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# BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF 

DYLAN W. D'ASCENDIS, CRRA, CVA ON BEHALF OF TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY

## I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Q. Please state your name, affiliation, and business address.
A. My name is Dylan W. D'Ascendis. I am a Director at ScottMadden, Inc. My business address is 3000 Atrium Way, Suite 241, Mount Laurel, New Jersey 08054.
Q. On whose behalf are you submitting this testimony?
A. I am submitting this direct testimony before the Florida Public Service Commission ("Commission") on behalf of Tampa Electric Company ("Tampa Electric" or the "company").
Q. Please summarize your educational background and professional experience.
A. I am a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, where I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economic History. I have also received a Master of Business Administration with
high honors and concentrations in Finance and International Business from Rutgers University.

I have offered expert testimony on behalf of investor-owned utilities in over 25 state regulatory commissions in the United States, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Alberta Utility Commission, and one American Arbitration Association panel 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 of "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 of "Certified Valuation Analyst" by the NACVA in 2015.

The details of my educational background and expert witness appearances are provided in Document No. 1 of Exhibit No. (DWD-1) .
Q. What is the purpose of your prepared direct testimony in this proceeding?
A. The purpose of my direct testimony is to present evidence on behalf of Tampa Electric and recommend a return on equity ("ROE") to be used for ratemaking purposes in this proceeding.
Q. Have you prepared an exhibit in support of your prepared direct testimony?
A. Yes. My analyses and conclusions are supported by the data presented in Document Nos. 2 through 13 of Exhibit No. (DWD1), which have been prepared by me or under my direction and supervision.

## II. SUMMARY

Q. What is your recommended ROE for Tampa Electric?
A. I recommend that the Commission authorize Tampa Electric the opportunity to earn an ROE of 10.75 percent on its jurisdictional rate base. The ratemaking capital structure and cost of long-term debt is sponsored by Tampa Electric witnesses Jeffrey S. Chronister and Kenneth McOnie.
Q. Please summarize the support for your recommended ROE for Tampa Electric.
A. My recommended ROE of 10.75 percent is summarized in Document No. 2. To support my ROE recommendation, I have assessed the market-based common equity cost rates of companies of relatively similar, but not necessarily identical, risk to Tampa Electric. Using companies of relatively comparable risk as proxies is consistent with the principles of fair rate of return established by the United States 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 identical 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 applying several cost of common equity models, specifically the Discounted Cash Flow ("DCF") model, the Risk Premium Model ("RPM"), and the Capital Asset Pricing Model ("CAPM"), to the market data of the Utility Proxy Group whose selection criteria will be discussed below. In addition, I applied the DCF model, RPM, and CAPM to the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group as discussed further below. The results derived from each are summarized in Document No. 2.

As shown in Document No. 2, I adjusted the indicated common equity cost rate to reflect the effect of flotation costs, as well as the company's business risks associated with its smaller relative size and lack of geographic diversification as compared to the Utility Proxy Group. These adjustments resulted in a company-specific indicated range of common equity cost rates between 10.30 percent and 11.30 percent. Given the Utility Proxy Group and company-specific ranges of common equity cost rates, and the company's high customer growth and level of capital investment plans, my recommended ROE for the company is 10.75 percent.
Q. Please summarize the company's proposed capital structure.
A. The company is proposing a capital structure which includes a 55.00 percent common equity ratio. That common equity ratio is consistent with the company's historical equity ratios, and the equity ratios maintained by the Utility Proxy Group and their operating subsidiary utility companies.

## III. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Q. What general principles have you considered in arriving at your recommended common equity cost rate of 10.75 percent?
A. In unregulated industries, marketplace competition is the principal determinant of the price of products or services. For regulated public utilities, regulation must act as a substitute for marketplace competition. Assuring that a utility can fulfill its obligations to the public, while providing safe and reliable service at all times, requires a level of earnings sufficient to maintain the integrity of presently invested capital. Sufficient earnings also permit a utility to attract needed new capital at a reasonable cost, for which the utility must compete with other firms of comparable risk, consistent with the fair rate of return standards established by the U.S. Supreme Court in the
previously cited Hope and Bluefield cases. Consequently, marketplace data must be relied on in assessing a common equity cost rate appropriate for ratemaking purposes. Just as the use of market data for the Utility Proxy Group adds the reliability necessary to inform expert judgment in arriving at a recommended common equity cost rate, the use of multiple generally accepted common equity cost rate models also adds reliability and accuracy when arriving at a recommended common equity cost rate.

## Business Risk

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

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 risks 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 include, but are not limited to, the regulatory environment, mandatory environmental compliance requirements, customer mix and concentration of customers, service territory economic growth, market demand, risks and uncertainties of supply, operations, capital intensity, size, the degree of operating leverage, emerging technologies including distributed energy resources, the vagaries of weather, all of which have a direct bearing on earnings. Although analysts, including rating agencies, may categorize business risks individually, as a practical matter, such risks are interrelated and not wholly distinct from one another. Therefore, it is difficult to specifically and numerically quantify the effect of any individual risk on investors' required return, i.e., the cost of capital. For determining an appropriate return on common equity, the relevant issue is where investors see the subject company as falling within a spectrum of risk. To the extent investors view a company as being exposed to higher risk, the required return will increase, and vice versa.

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

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 of events that may lead to losses, however, also are uncertain and, consequently, those risks and their implications for the required return on equity tend to be difficult to quantify. Regulatory commissions (like investors who commit their capital) must review a variety of quantitative and qualitative data and apply their reasoned judgment to determine how long-term risks weigh in
their assessment of the market-required return on common equity.

## Financial Risk

Q. Please define financial risk and explain why it is important in determining a fair rate of return.
A. Financial risk is the additional risk created by the introduction of debt and preferred stock into the capital structure. The higher the proportion of debt and preferred stock in the capital structure, the higher the financial risk to common equity owners (i.e., failure to receive dividends due to default or other covenants). Therefore, consistent with the basic financial principle of risk and return, common equity investors require higher returns as compensation for bearing higher financial risk.
Q. Can bond and credit ratings be a proxy for a firm's combined business and financial risks to equity owners (i.e., investment risk)?
A. Yes, similar bond ratings/issuer credit ratings reflect, and are representative of, similar combined business and financial risks (i.e., total risk) faced by bond investors. ${ }^{1}$ Although specific business or financial risks may differ
between companies, the same bond/credit rating indicates that the combined risks are roughly similar from a debtholder perspective. The caveat is that these debtholder risk measures do not translate directly to risks for common equity.
Q. Do rating agencies account for company size in their bond ratings?
A. No. Neither Standard \& Poor's ("S\&P") nor Moody's Investor Services ("Moody's") have minimum company size requirements for any given rating level. This means, all else being equal, a relative size analysis must be conducted for equity investments in companies with similar bond ratings.

## IV. TAMPA ELECTRIC AND THE UTILITY PROXY GROUP

Q. Are you familiar with the company's operations?
A. Yes. Tampa Electric's electric division provides generation, transmission, and distribution electric service to approximately 800,000 retail customers in Florida. ${ }^{2}$ Tampa Electric has long-term issuer ratings of A3 from Moody's and BBB+ from S\&P. ${ }^{3}$ The company is not publicly traded as it comprises an operating subsidiary of TECO Energy, Inc., whose ultimate parent is Emera Incorporated ("Emera" or the
"Parent"). Emera has electric generation, transmission, and distribution operations, natural gas transmission and distribution operations, and non-regulated energy marketing operations in Canada, the United States, and the Caribbean. ${ }^{4}$

Page 1 of Document No. 3 contains comparative capitalization and financial statistics for Tampa Electric for the years 2015 to 2019.5 During the five-year period ending 2019, the historically achieved average earnings rate on book common equity for the company averaged 10.77 percent. The average common equity ratio based on total permanent capital (excluding short-term debt) was 55.44 percent, and the average dividend payout ratio was 99.71 percent.

Total debt to earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization for the years 2015 to 2019 ranges between 2.65 and 3.82 times, with an average of 3.10 times. Funds from operations to total debt range from 20.92 percent to 32.22 percent, with an average of 25.46 percent.
Q. Please explain how you chose the companies in the Utility Proxy Group.
A. The companies selected for the Utility Proxy Group met the following criteria:

- They were included in the Eastern, Central, or Western Electric Utility Group of Value Line (Standard Edition);
- They have 70.00 percent or greater of fiscal year 2019 total operating income derived from, and 70.00 percent or greater of fiscal year 2019 total assets attributable to, regulated electric operations;
- They are vertically integrated (i.e., utilities that own and operate regulated generation, transmission, and distribution assets);
- At the time of preparation of this direct testimony, they had not publicly announced that they were involved in any major merger or acquisition activity (i.e., one publicly traded utility merging with or acquiring another) or any other major development;
- They have not cut or omitted their common dividends during the five years ending 2019 or through the time of preparation of this direct testimony;
- They have Value Line and Bloomberg Professional Services ("Bloomberg") adjusted Betas;
- They have positive Value Line five-year dividends per share ("DPS") growth rate projections; and
- They have Value Line, Zacks, or Yahoo! Finance consensus five-year earnings per share ("EPS") growth rate projections.

The following 13 companies met these criteria: ALLETE, Inc. (ALE); Alliant Energy Corporation (LNT); Ameren Corporation (AEE); Duke Energy Corporation (DUK); Edison International (EIX); Entergy Corporation (ETR); IDACORP, Inc. (IDA); NorthWestern Corporation (NWE); OGE Energy Corporation (OGE); Otter Tail Corporation (OTTR); Pinnacle West Capital Corporation (PNW); Portland General Electric Company (POR); and Xcel Energy, Inc. (XEL).
Q. Please describe Document No. 3, page 2.
A. Page 2 of Document No. 3 contains comparative capitalization and financial statistics for the Utility Proxy Group for the years 2015 to 2019 .

During the five-year period ending 2019, the historically achieved average earnings rate on book common equity for the Utility Proxy Group averaged 8.92 percent, the average common equity ratio based on total permanent capital (excluding short-term debt) was 48.93 percent, and the average dividend payout ratio was 53.55 percent.

Total debt to earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization for the years 2015 to 2019 for the Utility Proxy Group ranges between 3.96 and 5.30 times, with an
average of 4.52 times. Finally, funds from operations to total debt for the Utility Proxy Group range from 15.01 percent to 23.50 percent, with an average of 19.71 percent.

## V. CAPITAL STRUCTURE

Q. What is Tampa Electric's requested capital structure?
A. The company's requested capital structure (investor sources) consists of 45.00 percent long-term debt and 55.00 percent common equity. Tampa Electric's requested capital structure is its projected capital structure at the end of the test year, as testified to by Mr. McOnie.
Q. Does Tampa Electric have a separate capital structure that is recognized by investors?
A. Yes. Tampa Electric is a separate corporate entity that has its own capital structure and issues its own debt. Tampa Electric's actual capital structure is reflected in registrations of its debt issuances with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission.
Q. What are the typical sources of capital commonly considered in establishing a utility's capital structure?
A. Common equity and long-term debt are commonly considered in establishing a utility's capital structure because they are the typical sources of capital financing for a utility's rate base.
Q. Please explain.
A. Long-lived assets are typically financed with long-lived securities, so that the overall term structure of the utility's long-term liabilities (both debt and equity) closely match the life of the assets being financed. As stated by Brigham and Houston:
In practice, firms don't finance each specific asset
with a type of capital that has a maturity equal to the
asset's life. However, academic studies do show that
most firms tend to finance short-term assets from
short-term sources and long-term assets from long-term
sources. ${ }^{6}$

Whereas short-term debt has a maturity of one year or less, long-term debt may have maturities of 30 years or longer. Although there are practical financing constraints, such as the need to "stagger" long-term debt maturities, the general objective is to extend the average life of long-term debt. Still, long-term debt has a finite life, which is likely to be less than the life of the assets included in rate base.

Common equity, on the other hand, is outstanding into perpetuity. Thus, common equity more accurately matches the life of the going concern of the utility, which is also assumed to operate in perpetuity. Consequently, it is both typical and important for utilities to have significant proportions of common equity in their capital structures.
Q. Why is it important that the company's requested capital structure, consisting of 45.00 percent long-term debt and 55.00 percent common equity, be authorized in this proceeding?
A. In order to provide safe, reliable, and affordable service to its customers, Tampa Electric must meet the needs and serve the interests of its various stakeholders, including its customers, shareholders, and bondholders. The interests of these stakeholder groups are aligned with maintaining a healthy balance sheet, strong credit ratings, and a supportive regulatory environment, so that the company has access to capital on reasonable terms in order to make necessary investments.

Safe and reliable service cannot be maintained at a reasonable cost if utilities do not have the financial flexibility and strength to access competitive financing
markets on reasonable terms. As Mr. McOnie explains, an appropriate capital structure is important not only to ensure long-term financial integrity, it also is critical to enabling access to capital during constrained markets, or when near-term liquidity is needed to fund extraordinary requirements. In that respect, the capital structure, and the financial strength it engenders, must support both normal circumstances and periods of market uncertainty. The authorization of a capital structure that understates the company's actual common equity will weaken the financial condition of its operations and adversely impact the company's ability to address expenses and investments, to the detriment of customers and shareholders. Safe and reliable service for customers cannot be sustained over the long term if the interests of shareholders and bondholders are minimized such that the public interest is not optimized.
Q. How does the company's requested common equity ratio of 55.00 percent compare with the common equity ratios maintained by the Utility Proxy Group?
A. The company's requested ratemaking common equity ratio of 55.00 percent is reasonable and consistent with the range of common equity ratios maintained by the utility Proxy

Group. As shown on pages 3 and 4 of Document No. 3, common equity ratios of the Utility Proxy Group companies range from 36.11 percent to 58.04 percent for fiscal year 2019 .

I also considered the Value Line projected capital structures for the Utility Proxy Group companies for 20232025. That analysis shows a range of projected common equity ratios between 37.50 percent and 59.00 percent (see, pages 2 through 14 of Document No. 4).

In addition to comparing the company's actual common equity ratio with current and projected common equity ratios maintained by the Utility Proxy Group companies, I also compared the company's actual common equity ratio with the equity ratios maintained by the utility operating subsidiaries of the Utility Proxy Group companies. As shown on page 5 of Document No. 3, common equity ratios of the utility operating subsidiaries of the Utility Proxy Group range from 47.47 percent to 65.22 percent for fiscal year 2019.
Q. Is Tampa Electric's equity ratio of 55.00 percent appropriate for ratemaking purposes given these measures cited above?
A. Yes, it is. The company's equity ratio of 55.00 percent is appropriate for ratemaking purposes in the current proceeding because it is within the range of the common equity ratios currently maintained, and expected to be maintained, by the Utility Proxy Group and their utility operating subsidiaries.

## VI. COMMON EQUITY COST RATE MODELS

## Discounted Cash Flow Model

Q. What is the theoretical basis of the DCF model?
A. The theory underlying the DCF model is that the present value of an expected future stream of net cash flows during the investment holding period can be determined by discounting those cash flows at the cost of capital, or the investors' capitalization rate. DCF theory indicates that an investor buys a stock for an expected total return rate, which is derived from the cash flows received from dividends and market price appreciation. Mathematically, the dividend yield on market price plus a growth rate equals the capitalization rate, i.e., the total common equity return rate expected by investors.
Q. Which version of the DCF model did you rely on?
A. I used the single-stage constant growth DCF model in my analyses.
Q. Please describe the dividend yield you used in applying the constant growth DCF model.
A. The unadjusted dividend yields are based on the Utility Proxy Group companies' dividends as of January 29, 2021, divided by the average closing market price for the 60 trading days ended January 29, 2021 (see, Column 1, page 1 of Document No. 4).
Q. Please explain your adjustment to the dividend yield.
A. Because dividends are paid periodically (e.g., quarterly), as opposed to continuously (daily), an adjustment must be made to the dividend yield. This is often referred to as the discrete, or the Gordon Periodic, version of the DCF model.

DCF theory calls for using the full growth rate, or $D_{1}$, in calculating the model's dividend yield component. Since the companies in the Utility Proxy Group increase their quarterly dividends at various times during the year, a reasonable assumption is to reflect one-half of the annual dividend growth rate in the dividend yield component, or

D1/2. Because the dividend should be representative of the next 12-month period, this adjustment is a conservative approach that does not overstate the dividend yield. Therefore, the actual average dividend yields in Column 1, page 1 of Document No. 4 were adjusted upward to reflect one-half of the average projected growth rate shown in Column 6.
Q. Please explain the basis for the growth rates you apply to the Utility Proxy Group in your constant growth DCF model.
A. Investors with more limited resources than institutional investors are likely to rely on widely available financial information services, such as Value Line, Zacks, and Yahoo! Finance. Investors realize that analysts have significant insight into the dynamics of the industries and individual companies they analyze, as well as companies' abilities to effectively manage the effects of changing laws and regulations, and ever-changing economic and market conditions. For these reasons, I used analysts' five-year forecasts of EPS growth in my DCF analysis.

Over the long run, there can be no growth in DPS without growth in EPS. Security analysts' earnings expectations have a more significant influence on market prices than dividend
expectations. Thus, using projected earnings growth rates in a DCF analysis provides a better match between investors' market price appreciation expectations and the growth rate component of the DCF.
Q. Please summarize the constant growth DCF model results.
A. As shown on page 1 of Document No. 4, the application of the constant growth DCF model to the Utility Proxy Group results in a wide range of indicated ROEs from 6.28 percent to 11.20 percent. The adjusted mean of those results is 9.03 percent, the adjusted median result is 8.85 percent, and the average of the two is 8.94 percent. In arriving at a conclusion for the constant growth DCF-indicated common equity cost rate for the Utility Proxy Group, I relied on an average of the mean and the median results of the DCF.

## The Risk Premium Model

Q. Please describe the theoretical basis of the RPM.
A. The RPM is based on the fundamental financial principle of risk and return; namely, that investors require greater returns for bearing greater risk. The RPM recognizes that common equity capital has greater investment risk than debt capital, as common equity shareholders are behind
debtholders in any claim on a company's assets and earnings. As 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 yields, the investors' required common equity returns cannot be directly determined or observed. According to RPM theory, one can estimate a common equity risk premium over bonds (either historically or prospectively) and use that premium to derive a cost rate of common equity. The cost of common equity equals the expected cost rate for long-term debt capital, plus a risk premium over that cost rate, to compensate common shareholders for the added risk of being unsecured and last-in-line for any claim on the corporation's assets and earnings upon liquidation.
Q. Please explain how you derived your indicated cost of common equity based on the RPM.
A. To derive my indicated cost of common equity under the RPM, I used two risk premium methods. The first method was the Predictive Risk Premium Model ("PRPM"), and the second method was a risk premium model using a total market approach. The PRPM estimates the risk-return relationship
directly, while the total market approach indirectly derives a risk premium by using known metrics as a proxy for risk.
Q. Please explain the first risk premium method (i.e., the PRPM) .
A. The PRPM, published in the Journal of Regulatory Economics, ${ }^{7}$ was developed from the work of Robert F. Engle III, who shared the Nobel Prize in Economics in 2003 "for methods of analyzing economic time series with time-varying volatility" or ARCH. ${ }^{8}$ Engle found that volatility changes over time and is related from one period to the next, especially in financial markets. Furthermore, Engle discovered that the volatility of prices and returns cluster over time and is, therefore, highly predictable and can be used to predict future levels of risk and risk premiums.

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).

The inputs to the model are the historical returns on the
common shares of each Utility Proxy Group company minus the historical monthly yield on long-term United States Treasury securities through January 2021. Using a generalized form of ARCH, known as GARCH, I calculated each Utility Proxy Group company's 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 (see, Columns 1 and 2, page 2 of Document No. 5) and a GARCH coefficient (see, Column 4, page 2 of Document No. 5). Multiplying the predicted monthly variance by the GARCH coefficient and then annualizing it9 produces the predicted annual equity risk premium. I then added the forecasted 30 -year U.S. Treasury bond yield of 2.31 percent (see, Column 6, page 2 of Document No. 5.) to each company's PRPM-derived equity risk premium to arrive at an indicated cost of common equity. The 30 -year U.S. Treasury bond yield is a consensus forecast derived from Blue Chip Financial Forecasts ("Blue Chip"). ${ }^{10}$

As shown on page 2 of Document No. 5, the mean PRPM indicated common equity cost rate for the Utility Proxy Group is 10.47 percent, the median is 10.24 percent, and the average of the two is 10.36 percent. Consistent with my reliance on the average of the median and mean results of the DCF models, I relied on the average of the mean and median results of the

Utility Proxy Group PRPM to calculate a cost of common equity rate of 10.36 percent.
Q. Please explain the second risk premium method (i.e., the total market approach RPM).
A. The total market approach RPM adds a prospective public utility bond yield to an average of: (1) an equity risk premium that is derived from a Beta-adjusted total market equity risk premium, (2) an equity risk premium based on the S\&P Utilities Index, and (3) an equity risk premium based on authorized ROEs for electric utilities.
Q. Please explain the basis of the expected bond yield of 3.66 percent applicable to the Utility Proxy Group.
A. The first step in the total market approach RPM analysis is to determine the expected bond yield. Because both ratemaking and the cost of capital, including the common equity cost rate, are prospective in nature, a prospective yield on similarly-rated long-term debt is essential. I relied on a consensus forecast of about 50 economists of the expected yield on Aaa-rated corporate bonds for the six calendar quarters ending with the second calendar quarter of 2022, and Blue Chip's long-term projections for 2022 to

2026, and 2027 to 2031. As shown on line 1, page 3 of Document No. 5, the average expected yield on Moody's Aaarated corporate bonds is 3.06 percent. In order to adjust the expected Aaa-rated corporate bond yield to an equivalent A2-rated public utility bond yield, I made an upward adjustment of 0.50 percent, which represents a recent spread between Aaa-rated corporate bonds and A2-rated public utility bonds (as shown on line 2 and explained in note 2 on page 3 of Document No. 5). Adding that recent 0.50 percent spread to the expected Aaa-rated corporate bond yield of 3.06 percent results in an expected A2-rated public utility bond yield of 3.56 percent. Since the Utility Proxy Group's average Moody's long-term issuer rating is A3, another adjustment to the expected A2-rated public utility bond is needed to reflect this difference in bond ratings. An upward adjustment of 0.10 percent, which represents one-third of a recent spread between A2-rated and Baa2-rated public utility bond yields, is necessary to make the A2 prospective bond yield applicable to an A3-rated public utility bond (as shown on line 4 and explained in note 3 on page 3 of Document No. 5). Adding the 0.10 percent to the 3.56 percent prospective A2-rated public utility bond yield results in a 3.66 percent expected bond yield applicable to the Utility Proxy Group as shown on page 3 of Document No. 5.
Q. Please explain how the Beta-derived equity risk premium is determined.
A. The components of the Beta-derived risk premium model are: (1) an expected market equity risk premium over corporate bonds, and (2) the Beta coefficient. The derivation of the Beta-derived equity risk premium that I applied to the Utility Proxy Group is shown on lines 1 through 9, on page 8 of Document No. 5. The total Beta-derived equity risk premium I applied is based on an average of three historical market data-based equity risk premiums, two Value Line-based equity risk premiums, and a Bloomberg-based equity risk premium. Each of these is described below.
Q. How did you derive a market equity risk premium based on long-term historical data?
A. To derive an historical market equity risk premium, I used the most recent holding period returns for the large company common stocks from the Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation ("SBBI") Yearbook 2020 ("SBBI - 2020") ${ }^{11}$ less the average historical yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds for the period 1928 to 2019. Using holding period returns over a long period of time is appropriate because it is consistent with the long-term investment horizon presumed by investing
in a going concern, i.e., a company expected to operate in perpetuity.

SBBI's long-term arithmetic mean monthly total return rate on large company common stocks was 11.83 percent and the long-term arithmetic mean monthly yield on Moody's Aaa/Aarated corporate bonds was 6.05 percent (as explained in note 1, page 9 of Document No. 5). As shown on line 1 , page 8 of Document No. 5, subtracting the mean monthly bond yield from the total return on large company stocks results in a longterm historical equity risk premium of 5.78 percent.

I used the arithmetic mean monthly total return rates for the large company stocks and yields (income returns) for the Moody's Aaa/Aa corporate bonds, because they are appropriate for the purpose of estimating the cost of capital as noted in SBBI - 2020. ${ }^{12}$ Using the arithmetic mean return rates and yields is appropriate because historical total returns and equity risk premiums provide insight into the variance and standard deviation of returns needed by investors in estimating future risk when making a current investment. If investors relied on the geometric mean of historical equity risk premiums, they would have no insight into the potential variance of future returns, because the geometric mean relates the change over many periods to a constant rate of
change, thereby obviating the year-to-year fluctuations, or variance, which is critical to risk analysis.
Q. Please explain the derivation of the regression-based market equity risk premium.
A. To derive the regression-based market equity risk premium of 9.30 percent shown on line 2, page 8 of Document No. 5, I used the same monthly annualized total returns on large company common stocks relative to the monthly annualized yields on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds as mentioned above. I modeled the relationship between interest rates and the market equity risk premium using the observed monthly market equity risk premium as the dependent variable, and the monthly yield on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds as the independent variable. I then used a linear Ordinary Least Squares ("OLS") regression, in which the market equity risk premium is expressed as a function of the Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds yield:

$$
R P=\alpha+\beta\left(R_{\text {Aaa/Aa }}\right)
$$

Q. Please explain the derivation of the PRPM equity risk premium.
A. I applied the same PRPM approach described above to the PRPM equity risk premium. The inputs to the model are the historical monthly returns on large company common stocks minus the monthly yields on Moody's Aaa/Aa-rated corporate bonds during the period from January 1928 through January 2021. ${ }^{13}$ Using the previously discussed generalized form of ARCH, known as GARCH, the projected equity risk premium is determined using Eviews© statistical software. The resulting PRPM predicted a market equity risk premium of 9.65 percent (see, line 3, page 8 of Document No. 5).
Q. Please explain the derivation of a projected equity risk premium based on Value Line data for your RPM analysis.
A. As noted above, because both ratemaking and the cost of capital are prospective, a prospective market equity risk premium is needed. The derivation of the forecasted or prospective market equity risk premium can be found in note 4, page 9 of Document No. 5. Consistent with my calculation of the dividend yield component in my DCF analysis, this prospective market equity risk premium is derived from an average of the three- to five-year median market price appreciation potential by Value Line for the 13 weeks ended January 29, 2021, plus an average of the median estimated dividend yield for the common stocks of the 1,700 firms
covered in Value Line (as explained in note 1, page 2 of Document No. 6).

The average median expected price appreciation is 35.00 percent, which translates to a 7.79 percent annual appreciation, and when added to the average of Value Line's median expected dividend yields of 2.04 percent, equates to a forecasted annual total return rate on the market of 9.83 percent. The forecasted Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bond yield of 3.06 percent is deducted from the total market return of 9.83 percent, resulting in an equity risk premium of 6.77 percent, as shown on line 4 , page 8 of Document No. 5.
Q. Please explain the derivation of an equity risk premium based on the S\&P 500 companies.
A. Using data from Value Line, I calculated an expected total return on the $S \& P 500$ companies using expected dividend yields and long-term growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation. The expected total return for the $S \& P 500$ is 14.10 percent. Subtracting the prospective yield on Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bonds of 3.06 percent results in a 11.04 percent projected equity risk premium as shown on line 5, page 8 of Document No. 5.
Q. Please explain the derivation of an equity risk premium based on Bloomberg data.
A. Using data from Bloomberg, I calculated an expected total return on the $S \& P 500$ using expected dividend yields and long-term growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation, identical to the method described above. The expected total return for the $S \& P 500$ is 17.78 percent. Subtracting the prospective yield on Moody's Aaa-rated corporate bonds of 3.06 percent results in a 14.72 percent projected equity risk premium as shown on line 6, page 8 of Document No. 5.
Q. What is your conclusion of a Beta-derived equity risk premium for use in your RPM analysis?
A. I gave equal weight to all six equity risk premiums based on each source - historical, Value Line, and Bloomberg - in arriving at a 9.54 percent equity risk premium as shown on line 7, page 8 of Document No. 5.

After calculating the average market equity risk premium of 9.54 percent, I adjusted it by the Beta coefficient to account for the risk of the Utility Proxy Group. As discussed below, the Beta coefficient is a meaningful measure of
prospective relative risk to the market as a whole, and is a logical way to allocate a company's, or proxy group's, share of the market's total equity risk premium relative to corporate bond yields. As shown on page 1 of Document No. 6, the average of the mean and median Beta coefficient for the Utility Proxy Group is 0.96 . Multiplying the 0.96 average Beta coefficient by the market equity risk premium of 9.54 percent results in a Beta-adjusted equity risk premium for the Utility Proxy Group of 9.16 percent (see line 9, page 8 of Document No. 5).
Q. How did you derive the equity risk premium based on the $S \& P$ Utility Index and Moody's A-rated public utility bonds?
A. I estimated three equity risk premiums based on the $S \& P$ Utility Index holding period returns, and two equity risk premiums based on the expected returns of the $S \& P$ Utilities Index, using Value Line and Bloomberg data, respectively. Turning first to the S\&P Utility Index holding period returns, I derived a long-term monthly arithmetic mean equity risk premium between the $S \& P$ Utility Index total returns of 10.74 percent and monthly Moody's A-rated public utility bond yields of 6.53 percent from 1928 to 2019 to arrive at an equity risk premium of 4.21 percent (as shown on line 1, page 12 of Document No. 5.). I then used the same
historical data to derive an equity risk premium of 6.83 percent based on a regression of the monthly equity risk premiums (as shown on line 2 , page 12 of Document No. 5). The final S\&P Utility Index holding period equity risk premium involved applying the PRPM using the historical monthly equity risk premiums from January 1928 to January 2021 to arrive at a PRPM-derived equity risk premium of 5.59 percent for the $S \& P$ Utility Index (as shown on line 3, page 12 of Document No. 5).

I then derived expected total returns on the S\&P Utilities Index of 10.36 percent and 7.67 percent using data from Value Line and Bloomberg, respectively, and subtracted the prospective Moody's A2-rated public utility bond yield of 3.56 percent (derived on line 3, page 3 of Document No. 5), which resulted in equity risk premiums of 6.80 percent and 4.11 percent, respectively (as shown on lines 4 and 5, respectively, on page 12 of Document No. 5). As with the market equity risk premiums, I averaged each risk premium based on each source (i.e., historical, Value Line, and Bloomberg) to arrive at my utility-specific equity risk premium of 5.51 percent as shown on line 6, page 12 of Document No. 5.
Q. How do you derive an equity risk premium of 5.92 percent
based on authorized ROEs for electric utilities?
A. The equity risk premium of 5.92 percent shown on line 3, page 7 of Document No. 5 is the result of a regression analysis based on regulatory awarded ROEs related to the yields on Moody's A2-rated public utility bonds. That analysis is shown on page 13 of Document No. 5. Page 13 of Document No. 5 contains the graphical results of a regression analysis of 1,179 rate cases for electric utilities which were fully litigated during the period from January 1, 1980, through January 29, 2021. It shows the implicit equity risk premium relative to the yields on A2rated public utility bonds immediately prior to the issuance of each regulatory decision. It is readily discernible that there is an inverse relationship between the yield on A2rated public utility bonds and equity risk premiums. In other words, as interest rates decline, the equity risk premium rises and vice versa, a result consistent with financial literature on the subject. ${ }^{14}$ I used the regression results to estimate the equity risk premium applicable to the projected yield on Moody's A2-rated public utility bonds. Given the expected A2-rated utility bond yield of 3.56 percent, it can be calculated that the indicated equity risk premium applicable to that bond yield is 5.92 percent, which is shown on line 3 , page 7 of Document No. 5.
Q. What is your conclusion of an equity risk premium for use in your total market approach RPM analysis?
A. The equity risk premium I apply to the Utility Proxy Group is 6.86 percent, which is the average of the Beta-adjusted equity risk premium for the Utility Proxy Group, the $S \& P$ Utilities Index, and the authorized return utility equity risk premiums of 9.16 percent, 5.51 percent, and 5.92 percent, respectively, as shown on page 7 of Document No. 5.
Q. What is the indicated RPM common equity cost rate based on the total market approach?
A. As shown on line 7, page 3 of Document No. 5, I calculated a common equity cost rate of 10.52 percent for the Utility Proxy Group based on the total market approach RPM.
Q. What are the results of your application of the PRPM and the total market approach RPM?
A. As shown on page 1 of Document No. 5, the indicated RPMderived common equity cost rate is 10.44 percent, which gives equal weight to the PRPM ( 10.36 percent) and the adjusted-market approach results (10.52 percent).

## The Capital Asset Pricing Model

Q. Please explain the theoretical basis of the CAPM.
A. CAPM theory defines risk as the co-variability of a security's returns with the market's returns as measured by the Beta coefficient ( $\beta$ ). A Beta coefficient less than 1.0 indicates lower variability than the market as a whole, while a Beta coefficient greater than 1.0 indicates greater variability than the market.

The CAPM assumes that all non-market or unsystematic risk can be eliminated through diversification. The risk that cannot be eliminated through diversification is called market, or systematic, risk. In addition, the CAPM presumes that investors only require compensation for systematic risk, which is the result of macroeconomic and other events that affect the returns on all assets. The model is applied by adding a risk-free rate of return to a market risk premium, which is adjusted proportionately to reflect the systematic risk of the individual security relative to the total market as measured by the Beta coefficient. The traditional CAPM model is expressed as:

$$
R_{s} \quad=R_{f}+\beta\left(R_{m}-R_{f}\right)
$$

Where: $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}=$ Return rate on the common stock;

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}= & \text { Risk-free rate of return; } \\
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}= & \text { Return rate on the market as a whole; } \\
& \text { and } \\
\beta= & \text { Adjusted Beta coefficient (volatility } \\
& \text { of the security relative to the market } \\
& \text { as a whole) }
\end{aligned}
$$

Numerous tests of the CAPM have measured the extent to which security returns and Beta coefficients are related as predicted by the CAPM, confirming its validity. The empirical CAPM ("ECAPM") reflects the reality that while the results of these tests support the notion that the Beta coefficient 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. ${ }^{15}$

The ECAPM reflects this empirical reality. Fama and French clearly state regarding the figure in Document No. 12, that "[t]he returns on the low beta portfolios are too high, and the returns on the high beta portfolios are too low."16

In addition, Morin observes that while the results of these tests support the notion that Beta is related to security returns, the empirical $S M L$ described by the CAPM formula is not as steeply sloped as the predicted SML. Morin states:

With few exceptions, the empirical studies agree that ... low-beta securities earn returns somewhat higher than the CAPM would predict, and high-beta securities earn less than predicted. ${ }^{17}$

Therefore, the empirical evidence suggests that the expected return on a security is related to its risk by the following approximation:

$$
K \quad=\quad R_{E}+x\left(R_{M}-R_{E}\right)+(1-x) \beta\left(R_{M}-R_{F}\right)
$$

where $x$ is a fraction to be determined empirically. The value of $x$ that best explains the observed relationship [is] Return $=0.0829+0.0520 \beta$ is between 0.25 and 0.30. If $x=0.25$, the equation becomes:

$$
K=R_{F}+0.25\left(R_{M}-R_{F}\right)+0.75 \beta\left(R_{M}-R_{F}\right)^{18}
$$

Fama and French provide similar support for the ECAPM when they state:

The early tests firmly reject the Sharpe-Lintner version of the CAPM. There is a positive relation between beta and average return, but it is too 'flat.'... The regressions consistently find that the intercept is greater than the average risk-free rate... and the coefficient on beta is less than the average excess market return... This is true in the early tests... as well
as in more recent cross-section regressions tests, like Fama and French (1992). ${ }^{19}$

Finally, Fama and French further note:
Confirming earlier evidence, the relation between beta and average return for the ten portfolios is much flatter than the Sharpe-Linter CAPM predicts. The returns on low beta portfolios are too high, and the returns on the high beta portfolios are too low. For example, the predicted return on the portfolio with the lowest beta is 8.3 percent per year; the actual return as 11.1 percent. The predicted return on the portfolio with the highest beta is 16.8 percent per year; the actual is 13.7 percent. ${ }^{20}$

Clearly, the justification from Morin, Fama, and French, along with their reviews of other academic research on the CAPM, validate the use of the ECAPM. In view of theory and practical research, I have applied both the traditional CAPM and the ECAPM to the companies in the Utility Proxy Group and averaged the results.
Q. What Beta coefficients did you use in your CAPM analysis?
A. For the Beta coefficients in my CAPM analysis, I considered
two sources: Value Line and Bloomberg. While both of those services adjust their calculated (or "raw") Beta coefficients to reflect the tendency of the Beta coefficient to regress to the market mean of 1.00 , Value Line calculates the Beta coefficient over a five-year period, while Bloomberg calculates it over a two-year period.
Q. Please describe your selection of a risk-free rate of return.
A. As shown in Column 5, page 1 of Document No. 6, the riskfree rate adopted for both applications of the CAPM is 2.31 percent. This risk-free rate is based on the average of the Blue Chip consensus forecast of the expected yields on 30year U.S. Treasury bonds for the six quarters ending with the second calendar quarter of 2022, and long-term projections for the years 2022 to 2026 and 2027 to 2031.
Q. Why is the yield on long-term U.S. Treasury bonds appropriate for use as the risk-free rate?
A. The yield on long-term U.S. Treasury bonds is almost riskfree and its term is consistent with the long-term cost of capital of public utilities measured by the yields on Moody's A-rated public utility bonds; the long-term
investment horizon inherent in utilities' common stocks; and the long-term life of the jurisdictional rate base to which the allowed fair rate of return (i.e., cost of capital) will be applied. In contrast, short-term U.S. Treasury yields are more volatile and largely a function of Federal Reserve monetary policy.
Q. Please explain the estimation of the expected risk premium for the market used in your CAPM analyses.
A. The basis of the market risk premium is explained in detail in note 1, page 2 of Document No. 6. As discussed above, the market risk premium is derived from an average of three historical data-based market risk premiums, two Value Line data-based market risk premiums, and one Bloomberg databased market risk premium.

The long-term income return on U.S. Government securities of 5.09 percent was deducted from the SBBI - 2020 monthly historical total market return of 12.10 percent, which results in an historical market equity risk premium of 7.01 percent. ${ }^{21}$ I applied a linear OLS regression to the monthly annualized historical returns on the $S \& P 500$ relative to historical yields on long-term U.S. Government securities from SBBI - 2020. That regression analysis yielded a market
equity risk premium of 9.98 percent. The PRPM market equity risk premium is 10.76 percent and is derived using the PRPM relative to the yields on long-term U.S. Treasury securities from January 1926 through January 2021.

The Value Line-derived forecasted total market equity risk premium is derived by deducting the forecasted risk-free rate of 2.31 percent, discussed above, from the Value Line projected total annual market return of 9.83 percent, resulting in a forecasted total market equity risk premium of 7.52 percent. The S\&P 500 projected market equity risk premium using Value Line data is derived by subtracting the projected risk-free rate of 2.31 percent from the projected total return of the $S \& P 500$ of 14.10 percent. The resulting market equity risk premium is 11.79 percent.

The $S \& P 500$ projected market equity risk premium using Bloomberg data is derived by subtracting the projected riskfree rate of 2.31 percent from the projected total return of the $S \& P 500$ of 17.78 percent. The resulting market equity risk premium is 15.47 percent. These six measures, when averaged, result in an average total market equity risk premium of 10.42 percent as shown on page 2 of Document No. 6.
Q. What are the results of your application of the traditional
and empirical CAPM to the Utility Proxy Group?
A. As shown on page 1 of Document No. 6, the adjusted mean result of my CAPM/ECAPM analyses is 12.44 percent, the adjusted median is 12.28 percent, and the average of the two is 12.36 percent. Consistent with my reliance on the average of mean and median DCF results discussed above, the indicated common equity cost rate using the CAPM/ECAPM is 12.36 percent.

## Common Equity Cost Rates for a Proxy Group of Domestic, Non-Price Regulated Companies Based on the DCF, RPM, and CAPM

Q. Why do you also consider a proxy group of domestic, nonprice regulated companies?
A. In the Hope and Bluefield cases, the U.S. Supreme Court did not specify that comparable risk companies had to be utilities. Since the purpose of rate regulation is to be a substitute for marketplace competition, non-price regulated firms operating in the competitive marketplace make an excellent proxy if they are comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group being used to estimate the cost of common equity. The selection of such domestic, non-price regulated competitive firms theoretically and empirically results in a proxy group that is comparable in total risk to the Utility

Proxy Group, since all of these companies compete for capital in the exact same markets.
Q. How did you select non-price regulated companies that are comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group?
A. In order to select a proxy group of domestic, non-price regulated companies similar in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group, I relied on the Beta coefficients and related statistics derived from Value Line regression analyses of weekly market prices over the most recent 260 weeks (i.e., five years). These selection criteria resulted in a proxy group of 48 domestic, non-price regulated firms comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group. Total risk is the sum 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 Beta coefficients must lie within plus or minus two standard deviations of the average unadjusted Beta coefficients of the Utility Proxy Group; and
- The residual standard errors of the Value Line regressions which gave rise to the unadjusted Beta coefficients must

> lie within plus or minus two standard deviations of the average residual standard error of the Utility Proxy Group.

Beta coefficients measure market, or systematic, risk, which is not diversifiable. The residual standard errors of the regressions measure each firm's company-specific, diversifiable risk. Companies that have similar Beta coefficients and similar residual standard errors resulting from the same regression analyses have similar total investment risk.
Q. Have you prepared a schedule which shows the data from which you selected the 48 domestic, non-price regulated companies that are comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group?
A. Yes, the basis of my selection and both proxy groups' regression statistics are shown in Document No. 7 .
Q. Did you calculate common equity cost rates using the DCF model, RPM, and CAPM for the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group?
A. Yes. Because the DCF model, RPM, and CAPM have been applied in an identical manner as described above, I will not repeat
the details of the rationale and application of each model. One exception is in the application of the RPM, where $I$ did not use public utility-specific equity risk premiums, nor did I apply the PRPM to the individual non-price regulated companies.

Page 2 of Document No. 8 derives the constant growth DCF model common equity cost rate. As shown, the indicated common equity cost rate, using the constant growth DCF for the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group, is 11.52 percent.

Pages 3 through 5 of Document No. 8 contain the data and calculations that support the 12.67 percent $R P M$ common equity cost rate. As shown on line 1 , page 3 of Document No. 8, the consensus prospective yield on Moody's Baa-rated corporate bonds for the six quarters ending in the second quarter of 2022, and for the years 2022 to 2026 and 2027 to 2031, is 4.04 percent. ${ }^{22}$ Since the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group has an average Moody's long-term issuer rating of Baal, a downward adjustment of 0.15 percent to the projected Baa2-rated corporate bond yield is necessary to reflect the difference in ratings which results in a projected Baalrated corporate bond yield of 3.89 percent.

When the Beta-adjusted risk premium of 8.78 percent (as
derived on page 5 of Document No. 8) relative to the NonPrice Regulated Proxy Group is added to the prospective A3/Baal-rated corporate bond yield of 3.89 percent, the indicated $R P M$ common equity cost rate is 12.67 percent.

Page 6 of Document No. 8 contains the inputs and calculations that support my indicated CAPM/ECAPM common equity cost rate of 12.00 percent.
Q. What is the cost rate of common equity based on the NonPrice Regulated Proxy Group comparable in total risk to the Utility Proxy Group?
A. As shown on page 1 of Document No. 8, 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: 11.52 percent (DCF), 12.67 percent (RPM), and 12.00 percent (CAPM). The average of the mean and median of these models is 12.03 percent, which $I$ used as the indicated common equity cost rates for the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group.
VII. CONCLUSION OF COMMON EQUITY COST RATE BEFORE ADJUSTMENTS
Q. What is the indicated common equity cost rate before adjustments?
A. By applying multiple cost of common equity models to the Utility Proxy Group and the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group, the indicated range of common equity cost rates attributable to the Utility Proxy Group before any relative risk adjustments is between 9.94 percent and 10.94 percent as shown in Document No. 2. I used multiple cost of common equity models as primary tools in arriving at my recommended common equity cost rate because no single model is so inherently precise that it can be relied on to the exclusion of other theoretically sound models. Using multiple models adds reliability to the estimated common equity cost rate, with the prudence of using multiple cost of common equity models supported in both the financial literature and regulatory precedent.

Based on these common equity cost rate results, I conclude that a range of common equity cost rates between 9.94 percent and 10.94 percent is reasonable and appropriate before any adjustments for relative risk differences between the company and the Utility Proxy Group are made. The bottom of the indicated range (i.e., 9.94 percent) was calculated by averaging the average of all model results (10.94 percent) with the lowest model result ( 8.94 percent), and the top of the indicated range is the approximate average of all model results. I have chosen this indicated range of common equity
cost rates applicable to the Utility Proxy Group as a conservative estimate of the required ROE.

## VIII. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE COMMON EQUITY COST RATE Flotation Costs

Q. What are flotation costs?
A. Flotation costs are those costs associated with the sale of new issuances of common stock. They include market pressure and the mandatory unavoidable costs of issuance (e.g., underwriting fees and out-of-pocket costs for printing, legal, registration, etc.). For every dollar raised through debt or equity offerings, the company receives less than one full dollar in financing.
Q. Why is it important to recognize flotation costs in the allowed common equity cost rate?
A. It is important because there is no other mechanism in the ratemaking paradigm through which such costs can be recognized and recovered. Because these costs are real, necessary, and legitimate, recovery of these costs should be permitted. As noted by Morin:

The costs of issuing these securities are just as real as operating and maintenance expenses or costs incurred

> to build utility plants, and fair regulatory treatment must permit recovery of these costs... The simple fact of the matter is that common equity capital is not free... [Flotation costs] must be recovered through a rate of return adjustment. ${ }^{23}$
Q. Do the common equity cost rate models you have used already reflect investors' anticipation of flotation costs?
A. No. All of these models assume no transaction costs. The literature is quite clear that these costs are not reflected in the market prices paid for common stocks. For example, Brigham and Daves confirm this and provide the methodology utilized to calculate the flotation adjustment. ${ }^{24}$ In addition, Morin confirms the need for such an adjustment even when no new equity issuance is imminent. ${ }^{25}$ Consequently, it is proper to include a flotation cost adjustment when using cost of common equity models to estimate the common equity cost rate.
Q. How did you calculate the flotation cost allowance?
A. I modified the DCF calculation to provide a dividend yield that would reimburse investors for issuance costs in accordance with the method cited in literature by Brigham
and Daves, as well as by Morin. The flotation cost adjustment recognizes the actual costs of issuing equity that were incurred by Tampa Electric's parent, Emera, in its equity issuances since its acquisition of Tampa Electric. Based on the issuance costs shown on page 1 of Document No. 9, an adjustment of 0.13 percent is required to reflect the flotation costs applicable to the Utility Proxy Group.

## Business Risk Adjustment

Q. What company-specific business risks did you consider in your recommended ROE?
A. As detailed below, $I^{\prime} v e ~ c o n s i d e r e d ~ t h e ~ c o m p a n y ' s ~ s m a l l e r ~$ size and lack of geographic diversification relative to the Utility Proxy Group in my ROE recommendation.
Q. Does the company's smaller size relative to the Utility Proxy Group companies increase its business risk?
A. Yes. The company's 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.

Size affects business risk because smaller companies
generally are less able to cope with significant events that affect sales, revenues, and earnings. For example, smaller companies face more risk exposure to business cycles and economic conditions, both nationally and locally. Additionally, the loss of revenues from a few larger customers would have a greater effect on a small company than on a bigger company with a larger, more diverse, customer base.
Q. Is the increased relative risk due to small size and the associated implications on the rate of return on common equity supported by financial literature?
A. Yes, it is. As further evidence that smaller firms are riskier, investors generally demand greater returns from smaller firms to compensate for less marketability and liquidity of their securities. Duff \& Phelps' 2020 Valuation Handbook - U.S. Guide to Cost of Capital ("D\&P - 2020") discusses the nature of the small-size phenomenon, providing an indication of the magnitude of the size premium based on several measures of size. In discussing "Size as a Predictor of Equity Returns," D\&P - 2020 states:

The size effect is based on the empirical observation that companies of smaller size are associated with greater risk and, therefore, have greater cost of
capital [sic]. The "size" of a company is one of the most important risk elements to consider when developing cost of equity capital estimates for use in valuing a business simply because size has been shown to be a predictor of equity returns. In other words, there is a significant (negative) relationship between size and historical equity returns - as size decreases, returns tend to increase, and vice versa. (footnote omitted) (emphasis in original) ${ }^{26}$

Furthermore, in "The Capital Asset Pricing Model: Theory and Evidence," Fama and French note size is indeed a risk factor which must be reflected when estimating the cost of common equity. On page 14, they note:
. . . the higher average returns on small stocks and high book-to-market stocks reflect unidentified state variables that produce undiversifiable risks (covariances) in returns not captured in the market return and are priced separately from market betas. ${ }^{27}$

Based on this evidence, Fama and French proposed their three-factor model, which includes a size variable in recognition of the effect size has on the cost of common equity.

Also, it is a basic financial principle that the use of funds invested, and not the source of funds, is what gives rise to the risk of any investment. ${ }^{28}$ Eugene Brigham, a wellknown authority, states:

A number of researchers have observed that portfolios of small-firms (sic) have earned consistently higher average returns than those of large-firm stocks; this is called the "small-firm effect." On the surface, it would seem to be advantageous to the small firms to provide average returns in a stock market that are higher than those of larger firms. In reality, it is bad news for the small firm; what the small-firm effect means is that the capital market demands higher returns on stocks of small firms than on otherwise similar stocks of the large firms. ${ }^{29}$ (emphasis added)

Consistent with the financial principle of risk and return discussed above, increased relative risk due to Tampa Electric's smaller size must be considered in the allowed rate of return on common equity. Therefore, the Commission's authorization of a cost rate of common equity in this proceeding must appropriately reflect the unique risks of the company, including its smaller relative size, which is justified and supported above by evidence in the financial literature.
Q. Please describe the company's lack of geographic diversity and why that increases its relative risk?
A. Tampa Electric's service area in West Central Florida is extremely compact compared to other Florida investor-owned utilities. In the event of a substantial storm or other catastrophic event, the entire system and customer base of Tampa Electric is at risk for damage, outages, and other customer impacts. This is unlike other utilities in Florida, and more importantly, the Utility Proxy Group, which have more geographically diverse service areas or larger service territories, which may only have a portion of the system assets and customer base affected in the case of storms or other natural disasters or catastrophic events, allowing the unaffected areas and assets to help mitigate certain impacts and help sustain the utility while repairs are made in affected areas. Tampa Electric's smaller size and limited geographic diversity have also been recognized as key risks in the company's recent $S \& P$ and Moody's credit ratings reports. ${ }^{30}$
Q. Is there a way to quantify a relative risk adjustment due to the company's smaller size and lack of geographic diversity when compared to the Utility Proxy Group?
A. Yes. The company has greater relative risk than the average utility in the Utility Proxy Group because of its smaller size and lack of geographic diversity. As a proxy for its greater risk, I will use the difference in size between Tampa Electric and the Utility Proxy Group as measured by its estimated market capitalization of common equity.

As shown in Document No. 10, the company's estimated market capitalization is approximately $\$ 7,780$ million, compared with the market capitalization of the average company in the Utility Proxy Group of $\$ 15,616$ million. The average company in the Utility Proxy Group has a market capitalization approximately 2.00 times the size of the company's estimated market capitalization.

As a result, it is necessary to upwardly adjust the indicated range of common equity cost rates attributable to the Utility Proxy Group to reflect the company's greater risk due to its smaller relative size. The determination is based on the size premiums for portfolios of New York Stock Exchange, American Stock Exchange, and NASDAQ listed companies ranked by deciles for the 1926 to 2019 period. The average size premium for the Utility Proxy Group with a market capitalization of $\$ 15,616$ million falls in the second decile, while the company's estimated market capitalization
of $\$ 7,780$ million places it in the third decile. The size premium spread between the second decile and the third decile is 0.23 percent.
Q. Since Tampa Electric is part of a larger corporation, why is the size of the total corporation not more appropriate to use when determining the size adjustment?
A. The return derived in this proceeding will not apply to Emera's operations as a whole, but only to Tampa Electric's. Emera is the sum of its constituent parts, including those constituent parts' ROEs. Potential investors in the parent company are aware that it is a combination of operations in each state, province, and country and that each geographic area's operations experience the operating risks specific to their jurisdiction. The market's expectation of Emera's return is commensurate with the realities of the corporation's composite operations in each of the geographic areas in which it operates.

Other Considerations
Q. Have you considered any other company-specific issues in your recommended ROE?
A. Yes, I have. In addition to the company's flotation costs
and its smaller relative size, $I$ have also considered the company's high customer growth, and level of capital expenditures compared to the Utility Proxy Group companies in my ROE recommendation.
Q. Please describe the company's high customer growth.
A. Tampa Electric's total number of retail customers has increased by 56,500 (i.e., approximately 7.7 percent) over the past five years. ${ }^{31}$ The increased customer growth in Tampa Electric's service territory necessitates increased and accelerated capital investment.
Q. Please briefly summarize the company's capital investment plans.
A. Tampa Electric currently plans to invest over $\$ 4.0$ billion of additional capital over the $2021-2024$ period, 32 which represents over 54.00 percent of its 2019 year-end net utility plant. ${ }^{33}$ That amount includes investments required to support growth, and to maintain safe, sufficient, and reliable service in both its transmission and distribution facilities. As discussed by Mr. McOnie, the company will require continued access to the capital markets, at reasonable terms, to finance its capital spending plan. As
the company moves forward with its capital spending plan, timely recovery of its capital costs is critical to mitigate the delay of capital recovery and execute its capital spending program.
Q. Do substantial capital expenditures directly relate to a utility being allowed the opportunity to earn a return adequate to attract capital at reasonable terms?
A. Yes, they do. The allowed ROE should enable the subject utility to finance capital expenditures and working capital requirements at reasonable rates, and to maintain its financial integrity in a variety of economic and capital market conditions. As discussed throughout my direct testimony, a return adequate to attract capital at reasonable terms enables the utility to provide safe, reliable service while maintaining its financial soundness. To the extent a utility is provided the opportunity to earn its market-based cost of capital, neither customers nor shareholders should be disadvantaged. These requirements are of particular importance to a utility when it is engaged in a substantial capital expenditure program.

The ratemaking process is predicated on the principle that, for investors and companies to commit the capital needed to
provide safe and reliable utility services, the utility must have the opportunity to recover the return of, and the market-required return on, invested capital. Regulatory commissions recognize that since utility operations are capital intensive, regulatory decisions should enable the utility to attract capital at reasonable terms; doing so balances the long-term interests of the utility and its ratepayers.

Further, the financial community carefully monitors the current and expected financial conditions of utility companies, as well as the regulatory environment in which those companies operate. In that respect, the regulatory environment is one of the most important factors considered in both debt and equity investors' assessments of risk. That is especially important during periods in which the utility expects to make significant capital investments and, therefore, may require access to capital markets.
Q. Do credit rating agencies recognize risk associated with increased capital expenditures?
A. Yes, they do. From a credit perspective, the additional pressure on cash flows associated with high levels of capital expenditures exerts corresponding pressure on credit
metrics and, therefore, credit ratings. S\&P has noted several long-term challenges for utilities' financial health including: heavy construction programs to address demand growth; declining capacity margins; and aging infrastructure and regulatory responsiveness to mounting requests for rate increases. ${ }^{34}$ More recently, S\&P noted:

We assume that capital spending will remain a focus of most utility managements and strain credit metrics. It provides growth when sales are diminished by ongoing demanded efficiency from regulators and other trends, and it is welcomed by policymakers that appreciate the economic stimulus and the benefits of safer, more reliable service. The speed with which the regulatory process turns the new spending into higher rates to begin to pay for it is an important factor in our assumptions and the forecast. Any extended lag between spending and recovery can exacerbate the negative effect on credit metrics and therefore ratings. ${ }^{35}$

The rating agency views noted above also are consistent with certain observations discussed in my direct testimony: (1) the benefits of maintaining a strong financial profile are significant when capital access is required and become particularly acute during periods of market instability; and (2) the Commission's decision in this proceeding will have
a direct bearing on the company's credit profile and its ability to access the capital needed to fund its investments.
Q. How do the company's expected capital expenditures compare to the Utility Proxy Group?
A. To reasonably make that comparison, I calculated the ratio of expected capital expenditures to net plant for each company in the Utility Proxy Group. I performed that calculation using Tampa Electric's projected capital expenditures during 2021 through 2024 relative to its net plant for the year ended December 31, 2019. As shown in Document No. 11, Tampa Electric has the highest ratio of projected capital expenditures to net plant relative to the Utility Proxy Group, approximately 39.00 percent higher than the Utility Proxy Group median.
Q. What are your conclusions regarding the effect of Tampa Electric's capital investment plan on its risk profile and cost of capital?
A. It is clear that Tampa Electric's capital investment plan relative to net plant is larger than the median of the Utility Proxy Group companies. It also is clear that equity
investors and credit rating agencies recognize the additional risks associated with substantial capital expenditures.
Q. What is the indicated cost of common equity after your company-specific adjustments?
A. Applying the 0.13 percent flotation cost adjustment and the 0.23 percent business risk adjustment to the indicated range of common equity cost rates between 9.94 percent and 10.94 percent results in a company-specific range of common equity rates between 10.30 percent and 11.30 percent. In consideration of both of these indicated ranges in addition to the company's high customer growth, and its substantial capital expenditure program, I recommend an ROE of 10.75 percent for Tampa Electric in this proceeding.

## IX. CONCLUSION

Q. What is your recommended ROE for Tampa Electric?
A. Given the discussion above and the results from the analyses that $I$ have performed, I recommend that an ROE of 10.75 percent is appropriate for the company at this time.
Q. In your opinion, is your proposed ROE of 10.75 percent fair
and reasonable to the company and its customers?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. In your opinion, is the company's proposed equity ratio of 55.00 percent fair and reasonable to the company and its customers?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Does this conclude your prepared direct testimony?
A. Yes, it does.
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Resume \& Testimony Listing of:
Dylan W. D'Ascendis, CRRA, CVA Director

## Summary

Dylan is an experienced consultant and a Certified Rate of Return Analyst (CRRA) and Certified Valuation Analyst (CVA). He has served as a consultant for investor-owned and municipal utilities and authorities for 12 years. Dylan has extensive experience in rate of return analyses, class cost of service, rate design, and valuation for regulated public utilities. He has testified as an expert witness in the subjects of rate of return, cost of service, rate design, and valuation before 30 regulatory commissions in the U.S., one Canadian province, and an American Arbitration Association panel.

He also maintains the benchmark index against which the Hennessy Gas Utility Mutual Fund performance is measured.

## Areas of Specialization

| $\square$ | Regulation and Rates | - | Financial Modeling | $\square$ | Rate of Return |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | Utilities | $\square$ | Valuation | $\square$ | Cost of Service |
| $\square$ | Mutual Fund Benchmarking | $\square$ | Regulatory Strategy | - | Rate Design |
| $\square$ | Capital Market Risk |  | Rate Case Support |  |  |

- Capital Market Risk ■ Rate Case Support

Recent Expert Testimony Submission/Appearances

## Jurisdiction

- Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
- New Jersey Board of Public Utilities
- Hawaii Public Utilities Commission
- South Carolina Public Service Commission
- American Arbitration Association

Topic
Rate of Return
Rate of Return
Cost of Service, Rate Design
Return on Common Equity
Valuation

## 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 company in response to a new state regulation which allowed the appraised value of acquired assets into rate base


## Recent Publications and Speeches

- Co-Author of: "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.
- Co-Author of: "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", 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.
- Co-author of: "Comparative Evaluation of the Predictive Risk Premium Model ${ }^{\top M}$, 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", before the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts: 45th Financial Forum, April 17-18, 2013, Indianapolis, IN.
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| SPONSOR | Date | CASE/APPLICANT | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regulatory Commission of Alaska |  |  |  |  |
| Alaska Power Company | 09/20 | Alaska Power Company; Goat Lake Hydro, Inc.; BBL Hydro, Inc. | Tariff Nos. TA886-2; TA6-521; TA4-573 | Capital Structure |
| Alaska Power Company | 07/16 | Alaska Power Company | Docket No. TA857-2 | Rate of Return |
| Alberta Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| AltaLink, L.P., and EPCOR Distribution \& Transmission, Inc. | 01/20 | AltaLink, L.P., and EPCOR <br> Distribution \& Transmission, Inc. | 2021 Generic Cost of Capital, Proceeding ID. 24110 | Rate of Return |
| Arizona Corporation Commission |  |  |  |  |
| EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc. | 06/20 | EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc. | Docket No. WS-01303A-200177 | Rate of Return |
| Arizona Water Company | 12/19 | Arizona Water Company - Western Group | Docket No. W-01445A-19- $0278$ | Rate of Return |
| Arizona Water Company | 08/18 | Arizona Water Company - Northern Group | Docket No. W-01445A-180164 | Rate of Return |
| Colorado Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Delaware Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | 09/20 | Washington Gas Light Company | Formal Case No. 1162 | Rate of Return |
| Federal Energy Regulatory Commission |  |  |  |  |
| LS Power Grid California, LLC | 10/20 | LS Power Grid California, LLC | Docket No. ER21-195-000 | Rate of Return |
| Florida Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Peoples Gas System | 09/20 | Peoples Gas System | Docket No. 20200051-GU | Rate of Return |
| Utilities, Inc. of Florida | 06/20 | Utilities, Inc. of Florida | Docket No. 20200139-WS | Rate of Return |
| Hawaii Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Launiupoko Irrigation Company, Inc. | 12/20 | Launiupoko Irrigation Company, Inc. | Docket No. 2020-0217 | Capital Structure |
| Lanai Water Company, Inc. | 12/19 | Lanai Water Company, Inc. | Docket No. 2019-0386 | Cost of Service / Rate Design |
| Manele Water Resources, LLC | 08/19 | Manele Water Resources, LLC | Docket No. 2019-0311 | Cost of Service / 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 Commerce Commission |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
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| SPONSOR | Date | Case/Applicant | Docket No. | Subject |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | 11/17 | Utility Services of Illinois, Inc. | Docket No. 17-1106 | Cost of Service / 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 Utility Regulatory Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Aqua Indiana, Inc. | 03/16 | Aqua Indiana, Inc. Aboite Wastewater Division | Docket No. 44752 | Rate of Return |
| Twin Lakes, Utilities, Inc. | 08/13 | Twin Lakes, Utilities, Inc. | Docket No. 44388 | Rate of Return |
| Kansas Corporation Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Atmos Energy | 07/19 | Atmos Energy | 19-ATMG-525-RTS | Rate of Return |
| Kentucky Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company | 10/20 | Bluegrass Water Utility Operating Company | 2020-00290 | Return on Equity |
| Louisiana Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Southwestern Electric Power Company | 12/20 | Southwestern Electric Power Company | Docket No. U-35441 | Return on Equity |
| Atmos Energy | 04/20 | Atmos Energy | Docket No. U-35535 | Rate of Return |
| Louisiana Water Service, Inc. | 06/13 | Louisiana Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. U-32848 | Rate of Return |
| Maryland Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Washington Gas Light Company | 08/20 | Washington Gas Light Company | Case No. 9651 | Rate of Return |
| FirstEnergy, Inc. | 08/18 | Potomac Edison Company | Case No. 9490 | Rate of Return |
| Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities |  |  |  |  |
| Unitil Corporation | 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 Utilities | 07/15 | Liberty Utilities d/b/a New England Natural Gas Company | Docket No. 15-75 | Rate of Return |
| Minnesota Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Northern States Power Company | 11/20 | Northern States Power Company | Docket No. E002/GR-20-723 | Rate of Return |
| Mississippi Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Atmos Energy | 03/19 | Atmos Energy | Docket No. 2015-UN-049 | Capital Structure |
| Atmos Energy | 07/18 | Atmos Energy | Docket No. 2015-UN-049 | Capital Structure |
| Missouri Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Spire Missouri, Inc. | 12/20 | Spire Missouri, Inc. | Case No. GR-2021-0108 | Return on Equity |
| Indian Hills Utility Operating Company, Inc. | 10/17 | Indian Hills Utility Operating Company, Inc. | Case No. SR-2017-0259 | Rate of Return |
| Raccoon Creek Utility Operating Company, Inc. | 09/16 | Raccoon Creek Utility Operating Company, Inc. | Docket No. SR-2016-0202 | Rate of Return |
| Public Utilities Commission of Nevada |  |  |  |  |
| Southwest Gas Corporation | 08/20 | Southwest Gas Corporation | Docket No. 20-02023 | Return on Equity |
| New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire, Inc. | 12/20 | Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire, Inc. | Docket No. DW 20-184 | Rate of Return |
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| SPONSOR | Date | CASE/APPLICANT | Docket No. | SUBJECT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New Jersey Board of Public Utilities |  |  |  |  |
| Atlantic City Electric Company | 12/20 | Atlantic City Electric Company | Docket No. ER20120746 | Return on Equity |
| FirstEnergy | 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 Sewerage Company | 10/14 | The Atlantic City Sewerage Company | Docket No. WR14101263 | Cost of Service / Rate Design |
| Middlesex Water Company | 11/13 | Middlesex Water Company | Docket No. WR1311059 | Capital Structure |
| New Mexico Public Regulation Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Southwestern Public Service Company | 01/21 | Southwestern Public Service Company | Case No. 20-00238-UT | Return on Equity |
| North Carolina Utilities Commission |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| 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 Dakota Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Northern States Power Company | 11/20 | Northern States Power Company | Case No. PU-20-441 | Rate of Return |
| Public Utilities Commission of Ohio |  |  |  |  |
| Aqua Ohio, Inc. | 05/16 | Aqua Ohio, Inc. | Docket No. 16-0907-WW-AIR | Rate of Return |
| Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |
| Penn Estates Utilities, Inc. | 12/11 | Penn Estates, Utilities, Inc. | Docket No. R-2011-2255159 | Capital Structure / Long-Term Debt Cost Rate |
| South Carolina Public Service Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Blue Granite Water Co. | 12/19 | Blue Granite Water Company | Docket No. 2019-292-WS | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | 02/18 | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. 2017-292-WS | Rate of Return |
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| SPONSOR | DATE | CASE/APPLICANT | DocKET No. | SUBJECT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | $06 / 15$ | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. 2015-199-WS | Rate of Return |
| Carolina Water Service, Inc. | $11 / 13$ | Carolina Water Service, Inc. | Docket No. 2013-275-WS | Rate of Return |
| United Utility Companies, Inc. | $09 / 13$ | United Utility Companies, Inc. | Docket No. 2013-199-WS | Rate of Return |
| Utility Services of South <br> Carolina, Inc. | $09 / 13$ | Utility Services of South Carolina, <br> Inc. | Docket No. 2013-201-WS | Rate of Return |
| Tega Cay Water Services, <br> Inc. | $11 / 12$ | Tega Cay Water Services, Inc. | Docket No. 2012-177-WS | Capital Structure |
| Tennessee Public Utility Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Piedmont Natural Gas <br> Company | $07 / 20$ | Piedmont Natural Gas Company | Docket No. 20-00086 | Return on Equity |
| Public Utility Commission of Texas | Docket No. 51802 | Return on Equity |  |  |
| Southwestern Public Service <br> Company | $02 / 21$ | Southwestern Public Service <br> Company | Docket No. 51415 | Rate of Return |
| Southwestern Electric Power <br> Company | $10 / 20$ | Southwestern Electric Power <br> Company | Case No. PUE-2020-00039 |  |

Tampa Electric Company, Inc. Brief Summary of Common Equity Cost Rate

| $\underline{\text { Line No. }}$ | Principal Methods | Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCF) (1) | 8.94\% |
| 2. | Risk Premium Model (RPM) (2) | 10.44\% |
| 3. | Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) (3) | 12.36\% |
| 4. | Market Models Applied to Comparable Risk, Non-Price Regulated Companies (4) | 12.03\% |
| 5. | Indicated Range of Common Equity Cost Rates before Adjustment for Company-Specific Risk (5) | 9.94\%-10.94\% |
| 6. | Flotation Cost Adjustment (6) | 0.13\% |
| 7. | Business Risk Adjustment (7) | 0.23\% |
| 8. | Indicated Range of Common Equity Cost Rates after Adjustment | 10.30\%-11.30\% |
| 9. | Recommended Common Equity Cost Rate | 10.75\% |

Notes: (1) From page 1 of Document No. 4.
(2) From page 1 of Document No. 5.
(3) From page 1 of Document No. 6.
(4) From page 1 of Document No. 8.
(5) The low end of the indicated range is calculated by using the average of the DCF results ( $8.94 \%$ ) and average model result ( $10.94 \%$ ). The high end of the indicated range is the average model result (10.94\%).
(6) Adjustment to reflect an allowance for flotation costs as detailed in Mr. D'Ascendis' direct testimony.
(7) Adjustment to reflect the Company's greater business risk due to its smaller size and lack of geographic diversity relative to the Utility Proxy Group as detailed in Mr. D'Ascendis' direct testimony.

Tampa Electric Company, Inc. Capitalization and Financial Statistics (1)

2015-2019, Inclusive


Notes:
(1) All capitalization and financial statistics 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.
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Capital Structure Based upon Total Permanent Capital for the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies
2015-2019, Inclusive


Capital Structure Based upon Total Permanent Capital for the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies
2015-2019. Inclusive

|  | $\underline{2019}$ |  | $\underline{2018}$ |  | 2017 |  | $\underline{2016}$ |  | $\underline{2015}$ |  | 5 YEAR <br> VERAGE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NorthWestern Corporation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Debt | 52.27 | \% | 51.98 | \% | 50.26 | \% | 52.05 | \% | 53.08 | \% | 51.93 | \% |
| Preferred Stock | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Common Equity | 47.73 |  | 48.02 |  | 49.74 |  | 47.95 |  | 46.92 |  | 48.07 |  |
| Total Capital | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% |
| OGE Energy Corporation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Debt | 43.56 | \% | 44.00 | \% | 43.78 | \% | 43.31 | \% | 45.31 | \% | 43.99 | \% |
| Preferred Stock | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Common Equity | 56.44 |  | 56.00 |  | 56.22 |  | 56.69 |  | 54.69 |  | 56.01 |  |
| Total Capital | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% |
| Otter Tail Corporation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Debt | 46.88 | \% | 44.74 | \% | 41.31 | \% | 44.56 | \% | 45.17 | \% | 44.53 | \% |
| Preferred Stock | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Common Equity | 53.12 |  | 55.26 |  | 58.69 |  | 55.44 |  | 54.83 |  | 55.47 |  |
| Total Capital | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% |
| Pinnacle West Capital Corporation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Debt | 50.91 | \% | 49.59 | \% | 48.68 | \% | 46.33 | \% | 45.45 | \% | 48.19 | \% |
| Preferred Stock | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Common Equity | 49.09 |  | 50.41 |  | 51.32 |  | 53.67 |  | 54.55 |  | 51.81 |  |
| Total Capital | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% |
| Portland General Electric Company |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Debt | 50.06 | \% | 49.72 | \% | 50.10 | \% | 50.06 | \% | 49.39 | \% | 49.87 | \% |
| Preferred Stock | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Common Equity | 49.94 |  | 50.28 |  | 49.90 |  | 49.94 |  | 50.61 |  | 50.13 |  |
| Total Capital | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% |
| Xcel Energy, Inc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Debt | 57.77 | \% | 57.01 | \% | 56.66 | \% | 56.73 | \% | 55.36 | \% | 56.71 | \% |
| Preferred Stock | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  | - |  |
| Common Equity | 42.23 |  | 42.99 |  | 43.34 |  | 43.27 |  | 44.64 |  | 43.29 |  |
| Total Capital | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% |
| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Companies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Long-Term Debt | 51.19 | \% | 50.79 | \% | 49.83 | \% | 49.65 | \% | 49.24 | \% | 50.14 | \% |
| Preferred Stock | 0.75 |  | 0.90 |  | 0.95 |  | 0.99 |  | 1.01 |  | 0.92 |  |
| Common Equity | 48.06 |  | 48.31 |  | 49.22 |  | 49.36 |  | 49.75 |  | 48.94 |  |
| Total Capital | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% | 100.00 | \% |

[^0]Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Operating Subsidiary Company Capital Structures of the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

| Company Name | 2019 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Parent <br> Company Ticker | Common Equity | Long-Term Debt | Total Capital |
| ALLETE (Minnesota Power) | ALE | 59.59\% | 40.41\% | 100.00\% |
| Superior Water, Light and Power Company | ALE | 58.08\% | 41.92\% | 100.00\% |
| Interstate Power and Light Company | LNT | 50.23\% | 49.77\% | 100.00\% |
| Wisconsin Power and Light Company | LNT | 53.78\% | 46.22\% | 100.00\% |
| Ameren Illinois Company | AEE | 53.00\% | 47.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Union Electric Company | AEE | 51.90\% | 48.10\% | 100.00\% |
| Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC | DUK | 52.11\% | 47.89\% | 100.00\% |
| Duke Energy Florida, LLC | DUK | 49.91\% | 50.09\% | 100.00\% |
| Duke Energy Indiana, LLC | DUK | 52.84\% | 47.16\% | 100.00\% |
| Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. | DUK | 49.37\% | 50.63\% | 100.00\% |
| Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. | DUK | 65.22\% | 34.78\% | 100.00\% |
| Duke Energy Progress, LLC | DUK | 51.29\% | 48.71\% | 100.00\% |
| Southern California Edison Company | EIX | 50.43\% | 49.57\% | 100.00\% |
| Entergy Arkansas, LLC | ETR | 47.90\% | 52.10\% | 100.00\% |
| Entergy Louisiana, LLC | ETR | 47.47\% | 52.53\% | 100.00\% |
| Entergy Mississippi, LLC | ETR | 48.60\% | 51.40\% | 100.00\% |
| Entergy New Orleans, LLC | ETR | 49.26\% | 50.74\% | 100.00\% |
| Entergy Texas, Inc. | ETR | 50.43\% | 49.57\% | 100.00\% |
| Idaho Power Company | IDA | 55.14\% | 44.86\% | 100.00\% |
| NorthWestern Corporation | NWE | 47.59\% | 52.41\% | 100.00\% |
| Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company | OGE | 55.15\% | 44.85\% | 100.00\% |
| Otter Tail Power Company | OTTR | 51.12\% | 48.88\% | 100.00\% |
| Arizona Public Service Company | PNW | 52.80\% | 47.20\% | 100.00\% |
| Portland General Electric Company | POR | 49.85\% | 50.15\% | 100.00\% |
| Northern States Power Company - MN | XEL | 52.20\% | 47.80\% | 100.00\% |
| Northern States Power Company - WI | XEL | 54.23\% | 45.77\% | 100.00\% |
| Public Service Company of Colorado | XEL | 56.32\% | 43.68\% | 100.00\% |
| Southwestern Public Service Company | XEL | 54.14\% | 45.86\% | 100.00\% |
|  | Mean | 52.50\% | 47.50\% | 100.00\% |
|  | Median | 52.00\% | 48.00\% | 100.00\% |

Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate Using the Discounted Cash Flow Model for the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] | [6] | [7] | [8] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies | Average Dividend Yield (1) | Value Line Projected Five Year Growth in EPS (2) | Zack's Five Year Projected Growth Rate in EPS | Bloomberg's Five Year Projected Growth Rate in EPS | Yahoo! Finance Projected Five Year Growth in EPS | Average Projected Five Year Growth in EPS (3) | Adjusted Dividend Yield (4) | Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate (5) |
| ALLETE, Inc. | 4.09 \% | 4.50 \% | NA \% | 5.50 \% | 7.00 \% | 5.67 \% | 4.21 \% | 9.88 \% |
| Alliant Energy Corporation | 3.10 | 5.50 | 5.90 | 5.79 | 5.80 | 5.75 | 3.19 | 8.94 |
| Ameren Corporation | 2.65 | 6.00 | 6.80 | 7.03 | 6.60 | 6.61 | 2.74 | 9.35 |
| Duke Energy Corporation | 4.19 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.07 | 2.81 | 4.07 | 4.28 | 8.35 |
| Edison International | 4.29 | 12.00 | 3.10 | 4.17 | (0.50) | 6.42 | 4.43 | 10.85 |
| Entergy Corporation | 3.73 | 3.00 | 5.20 | 4.62 | 5.20 | 4.51 | 3.81 | 8.32 |
| IDACORP, Inc. | 3.09 | 4.50 | 2.60 | 2.88 | 2.60 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 6.28 (6) |
| NorthWestern Corporation | 4.19 | 2.50 | 3.70 | 3.90 | 3.20 | 3.32 | 4.26 | 7.58 |
| OGE Energy Corporation | 4.99 | 3.00 | 3.60 | 3.51 | 2.10 | 3.05 | 5.07 | 8.12 |
| Otter Tail Corporation | 3.55 | 6.50 | NA | 7.05 | 9.00 | 7.52 | 3.68 | 11.20 |
| Pinnacle West Capital Corporation | 4.10 | 4.50 | 3.50 | 3.78 | 3.70 | 3.87 | 4.18 | 8.05 |
| Portland General Electric Company | 3.87 | 4.00 | 5.50 | 5.12 | 5.50 | 5.03 | 3.97 | 9.00 |
| Xcel Energy, Inc. | 2.55 | 6.00 | 6.20 | 6.14 | 6.20 | 6.13 | 2.63 | 8.76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average | 9.03 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Median | 8.85 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Average of Me | and Median | 8.94 \% |

NMF= Not Meaningful Figure
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| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATI |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Change Retail Sales (KWH) |  |  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
|  |  |  |  |  | -15 |
| Avg. Indust. Lse (MWH) |  |  | NA | NA | A |
| Avg. Indust. Revs. per K Capacity at Peak (Mw) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  |  |  |  | NA | A |
| Peak Load, Winter (Mv |  |  | 9, |  |  |
| Annual Load Factor (\%) <br> \% Change Customers (avg.) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | NA | NA | N |
| Fixed Charge Cov. (\%) |  |  | 339 |  | 277 |
| ANNUAL RATES <br> of change (per sh) <br> Revenues <br> "Cash Flow" <br> Earnings <br> Dividends <br> Book Value |  | Past |  Past Est'd '17.'11 <br>  5 Yrs. to 23.25 <br>  $2.0 \%$ $-1.2 \%$ <br> $\%$ $6.0 \%$ $4.5 \%$ <br> $\%$ $4.0 \%$ $4.5 \%$ <br> $\%$ $3.5 \%$ $4.0 \%$ <br> $\%$ $5.0 \%$ $3.5 \%$ <br>    |  |  |
|  |  | 10 Yrs. |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1.0\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5.5\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2.5\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3.0\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 5.0\% |  |  |  |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES (\$ mill.) Mar. 31 Jun. 30 Sep. 30 Dec. 31 |  |  |  | all |
|  |  |  |  |  | Year |
| 2017 | 365.6 | 353.3 | 362.5 | 337.9 | 1419.3 |
| 2018 | 358.2 | 344.1 | 348.0 | 448.3 | 1498.6 |
| 2019 | 357.2 | 290.4 | 288.3 | 304.6 | 1240.5 |
| 2020 | 311.6 | 243.2 | 293.9 | 306.3 | 1155 |
| 2021 | $325 \quad 2$ | 285 | 305 | 325 | 1240 |
| Calendar | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mar. 31 J | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2017 | . 97 | . 72 | . 88 | . 56 | 3.13 |
| 2018 | . 99 | . 61 | . 59 | 1.18 | 3.38 |
| 2019 | 1.18 | . 64 | . 60 | . 92 | 3.33 |
| 2020 | 1.28 | . 39 | . 78 | . 75 | 3.20 |
| 2021 | 1.20 | . 70 | . 75 | . 85 | 3.50 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cal- } \\ & \text { endar } \end{aligned}$ | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {B }}$ - $\dagger$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2016 | . 52 | . 52 | 52 | . 52 | 2.08 |
| 2017 | . 535 | . 535 | . 535 | . 535 | 2.14 |
| 2018 | . 56 | . 56 | . 56 | . 56 | 2.24 |
| 2019 | . 5875 | . 5875 | . 5875 | . 5875 | 2.35 |
| 2020 | . 6175 | . 6175 | . 6175 | . 6175 |  |

BUSINESS: ALLETE Inc is the parent of Minnesota Power which supplies electricity to 146,000 customers in northeastern MN, \& Superior Water, Light \& Power in northwestern WI. Electric rev. breakdown: taconite mining/processing, 26\%; paper/wood products, $9 \%$; other industrial, $8 \%$; residential, $12 \%$; commercial, $13 \%$; wholesale, $16 \%$ other, $16 \%$. ALLETE Clean Energy (ACE) owns renewable en-
ALLETE is facing a challenging operating environment. The recession and the coronavirus problems have hurt the company's primary utility subsidiary, Minnesota Power, more than most electric companies because the utility has a smaller residential sector and a larger industrial sector. One of its industrial customers just restarted its facility this month, but another customer's plant remains shut. ALLETE Clean Energy (ACE), which invests in wind projects, is experiencing increased competition and pricing pressure. Profits are likely to decline in 2020 due in part to a $\$ 0.16$-a-share charge the company took in the second quarter for the refund of previously collected revenues. We include this in our earnings presentation even though management is excluding it from its guidance of $\$ 3.25-\$ 3.45$ a share. Considering all of these factors, the stock price has declined $31 \%$ in 2020 , making this one of the worst-performing equities in this industry.
We expect much higher earnings in 2021. The second-quarter comparison will be easy due to the revenue refund in 2020. Most of Minnesota Power's taconite cus-
ergy projects. Acq'd U.S. Water Services 2/15; sold it 3/19. Generating sources: coal \& lignite, $30 \%$; wind, $11 \%$; other, $5 \%$; purchased, $54 \%$. Fuel costs: $31 \%$ of revs. ' 19 deprec. rate: $3.3 \%$. Has 1,400 employees. Chairman: Alan R. Hodnik. President \& CEO: Bethany M. Owen. Inc.: MN. Address: 30 West Superior St., Duluth, MN 55802-2093. Tel.: 218-279-5000. Internet: www.allete.com.
tomers have submitted demand nominations (telling the utility how much electricity they expect to need) for full power for the first four months of 2021. ACE should benefit from a 303-megawatt project in Oklahoma that should be completed by yearend 2020 at a cost of $\$ 450$ million.
Rate cases are likely upcoming in 2021. Filings were postponed from 2020 due to the effects of the weak economy. Minnesota Power expects to apply in November, and Superior Water, Light \& Power will probably file sometime next year. These applications should raise ALLETE's earning power in 2022.
We expect a dividend increase in the first quarter of 2021. This is the usual timing of a hike. We estimate a boost of $\$ 0.09$ a share (3.6\%) in the annual disbursement. This would be smaller than in 2020 because the payout ratio is above ALLETE's targeted range of $60 \%-65 \%$.
The equity's dividend yield is about one percentage point above the utility average. Total return potential is above average for the next 18 months and decent for the 3 - to 5 -year period.
Paul E. Debbas, CFA December 11, 2020
A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrec. gains (losses): $\quad$ to rounding. Next earnings report due early $\quad$ deferred charges. In '19: \$8.15/sh. (D) In mill. $\quad$ Company's Financial Strength
'04, (25¢); '05, (\$1.84); '15, (46¢);'17, 254 ; '19, 1 Feb. (B) Div'ds historically paid in early Mar., $\quad$ (E) Rate base: Orig. cost depr. Rate allowed in Stock's Price Stability
26¢; gain (losses) on disc. ops.: '04, \$2.57, '05, June, Sept. and Dec. - Div'd reinvest. plan $\quad$ MN on com. eq. in; '18: $9.25 \%$; earned on avg.
(16¢); '06, (2¢). ' 18 \& '19 EPS don't sum due avail. † Shareholder invest. plan avail. (C) Incl. com. eq., '19: 7.9\%. Regulatory Climate: Avg.
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BUSINESS: Alliant Energy Corp., formerly named Interstate Energy, is a holding company formed through the merger of WPL Hold ings, IES Industries, and Interstate Power. Supplies electricity, gas, and other services in Wisconsin, lowa, and Minnesota. Elect. revs. by state: WI, 42\%; IA, 57\%; MN, 1\%. Elect. rev.: residential, 34\%; commercial, $29 \%$; industrial, $28 \%$; wholesale, $7 \%$; other, $2 \%$. Fuel
Alliant Energy raised its 2020 earnings outlook. The utility now expects share net to be between $\$ 2.40$ and $\$ 2.46$, versus its previous guidance range of $\$ 2.34-\$ 2.48$. The midpoint of the forecast was increased by $\$ 0.02$ a share, primarily due to higher earnings from temperature impacts on retail electric and gas sales during the first nine months of the year.
The company provided 2021 earnings guidance for the first time. Leadership expects share net to be between $\$ 2.50$ and $\$ 2.64$, representing growth of $2 \%-8 \%$ from our 2020 estimate of $\$ 2.45$. The projection assumes, among other things, a stable economy and continued negative impact from the COVID-19 health crisis. In addition, due to production tax credits from wind projects being placed into service, Alliant expects to have a consolidated effective tax rate of negative $14 \%$ in 2021 .
The Iowa Service Area was hit by a Derecho in late August. The wind storm caused considerable damage to the company's electric distribution system, resulting in over 250,000 customers losing power. Repair and restoration efforts are current-
sources, 2019: coal, 27\%; gas, 34\%; other, 39\%. Fuel costs: 41\% of revs. 2019 depreciation rate: $5.9 \%$. Estimated plant age: 17 years. Has approximately 3,597 employees. Chairman \& Chief Executive Officer: John O. Larsen. Incorporated: Wisconsin. Address 4902 N. Biltmore Lane, Madison, Wisconsin 53718. Telephone: 608-458-3311. Internet: www.alliantenergy.com.
cost of the weather event stands at approximately $\$ 140$ million. Although this will mostly impact 2020 figures (earnings guidance incorporated expected Derechorelated costs), leadership is anticipating a modest sales headwind in the affected areas through the first half of 2021.
The board of directors raised the dividend in November. This has been the pattern in recent years. The increase was $\$ 0.0225$ a share (6\%) quarterly, slightly less than last year's expansion. Alliant is targeting a payout ratio of $60 \%-70 \%$
Alliant continues to bet big on renewables. In 2020, the company will generate approximately $34 \%$ of its energy from renewables, with much of that coming from wind power. Coal-fired generation currently stands at $25 \%$, though management intends to reduce that number to the low single digits by 2030. Natural gas, at $41 \%$ of the energy mix, is expected to stay roughly the same over the next five years. This stock does not stand out. The dividend yield is below average for an electric utility, and capital appreciation potential out to 2023-2025 is flat to negative.
A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrecur. gains (losses): reinvest. plan avail. † Shareholder invest. plan in IA in '19: $10.0 \%$; in WI in '19 Regul. Clim.: Company's Financial Strength

10, ( $8 ¢$ ); '11, (1¢); '12, (8¢). Next earnings rpt. $\quad$ avail. (C) Incl. deferred chgs. In '19: $\$ 72.0$ mill., WI, Above Avg.; IA, Avg. due mid-February. (B) Dividends historically $\$ 0.29 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In millions, adjusted for split. (E)
paid in mid-Feb., May, Aug., and Nov. - Div'd Rate base: Orig. cost. Rates all'd on com. eq.
2020 Value Line, Inc. All rights reserved. Factual material is obtained from sources believed to be reliable and is provided without warranties of any kind.
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of it may be reproduced, resold, stored or transmitted in any printed, electronic or other form, or used for generating or marketing any printed or electronic publication, senvice or product


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2018 \\ +5.6 \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2019 \\ -3.5 \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \end{array}$ | BUSINESS: Ameren Corporation is a holding company formed through the merger of Union Electric and CIPSCO. Has 1.2 million electric and 127,000 gas customers in Missouri; 1.2 million electric and 813,000 gas customers in Illinois. Discontinued nonregulated power-generation operation in '13. Electric revenue breakdown: residential, $43 \%$; commercial, $32 \%$; industrial, $8 \%$; other, $17 \%$. | sident \& CEO: en Plaza, 1901 ri 63166-6149. |
| Fixed C | Cov. (\%) |  | 350 | 313 | 307 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reve } \\ & \text { "Cas } \\ & \text { Earni } \\ & \text { Divid } \\ & \text { Book } \end{aligned}$ | RATES (per sh) ow" s | $\begin{gathered} \text { Past } \\ 10 \text { Yrs. } \\ -3.00 \\ 1.5 \\ 1.0 \\ -2.0 \\ -.50 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { '17-'19 } \\ & 23-25 \\ & .5 \% \\ & .0 \% \\ & 6.0 \% \\ & 6.0 \% \\ & 6.0 \% \end{aligned}$ | till wind up above the 2019 tally, the negative effects of the reces- | An order is due by January, iffs taking effect in February. with a better economy, should er profits in 2021. |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { QUA } \\ \text { Mar. } 31 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | c. 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Full } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | $1-$ | of |
| 2017 | 514 | 538 | 1723 | 1402 |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 585 | 63 | 24 | 1419 | 6291.0 | S |  |
| 2019 | 56 | 1379 | 1659 | 1316 | 5910 |  | slip into the first quarter of 2021. |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2020 \\ & 2021 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1440 \\ & 1600 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1398 \\ & 1450 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1628 \\ & 1700 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1284 \\ & 1350 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5750 \\ & 6100 \end{aligned}$ | Missouri on April 1st and investments in the electric transmission business. Our re- | The board of directors raised the dividend in the fourth quarter. The in- |
| en | Mar. 31 | $\text { in. } 30$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Full } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | vised estimate is within Ameren's targeted range of $\$ 3.40-\$ 355$ a share, which was | al |
|  |  | 79 | 1.18 | . 39 |  |  |  |
|  | . 62 | . 97 | 1.45 | 28 |  |  |  |
|  | . 78 | 72 | 1.47 | . 38 |  |  |  |
| 2020 | . 59 | 98 | 1.47 | . 41 | 3.45 | n is seeking a gas increase | top performers among utilities in |
| 221 | . 65 | . 90 | 1.70 | . 45 | 3.70 |  |  |
|  |  |  | ENDS P | $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{m}^{1}$ |  |  | bad year for most electric utilias investors like Ameren's |
| endar | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 3 |  | - | - |
|  | . 425 | 425 | 425 | . 44 |  | Illinois Commerce | W |
| 2017 | . 44 | 44 | . 44 | 4575 | 1.78 | n | potelial has appeal for the 18 month |
| 2018 | . 4575 | 75 | $.4575$ | . 475 | 1.85 |  | r the 2023-2025 period. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ty ratio, and | Debbas, |

[^1]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 2017 \\ -2.0 \\ 2914 \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ +1.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2018 \\ +3.9 \\ 2953 \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ +1.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2019 \\ -9 \\ -994 \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \\ \text { NA } \end{array}$ | BUSINESS: Duke Energy Corporation is a holding company for utilities with 7.6 mill. elec. customers in NC, FL, IN, SC, OH, \& KY, and 1.6 mill. gas customers in OH, KY, NC, SC, and TN. Owns independent power plants \& has $25 \%$ stake in National Methanol in Saudi Arabia. Acq'd Progress Energy 7/12; Piedmont Natural Gas 10/16; discontinued most int'l ops. in '16. Elec. rev. breakdown: |
| Fixed C | Cov. $1 \%$ ) |  | 272 | 218 | 233 | Is Duke Energy a takeover candidate? |
| ANN Reve "Cas Earni Book | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RATES } \\ & \text { persh) } \\ & \hline \text { es } \end{aligned}$ | Past 10 Yrs. 1.0\% $3.0 \%$ $3.0 \%$ $2.0 \%$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Es } \\ & \% \\ & \% \\ & \% \\ & \% \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { '17.'19 } \\ & \hline 23.25 \\ & .5 \% \\ & 5.0 \% \\ & 5.0 \% \\ & 2.5 \% \\ & 2.5 \% \end{aligned}$ | The stock price rose $7 \%$ on September 30th, after The Wall Street Journal reported that NextEra Energy approached Duke about a possible combination. Not surprisingly, Duke did not issue a comment about this. Even if NextEra makes a |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { QUAF } \\ \text { Mar. } 31 \end{array}$ | $\overline{Y R E}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VENUES }(:- \\ & \text { Sep. } 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{1 I .)} \\ & c .31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Full } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | formal offer, there is no assurance that Duke will accept the proposal, and even if |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2018 \\ & 2019 \\ & 2020 \\ & 2021 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5729 \\ & 6135 \\ & 6163 \\ & 5949 \\ & 6200 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5555 \\ & 5643 \\ & 5873 \\ & 5421 \\ & 5650 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6482 \\ & 6628 \\ & 6940 \\ & 6780 \\ & 6850 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5799 \\ & 6115 \\ & 6103 \\ & 5950 \\ & 6050 \end{aligned}$ | 23565 24521 25079 24100 24750 | a deal is struck, there is no assur this will win regulatory approval. The price of Duke stock has strengthened further since late September, and has been trading in the low- $\$ 90$ range recently |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { Cal- } \\ \text { endar } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\text { Mar. } 31$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RNNINGS PE } \\ & \text { Jun. } 30 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Full } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ | (compared with the low- $\$ 80$ range prior to the Journal's report). The stock's Timeli- |
| 2017 | 1.02 | 98 | 1.36 | . 86 | 4.22 | ess rank is suspended due to the take |
| 2018 | 1.17 | . 71 | 1.63 | . 61 | 4.13 | over speculation. |
| 2019 | 1.24 | 1.12 | 1.82 | . 89 | 5.07 | The company took a huge nonrecur- |
| 2020 | 1.24 | 1.08 | 1.88 | 1.00 | 5.20 | ring charge for the second quarter. |
| 202 | 1.25 | 1.10 | 1.95 | 1.00 | 5.30 | This was $\$ 1.6$ billion ( $\$ 2.21$ a share) after |
| Cal- endar | $\begin{gathered} \text { QUARTE } \\ \text { Mar. } 31 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TERLY DIV } \\ \text { Jun. } 30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DENDS PA } \\ & \text { Sep. } 30 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { AlD }^{\mathrm{B}} \mathbf{1} \\ \text { Dec. } 31 \end{gathered}$ | Full | taxes, and was for the write-off of Duke's interest in a pipeline project that was can- |
| 2016 | . 825 | . 825 | . 855 | . 855 | 3.36 |  |
| 2017 | . 855 | . 855 | . 89 | . 89 | 3.49 | stemming |
| 2018 | . 89 | . 89 | . 9275 | . 9275 | 3.64 | d |
| 2019 | . 9275 | . 9275 |  | 945 | 3.75 | additional charges of under $\$ 100$ within the next 12 months. |

residential, 44\%; commercial, 28\%; industrial, 14\%; other, 14\%, Generating sources: gas, $29 \%$; nuclear, $29 \%$; coal, $22 \%$; other, $1 \%$; purchased, 19\%. Fuel costs: $30 \%$ of revs. '19 reported deprec. rate $3.1 \%$. Has 28,800 employees. Chairman, President \& CEO: Lynn J. Good. Inc.: DE. Address: 550 South Tryon St., Charlotte, NC 28202-1803. Tel.: 704-382-3853. Internet: www.duke-energy.com.
We estimate modest earnings increases in 2020 and 2021. Despite the effects of the recession on kilowatt-hour sales, management expects to offset this by cutting expenses by $\$ 350$ million $\$ \$ 450$ million. Rate relief is a positive factor. Duke was granted an increase in Indiana earlier this year, and has reached a settlement, subject to regulatory approval, in North Carolina (see below). Our 2020 profit estimate is within the company's targeted range of $\$ 5.05-\$ 5.45$ a share. Duke is guiding analysts toward the lower half.
Duke's utilities in North Carolina have reached settlements of their general rate cases. The company and the staff of the state commission agreed to rate hikes totaling $\$ 70$ million, based on a return of $9.6 \%$ and a common-equity ratio of $52 \%$. Interim rates (subject to refund) took effect in the third quarter. When the North Carolina commission will rule on the settlement is unknown.
Duke stock has an above-average dividend yield for a utility. Prospects for the 18 -month span are attractive, but 3 - to 5 -year total return potential is subpar.
Paul E. Debbas, CFA November 13, 2020
(A) Dil. EPS. Excl. nonrec. losses: '12, 70¢; $\quad$ report due mid-Feb. (B) Div'ds paid mid-Mar., Rate all'd on com. eq. in '18 in NC: $9.9 \%$; in '19 $\quad$ Company's Financial Strength
 $\$ 2.21$; losses on disc. ops.: '14, 80¢; '16, 60¢; $($ (C) Incl. intang. In '19: $\$ 44.37 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill., $\operatorname{IN}: 9.7 \%$; earn. on avg. com. eq., '19: $8.3 \%$. Price Growth Persistence '18 EPS don't sum due to rounding. Next egs. adj. for rev. split. (E) Rate base: Net orig. cost. Reg. Clim.: NC Avg.; SC, OH, IN Above Avg. © 2020 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 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 or marketing any printed or electronic publication, senvice or product

| $E$ | 0 | $V$ | 8 | $7^{\prime}$ | IY |  |  | ENT | $61.6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P/E } \\ & \text { RATI } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left(\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{Tra} \\ \mathrm{Me} \end{array}\right.$ | $\mathrm{g}: \mathrm{NMF}$ | RELAT P/E R | $\mathrm{N} \\|$ | DIV'D YLD |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IALUE } \\ & \text { LINE } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { IESS } 3$ | Lowered | 2/21 | High: Low: | $\begin{aligned} & 36.7 \\ & 23.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39.4 \\ & 30.4 \end{aligned}$ | 41.6 32.6 | $\begin{aligned} & 48.0 \\ & 39.6 \end{aligned}$ | 54.2 44.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 68.7 \\ & 447 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69.6 \\ & 55.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78.7 \\ & 58.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83.4 \\ & 62.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.0 \\ & 45.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.4 \\ & 53.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78.9 \\ & 43.6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Target Price 2023 2024 | Range 2025 |
| SAFE <br> TECH |  | Lowered <br> Lowered | $\begin{aligned} & 11 / 23 / 18 \\ & 1 / 22 / 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LEGEN } \\ \text { divi } \\ \text { dit } \end{gathered}$ | NS $80 \times$ Divid ided by | ds ph rest Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $200$ |
| BETA | $(1.00=$ | rket) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \ldots . . \mathrm{R} \\ & \text { Options: } \\ & \text { Shaded } \end{aligned}$ |  | Strength |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -160 |
|  | Targ | Price | Range |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -100 \\ & -80 \end{aligned}$ |
| Low-Hig | h Midp | oint (\% | ( Mid) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1,1{ }^{\prime \prime \prime} \mid$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$45-\$ | \$81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  | $\|1,1\|^{\prime \prime}$ |  |  |  | 60 -50 -50 |
|  | 5 PR | ETIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
|  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -30 |
| High Low | $\begin{aligned} & 95 \\ & 65 \end{aligned}$ | \%) | $\begin{gathered} 14 \% \\ 6 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -20 |
| Instit | nal D | ision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | RETURN 12/20 |  |
|  | 102020 | 202020 | 302020 | Percen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 yr . | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { STOCK } & \text { INDEX } \\ -12.8 & 18.8\end{array}$ | - |
| to Sell | 304 | 264 | 264 | shares traded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $3 \mathrm{yr} .$ | $12.0 \quad 29.9$ |  |
| Hld's'(000) | 318333 | 329959 | 334110 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \|||||||| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 26.681 .5 |  |
| 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | ${ }^{\text {® VAL }}$ | JE LINE PUB. LLC | 23-25 |
| 31.30 | 36.38 | 38.74 | 40.25 | 43.31 | 37.98 | 38.09 | 39.16 | 36.41 | 38.61 | 41.17 | 35.37 | 36.43 | 37.81 | 38.85 | 34.11 | 35.60 | 35.45 | Reve | s per sh | 41.25 |
| 3.79 | 6.99 | 7.25 | 7.60 | 8.08 | 7.96 | 8.41 | 9.03 | 9.63 | 8.80 | 9.95 | 10.35 | 10.43 | 11.03 | 4.69 | 9.15 | 7.95 | 10.30 | "Cash | ow" per sh | 12.25 |
| . 69 | 3.34 | 3.28 | 3.32 | 3.68 | 3.24 | 3.35 | 3.23 | 4.55 | 3.78 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 3.94 | 4.51 | d1.26 | 3.98 | 1.70 | 4.05 | Earnin | per sh A | 4.75 |
| . 80 | 1.02 | 1.10 | 1.18 | 1.23 | 1.25 | 1.27 | 1.29 | 1.31 | 1.37 | 1.48 | 1.73 | 1.98 | 2.23 | 2.43 | 2.48 | 2.58 | 2.68 | Div'd | cl'd per sh ${ }^{\text {B }}$ ■ | 3.00 |
| 5.32 | 5.73 | 7.78 | 8.67 | 8.67 | 10.07 | 13.94 | 14.76 | 12.73 | 11.05 | 11.99 | 12.97 | 11.46 | 11.75 | 13.84 | 13.47 | 13.20 | 13.65 | Cap' | ending per sh | 13.75 |
| 18.57 | 20.30 | 23.66 | 25.92 | 29.21 | 30.20 | 32.44 | 30.86 | 28.95 | 30.50 | 33.64 | 34.89 | 36.82 | 35.82 | 32.10 | 36.75 | 36.65 | 39.05 | Book | ue per sh C | 44.00 |
| 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 325.81 | 361.99 | 379.00 | 395.00 | Com | Shs Outst'g D | 395.00 |
| 37.6 | 11.7 | 13.0 | 16.0 | 12.4 | 9.7 | 10.3 | 11.8 | 9.7 | 12.7 | 13.0 | 14.8 | 17.9 | 17.2 | -- | 16.7 | NMF |  | Avg | 'I P/E Ratio | 16.5 |
| 1.99 | . 62 | . 70 | . 85 | . 75 | . 65 | . 66 | . 74 | . 62 | . 71 | . 68 | . 75 | . 94 | . 87 | -- | . 89 | NMF |  | Relati | P/E Ratio | . 90 |
| 3.1\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.2\% | 2.7\% | 4.0\% | 3.7\% | 3.4\% | 3.0\% | 2.8\% | 2.6\% | 2.8\% | 2.8\% | 2.9\% | 3.8\% | 3.7\% | 4.3\% |  | Avg An | I Div'd Yield | 3.8\% |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/20 Total Debt $\$ 21738$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 6123$ mill. LT Debt $\$ 18958$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 891$ mill. (LT interest earned: 2.0x) <br> Leases, Uncapitalized Annual rentals $\$ 107$ mill. Pens. Assets-12/19 \$3755 mill. Oblig $\$ 4139$ mill. Pfd Stock $\$ 2193$ mill. Pfd Div'd $\$ 121$ mill. 4,800,198 sh. 4.08\%-4.78\%, \$25 par, call. \$25.50\$28.75/sh.; 3,250,000 sh. variable, noncum., call. $\$ 100 ; 1,250,000$ sh. $6.5 \%$, cum., $\$ 100$ liq. value; 350,000 sh. $6.25 \%$, $\$ 1000$ liq. value; 460,012 sh. $5.1 \%-5.75 \%$, $\$ 2500$ liq. value. <br> Common Stock 378,513,912 shs. as of 10/20/20 MARKET CAP: $\$ 23$ billion (Large Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 12409 | 12760 | 11862 | 12581 | 13413 | 11524 | 11869 | 12320 | 12657 | 12347 | 13500 | 14000 | Reve | (\$mill) | 16300 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1153.0 | 1112.0 | 1594.0 | 1344.0 | 1539.0 | 1480.0 | 1422.0 | 1603.0 | d290.0 | 1477.0 | 755 | 1730 | Net Pr | (\$mill) | 2000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 32.1\% | 25.7\% | 14.3\% | 25.2\% | 22.4\% | 6.6\% | 11.1\% | 5.0\% | .- | NMF | NMF | Nil | Incom | Tax Rate | Nil |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 16.9\% | 14.8\% | 8.5\% | 7.8\% | 5.8\% | 8.0\% | 6.8\% | 7.2\% | ..- | 11.1\% | 24.0\% | 10.0\% | AFUD | \% to Net Profit | 9.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.8\% | 55.3\% | 45.2\% | 45.7\% | 44.1\% | 45.0\% | 41.8\% | 45.6\% | 53.6\% | 53.5\% | 55.5\% | 57.0\% | Long- | m Debt Ratio | 59.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.3\% | 40.6\% | 46.2\% | 46.2\% | 47.2\% | 46.7\% | 49.2\% | 45.8\% | 38.3\% | 39.9\% | 39.5\% | 38.0\% | Comm | Equity Ratio | 37.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 23861 | 24773 | 20422 | 21516 | 23216 | 24352 | 24362 | 25506 | 27284 | 33360 | 35125 | 38600 | Total | pital (\$mill) | 46500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 24778 | 32116 | 30273 | 30455 | 32981 | 35085 | 37000 | 39050 | 41348 | 44285 | 46900 | 49800 | Net Pl | (\$mill) | 57700 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.3\% | 6.0\% | 8.9\% | 7.3\% | 7.7\% | 7.1\% | 6.9\% | 7.3\% | .1\% | 5.6\% | 3.5\% | 5.5\% | Return | - Total Cap'l | 5.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 14.2\% | 11.5\% | 11.9\% | 11.1\% | 10.0\% | 11.6\% | NMF | 9.5\% | 5.0\% | 9.5\% | Return | S Shr. Equity | 10.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4\% | 10.5\% | 15.9\% | 12.5\% | 13.0\% | 12.0\% | 10.8\% | 12.7\% | NMF | 10.2\% | 4.5\% | 10.0\% | Return | Com Equity E | 11.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6.5 \% \\ 40 \% \end{gathered}$ | 6.3\% | 11.4\% | 8.1\% | 8.8\% | 7.2\% | 5.6\% | 6.6\% | NMF | 4.1\% | NMF | 3.5\% | Retain | to Com Eq | 4.0\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  |  | 43\% | 32\% | 40\% | 37\% | 44\% | 53\% | 52\% | NMF | 63\% | NMF | 68\% | All Div' | to Net Prof | 64\% |


(A) Dil. EPS. Excl. nonrec. gains (losses): '04, (\$5.11); '13, 11ष; '14, $57 \%$;' '15, 11c; '18, 10¢. $\quad$ avail. (C) Incl. def'd charges. In '19: \$16.82/sh. $\quad$ Company's Financial Strength
$\$ 2.12 ;$ ' 09 , (64¢); '10, $544 ;$ '11, ( $\$ 3.33$ ); '13, '19 EPS don't sum due to chng. in shs. Next $\quad$ (D) In mill. (E) Rate base: net orig. cost. Rate $\quad$ Stock's Price Stability
(\$1.12); '15, (\$1.18); '17, (\$1.37); '18, (15¢); earnings report due late Feb. (B) Div'ds paid all'd on com. eq. in '20: $10.3 \%$; earned on avg. Price Growth Persistence
'19, (21c); gains (loss) from disc. ops.: '12, late Jan., Apr., July, \& Oct. - Div'd reinv. plan com. eq., '19: 11.5\%. Regulatory Climate: Avg.
© 2021 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 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 or marketing any printed or electronic publication, senvice or product

| ENTERGY CORP. NYSE-ETR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RECENT } 108.85 \\ & \text { PRICE } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l} \hline \text { P/E } \\ \text { RATIO } 18.4\binom{\text { Trailing: } 15.8}{\text { Median: } 13.0} \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RELATIVE } 0.88 \\ & \text { P/E RATIO } \\ & \hline 108 \end{aligned}$ |  | $8 \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l\|l} 8 & \text { YV'D } \\ \hline \end{array}\right.$ | $3.5 \%$ |  | VALUE LINE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIMELINESS $\mathbf{3}$ Raised 10/26/18  <br> SAFETY $\mathbf{2}$ Raised 12/13/19  <br> TECHNICAL 3 Raised 12/11/20 <br> BETA .95 (1.00 $=$ Market)  |  |  |  | High: | 86.6 59.9 | 84.3 68.7 | 74.5 57.6 | $74.5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 72.6 \\ & 60.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 92.0 \\ & 60.4 \end{aligned}$ | $90.3$ | $82.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 87.9 \\ & 69.6 \end{aligned}$ | $90.8$ | $\begin{array}{r} 122.1 \\ 8.2 \end{array}$ | $135.5$ |  |  | Target Pri |  |
|  |  |  |  | LEGENDS <br> - $0.54 \times$ Dividends $p$ sh Options: Yes <br> dividad by interest Rate <br> Shaded area indicates recession |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-Month Target Price Range  <br> Low-High Midpoint $(\%$ to Mid) <br> $\$ 82-\$ 181$ $\$ 132(20 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \%-1/4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.4111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Percen shares raded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | RETURN 1 |  |
| Institutional Decis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {HTIIS }}$ VL |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\frac{1\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\|\mid}{2012}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.815 .7 |  |
|  |  |  | 285 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}30.3 & 23.5 \\ 9.5 & 64.0\end{array}$ |  |
| 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |  |  |  | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |  | UE LINE PUB.LLC | 23-25 |
| 46.69 | 46.61 | 53.94 | 59.47 | 69.15 | 56.82 | 64.27 | 63.67 | 57.94 | 63.86 | 69.71 | 64.54 | 60.55 | 61.35 | 58.23 | 54.63 | 50.50 | 50.50 | Reven | es per | 50.50 |
| 8.33 | 8.18 | 10.69 | 11.73 | 12.89 | 13.29 | 16.54 | 17.53 | 15.98 | 16.25 | 17.68 | 17.71 | 18.72 | 16.70 | 16.50 | 17.19 | 17.10 | 18.05 | "Cash | low" per sh | 21.00 |
| 3.93 | 4.40 | 5.36 | 5.60 | 6.20 | 6.30 | 6.66 | 7.55 | 6.02 | 4.96 | 5.77 | 5.81 | 6.88 | 5.19 | 5.88 | 6.30 | 5.65 | 5.95 | Earnin | per sh A | 7.00 |
| 1.89 | 2.16 | 2.16 | 2.58 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.24 | 3.32 | 3.32 | 3.32 | 3.32 | 3.34 | 3.42 | 3.50 | 3.58 | 3.66 | 3.7 | 3.86 | Div'd | ccl'd per sh ${ }^{\text {B }} \dagger$ | 4.55 |
| 6.51 | 6.72 | 9.44 | 10.29 | 13.92 | 12.99 | 13.33 | 15.21 | 18.18 | 15.73 | 14.82 | 16.79 | 17.28 | 22.07 | 22.45 | 21.72 | 20.60 | 18.70 | Cap'IS | ending per sh | 19.00 |
| 38.26 | 35.71 | 40.45 | 40.71 | 42.07 | 45.54 | 47.53 | 50.81 | 51.73 | 54.00 | 55.83 | 51.89 | 45.12 | 44.28 | 46.78 | 51.34 | 53.55 | 56.30 | Book | lue per sh C | 64.50 |
| 216.83 | 216.83 | 202.67 | 193.12 | 189.36 | 189.12 | 178.75 | 176.36 | 177.81 | 178.37 | 179.24 | 178.39 | 179.13 | 180.52 | 189.06 | 199.15 | 201.00 | 204.00 | Common Shs Outst'g $D$ <br> Avg Ann'I P/E Ratio Relative P/E Ratio Avg Ann'I Div'd Yield |  | 210.00 |
| 15.1 | 16.3 | 14.3 | 19.3 | 16.6 | 12.0 | 11.6 | 9.1 | 11.2 | 13.2 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 10.9 | 15.0 | 13.8 | 16.5 | Bold figures are Value Line estimates |  |  |  | 17.5 |
| . 80 | . 87 | . 77 | 1.02 | 1.00 | . 80 | . 74 | 57 | . 71 | 74 | . 68 | 63 | . 57 | . 75 | . 75 | 88 |  |  | . 95 |
| 3.2\% | 3.0\% | 2.8\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 4.0\% | 4.2\% | 4.9\% | 4.9\% | 5.1\% | 4.5\% | 4.6\% | 4.6\% | 4.5\% | 4.4\% | 3.5 |  |  | 3.76 |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/20 Total Debt $\$ 22060$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 8573.8$ mill. LT Debt $\$ 19613$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 831.0$ mill. Incl. \$209.2 mill. of securitization bonds. (LT interest earned: 2.2x) <br> Leases, Uncapitalized Annual rentals $\$ 62.1$ mill. Pension Assets-12/19 \$6271.2 mill. <br> Oblig $\$ 8406.2$ mill. <br> Pfd Stock $\$ 254.4$ mill. Pfd Div'd $\$ 18.3$ mill. 200,000 shs. $6.25 \%-7.5 \%$, $\$ 100$ par; 250,000 shs. $8.75 \%, 1.4$ mill. shs. $5.375 \%$; all cum., without sinking fund. <br> Common Stock 200,232,522 shs. as of 10/30/20 MARKET CAP: $\$ 22$ billion (Large Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 11488 | 11229 | 10302 | 11391 | 12495 | 11513 | 10846 | 11074 | 11009 | 10879 | 10150 | 10300 |  |  | Reven | es (\$mill) | 10600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1270.3 | 1367.4 | 1091.9 | 904.5 | 1060.0 | 1061.2 | 1249.8 | 950.7 | 1092.1 | 1258.2 | 1155 | 1225 |  |  | Net Profit (Smill) |  | 1480 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 32.7\% | 17.3\% | 13.0\% | 26.7\% | 37.8\% | 2.2\% | 11.3\% | 1.8\% | 1.8\% | NMF | 14.0\% | 22.0\% | Income Tax Rate AFUDC \% to Net Profit |  | 22.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4\% | 8.9\% | 11.9\% | 10.1\% | 9.3\% | 7.4\% | 8.1\% | 14.7\% | 17.5\% | 16.7\% | 18.0\% | 14.0\% |  |  | 12.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.3\% | 52.2\% | 55.8\% | 55.1\% | 54.9\% | 57.8\% | 63.6\% | 63.6\% | 63.2\% | 62.0\% | 64.5\% | 64.0\% | Long-Term Debt Ratio Common Equity Ratio |  | 60.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 42.1\% | 46.4\% | 42.9\% | 43.6\% | 43.8\% | 40.8\% | 35.5\% | 35.5\% | 35.9\% | 37.1\% | 35.0\% | 35.0\% |  |  | 38.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 20166 | 19324 | 21432 | 22109 | 22842 | 22714 | 22777 | 22528 | 24602 | 27557 | 30900 | 32725 | Common Equity Ratio |  | 35100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 23848 | 25609 | 27299 | 27882 | 28723 | 27824 | 27921 | 29664 | 31974 | 35183 | 37075 | 38475 | Net Plant (Smill) |  | 42400 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.79 | 8.5\% | 6.4\% | 5.4\% | 6.0\% | 6.0\% | 6.9\% | 5.7\% | 5.8 | 5.9\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | Return on Total Cap'I |  | 5.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.4\% | 14.8\% | 11.5\% | 9.1\% | 10.3\% | 11.1\% | 15.1\% | 11.6\% | 12.0\% | 12.0\% | 10.5\% | 10.5\% | Return on Shr. Equity |  | 10.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.7\% | 15.0\% | 11.6\% | 9.2\% | 10.4\% | 11.2\% | 15.2\% | 11.7\% | 12.2\% | 12.1\% | 10.5\% | 10.5\% | Return | on Com Equity E | 11.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.6\% | 8.4\% | 5.2\% | 3.0\% | 4.4\% | 4.8\% | 7.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.9\% | 5.2\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | Retain | do Com Eq | 4.0\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  | 49\% | 45\% | 56\% | 68\% | 58\% | 58\% | 50\% | 68\% | 61\% | 58\% | 66\% | 65\% | All Div | Is to Net Prof |  |


dustrial, $27 \%$; other, $9 \%$. Generating sources: gas, $40 \%$; nuclear, $28 \%$; coal, $6 \%$; purchased, $26 \%$. Fuel costs: $30 \%$ of revenues. ' 19 reported depreciation rate: $2.8 \%$. Has 13,600 employees. Chairman \& CEO: Leo P. Denault. Incorporated: Delaware. Address: 639 Loy ola Avenue, P.O. Box 61000, New Orleans, Louisiana 70161. Telephone: 504-576-4000. Internet: www.entergy.com.
regulatory approval.
Some regulatory matters are pending. Entergy Arkansas is seeking a $\$ 73$ million rate hike under the state's Formula Rate Plan (FRP). The utility also wants to renew the FRP. Entergy Louisiana wants to review that state's FRP, as well. Entergy Texas filed for increases totaling $\$ 38.4$ million under regulatory mechanisms for the recovery of transmission and distribution costs. Rate relief and a stronger economy should enable earnings to increase in 2021. However, there is a potentially negative matter before federal regulators. State regulators allege that the federally granted allowed return on equity on certain as sets is too high
The board of directors raised the dividend in the fourth quarter. The increase was two cents a share (2.2\%) quarterly, the same as in recent years. Entergy has stated that it expects dividend growth to accelerate in late 2021.
The dividend yield is about average for a utility. Total return potential is attractive for the 18 -month period, but low for the next 3 to 5 years.
Paul E. Debbas, CFA December 11, 2020
(A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrec. losses: '05, $21 ष ;$ paid in early Mar., June, Sept., \& Dec. a Div'd $\begin{aligned} & \text { original cost. Allowed ROE (blended): 9.95\%; } \\ & \text { Company's Financial Strength }\end{aligned}$
'12, \$1.26; '13, \$1.14; '14, 564; '15, \$6.99; '16, reinvestment plan avail. $\dagger$ Shareholder invest- earned on avg. com. eq., '19: 13.0\%. Regula$\$ 10.14$; '17, \$2.91; '18, \$1.25. Next earnings ment plan avail. (C) Incl. def'd charges. In '19: tory Climate: Average. eport due early Feb. (B) Div'ds historically $\$ 29.67 /$ sh. (D) In millions. (E) Rate base: Net
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|  |  |  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | +2.6 | + 1 | - 3 |
|  |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
|  |  |  | 5.83 | 5.64 | 5.32 |
| Capacity at Peak (Mw) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| Peak Load, Summer (Mw) |  |  | 3422 | 3392 | 3242 |
| Annual Load Factor (\%) |  |  | NA | NA | NA |
| \% Change Customers (yr-end) |  |  | +2.0 | +2.3 | +2.5 |
| Fixed Charge Cov. (\%) |  |  | 329 | 309 | 307 |
| ANNUAL RATES |  |  | Past Est'd '17-'19 |  |  |
| of change (per sh) |  | 10 Yrs. | 5 Yr |  | '25 |
| Revenues |  | 2.5\% |  | \% | 2.0\% |
| "Cash Flow" |  | 5.5\% |  | \% | 4.0\% |
| Earnings |  | 7.0\% |  | \% | 4.5\% |
| Dividends |  | 7.0\% |  | \% | 6.5\% |
| Book Value |  | 5.5\% |  | \% | 4.0\% |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY REVENUES(\$ mill.) |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 |  |
| 2017 | 302.6 | 333.0 | 408.3 | 305.6 | 1349.5 |
| 2018 | 310.1 | 340.0 | 408.8 | 311.9 | 1370.8 |
| 2019 | 350.3 | 316.9 | 386.3 | 292.9 | 1346.4 |
| 2020 | 291.0 | 318.8 | 425.3 | 289.9 | 1325 |
| 2021 | 305 | 330 | 440 | 300 | 1375 |
| Calendar | EARNINGS PER SHARE A |  |  |  | Full Year |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 |  |
| 2017 | . 66 | . 99 | 1.80 | . 76 | 4.21 |
| 2018 | . 72 | 1.23 | 2.02 | . 52 | 4.49 |
| 2019 | . 84 | 1.05 | 1.78 | . 93 | 4.61 |
| 2020 | . 74 | 1.19 | 2.02 | . 70 | 4.65 |
| 2021 | . 85 | 1.15 | 2.00 | . 80 | 4.80 |
| Calendar | QUARTERLY DIVIDENDS PAID ${ }^{\text {® }} \dagger$ |  |  |  | Full |
|  | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2017 | . 55 | . 55 | . 55 | . 59 | 2.24 |
| 2018 | . 59 | . 59 | . 59 | . 63 | 2.40 |
| 2019 | . 63 | . 63 | . 63 | . 67 | 2.56 |
| 2020 | . 67 | . 67 | . 67 | . 71 | 2.72 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |

BUSINESS: IDACORP, Inc is a holding company for Idaho Power Company, a regulated electric utility that serves 583,000 customers throughout a 24,000 -square-mile area in southern Idaho and eastern Oregon (population: 1.2 million). Most of the company's revenues are derived from the Idaho portion of its service area. Reve nue breakdown: residential, 39\%; commercial, $22 \%$; industrial,
We estimate that IDACORP's earnings rose slightly in 2020 . We figure this happened despite a difficult comparison in the fourth quarter. The company's utility subsidiary, Idaho Power, benefited from favorable weather conditions in its service area. Also, while the national recession hurt the economy in Idaho, this was less severe in the state because of the concentration of food-processing customers, which continued to operate even as some other businesses were ordered to close. Other businesses are expanding; for instance, Amazon opened a distribution center. Some companies have relocated from California to Idaho. Customer growth is rapid, and amounted to $2.6 \%$ for the 12 -month period that ended on September 30th. Cost control has been effective, and operating and maintenance expenses likely declined. Upon reporting third-quarter results in share-earnings guidance from $\$ 4.45-\$ 4.65$ to $\$ 4.55-\$ 4.65$. Our estimate remains at the upper end of this range.
We look for a modest profit increase
this year. The service area's economy this year. The service area's economy
should continue to recover. On the other
$13 \%$; irrigation, $10 \%$; other, $16 \%$. Generating sources: hydro, $45 \%$; coal, $16 \%$; gas, $11 \%$; purchased, $28 \%$. Fuel costs: $33 \%$ of revenues. '19 reported depreciation rate: $2.9 \%$. Has 2,000 employees. Chairman: Richard J. Dahl. President \& CEO: Lisa Grow. Incorporated: Idaho. Address: 1221 W. Idaho St., Boise, Idaho 83702. Telephone: 208-388-2200. Internet: www.idacorpinc.com.
hand, a return to normal weather patterns would be a negative factor for the year-toyear comparison. Our estimate of $\$ 4.80$ a share would produce a $3 \%$ increase over our expectation for 2020. Management will issue earnings guidance for 2021 when it reports fourth-quarter results next month.
Finances are solid. The fixed-charge coverage and common-equity ratio are comfortably above the averages for the electric utility industry. The earned return on equity is consistently healthy. IDACORP has not issued any common equity for several years, and expects no need for new equity in the next few years. The company's Financial Strength rating is A. We have raised the equity's Safety rank one notch, to 1 (Highest).
The dividend yield of this timely stock is a cut below the utility mean. The issue offers superior total return potential for the next 18 months. For the 3 - to 5 year period, however, total return prospects are unexceptional, despite the likelihood of strong dividend growth. The recent quotation is near the lower end of our 2023-2025 Target Price Range.

[^2] 05, (24¢); '06, 17c. '17 \& '19 earnings don't $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fent plan available. } \dagger \text { Shareholder investment } \\ & \text { ment } \\ & \text { '12: } 10 \% \text { (imputed); earned on avg. com. }\end{aligned}$ sum due to rounding. Next earnings report due plan available. (C) Incl. intangibles. In '19: eq., '19: $9.6 \%$. Regulatory Climate: Above mid-Feb. (B) Dividends historically paid in late $\$ 26.31 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In millions. (E) Rate base: Net Average.
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| N0 | 1 | $E$ | $E$ | N | NWE |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CENT } \\ & \text { ICE } \end{aligned}$ | $56$ | P／E RATIO | $16 .$ | $\text { ( } \begin{aligned} & \text { Trailin } \\ & \text { Media } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ng: } 17.8 \\ & \text { an: } 17.0 \end{aligned}$ | RELATIVE P/E RATIC | $0.7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DIV'D } \\ & \text { YLD } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | INE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { NESS } 3$ | Raised 11 |  | High： Low： | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline 26.8 \\ 18.5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30.6 \\ & 23.8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 36.6 27.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 38.0 \\ & 33.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47.2 \\ & 35.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.7 \\ & 42.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.7 \\ & 48.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 63.8 \\ & 52.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64.5 \\ & 55.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 65.7 \\ & 50.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.7 \\ & 57.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.5 \\ & 45.1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Target Pric 2023 202 | Range 2025 |
| SAFETY <br> TECHN |  | Raised 7 | 7／18 |  | DS | ds p sh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-160$ |
| BETA | (1.00 | arket) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Options: } \\ & \text { Shade } \end{aligned}$ |  | Strength |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r}160 \\ -100 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| 18－Mo | Targ | Price | ange | Shad | a ind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ， |  |  |  |  | －80 |
| Low－H | Mid | nt (\% t | Mid） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | －60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1，小1 |  |  | 11 m |  | ， |  |  |  | 50 |
| \＄41－\＄1 | \＄71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 山而 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
|  | 5 P | ECT |  |  |  |  | 川 | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | －30 |
|  | Price |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\because$ |  |  |  | －30 |
| High <br> Low |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 14 \% \\ 8 \% \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | －15 |
| Institu | ional D | ecision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 102020 | 202020 | 302020 | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { STOCK } & \text { INDEX } \\ -15.1 & 18.8\end{array}$ |  |
| to Buy to Sell | $\begin{aligned} & 127 \\ & 144 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 143 \\ & 137 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 134 \\ & 126 \end{aligned}$ | shares traded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 yr ． | $\begin{array}{rrr}-15.1 & 18.8 \\ 9.4 & 29.9\end{array}$ |  |
| Hld＇s（000） | 48390 | 48127 | 47772 |  |  |  |  |  |  | ｜I｜l｜｜｜ | III | ｜｜1｜ |  | ｜｜｜｜｜1 | ｜｜｜｜1 |  |  | 5 yr ． | 29.081 .5 |  |
| 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{VA}$ | UE LINE PUB．LLC | 23－25 |
| 29.18 | 32.57 | 31.49 | 30.79 | 35.09 | 31.72 | 30.66 | 30.80 | 28.76 | 29.80 | 25.68 | 25.21 | 26.01 | 26.45 | 23.81 | 24.93 | 24.00 | 24.55 | Reve | s per sh | 27.25 |
| 3.20 | 4.00 | 3.62 | 3.70 | 4.40 | 4.62 | 4.76 | 5.42 | 5.18 | 5.45 | 5.39 | 5.92 | 6.74 | 6.76 | 6.96 | 7.07 | 6.80 | 7.25 | ＂Cash | low＂per sh | 8.50 |
| d14．32 | 1.71 | 1.31 | 1.44 | 1.77 | 2.02 | 2.14 | 2.53 | 2.26 | 2.46 | 2.99 | 2.90 | 3.39 | 3.34 | 3.40 | 3.53 | 3.15 | 3.50 | Earni | s per sh A | 4.00 |
| － | 1.00 | 1.24 | 1.28 | 1.32 | 1.34 | 1.36 | 1.44 | 1.48 | 1.52 | 1.60 | 1.92 | 2.00 | 2.10 | 2.20 | 2.30 | 2.40 | 2.48 | Div＇d | cl＇d per sh ${ }^{\text {B }}$－$\dagger$ | 2.75 |
| 2.25 | 2.26 | 2.81 | 3.00 | 3.47 | 5.26 | 6.30 | 5.20 | 5.89 | 5.95 | 5.76 | 5.89 | 5.96 | 5.60 | 5.64 | 6.26 | 7.90 | 8.75 | Cap＇ | ending per sh | 7.50 |
| 19.92 | 20.60 | 20.65 | 21.12 | 21.25 | 21.86 | 22.64 | 23.68 | 25.09 | 26.60 | 31.50 | 33.22 | 34.68 | 36.44 | 38.60 | 40.42 | 41.10 | 42.40 | Book | lue per sh C | 45.75 |
| 35.60 | 35.79 | 35.97 | 38.97 | 35.93 | 36.00 | 36.23 | 36.28 | 37.22 | 38.75 | 46.91 | 48.17 | 48.33 | 49.37 | 50.32 | 50.45 | 50.60 | 51.50 | Comm | Shs Outst＇g ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | 53.00 |
| －－ | 17.1 | 26.0 | 21.7 | 13.9 | 11.5 | 12.9 | 12.6 | 15.7 | 16.9 | 16.2 | 18.4 | 17.2 | 17.8 | 16.8 | 19.9 | 18.9 |  | Avg | ＇I P／E Ratio | 18.5 |
| －－ | ． 91 | 1.40 | 1.15 | ． 84 | ． 77 | ． 82 | ． 79 | 1.00 | ． 95 | ． 85 | ． 93 | ． 90 | ． 90 | ． 91 | 1.06 | ． 95 |  | Relativ | P／E Ratio | 1.05 |
|  | 3．4\％ | 3．6\％ | 4．1\％ | 5．4\％ | 5．7\％ | 4．9\％ | 4．5\％ | 4．2\％ | 3．7\％ | 3．3\％ | 3．6\％ | 3．4\％ | 3．5\％ | 3．9\％ | 3．3\％ | 4．0\％ |  | Avg An | Div＇d Yield | 3．7\％ |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9／30／20 Total Debt $\$ 2307.0$ mill．Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 548.1$ mill． LT Debt $\$ 2204.4$ mill．LT Interest $\$ 80.5$ mill． Incl．\＄15．5 mill．capitalized leases． （LT interest earned：2．8x） |  |  |  |  |  | 1110.7 | 1117.3 | 1070.3 | 1154.5 | 1204.9 | 1214.3 | 1257.2 | 1305.7 | 1198.1 | 1257.9 | 1215 | 1265 | Reve | s（\＄mill） | 1450 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 77.4 | 92.6 | 83.7 | 94.0 | 120.7 | 138.4 | 164.2 | 162.7 | 171.1 | 179.3 | 160 | 180 | Net P | it（\＄mill） | 220 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 25．0\％ | 9．8\％ | 9．6\％ | 13．2\％ | ．－ | 13．7\％ | －－ | 7．6\％ | 7．6\％ | 1．6\％ | NMF | Nil | Income | Tax Rate | 10．0\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 14．2\％ | 3．3\％ | 9．4\％ | 8．7\％ | 8．9\％ | 9．8\％ | 4．3\％ | 5．2\％ | 3．4\％ | 4．6\％ | 6．0\％ | 6．0\％ | AFUDC | \％to Net Profit | 4．0\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 57．2\％ | 52．2\％ | 53．8\％ | 53．5\％ | 53．4\％ | 53．1\％ | 52．0\％ | 50．2\％ | 52．2\％ | 52．5\％ | 49．0\％ | 51．5\％ | Long－T | rm Debt Ratio | 48．0\％ |
| Pension Assets－12／19 $\$ 609.0$ mill． <br> Oblig $\$ 735.6$ mill． <br> Pfd Stock None |  |  |  |  |  | 42．8\％ | 47．8\％ | 46．2\％ | 46．5\％ | 46．6\％ | 46．9\％ | 48．0\％ | 49．8\％ | 47．8\％ | 47．5\％ | 51．0\％ | 48．5\％ | Comm | Equity Ratio | 52．0\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1916.4 | 1797.1 | 2020.7 | 2215.7 | 3168.0 | 3408.6 | 3493.9 | 3614.5 | 4064.6 | 4289.8 | 4090 | 4490 | Total C | pital（\＄mill） | 4675 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2118.0 | 2213.3 | 2435.6 | 2690.1 | 3758.0 | 4059.5 | 4214.9 | 4358.3 | 4521.3 | 4700.9 | 4915 | 5175 | Net P | t（\＄mill） | 5800 |
| Common Stock $50,581,973$ shs． as of $10 / 16 / 20$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5．9\％ | 7．0\％ | 5．5\％ | 5．5\％ | 4．8\％ | 5．2\％ | 5．9\％ | 5．6\％ | 5．2\％ | 5．2\％ | 5．0\％ | 5．0\％ | Return | on Total Cap＇l | 5．5\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 9．4\％ | 10．8\％ | 9．0\％ | 9．1\％ | 8．2\％ | 8．6\％ | 9．8\％ | 9．0\％ | 8．8\％ | 8．8\％ | 8．0\％ | 8．5\％ | Return | on Shr．Equity | 9．0\％ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 9．4\％ | 10．8\％ | 9．0\％ | 9．1\％ | 8．2\％ | 8．6\％ | 9．8\％ | 9．0\％ | 8．8\％ | 8．8\％ | 8．0\％ | 8．5\％ | Return | on Com Equity E | 9．0\％ |
| MARKET CAP：\＄2．9 billion（Mid Cap） |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3.5 \% \\ & 63 \% \end{aligned}$ | 4．7\％ | 3．2\％ | 3．5\％ | 3．8\％ | 3．0\％ | 4．1\％ | 3．4\％ | 3．2\％ | 3．1\％ | 2．0\％ | 2．5\％ | Retain | to Com Eq | 3．0\％ |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56\％ | 65\％ | 61\％ | 54\％ | 65\％ | 58\％ | 62\％ | 64\％ | 64\％ | 75\％ | 70\％ | All Div | ds to Net Prof | 66\％ |



BUSINESS：NorthWestern Corporation（doing business as North Western Energy）supplies electricity \＆gas in the Upper Midwest and Northwest，serving 443，000 electric customers in Montana and South Dakota and 292,000 gas customers in Montana（ $85 \%$ of gross margin），South Dakota（14\％），and Nebraska（1\％）．Electric revenue breakdown：residential，39\％；commercial，47\％；industrial，
NorthWestern＇s earnings almost cer－ tainly declined in 2020．Mild weather and unusual costs hurt the first－quarter comparison．Over the remainder of the year，the utility was affected by the slump in commercial and industrial kilowatt－ hour sales resulting from the weak econo－ my（partly offset by higher residential volume）and some coronavirus－related costs．NorthWestern stated that it planned to book a pretax charge of $\$ 9.5$ million against fourth－quarter results because the Montana commission disallowed some purchased－power costs．We are including this in our earnings presentation even though the company is excluding it from its targeted range of $\$ 3.30-\$ 3.45$ a share．
We expect earnings in 2021 to ap－ proach the 2019 tally．We figure North－ Western will have a more－typical showing in the March quarter，lower coronavirus－ related effects for the full－year，and no charge for the disallowance in the Decem－ ber period．Our profit estimate of $\$ 3.50$ a share is at the midpoint of the company＇s preliminary guidance of $\$ 3.40-\$ 3.60$ ．

## NorthWestern is adding generating

$4 \%$ ；other， $10 \%$ ．Generating sources：hydro， $34 \%$ ；coal， $28 \%$ ；wind $5 \%$ ；other， $3 \%$ ；purchased， $30 \%$ ．Fuel costs： $25 \%$ of revenues．＇19 reported deprec．rate： $2.8 \%$ ．Has 1,500 employees．Chairman： Stephen P．Adik．President \＆CEO：Robert C．Rowe．Inc．：Dela ware．Address： 3010 West 69th Street，Sioux Falls，South Dakota 57108．Tel．：605－978－2900．Internet：www．northwesternenergy．com
megawatt gas－fired plant in South Dakota that is scheduled to be on line in late 2021 at a cost of $\$ 80$ million．The utility plans to add another $30-40 \mathrm{mw}$ of capacity in 2023 at an expected cost of $\$ 60$ million． NorthWestern canceled plans to purchase a stake in a coal－fired plant because ob－ taining regulatory approval appeared un－ likely．The utility has a request for propo－ sals pending in Montana，and expects to announce the winning bidder（s）in the cur－ rent quarter．
We think the board of directors will raise the dividend in the current quarter．We estimate the annual dis－ bursement will be hiked by $\$ 0.08$ a share $(3.3 \%)$ ．This would be a slightly smaller in－ crease than in recent years．Based on our estimates for earnings and dividends this year，the payout ratio would be at the up－ per end of NorthWestern＇s goal of $60 \%$－ $70 \%$ ．
The dividend yield of NorthWestern stock is somewhat above the utility average．Total return potential is attrac－ tive for the year ahead and respectable for the 3 －to 5 －year period．
Paul E．Debbas，CFA
January 22， 2021
（A）Diluted EPS．Excl．gain（loss）on disc．ops．： $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb．（B）Div＇ds historically paid in late Mar．，} \\ & \text { allowed on com．eq．in MT in＇19（elec．）：} \\ & \text { Company＇s Financial Strength }\end{aligned}$
＇05，（6¢）；＇06，1¢；nonrec．gains：＇12，39¢ net；June，Sept．\＆Dec．－Div＇d reinvestment plan $9.65 \%$ ；in＇17（gas）：9．55\％；in SD in＇ 15 ：none 15，27¢；＇18， $52 ¢$ ；＇19，45¢．＇18 EPS don＇t sum avail．（C）Incl．def＇d charges．In＇19：\＄16．68／sh．spec．；in NE in＇07：10．4\％；earned on avg． due to rounding．Next earnings report due mid－（D）In mill．（E）Rate base：Net orig．cost．Rate com．eq．，＇19：9．0\％．Reg．Climate：Below Avg． © 2021 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 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 or marketing any printed or electronic publication，service or product
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| OGE ENERGY CORP, nYSE-oge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RECENT } \\ & \text { PRICE } \end{aligned}$ | $32.3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { P/E } \\ & \text { RATIO } 15.7\binom{\text { Trailing: }}{\text { Median: } 17.9} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RELATIVE } 0.75 \\ & \text { PIE RATIO } \\ & \hline .75 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $5.0 \%$ |  | VALUE LINE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|    <br> TIMELINESS $\mathbf{3}$ Lowered 36120  <br> SAFETY $\mathbf{2}$ Lowered 12/18/15  <br> TECHNICAL $\mathbf{4}$ Raised $11120 / 20$  <br> BETA 1.10 (1.00 $=$ Market) |  |  |  | High: | $\begin{array}{r}18.9 \\ 9.9 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 23.1 16.9 | 28.6 20.3 | 30.1 25.1 | 40.0 27.7 | 39.3 32.8 | $\begin{aligned} & 36.5 \\ & 24.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.2 \\ & 23.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.4 \\ & 32.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 41.8 \\ & 29.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.8 \\ & 38.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.4 \\ & 23.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Target Price <br> 2023 <br> 2024 | Range <br> 2025 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| 18-Month Target Price Range Low-High Midpoint (\% to Mid) \$23-\$62 $\$ 43$ (30\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2-10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50 |
| 2023-25 PROJECTIONS    <br>  Price Gain Ann'ITotal <br>  Return   <br> High 55 $(+70 \%)$ $18 \%$ <br> Low 40 $(+25 \%)$ $10 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
|  |  |  |  | 边 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| Institutional Decisions |  |  |  | \|l|lı |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | T. RETURN 11/20 |  |
|  | 402019 | 102220 | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | STock |  |
| ${ }_{\text {to }}^{\text {to Suy }}$ to | ${ }_{185}^{205}$ | ${ }_{221}^{176}$ | 182 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.0 15.7 <br> 1.4 23.5 |  |
|  | 133273 | 128589 | 129209 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 yr . | $49.6 \quad 64.0$ |  |
| 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | ${ }^{\circ}$ VAL | UE LINE PUB. LLC | 23-25 |
| 27.37 | 32.83 | 21.96 | 20.68 | 21.77 | 14.79 | 19.04 | 19.96 | 18.58 | 14.45 | 12.30 | 11.00 | 11.31 | 11.32 | 11.37 | 11.15 | 10.50 | 11.50 | Reve | es per sh | 13.75 |
| 1.87 | 1.94 | 2.23 | 2.39 | 2.40 | 2.69 | 3.01 | 3.31 | 3.69 | 3.46 | 3.40 | 3.23 | 3.31 | 3.34 | 3.74 | 4.02 | 4.05 | 4.40 | "Cash | Flow" per sh | 5.25 |
| . 89 | . 92 | 1.23 | 1.32 | 1.25 | 1.33 | 1.50 | 1.73 | 1.79 | 1.94 | 1.98 | 1.69 | 1.69 | 1.92 | 2.12 | 2.24 | 2.05 | 2.25 | Earning | s per sh ${ }^{\text {A }}$ | 2.50 |
| . 67 | 67 | . 67 | . 68 | . 70 | . 71 | . 73 | . 76 | . 80 | 85 | . 95 | 1.05 | 1.16 | 1.27 | 1.40 | 1.51 | 1.58 | 1.68 | Div'd D | ecl'd per sh ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | 1.95 |
| 1.51 | 1.65 | 2.67 | 3.04 | 4.01 | 4.37 | 4.36 | 6.48 | 5.85 | 4.99 | 2.86 | 2.74 | 3.31 | 4.13 | 2.87 | 3.18 | 2.90 | 3.65 | Cap'IS | pending per sh | 3.75 |
| 7.14 | 7.59 | 8.79 | 9.16 | 10.14 | 10.52 | 11.73 | 13.06 | 14.00 | 15.30 | 16.27 | 16.66 | 17.24 | 19.28 | 20.06 | 20.69 | 18.15 | 18.80 | Book V | alue per sh ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 20.75 |
| 180.00 | 181.20 | 182.40 | 183.60 | 187.00 | 194.00 | 195.20 | 196.20 | 197.60 | 198.50 | 199.40 | 199.70 | 199.70 | 199.70 | 199.70 | 200.10 | 200.00 | 200.00 | Commo | S Shs Outstg ${ }^{\text {D }}$ | 200.00 |
| 14.1 | 14.9 | 13.7 | 13.8 | 12.4 | 10.8 | 13.3 | 14.4 | 15.2 | 17.7 | 18.3 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 18.3 | 16.5 | 19.0 | Bold fig | res are | Avg An | 'I P/E Ratio | 19.5 |
| . 74 | . 79 | . 74 | . 73 | . 75 | 72 | . 85 | . 90 | . 97 | . 99 | 96 | . 89 | . 93 | . 92 | 89 | 1.02 |  |  | Relative | P/E Ratio | 1.10 |
| 5.3\% | 4.9\% | 4.0\% | 3.8\% | 4.5\% | 5.0\% | 3.7\% | 3.1\% | 2.9\% | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% | 3.5\% |  |  | Avg An | 'l Div'd Yield | 4.0\% |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/20 Total Debt $\$ 3493.9$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 79.4$ mill. LT Debt $\$ 3493.9$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 150.2$ mill. (LT interest earned: 3.9x) |  |  |  |  |  | 3716.9 | 3915.9 | 3671.2 | 2867.7 | 2453.1 | 2196.9 | 2259.2 | 2261.1 | 2270.3 | 2231.6 | 2100 | 2300 | Revenu | es (\$mill) | 2750 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 295.3 | 342.9 | 355.0 | 387.6 | 395.8 | 337.6 | 338.2 | 384.3 | 425.5 | 449.6 | 415 | 450 | Net Pro | fit (Smill) | 520 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 34.9\% | 30.7\% | 26.0\% | 24.9\% | 30.4\% | 29.2\% | 30.5\% | 32.5\% | 14.5\% | 7.4\% | 13.0\% | 13.0\% | Incom | Tax Rate | 13.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.7\% | 9.0\% | 2.7\% | 2.6\% | 1.7\% | 3.7\% | 6.4\% | 15.0\% | 8.3\% | 1.6\% | 1.0\% | 2.0\% | AFUDC | \% to Net Profit | 2.0\% |
| Leases, Uncapitalized Annual rentals $\$ 6.2$ mill. |  |  |  |  |  | 50.8\% | 51.6\% | 50.7\% | 43.1\% | 45.9\% | 44.3\% | 41.1\% | 41.7\% | 42.0\% | 43.6\% | 49.0\% | 48.0\% | Long-T | rm Debt Ratio | 49.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 49.2\% | 48.4\% | 49.3\% | 56.9\% | 54.1\% | 55.7\% | 58.9\% | 58.3\% | 58.0\% | 56.4\% | 51.0\% | 52.0\% | Commo | Equity Ratio | 51.0\% |
| Pension Assets-12/19 \$530.3 mill. Oblig $\$ 616.9$ mill. |  |  |  |  |  | 4652.5 | 5300.4 | 5615.8 | 5337.2 | 5999.7 | 5971.6 | 5849.6 | 6600.7 | 6902.0 | 7334.7 | 7130 | 7250 | Total C | apital (\$mill) | 8100 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6464.4 | 7474.0 | 8344.8 | 6672.8 | 6979.9 | 7322.4 | 7696.2 | 8339.9 | 8643.8 | 9044.6 | 9225 | 9525 | Net Pla | nt (Smill) | 10275 |
| Pfd Stock None |  |  |  |  |  | 7.8\% | 7.8\% | 7.7\% | 8.6\% | 7.8\% | 6.9\% | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | 7.3\% | 7.1\% | 7.0\% | 7.5\% | Return | on Total Cap'I | 7.5\% |
| Common Stock 200,020,017 shs. |  |  |  |  |  | 12.9\% | 13.4\% | 12.8\% | 12.8\% | 12.2\% | 10.2\% | 9.8\% | 10.0\% | 10.6\% | 10.9\% | 11.5\% | 12.0\% | Return | on Shr. Equity | 12.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.9\% | 13.4\% | 12.8\% | 12.8\% | 12.2\% | 10.2\% | 9.8\% | 10.0\% | 10.6\% | 10.9\% | 11.5\% | 12.0\% | Return | on Com Equity E | 12.5\% |
| MARKET CAP: $\$ 6.5$ billion (Large Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7\% | 7.7\% | 7.2\% | 7.3\% | 6.5\% | 4.0\% | 3.3\% | 3.5\% | 3.8\% | 3.6\% | 2.5\% | 3.5\% | Retain | do Com Eq | 3.0\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  | 48\% | 43\% | 44\% | 43\% | 47\% | 61\% | 67\% | 64\% | 64\% | 67\% | 76\% | 73\% | All Div' | ds to Net Prof | 75\% |


ting sources: gas, $35 \%$; coal, $15 \%$; wind, $5 \%$; purchased, $45 \%$, Fuel costs: $35 \%$ of revenues. ' 19 reported depreciation rate (utility): 2.7\%. Has 2,400 employees. Chairman, President and Chief Exec utive Officer: Sean Trauschke. Incorporated: Oklahoma. Address: 321 North Harvey, P.O. Box 321, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101 0321. Telephone: 405-553-3000. Internet: www.oge.com.

The Oklahoma Corporation Commission approved a grid-enhancement plan. Oklahoma Gas and Electric plans to spend $\$ 810$ million through 2024 . The utility will receive $\$ 7$ million in revenues for this plan in 2021 and 2022, and file a rate case by the end of the first quarter of 2022.

The utility filed for an increase in Arkansas under the state's formula rate plan. OG\&E is seeking $\$ 7$ million, which would take effect at the start of April. The company has reached settlements in previous formula rate requests.
The board of directors raised the dividend, effective with the October payment. The increase was $\$ 0.06$ a share (3.9\%) annually, smaller than in recent years. We believe this deceleration reflects the situation with Enable. We project better dividend growth by 2023-2025.
This stock offers an attractive dividend yield. The yield is more than one percentage point above the utility average. In addition, total return potential is superior for both the 18 -month span and the 3 to 5 -year period.
Paul E. Debbas, CFA December 11, 2020


(A) Dil. EPS. Excl. nonrec. gains (loss): '10,
(444); '11, 26¢;' 13,2 , ; gains (losses) from disc. ops.: '04, 8c; '05, 33c; '06, 14; '11, \$1.11); '12, (\$1.22); '13, 24;' '14, 2¢; '15, 2¢;

BUSINESS: Otter Tail Corporation is the parent of Otter Tail Power Company, which supplies electricity to 132,000 customers in Minnesota ( $52 \%$ of retail electric revenues), North Dakota ( $38 \%$ ), and South Dakota ( $10 \%$ ). Electric rev. breakdown: residential, $32 \%$; commercial \& farms, $36 \%$; industrial, $30 \%$; other, $2 \%$. Generating sources: coal, $45 \%$; wind \& hydro, $8 \%$; other, $1 \%$; purchased, $46 \%$.
Otter Tail Corporation raised its 2020 earnings guidance for the secondconsecutive quarter. The company's nonutility operations are faring better than management expected three months earlier. Accordingly, upon reporting thirdquarter profits in early November, Otter Tail raised its targeted range for share net from $\$ 2.10-\$ 2.30$ to $\$ 2.26-\$ 2.36$. The company now expects its Manufacturing division to earn $\$ 0.23-\$ 0.25$ a share, versus $\$ 0.15-\$ 0.23$ previously and $\$ 0.32$ in 2019, and its Plastics segment to contribute $\$ 0.64-\$ 0.66$, versus $\$ 0.50-\$ 0.54$ previously and $\$ 0.51$ in 2019. The latter operation is seeing strong demand and pricing for PVC pipe. The revised earnings guidance is near the $\$ 2.22-\$ 2.37$ range Otter Tail issued in mid-February, before the coronavirus problems emerged. We raised our 2020 share-earnings estimate by $\$ 0.15$, to
$\$ 2.30$, and boosted our 2021 estimate by the same amount, to $\$ 2.45$, thanks to the nonutility operations' improved prospects.
Otter Tail Power filed a rate case in Minnesota. This was the utility's first ap-
plication there since 2016. Otter Tail requested a hike of $\$ 14.5$ million (6.8\%), Paul E. Debbas, CFA December 11, 2020

16, 1\&; '17, 14. '19 EPS don't sum due to $\quad \$ 4.67 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill. (E) Rate all'd on com. eq. $\quad$ Company's Financial Strength | '16, 1c; '17, 16. '19 EPS don't sum due to | $\$ 4.67 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill. (E) Rate all'd on com. eq. | Company's Financial St |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| rndg. Next egs. rept. due mid-Feb. (B) Div'ds | in MN in '17: 9.41\%; in ND in '18: 9.77\%; in SD | Stock's Price Stability |
| histor pd in early Mar |  |  | histor. pd. in early Mar., Jun., Sept., \& Dec. - in '19: 8.75\%; earn. avg. com. eq., '19: 11.6\%. Div'd reinv. plan avail. (C) Incl. intang. In '19: $\quad$ Reg. Clim.: MN, ND, Avg.; SD, Above Avg.

© 2020 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 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 or marketing any printed or electronic publication, senvice or product.

Fuel costs: $14 \%$ of revenues. Also has operations in manufacturing and plastics ( $27 \%$ of '19 operating income). '19 reported deprec. rate (utility): $2.8 \%$. Has 2,300 employees. Chairman: Nathan I. Partain. President \& CEO: Charles S. MacFarlane. Inc.: Minnesota. Address: 215 South Cascade St., P.O. Box 496, Fergus Falls, MN 56538-0496. Tel.: 866-410-8780. Internet: www.ottertail.com.
based on a return on equity of $10.2 \%$ and a common-equity ratio of $52.5 \%$. The utility is requesting an interim tariff increase of $\$ 13.6$ million that would take effect at the start of 2021. Otter Tail also wants a regulatory mechanism that would decouple revenues and volume. An order is expected in late 2021
Two large construction projects are scheduled for completion soon. A 150megawatt wind project, the largest in Otter Tail Power's history, is slated for commercial operation by yearend at an expected cost of $\$ 260$ million. A $245-\mathrm{mw}$ gas-fired plant is scheduled for commercial operation in the first quarter of 2021 at an ex pected cost of $\$ 152.5$ million. Separately, the utility has submitted 12 potential projects with the Minnesota commission for a total capital investment of $\$ 153$ million-\$173 million
This stock's dividend yield is slightly above the utility average. Despite Otter Tail's improved prospects, the stock price is down $22 \%$ in 2020 . Total return potenis down $22 \%$ in is appealing for the next 18 months tial is appealing for the next 18 mont
but unexciting for the $2023-2025$ period.
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|  |  |  | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Change | Retail Sales (KN |  |  | -. 3 | -. 3 |
| Avg. Indus | Use (MWH) |  | 620 | 662 | 714 |
| Avg. Indus | Revs. per KW | NH (c) | 8.34 | 8.40 | 7.88 |
| Capacity | Peak (Mw) |  | 8438 | 8643 | 8241 |
| Peak Load | Summer (Mw) |  | 7363 | 7320 | 7115 |
| Annual Loa | Factor (\%) |  | 46.3 | 47.0 | 47.1 |
| \% Change | Customers (yres |  | +1.8 | +2.0 | +2.0 |
| Fixed Char | e Cov. (\%) |  | 425 | 318 | 286 |
| ANNU of chang | L RATES (per sh) | Past 10 Yrs. | Pa 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est'd } \\ & \text { to } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { '17-'19 } \\ & 23-25 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Reven |  | -.5\% |  | 5\% | .5\% |
| "Cash | Flow" | 2.5\% |  | \% | .5\% |
| Earnin |  | 6.5\% |  | \% | .5\% |
| Divide |  | 3.0\% |  | \% | .0\% |
| Book V | alue | 3.0\% |  | \% | 3.5\% |
| Cal- | QUART | TERLY REV | VENUES | mil.) | Full |
| endar | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2017 | 677.7 | 944.6 | 1183.3 | 759.7 | 3565.3 |
| 2018 | 692.7 | 974.1 | 1268.0 | 756.4 | 3691.2 |
| 2019 | 740.5 | 869.5 | 1190.8 | 670.4 | 3471.2 |
| 2020 | 661.9 | 929.6 | 1254.5 | 729 | 3575 |
| 2021 | 750 | 900 | 1250 | 750 | 3650 |
| Cal- |  | RNINGS PE | ER SHAR |  | Full |
| endar | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2017 | . 21 | 1.49 | 2.46 | . 27 | 4.43 |
| 2018 | . 03 | 1.48 | 2.80 | . 23 | 4.54 |
| 2019 | . 16 | 1.28 | 2.77 | . 57 | 4.77 |
| 2020 | . 27 | 1.71 | 3.07 | . 05 | 5.10 |
| 2021 | . 15 | 1.50 | 3.15 | . 35 | 5.15 |
| Cal- | QUART | ERLY DIVID | DENDS P | $\mathrm{ID}^{\mathrm{B}}$ - | Full |
| endar | Mar. 31 | Jun. 30 | Sep. 30 | Dec. 31 | Year |
| 2017 | . 655 | . 655 | . 655 | . 695 | 2.66 |
| 2018 | . 695 | . 695 | . 695 | . 7375 | 2.82 |
| 2019 | . 7375 | . 7375 | . 7375 | . 7825 | 3.00 |
| 2020 | . 7825 | . 7825 | . 7825 | . 83 | 3.18 |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |

BUSINESS: Pinnacle West Capital Corporation is a holding compa ny for Arizona Public Service Company (APS), which supplies electricity to 1.3 million customers in most of Arizona, except about half of the Phoenix metro area, the Tucson metro area, and Mohave County in northwestern Arizona. Discontinued SunCor real estate subsidiary in '10. Electric revenue breakdown: residential, 51\%;
Pinnacle West's utility subsidiary has revised its general rate case. Arizona Public Service originally filed for an increase of $\$ 184$ million ( $5.6 \%$ ), based on a return on equity of $10.15 \%$ and a commonequity ratio of $54.7 \%$. The utility reduced its requested hike to $\$ 169$ million ( $5.1 \%$ ), based on an ROE of $10 \%$ and the same common-equity ratio. APS is trying to place capital investments in the rate base and obtain regulatory mechanism to track and recover certain expenses, such as property taxes. The staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission recommended an increase of $\$ 59.8$ million ( $1.8 \%$ ), based on a $9.4 \% \mathrm{ROE}$ and the same common-equity ratio. There is no statutory time frame for an order, and the case has been delayed several months. Perhaps an increase will go into effect as early as mid-2021. There is always some risk surrounding rate cases, but the fact that two of the five commissioners are new to their positions adds uncertainty to the current proceedings
We raised our 2020 earnings estimate by $\$ 0.15$ a share, to $\$ 5.10$. The company's third-quarter tally was boosted significantly by a record-hot summer in APS'
ommercial, 38\%; industrial, $5 \%$; other, $6 \%$. Generating sources: nuclear, $28 \%$; gas \& other, $28 \%$; coal, $24 \%$; purchased, $20 \%$. Fuel costs: $30 \%$ of revenues. '19 reported deprec. rate: $2.8 \%$. Has 6,200 employees. Chairman, President \& CEO: Jeffrey B. Guldner. Inc. AZ. Address: 400 North Fitth St., P.O. Box 53999, Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999. Tel.: 602-250-1000. Internet: www.pinnaclewest.com.
service area. In fact, upon reporting thirdquarter profits, Pinnacle West raised its targeted range by $\$ 0.20$ a share, to $\$ 4.95-$ $\$ 5.15$. The fourth-quarter comparison will almost certainly be materially negative due to some discretionary spending and the acceleration of some operating ex penses from 2021 to 2020.
We look for slightly higher profits this year. This is based on the assumption that a rate increase will be in effect by the start of the seasonally strong third quar ter. However, APS benefited from favorable weather conditions in the second and third quarters of 2020 , and we base our 2021 estimate on normal weather.
The board of directors raised the annual dividend $\$ 0.19$ a share (6.1\%) in the fourth quarter. This has been the growth rate of the disbursement in recent years. We think dividend hikes will continue at that level through 2023-2025.
This timely stock is attractive for conservative income-oriented investors The yield is above the utility average, and total return potential for the 18-month span and 3- to 5 -year period are solid. Paul E. Debbas, CFA January 22, 2021
(A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrec. gain (loss): '09, due to rounding. Next earnings report due late deferred charges. In '19: \$14.00/sh. (D) In mill. Company's Financial Strength
(\$1.45); '17, 8¢; gains (losses) from discont. Feb. (B) Div'ds historically paid in early Mar., (E) Rate base: Fair value. Rate allowed on ps.: '05, (36c); '06, 10¢; '08, 28¢; '09, (13c); June, Sept., \& Dec. There were 5 declarations com. eq. in '17: 10.0\%; earned on avg. com. '10, 18¢; '11, 10c; '12, (5c). '19 EPS don't sum in '12. - Div'd reinvestment plan avail. (C) Incl. eq., '19: 10.1\%. Regulatory Climate: Average. © 2021 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 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 or marketing any printed or electronic publication, senvice or product.
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| PORTAND |  |  | $E$ | ERAL NYSE-POR |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \text { RECENT } \\ \text { PRICE } \end{array} \mathbf{4 1 . 9 0}\right.$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|ll\|} \hline \text { P/E } \\ \text { RATIO } 27.7\binom{\text { Trailing: } 14.3}{\text { Median: } 17.0} \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { RELATIVE } \\ \text { P/E RATIO } & 1.28 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|ccc} \hline \text { DIV'D } & 4.0 \% & \text { VALUE } \\ \text { YLD } & \text { LINE } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIMELINESS $\mathbf{4}$ Lowered $1 / 22 / 21$ <br> SAFETY $\mathbf{3}$ Lowered $9 / 4 / 20$ <br> TECHNICAL 4 Lowered $18 / 81$ <br> BETA .85 $(1.00=$ Market) |  |  |  | High: Low: | 21.4 13.5 | 22.7 <br> 17.5 | 26.0 21.3 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 28.1 \\ & 24.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline 33.3 \\ 27.4 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.3 \\ & 29.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.0 \\ & 33.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.2 \\ & 35.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 50.1 \\ & 42.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.4 \\ & 39.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.4 \\ & 44.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63.1 \\ & 32.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Target Pric 2023202 | Range 2025 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-128$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 18-Month Target Price Range <br> Low-High Midpoint (\% to Mid) $\$ 34-\$ 80 \quad \$ 57(35 \%)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 64 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 48 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\pi_{1,11}$ |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 32 |
|  | 5 PR | ECTIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 'י'י' |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
|  | rice |  | n'I Total Return |  |  |  |  |  | 91! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | * |  |  |  | -16 |
|  |  |  | $15 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **** |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  | -12 |
| Institutional Decisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \% TO | RETURN 12/20 |  |
|  | 102020 | 202020 | 302020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | STOCK |  |
| to Buy to Sell Hld's(000) | $\begin{aligned} & 132 \\ & 197 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 157 \\ & 158 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 147 \\ & 180 \end{aligned}$ | Percent shares traded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 yr. 3 yr. | -20.3 18.8 <br> 37.7 29.9 <br> 7.9  | - |
|  | 86455 | 90761 | 81534 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 yr . | 37.981 .5 |  |
| 2004 2005 ${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | ${ }^{\text {® VAL }}$ | JE LINE PUB. LLC | 23-25 |
| -- | 23.14 | 24.32 | 27.87 | 27.89 | 23.99 | 23.67 | 24.06 | 23.89 | 23.18 | 24.29 | 21.38 | 21.62 | 22.54 | 22.30 | 23.75 | 24.00 | 24.55 | Reven | s per sh | 27.25 |
| -- | 4.75 | 4.64 | 5.21 | 4.71 | 4.07 | 4.82 | 4.96 | 5.15 | 4.93 | 6.08 | 5.37 | 5.78 | 6.16 | 6.65 | 6.97 | 6.25 | 7.50 | "Cash | ow" per sh | 8.75 |
| -- | 1.02 | 1.14 | 2.33 | 1.39 | 1.31 | 1.66 | 1.95 | 1.87 | 1.77 | 2.18 | 2.04 | 2.16 | 2.29 | 2.37 | 2.39 | 1.55 | 2.65 | Earnin | per sh A | 3.00 |
|  |  | . 68 | . 93 | . 97 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.06 | 1.08 | 1.10 | 1.12 | 1.18 | 1.26 | 1.34 | 1.43 | 1.52 | 1.59 | 1.68 | Div'd | cl'd per sh ${ }^{\text {B - }} \dagger$ | 2.00 |
|  | 4.08 | 5.94 | 7.28 | 6.12 | 9.25 | 5.97 | 3.98 | 4.01 | 8.40 | 12.87 | 6.73 | 6.57 | 5.77 | 6.67 | 6.78 | 8.60 | 7.45 | Cap' | ending per sh | 6.00 |
|  | 19.15 | 19.58 | 21.05 | 21.64 | 20.50 | 21.14 | 22.07 | 22.87 | 23.30 | 24.43 | 25.43 | 26.35 | 27.11 | 28.07 | 28.99 | 28.95 | 29.90 | Book | ue per sh c | 33.00 |
|  | 62.50 | 62.50 | 62.53 | 62.58 | 75.21 | 75.32 | 75.36 | 75.56 | 78.09 | 78.23 | 88.79 | 88.95 | 89.11 | 89.27 | 89.39 | 89.55 | 89.65 | Comm | Shs Outst'g D | 90.00 |
| - | -- | 23.4 | 11.9 | 16.3 | 14.4 | 12.0 | 12.4 | 14.0 | 16.9 | 15.3 | 17.7 | 19.1 | 20.0 | 18.4 | 22.3 | 29.4 |  | Avg | 'IP/E Ratio | 18.0 |
| -- | -- | 1.26 | . 63 | . 98 | . 96 | . 76 | . 78 | . 89 | . 95 | . 81 | . 89 | 1.00 | 1.01 | . 99 | 1.19 | 1.50 |  | Relativ | P/E Ratio | 1.00 |
|  |  | 2.5\% | 3.3\% | 4.3\% | 5.4\% | 5.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.1\% | 3.7\% | 3.3\% | 3.3\% | 3.1\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.5\% |  | Avg An | I Div'd Yield | 3.7\% |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/20 <br> Total Debt $\$ 3058$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 541$ mill. <br> LT Debt $\$ 2657$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 129$ mill. <br> Incl. $\$ 135$ mill. capitalized leases. <br> (LT interest earned: 2.2x) <br> Leases, Uncapitalized Annual rentals $\$ 8$ mill. Pension Assets-12/19 \$695 mill. <br> Oblig $\$ 905$ mill. |  |  |  |  |  | 1783.0 | 1813.0 | 1805.0 | 1810.0 | 1900.0 | 1898.0 | 1923.0 | 2009.0 | 1991.0 | 2123.0 | 2150 | 2200 | Reve | (\$mill) | 2450 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 125.0 | 147.0 | 141.0 | 137.0 | 175.0 | 172.0 | 193.0 | 204.0 | 212.0 | 214.0 | 140 | 240 | Net Pr | (\$mill) | 275 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 30.5\% | 28.3\% | 31.4\% | 23.2\% | 26.0\% | 20.7\% | 20.6\% | 25.3\% | 7.4\% | 11.2\% | Nil | 11.0\% | Income | Tax Rate | 11.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.6\% | 5.4\% | 7.1\% | 14.6\% | 33.7\% | 19.8\% | 16.6\% | 8.8\% | 8.0\% | 7.0\% | 14.0\% | 6.0\% | AFUDC | \% to Net Profit | 6.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.0\% | 49.6\% | 47.1\% | 51.3\% | 52.7\% | 47.8\% | 48.4\% | 50.1\% | 46.5\% | 51.3\% | 53.5\% | 55.0\% | Long-T | m Debt Ratio | 54.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.0\% | 50.4\% | 52.9\% | 48.7\% | 47.3\% | 52.2\% | 51.6\% | 49.9\% | 53.5\% | 48.7\% | 46.5\% | 45.0\% | Comme | Equity Ratio | 46.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3390.0 | 3298.0 | 3264.0 | 3735.0 | 4037.0 | 4329.0 | 4544.0 | 4842.0 | 4684.0 | 5323.0 | 5575 | 5965 | Total C | pital (\$mill) | 6475 |
| Pfd Stock None |  |  |  |  |  | 4133.0 | 4285.0 | 4392.0 | 4880.0 | 5679.0 | 6012.0 | 6434.0 | 6741.0 | 6887.0 | 7161.0 | 7510 | 7745 | Net Pla | (\$mill) | 7875 |
| Common Stock 89,510,606 shs. as of $10 / 26 / 20$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5.4\% | 6.2\% | 5.9\% | 5.1\% | 5.8\% | 5.4\% | 5.6\% | 5.5\% | 5.8\% | 5.1\% | 3.5\% | 5.0\% | Return | n Total Cap'l | 5.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.9\% | 8.8\% | 8.2\% | 7.5\% | 9.2\% | 7.6\% | 8.2\% | 8.4\% | 8.5\% | 8.3\% | 5.5\% | 9.0\% | Return | n Shr. Equity | 9.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.9\% | 8.8\% | 8.2\% | 7.5\% | 9.2\% | 7.6\% | 8.2\% | 8.4\% | 8.5\% | 8.3\% | 5.5\% | 9.0\% | Return | n Com Equity E | 9.5\% |
| MARKET CAP: $\$ 3.8$ billion (Mid Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0\% | 4.1\% | 3.5\% | 2.9\% | 4.6\% | 3.3\% | 3.5\% | 3.6\% | 3.5\% | 3.1\% | NMF | 3.0\% | Retaine | to Com Eq | 3.0\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  | 62\% | 54\% | 57\% | 61\% | 50\% | 56\% | 57\% | 58\% | 59\% | 63\% | NMF | 63\% | All Div' | s to Net Prof | 65\% |


$36 \%$; coal, $19 \%$; wind, $8 \%$; hydro, $6 \%$; purchased, $31 \%$. Fuel costs: $29 \%$ of revenues. '19 reported depreciation rate: $3.6 \%$. Has 2,900 employees. Chairman: Jack E. Davis. President and Chief Executive Officer: Maria M. Pope. Incorporated: Oregon. Address: 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Portland, Oregon 97204. Telephone: 503-4648000. Internet: www.portlandgeneral.com.
company expects the trading loss will not affect this.
A noteworthy capital project was completed in 2020, and another is on track for completion in 2021. PGE has a one-third stake in a 300-megawatt windfarm in a joint venture with NextEra Energy. (In conjunction with the project, the latter company will own 50 mw of solar capacity and 30 mw of battery of storage that are scheduled for completion by yearend.) The cost of PGE's share of the wind farm was $\$ 160$ million. The company is building an integrated operations center at an expected cost of $\$ 200$ million. This is scheduled for completion by yearend.
Despite the trading loss, finances are sound. Interest coverage is adequate, and the common-equity ratio is healthy. PGE does not need to issue equity to finance its capital expenditures. PGE's Financial Strength rating is B++.
This untimely stock's dividend yield is slightly above the utility average. The equity is noteworthy for its 18 -month pros pects, however, and offers respectable 3 - to 5 -year total return potential.
Paul E. Debbas, CFA January 22, 2021
(A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrecurring losses: '13, holder investment plan avail. (C) Incl. deferred $^{\prime}$ '19: $8.4 \%$. Regulatory Climate: Average. (F) '05 $\quad$ Company's Financial Strength

42¢; '17, 19¢. Next earnings report due mid- charges. In '19: $\$ 483$ mill., $\$ 5.40 / \mathrm{sh}$. (D) In mill. per-share data are pro forma, based on shs. Feb. (B) Div'ds paid mid-Jan., Apr., July, and (E) Rate base: Net orig. Cost. Rate allowed on outstanding when stock began trading in '06. Oct. - Div'd reinvestment plan avail. † Share- com. eq. in '19: 9.5\%; earned on avg. com. eq.,
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|  | $\square$ | $E$ | V | NDQ-XEL |  |  | RECENT PRICE |  | $64.40$ | $\left.\begin{array}{ll} \text { P/E } & 222 \\ \text { RATIO } 2 \end{array} \text { ( Trailing: } 23.0\right)$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RELATIVE } 1.02 \\ & \text { PIE RATIO } 1.02 \end{aligned}$ |  | DIV'D YLD | $2.8 \%$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { VALUE } \\ & \text { LINE } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIMELINESS $\mathbf{1}$ Raised $12 / 4 / 20$ <br> SAFETY $\mathbf{1}$ Raised $5 / 1 / 15$ <br> TECHNICAL $\mathbf{2}$ Lowered $1 / 15 / 21$ <br> BETA $.80 \quad(1.00=$ Market $)$   |  |  |  | High: Low: | $\begin{aligned} & 21.9 \\ & 16.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 24.4 \\ & 19.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.8 \\ & 21.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.9 \\ & 25.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.8 \\ & 26.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.6 \\ & 27.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.3 \\ & 31.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.4 \\ & 35.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.2 \\ & 40.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.1 \\ & 41.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 66.1 \\ & 47.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.4 \\ & 46.6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Target Price Range 2023 2024 2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | LEGENDS$0.68 \times$ Dividends $p$ sh <br> divided by linterest Rate <br> $\ldots .$. Relative Price StrengthOptions: YesShaded area indicates recession |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\left[\begin{array}{c} 20<0 \\ 160 \end{array}\right.$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -120 |
| 18-Month Target Price Range |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60 |
| Low-H | Mid |  | id) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 少 |  |  |  |  | 60 |
| \$51-\$10 | \$79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
|  | 25 PR | JECTIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ,111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
|  | Price |  | I Total eturn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  | -30 |
| High Low | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 55 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 5 \% \\ \mathrm{NiI} \end{gathered}$ | $\cdots$ | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -15 |
| Institu | tional D | ecision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | RETURN 12/20 |  |
|  | 102020 | 202020 | 3 Q2020 | Percent | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{rr}\text { STOCK } & \text { INDEX } \\ 7.8 & 18.8\end{array}$ | - |
| to Buy | $\begin{array}{r} 365 \\ 378 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 343 \\ & 366 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 356 \\ 362 \end{array}$ | shares traded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 yr. 3 yr. | $\begin{array}{rr} 7.8 & 18.8 \\ 51.1 & 29.9 \end{array}$ |  |
| Hld's(000) | 407479 | 412864 | 407854 |  |  | \|||||||| | \|l||| | 1 |  | \||||||||| |  |  | \|11 |  |  | \||I|| |  | 5 yr . | 115.781 .5 |  |
| 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | $\bigcirc$ © VA | JE LINE PUB. LLC | 23-25 |
| 20.84 | 23.86 | 24.16 | 23.40 | 24.69 | 21.08 | 21.38 | 21.90 | 20.76 | 21.92 | 23.11 | 21.72 | 21.90 | 22.46 | 22.44 | 21.98 | 21.15 | 22.15 | Reve | ser sh | 24.25 |
| 3.27 | 3.28 | 3.61 | 3.45 | 3.50 | 3.48 | 3.51 | 3.79 | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.28 | 4.56 | 5.04 | 5.47 | 5.92 | 6.25 | 6.60 | 7.20 | "Cash | low" per sh | 9.00 |
| 1.27 | 1.20 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 1.46 | 1.49 | 1.56 | 1.72 | 1.85 | 1.91 | 2.03 | 2.10 | 2.21 | 2.30 | 2.47 | 2.64 | 2.80 | 2.95 | Earnin | s per sh A | 3.50 |
| . 81 | . 85 | . 88 | . 91 | . 94 | . 97 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1.20 | 1.28 | 1.36 | 1.44 | 1.52 | 1.62 | 1.72 | 1.82 | Div'd | cl'd per sh ${ }^{\text {B }}$ ■ | 2.15 |
| 3.19 | 3.25 | 4.00 | 4.89 | 4.66 | 3.91 | 4.60 | 4.53 | 5.27 | 6.82 | 6.33 | 7.26 | 6.42 | 6.54 | 7.70 | 8.05 | 6.70 | 7.70 | Cap' | pending per sh | 8.25 |
| 12.99 | 13.37 | 14.28 | 14.70 | 15.35 | 15.92 | 16.76 | 17.44 | 18.19 | 19.21 | 20.20 | 20.89 | 21.73 | 22.56 | 23.78 | 25.24 | 27.25 | 28.55 | Book | alue per sh C | 33.25 |
| 400.46 | 403.39 | 407.30 | 428.78 | 453.79 | 457.51 | 482.33 | 486.49 | 487.96 | 497.97 | 505.73 | 507.54 | 507.22 | 507.76 | 514.04 | 524.54 | 539.00 | 542.00 | Comm | Shs Outst'g D | 555.00 |
| 13.6 | 15.4 | 14.8 | 16.7 | 13.7 | 12.7 | 14.1 | 14.2 | 14.8 | 15.0 | 15.4 | 16.5 | 18.5 | 20.2 | 18.9 | 22.3 | 23.8 |  | Avg | P/E Ratio | 18.0 |
| . 72 | . 82 | . 80 | . 89 | . 82 | . 85 | . 90 | . 89 | . 94 | . 84 | . 81 | . 83 | . 97 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.19 | 1.20 |  | Relativ | P/E Ratio | 1.00 |
| 4.7\% | 4.6\% | 4.4\% | 4.0\% | 4.7\% | 5.1\% | 4.5\% | 4.2\% | 3.9\% | 3.9\% | 3.8\% | 3.7\% | 3.3\% | 3.1\% | 3.3\% | 2.7\% | 2.6\% |  | Avg An | 'I Div'd Yield | 3.4\% |
| CAPITAL STRUCTURE as of 9/30/20 Total Debt $\$ 20861$ mill. Due in 5 Yrs $\$ 3725$ mill. LT Debt $\$ 19960$ mill. LT Interest $\$ 800$ mill. Incl. $\$ 77$ mill. capitalized leases. (LT interest earned: 2.8x) |  |  |  |  |  | 10311 | 10655 | 10128 | 10915 | 11686 | 11024 | 11107 | 11404 | 11537 | 11529 | 11400 | 12000 | Reven | es (\$mill) | 13500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 727.0 | 841.4 | 905.2 | 948.2 | 1021.3 | 1063.6 | 1123.4 | 1171.0 | 1261.0 | 1372.0 | 1480 | 1600 | Net Pr | it (Smill) | 1960 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 37.5\% | 35.8\% | 33.2\% | 33.8\% | 33.9\% | 35.8\% | 34.1\% | 30.7\% | 12.6\% | 8.5\% | Nil | NMF | Income | Tax Rate | NMF |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.7\% | 9.4\% | 10.8\% | 13.4\% | 12.5\% | 7.7\% | 7.8\% | 9.4\% | 12.4\% | 8.3\% | 11.0\% | 7.0\% | AFUDC | \% to Net Profit | 7.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 53.1\% | 51.1\% | 53.3\% | 53.3\% | 53.0\% | 54.1\% | 56.3\% | 55.9\% | 56.4\% | 56.8\% | 57.0\% | 56.0\% | Long | $m$ Debt Ratio | 55.5\% |
| Leases, Uncapitalized Annual rentals \$262 mill. |  |  |  |  |  | 46.3\% | 48.9\% | 46.7\% | 46.7\% | 47.0\% | 45.9\% | 43.7\% | 44.1\% | 43.6\% | 43.2\% | 43.0\% | 44.0\% | Comm | Equity Ratio | 44.5\% |
| Oblig \$3701 mill. |  |  |  |  |  | 17452 | 17331 | 19018 | 20477 | 21714 | 23092 | 25216 | 25975 | 28025 | 30646 | 34350 | 35325 | Total | pital (\$mill) | 41500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 20663 | 22353 | 23809 | 26122 | 28757 | 31206 | 32842 | 34329 | 36944 | 39483 | 41000 | 42875 | Net Pla | t (\$mill) | 48400 |
| d Stock None |  |  |  |  |  | 5.7\% | 6.5\% | 6.1\% | 6.0\% | 6.0\% | 5.8\% | 5.7\% | 5.8\% | 5.7\% | 5.6\% | 5.5\% | 5.5\% | Return on Total Cap'l |  | 6.0\% |
| Common Stock 525,457,773 shs. |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9\% | 9.9\% | 10.2\% | 9.9\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.2\% | 10.2\% | 10.3\% | 10.4\% | 10.0\% | 10.5\% | Return on Shr. Equity |  | 10.5\% |
| as of 10/19/20 <br> MARKET CAP: $\$ 34$ billion (Large Cap) |  |  |  |  |  | 8.9\% | 9.9\% | 10.2\% | 9.9\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.2\% | 10.2\% | 10.3\% | 10.4\% | 10.0\% | 10.5\% |  |  | 10.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.6\% | 4.3\% | 4.7\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | 4.3\% | 4.0\% | 3.9\% | 4.3\% | 4.4\% | 4.0\% | 4.0\% | Retained to Com Eq |  | 4.0\% |
| ELECTRIC OPERATING STATISTICS |  |  |  |  |  | 59\% | 56\% | 54\% | 54\% | 55\% | 57\% | 61\% | 62\% | 58\% | 58\% | 62\% | 61\% | All Div'ds to Net Prof |  | 61\% |
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc. Summary of Risk Premium Models for the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

| Predictive Risk Premium |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model (PRPM) (1) |  | 10.36 |
| Risk Premium Using an Adjusted Total Market |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Approach (2) |  | 10.52 |
|  | Average | 10.44 |

Notes:
(1) From page 2 of Document No. 5.
(2) From page 3 of Document No. 5 .
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Indicated ROE
Derived by the Predictive Risk Premium Model (1)

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] | [6] | [7] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies | LT Average Predicted Variance | Spot <br> Predicted Variance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Recommended } \\ \text { Variance (2) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | GARCH <br> Coefficient | Predicted Risk Premium (3) | Risk-Free <br> Rate (4) | Indicated <br> ROE (5) |
| ALLETE, Inc. | 0.29\% | 0.46\% | 0.29\% | 2.1356 | 7.57\% | 2.31\% | 9.88\% |
| Alliant Energy Corporation | 0.27\% | 0.31\% | 0.27\% | 2.5648 | 8.54\% | 2.31\% | 10.85\% |
| Ameren Corporation | 0.23\% | 0.23\% | 0.23\% | 1.9178 | 5.38\% | 2.31\% | 7.69\% |
| Duke Energy Corporation | 0.31\% | 0.27\% | 0.31\% | 1.8161 | 7.01\% | 2.31\% | 9.32\% |
| Edison International | 0.43\% | 0.61\% | 0.43\% | 1.4753 | 7.93\% | 2.31\% | 10.24\% |
| Entergy Corporation | 0.40\% | 0.56\% | 0.40\% | 2.1949 | 11.06\% | 2.31\% | 13.37\% |
| IDACORP, Inc. | 0.29\% | 0.39\% | 0.29\% | 2.1492 | 7.65\% | 2.31\% | 9.96\% |
| NorthWestern Corporation | 0.34\% | 0.34\% | 0.34\% | 2.3264 | 9.94\% | 2.31\% | 12.25\% |
| OGE Energy Corporation | 0.31\% | 0.30\% | 0.31\% | 2.1283 | 8.17\% | 2.31\% | 10.48\% |
| Otter Tail Corporation | 0.37\% | 0.35\% | 0.37\% | 1.5726 | 7.28\% | 2.31\% | 9.59\% |
| Pinnacle West Capital Corporation | 0.60\% | 0.42\% | 0.60\% | 1.2411 | 9.27\% | 2.31\% | 11.58\% |
| Portland General Electric Company | 0.27\% | 0.35\% | 0.27\% | 2.0055 | 6.73\% | 2.31\% | 9.04\% |
| Xcel Energy, Inc. | 0.27\% | 0.18\% | 0.27\% | 2.7949 | 9.54\% | 2.31\% | 11.85\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Average | 10.47\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Median | 10.24\% |
|  |  |  |  |  | rage of Mea | and Median | 10.36\% |

Notes:
(1) The Predictive Risk Premium Model uses historical data to generate a predicted variance and a GARCH coefficient. The historical data used are the equity risk premiums for the first available trading month as reported by Bloomberg Professional Service.
(2) Given current market conditions, I recommend using the long-term average predicted variance.
(3) $\left(1+\left(\right.\right.$ Column $[3] *$ Column [4]) $\left.{ }^{\wedge}\right)-1$.
(4) From note 2 on page 2 of Document No. 6
(5) Column [5] + Column [6].
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.<br>Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate<br>Through Use of a Risk Premium Model<br>Using an Adjusted Total Market Approach

| Line No. |  | Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Prospective Yield on Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds (1) | 3.06 \% |
| 2. | Adjustment to Reflect Yield Spread Between Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds and A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds | 0.50 (2) |
| 3. | Adjusted Prospective Yield on A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds | 3.56 \% |
| 4. | Adjustment to Reflect Bond Rating Difference of Proxy Group | 0.10 (3) |
| 5. | Adjusted Prospective Bond Yield | 3.66 \% |
| 6. | Equity Risk Premium (4) | 6.86 |
| 7. | Risk Premium Derived Common Equity Cost Rate | 10.52 \% |

Notes: (1) Consensus forecast of Moody's Aaa Rated Corporate bonds from Blue Chip Financial Forecasts (see pages 10 and 11 of Document No. 5).
(2) The average yield spread of A2 rated public utility bonds over Aaa rated corporate bonds of $0.50 \%$ from page 4 of Document No. 5 .
(3) Adjustment to reflect the A3 Moody's LT issuer rating of the Utility Proxy Group as shown on page 5 of Document No. 5. The 0.1\% upward adjustment is derived by taking $1 / 3$ of the spread between A2 and Baa2 Public Utility Bonds $(1 / 3 * 0.3 \%=0.10 \%)$ as derived from page 4 of Document No. 5 .
(4) From page 7 of Document No. 5.
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Interest Rates and Bond Spreads for Moody's Corporate and Public Utility Bonds

## Selected Bond Yields



## Selected Bond Spreads

A2 Rated Public Utility Bonds Over Aaa Rated Corporate Bonds:

$$
0.50 \%(1)
$$

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

$$
0.30 \%(2)
$$

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

Source of Information: Bloomberg Professional Service

Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Comparison of Long-Term Issuer Ratings for Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies


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

| Moody's Bond Rating | Numerical Bond Weighting | Standard \& Poor's Bond Rating |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aaa | 1 | AAA |
| Aa1 | 2 | AA+ |
| Aa2 | 3 | AA |
| Aa3 | 4 | AA- |
| A1 | 5 | A+ |
| A2 | 6 | A |
| A3 | 7 | A- |
| Baa1 | 8 | BBB+ |
| Baa2 | 9 | BBB |
| Baa3 | 10 | BBB- |
| Ba1 | 11 | BB+ |
| Ba2 | 12 | BB |
| Ba3 | 13 | BB- |
| B1 | 14 | B+ |
| B2 | 15 | B |
| B3 | 16 | B- |
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc. Judgment of Equity Risk Premium for Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

Line
No.

1. Calculated equity risk premium based on the total market using the beta approach (1)
2. Mean equity risk premium based on a study using the holding period returns of public utilities with A2 rated bonds (2)
3. Predicted Equity Risk Premium Based on Regression Analysis of 1,179 Fully-Litigated Electric Utility Rate Cases
4. Average equity risk premium

Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies 5.92

Notes: (1) From page 8 of Document No. 5.
(2) From page 12 of Document No. 5.
(3) From page 13 of Document No. 5.
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.<br>Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach<br>Using the Beta for the<br>Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

| $\underline{\text { Line No. }}$ | Equity Risk Premium Measure | Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ibbotson-Based Equity Risk Premiums: |  |  |
| 1. | Ibbotson Equity Risk Premium (1) | 5.78 \% |
| 2. | Regression on Ibbotson Risk Premium Data (2) | 9.30 |
| 3. | Ibbotson Equity Risk Premium based on PRPM (3) | 9.65 |
| 4. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line Summary and Index (4) | 6.77 |
| 5. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line S\&P 500 Companies (5) | 11.04 |
| 6. | Equity Risk Premium Based on Bloomberg S\&P 500 Companies (6) | 14.72 |
| 7. | Conclusion of Equity Risk Premium | 9.54 \% |
| 8. | Adjusted Beta (7) | 0.96 |
| 9. | Forecasted Equity Risk Premium | 9.16 \% |

Notes provided on page 9 of Document No. 5.

Tampa Electric Company, Inc.<br>Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach<br>Using the Beta for the<br>Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

## Notes:

(1) Based on the arithmetic mean historical monthly returns on large company common stocks from Ibbotson® SBBI® 2021 Market Report minus the arithmetic mean monthly yield of Moody's average Aaa and Aa2 corporate bonds from 1926-2019.
(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 1928-2019 referenced in note 1 above.
(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 Aa2 corporate monthly bond yields, from January 1928 through January 2021.
(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 $3.06 \%$ (from page 3 of Document No. 5) from the projected 3-5 year total annual market return of 9.83\% (described fully in note 1 on page 2 of Document No. 6).
(5) Using data from Value Line for the S\&P 500, an expected total return of $14.10 \%$ was derived of based upon expected dividend yields and long-term earnings growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation. Subtracting the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of $3.06 \%$ results in an expected equity risk premium of $11.04 \%$.
(6) Using data from the Bloomberg Professional Service for the S\&P 500, an expected total return of $17.78 \%$ was derived of based upon expected dividend yields and long-term earnings growth estimates as a proxy for capital appreciation. Subtracting the average consensus forecast of Aaa corporate bonds of $3.06 \%$ results in an expected equity risk premium of $14.72 \%$.
(7) Average of mean and median beta from Document No. 6.

Sources of Information:
Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation - 2020 SBBI Yearbook, John Wiley \& Sons, Inc. Industrial Manual and Mergent Bond Record Monthly Update.
Value Line Summary and Index
Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, December 1, 2020 and February 3, 2021
Bloomberg Professional Service

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

| Interest Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Consensus Forecasts-Quarterly Avg. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -------Average For Week Ending------ |  |  |  | ----Average For Month--- Latest Qtr |  |  |  | $1 Q$ | 2Q | 3Q | 4Q | $1 Q$ | 2Q |
|  | Jan 22 | Jan 15 | Jan 8 | Jan 1 | Dec | Nov | Oct | 4Q 2020 | $\underline{2021}$ | 2021 | 2021 | 2021 | 2022 | $\underline{2022}$ |
| Federal Funds Rate | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Prime Rate | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| LIBOR, 3-mo. | 0.22 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Commercial Paper, 1-mo. | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Treasury bill, 3-mo. | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Treasury bill, 6-mo. | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Treasury bill, 1 yr. | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Treasury note, 2 yr . | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| Treasury note, 5 yr . | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.42 | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.34 | 0.37 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| Treasury note, 10 yr . | 1.11 | 1.13 | 1.03 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.87 | 0.79 | 0.86 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Treasury note, 30 yr . | 1.85 | 1.86 | 1.78 | 1.66 | 1.67 | 1.62 | 1.57 | 1.62 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.2 |
| Corporate Aaa bond | 2.65 | 2.67 | 2.61 | 2.49 | 2.52 | 2.58 | 2.65 | 2.58 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| Corporate Baa bond | 3.13 | 3.16 | 3.12 | 3.00 | 3.03 | 3.13 | 3.27 | 3.14 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.9 |
| State \& Local bonds | 2.66 | 2.67 | 2.67 | 2.67 | 2.70 | 2.82 | 2.93 | 2.82 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Home mortgage rate | 2.77 | 2.79 | 2.65 | 2.67 | 2.68 | 2.77 | 2.83 | 2.76 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
|  |  |  |  | -Histor |  |  |  |  |  | nsensu | F Fore | casts- | Quarter |  |
|  | 1Q | 2Q | 3Q | 4Q | 1Q | 2Q | 3Q | 4Q | 1Q | 2Q | 3Q | 4Q | 1 Q | 2Q |
| Key Assumptions | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2019}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2020}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | 2021 | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2021}$ | $\underline{2022}$ | $\underline{2022}$ |
| Fed's AFE \$ Index | 109.4 | 110.3 | 110.5 | 110.3 | 111.2 | 112.4 | 107.2 | 105.2 | 103.4 | 102.8 | 102.7 | 102.7 | 102.5 | 102.6 |
| Real GDP | 2.9 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 | -5.0 | -31.4 | 33.4 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 3.0 |
| GDP Price Index | 1.2 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 | -1.8 | 3.5 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| Consumer Price Index | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.2 | -3.5 | 5.2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| PCE Price Index | 0.6 | 2.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | -1.6 | 3.7 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 |

Forecasts for interest rates and the Federal Reserve's Major Currency Index represent averages for the quarter. Forecasts for Real GDP, GDP Price Index and Consumer 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 Freddie Mac, 30-year, fixed; LIBOR quotes from Intercontinental Exchange. All interest rate data are sourced from Haver Analytics. Historical data for Fed's Major Currency Index are from FRSR H.10. Historical data for Real GDP and GDP Chained Price Index are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). Consumer Price Index (CPI) history is from the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).
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## 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 2022 through 2026 and averages for the five-year periods 2022-2026 and 2027-2031. Apply these projections cautiously. Few if any economic, demographic and political forces can be evaluated accurately over such long time spans.


Tampa Electric Company, Inc.<br>Derivation of Mean Equity Risk Premium Based Studies Using Holding Period Returns and Projected Market Appreciation of the S\&P Utility Index

$\left.\begin{array}{clc}\text { Line No. }\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Implied Equity Risk } \\ \text { Premium }\end{array}\right)$

Notes: (1) Based on S\&P Public Utility Index monthly total returns and Moody's Public Utility Bond average monthly yields from 1928-2019. 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 1928-2019 referenced in note 1 above.
(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 - January 2021.
(4) Using data from Value Line for the S\&P 500 Utilities Index, an expected return of $10.36 \%$ was derived of based upon expected dividend yields and long-term earnings growth estimates as a proxy for market appreciation. Subtracting the expected A2 rated public utility bond yield of $3.56 \%$, calculated on line 3 of page 3 of Document No. 5 results in an equity risk premium of $6.80 \%$. ( $10.36 \%-3.56 \%$ )
(5) Using data from the Bloomberg Professional Service for the S\&P 500 Utilities Index, an expected return of $7.67 \%$ was derived of based upon expected dividend yields and long-term earnings growth estimates as a proxy for market appreciation. Subtracting the expected A2 rated public utility bond yield of 3.56\%, calculated on line 3 of page 3 of Document No. 5 results in an equity risk premium of $4.11 \%$. $(7.67 \%-3.56 \%=4.11 \%)$
(6) Average of lines 1 through 5.
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Prediction of Equity Risk Premiums Relative to
Moody's A2 Rated Utility Bond Yields


A2 Rated Moody's Bond Yield (\%)


Notes:
(1) From line 3 of page 3 of Document No. 5.

Source of Information: Regulatory Research Associates

Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric
Companies
ALLETE, Inc.
Alliant Energy Corporation
Ameren Corporation
Duke Energy Corporation
Edison International
Entergy Corporation
IDACORP, Inc.
NorthWestern Corporation
OGE Energy Corporation
Otter Tail Corporation Corporation
Pinnacle West Capital Corp
Portland General Electric Company
Xcel Energy, Inc.
Mean
Average of Mean and Median
Notes on page 2 of Document No. 6.
$\infty$

| Indicated <br> Common Equity <br> Cost Rate (3) |
| :---: |
| $12.28 \quad \%$ |
| 12.09 |
| 11.82 |
| 12.00 |
| 13.01 |
| 13.28 |
| 12.00 |
| $13.64 \quad$ |
| $14.37 \quad(4)$ |
| 12.28 |
| 12.82 |
| 12.28 |
| 11.73 |





$\sigma$ Traditional
CAPM Cost
Rate





$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{N}$
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Notes on page 2 of Document
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## Tampa Electric Company, Inc.

Notes to Accompany the Application of the CAPM and ECAPM
Notes:
(1) The market risk premium (MRP) is derived by using six different measures from three sources: Ibbotson, Value Line, and Bloomberg as illustrated below:

Historical Data MRP Estimates:
Measure 1: Ibbotson Arithmetic Mean MRP (1926-2019)

| Arithmetic Mean Monthly Returns for Large Stocks 1926-2019: | $12.10 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Arithmetic Mean Income Returns on Long-Term Government Bonds: | 5.09 |
| MRP based on Ibbotson Historical Data: | 7.01 |

Measure 2: Application of a Regression Analysis to Ibbotson Historical Data (1926-2019)
9.98 \%

Measure 3: Application of the PRPM to Ibbotson Historical Data:
(January 1926 - January 2021)
10.76 \%

Value Line MRP Estimates:
Measure 4: Value Line Projected MRP (Thirteen weeks ending January 29, 2021)
Total projected return on the market 3-5 years hence*: $\quad 9.83 \%$
Projected Risk-Free Rate (see note 2):
MRP based on Value Line Summary \& Index:
$\frac{2.31}{7.52} \%$
*Forcasted 3-5 year capital appreciation plus expected dividend yield

Measure 5: Value Line Projected Return on the Market based on the S\&P 500

| Total return on the Market based on the S\&P 500: |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Projected Risk-Free Rate (see note 2): |  |  |
| MRP based on Value Line data |  |  |
| Measure 6: Bloomberg Projected MRP |  |  |
| Total return on the Market based on the S\&P 500: |  |  |
| Projected Risk-Free Rate (see note 2): | MRP based on Bloomberg data |  |

(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 10 and 11 of Document No. 5) The projection of the risk-free rate is illustrated below:

| First Quarter 2021 | $1.80 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- |
| Second Quarter 2021 | 1.90 |
| Third Quarter 2021 | 2.00 |
| Fourth Quarter 2021 | 2.10 |
| First Quarter 2022 | 2.10 |
| Second Quarter 2022 | 2.20 |
| 2022-2026 | 2.80 |
| 2027-2031 | $\underline{3.60}$ |
|  | $\underline{\text { 2.31 }} \%$ |

(3) Average of column 6 and column 7.
(4) OGE Energy Corporation's results were excluded from the final average and median as they were more than two standard deviations above the proxy group mean.

## Sources of Information:

Value Line Summary and Index
Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, December 1, 2020 and February 3, 2021
Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation - 2020 SBBI Yearbook, John Wiley \& Sons, Inc.
Bloomberg Professional Services
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc. Basis of Selection of the Group of Non-Price Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Utility Proxy Group

The criteria for selection of the Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group was that the nonprice regulated companies be domestic and reported in Value Line Investment Survey (Standard Edition).

The Non-Price Regulated Proxy Group was then selected based on the unadjusted beta range of $0.65-0.93$ and residual standard error of the regression range of 2.4869-2.9661 of the Utility Proxy Group.

These ranges are based upon plus or minus two standard deviations of the unadjusted beta and standard error of the regression. Plus or minus two 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 0.1198 . The standard deviation of the standard error of the regression is calculated as follows:

Standard Deviation of the Std. Err. of the Regr. $=\underline{\text { Standard Error of the Regression }}$ $\sqrt{2 N}$
where: $\mathrm{N}=$ number of observations. Since Value Line betas are derived from weekly price change observations over a period of five years, $\mathrm{N}=259$

$$
\text { Thus, } 0.1198=\frac{2.7265}{\sqrt{518}}=\frac{2.7265}{22.7596}
$$
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Basis of Selection of Comparable Risk Domestic Non-Price Regulated Companies

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies | Value Line Adjusted Beta | $\begin{gathered} \text { Unadjusted } \\ \text { Beta } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Residual <br> Standard <br> Error of the Regression | Standard <br> Deviation of Beta |
| ALLETE, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.75 | 2.7231 | 0.0685 |
| Alliant Energy Corporation | 0.85 | 0.73 | 2.7326 | 0.0687 |
| Ameren Corporation | 0.85 | 0.70 | 2.6062 | 0.0655 |
| Duke Energy Corporation | 0.85 | 0.77 | 2.8284 | 0.0711 |
| Edison International | 0.95 | 0.88 | 3.2843 | 0.0826 |
| Entergy Corporation | 0.95 | 0.89 | 2.6240 | 0.0660 |
| IDACORP, Inc. | 0.80 | 0.68 | 2.5421 | 0.0639 |
| NorthWestern Corporation | 0.95 | 0.85 | 2.7335 | 0.0687 |
| OGE Energy Corporation | 1.10 | 1.08 | 2.6719 | 0.0672 |
| Otter Tail Corporation | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.4857 | 0.0625 |
| Pinnacle West Capital Corporation | 0.90 | 0.80 | 2.7203 | 0.0684 |
| Portland General Electric Company | 0.85 | 0.75 | 2.8187 | 0.0709 |
| Xcel Energy, Inc. | 0.80 | 0.66 | 2.6743 | 0.0672 |
| Average | 0.89 | 0.79 | 2.7265 | 0.0686 |
| Beta Range ( $+/-2$ std. Devs. of Beta) | 0.65 | 0.93 |  |  |
| 2 std. Devs. of Beta | 0.14 |  |  |  |
| Residual Std. Err. Range ( $+/-2$ std. Devs. of the Residual Std. Err.) | 2.4869 | 2.9661 |  |  |
| Std. dev. of the Res. Std. Err. | 0.1198 |  |  |  |
| 2 std. devs. of the Res. Std. Err. | 0.2396 |  |  |  |

Source of Information: Value Line Proprietary Database, January 2021
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc
Proxy Group of Non-Price Regulated Companies
Comparable in Total Risk to the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

|  | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Forty-Eight Non-Price Regulated Companies | VL Adjusted <br> Beta | Unadjusted Beta | Residual Standard Error of the Regression | Standard Deviation of Beta |
| Abbot Laboratories | 0.95 | 0.91 | 2.7460 | 0.0690 |
| Analog Devices | 0.95 | 0.86 | 2.6778 | 0.0673 |
| Assurant Inc. | 0.95 | 0.85 | 2.9139 | 0.0733 |
| ANSYS, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.8279 | 0.0711 |
| Smith (A.O.) | 0.90 | 0.83 | 2.7524 | 0.0692 |
| Becton, Dickinson | 0.80 | 0.67 | 2.8794 | 0.0724 |
| Brown-Forman 'B' | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.6920 | 0.0677 |
| Broadridge Fin'l | 0.85 | 0.72 | 2.7392 | 0.0689 |
| Cerner Corp. | 0.95 | 0.87 | 2.7913 | 0.0702 |
| Chemed Corp. | 0.85 | 0.75 | 2.5303 | 0.0636 |
| Cooper Cos. | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.7038 | 0.0680 |
| Cisco Systems, Inc. | 0.95 | 0.85 | 2.4987 | 0.0628 |
| CSW Industrials | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.7444 | 0.0690 |
| Quest Diagnostics | 0.90 | 0.80 | 2.6677 | 0.0671 |
| Dolby Labs. | 0.95 | 0.87 | 2.6659 | 0.0670 |
| Estee Lauder | 0.90 | 0.83 | 2.7514 | 0.0692 |
| Exponent, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.9154 | 0.0733 |
| Gentex Corporation | 0.95 | 0.91 | 2.7484 | 0.0691 |
| Alphabet Inc. | 0.85 | 0.75 | 2.5514 | 0.0641 |
| Hershey Co. | 0.85 | 0.72 | 2.7087 | 0.0681 |
| Ingredion Inc. | 0.90 | 0.78 | 2.9266 | 0.0736 |
| Hunt (J.B.) | 0.95 | 0.88 | 2.8114 | 0.0707 |
| J \& J Snack Foods Corp. | 0.90 | 0.82 | 2.8400 | 0.0714 |
| Jack Henry \& Associates, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.70 | 2.7540 | 0.0692 |
| McCormick and Co. | 0.85 | 0.70 | 2.7595 | 0.0694 |
| Altria Group | 0.90 | 0.79 | 2.8916 | 0.0727 |
| MSCI Inc. | 0.95 | 0.86 | 2.9256 | 0.0735 |
| Motorola Solutions, Inc. | 0.90 | 0.82 | 2.8041 | 0.0705 |
| Maxim Integrated | 0.95 | 0.85 | 2.9413 | 0.0739 |
| NewMarket Corp. | 0.80 | 0.66 | 2.5362 | 0.0638 |
| Northrop Grumman | 0.85 | 0.71 | 2.8969 | 0.0728 |
| Omnicom Group Inc. | 1.00 | 0.93 | 2.5166 | 0.0633 |
| PerkinElmer, Inc. | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.6809 | 0.0674 |
| Pool Corp. | 0.90 | 0.82 | 2.9389 | 0.0739 |
| Rollins, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.8807 | 0.0724 |
| Starbucks Corporation | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.6496 | 0.0666 |
| The Sherwin-Williams Company | 0.95 | 0.91 | 2.5559 | 0.0643 |
| Selective Ins. Group | 0.85 | 0.74 | 2.9102 | 0.0732 |
| Synopsys, Inc. | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.5128 | 0.0632 |
| Sensient Technologies Corporation | 0.90 | 0.82 | 2.5687 | 0.0646 |
| Tetra Tech | 0.90 | 0.83 | 2.9490 | 0.0741 |
| Texas Instruments | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.5625 | 0.0644 |
| AMERCO | 0.95 | 0.87 | 2.6739 | 0.0672 |
| UniFirst Corporation | 0.95 | 0.92 | 2.4960 | 0.0628 |
| Verisign | 0.95 | 0.85 | 2.6197 | 0.0659 |
| Waters Corp. | 0.95 | 0.87 | 2.7355 | 0.0688 |
| Watsco, Inc. | 0.85 | 0.76 | 2.6256 | 0.0660 |
| Western Union | 0.80 | 0.68 | 2.7006 | 0.0679 |
| Average | 0.90 | 0.81 | 2.7300 | 0.0700 |
| Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies | 0.89 | 0.79 | 2.7265 | 0.0686 |
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Summary of Cost of Equity Models Applied to
Proxy Group of Forty-Eight Non-Price Regulated Companies
Comparable in Total Risk to the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies
$\underline{\text { Principal Methods }}$
Proxy Group of
Forty-Eight Non-
Price Regulated Companies

Discounted Cash Flow Model (DCF) (1)

Risk Premium Model (RPM) (2)
Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) (3)

Mean

Median
12.00 \%

| 12.00 |
| :--- |
| 12.06 |$\%$

12.00 \%

Average of Mean and Median
12.03 \%

Notes:
(1) From page 2 of Document No. 8.
(2) From page 3 of Document No. 8.
(3) From page 6 of Document No. 8.
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
DCF Results for the Proxy Group of Non-Price-Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.<br>Indicated Common Equity Cost Rate<br>Through Use of a Risk Premium Model<br>Using an Adjusted Total Market Approach

Line No.

1. Prospective Yield on Baa2 Rated

Corporate Bonds (1) $4.04 \%$
2. Adjustment to Reflect Proxy Group Bond Rating (2)

Prospective Bond Rating
Proxy Group of FortyEight Non-Price Regulated Companies
3.
4.

Equity Risk Premium (3)

Risk Premium Derived Common Equity Cost Rate
8.78 (0.15) 3.89
$\qquad$
12.67 \%

Notes: (1) Average forecast of Baa2 corporate bonds based upon the consensus of nearly 50 economists reported in Blue Chip Financial Forecasts dated December 1, 2020 and February 3, 2021 (see pages 10 and 11 of Document No. 5). The estimates are detailed below.

| First Quarter 2021 | $3.40 \%$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| Second Quarter 2021 | 3.60 |
| Third Quarter 2021 | 3.70 |
| Fourth Quarter 2021 | 3.80 |
| First Quarter 2022 | 3.90 |
| Second Quarter 2022 | 3.90 |
| 2022-2026 | 4.60 |
| 2027-2031 | 5.40 |
| Average |  |

(2) To reflect the Baa1 average rating of the non-utility proxy group, the prosepctive yield on Baa corporate bonds must be adjusted downward by $1 / 3$ of the spread between A2 and Baa2 corporate bond yields as shown below:

|  | A2 Corp. <br> Bond Yield | Baa2 Corp. <br> Bond Yield | Spread |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | 0.41 $\%$

(3) From page 5 of Document No. 8 .
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Comparison of Long-Term Issuer Ratings for the
Proxy Group of Forty-Eight Non-Price Regulated Companies of Comparable risk to the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

|  | Moody's <br> Long-Term Issuer Rating January 2021 |  | Standard \& Poor's Long-Term Issuer Rating January 2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Proxy Group of Forty-Eight NonPrice Regulated Companies | Long-Term Issuer Rating | Numerical <br> Weighting (1) | Long-Term Issuer Rating | Numerical Weighting (1) |
| Abbot Laboratories | A3 | 7.0 | A | 6.0 |
| Analog Devices | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Assurant Inc. | Baa3 | 10.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| ANSYS, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Smith (A.O.) | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Becton, Dickinson | Baa3 | 10.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Brown-Forman 'B' | A1 | 5.0 | A- | 7.0 |
| Broadridge Fin'l | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Cerner Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Chemed Corp. | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| Cooper Cos. | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| Cisco Systems, Inc. | A1 | 5.0 | AA- | 4.0 |
| CSW Industrials | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Quest Diagnostics | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Dolby Labs. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Estee Lauder | A1 | 5.0 | A+ | 5.0 |
| Exponent, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Gentex Corporation | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Alphabet Inc. | Aa2 | 3.0 | AA+ | 2.0 |
| Hershey Co. | A1 | 5.0 | A | 6.0 |
| Ingredion Inc. | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Hunt (J.B.) | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| J \& J Snack Foods Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Jack Henry \& Associates, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| McCormick and Co. | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Altria Group | A3 | 7.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| MSCI Inc. | Ba2 | 12.0 | BB+ | 11.0 |
| Motorola Solutions, Inc. | Baa3 | 10.0 | BBB- | 10.0 |
| Maxim Integrated | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| NewMarket Corp. | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| Northrop Grumman | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Omnicom Group Inc. | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| PerkinElmer, Inc. | Baa3 | 10.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Pool Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Rollins, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Starbucks Corporation | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 8.0 |
| The Sherwin-Williams Company | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB- | 10.0 |
| Selective Ins. Group | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Synopsys, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Sensient Technologies Corporation | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| Tetra Tech | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Texas Instruments | A1 | 5.0 | A+ | 5.0 |
| AMERCO | WR | -- | NR | -- |
| UniFirst Corporation | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Verisign | Ba1 | 11.0 | BBB- | 10.0 |
| Waters Corp. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Watsco, Inc. | NA | -- | NA | -- |
| Western Union | Baa2 | 9.0 | BBB | 9.0 |
| Average | Baa1 | 8.0 | BBB+ | 7.9 |

Notes:
(1) From page 6 of Document No. 5

Source of Information:
Bloomberg Professional Services
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Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Derivation of Equity Risk Premium Based on the Total Market Approach
Using the Beta for
Proxy Group of Forty-Eight Non-Price Regulated Companies of Comparable risk to the Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

Line No. Equity Risk Premium Measure
Proxy Group of
Forty-Eight NonPrice Regulated

Companies

Ibbotson-Based Equity Risk Premiums:

1. Ibbotson Equity Risk Premium (1) $5.78 \quad \%$
2. Regression on Ibbotson Risk Premium Data (2) 9.30
3. Ibbotson Equity Risk Premium based on PRPM (3) 9.65
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { 4. } & \text { Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line } \\ \text { Summary and Index (4) } & 6.77\end{array}$

5 Equity Risk Premium Based on Value Line
S\&P 500 Companies (5)
11.04
6. Equity Risk Premium Based on Bloomberg

S\&P 500 Companies (6)
14.72
7. Conclusion of Equity Risk Premium $9.54 \quad \%$
8. Adjusted Beta (7) 0.92
9. Forecasted Equity Risk Premium
8.78 \%

Notes:
(1) From note 1 of page 9 of Document No. 5.
(2) From note 2 of page 9 of Document No. 5.
(3) From note 3 of page 9 of Document No. 5.
(4) From note 4 of page 9 of Document No. 5.
(5) From note 5 of page 9 of Document No. 5.
(6) From note 6 of page 9 of Document No. 5.
(7) Average of mean and median beta from page 6 of Document No. 8.

Sources of Information:
Stocks, Bonds, Bills, and Inflation - 2020 SBBI Yearbook, John Wiley \& Sons, Inc. Value Line Summary and Index
Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, December 1, 2020 and February 3, 2021
Bloomberg Professional Services
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Traditional CAPM and ECAPM Results for the Proxy Group of Non-Price-Regulated Companies Comparable in Total Risk to the
Proxy Group of Thirteen Electric Companies

(1) From note 1 of page 2 of Document No. 6
(2) From note 2 of page 2 of Document No. 6.

Average of CAPM and ECAPM cost rates
4) NEU's CAPM results were excluded from the final average and median as they were more than 2 standard deviations below the proxy group's mean
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Derivation of the Flotation Cost Adjustment to the Cost of Common Equity
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Derivation of Investment Risk Adjustment Based upon
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$\stackrel{\square}{\square}$
$\sqrt{5}$

$\pm$


## 

モ
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| Company |
| :--- |
| Tampa Electric Company, Inc. |
|  |
| Based upon Proxy Group of Thirteen |
| Electric Companies |





$$
\begin{gathered}
{[2]} \\
\text { Book Value per } \\
\text { Share at Fiscal } \\
\text { Year End 2019 } \\
(1) \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$



## [1] <br> [г]




| 51.696 |
| :---: |
| 245.023 |
| 246.232 |
| 733.321965 |
| 361.985 |
| 199.727 |
| 50.410 |
| 53.999 |
| 200.177 |
| 40.158 |
| 112.540 |
| 89.387 |
| 524.539 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 223.784 \\
& \hline \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

| $\$ \quad 36.785$ |
| :--- |


Sources of Information: 2019 Annual Forms 10-K
Bloomberg Professional Service
Average
$\mathrm{NA}=$ Not Available

Tampa Electric Company, Inc.
Comparison of Projected Capital Expenditures Relative to Net Plant


## Fama and French's Figure $\mathbf{2 ~}^{1}$

Figure 2 http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/0895330042162430
Average Annualized Monthly Return versus Beta for Value Weight Portfolios Formed on Prior Beta, 1928-2003
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Risk distinctions within S\&P's bond rating categories are recognized by a 'plus' or 'minus', e.g., within the A category, 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., within the A category, a Moody's rating can be A1, A2 and A3.

See, Tampa Electric Company, SEC Form 10-K, at 5 (Dec. 31, 2020). The Company's operations include electricity sold at the wholesale level to municipalities, electric cooperative utilities, power marketers, and other load-serving entities.

Source: S\&P Global Market Intelligence.
See, Emera Incorporated, SEC Form 40-F, at 7-8 (Dec. 31, 2019).
Source: Tampa Electric Company, FERC Form 1.
Eugene F. Brigham and Joel F. Houston, Fundamentals of Financial Management, Concise $4^{\text {th }}$ Ed., Thomson South-Western, 2004, at 574.

Pauline M. Ahern, Frank J. Hanley, and Richard A. Michelfelder, Ph.D., A New Approach for Estimating the Equity Risk Premium for Public Utilities, The Journal of Regulatory Economics (December 2011), 40:261278.

Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity; see also, www.nobelprize.org/prizes/economic-sciences/2003/engle/facts/.

Annualized Return $=(1+$ Monthly Return)^ 12 - 1.
See, Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, December 1, 2020 at 14; and February 3, 2021 at 2.

See, SBBI - 2020, Appendix A Tables: Morningstar Stocks, Bonds, Bills, \& Inflation 1926-2019.

See, SBBI - 2020, at 10-22.
Data from January 1928 to December 2019 is from SBBI - 2020. Data from January 2020 to January 2021 is from Bloomberg Professional Services.

See, e.g., Robert S. Harris and Felicia C. Marston, The Market Risk Premium: Expectational Estimates Using Analysts' Forecasts, Journal of Applied Finance, 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, Financial Management, Spring 1985, at 33-45.
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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").

Morin, at 175.
Morin, at 190.
Fama and French, at 32.
Fama and French, at 33.
See, SBBI - 2020, Appendix A-1 (1) through A-1 (3) and Appendix A-7 (19) through A-7 (21).

Blue Chip Financial Forecasts, December 1, 2020, at 14; and February 3, 2021, at 2.

Morin, at 321.
Eugene F. Brigham and Phillip R. Daves, Intermediate Financial Management, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Thomson/Southwestern, at page 342.

Morin, at 327-30.
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See, S\&P Global Ratings, RatingsDirect: Tampa Electric Co., April 17, 2020; and Moody's Investor Service, Credit Opinion: Tampa Electric Company, December 22, 2020.

Source: Company provided data.
Source: Company provided data.
Source: Tampa Electric Company, 2019 FERC Form 1, at 110.

Standard \& Poor's, Industry Report Card: Utility Sectors in the Americas Remain Stable, While Challenges Beset European, Australian, and New Zealand Counterparts, RatingsDirect, June 27, 2008, at 4.

Standard \& Poor's, Industry Top Trends 2017: Utilities, RatingsDirect, February 16, 2017, at 4.


[^0]:    Source of Information: Company Annual Forms 10-K

[^1]:    A) Dil. EPS. Excl. nonrec. gain (losses): '05, Next egs. report due mid-Feb. (B) Div'ds pd. all'd on com. eq. in MO in '20: elec., none; in Company's Financial Strength
    
    $\begin{array}{lll}\text { '15, } 21 \mathrm{C} \text {. '17 EPS don't sum due to rounding. } & \text { (D) In mill. (E) Rate base: Orig. cost depr. Rate } & \text { gas, } 9.87 \% \text {; earned on avg. com. eq.,' } 19 \text { : }\end{array}$
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[^2]:    A) Diluted EPS. Excl. nonrecurring gain (loss): $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feb., May, Aug., and Nov. - Dividend reinvest- } \\ & \text { original cost. Rate allowed on common equity }\end{aligned}$

[^3]:    1 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").

