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III. COST OF EQUITY CAPITAL

It is widely accepted that a public utility should earn a return on capital that allows it to raise the capital necessary to meet the demand for its services without an adverse affect on current shareholder stock. Such a rate of return is called the utility's cost of capital. A return in excess of that rate burdens the consumer with prices which are excessive and causes an unjustified transfer of income from the consuming public to the shareholders of the utility. It also encourages the utility to increase costs and prices further by overinvesting in plant facilities. On the other hand, a return on capital below the required return may discourage the utility from raising sufficient capital to meet demands for service, causing consumers to suffer an impairment in the quality and quantity of service. Therefore, if the return allowed by the Commission is either too high or too low, the result is less than satisfactory to the consumer. The testimony which follows is offered with a view to estimating as closely as possible the actual required return on capital (also called the cost of capital) and, with some care, to avoiding any bias in either direction.

In measuring the cost of capital from each source, the cost of debt and the cost of preferred capital pose few problems. It is clear that the utility must pay the
embedded interest on its outstanding debt and the prescribed dividend on the preferred stock. Both of these measurements involve perfectly straightforward calculations. Somewhat more controversial is the problem of determining the cost of common equity capital.

A. General Principles

A utility's cost of common equity capital is the return or yield that investors on average require on its common stock as implied in the price that they are willing to pay to hold the stock. This implied yield is the cost of common equity capital, because the existing shareholders neither gain nor lose as a consequence of additional investment and financing, regardless of the method of financing, as long as the return the company earns on its common equity is equal to the return investors require on the stock. By contrast, when the allowed return on common is above the return investors require, each dollar of additional financing raises the value of the existing shares. Conversely, when the utility's operating income less interest on debt, income taxes, and preferred dividends does not leave a return on common equity equal to the return investors require on the stock, we not only have a depressed stock price because of the low return, but, in addition, each dollar of additional investment and financing
further depresses the price.

The theoretical basis for the conclusion just stated has been fully developed, but a simple analogy goes a long way in demonstrating the point. Ignoring operating costs, a bank that borrows at 6% and lends at 10% adds 2% of the amount borrowed and loaned to the earnings of the bank's shareholders. The more the bank borrows and lends with this 2% spread, the more it increases future earnings on and the current value of its common stock. The return that investors require on a utility's common stock is, in one form or another, what must be paid for additional equity funds, and if the company earns more on the money than it must pay to get the funds, the excess adds to the earnings on and value of the existing shares. Conversely, if the company earns a lower rate of return than it pays on additional funds, the difference comes out of the pockets of the existing shareholders.

While the management of a utility may or may not be able to prevent a regulatory agency from allowing it a rate of return on capital below its costs of capital, it will, quite understandably, be reluctant to compound the mis-

1 For an extensive discussion, see M. J. Gordon, The Cost of Capital to a Public Utility, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1974.
fortunes of its shareholders by further depressing the stock price through undertaking further investment in the face of an inadequate return on capital. A difference between the return on capital and its cost is fully reflected in the return on common equity, since the bondholders and preferred shareholders are assured of receiving their prescribed returns on capital regardless of the allowed rate on total capital. However, the long-run dependence of the value of a public utility's stock on the service provided to its customers could make it advisable for the company to undertake essential capital expenditures in the face of a small and hopefully temporary unfavorable difference between the allowed rate of return and the cost of capital.

Management's own commitment to continued growth or its reluctance to face the problems of a sharp curtailment in growth may persuade it to continue a high rate of investment in the face of an unsatisfactory rate of return. However, this amounts to an appropriation of shareholder wealth in pursuit of managerial objectives, and sooner or later the shareholders may turn to a new management that is more solicitous of shareholder welfare.

B. Measurement of DCF Cost of Equity Capital

The principles used to measure the cost of common
equity are the same as those used in measuring the yield which investors require on debt or the yield required on outstanding preferred stock. However, in the case of debt and preferred stock, the payments to investors are relatively certain and, thus, amenable to objective calculation. However, the future dividend payments on a share of stock are uncertain, and determination of the expected yield required by investors requires the use of a more complex, yet still relatively simple and very reliable, method for dealing with the problem at hand.

This method is called the DCF (Discounted Cash Flow) Method for computing the cost of equity capital.1 It represents the valuation of a share of stock by the expression:

\[ P_0 = \frac{D_1}{(1+k)^1} + \frac{D_2}{(1+k)^2} + \ldots + \frac{D_t}{(1+k)^t} + \ldots + \frac{D_n}{(1+k)^n} \]

In this expression:

- \( P_0 \) = the current price per share;
- \( D_t \) = the expected value of the dividend the share will pay at the end of period \( t \); and
- \( k \) = the yield or return investors require on the share.

1This method was developed by Myron J. Gordon in an article in Management Science in 1956 and was first introduced in testimony in the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. Case, F.C.C. Docket 16256, 1966.
If the future dividends are expected to grow at the rate of \( g \) each period, Equation (1) reduces to:

\[
P_0 = \frac{D_1}{k-g}
\]  
(2)

Solving Equation (2) for \( k \) results in an expression for the yield that investors require:

\[
k = \frac{D_1}{P_0} + g.
\]  
(3)

In other words, to measure the expected return that investors require we may take the sum of the dividend yield and the expected rate of growth in the dividend.

An alternate approach to Equation (1) for the price of a share is:

\[
P_0 = \frac{D_1 + P_1}{1 + k}
\]  
(4)

Here, we take as the future payments the next period's dividend and the end-of-period price. However, \( P_1 = P_0(1+g) \), and this substitution plus a little algebra results in Equation (2). Hence, the two approaches to share valuation result in the same measurement equation for share yield.

In order to use Equation (3), we need to measure both
the dividend yield and the expected rate of growth in the dividend.

1. Measurement of Dividend Yield

The term for dividend yield in the Eq. (3) expression for a share's yield is the forecast dividend for the coming period, \( D_t \), divided by the current price, \( P_0 \). The value assigned to \( P_0 \) should be the price of the share at the time the share yield is being estimated. The rationale for using the current price is that at each point in time it reflects all the information available to a company's investors regarding future dividends. Hence, the yield investors require on any date is the discount rate that equates on that date the current price and the expected stream of future dividends. To use an average of share prices over some prior time period for \( P_0 \) would result in a value for \( k \) without meaning, that is, it would not provide the average value for \( k \) over the prior time period. Furthermore, to obtain an average value for \( k \) over some prior time period, one must average the values of share yield — not of share price.

\( D_t \) is the forecast dividend for the coming year if dividends are paid annually. Common practice, however, is to pay dividends quarterly, in which case \( D_t \) in Eq. (1), the fundamental expression for share price, is a quarterly
dividend. The value of \( k \) that satisfies Eq. (1) is the quarterly yield on the share, and the \( g \) in Eqs. (2) and (3) is the quarterly rate at which the dividend is expected to grow.

Because it is customary and convenient to think in terms of annual and not quarterly figures for rate of return and growth statistics, annualized figures will be used here. Annualized figures are simply four times quarterly figures. That is, if the current price of a share is \( P_0 = $30,000 \), and if its forecast dividend for the coming quarter is \( D_1 = $1.25 \), the quarterly dividend yield is \( $1.25 / $30.00 = 2.5% \), and the annualized dividend yield is 10%.

We all know from bank advertisements that when interest is compounded more frequently than once a year, two annual interest rates may be computed. To illustrate, an interest rate of 15% per year with the interest compounded quarterly means that a dollar left on deposit for a year will have 3.75% added to the balance at the end of each quarter, and the balance in the account at the end of the year will be $1.1587. In other words, a 15% interest rate compounded quarterly will earn interest equal to 15.87% of the balance at the start of the year.

What does this imply for arriving at a rate of return equal to the cost of equity capital? If the quarterly yield at which a public utility share sells is 3.75%, should the utility be allowed to earn for the year a rate of return on
common equity of 15% or something more? The answer is:

(1) more than 15%, if the rate of return the company earns is calculated on the basis of the common equity at the start of the year; and (2) only 15%, if the rate of return on common equity is calculated by averaging its values at the start and at the end of the year. This statement is proved in Schedule 27. The latter method represents common practice and the practice followed here. Hence, in arriving at the cost of equity capital, the correct figure for the dividend-yield term in Eq. (3) is the annualized value of the forecast dividend for the coming quarter divided by the current price.

2. Measurement of Expected Growth

A difficult problem is the determination of the long-run dividend growth expectations of investors. In other words, what is the expected rate of growth in future dividends per share, g, in which investors on average believe?

To solve the problem, it is essential to understand the determinants of long-run expected dividend growth. If a company is expected to earn a rate of return of r on its common equity, and if it retains the fraction b of its earnings, then each year its earnings per share can be expected to increase by the fraction br of its earnings per share in
the previous year. Thus, $b_r$ is an excellent measure of the expected rate of growth in future earnings per share. If the company is expected to have a stable retention ratio and, therefore, a stable dividend payout ratio, it follows that $b_r$ is also an excellent measure of the expected rate of growth in future dividends per share. That is:

$$g = b_r$$  \(\text{(5)}\)

This relationship is illustrated in Schedule 18.

There the hypothetical initial common equity or book value per share $= \$10.00$, $r = .10$ and $b = .4$. The first period earnings are expected to be $\$1.00$ per share and the expected dividend is $\$0.60$. The retained earnings raise the book value of equity to $\$10.40$ at the start of the second year, and $r$ times that is $\$1.04$, which is equal to the earnings per share the second year. The dividend in the second year is expected to be $\$0.624$, and so on through time. The earnings, dividends, and stock price are expected to grow at the rate $b_r = (.4)(.10) = .04$ in every future year.

If investors require an 8% return on the stock, the initial price is:

$$P_0 = \frac{D_1}{r - g} = \frac{\$0.60}{.08 - .04} = \$15.00.$$  \(\text{(6)}\)
Similarly, the expected share price after one year is:
\[ P_1 = \frac{D_2}{k-g} = \frac{9.624}{0.08 - 0.02} = \$15.60 \]  

The price in subsequent periods rises by 4% as long as the yield investors require on the share remains equal to 8%.

In fact, a company's return and retention rates do not remain constant over time. However, if investors expect that a company will on average earn a return of \( r \) and reinvest the fraction \( b \) of its earnings, they will expect the dividends, earnings, and price to grow at a rate \( br \) due to retention of earnings.

Stock financing will be a further cause of expected growth if the company is expected to issue new shares and if the stock's market price is greater than book value. Conversely, when a company is expected to engage in stock financing through the sale of stock at share prices below book value, ignoring the stock financing results in an overestimate of growth and share yield. If the company is expected to engage in little or no stock financing, or if stock financing is expected to occur only when the market value is close to book value, the expected rate of growth in the earnings, dividends, and price per share is \( g = br \). As will be shown later, we may ignore stock financing and only consider growth due to retention of earnings.
If two conditions are satisfied, the best estimate of \( g \) is obtained either from the company's current values of \( b \) and \( r \) or from weighted averages of their recent values. These two conditions are: stock financing may be ignored for either of the reasons stated above, and there is no information other than the past values of \( b \) and \( r \) which can be used to forecast their future values.

The sharp rise in energy prices and other costs over the past decade have had a disruptive influence on the electric utility industry, and they have created situations in which there are obvious reasons why past values of \( b \) and \( r \) should not be projected into the future. In two recent cases, the DCF formula was adapted to deal with the peculiar circumstances of each case.\(^1\) Similarly, as will be shown below, the recent dramatic changes in anticipated inflation provide information which should be used to modify the past values of \( b \) and \( r \) in order to obtain a more accurate forecast of expected growth.

3. Alternative Measures of Expected Growth

It might be thought that past rates of growth in

\(^1\) Testimony of Myron J. Gordon, Boston Edison Company Case No. DPU 19300, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Public Utilities, 1977; and Testimony of Myron J. Gordon, Public Service Company of New Mexico Case No. 1419, New Mexico Public Service Commission, 1979.
either earnings, dividends, or price could be used as estimates of $g$, the forecast rate of future growth in dividends. However, these past rates of growth are most unreliable due to extraneous influences on them, such as changes in the rate of return on common equity, changes in the retention rate, or changes in the yield required by investors in the case of price changes. The potential error in using past growth in earnings to estimate $g$ is illustrated in Schedule 19, where the hypothetical company’s return on common equity is 10% in the first three periods and 15% in the last three periods. With a retention rate of 40% and a return rate of 15% the growth rate is 5% in the last three years. This is a reasonable estimate of the expected future growth rate as of the end of the 6th year. However, with the 36% growth rate due to the rise in the return rate in the fourth year, a simple average of the five annual past growth rates in earnings is in excess of 15%. Clearly, this type of estimate of future growth rates cannot be used with any reliability at all, especially now when public utilities have received frequent upward adjustments in their allowed rates of return over the past five years. To do so would be to expect the company’s rate of return on common equity to increase by 50% about every five years. This would be a ridiculous forecast, which the use of $h$ and $r$ would make readily apparent.
It can also be demonstrated that a change in the dividend payout rate makes the past rate of growth in dividends an incorrect basis for predicting \( g \). Assume that a company has been earning a rate of return on its common stock of \( r = .10 \), that it has been retaining the fraction \( b = .60 \) of its earnings, and that, as a consequence, its dividend has been growing at the rate \( br = (.60)(.10) = .06 \).

If the company were to raise the fraction of earnings it pays in dividends so that \( b \) falls to \( .25 \), the rate of growth in the dividend would then fall to \( br = (.25)(.10) = .025 \). However, over the period that spans the rise in the dividend payout rate, the dividend would have grown at an even higher rate than the prior 6%. It would only be correct to project the past rate of growth in the dividend into the future on the highly implausible assumption that the company is expected periodically to raise its payout rate. Therefore, unless there is convincing evidence to the contrary, current expectations of \( b \) and \( r \) provide the best basis for forecasting future growth.
C. **Cost of Equity Capital for AT&T**

Under the method we have advocated for estimating future growth, the DCF formula for a company's cost of equity capital is:

\[ k = \frac{D_2}{P_0} + br. \]  \tag{8}

To arrive at a company's current value of \( k \), the current value of each of the quantities on the right-hand side of Equation (8) must be determined. This is done below for AT&T. As we will see, obtaining estimates of these values is extremely difficult in the turbulent of today's capital markets.

1. **Dividend Yield**

We argued above that the projected dividend yield is appropriate for setting the allowed rate of return on equity. The current quarterly dividend payable on April 1, 1980, is $1.25. The Value Line forecast for dividends over the next 12 months has been reduced from $5.20 in June, 1979, to a current forecast of $3.00.\(^1\) Value Line reduced its forecast dividend even though it was aware of AT&T's stated intent to maintain shareholders' real dividend income against inflation.\(^2\) For the last few years AT&T has followed a policy of raising its dividend in the first quarter. With the recent declaration of the dividend to be paid on April 1, 1980 maintained at $1.25.

\(^1\) Value Line, March 15, 1980.

\(^2\) Value Line, February 1, 1980.
the Value Line estimate appears reasonable, and we will use a dividend of $1.00, equal to the annualized value of the current quarterly dividend of $1.25. ¹

We have also argued that we should use the share price on the date for which the estimate was made. Since this testimony was finalized on March 29, 1980, we will use the company’s closing price on the previous day, that is, \( P_0 = 48.50 \), which results in a dividend yield of \( 5.000 \times \frac{48.50}{48.50} = 10.31\% \).

Ordinarily, for periods of up to a few months, the price of a public utility share only fluctuates in a narrow range, and the choice among the prevailing prices is usually of no particular significance. However, the impact of inflation during the second half of 1979 and the actions and statements of the Federal Reserve Board and other government officials (beginning in October and culminating in President Carter’s recent anti-inflation program) have had a striking impact on the capital markets. Short-term interest rates have risen sharply, and the yields and prices on long-term securities have fluctuated dramatically. In particular, as can be seen in Schedule 10, AT&T’s stock fell from $57.83 on June 30, 1979, to $55 on September 30, 1979. Since then it has decreased steadily to a low of $45 on March 7, 1980, before rising to the current price of $48.50 on March 28, 1980. During the same period its dividend

¹Projection of a higher dividend in the current economic environment would require a downward revision in the growth rate forecasts below.
yield rose steadily from 8.9% on June 30, 1979, to the current projected yield of 10.31%. This was due mainly to the effects of its dropping share price, but also to the reduction in its projected dividend from $3.20 to $3.00.

Through their impact on the dividend yield, the data and the share price used to arrive at AT&T's cost of equity capital have a material impact on the value obtained for k. In other words, in a period over which interest rates fluctuate widely, share prices and the cost of equity capital also fluctuate widely. At the time this testimony was prepared, the reaction to President Carter's anti-inflation program was unknown. Although our estimated dividend yield of 10.31% represents our best estimate at this time, the unfolding reaction to the President's program may cause AT&T's dividend yield to vary considerably over the next few months.

2. Growth Rate—Past Financial Data

In order to arrive at AT&T's growth rate, we require the retention rate, b, and the rate of return on common equity, r, that investors may reasonably expect.

As a first step, let us estimate b and r using only historical data. Schedule 21 shows the underlying data for the years 1975 to 1979 that is needed to calculate b and r.

For the rate of return on common equity that investors expect, we first note that a simple average of the
five values of \( r_e \) (row 5) from 1975 to 1979 is 11.81\%. However, inspection of the annual values reveal that although \( r \) was abnormally depressed in 1975, its values for the next three years exhibited a definite upward trend, and then only declined slightly in 1979. Investors now might well believe that the material rise in the cost of capital between 1975 and 1979 justifies the rates of return the company realized in the more recent years, in which case they would rely primarily on the 1978 and 1979 figures in forecasting the company’s future rate of return. A simple average of these figures is 13.05\% and it seems reasonable that investors might conclude that 13\% represents the best estimate of the long-term return AT&T is expected to earn on common equity.

For the retention rate that investors expect, we first note that a simple average of the five values of \( b_e \) (row 9) from 1975 to 1979 is 37.23\%. However, this average is affected by the low retention rate in 1975, and in recent years, 1977-1979, the retention rate has averaged 38.93\%. It seems reasonable that on the basis of this data, investors might use these recent years, and arrive at 39\% as the best estimate of AT&T’s retention ratio.

Combining the above values (obtained by using historical values in Equation (3) for \( P_0, D_1, b, \) and \( r \)) provides an estimate of AT&T’s cost of equity capital as of March 28,
\[ k = \frac{D_1 + br}{P_0} \]
\[ = \frac{5.00 + (.39)(.13)}{48.30} \]
\[ = .1031 + .0507 = 15.38 \%

However, before accepting this result it may be instructive to pose the following question: What would have been the estimate for \( k \) as of June 30, 1979?

3. Growth Rate - Recent Developments

On June 30, 1979, Value Line estimated that AT&T's 1979 earnings would be $8.00 per share. The actual value of earnings per share for 1979 was $8.04.

Since we would have been reluctant to estimate \( k \) at that time without 1979 data, we would have relied on the Value Line forecast to complete the 1979 annual data, a procedure we have used in the past. Since the Value Line estimates were extremely close to the actual 1979 results, using these estimates and the historical data would have produced the same estimates of \( b \) and \( r \) obtained previously.

It is obvious that if the data and analysis do not change materially, we would obtain the same measurement of the growth rate at any point between June 30, 1979, and March 28, 1980.

The estimates which would have been obtained on two previous dates are provided below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>$\frac{D_1}{P_0}$</th>
<th>$b_r$</th>
<th>$k$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1979</td>
<td>8.99%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19, 1979</td>
<td>9.39%</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An estimate is provided for November 19, 1979, for comparative purposes, since an estimate of $k$ was obtained for Rochester Telephone Co. on that date of 14.83%. The difference in $k$ between Rochester Telephone and AT&T may be attributed to AT&T's slightly lower business risk due to its greater diversification.

The problem can now be easily seen. The estimate of 15.38% obtained for AT&T is correct only if we assume that the large increase in the expected rate of inflation (which raised the dividend yield on AT&T from 8.99% on June 30, 1979, to 10.31% on March 28, 1980) had no effect on the anticipated growth in the dividend.

It is extremely unlikely that investors believe that to be true. The rise in the expected rate of inflation has not only increased interest rates, but also the expected rate at which AT&T's other costs of production, such as materials and labor, will grow. A continued expectation that the company will earn a return on common of 13% and retain 39% of earnings would require the belief that the rate of growth in its revenues will rise to match

---

the rise in the rate of growth of its costs. However, if investors fear that the regulatory process will not be fully responsive to the increase in the rate at which the company’s costs are rising, they will revise their growth estimate downward. That is, with any regulatory lag in the pass through of higher costs, a rise in the expected inflation rate would reduce investor estimates of long-run return on common equity, and would, therefore, result in a downward revision of expected growth. In that event, simply raising the estimate of AT&T’s cost of equity capital by the increase in the dividend yield would result in an overstatement of the required return.

It is our judgment that the response of investors to the rise in the expected rate of inflation has been a downward revision in expectations regarding AT&T’s rate of return on common equity, implying a downward revision in its retention rate also. In support of this position, we note that Value Line lowered its prediction of 1980 earnings per share for AT&T to $7.50, and lowered its predicted 1980 dividend per share to $5.00.1 This implies for 1980 an estimate for r of 11.60% and an estimate for b of 33.33%.

Under the present turbulent economic conditions it is extremely difficult to estimate with precision the extent

1 Value Line, February 1, 1980.
to which these rates have been revised downward. If the revised figures are a 12.50% return on common equity and 20.0% retention rate, then the estimated growth rate must be raised from 5.07% to 4.63%. Adding the latter figure to the current dividend yield of 10.31% results in a cost of equity capital of 14.94%. On the other hand, the rise in interest rates over the past six months may be taken as evidence that the cost of equity capital has gone up over the same time period. Hence, in some measure, this rise in interest rates will lead to an upward revision in the rate of return allowed by the numerous regulatory commissions that set rates for AT&T. A generous allowance for a probable impact of increases in the allowed rate of return on invested capital of the AT&T growth rate to a rate in the vicinity of 4.8-5.2%. This latter growth rate implies a 10.01% dividend yield for equity capital of 14.56%. In our judgment, the AT&T cost of equity capital may well be as low as 15.54% and 15.23%. These rates have been estimated as of March 28, 1980.

Using this reasoning, the growth rate was adjusted downward by 60 basis points for Rochester Telephone. Id., Supplemental Prepared Direct Testimony, March 24, 1980.