

Exhibit No.: BJC-001

Issues: Return on Equity

Witness: Billie Sue LaConte

Sponsoring Party: BJC Healthcare

Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony

Case No.: WR-2011-0337

SR-2011-0338

Date Testimony Prepared: November 17, 2011

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Missouri-American Water Company's )  
Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate ) File No. WR-2011-0337  
Increase for Water and Sewer Service Provided in ) File No. SR-2011-0338  
Missouri Service Areas )

**DIRECT TESTIMONY AND SCHEDULES**

**OF**

**BILLIE SUE LACONTE**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**BJC HEALTHCARE**

BJC Exhibit No. 1  
Date 2-21-12 Reporter JL  
File No. WR-2011-0337

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	BJC's Recommended Return on Equity.....	2
2	BJC Discounted Cash Flow Method .....	3
3	DCF Model.....	3
4	Capital Asset Pricing Model .....	9
5	Risk Factors .....	12

1 *BJC's Recommended Return on Equity*

2 Q WHAT RETURN ON EQUITY DID YOU CALCULATE FOR MAWC?

3 A Based on my analysis, I have determined a return on equity of 9.0%. The components of  
4 this are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Recommended Return on Equity

<u>Method</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>Avg.</u>
DCF Method-Constant Growth (Analyst Growth)	9.8%	10.1%
DCF Method-Constant Growth (GDP Growth)	8.4	8.7
DCF Method-Two-stage Growth (GDP Growth)	8.2	8.4
CAPM	9.1	9.2
Average	8.9%	9.1%

5 Q HOW DID YOU CALCULATE THE RECOMMENDED RETURN ON EQUITY?

6 A I used two Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) methods and the Capital Asset Pricing Method  
7 (CAPM). These are all standard methods (or formulas) that have been used for years.  
8 Where people differ is in the choices of the inputs: the group of comparable companies;  
9 the time period for calculating stock price; the estimated growth rate (or rates); the risk  
10 associated with various stocks and so on. Those choices affect the numerical results.  
11 Where I differ from MAWC is in the *values* of some inputs and, therefore, the results.

1 In other words, the expected return equals (1) the current dividend rate, plus (2) the  
2 expected growth in dividends. The expected growth in dividends is also measured by  
3 the expected growth in earnings.

4 Q HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE VALUES FOR THE STOCK PRICE, GROWTH RATE AND  
5 DIVIDEND?

6 A The stock prices are based on the average stock prices from August 10, 2011 to  
7 November 10, 2011, from Yahoo Finance. The growth rates are the forecast EPS growth  
8 rate for the next five years from Value Line Investment Analyzer (Value Line), Reuters  
9 and Yahoo Finance. The dividends are based on estimated dividends for 2011, also from  
10 Value Line.

11 Q WHAT COMPANIES DID YOU INCLUDE IN YOUR DCF ANALYSIS?

12 A I used the same list of regulated public water utilities as used by MAWC's witness,  
13 Pauline Ahern.

Table 2

Regulated Public Water Utilities

American States Water  
American Water Works  
Aqua America  
Artesian Resources Corporation  
California Water  
Connecticut Water Services  
Middlesex Water  
SJW Corporation  
York Water Company

1 Q WHY IS THIS USED?

2 A The underlying assumption is that mature, established companies can grow at a rate  
3 that is similar to or lower than the GDP growth rate. While some companies in the  
4 economy will grow faster than GDP for a while, this cannot happen consistently over a  
5 long period.

6 Q HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE FORECAST LONG-TERM GDP GROWTH RATE?

7 A The long-term GDP growth rate of 5.2% is based on The Congressional Budget Office's  
8 report *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2011-2021*, page 29, Table 2-1.

9 Q WHAT IS THE ROE USING THIS METHOD?

10 A The estimated RoE is:

Table 4  
Estimated RoE Single Stage DCF  
with Long-term GDP Growth

<u>Utility</u>	<u>Estimated RoE</u>
American States Water	8.4%
American Water Works	8.3
Aqua America	8.1
Artesian Resources Corp.	9.6
California Water	8.7
Connecticut Water Services	9.3
Middlesex Water	9.4
SJW Corporation	7.8
York Water Co.	8.3
Average	8.7
Median	8.4%

1 Q WHAT IS YOUR ESTIMATED ROE USING THE TWO-STAGE DCF METHOD?

2 A The estimated RoE is 8.2% using the two-stage model.

Table 5

Estimated RoE Using Two-Stage DCF Method

<u>Utility</u>	<u>Estimated RoE</u>
American States Water	8.2%
American Water Works	8.2
Aqua America	8.1
Artesian Resources Corporation	9.4
California Water	8.4
Connecticut Water Services	8.8
Middlesex Water	8.9
SJW Corporation	7.7
York Water Company	7.9
Average	8.4
Median	8.2%

3 Compared to the single stage method, the two-stage method provides a more realistic  
 4 expectation of growth, in the short-term and the long-term. A regulated utility's RoE  
 5 that is based solely on analysts' short-term forecasts may overstate (or understate) the  
 6 expected RoE. For example, the single stage DCF using analysts' forecasts produces a  
 7 RoE of 5.5% for Middlesex Water, and a RoE of 9.4% using forecast GDP, or a 390 basis  
 8 point difference. The two-stage method produces a RoE of 8.9%. The lower short-term  
 9 growth is recognized, but it does not dictate the estimated RoE for the long-term.

1 Q WHAT MARKET RISK PREMIUM (MRP) DID YOU USE IN YOUR ANALYSIS?

2 A I used 6.7%. This is the historical MRP, as shown in Ibbotson's *Stocks, Bonds, Bills and*  
3 *Inflation, 2010 Yearbook.*

4 Q WHAT IS BETA?

5 A Beta (B) measures the volatility of a security in comparison to the market as a whole. A  
6 beta equal to 1.00 means that a stock's price fluctuates exactly the same as the market  
7 as a whole. A beta higher than 1.00 implies the stock's price is more volatile than the  
8 market; a beta less than 1.00 implies the security's price is less volatile than the market.  
9 For example, the beta for the Las Vegas Sands, a casino company, is 2.70, whereas the  
10 beta for American Water Works (MAWC's parent corporation) is 0.65.

11 Q HOW DID YOU DETERMINE BETA?

12 A To determine the beta, I reviewed the betas of the same group of companies that I used  
13 in my DCF analysis. Based on this proxy group, the median beta is 0.70 and the average  
14 beta is 0.72.

15

1 Value Line betas have been adjusted and therefore reflect each utility's risk, there is no  
2 need to "re-adjust" them.

3 ***Risk Factors***

4 Q ARE THERE OTHER FACTORS TO CONSIDER WHEN DETERMINING THE COMPANY'S  
5 ROE?

6 A Yes, the Company's risk profile, including business risk and financial risk, may affect a  
7 utility's estimated RoE.

8 Q PLEASE COMMENT ON MAWC'S BUSINESS RISK PROFILE.

9 A As a regulated utility, MAWC's business risk profile is strong. Its parent company's  
10 business risk profile, per Standard and Poor's (S&P), is excellent (see Schedule PMA-10,  
11 Page 2). S&P uses five basic characteristics to determine business risk, including  
12 regulation, markets, operation, competitiveness and management. Regulated water  
13 utilities usually have an excellent or strong business risk, since they have a defined  
14 service territory that is generally not affected by competition, they provide an essential  
15 service and they have regulators that want to support the utility's financial profile.

16



Table 6

Key Financial Ratios

	<u>FFO/ Debt</u>	<u>Debt/ EBITDA</u>	<u>Debt/ Capital</u>
11.3% RoE	25%	3.12	49.4%
9.0% RoE	23%	3.51	49.4%
S&P Range	20%-30%	3-4	45%-50%

1 The ratios using a 9.0% RoE are within the same range as the ratios using an 11.3% RoE.  
2 The lower RoE should not warrant a change to its bond rating. In fact, the ratios for  
3 MAWC suggest it has lower financial risk than that of its parent company (significant  
4 versus aggressive, based on S&P's ratings method). The details of Table 6 are included  
5 in Schedule BSL-5.

6 Q SHOULD MAWC'S ROE BE ADJUSTED TO REFLECT ITS RISK PROFILE?

7 A No. As explained above, MAWC's risk profile as related to the comparable group of  
8 companies is similar and does not require any adjustment to my recommended RoE.

9 Q PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.

10 A I have estimated a return on equity for MAWC of 9.0%. Determining the appropriate  
11 return on equity for a utility is not an exact science; one must take into consideration

1

### Experience of Billie S. LaConte

2 Ms. LaConte joined Drazen Consulting Group, Inc. in May 1995. Her work has focused  
3 on cost allocation, rate design, sales and price forecasts, power cost forecasting, electric  
4 restructuring issues, cost of capital issues and contract interpretation.

5 Ms. LaConte has advised clients on economic and strategic issues concerning the natural  
6 gas pipeline, oil pipeline, electric, waste water and water industries. She has prepared cost  
7 allocation and rate design studies to provide timely support to clients engaged in settlement  
8 negotiations in electric and gas utility proceedings. Ms. LaConte has prepared cost of service  
9 studies for wastewater utilities. She has provided power cost forecasting studies to assist  
10 clients in project planning, negotiating contracts with electric utilities for standby services and  
11 interruptible rates. She has prepared studies on electric and gas utilities' performance-based  
12 rates (PBR) and benchmarking programs to evaluate their success and to provide  
13 recommendations on methods to be used. Ms. LaConte has worked on contract interpretation  
14 to resolve contract disputes for several clients.

15 Ms. LaConte has provided economic and strategic analysis and contract interpretation  
16 for clients located in several jurisdictions, including Georgia, Maine, Iowa, Virginia, Alberta,  
17 Québec and Nova Scotia. She has provided financial and cost of service analysis for natural gas  
18 pipelines certificate approval from the Federal Energy and Regulatory Commission (FERC) and  
19 the Canadian National Energy Board (NEB). Ms. LaConte has testified before the Missouri  
20 Public Service Commission on cost allocation, rate design, cost of capital and other matters.  
21 She testified before the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board on power cost forecasting issues,  
22 electric restructuring issues, sales and price forecasts and cost allocation issues. She has  
23 similarly testified before the Iowa Utilities Board, the St. Louis Metropolitan Sewer District  
24 Commission, the Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board and the Arkansas Public Service  
25 Commission.

## MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

### Estimated RoE Single Stage DCF with Analyst Growth Rates

<u>Utility</u>	<u>Close</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>Div.</u>	<u>Analysts' Estimated Growth Rates</u>				<u>RoE</u>
	<u>8/2011-11/2011</u>			<u>Dividend</u>	<u>Yield</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Yahoo</u>	
	<u>Avg. Stock Price</u>			<u>Line</u>	<u>Reuters</u>	<u>Finance</u>		
American States Water	34.04	1.10	3.2%	5.50%	7.15%	7.15%	6.60%	9.8%
American Water Works	29.63	0.91	3.1%	9.50%	11.09%	8.03%	9.54%	12.6%
Aqua America	21.59	0.62	2.9%	10.50%	7.60%	6.67%	8.26%	11.1%
Artesian Resources Corporation	17.91	0.79	4.4%	3.60%	5.00%	4.00%	4.20%	8.6%
California Water	17.68	0.62	3.5%	6.00%	7.00%	15.00%	9.33%	12.8%
Connecticut Water Services	22.62	0.93	4.1%	4.00%	5.50%	3.00%	4.17%	8.3%
Middlesex Water	17.52	0.73	4.2%	6.00%	-5.00%	3.00%	1.33%	5.5%
SJW Corporation	26.27	0.69	2.6%	7.50%	n/a	14.00%	10.75%	13.4%
York Water Company	16.85	0.52	3.1%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	9.1%
<b>Average</b>							6.7%	10.1%
<b>Median</b>							6.6%	9.8%

## MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

### Estimated RoE Using Single Stage DCF with Long Term GDP Growth

<u>Utility</u>	<u>Close</u> <u>8/2011-11/2011</u> <u>Avg. Stock Price</u>	<u>2011</u> <u>Dividend</u>	<u>Dividend</u> <u>Yield</u>	<u>Long Term</u> <u>GDP</u> <u>Growth Rate*</u>	<u>Estimated</u> <u>RoE</u>
American States Water	34.04	1.10	3.2%	5.20%	8.4%
American Water	29.63	0.91	3.1%	5.20%	8.3%
Aqua America	21.59	0.62	2.9%	5.20%	8.1%
Artesian Resources Corporation	17.91	0.79	4.4%	5.20%	9.6%
California Water	17.68	0.62	3.5%	5.20%	8.7%
Connecticut Water Services	22.62	0.93	4.1%	5.20%	9.3%
Middlesex Water	17.52	0.73	4.2%	5.20%	9.4%
SJW Corporation	26.27	0.69	2.6%	5.20%	7.8%
York Water Company	16.85	0.52	3.1%	5.20%	8.3%
<b>Average</b>					<b>8.7%</b>
<b>Median</b>					<b>8.4%</b>

\* Forecast long-term GDP growth rate from Congressional Budget Office, Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2011 to 2021.

## MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

### Estimated RoE Using Two-Stage DCF Model with Long Term GDP

<u>Utility</u>	<u>Close</u> 8/2011-11/2011 <u>Avg. Stock Price</u>	<u>2011</u> <u>Dividend</u>	<u>Est.</u> 2015 <u>Dividend</u>	<u>Annual</u> Change to 2015	<u>Recent</u> <u>Price</u>	<u>2011</u> Year 1 <u>Div.</u>	<u>2012</u> Year 2 <u>Div.</u>	<u>2013</u> Year 3 <u>Div.</u>	<u>2014</u> Year 4 <u>Div.</u>	<u>2015</u> Year 5 <u>Div.</u>	<u>Year 6-150</u> <u>Div Growth</u>	<u>IRR</u> Years 0-150 <u>RoE</u>
American States Water	34.04	1.10	1.28	0.05	(34.04)	1.10	1.15	1.19	1.24	1.28	5.20%	8.2%
American Water	29.63	0.91	1.10	0.05	(29.63)	0.91	0.96	1.01	1.05	1.10	5.20%	8.2%
Aqua America	21.59	0.62	0.78	0.04	(21.59)	0.62	0.66	0.70	0.74	0.78	5.20%	8.1%
Artesian Resources Corporation *	17.91	0.79	-	0.03	(17.91)	0.79	0.82	0.85	0.88	0.92	5.20%	9.4%
California Water	17.68	0.62	0.70	0.02	(17.68)	0.62	0.64	0.66	0.68	0.70	5.20%	8.4%
Connecticut Water Services *	22.62	0.93	-	0.02	(22.62)	0.93	0.95	0.96	0.98	0.99	5.20%	8.8%
Middlesex Water	17.52	0.73	0.80	0.02	(17.52)	0.73	0.75	0.77	0.78	0.80	5.20%	8.9%
SJW Corporation	26.27	0.69	0.82	0.03	(26.27)	0.69	0.72	0.76	0.79	0.82	5.20%	7.7%
York Water Company *	16.85	0.52	-	0.01	(16.85)	0.52	0.53	0.54	0.55	0.56	5.20%	7.9%
<b>Average</b>												8.4%
<b>Median</b>												8.2%

\* Estimated 2015 dividend not available. Annual dividend growth (col. 5) based on historical 5 year dividend growth rate.

## MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

### Estimate RoE using CAPM

<u>Line</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Value Line Beta</u>
1	American States Water	0.75
2	American Water	0.65
3	Aqua America	0.65
4	Artesian Resources Corporation	0.60
5	California Water	0.70
6	Connecticut Water Services	0.80
7	Middlesex Water	0.75
8	SJW Corporation	0.90
9	York Water Company	0.70
10	Group average	0.72
11	Group median	0.70
12	Market risk premium	6.70%
13	Equity risk premium - average beta <small>In. 10 * In. 12</small>	4.84%
14	Equity risk premium-median beta <small>In. 11 * In. 12</small>	4.69%
15	Risk free rate	4.38%
16	Estimated RoE-average beta <small>In. 13 + In. 15</small>	9.22%
17	Estimated RoE-median beta <small>In. 14 + In. 15</small>	9.07%

Market risk premium is historical market risk premium as shown in Ibbotson SBB 2011 Valuation Yearbook.

Risk free rate based on forecast yield of US 30 treasury bond for May 2012, as of November, 2011.

## MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

### Effect of Lower Return on Equity

<u>Line</u>	<u>Type of Capital</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Cost Rate</u>	<u>Wtd. RoR</u>
1	Long-Term Debt	Schedule PMA-1,p.1	\$423,114,710	49.4%	6.36%	3.14%
2	Preferred Stock	Schedule PMA-1,p.1	2,306,034	0.3%	9.23%	0.02%
3	Common Equity	Schedule PMA-1,p.1	431,741,678	50.4%	11.30%	5.69%
4	<b>Total</b>		<b>\$857,162,422</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>8.86%</b>
	<u>Type of Capital</u>		<u>Amount</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>Cost Rate</u>	<u>Wtd. RoR</u>
5	Long-Term Debt		\$423,114,710	49.4%	6.36%	3.14%
6	Preferred Stock		2,306,034	0.3%	9.23%	0.02%
7	Common Equity		431,741,678	50.4%	9.00%	4.53%
8	<b>Total</b>		<b>\$857,162,422</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>7.70%</b>
9	Rate base	Schedule CAS-1,p.1	\$849,106,802			
10	Return 11.3% RoE	In. 9 * In.4, c. 4	75,196,352			
11	Return 9.0% RoE	In. 9 * In. 8, c.4	65,359,616			
12	<b>Difference</b>		<b>\$9,836,736</b>			
13	<b>Debt</b>		<b>\$423,114,710</b>			
			<u>11.3% RoE</u>	<u>9.0% RoE</u>		
14	Operating income	Schedule CAS-2, p.1	\$75,145,964	\$65,309,228		
15	Depreciation	Schedule CAS-2, p.1	30,023,171	30,023,171		
16	Amortization	Schedule CAS-2, p.1	500,278	500,278		
17	Deferred income tax	Schedule CAS-2, p.1	449,557	449,557		
18	<b>Fund from operations (FFO)</b>		<b>\$106,118,970</b>	<b>\$96,282,234</b>		
19	<b>FFO/Debt</b>	In. 18 / In. 13	<b>25%</b>	<b>23%</b>		
			<u>11.3% RoE</u>	<u>9.0% RoE</u>		
20	Operating income		\$75,145,964	\$65,309,228		
21	Depreciation		30,023,171	30,023,171		
22	Amortization		500,278	500,278		
23	Federal income tax	Schedule CAS-2, p.1	26,095,008	21,211,600		
24	State income tax	Schedule CAS-2, p.1	3,990,986	3,449,995		
25	<b>Earnings before inc. tax, depr/amort.</b>		<b>\$135,755,407</b>	<b>\$120,494,273</b>		
26	<b>Debt/EBITDA</b>		<b>3.12</b>	<b>3.51</b>		

Notes: 9.0% RoE federal tax estimated using 33.175%; State tax estimated using 5.213% tax rate.

Tax rates from Schedule CAS-9, p.1.

Rate base from Schedule CAS-1, page 1.