2.8857	0.0644
Waters Corp.	0.95	0.86	3.2280	0.0721
Watsco, Inc.	0.85	0.76	3.1218	0.0697
Average	0.89	0.80	3.0829	0.0688
Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	0.88	0.78	3 1 1 4 7	0.0695
2 I	0.00	0.70	0.1117	0.0000

Source of Information:

Value Line Proprietary Database, December 2024.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 7 PAGE 1 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Summary of Cost of Equity Models Applied to Proxy Group of Non-Price Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

Principal Methods	Proxy Group of Forty-N Non-Price Regulate Companies	Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies		line d M)
Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCF) (1)	11.37	%	11.37	%
Risk Premium Model (RPM) (2)	12.44		12.42	
Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) (3)	11.86	-	11.85	-
М	ean <u>11.89</u>	- %	11.88	%
Med	lian <u>11.86</u>	- %	11.85	- %
Average of Mean and Mea	lian 11.88	%	11.87	%

Notes:

(1) From page 2 of this Document.

(2) From page 3 of this Document.

(3) From page 6 of this Document.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 7 PAGE 2 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025

[7]

[6]

Peoples Gas System DCF Results for the Proxy Group of Non-Price-Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

[3]

[4]

[5]

[2]

[1]

Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies	Average Dividend Yield	Value Line Projected Five Year Growth in EPS	Zack's Five Year Projected Growth Rate in EPS	S&P Capital 1Q Projected Five Year Growth in EPS	Average Projected Five Year Growth Rate in EPS (1)	Adjusted Dividend Yield	Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate (2)
Abbott Labs.	2.05 %	4.00 %	9.10 %	8.58 %	7.23 %	2.12 %	9.35 %
AbbVie lnc.	3.63	4.00	8.30	8.03	6.78	3.75	10.53
Air Products & Chem.	2.27	10.50	7.80	11.76	10.02	2.38	12.40
Alphabet Inc.	0.44	13.50	17.80	16.40	15.90	0.47	16.37
Altria Group	7.59	6.00	3.60	4.35	4.65	7.77	12.42
Apple Inc.	0.42	9.00	13.70	9.52	10.74	0.44	11.18
Assurant Inc.	1.52	9.50	NA	NA	9.50	1.59	11.09
AutoZone Inc.	-	11.50	11.80	12.73	12.01	-	NA
Booz Allen Hamilton	1.36	10.00	13.30	13.15	12.15	1.44	13.59
Brady Corp.	1.30	15.50	NA	11.00	13.25	1.39	14.64
BWX Technologies	0.79	9.00	9.30	10.55	9.62	0.83	10.45
CACl Int'l	-	4.50	13.80	13.77	10.69	-	NA
Casey's Gen'l Stores	0.49	12.00	12.60	12.53	12.38	0.52	12.90
Cencora	0.93	6.50	10.40	9.10	8.67	0.97	9.64
CSW Industrials	0.25	13.50	NA	15.00	14.25	0.27	14.52
CVS Health	5.02	1.50	10.90	12.76	8.39	5.23	13.62
Danaher Corp.	0.45	2.00	6.70	6.51	5.07	0.46	5.53
Dolby Labs.	1.72	9.50	NA	NA	9.50	1.80	11.30
Exponent, Inc.	1.16	7.00	NA	NA	7.00	1.20	8.20
Fastenal Co.	1.99	9.00	8.30	7.90	8.40	2.07	10.47
Franklin Electric	0.97	7.50	12.00	12.00	10.50	1.02	11.52
GATX Corp.	1.52	10.50	NA	NA	10.50	1.60	12.10
Henry (Jack) & Assoc	1.24	6.50	9.20	8.65	8.12	1.29	9.41
Hunt (J.B.)	0.95	6.00	8.10	9.71	7.94	0.99	8.93
Huntington Ingalis	2.66	10.00	7.40	7.36	8.25	2.//	11.02
L3Harris Technologie	1.98	11.00	8.70	8.89	9.53	2.07	11.60
Landstar System	0.80	5.00	NA	11.00	8.00	0.83	8.83
Lockneed Martin	2.53	9.50	4.40	3.10	5.67	2.60	8.27
Microsoft Com	0.49	14.50	14.10	13.77	14.02	0.52	13.14
Microsoft Gorp. MSC Industrial Direc	0.78	14.50	14.00	15.20 NA	050	4.16	466 (2)
Oracle Corp	4.15	10.00	10.20	11.16	10.50	4.10	4.00 (3)
O'Poilly Automotivo	0.91	10.00	12.10	11.10	11 61	0.90	11.41 NA
OSI Systems		10.50	12.10	14.05	12.48		NA
Packaging Corn	2.14	9.00	9.00	13 53	10.51	2.25	12.76
Pfizer Inc	646	2.50	14.20	822	831	673	15.04
Philip Morris Int'l	4.27	5.00	8.60	10.39	8.00	4.44	12.44
Prestige Consumer	-	5.50	8.00	8.00	7.17	-	NA
Selective Ins. Group	1.59	17.50	NA	16.40	16.95	1.72	18.67 (3)
Service Corp. Int'l	1.46	4.50	9.70	9.75	7.98	1.52	9.50
Sherwin-Williams	0.78	12.00	11.00	9.51	10.84	0.82	11.66
Smith (A.O.)	1.87	9.00	10.00	11.00	10.00	1.96	11.96
Thermo Fisher Sci.	0.29	6.00	6.50	8.30	6.93	0.30	7.23
UniFirst Corp.	0.73	7.00	NA	NA	7.00	0.76	7.76
UnitedHealth Group	1.51	12.00	12.30	14.98	13.09	1.61	14.70
Universal Corp.	6.02	13.50	NA	NA	13.50	6.43	19.93 (3)
VeriSign Inc.		12.00	NA	NA	12.00	-	NA
Waters Corp.	-	6.50	4.40	7.33	6.08	-	NA
Watsco, Inc.	2.14	7.00	NA	NA	7.00	2.21	9.21
	NA = Not Availa	ble				Mean	<u>11.32</u> %
						Median	11.41 %

Notes:

 (1) Average of columns 2 through 4 excluding negative growth rates and extreme positive values.
 (2) The application of the DCF model to the domestic, non-price regulated comparable risk companies is identical to the application of the DCF to the Utility Proxy Group. The dividend yield is derived by using the 60 day average price and the spot indicated dividend as of 1/15/2025. The dividend yield is then adjusted by 1/2 the average projected growth rate in EPS, which is calculated by averaging the 5 year projected growth in EPS provided by Value Line, www.zacks.com, and S&P Capital IQ (excluding any negative growth rates) and then adding that growth rate to the adjusted dividend yield.

Average of Mean and Median

11.37 %

(3) Results were excluded from the final average and median as they were more than two standard deviations from the proxy group's mean.

Source of Information:

Value Line Investment Survey. www.zacks.com, Downloaded on 01/15/2025 S&P Capital 1Q

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 7 PAGE 3 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate Through Use of a Risk Premium Model Using an Adjusted Total Market Approach

Line No.		Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non- Price Regulated Companies	Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non- Price Regulated Companies (excl. PRPM)
1.	Prospective Yield on Baa2 Rated Corporate Bonds (1)	6.01 %	6.01
2.	Adjustment to Reflect Bond rating Difference of Non-Price Regulated Companies (2)	(0.09)	(0.09)
3.	Adjusted Bond Yield	5.92	5.92
4.	Equity Risk Premium (3)	6.52	6.50
5.	Risk Premium Derived Common Equity Cost Rate	12.44 %	12.42

Notes: (1) Average forecast of Baa corporate bonds based upon the consensus of nearly 50 economists reported in Blue Chip Financial Forecasts dated November 27, 2024 and December 30, 2024 (see pages 7 and 8 of Document No. 4). The estimates are detailed below.

First Quarter 2025	6.00	%
Second Quarter 2025	6.00	
Third Quarter 2025	6.00	
Fourth Quarter 2025	6.10	
First Quarter 2026	6.10	
Second Quarter 2026	6.00	
2026-2030	6.00	
2031-2035	5.90	_
		-
Average	6.01	%

(2) The average yield spread of Baa2 rated corporate bonds over A2 corporate bonds for the three months ending December 2024. To reflect the Baa1 average rating of the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group, the yield on the Baa corporate bond must be adjusted by 1/3 of the spread between A2 and Baa2 corporate bond yields as shown below:

	A2 Corp. Bond Yield	Baa2 Corp. Bond Yield	Spread	_
Dec-24	5.53 %	5.80 %	0.27	%
Nov-24	5.50	5.78	0.28	
Oct-24	5.33	5.63	0.30	_
		Average yield spread	0.28	
		1/3 of spread	0.09	_

(3) From page 5 of this Document.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 7 PAGE 4 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Comparison of Long-Term Issuer Ratings for the <u>Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies</u>

		Moo Long-Term Januar	ody's Issuer Rating ry 2025	Standard & Poor's Long-Term Issuer Rating January 2025	
Proxy Group of Forty	-Nine Non-Price Regulated	Long-Term	Numerical Weighting (1)	Long-Term	Numerical Weighting (1)
companies		Issuel Kaulig		Issuel Raulig	
Abbott Labs.		Aa3	4.0	AA-	4.0
AbbVie Inc.		Baa1	8.0	BBB+	8.0
Air Products & Chem		A2	6.0	А	6.0
Alphabet Inc.		Aa2	3.0	AA+	2.0
Altria Group		A3	7.0	BBB	9.0
Apple Inc.		Baa1	8.0	BBB+	8.0
Assurant Inc.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
AutoZone Inc.		A2	6.0	А	6.0
Booz Allen Hamilton		NA		NA	
Brady Corp.		NA		NA	
BWX Technologies		NA		NA	
CACI Int'l		NA		BB+	11.0
Casey's Gen'l Stores		NA		NA	
Cencora		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
CSW Industrials		NA		NA	
CVS Health		NA		NA	
Danaher Corp.		A3	7.0	A-	7.0
Dolby Labs.		NA		NA	
Exponent, Inc.		NA		NA	
Fastenal Co.		NA		NA	
Franklin Electric		NA		NA	
GATX Corp.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
Henry (Jack) & Assoc		NA		NA	
Hunt (J.B.)		Baa1	8.0	BBB	9.0
Huntington Ingalls		A2	6.0	А	6.0
L3Harris Technologie	2	NA		NA	
Landstar System		NA		NA	
Lockheed Martin		A2	6.0	A-	7.0
McKesson Corp.		A3	7.0	BBB+	8.0
Microsoft Corp.		Aaa	1.0	AAA	1.0
MSC Industrial Direc		NA		NA	
Oracle Corp.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
O'Reilly Automotive		Baa1	8.0	BBB	9.0
OSI Systems		NA		NA	
Packaging Corp.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
Pfizer, Inc.		A2	6.0	А	6.0
Philip Morris Int'l		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
Prestige Consumer		NA		NA	
Selective Ins. Group		WR		A+	5.0
Service Corp. Int'l		Ba3	13.0	BB+	11.0
Sherwin-Williams		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
Smith (A.O.)		NA		NA	
Thermo Fisher Sci.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
UniFirst Corp.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
UnitedHealth Group		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
Universal Corp.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
VeriSign Inc.		Baa2	9.0	BBB	9.0
Waters Corp.		Baa3	10.0	BBB-	10.0
Watsco, Inc.		Baa3	10.0	BBB-	10.0
	Electric CEM Proxy Group Average	Baa1	7.7	BBB+	7.8

Notes:

(1) From page 4 of Document No. 4.

Source of Information:

Bloomberg Professional Services.
DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 7 PAGE 5 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach Using the Beta for Non-Price Regulated Companies of Comparable risk to the <u>Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies</u>

Line No.	Equity Risk Premium Measure	Proxy Group of Forty- Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies	Proxy Group of Forty- l Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies (excl. PRPM)
1.	Kroll Equity Risk Premium (1)	6.10 %	6.10 %
2.	Regression on Kroll Risk Premium Data (2)	7.03	7.03
3.	Kroll Equity Risk Premium based on PRPM (3)	7.56	NA
4.	Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line Summary and Index (4)	5.61	5.61
5.	Equity Risk Premium Based on Bloomberg, Value Line, and S&P Global Market Intelligence S&P 500 Companies (5)	11.15	11.15
6.	Conclusion of Equity Risk Premium	7.49 %	7.47 %
7.	Adjusted Beta (6)	0.87	0.87
8.	Forecasted Equity Risk Premium	6.52 %	6.50 %

Notes:

- (1) From note 1 of page 6 of Document No. 4.
- (2) From note 2 of page 6 of Document No. 4.
- (3) From note 3 of page 6 of Document No. 4.
- (4) From note 4 of page 6 of Document No. 4.
- (5) From note 5 of page 6 of Document No. 4.
- (6) Average of mean and median beta from page 6 of this Document.

Sources of Information:

Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation - 2023 SBBI Yearbook, Kroll. Value Line Summary and Index. Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, November 27, 2024 and December 30, 2024. Bloomberg Professional Services.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 7 PAGE 6 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Traditional CAPM and ECAPM Results for the Proxy Groups of Non-Price-Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the <u>Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies</u>

Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies	Value Line Adjusted Beta	Bloomberg Beta	Average Beta	Market Risk Premium (1)	Risk-Free Rate (2)	Traditional CAPM Cost Rate	ECAPM Cost Rate	Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate (3)
Abbott Labs	0.90	0.66	0.78	8.41 %	4.44 %	11.00 %	11.46 %	11.23 %
AbbVie Inc.	0.80	1.02	0.91	8.41	4.44	12.09	12.28	12.19
Air Products & Chem.	0.90	0.81	0.86	8.41	4.44	11.67	11.97	11.82
Alphabet Inc.	0.90	1.04	0.97	8.41	4.44	12.60	12.66	12.63
Altria Group	0.85	0.47	0.66	8.41	4.44	9.99	10.71	10.35
Apple Inc.	0.95	1.02	0.99	8.41	4.44	12.77	12.79	12.78
Assurant Inc.	0.90	0.79	0.85	8.41	4.44	11.59	11.91	11.75
AutoZone Inc.	0.90	0.81	0.86	8.41	4.44	11.67	11.97	11.82
Booz Allen Hamilton	0.85	0.96	0.91	8.41	4.44	12.09	12.28	12.19
Brady Corp.	0.95	0.69	0.82	8.41	4.44	11.34	11.72	11.53
BWX Technologies	0.85	0.69	0.77	8.41	4.44	10.92	11.40	11.16
CACI Int I	0.90	0.84	0.87	8.41	4.44	11.76	12.03	11.89
Casey's Gen'l Stores	0.90	0.63	0.77	8.41	4.44	10.92	11.40	11.16
Cencora CSW Industriale	0.80	0.57	0.68	8.41	4.44	10.16	10.83	10.50
CVS Health	0.90	1.22	1.06	8.41	4.44	13.36	13.23	13.29
Danaher Corn	0.90	0.88	0.89	8.41	4.44	11.93	12.16	12.04
Dolhy Lahs	0.95	0.00	0.93	8.41	4.4.4	12.26	12.10	12.01
Exponent. Inc.	0.95	1.16	1.06	8.41	4.44	13.36	13.23	13.29
Fastenal Co.	0.85	0.96	0.91	8.41	4.44	12.09	12.28	12.19
Franklin Electric	0.90	1.04	0.97	8.41	4.44	12.60	12.66	12.63
GATX Corp.	0.95	1.04	0.99	8.41	4.44	12.77	12.79	12.78
Henry (Jack) & Assoc	0.85	0.74	0.80	8.41	4.44	11.17	11.59	11.38
Hunt (J.B.)	0.95	0.67	0.81	8.41	4.44	11.25	11.65	11.45
Huntington Ingalls	0.95	1.08	1.02	8.41	4.44	13.02	12.98	13.00
L3Harris Technologie	0.95	0.74	0.85	8.41	4.44	11.59	11.91	11.75
Landstar System	0.80	0.96	0.88	8.41	4.44	11.84	12.09	11.97
Lockheed Martin	0.85	0.44	0.64	8.41	4.44	9.82	10.58	10.20
McKesson Corp.	0.85	0.64	0.74	8.41	4.44	10.66	11.21	10.94
Microsoft Corp.	0.90	1.03	0.97	8.41	4.44	12.60	12.66	12.63
MSC Industrial Direc	0.90	0.91	0.91	8.41	4.44	12.09	12.28	12.19
O'Bailly Automativa	0.85	1.27	0.74	8.41	4.44	10.66	13.23	13.29
OSI Systems	0.90	117	1.03	8.41	4.44	13.10	13.04	13.07
Packaging Corp	0.95	0.78	0.86	8.41	4.4.4	11.67	11.97	11.82
Pfizer Inc	0.80	0.50	0.65	8 4 1	4 4 4	9.91	10.64	10.28
Philip Morris Int'l	0.90	0.78	0.84	8.41	4.44	11.51	11.84	11.67
Prestige Consumer	0.90	1.17	1.03	8.41	4.44	13.10	13.04	13.07
Selective Ins. Group	0.90	1.03	0.97	8.41	4.44	12.60	12.66	12.63
Service Corp. Int'l	0.95	0.94	0.94	8.41	4.44	12.35	12.47	12.41
Sherwin-Williams	0.95	1.12	1.04	8.41	4.44	13.19	13.10	13.15
Smith (A.O.)	0.90	1.00	0.95	8.41	4.44	12.43	12.54	12.48
Thermo Fisher Sci.	0.85	0.58	0.72	8.41	4.44	10.50	11.09	10.79
UniFirst Corp.	0.90	0.58	0.74	8.41	4.44	10.66	11.21	10.94
UnitedHealth Group	0.95	0.58	0.77	8.41	4.44	10.92	11.40	11.16
Universal Corp.	0.85	0.58	0.72	8.41	4.44	10.50	11.09	10.79
VeriSign Inc.	0.90	0.58	0.74	8.41	4.44	10.66	11.21	10.94
waters Corp.	0.95	0.69	0.82	8.41	4.44	11.34	11.72	11.53
Watsco, Inc.	0.90	0.69	0.79	8.41	4.44	11.09	11.53	11.31
		Mean	0.87			11.75 %	12.03 %	11.89 %
		Median	0.86			11.67 %	<u>11.97</u> %	11.82 %
	Average of M	ean and Median	0.87			<u>11.71</u> %	12.00 %	11.86 %

Notes:

From note 1 of page 2 of Document No. 5.
From note 2 of page 2 of Document No. 5.
Average of CAPM and ECAPM cost rates.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 7 PAGE 7 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025

Peoples Gas System Traditional CAPM and ECAPM Results (excl. PRPM MRP) for the Proxy Groups of Non-Price-Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies

Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
Proxy Group of Forty-Nine Non-Price Regulated Companies	Value Line Adjusted Beta	Bloomberg Beta	Average Beta	Market Risk Premium (1)	Risk-Free Rate (2)	Traditional CAPM Cost Rate	ECAPM Cost Rate	Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate (3)
Abbott Labs.	0.90	0.66	0.78	8.40 %	4.44 %	10.99 %	11.45 %	11.22 %
AbbVie Inc.	0.80	1.02	0.91	8.40	4.44	12.08	12.27	12.18
Air Products & Chem.	0.90	0.81	0.86	8.40	4.44	11.66	11.96	11.81
Alphabet Inc.	0.90	1.04	0.97	8.40	4.44	12.59	12.65	12.62
Altria Group	0.85	0.47	0.66	8.40	4.44	9.98	10.70	10.34
Apple Inc.	0.95	1.02	0.99	8.40	4.44	12.76	12.78	12.77
Assurant Inc.	0.90	0.79	0.85	8.40	4.44	11.58	11.90	11.74
AutoZone Inc.	0.90	0.81	0.86	8.40	4.44	11.66	11.96	11.81
Booz Allen Hamilton	0.85	0.96	0.91	8.40	4.44	12.08	12.27	12.18
Brady Corp.	0.95	0.69	0.82	8.40	4.44	11.33	11.71	11.52
BWX Technologies	0.85	0.69	0.77	8.40	4.44	10.91	11.39	11.15
CACI INTI Gazaria Can'i Stanca	0.90	0.84	0.87	8.40	4.44	11.75	12.02	11.89
Casey's Gen I Stores	0.90	0.63	0.77	8.40	4.44	10.91	11.39	11.15
CSW Industrials	0.00	0.57	0.66	6.40 8.40	4.44 A.A.A	13.34	13.22	10.49
CVS Health	0.90	1.22	1.06	8.40	4.44	13.34	13.22	13.28
Danaher Corp	0.90	0.88	0.89	8.40	4 4 4	11.92	12.15	12.03
Dolhy Labs.	0.95	0.91	0.93	8.40	4.44	12.25	12.40	12.33
Exponent. Inc.	0.95	1.16	1.06	8.40	4.44	13.34	13.22	13.28
Fastenal Co.	0.85	0.96	0.91	8.40	4.44	12.08	12.27	12.18
Franklin Electric	0.90	1.04	0.97	8.40	4.44	12.59	12.65	12.62
GATX Corp.	0.95	1.04	0.99	8.40	4.44	12.76	12.78	12.77
Henry (Jack) & Assoc	0.85	0.74	0.80	8.40	4.44	11.16	11.58	11.37
Hunt (J.B.)	0.95	0.67	0.81	8.40	4.44	11.24	11.64	11.44
Huntington Ingalls	0.95	1.08	1.02	8.40	4.44	13.01	12.97	12.99
L3Harris Technologie	0.95	0.74	0.85	8.40	4.44	11.58	11.90	11.74
Landstar System	0.80	0.96	0.88	8.40	4.44	11.83	12.08	11.96
Lockheed Martin	0.85	0.44	0.64	8.40	4.44	9.82	10.57	10.19
McKesson Corp.	0.85	0.64	0.74	8.40	4.44	10.66	11.20	10.93
Microsoft Corp.	0.90	1.03	0.97	8.40	4.44	12.59	12.65	12.62
MSC Industrial Direc	0.90	0.91	0.91	8.40	4.44	12.08	12.27	12.18
Oracle Corp.	0.85	1.27	1.06	8.40	4.44	13.34	13.22	13.28
O Relly Automotive	0.90	0.59	0.74	8.40	4.44	12.66	11.20	10.93
Dar Systems Packaging Corp	0.50	0.79	1.05	0.40	4.44	11.09	11.05	11.06
Pfizer Inc	0.95	0.78	0.65	8.40	4.44	9.90	10.64	10.27
Philip Morris Int'l	0.00	0.78	0.84	8.40	4 4 4	11.50	11.83	11.66
Prestige Consumer	0.90	1.17	1.03	8.40	4.44	13.09	13.03	13.06
Selective Ins. Group	0.90	1.03	0.97	8.40	4.44	12.59	12.65	12.62
Service Corp. Int'l	0.95	0.94	0.94	8.40	4.44	12.34	12.46	12.40
Sherwin-Williams	0.95	1.12	1.04	8.40	4.44	13.18	13.09	13.13
Smith (A.O.)	0.90	1.00	0.95	8.40	4.44	12.42	12.53	12.47
Thermo Fisher Sci.	0.85	0.58	0.72	8.40	4.44	10.49	11.08	10.78
UniFirst Corp.	0.90	0.58	0.74	8.40	4.44	10.66	11.20	10.93
UnitedHealth Group	0.95	0.58	0.77	8.40	4.44	10.91	11.39	11.15
Universal Corp.	0.85	0.58	0.72	8.40	4.44	10.49	11.08	10.78
VeriSign Inc.	0.90	0.58	0.74	8.40	4.44	10.66	11.20	10.93
Waters Corp.	0.95	0.69	0.82	8.40	4.44	11.33	11.71	11.52
Watsco, Inc.	0.90	0.69	0.79	8.40	4.44	11.08	11.52	11.30
		Mean	0.87			11.74 %	12.02 %	11.88 %
		Median	0.86			11.66 %	11.96 %	11.81 %
	Average of M	lean and Median	0.87			11.70 %	11.99 %	11.85 %

Notes:

From note 1 of page 2 of Document No. 5.
From note 2 of page 2 of Document No. 5.
Average of CAPM and ECAPM cost rates.

Peoples Gas System Derivation of Investment Risk Adjustment Based upon Kroll Associates' Size Premia for the Decile Portfolios of the NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ

			[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
Line No.		Mar	ket Capitalizati 2025	on on January 15, (1)	Applicable Decile of the NYSE/AMEX/ NASDAQ (2)	Applicable Size Premium (3)	Spread from Applicable Size Premium (4)
		(millions)	(times larger)			
1.	Peoples Gas System	\$	2,692.848		6	1.21%	
2.	Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies	\$	8,011.105	3.0 x	3	0.61%	0.60%
				[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]

-	Decile	Caj Sma	Market bitalization of llest Company (millions)	C. La	Market apitalization of Irgest Company (millions)	Size Premium (Return in Excess of CAPM)*
Largest	1	\$	36,942.976	\$	2,662,326.048	-0.06%
	2		14,910.719		36,391.113	0.46%
	3		7,493.607		14,820.048	0.61%
	4		4,622.261		7,461.284	0.64%
	5		3,011.224		4,621.785	0.95%
	6		1,864.293		3,010.806	1.21%
	7		1,050.083		1,862.491	1.39%
	8		555.880		1,046.037	1.14%
	9		213.039		554.523	1.99%
Smallest	10		1.576		212.644	4.70%
		*From 2	024 Kroll Cost of	Capita	l Navigator	

(1) From page 2 of this Document.

Notes:

- (2) Gleaned from Columns [B] and [C] on the bottom of this page. The appropriate decile (Column [A]) corresponds to the market capitalization of the proxy group, which is found in Column [1].
- (3) Corresponding risk premium to the decile is provided in Column [D] on the bottom of this page.
- (4) Line No. 1 Column [3] Line No. 2 Column [3]. For example, the 0.60% in Column [4], Line No. 2 is derived as follows 0.60% = 1.21% - 0.61%.

PAGE FILED: DOCUMENT WITNESS DOCKET XHIB Ч Ĥ OF NO 03/31/2025 רי 2 אס ō D'ASCENDIS Ν ٠ 0250029ω Ĝ

		<u>Proxy Gr</u>	oup or s	even Natural G	as Compan	iles					
		[1]		[2]		[3]		[4]	[5]		[6]
Company	Exchange	Common Stock Shares Outstanding at Fiscal Year End 2023 (millions)	Bool Sha Year	c Value per re at Fiscal End 2023 (1)	Total C at Fis	ommon Equity scal Year End 2023 millions)	Clo Mar Ja	sing Stock ket Price on nuary 15, 2025	Market-to- Book Ratio on January 15, 2025 (2)	Caj Jan	Market pitalization on uary 15, 2025 (3) (millions)
Peoples Gas System		NA		NA		1,615.386 (4)	NA			
Based upon Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies									166.7 (5)	\$	2,692.848 (6)
Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies											
Atmos Energy Corporation	NYSE	148.493	\$	73.203	\$	10,870.06	\$	141.080	192.7 %	\$	20,949.362
New Jersey Resources Corporation	NYSE	97.584	\$	20.400		1,990.74		46.470	227.8		4,534.750
NiSource Inc.	NYSE	447.382	\$	17.398		7,783.50		36.910	212.2		16,512.857
Northwest Natural Holding Company	NYSE	37.631	\$	34.116		1,283.84		39.360	115.4		1,481.156
ONE Gas, Inc.	NYSE	56.546	\$	48.914		2,765.88		70.890	144.9		4,008.541
Southwest Gas Holdings, Inc.	NYSE	71.564	\$	46.253		3,310.04		69.830	151.0		4,997.297
Spire Inc.	NYSE	53.170	\$	54.867		2,917.30		67.590	123.2		3,593.775
Average		130.339	\$	42.164	\$	4,417.336	\$	67.447	166.7_%	\$	8,011.105

<u>Peoples Gas System</u> Market Capitalization of Peoples Gas System and the

NA= Not Available

Notes: (1) Column 3 / Column 1.

(2) Column 4 / Column 2.

(3) Column 1 * Column 4.

(4) Requested rate base multiplied by the requested common equity ratio.

(5) The market-to-book ratio of Peoples Gas System on January 15, 2025 is assumed to be equal to the market-to-book ratio of Proxy Group of Seven Natural Gas Companies on January 15, 2025 as appropriate.

(6) Column [3] multiplied by Column [5].

Source of Information: 2023 Annual Forms 10-K Bloomberg Professional

60]

Peoples Gas System Derivation of the Flotation Cost Adjustment to the Cost of Common Equity

Equity Issuances

Merage bersing finance Total Offering finance Total Finance Total Offering finance Total Finance Total Finance	Average for the first refluence (1) Total Offensing Inderviting Total Offensing First Share (1) Net Proceeds Share (1) Total Offensing Share (1) Total Offension Share (1) <th></th>	
		res Issued Market Pri (1) per Share (
		5,117,273 8,287,037 4.072,469
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	4,987,123 4,544,025
dilustment 5 52,621,634 5 25,4640,090 5 2,542,018,456 2.0 1[4] [15] [16] [16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.16] 1.11] <	ment55.2621,63452.594,640,90052.542016,456 $[14]$ $[15]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ verage DCF adjusted for adjusted for $[10]$ DCF Cost Rate Adjustent $[11]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ $[16]$ 9.4 $[1002]$ $[008]$ $[008]$ $[100]$ $[100]$ $[100]$ $[100]$ $[100]$	1,768,120 4,614,000 7,624,500 44.2
[14] [15] [16] Average DCF Average DCF Cost Rate Cost Rate DCF Cost Rate Flotation Cost Unadjusted for Adjusted for Adjusted for Flotation (9) Flotation (10) (11) 6 934 10.02 %	[14] [15] [16] verage DCF DCF fost Rate Flotation Cost cost Rate DCF fost Rate Flotation Cost adjusted for Adjusted for Adjusted for adjusted for Editation (10) (11) 9.94 % 10.02 %	Flotation Co
Average DCF Cost Rate DCF Cost Rate Flotation Cost Unadjusted for Adjusted for Adjustment Flotation (9) Flotation (10) (11) 6 9.94 % 10.02 % 0.08 %	verage DCF DCF Cost Rate Flotation Cost dadjusted for Adjusted for Adjustment adjusted for Adjustment p34 % 10.02	[12] [13]
6 - 9.94 - % - 10.02 - % - 0.08 - %	9.94 % 10.02 % 0.08 %	Verage jected EPS Adjusted wth Rate Dividend Yiel (7) (8)
		6.17 % 3.7

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 9 PAGE 1 OF 1 FILED: 03/31/2025

110

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 10 PAGE 1 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

Referenced Endnotes

for the

Prepared Direct Testimony

of

Dylan W. D'Ascendis

- ¹ Hope, 320 U.S. 591 (1944), at 603.
- ² As will be discussed later in this testimony, another definition of total risk is systematic risk plus unsystematic risk.
- ³ Risk distinctions within S&P's bond rating categories are recognized by a plus or minus, *e.g.*, an S&P rating can be an A+, A, or A-. Similarly, risk distinction for Moody's ratings are distinguished by numerical rating gradations, *e.g.*, a Moody's rating can be A1, A2 and A3.
- ⁴ Emera Incorporated, Investor Presentation, December 2024, at 33.
- ⁵ Emera Incorporated, U.S. SEC Form 40-F for the year ended December 31, 2023, at 6.
- ⁶ The development of the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group is explained in more detail in Section VI.
- ⁷ Eugene F. Brigham and Joel F. Houston, <u>Fundamentals of Financial</u> Management, Concise 4th Ed., Thomson South-Western, 2004, at 574.
- ⁸ Excluding securitized debt.
- ⁹ In re: Petition for rate increase by Peoples, Docket No. 080318-GU, Final Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Petition for Rate Increase, at 12 (June 9, 2009).
- ¹⁰ In re: Petition for rate increase by Peoples Gas System, Inc., Docket No. 20230023-GU, Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Peoples Gas System, Inc.'s Petition for a Rate Increase, at 62-66, 71 (December 27, 2023).

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 10 PAGE 2 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

- ¹¹ See, SBBI-2023, at 201.
- Pauline M. Ahern, Frank J. Hanley, and Richard A. Michelfelder, "A New Approach for Estimating the Equity Risk Premium for Public Utilities", The Journal of Regulatory Economics (December 2011), 40:261-278.
- ¹³ Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity; see also www.nobelprize.org.
- ¹⁴ Shown on line 3, page 6 of Document No. 4.
- See, e.g., Robert S. Harris and Felicia C. Marston, The Market Risk Premium: Expectational Estimates Using Analysts' Forecasts, Journal of <u>Applied Finance</u>, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2001, at 11-12; Eugene F. Brigham, Dilip K. Shome, and Steve R. Vinson, The Risk Premium Approach to Measuring a Utility's Cost of Equity, <u>Financial Management</u>, Spring 1985, at 33-45.
- ¹⁶ Roger A. Morin, Modern Regulatory Finance, (2021) at 205-209 ("Morin").
- Eugene F. Fama and Kenneth R. French, The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Theory and Evidence, Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 18, No. 3, Summer 2004 at 33 ("Fama & French"). See also, https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/0895330042162430.
- ¹⁸ Morin, at 207.
- ¹⁹ Morin, at 221.
- ²⁰ Fama & French, at 32.
- ²¹ Fama & French, at 33.
- Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, December 30, 2024, at 2 and November 27, 2024, at 14.
- In re: Petition for rate increase by Peoples Gas System, Inc., Docket No. 20230023-GU, Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Peoples Gas System, Inc.'s Petition for a Rate Increase, at 68 (December 27, 2023).
- ²⁴ Morin, at 329.
- ²⁵ Eugene F. Brigham and Phillip R. Daves, <u>Intermediate Financial</u> Management, 9th Edition, Thomson/Southwestern, at 342.
- ²⁶ Morin, at 337-339.
- 27 Kroll, <u>Cost of Capital Navigator: U.S. Cost of Capital Module</u>, Size as a Predictor of Equity Returns, at 1.
- ²⁸ Fama & French, at 25-43.

112

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 10 PAGE 3 OF 3 FILED: 03/31/2025

- ²⁹ Richard A. Brealey and Steward C. Myers, <u>Principles of Corporate</u> Finance (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1996), at 204-205, 229.
- ³⁰ Eugene F. Brigham, <u>Fundamentals of Financial Management</u>, Fifth Edition (The Dryden Press, 1989), at 623.

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 11 PAGE 1 OF 1 FILED: 03/31/2025

Fama & French - Figure 2

Average Annualized Monthly Return versus Beta for Value Weight Portfolios Formed on Prior Beta, 1928-2003



DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 12 PAGE 1 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025



Dylan W. D'Ascendis, CRRA, CVA Partner

Summarv

Dylan is an experienced consultant and a Certified Rate of Return Analyst (CRRA) and Certified Valuation Analyst (CVA). Dylan joined ScottMadden in 2016 and is a leading expert witness with respect to cost of capital, capital structure, and valuation. He has served as a consultant for investor-owned and municipal utilities and authorities for 16 years. Dylan has testified as an expert witness on over 150 occasions regarding rate of return, cost of service, rate design, and valuation before more than 40 regulatory jurisdictions in the United States and Canada, an American Arbitration Association panel, and the Superior Court of Rhode Island. He also maintains the benchmark index against which the Hennessy Gas Utility Mutual Fund performance is measured. Dylan holds a B.A. in economic history from the University of Pennsylvania and an M.B.A. with concentrations in finance and international business from Rutgers University.

Areas of Specialization

- Expert Witness Testimony
- Rates and Regulation
- Return on Equity
- Valuation
- Utility Regulations
- Rate Case Planning, Management, and Support

Utility Benchmarking **Recent Articles and Speeches**

- "Decoupling, Risk Impacts, and the Cost of Capital." Co-authored with Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D., Rutgers University and Pauline M. Ahern. The Electricity Journal. March 2020
- "Decoupling Impact and Public Utility Conservation Investment." Co-authored with Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D., Rutgers University and Pauline M. Ahern. Energy Policy Journal. 130 (2019), 311-319
- "Establishing Alternative Proxy Groups." Presentation before the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts: 51st Financial Forum. April 4, 2019. New Orleans, LA
- "Past Is Prologue: Future Test Year." Presentation before the National Association of Water Companies 2017 Southeast Water Infrastructure Summit. May 2, 2017. Savannah, GA "Comparative Evaluation of the Predictive Risk Premium ModelTM, the Discounted Cash Flow Model and the
- Capital Asset Pricing Model." Co-authored with Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D., Rutgers University, Pauline M. Ahern, and Frank J. Hanley. The Electricity Journal. May 2013 "Decoupling: Impact on the Risk and Cost of Common Equity of Public Utility Stocks." Presentation before the
- Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts: 45th Financial Forum. April 17-18, 2013. Indianapolis, IN

Recent Assignments

- Provided expert testimony on the cost of capital for ratemaking purposes before numerous state utility regulatory agencies
- Maintains the benchmark index against which the Hennessy Gas Utility Mutual Fund performance is measured
- Sponsored valuation testimony for a large municipal water company in front of an American Arbitration Association Board to justify the reasonability of their lease payments to the city
- Co-authored a valuation report on behalf of a large investor-owned utility in response to a new state regulation which allowed the appraised value of acquired assets into rate base

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 12 PAGE 2 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025



Dylan W. D'Ascendis, CRRA, CVA Partner

Sponsor	Date	Case/Applicant	Docket No.	Subject
Regulatory Comm ssion of Alaska				
Goat Lake Hydro, Inc.	12/24	Goat Lake Hydro, Inc.	Docket No. TA7-521	Rate of Return
Alaska Power Company	08/23	Alaska Power Company	Docket No. TA 909-2 / U-23-054	Capital Structure
ENSTAR Natural Gas Company	08/22	ENSTAR Natural Gas Company	Docket No. TA334-4	Rate of Return
Cook Inlet Natural Gas Storage		Cook Inlet Natural Gas Storage		
Alaska, LLC	07/21	Alaska, LLC	Docket No. TA45-733	Capital Structure
Alaska Dawar Garra anu	00/00	Alaska Power Company; Goat Lake	Tariff Nos. TA886-2; TA6-521;	On mital Otructure
Alaska Power Company	09/20	Hydro, Inc.; BBL Hydro, Inc.	Desket Na TAREZ 2	Capital Structure
Alaska Power Company	07/16	Alaska Power Company	Docket No. 1A657-2	Rate of Return
Alberta Otinties Commission				Determination of
AltaLink I P and EPCOR		Altal ink I.P. and FPCOR		Cost-of-Capital
Distribution & Transmission, Inc.	02/23	Distribution & Transmission, Inc.	Proceeding ID. 27084	Parameters
AltaLink, L.P., and EPCOR		AltaLink, L.P., and EPCOR	2021 Generic Cost of Capital,	
Distribution & Transmission, Inc.	01/20	Distribution & Transmission, Inc.	Proceeding ID. 24110	Rate of Return
Arize Corporat on Commission	· ·			
			Docket No. WS-01303A-24-	
EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc.	06/24	EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc.	0130	Rate of Return
Arizona Mater Company	05/04	Arizona Water Company – Northern	Desket No. 14 014454 24 0117	Bata of Baturn
Alizona Water Company	03/24	Gloup	DOCKELING: W-01445A-24-0117	Rate of Return and
				Fair Value Rate
Foothills Water & Sewer, LLC	10/23	Foothills Water & Sewer, LLC	Docket No. WS-21182A-23-0292	Base
		Arizona Water Company - Eastern		
Arizona Water Company	12/22	Group	Docket No. W-01445A-22-0286	Rate of Return
			Docket No. WS-01303A-22-	
EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc.	08/22	EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc.	0236	Rate of Return
EPCOR Water Arizona Inc	06/20	EPCOR Water Arizona Inc	Docket No. WS-01303A-20-	Rate of Return
LI COR Water Anzona, Inc.	00/20	Arizona Water Company - Western	0177	Tale of Reluin
Arizona Water Company	12/19	Group	Docket No. W-01445A-19-0278	Rate of Return
		Arizona Water Company - Northern		
Arizona Water Company	08/18	Group	Docket No. W-01445A-18-0164	Rate of Return
Arkansas Public Service Commissi	on			
Summit Utilities Arkansas, Inc.	01/24	Summit Utilities Arkansas, Inc.	Docket No. 23-079-U	Rate of Return
Southwestern Electric Power Co.	07/21	Southwestern Electric Power Co.	Docket No. 21-070-U	Return on Equity
CenterPoint Energy Resources				
Corp.	05/21	CenterPoint Arkansas Gas	Docket No. 21-004-U	Return on Equity
Califo nia Public Utilities Commiss	on			
Southwest Gas Corporation	07/24	Southwest Gas Corporation	Docket No. A24-09-001	Return on Equity
San Gabriel Valley Water Company	05/23	San Gabriel Valley Water Company	Docket No. A23-05-001	Return on Equity
City of Edmonton Canada				
			Performance Based Regulation	
EPCOR Water Services Inc.	05/24	EPCOR Water Services, Inc.	Application	Cost of Capital
Colorado Public Illities Commissi	on			
Atmos Energy Corporation	08/22	Atmos Energy Corporation	Docket No. 22AL-0348G	Rate of Return
Summit Utilities, Inc.	04/18	Colorado Natural Gas Company	Docket No. 18AL-0305G	Rate of Return
Atmos Energy Corporation	06/17	Atmos Energy Corporation	Docket No. 17AL-0429G	Rate of Return

2

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 12 PAGE 3 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025



Sponsor	Date	Case/Applicant	Docket No.	Subject
Commission of the Ganada Energy	Regulator			
Trans-Northern Pipelines Inc.	11/22	Trans-Northern Pipelines Inc.	Docket No. C-22197	Cost of Capital
Delaware Public Service Commissi	on			
Delmarva Power & Light Co	09/24	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 24-1044 (Gas)	Return on Equity
Tidewater Utilities Inc	08/24	Tidewater Utilities, Inc.	Docket No. 24-0991	Rate of Return
Delmarva Power & Light Co.	07/24	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 24-0868	Alternative Forms of Rate Regulation
Artesian Water Company, Inc.	04/23	Artesian Water Company, Inc.	Docket No. 23-0601	Rate of Return
Delmarva Power & Light Co.	12/22	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 22-0897 (Electric)	Return on Equity
Delmarva Power & Light Co.	01/22	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 22-002 (Gas)	Return on Equity
Delmarva Power & Light Co.	11/20	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 20-0149 (Electric)	Return on Equity
Delmarva Power & Light Co.	10/20	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	Docket No. 20-0150 (Gas)	Return on Equity
Tidewater Utilities, Inc.	11/13	Tidewater Utilities, Inc.	Docket No. 13-466	Capital Structure
Public Service Commission of the	District of (Columbia		
Washington Gas Light Company	08/24	Washington Gas Light Company	Formal Case No. 1180	Rate of Return
Washington Gas Light Company	04/22	Washington Gas Light Company	Formal Case No. 1169	Rate of Return
Washington Gas Light Company	09/20	Washington Gas Light Company	Formal Case No. 1162	Rate of Return
Federal Energy Regulatory Commis	ssion		•	
LS Power Grid California, LLC	10/20	LS Power Grid California, LLC	Docket No. ER21-195-000	Rate of Return
Flor da Publ c Service Commission				
Tampa Electric Company	04/24	Tampa Electric Company	Docket No. 20240025-EI	Return on Equity
Peoples Gas System, Inc.	04/23	Peoples Gas System, Inc.	Docket No. 20230023-GU	Rate of Return
Tampa Electric Company	04/21	Tampa Electric Company	Docket No. 20210034-EI	Return on Equity
Peoples Gas System, Inc.	09/20	Peoples Gas System, Inc.	Docket No. 20200051-GU	Rate of Return
Utilities, Inc. of Florida	06/20	Utilities, Inc. of Florida	Docket No. 20200139-WS	Rate of Return
Hawail Public Utilities Commission				
			Docket No. 2020-0217 /	
Launiupoko Irrigation Company, Inc.	12/20	Launiupoko Irrigation Company, Inc.	Transferred to 2020-0089	Capital Structure
Lanai Water Company, Inc.	12/19	Lanai Water Company, Inc.	Docket No. 2019-0386	Cost of Service / Rate Design
				Cost of Service /
Manele Water Resources, LLC	08/19	Manele Water Resources, LLC	Docket No. 2019-0311	Rate Design
Kaupulehu Water Company	02/18	Kaupulehu Water Company	Docket No. 2016-0363	Rate of Return
Aqua Engineers, LLC	05/17	Puhi Sewer & Water Company	Docket No. 2017-0118	Cost of Service / Rate Design
Hawaii Resources, Inc.	09/16	Laie Water Company	Docket No. 2016-0229	Cost of Service / Rate Design
Illinois Com. erce Comm ss on	.			
Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a	0.1.75	Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a		
Ameren Illinois	01/25	Ameren Illinois	Docket No. 25-0084 (Gas)	Return on Equity
Aqua Illinois, Inc.	01/24	Aqua Illinois, Inc.	Docket No. 24-0044	Rate of Return
Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois	01/23	Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois	Docket No. 23-0082 (Electric)	Return on Equity
Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a		Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a		
Ameren Illinois	01/23	Ameren Illinois	Docket No. 23-0067 (Gas)	Return on Equity
Utility Services of Illinois, Inc.	02/21	Utility Services of Illinois, Inc.	Docket No. 21-0198	Rate of Return
Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois	07/20	Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois	Docket No. 20-0308	Return on Equity

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 12 PAGE 4 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025



Sponsor	Date	Case/Applicant	Docket No.	Subject
				Cost of Service /
Utility Services of Illinois, Inc.	11/17	Utility Services of Illinois, Inc.	Docket No. 17-1106	Rate Design
Aqua Illinois, Inc.	04/17	Aqua Illinois, Inc.	Docket No. 17-0259	Rate of Return
Utility Services of Illinois, Inc.	04/15	Utility Services of Illinois, Inc.	Docket No. 14-0741	Rate of Return
Indiana Util y Regulatory Commiss	on			
		Aqua Indiana, Inc. Aboite		
Aqua Indiana, Inc.	03/16	Wastewater Division	Docket No. 44752	Rate of Return
Twin Lakes Utilities Inc.	08/13	Twin Lakes, Utilities, Inc.	Docket No. 44388	Rate of Return
Ransas Corporation Commission	г			1
Atmos Energy Corporation	07/19	Atmos Energy Corporation	19-ATMG-525-RTS	Rate of Return
Kentucky Public Servic Commissi	on			
Atmos Energy Corporation	09/24	Atmos Energy Corporation	2024-00276	Rate of Return
Bluegrass Water Utility Operating	00/00	Bluegrass Water Utility Operating	2022 00 100	
Company	02/23	Company	2022-00432	Return on Equity
Atmos Energy Corporation	07/22	Atmos Energy Corporation	2022-00222	PRP Rider Rate
Water Service Corporation of KY	06/22	Water Service Corporation of KY	2022-00147	Rate of Return
Atmos Energy Corporation	07/21	Atmos Energy Corporation	2021-00304	PRP Rider Rate
Atmos Energy Corporation	06/21	Atmos Energy Corporation	2021-00214	Rate of Return
Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.	06/21	Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.	2021-00190	Return on Equity
Bluegrass Water Utility Operating	10/00	Bluegrass Water Utility Operating	2020 00200	Detum en Envitu
Company	10/20	Company	2020-00290	Return on Equity
Louisiana Public Service Commiss	on			
	05/21	Utilities, Inc. of Louisiana	DOCKET NO. U-36003	Rate of Return
Southwestern Electric Power	12/20	Company	Docket No. 11-35///1	Return on Equity
Atmos Energy Corporation	04/20	Atmos Energy Corporation	Docket No. 11-35535	Rate of Return
Louisiana Water Service Inc	06/13	Louisiana Water Service Inc	Docket No. 11-32848	Rate of Return
Maine Public Utilities Commission	00/10		Bocket 110: 0 02040	Rate of Retain
Northern Life ties Inc. d/b/a Linite	05/23	Northern Utilities Inc. d/b/a Unitil	Docket No. 2023-00051	Return on Equity
Summit Natural Gas of Maine Inc.	03/22	Summit Natural Gas of Maine, Inc.	Docket No. 2022-00031	Rate of Return
The Maine Water Company	09/21	The Maine Water Company	Docket No. 2021-00053	Rate of Return
Maryland Public Service Commissi	00/21	The Maine Water Company	D00K6(110:2021-00033	Trate of Retain
Washington Gas Light Company	05/23	Washington Gas Light Company	Case No. 9704	Rate of Return
FirstEnorgy Sonvice Company	03/23	Potomac Edison Company	Case No. 9695	Rate of Return
Washington Gas Light Company	03/23	Washington Gas Light Company	Case No. 9651	Rate of Return
FirstEnergy Corporation	08/18	Potomac Edison Company		Rate of Return
	00/10	r otomac Edison Company	Case 110. 9490	Trate of Return
Unitil Corporation	00/22	Eitabhurg Cas & Electric Co. (Elec.)	D BUL 22 80	Pote of Poturn
	00/23	Fitchburg Cas & Electric Co. (Elec.)	D.F.0. 23-00	Rate of Return
	09/23	Fileliburg Gas & Electric Co. (Gas)	D.F.U. 23-01	
	12/19	Fitchburg Gas & Electric Co. (Elec.)	D.P.U. 19-130	Rate of Return
Unitil Corporation	12/19	Fitchburg Gas & Electric Co. (Gas)	D.P.U. 19-131	Rate of Return
Liberty Utrities	07/15	Liberty Utilities d/b/a New England Natural Gas Company	D.P.U. 15-75	Rate of Return
Minnesota Public Utilities Commiss	ion			
Northern States Power Company	11/01	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. G002/GR-21-678	Return on Equity
Northern States Power Company	10/21	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. E002/GR-21-630	Return on Equity
Northern States Power Company	11/20	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. E002/GR-20-723	Return on Equity

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 12 PAGE 5 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025



Sponsor	Date	Case/Applicant	Docket No.	Subject
Mississippi P. bl c Service Commis	ion			
Great River Utility Operating Co.	07/22	Great River Utility Operating Co.	Docket No. 2022-UN-86	Rate of Return
Atmos Energy Corporation	03/19	Atmos Energy Corporation	Docket No. 2015-UN-049	Capital Structure
Atmos Energy Corporation	07/18	Atmos Energy Corporation	Docket No. 2015-UN-049	Capital Structure
Missouri Public Service Commissio	n		•	
Confluence Rivers Utility Operating		Confluence Rivers Utility Operating	Case No. WR-2023-0006/SR-	
Company, Inc.	01/23	Company, Inc.	2023-0007	Rate of Return
Spire Missouri, Inc.	12/20	Spire Missouri, Inc.	Case No. GR-2021-0108	Return on Equity
Indian Hills Utility Operating		Indian Hills Utility Operating		
Company, Inc.	10/17	Company, Inc.	Case No. SR-2017-0259	Rate of Return
Raccoon Creek Utility Operating	00/10	Raccoon Creek Utility Operating	Case No. CD 2016 0202	Data of Datum
Company, Inc.	09/16	Company, Inc.	Case No. SR-2016-0202	Rate of Return
Public Durines Commission of Nev	00/02	Courthweat Cas Comparation	Desket No. 22 00012	Detum on Fourty
Southwest Gas Corporation	09/23	Southwest Gas Corporation	Docket No. 23-09012	Return on Equity
Southwest Gas Corporation	09/21	Southwest Gas Corporation	Docket No. 21-09001	Return on Equity
Southwest Gas Corporation	08/20	Southwest Gas Corporation	DOCKELING. 20-02023	Return on Equity
New Hampshire Public Others Con	nmion	Annanian Matao Osmannus of Navi		
Aquarion water Company of New	12/20	Hampshire Inc	Docket No. DW 20-184	Rate of Return
Man Internet Black PL Ilition	12/20	Thampshire, inc.	Docket 110: D11 20-104	Trate of Retain
Atlantic City Electric Company	11/2/	Atlantic City Electric Company	Docket No. ER24110854	Rate of Return
New Jersey Natural Gas Company	01/24	New Jersey Natural Gas Company	Docket No. GR24010071	Rate of Return
Middlesey Water Company	05/23	Middlesex Water Company	Docket No. WR23050292	Rate of Return
FirstEnergy Service Company	03/23	Jersey Central Power & Light Co	Docket No. ER23030144	Rate of Return
Atlantic City Electric Company	02/23	Atlantic City Electric Company	Docket No. ER23020091	Return on Equity
Middlesex Water Company	05/21	Middlesex Water Company	Docket No. WR21050813	Rate of Return
Atlantic City Electric Company	12/20	Atlantic City Electric Company	Docket No. ER20120746	Return on Equity
FirstEnergy Service Company	02/20	Jersey Central Power & Light Co	Docket No. ER20020146	Rate of Return
Aqua New Jersey Inc	12/18	Aqua New Jersey Inc	Docket No. WR18121351	Rate of Return
Middlesex Water Company	10/17	Middlesex Water Company	Docket No. WR17101049	Rate of Return
Middlesex Water Company	03/15	Middlesex Water Company	Docket No. WR15030391	Rate of Return
The Atlantic City Severage	00/10	The Atlantic City Sewerage	Docket No. WITTOODOOT	Cost of Service /
Company	10/14	Company	Docket No. WR14101263	Rate Design
Middlesex Water Company	11/13	Middlesex Water Company	Docket No. WR1311059	Capital Structure
New Mexico Public Regulation Com	mission		4	
New Mexico Gas Company	09/23	New Mexico Gas Company	Case No. 23-00255-UT	Return on Equity
Southwestern Public Service Co.	11/22	Southwestern Public Service Co.	Case No. 22-00286-UT	Return on Equity
Southwestern Public Service Co.	01/21	Southwestern Public Service Co.	Case No. 20-00238-UT	Return on Equity
North Carolina Utilities Commission	2			
Pluris Hampstead, LLC	09/24	Pluris Hampstead, LLC	Docket No. W-1305, Sub 38	Rate of Return
Old North State Water Co., Inc.	06/24	Old North State Water Co., Inc.	Docket No. W-1300, Sub 100	Rate of Return
Carolina Water Service, Inc.	07/22	Carolina Water Service, Inc.	Docket No. W-354 Sub 400	Rate of Return
Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	06/22	Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	Docket No. W-218 Sub 573	Rate of Return
Carolina Water Service, Inc.	07/21	Carolina Water Service, Inc.	Docket No. W-354 Sub 384	Rate of Return
Piedmont Natural Gas Co., Inc.	03/21	Piedmont Natural Gas Co., Inc.	Docket No. G-9, Sub 781	Return on Equity
Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	07/20	Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	Docket No. E-7, Sub 1214	Return on Equity
Duke Energy Progress, LLC	07/20	Duke Energy Progress, LLC	Docket No. E-2. Sub 1219	Return on Equity
L 0, 0 ,			· · ·	1 1 1

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 12 PAGE 6 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025



Sponsor	Date	Case/Applicant	Docket No.	Subject
Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	12/19	Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	Docket No. W-218 Sub 526	Rate of Return
Carolina Water Service, Inc.	06/19	Carolina Water Service, Inc.	Docket No. W-354 Sub 364	Rate of Return
Carolina Water Service Inc.	09/18	Carolina Water Service, Inc.	Docket No. W-354 Sub 360	Rate of Return
Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	07/18	Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	Docket No. W-218 Sub 497	Rate of Return
North D-kot Public Service Comm	iss on			
Northern States Power Company	09/21	Northern States Power Company	Case No. PU-21-381	Rate of Return
Northern States Power Company	11/20	Northern States Power Company	Case No. PU-20-441	Rate of Return
Public Utilities Commission of Ohio)			
FirstEnergy	06/24	Ohio Edison Co., Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Toledo Edison Co.	Case No. 24-0468-EL-AIR	Rate of Return
Aqua Ohio, Inc.	11/22	Aqua Ohio, Inc.	Case No. 22-1094-WW-AIR	Rate of Return
Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	10/21	Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.	Case No. 21-887-EL-AIR	Return on Equity
Aqua Ohio, Inc.	07/21	Agua Ohio, Inc.	Case No. 21-0595-WW-AIR	Rate of Return
Aqua Ohio, Inc.	05/16	Aqua Ohio, Inc.	Case No. 16-0907-WW-AIR	Rate of Return
Pennsy vania Public Utility Commi	sion			
FirstEnergy	04/24	Pennsylvania Electric Company	Docket No. R-2024-3047068	Rate of Return
Columbia Water Company	05/23	Columbia Water Company	Docket No. R-2023-3040258	Rate of Return
Borough of Ambler	06/22	Borough of Ambler – Bureau of Water	Docket No. R-2022-3031704	Rate of Return
Citizens' Electric Company of Lewisburg	05/22	C&T Enterprises	Docket No. R-2022-3032369	Rate of Return
Valley Energy Company	05/22	C&T Enterprises	Docket No. R-2022-3032300	Rate of Return
Community Utilities of Pennsylvania, Inc.	04/21	Community Utilities of Pennsylvania, Inc.	Docket No. R-2021-3025207	Rate of Return
Vicinity Energy Philadelphia, Inc.	04/21	Vicinity Energy Philadelphia, Inc.	Docket No. R-2021-3024060	Rate of Return
Delaware County Regional Water Control Authority	02/20	Delaware County Regional Water Control Authority	Docket No. A-2019-3015173	Valuation
Valley Energy, Inc.	07/19	C&T Enterprises	Docket No. R-2019-3008209	Rate of Return
Wellsboro Electric Company	07/19	C&T Enterprises	Docket No. R-2019-3008208	Rate of Return
Citizens' Electric Company of				
Lewisburg	07/19	C&T Enterprises	Docket No. R-2019-3008212	Rate of Return
Steelton Borough Authority	01/19	Steelton Borough Authority	Docket No. A-2019-3006880	Valuation
Mahoning Township, PA	08/18	Mahoning Township, PA	Docket No. A-2018-3003519	Valuation
SUEZ Water Pennsylvania Inc.	04/18	SUEZ Water Pennsylvania Inc.	Docket No. R-2018-000834	Rate of Return
Columbia Water Company	09/17	Columbia Water Company	Docket No. R-2017-2598203	Rate of Return
Veolia Energy Philadelphia, Inc.	06/17	Veolia Energy Philadelphia, Inc.	Docket No. R-2017-2593142	Rate of Return
Emporium Water Company	07/14	Emporium Water Company	Docket No. R-2014-2402324	Rate of Return
Columbia Water Company	07/13	Columbia Water Company	Docket No. R-2013-2360798	Rate of Return
Dann Estates Utilities Inc.	10/11	Donn Estatos Utilities Inc	Dookot No. D. 2011 2255150	Capital Structure / Long-Term Debt
Ferri Estates Otilities, IIIC.		Ferm Estates, otinities, inc.	DUCKELINU. R-2011-2200109	Cost Rate
Blue Granite Water Co	12/10	Blue Granite Water Company	Docket No. 2019 292 WS	Rate of Roturn
Carolina Water Co.	02/18	Carolina Water Company	Docket No. 2017-202-WS	Pate of Paturn
Carolina Water Service, Inc.	02/10	Carolina Water Service, Inc.	Docket No. 2017-292-WS	Rate of Return
	00/15	Carolina water Service, Inc.	Docket No. 2010-199-WS	Rate of Return
L Carolina water Service, Inc.	11/13	Larolina water Service, Inc.	DOCKET NO. 2013-275-WS	Kate of Keturn

DOCKET NO. 20250029-GU EXHIBIT NO. DD-1 WITNESS: D'ASCENDIS DOCUMENT NO. 12 PAGE 7 OF 7 FILED: 03/31/2025



Sponsor	Date	Case/Applicant	Docket No.	Subject
United Utility Companies, Inc.	09/13	United Utility Companies, Inc.	Docket No. 2013-199-WS	Rate of Return
Utility Services of South Carolina.		Utility Services of South Carolina.		
Inc.	09/13	Inc.	Docket No. 2013-201-WS	Rate of Return
Tega Cay Water Services, Inc.	11/12	Tega Cay Water Services, Inc.	Docket No. 2012-177-WS	Capital Structure
sarth Dakate Public Service Commission				
Northern States Power Company	06/22	Northern States Power Company	Docket No. EL22-017	Rate of Return
Tennessee Public Utility Commission				
				Capital Structure,
CSWR – Limestone Water Utility	07/07	CSWR - Limestone Water Utility		Cost of Debt,
Operating Company	07/24	Operating Company	Docket No. 24-00044	Return on Equity
Pledmont Natural Gas Company	07/20	Pledmont Natural Gas Company	Docket No. 20-00086	Return on Equity
Public Durity Commission of the as	40/04		Desistente 67000	Deter (Determ
CSWR TX Utility Operating Co, LLC	12/24	CSWR TX Utility Operating Co, LLC	Docket No. 57386	Rate of Return
BVRT Utility Holding Co., LLC	07/24	Texas Water Utilities, LP	Docket No. 56664	Rate of Return
Iexas Water Utilities, LP	06/24	Texas Water Utilities, LP	Docket No. 56665	Rate of Return
Southwestern Public Service Co.	02/23	Southwestern Public Service Co.	Docket No. 54634	Return on Equity
CSWR – Texas Utility Operating	00/00	CSWR – Texas Utility Operating	Dookot No. 54565	Boto of Boturn
Company, LLC	02/23	Onean Flastria Dalivary Ca. LLC	Docket No. 54505	Rate of Return
Chicol Electric Delivery Co. LLC	00/22	Chicol Electric Delivery Co. LLC	Docket No. 53601	Return on Equity
Southwestern Flastric Bower Co.	10/20	Southwestern Flastria Dowar Co.	Docket No. 51602	Retuin on Equity
Sournwestern Electric Power Co.	10/20	Southwestern Electric Power Co.	DOCKELINO, 51415	Rate of Return
Atmos Energy Corporation Mid	Γ	Atmos Energy Corporation Mid		
Texas Division	11/24	Texas Division	Docket No. OS-24-00019196	Return on Equity
Atmos Energy Corporation – West	11/21	Atmos Energy Corporation – West		
Texas Division	10/24	Texas Division	Docket No. OS-24-00018879	Return on Equity
Atmos Pipeline – Texas, a Division		Atmos Pipeline – Texas, a Division		
of Atmos Energy Corporation	05/23	of Atmos Energy Corporation	Docket No. OS-23-00013758	Return on Equity
Virginia State Corporation Commiss on				
Aqua Virginia, Inc.	07/23	Aqua Virginia, Inc.	PUR-2023-00073	Rate of Return
Washington Gas Light Company	06/22	Washington Gas Light Company	PUR-2022-00054	Return on Equity
Virginia Natural Gas, Inc.	04/21	Virginia Natural Gas, Inc.	PUR-2020-00095	Return on Equity
Massanutten Public Service		Massanutten Public Service		
Corporation	12/20	Corporation	PUE-2020-00039	Return on Equity
Aqua Virginia, Inc.	07/20	Aqua Virginia, Inc.	PUR-2020-00106	Rate of Return
WGL Holdings, Inc.	07/18	Washington Gas Light Company	PUR-2018-00080	Rate of Return
Atmos Energy Corporation	05/18	Atmos Energy Corporation	PUR-2018-00014	Rate of Return
Aqua Virginia, Inc.	07/17	Aqua Virginia, Inc.	PUR-2017-00082	Rate of Return
Manager than Dubling and a	00/11	Manager Han Dubli O 1 O		Rate of Return /
massanutten Public Service Corp.	08/14	wassanutten Public Service Corp.	PUE-2014-00035	Kate Design
Public Service Commission of West	virginia	Managemethols Days 2		
FirstEnergy Service Company	05/23	Mononganela Power Company and	Case No. 23-0460-E-42T	Return on Equity
- Hotenergy Gervice Company	00/20	Monongahela Power Company and	0000 NO. 20-0400-L-421	
FirstEnergy Service Company	12/21	The Potomac Edison Company	Case No. 21-0857-E-CN (ELG)	Return on Equity
		Monongahela Power Company and		
FirstEnergy Service Company	11/21	The Potomac Edison Company	Case No. 21-0813-E-P (Solar)	Return on Equity