

EXHIBIT NO. _____ (CJB-13)
DOCKET NO. _____
2003 POWER COST ONLY RATE CASE
WITNESS: CHARLES J. BLACK

**BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

Docket No. _____

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
CHARLES J. BLACK
ON BEHALF OF PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.**

Exhibit CJB-13

Economic Assumptions for New Electric Generating Resources, April 2003 Least Cost Plan¹

Cost of Capital

The company expects that the spread between the return for debt and equity for the IOU's should be four to five percent, consistent with recent practice. The debt/equity ratio and the corresponding rates of return were used to determine a weighted cost of capital for each developer segment. For the IPP's the model uses the higher rates for years 2004 and 2005.

PSE Cost of Capital Assumptions

Cost of Capital			
Return %	Public	IOU's	IPP's
Debt	6.5	7.5	10 to 8.5
Equity	0	11.5	30 to 17
Debt/Equity Ratio			
Debt	100	55	40
Equity	0	45	60
Total Cost (%)			
Weighted	6.5	9.3	22.0 to 14

New Resource Development

The second set of assumptions focus on which entities will be building new generation for each technology over the next 20 years. PSE used the developer mix assumptions made by the NPPC listed in the following table.

¹ Source: April 2003 Least Cost Plan, Appendix K, p. 4-5

NPPC Developer Mix Assumptions

Technology	Developer Mix (%)			Mix Weighted Cost of Capital
	Public	IOUs	IPPs	PSE
CCCT	15	15	70	17.8 to 11.9
SCCT	40	40	20	10.7 to 9.0
Wind	20	20	60	16.4 to 11.3
Coal	25	25	50	15.0 to 10.8
Solar	50	25	25	11.1 to 9.0

The developer mix percentages were applied to the weighted cost of capital for each developer segment (i.e. 6.5 percent, 9.3 percent, 13.6 percent) to produce a mix weighted cost of capital (values in bold font under PSE) for each technology. The mix-weighted cost of capital was then applied to the investment costs shown in Exhibit CJB-10.