

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

of

SHEENA KIGHT-GARLISCH

Senior Financial Analyst
Finance Department
Financial Analysis Division
Illinois Commerce Commission

North Shore Gas Company and
The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company

Proposed General Increase in Gas Rates

Docket Nos. 09-0166 and 09-0167
(Consolidated)

August 4, 2009

Table of Contents

WITNESS IDENTIFICATION..... 1

COST OF CAPITAL 2

CAPITAL STRUCTURE 2

 PEOPLES GAS COST OF LONG-TERM DEBT..... 5

 FORECASTED INTEREST RATES..... 7

RATE OF RETURN ON RATE BASE 8

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

WITNESS IDENTIFICATION

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Sheena Kight-Garlich. My business address is 527 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62701.

Q. Are you the same Sheena Kight-Garlich who testified previously in this proceeding?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?

A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company's ("Peoples Gas") and North Shore Gas Company's ("North Shore") (individually, the "Company" and collectively, the "Companies") witness Bradley A. Johnson, NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0. Specifically, I will address Mr. Johnson's testimony regarding the inclusion of short-term debt in the capital structure and the appropriate balances of the other components of the capital structure.

Q. Please summarize the remaining contested capital structure and cost of capital issues between the Companies and Staff.

A. Staff and the Companies continue to disagree on the cost of equity for both Companies and Peoples Gas' cost of Series OO long-term debt.

20

COST OF CAPITAL

21 **Q. Please summarize your findings.**

22 A. I recommend an overall cost of capital of 7.90% for North Shore and 7.75% for
23 Peoples Gas. The overall cost of capital for both Companies is shown on
24 Schedule 22.1.

25

CAPITAL STRUCTURE

26 **Q. Do you have any changes to the capital structures you propose for setting**
27 **rates?**

28 A. Yes. I have updated the balance of short-term debt to reflect each Company's
29 revised average balances for 2010. As a consequence of those revised average
30 short-term debt balances, I have accepted the Companies' proposed hypothetical
31 capital structure of 44% long-term debt and 56% common equity.

32 **Q. Please explain why you revised the balance of short-term debt.**

33 A. The Companies provided revised forecasts of short-term debt that reflect their
34 "forecasts of gas in storage, capital expenditures, and net retirement benefit
35 obligations" which were updated in Company witness John Hengtgen's rebuttal
36 testimony and exhibits.¹ The updated short-term debt balances are shown on
37 Schedule 22.2N and 22.2P.

¹ North Shore's response to Staff data request FIN 9.02; Peoples Gas' response to Staff data request FIN 9.02.

38 **Q. What capital structure do you recommend for North Shore?**

39 A. North Shore has an actual average 2010 capital structure comprising
40 \$72,476,045 long-term debt, \$6,843,865 short-term debt, and \$95,578,042
41 common equity, as shown in Schedule 22.3N. The Company proposed a
42 hypothetical capital structure comprising 44% long-term debt and 56% equity.
43 I re-evaluated the capital structures and their implied overall costs based on my
44 updated cost of short-term debt and the North Shore's updated balance of short-
45 term debt. The Company's proposed hypothetical, imputed capital structure,
46 which excludes short-term debt, produces an overall rate of return of 7.90%. The
47 Company's forecasted average 2010 capital structure, which includes short-term
48 debt, produces an overall rate of return of 7.85%. The capital structures and
49 overall cost of capital are presented in Schedule 22.3N. The overall rates of
50 return produced by both capital structures are very similar. Therefore, to reduce
51 issues in this case, I will accept for purposes of this proceeding North Shore's
52 proposed hypothetical capital structure of 0% short-term debt, 44% long-term
53 debt and 56% common equity even though North Shore clearly uses short-term
54 debt to finance rate base.

55 **Q. What capital structure do you recommend for Peoples Gas?**

56 A. Peoples Gas has an actual average 2010 capital structure comprising
57 \$532,238,953 long-term debt, \$19,113,513 short-term debt, and \$768,405,875
58 common equity, as shown in Schedule 22.3P. The Company proposed a
59 hypothetical capital structure comprising 44% long-term debt and 56% equity. In
60 direct testimony, I accepted the Company's proposed imputed common equity

61 and total debt ratios. However, I divided the imputed total debt ratio into short
62 and long-term debt components based on their relative magnitude in the
63 Company's forecasted average 2010 capital structure.

64 I re-evaluated the capital structure and its implied overall cost based on my
65 updated cost of short-term debt and the Peoples Gas' updated balance of short-
66 term debt. The Company's proposed hypothetical, imputed capital structure,
67 which excludes short-term debt, produces a lower overall rate of return for the
68 Company than its forecasted average 2010 capital structure, which includes
69 short-term debt. The capital structures and overall cost of capital are presented
70 in Schedule 22.3P. In addition, the capital structure I recommended in direct
71 testimony results in an overall cost of capital very similar to the overall costs from
72 the actual average 2010 capital structure and Peoples Gas' proposed
73 hypothetical capital structure. Therefore, to reduce issues in this case, I will
74 accept for purposes of this proceeding Peoples Gas' proposed hypothetical
75 capital structure of 0% short-term debt, 44% long-term debt and 56% common
76 equity even though Peoples Gas clearly uses short-term debt to finance rate
77 base.

78

Peoples Gas Cost of Long-Term Debt

79 **Q. Mr. Johnson argues that the insurance cost adjustment applied to Peoples**
80 **Gas' insured tax exempt bonds should reflect the Company's split rating.²**
81 **Please comment.**

82 A. Although I do not agree with the manner in which Mr. Johnson calculated the
83 insurance cost adjustment, for purposes of reducing issues in this case, I have
84 adjusted my cost of debt to reflect half the adjustment proposed in my direct
85 testimony. The revised cost of long-term debt for Peoples Gas of 5.28% is
86 presented in Schedule 22.4P.

87 **Q. Mr. Johnson argues that the interest rate applied to the Series OO auction**
88 **rate bonds is "excessive" and "unreasonable".³ Please comment.**

89 A. The Series OO bonds have failed at auction since March of 2008. Therefore,
90 Peoples Gas pays a default rate, which is 175% of LIBOR.⁴ For my direct
91 testimony I relied on the most recent, actual interest rate incurred for the Series
92 OO auction rate bonds of 0.998%. In fact, the rate paid by the Company has
93 been less than 1% since February of 2009. The Company's argument that my
94 adjustment is excessive and unreasonable is without merit, since it is the actual
95 current cost incurred by the Company.

96 The Company has proposed to remarket or refinance the Series OO issues with
97 fixed rate debt at an interest rate of approximately 7.16%. The Company's

² NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0, pp. 19-20.

³ NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0, pp. 15-16.

⁴ NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0, pp. 16-17.

98 arguments to refinance or remarket the debt issuance are nonsensical.⁵
99 Specifically, it claims that it “is concerned that forcing investors, including some
100 of the Utility’s core credit banks, to continue holding this debt in an auction rate
101 mode with a calculated failure rate versus a fair market rate of interest may be
102 detrimental to the Utility in the long-run.”⁶ The Utility should not be concerned
103 that investors in these bonds (some of which are the Company’s core credit
104 banks) are not earning a fair market rate. The investors in the bonds should
105 have known the risk of investing in the auction rate securities. Now that interest
106 rates have fallen and investors are not earning their desired return is not a valid
107 reason for the Utility to remarket or refinance its debt at a considerably greater
108 cost. Further, the Company’s concern for the investors’ earning their desired
109 returns is misplaced. The Company is paying a very low interest rate on this
110 debt issue, which the Company should embrace since it leads to a lower cost of
111 debt for the Company. It makes no sense for the Company to want to refinance
112 or remarket these bonds at this point in time, since it believes that the bonds will
113 continue to fail in the auction market for the “foreseeable future.”⁷

114 The Company also argues to refinance or remarket the bonds to fixed rate debt
115 because of the risk of fluctuating interest rates. This risk existed when the
116 Company decided to issue these auction rate bonds. If this was such a concern,
117 then the Company should not have issued auction rate bonds, but instead should

⁵ NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0, p. 17.

⁶ NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0, p. 17.

⁷ NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0 Rev., p. 17.

118 have issued it as fixed rate debt in 2003 when the Series OO bonds were first
119 issued.

120 **Forecasted Interest Rates**

121 **Q. Mr. Johnson advocates for the use of a forecasted 3-month LIBOR rate to**
122 **determine the cost of Peoples Gas' Series OO debt instead of Staff's**
123 **proposed 1-month LIBOR spot rate.⁸ Please comment.**

124 A. Accurately forecasting interest rates is problematic, as illustrated by Schedule
125 22.5, which compares actual (spot) 3-month LIBOR rates to projections
126 published by Mr. Johnson's source for interest rate projections, *Blue Chip*
127 *Financial Forecasts ("BCFF")*. Schedule 22.5 shows that *BCFF* interest rate
128 projections have consistently exceeded the actual interest rates. Importantly,
129 Schedule 22.5 illustrates that the accuracy of the forecasted yields diminishes as
130 the forecast period lengthens. Although interest rates may currently be low on a
131 historical basis, room exists for further interest rate declines. No one can predict
132 with certainty when interest rates will begin to rise, the rate at which they will rise,
133 how long they will rise before falling again, the rate at which they will fall, or even
134 whether they will rise before they fall further. Therefore, the Commission should
135 continue to use actual spot interest rates rather than forecasted interest rates to
136 estimate the Companies' cost of debt.

137 Further, the Company wants to rely upon the forecasted 3-month LIBOR rate to
138 determine the Series OO interest rate, even though the interest rate on the bonds

⁸ NS-PGL Ex. BAJ-2.0 Rev., pp. 13-14, and 19.

139 is determined using the 1-month LIBOR rate.⁹ The 3-month LIBOR rate has
140 been consistently higher than the 1-month LIBOR rate for at least the past year.
141 This is illustrated in Schedule 22.6. Thus, based on the foregoing, the spot
142 commercial paper rate should be used to determine the cost of short-term debt
143 and the spot 1-month rate LIBOR rate should be used to determine the interest
144 rate for Series OO bonds.

145 **RATE OF RETURN ON RATE BASE**

146 **Q. What is your recommended rate of return on rate base for North Shore?**

147 A. I recommend a 7.90% rate of return on North Shore's rate base. This rate of
148 return incorporates the 9.79% rate of return Staff witness Michael McNally
149 recommends for North Shore's common equity. The rate of return I recommend
150 on North Shore's rate base is shown on Schedule 22.1.

151 **Q. What is your recommended rate of return on rate base for Peoples Gas?**

152 A. I recommend a 7.75% rate of return on Peoples Gas' rate base. This rate of
153 return incorporates the 9.69% rate of return Staff witness Michael McNally
154 recommends for Peoples Gas' common equity. The rate of return I recommend
155 on Peoples Gas' rate base is shown on Schedule 22.1.

156 **Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?**

157 A. Yes, it does.

⁹ Peoples Gas WPD-3(1), p. B-14.

Weighted Average Cost of Capital

North Shore Gas Company

	<u>Percent of Total Capital</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Weighted Cost</u>
Long-term Debt	44.00%	5.49%	2.42%
Short-term Debt	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Common Equity	<u>56.00%</u>	9.79%	<u>5.48%</u>
Total Capital	100.00%		
Weighted Average Cost of Capital			7.90%

The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company

	<u>Percent of Total Capital</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Weighted Cost</u>
Long-term Debt	44.00%	5.28%	2.32%
Short-term Debt	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Common Equity	<u>56.00%</u>	9.69%	<u>5.43%</u>
Total Capital	100.00%		
Weighted Average Cost of Capital			7.75%

North Shore Gas Company

Balance of Short-term Debt
December 31, 2010

Date	Gross Short-term Debt Outstanding*	CWIP	CWIP Accruing AFUDC	(B) - (D)	(B) - ((B)/(C)*(D))	Net Short-term Debt Outstanding	Monthly Average
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)			(E)	(F)
Dec-09	\$30,369,965	\$ 195,000	\$ -	\$30,369,965	\$30,369,965	\$30,369,965	
Jan-10	\$23,021,789	\$ 205,000	\$ -	\$23,021,789	\$23,021,789	\$23,021,789	\$ 26,695,877
Feb-10	\$0	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 11,510,895
Mar-10	\$0	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Apr-10	\$0	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
May-10	\$0	\$ 305,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Jun-10	\$0	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Jul-10	\$0	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Aug-10	\$0	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Sep-10	\$0	\$ 430,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Oct-10	\$0	\$ 345,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Nov-10	\$24,490,693	\$ 194,000	\$ -	\$24,490,693	\$24,490,693	\$24,490,693	\$ 12,245,347
Dec-10	\$38,857,830	\$ 194,000	\$ -	\$38,857,830	\$38,857,830	\$38,857,830	\$ 31,674,262
Average							\$ 6,843,865

Notes: Column (E) = the greater of [Column (B) - Column (C)] or [Column (B) - Column (B) / Column (C) * Column (D)]

* North Shore's Response to Staff data request FIN 9.02.

Peoples Gas Light & Coke Company

Balance of Short-term Debt
December 31, 2010

Date	Gross Short-term Debt Outstanding*	CWIP	CWIP Accruing AFUDC	(B) - (D)	(B) - ((B)/(C)*(D))	Net Short-term Debt Outstanding	Monthly Average
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)			(E)	(F)
Dec-09	\$69,949,208	\$ 195,000	\$ -	\$69,949,208	\$69,949,208	\$69,949,208	
Jan-10	\$81,749,370	\$ 205,000	\$ -	\$81,749,370	\$81,749,370	\$81,749,370	\$ 75,849,289
Feb-10	\$0	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ 40,874,685
Mar-10	\$0	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Apr-10	\$0	\$ 214,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
May-10	\$0	\$ 305,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Jun-10	\$0	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Jul-10	\$0	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Aug-10	\$0	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Sep-10	\$0	\$ 430,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Oct-10	\$0	\$ 345,000	\$ -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$ -
Nov-10	\$107,949,563	\$ 194,000	\$ -	\$107,949,563	\$107,949,563	\$107,949,563	\$ 53,974,782
Dec-10	\$9,377,226	\$ 194,000	\$ -	\$9,377,226	\$9,377,226	\$9,377,226	\$ 58,663,395
Average							\$ 19,113,513

Notes: Column (E) = the greater of [Column (B) - Column (C)] or [Column (B) - Column (B) / Column (C) * Column (D)]

* Peoples Gas' Response to Staff data request FIN 9.02.

North Shore Gas Company

Actual Average 2010 Capital Structure

	<u>Balance</u>	<u>Percent of Total Capital</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Weighted Cost</u>
Long-term Debt	\$72,476,045	41.44%	5.49%	2.28%
Short-term Debt	\$6,843,865	3.91%	5.69%	0.22%
Common Equity	\$95,578,042	<u>54.65%</u>	9.79%	<u>5.35%</u>
Total Capital	\$174,897,952	100.00%		

Weighted Average Cost of Capital **7.85%**

Company's Proposed Hypothetical Capital Structure

	<u>Percent of Total Capital</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Weighted Cost</u>
Long-term Debt	44.00%	5.49%	2.42%
Short-term Debt	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Common Equity	<u>56.00%</u>	9.79%	<u>5.48%</u>
Total Capital	100.00%		

Weighted Average Cost of Capital **7.90%**

The Peoples Gas Light & Coke Company's Capital Structure and Cost

Actual Average 2010 Capital Structure

	<u>Balance</u>	<u>Percent of Total Capital</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Weighted Cost</u>
Long-term Debt	\$532,238,953	40.33%	5.28%	2.13%
Short-term Debt	\$19,113,513	1.45%	4.00%	0.06%
Common Equity	<u>\$768,405,125</u>	<u>58.22%</u>	9.69%	<u>5.64%</u>
Total Capital	\$1,319,757,591	100.00%		

Weighted Average Cost of Capital **7.83%**

Company's Proposed Hypothetical Capital Structure

	<u>Percent of Total Capital</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Weighted Cost</u>
Long-term Debt	44.00%	5.28%	2.32%
Short-term Debt	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Common Equity	<u>56.00%</u>	9.69%	<u>5.43%</u>
Total Capital	100.00%		

Weighted Average Cost of Capital **7.75%**

The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company

Embedded Cost of Long-Term Debt
Average 2010

Debt Issue Type, Coupon Rate (A)	Date Issued (B)	Maturity Date (C)	Original Principal Amount (D)	Face Amount Outstanding (F)	Debt Discount or (Premium) (H)	Unamortized Debt Expense (Gain) (I)	Carrying Value (J)	Coupon Interest Expense (K)	Amortization of Debt Discount or (Premium) (L)	Amortization of Debt Expense (M)	Total Expense (N)	
1 First and Refunding Mortgage Bonds:												
2 Series HH	4.75%	3/1/00	3/1/2030	50,000,000	50,000,000		1,407,999	48,592,001	2,375,000	-	71,552	2,446,552
3 Series KK	5.00%	2/6/03	2/1/2033	50,000,000	50,000,000	500,425	1,237,392	48,262,183	2,500,000	22,139	43,706	2,565,845
4 Series LL	3.75%	2/20/03	2/1/2033	50,000,000	50,000,000		871,917	49,128,083	1,875,000	-	34,900	1,909,900
5 Series MM	3.94%	2/27/03	3/1/2010	50,000,000	10,416,667	670	1,167	10,414,830	410,417	8,037	14,005	432,459
6 Series NN	4.57%	4/29/03	5/1/2013	75,000,000	75,000,000	17,011	429,184	74,553,805	3,426,250	6,002	151,428	3,583,680
7 Series OO	1.00%	10/9/03	10/1/2037	51,000,000	51,000,000		775,233	50,224,767	508,980	-	22,876	531,856
8 Series QQ	4.88%	11/25/03	11/1/2038	75,000,000	75,000,000		1,364,799	73,635,201	3,656,250	-	39,501	3,695,751
9 Series RR	4.30%	6/1/05	6/1/2035	50,000,000	50,000,000		787,699	49,212,301	2,150,000	-	28,563	2,178,563
10 Seiers SS	6.75%	11/3/08	11/1/2013	45,000,000	45,000,000		378,889	44,621,111	3,037,500	-	113,496	3,150,996
11 Series TT	7.70%	11/3/08	11/1/2018	5,000,000	5,000,000		52,492	4,947,508	385,000	-	6,293	391,293
12 New Issue	7.43%	10/1/09	10/1/2019	50,000,000	50,000,000		416,501	49,583,499	3,712,500	-	44,997	3,757,497
13 New Issue	7.58%	3/1/10	3/1/2020	50,000,000	39,583,333		341,029	39,242,305	2,998,438	-	45,025	3,043,463
14 ICC Issuance Fees for Long-Term debt							50,000	(50,000)	-	-	-	-
15 Sub-Total				601,000,000	551,000,000	518,106	8,114,301	542,367,593	27,035,334	36,178	616,343	27,687,854
16 Reaquired Debt												
17 Series LL	3.75%	2/20/03	2/1/33				1,712,669	(1,712,669)			75,768	75,768
18 Series HH	4.75%	7/1/04	3/1/30				377,327	(377,327)			19,175	19,175
19 Series KK	5.00%	2/6/03	2/1/33				1,309,402	(1,309,402)			57,928	57,928
20 Series QQ	4.88%	11/25/03	11/1/38				1,977,004	(1,977,004)			69,724	69,724
21 Series PP	4.85%	10/9/03	10/1/37				850,708	(850,708)			31,196	31,196
22 Series OO	2.52%	10/9/03	10/1/37				1,374,711	(1,374,711)			50,411	50,411
23 Series RR	4.30%	6/1/05	6/1/35				2,526,819	(2,526,819)			101,345	101,345
24 Sub-Total							10,128,640	(10,128,640)			405,547	405,547
25 Total				\$ 601,000,000	\$ 551,000,000	\$ 518,106	\$ 18,242,941	\$ 532,238,953	\$ 27,035,334	\$ 36,178	\$ 1,021,889	\$ 28,093,401

26 Embedded Cost of Long-Term Debt

5.28%

Actual Vs. Forecasted 3-Month LIBOR Rates

	<u>Actual Rate***</u>	<u>Forecasted Rate**</u>
3Q 2007	5.45%	5.40%
4Q 2007	5.03%	5.40%
1Q 2008	3.26%	5.30%
2Q 2008	2.75%	5.30%
3Q 2008	2.91%	5.30%
4Q 2008	2.72%	5.20%

** The Forecasted rates are from Blue Chip Financial Forecasts for July 1, 2007.

*** The actual LIBOR rates are from www.wsjprimerate.us/libor/libor_rates_history.htm.

1-Month LIBOR Vs. 3-Month LIBOR Rates

	LIBOR	
	1-Month Rate*	3-Month Rate*
Jul-08	2.46%	2.79%
Aug-08	2.47%	2.81%
Sep-08	2.93%	3.12%
Oct-08	3.81%	4.06%
Nov-08	1.62%	2.28%
Dec-08	1.08%	1.83%
Jan-09	0.38%	1.21%
Feb-09	0.46%	1.24%
Mar-09	0.53%	1.27%
Apr-09	0.45%	1.11%
May-09	0.34%	0.82%
Jun-09	0.32%	0.62%

* The actual LIBOR rates are from
www.wsjprimerate.us/libor/libor_rates_history.htm.