

**EXH. MNL-1T  
DOCKETS UE-240004/UG-240005  
2024 PSE GENERAL RATE CASE  
WITNESS: MARK NEWTON LOWRY**

**BEFORE THE  
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

**Complainant,**

**v.**

**PUGET SOUND ENERGY,**

**Respondent.**

**Docket UE-240004**

**Docket UG-240005**

**PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF**

**MARK NEWTON LOWRY**

**ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY**

**FEBRUARY 15, 2024**

**PUGET SOUND ENERGY**

**PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF  
MARK NEWTON LOWRY**

**CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. NEED FOR INFLATION RESEARCH IN CONTEMPORARY  
RATEMAKING.....3

III. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION FOR USING INFLATION  
INDEXES IN RATEMAKING .....7

IV. PRECEDENTS FOR USING INFLATION INDEXES IN  
RATEMAKING.....10

V. DETAILS OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PERFORMED BY  
PEG.....11

    A. Overview.....11

    B. Labor Prices .....13

    C. Material and Service Prices .....14

    D. Capital Asset Prices .....16

    E. Macroeconomic Price Indexes.....20

VI. CONCLUSION.....21

**PUGET SOUND ENERGY**

**PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF**

**MARK NEWTON LOWRY**

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Exh. MNL-2 Professional Qualifications of Mark Newton Lowry

Exh. MNL-3 Inflation Research for PSE

1 **PUGET SOUND ENERGY**

2 **PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY (NONCONFIDENTIAL) OF**  
3 **MARK NEWTON LOWRY**

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 **Q. Please state your name, business address, and occupation.**

6 A. My name is Mark Newton Lowry, and my business address is 44 East Mifflin  
7 Street, Suite 601, Madison, Wisconsin 53703. I am the President of Pacific  
8 Economics Group Research, LLC (“PEG”).

9 **Q. Have you prepared an exhibit describing your education, relevant**  
10 **employment experience, and other professional qualifications?**

11 A. Yes, I have. It is Exh. MNL-2.

12 **Q. What are your duties as President of PEG?**

13 A. My principal duties as President are supervision of research on utility cost and  
14 other topics, expert witness testimony, and client consultation. I also oversee  
15 PEG’s business affairs.

16 **Q. What topics are you covering in your testimony?**

17 A. I supervised a team that developed the inflation factors that Puget Sound Energy  
18 (“PSE” or “the Company”) used in the development of cost projections for the  
19 five-year business plan it discusses in this docket. In my testimony, I first address

1 the need for well-supported inflation assumptions in revenue requirement  
2 projections. There follow discussions of the rationale for using inflation indexes  
3 in ratemaking, precedents for their use, and results of our inflation research for  
4 PSE. Further details of our research are provided in the report, Inflation Research  
5 for PSE, which is included as the second exhibit to my prefiled testimony,  
6 Exh. MNL-3.

7 **Q. What are the key takeaways from your research and testimony?**

8 A. Here are some notable findings.

- 9 • Determination of revenue requirements for multiyear rate plans (“MYRPs”)  
10 and forward test year rate proceedings requires assumptions about input price  
11 inflation.
- 12 • Inflation in input prices faced by U.S. energy utilities has been unexpectedly  
13 rapid in recent years.
- 14 • Forecasting inflation accurately is still difficult in 2024. Inflation in the next  
15 few years may be materially higher or lower than expected.
- 16 • Forecasts of input price inflation should therefore play a larger role in rate  
17 proceedings today than they have in many years. Regulators should welcome  
18 more substantiation for inflation assumptions in revenue requirement  
19 proposals.
- 20 • Costs can be projected in real terms and converted to the nominal costs that  
21 matter for revenue requirements using inflation factors.
- 22 • There are many precedents for escalating utility rates or revenue requirements  
23 using inflation indexes. Inflation indexing is especially common in MYRPs  
24 because multiple years of inflation are at issue.

25 PEG has conducted empirical research for PSE that lays the foundation for using  
26 inflation indexes to establish revenue requirements in the two rate years of its  
27 proposed MYRP (2025 and 2026). This research employed sound indexing

1 practices and forecasts of publicly available inflation indexes from reputable  
2 agencies. Where warranted, adjustments were made for special Seattle-area  
3 business conditions.

4 **II. NEED FOR INFLATION RESEARCH IN CONTEMPORARY**  
5 **RATEMAKING**

6 **Q. Why is research and testimony on input price trends needed in this rate case**  
7 **proceeding?**

8 A. In Washington, gas and electric utilities are required by law to propose MYRPs  
9 with their general rate cases.<sup>1</sup> The permissible term of these plans is two to four  
10 years. Forward-looking cost projections are allowed in Washington MYRPs and  
11 input price inflation is a determinant of future cost.

12 In preparing cost projections for its January 2022 general rate case and MYRP  
13 application, PSE assumed that prices of most base rate inputs it purchased would  
14 average 2.5 percent annual growth. Inflation has materially exceeded this annual  
15 rate since 2021.


16 Figure 1 shows the inflation in the U.S. government's gross domestic product  
17 price index ("GDP-PI") from 1971 through the third quarter of 2023. As is shown  
18 in Figure 1, GDP-PI inflation has in the last three years reached its highest rates  
19 since the oil price shock of 1979-80.

---

<sup>1</sup> RCW 80.28.425, Multiyear rate plan.

1  
2

**Figure 1**  
**History of GDP-PI Inflation**




3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis Table 1.5.4. Price Indexes for Gross Domestic Product, Expanded Detail (Last Revised on: December 21, 2023)

PSE had lots of company when it underestimated future inflation. Figure 2 shows a comparison of Congressional Budget Office (“CBO”) forecasts to actuals for GDP-PI inflation in recent years. It can be seen that CBO’s forecasts of recent GDP-PI inflation have been well below actuals.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

**Figure 2**  
**Forecasted and Actual GDP-PI Inflation Using CBO Forecasts**




Sources: CBO 10-year Economic Projections and U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Table 1.5.4

The Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank’s Survey of Professional Forecasters provides detailed quarterly predictions of macroeconomic variables. Figure 3 depicts the full range of forecasted probabilities for 2024 GDP-PI inflation according to the survey. As is shown in Figure 3, the professional forecasters believe inflation could be much higher as well as much lower than the mean forecast.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

**Figure 3**  
**Aggregate Forecasted Probability of Each Range of Potential GDP-PI Inflation Outcomes This Year**



In this proceeding, PSE’s test year is the twelve months ending June 2023. The rate effective years of its MYRP will be 2025 and 2026, and the business plan extends to 2028. Inflation from June 2023 through the MYRP will thus be an issue in the proceeding.

Inflation has slowed in 2023 but may materially exceed pre-pandemic norms in some or all years of the 2024-2026 period.<sup>2</sup> There is, additionally, a real risk that inflation will be substantially higher or lower than expectations during these years. It is therefore beneficial for PSE to use explicit and well-substantiated inflation forecasts in its revenue requirement projections in this MYRP. As

---

<sup>2</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 4-6.

1 described further below, price inflation research is frequently used in utility  
2 ratemaking and can be integrated into utility cost projections.

3 **III. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION FOR USING INFLATION INDEXES IN**  
4 **RATEMAKING**

5 **Q. What is the theory behind using inflation indexes in revenue requirement**  
6 **forecasts?**

7 A. The cost of any input that a utility uses is the product of its quantity and price.  
8 The growth (rate) of such a cost is the sum of the growth of the quantity and  
9 price.<sup>3</sup> Since inflation can be brisk and vary widely from year to year, input price  
10 inflation can have a major impact on future utility revenue requirements.

11 The aggregate cost of several kinds of inputs that a utility uses is, analogously, the  
12 product of an input quantity index (“*Input Quantities*”) and an index of input  
13 prices in the surrounding region (“*Input Prices<sup>Regional</sup>*”). The growth in such an  
14 aggregated cost is the sum of the growth of these two indexes.

15 
$$\text{growth Cost} = \text{growth Input Quantities} + \text{growth Input Prices}^{\text{Regional}}. \quad [1]$$

16 The growth of an input price index should be a cost-share weighted average of the  
17 growth in price subindexes.

18 Relation [1] implies that growth in input quantities equals growth in real cost.  
19

---

<sup>3</sup> This result holds for certain kinds of growth rates.

1 
$$\text{growth Input Quantities} = \text{growth Cost} - \text{growth Input Prices}^{\text{Regional}}$$
  
2 
$$= \text{growth Real Cost.} \quad [2]$$

3 Cost growth is then the sum of growth in real cost and regional input prices.

4 
$$\text{growth Cost} = \text{growth Real Cost} + \text{growth Input Prices}^{\text{Regional}} \quad [3]$$

5 Suppose, then, that in 2023 PSE makes a forecast of its real cost in 2025 that is  
6 stated in 2023 dollars (“ $\text{Real Cost}_{2025}^{2023}$ ”). This forecast can be converted to  
7 *nominal* 2025 dollars (“ $\text{Cost}_{2025}^{2023}$ ”) by multiplying it by an inflation factor using an  
8 index that measures forecasted regional input price inflation between 2023 and  
9 2025.

10 
$$\text{PSE Cost}_{2025}^{2023} = \text{PSE Real Cost}_{2025}^{2023} \times \frac{\text{Regional Input Prices}_{2025}^{2023}}{\text{Regional Input Prices}_{2023}^{2023}} \quad [4]$$

11 An alternative approach to adjusting the revenue requirement for inflation is to  
12 make separate inflation adjustments to numerous cost categories. Summary input  
13 price indexes make inflation adjustments simpler, but at the cost of having to  
14 design and explain the price index formulas.

15 **Q. Are forecasts of inflation in the regional prices of all the base rate inputs that**  
16 **PSE uses readily available?**

17 A. No. Forecasts of inflation in regional prices are unavailable for most kinds of  
18 base rate inputs that the Company uses. However, for many of the inputs used by  
19 PSE, forecasts are available for national input price trends. We know that

1             $growth\ Input\ Prices^{Regional}$   
 2                    =  $growth\ Input\ Prices^{National}$   
 3                            +  $(growth\ Input\ Prices^{Regional} - growth\ Input\ Prices^{National})$     [5]

4            where the term in parentheses may be called a regional inflation differential. This  
 5            result provides the basis for modelling regional price inflation as the sum of the  
 6            forecasted growth in national input prices and a long-term regional inflation  
 7            differential, denoted by  $(\overline{Regional\ Input\ Prices} - \overline{National\ Input\ Prices})$ , which is  
 8            defined as the difference between longer-term regional and national input price  
 9            growth trends.

10    **Q.    What types of input price indexes are appropriate for capital prices?**

11    A.    The cost of owning capital has three basic components: depreciation, the  
 12            opportunity cost of investment (often called the return on investment), and taxes.  
 13            These costs depend in part on the price of asset acquisition and/or construction.  
 14            In statistical research on utility cost, the trend in the price of assets is often  
 15            measured by utility construction cost indexes. The return on asset ownership  
 16            depends, additionally, on market rates of return on capital. The capital price  
 17            inflation of a utility is accordingly a function of trends in market rates of return,  
 18            unit construction costs, and tax rates.

19            The design of a capital price that is consistent with the cost-of-service capital  
 20            accounting used in utility ratemaking is complex. When integrating inflation  
 21            trends into utility capital cost projections, a complicated capital price index

1 formula can be sidestepped by forecasting the trends in asset prices or  
2 construction costs and then running these results through the Company's capital  
3 revenue requirement model.

4 **IV. PRECEDENTS FOR USING INFLATION INDEXES IN RATEMAKING**

5 **Q. What are the precedents for using inflation indexes in ratemaking?**

6 A. Use of inflation indexes in utility ratemaking has been facilitated in North  
7 America by the ready availability of good inflation indexes and of standardized  
8 operating data for numerous utilities over many years. Much of the requisite data  
9 have been gathered by U.S. government agencies.

10 Some MYRPs in the gas and electric utility, railroad, telecommunication carrier,  
11 and oil pipeline industries have had rates or revenue requirements escalated by  
12 formulas that include inflation indexes.<sup>4</sup> Other MYRPs have featured "hybrid"  
13 approaches to revenue cap escalation that mix inflation indexing with other  
14 escalation methods (e.g., forecasting).<sup>5</sup> Inflation indexes are sometimes used to  
15 establish forward test year revenue requirements even in the absence of MYRPs.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 11-12.

<sup>5</sup> See *id.* at 12.

<sup>6</sup> See *id.* at 13.

1       **V.       DETAILS OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PERFORMED BY PEG**

2       **A.       Overview**

3       **Q.       Please provide an overview of your inflation research for PSE.**

4       A.       The Company asked PEG to conduct inflation factor research for the following  
5       kinds of operations and maintenance (“O&M”) expenses.

6       Electricity

- 7               Production (excluding generation fuel and purchased power)
- 8               Transmission (excluding transmission by others)
- 9               Distribution
- 10              Customer Accounts
- 11              Customer Service and Information (excluding conservation)
- 12              Administrative and General

13       Gas

- 14              Distribution (excluding compressor station fuel)
- 15              Customer Accounts
- 16              Customer Service and Information (excluding conservation)
- 17              Administrative and General

18       For these expenses, we were asked to itemize trends in salary and wage rates and  
19       material and service (“M&S”) prices.

20       The Company also asked PEG to develop inflation factors for the following types  
21       of capital expenditures (“capex”).

22              Electricity

- 23                      Production (excluding Colstrip)
- 24                      Transmission
- 25                      Distribution

26              Gas

27              General

28              Intangible

1 We considered a wide range of price indexes for use in our inflation factor  
2 calculations. PEG also examined PSE's detailed historical and forecasted cost  
3 data in developing inflation factors.

4 **Q. Please describe important qualities of inflation indexes that are used in**  
5 **ratemaking.**

6 A. The qualities of inflation indexes I find important for purposes of ratemaking  
7 include relevance, the availability of forecasts, and credibility.

- 8 • Indexes are relevant to the extent that they are designed to track the  
9 market price trends actually faced by subject utilities for their inputs.  
10 Indexes designed to measure same-region input price inflation are  
11 generally more relevant than indexes of national input price or  
12 macroeconomic (multi-sector) price inflation. For PSE, indexes specific  
13 to Washington state are relevant as well as indexes for the Seattle-  
14 Tacoma-Bellevue metropolitan area. The Company draws workers from  
15 the entire state and has generation operations outside the Seattle area.  
16 Indexes of price trends in the Pacific Northwest or broader West region  
17 are generally more relevant than those for the entire U.S.
- 18 • Inflation indexes are more useful to the extent that forecasts are readily  
19 available and frequently updated.
- 20 • Inflation indexes should ideally be computed and forecasted by credible  
21 public or private agencies.<sup>7</sup>

22 **Q. Please identify agencies that provide credible inflation indexes and/or**  
23 **forecasts.**

24 A. Agencies that calculate inflation indexes that are relevant for U.S. utility  
25 ratemaking include: the Bureau of Labor Statistics ("BLS") of the U.S.

---

<sup>7</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 15.

1 Department of Labor; the Bureau of Economic Analysis (“BEA”) of the U.S.  
2 Department of Commerce; the Power Planner Service of Standard and Poor’s  
3 Global (“Power Planner”); and Whitman, Requardt and Associates.  
4 Power Planner maintains and forecasts indexes for gas and electric utility wage  
5 rates, M&S prices, and (unit) construction costs. Credible forecasters of  
6 macroeconomic price inflation indexes include the CBO and Moody’s Investors  
7 Service.<sup>8</sup>

8 **B. Labor Prices**

9 **Q. Guided by the principles you discussed above, how did you calculate inflation**  
10 **factors for PSE’s salaries and wages?**

11 A. PEG forecasted wage rate inflation using Company-specific salary and wage  
12 shares and Power Planner forecasts of several national BLS labor price indexes.  
13 Our forecasts also reflect the typical 0.35 percent differential between annual  
14 wage rate inflation in the Seattle area and the U.S.<sup>9</sup> As shown in Table 1 below,  
15 PEG forecasts regional wage rate inflation to average 3.88 percent growth over  
16 the three years from 2024 to 2026 and 3.64 percent growth over the five years  
17 from 2024 to 2028.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 15.

<sup>9</sup> See *id.* at 16-28.

<sup>10</sup> See *id.* Table 5 at 28.



Table 1

**Wage Rate Inflation Forecasts**

Wage Rate Inflation Forecasts							
	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2024-2026	2024-2028
						3-year growth rate average	5-year growth rate average
Annual Inflation Rate	4.53%	3.73%	3.39%	3.29%	3.25%	<b>3.88%</b>	<b>3.64%</b>
Inflation Factor	1.04639	1.08614	1.12356	1.16117	1.19957		

**C. Material and Service Prices**

**Q. How did you calculate inflation factors for material and service prices?**

A. Power Planner calculates and forecasts the inflation of national M&S price indexes for major expense categories of gas and electric utilities such as power distribution. These indexes are constructed from producer price indexes (“PPIs”) that the BLS maintains.<sup>11</sup> Cost share weights for these summary price indexes are based on Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) Form 1 cost data.

PEG believes that the Power Planner index for administrative and general (“A&G”) material and service prices is sound. However, the inflation in the Power Planner M&S price indexes for other major expense categories such as power distribution are excessively volatile and grow too slowly over the 2024-26 period.<sup>12</sup>

These problems reflect an unsatisfactory treatment by Power Planner of prices that utilities pay for services. Weights on service price inflation are likely to be

<sup>11</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 29.

<sup>12</sup> See *id.* at 33.

1 too low. Costs of services are generally not itemized on FERC Form 1. Over the  
2 years, PSE like many other energy utilities has increased the use of outsourced  
3 services for O&M tasks. The weight on services in an M&S price index matters  
4 because costs of many services that utilities purchase (e.g., vegetation  
5 management) have a sizable labor component and wage rate inflation should  
6 generally stabilize and accelerate service price inflation.

7 Based on this analysis, PEG made a correction to the inflation yielded by Power  
8 Planner's summary M&S price indexes for major expense categories other than  
9 A&G. We assume that inflation in prices of outsourced services used in  
10 non-A&G activities is a weighted average of inflation in Power Planner's M&S  
11 price indexes, a capital price index, and our wage rate index. A capital price  
12 index is needed because some providers of outsourced services use an appreciable  
13 amount of capital equipment (e.g., bucket trucks for tree trimming). We used the  
14 gross domestic product implicit price deflator ("GDP-IPD") as a proxy for capital  
15 price inflation.<sup>13</sup> Inflation in our corrected custom M&S price index for non-  
16 A&G cost categories is effectively an average of the inflation in Power Planner  
17 M&S price indexes, the GDP-IPD, and our wage rate index.<sup>14</sup>

18 The corrected custom indexes calculated by PEG for all M&S prices (that is,  
19 including prices of A&G inputs) are shown in Table 2 below. Inflation in the

---

<sup>13</sup> The GDP-IPD was used in lieu of the GDP-PI because a more recent forecast of the former is available. *See* Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 44-47 for further discussion.

<sup>14</sup> *See id.* at 33.

1 PEG-calculated electric M&S price index is forecasted to average 1.61 percent  
 2 annual growth in the three years from 2024 to 2026 and 1.85 percent growth in  
 3 the five years from 2024 to 2028. Inflation in the PEG-calculated gas M&S price  
 4 index is forecasted to average 1.79 percent growth in the three years from 2024 to  
 5 2026 and 1.97 percent in the five years from 2024 to 2028.<sup>15</sup>

6 Table 2  
 7 **Corrected Custom M&S Price Inflation Forecasts**

	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2024-2026	2024-2028
						3-year growth rate average	5-year growth rate average
Electric M&S Inflation	1.05%	2.17%	1.61%	2.19%	2.22%	<b>1.61%</b>	<b>1.85%</b>
Inflation Factor	1.0106	1.0328	1.0495	1.0728	1.0968		
Gas M&S Inflation	1.24%	1.37%	2.75%	2.24%	2.25%	<b>1.79%</b>	<b>1.97%</b>
Inflation Factor	1.0125	1.0264	1.0551	1.0789	1.1035		

8  
 9 **D. Capital Asset Prices**

10 **Q. How did you calculate inflation factors for capex?**

11 A. Whitman, Requardt and Associates has for many decades calculated regional gas  
 12 and electric utility construction cost indexes (“Handy Whitman” indexes). The  
 13 Handy Whitman indexes for the Pacific region are most relevant for PSE.  
 14 Summary indexes are available for major electric utility asset categories such as  
 15 power distribution. These summary electric indexes and many more granular gas

---

<sup>15</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3, Tables 7a and 7b at 35.

1 and electric utility construction cost indexes are forecasted by Power Planner.  
2 Power Planner does not publish a summary gas distribution construction cost  
3 index but PEG constructed one using Company capex shares. As shown in Table  
4 3 below, PEG calculated separate inflation factors for the major electric and gas  
5 construction cost categories using Power Planner forecasts.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 35-40.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

Table 3<sup>17</sup>  
**Capex Price Inflation Forecasts**

	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2024-2026	2024-2028
						3-year growth rate average	5-year growth rate average
<b>Gas Distribution</b>							
Annual Inflation Rate	0.61%	-0.61%	-0.29%	0.31%	0.60%	-0.10%	0.12%
Inflation Factor	1.0061	1.0000	0.9971	1.0002	1.0062		
<b>Hydraulic Production</b>							
Annual Inflation Rate	0.46%	0.44%	0.79%	0.79%	0.94%	0.57%	0.69%
Inflation Factor	1.0046	1.0091	1.0171	1.0252	1.0349		
<b>Other Non-Nuclear Production</b>							
Annual Inflation Rate	8.59%	9.09%	4.66%	1.06%	-1.04%	7.45%	4.47%
Inflation Factor	1.0897	1.1934	1.2504	1.2637	1.2507		
<b>Power Transmission</b>							
Annual Inflation Rate	3.03%	0.12%	-0.62%	-0.88%	-0.24%	0.85%	0.28%
Inflation Factor	1.0308	1.0320	1.0257	1.0167	1.0142		
<b>Power Distribution</b>							
Annual Inflation Rate	6.33%	3.12%	1.15%	0.54%	1.07%	3.53%	2.44%
Inflation Factor	1.0654	1.0991	1.1118	1.1178	1.1297		
<b>General Plant</b>							
Annual Inflation Rate	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
Inflation Factor	1.0101	1.0202	1.0305	1.0408	1.0513		
<b>Intangible Plant</b>							
Annual Inflation Rate	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%
Inflation Factor	1.0101	1.0202	1.0305	1.0408	1.0513		

**Q. How did you determine inflation factors for general plant and intangible plant?**

A. General plant and intangible plant have the similarity that they are not readily attributable to a particular area of utility operation. In response to our questions, PSE indicated that its expenditures on intangible plant during the proposed multiyear rate plan will consist chiefly of software. General plant consists of

<sup>17</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 Tables 9a and 9b at 39-40.

1 other assets that are not easily classified into functional categories. PSE has  
2 indicated that computers and communications equipment are the biggest areas of  
3 expected general plant expenditures.

4 In our empirical research for most clients, we have used a Handy Whitman Index  
5 for office buildings as the inflation index for general plant additions. However,  
6 there are no Handy Whitman indexes for many kinds of general plant or  
7 intangible plant. Thus, we relied chiefly on price indexes from other sources such  
8 as the BLS.

9 Using capex shares provided by PSE that are specific to the Company, we  
10 computed weighted averages of growth rates in a selection of relevant inflation  
11 indexes for intangible plant and general plant. Most of the inflation subindexes  
12 were producer price indexes.

13 Another complication in developing inflation factors for general plant and  
14 intangible plant is that forecasts of inflation in the relevant PPIs are not to our  
15 knowledge available. We based our forecasts on the average annual inflation of  
16 the chosen indexes over the last 10 years (where available). As shown in Table 3  
17 above, based on this research we recommend annual inflation assumptions of  
18 1 percent for each of general plant and intangible plant.

1            **E.        Macroeconomic Price Indexes**

2            **Q.        Are any macroeconomic inflation measures used in utility ratemaking?**

3            A.        Yes. The GDP-PI has been used in U.S. rate and revenue cap index formulas and  
4            forward test year cost projections and it has often been used in utility cost  
5            research as a proxy for M&S price inflation.

6            The GDP-PI is computed by the BEA and is the federal government's featured  
7            index of inflation in prices of the economy's final goods and services. These  
8            products include capital goods and exports as well as consumer goods and  
9            services. There is less weight in the GDP-PI than in the consumer price index (all  
10           items) on prices of food, shelter, and energy commodities. The volatile inflation  
11           in these prices has little bearing on the cost of utility base rate inputs. The trend  
12           of the BEA's GDP-IPD is virtually identical to that of the GDP-PI.

13           **Q.        Did PEG consider the use of a macroeconomic inflation measure in the**  
14           **revenue requirement projections for PSE?**

15           A.        Yes. We examined the historical and, where available, forecasted trends of  
16           various national and Seattle-area macroeconomic inflation measures. These  
17           included the GDP-PI, consumer price indexes, and personal consumption  
18           expenditure price indexes.<sup>18</sup> The macroeconomic indexes for the national  
19           economy have had an historical tendency to grow more slowly than inflation in

---

<sup>18</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 41-48.

1 the prices of utility M&S inputs and even more slowly than labor or utility  
2 construction price inflation. The slow growth of macroeconomic inflation  
3 measures has been recognized by several regulators in MYRP proceedings.  
4 Macroeconomic inflation is more rapid in Seattle, but this has been due in large  
5 measure to rapid growth in shelter prices that have little relevance to utility cost.

6 One area where GDP-PI could be considered in this proceeding is as an  
7 alternative to our corrected custom M&S price indexes.<sup>19</sup> Inflation in the GDP-PI  
8 and utility M&S prices is expected to be similar in the next few years. Use of the  
9 GDP-PI would sidestep the complicated calculations used in our corrected custom  
10 M&S price index. PSE has instead chosen to use our corrected custom M&S  
11 price index in its cost projections. This index is expected to grow a little more  
12 slowly than the GDP-PI in the next few years.

## 13 VI. CONCLUSION

14 **Q. Does that conclude your prefled direct testimony?**

15 **A.** Yes, it does.

---

<sup>19</sup> See Lowry, Exh. MNL-3 at 48.