Exhibit No. DCP-1T Dockets UE-090704/UG-090705 Witness: David C. Parcell

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

DOCKET UE-090704 .

and

DOCKET UG-090705 (consolidated)

TESTIMONY

OF

DAVID C. PARCELL

ON BEHALF OF THE STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Cost of Capital

ĺ Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE" or "the Company") in these dockets. I have 2 performed independent studies and am making recommendations of the current cost 3 . of capital for PSE. 4 5 Q. Have you prepared any exhibits in support of your testimony? 6 A. Yes, I have. Exhibit No. DCP-2 through Exhibit No. DCP-18 represent the analyses 7 that support my cost of capital recommendation. These exhibits were prepared either 8 by me or under my direction. The information contained in these exhibits is true and 9 correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. 10 11 II. **RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY** 12 13 Q. What is your overall cost of capital recommendation in this proceeding? 14 A. My overall cost of capital recommendation for PSE is 7.89 percent, as is shown on 15 Exhibit No. DCP-3, and can be summarized as follows: 16 Percent Return Cost 17 Short-Term Debt 3.95% 2.47% 0.10% 3.29% Long-Term Debt 51.05% 6.45% 18 10.00% Common Equity 45.00% 4.50% 19 Total 100.00% 20 21 Q. Please compare your 7.89 percent estimate to the Company's proposed cost of 22 capital. PSE requests a return on common equity of 10.8 percent and an overall rate of return 23 A. 24 of 8.50 percent. My cost of capital recommendation differs from PSE's request in

1		versus 45 percent) at 5.757 percent. The resulting cost of long-term debt is 6.45
2		percent. This is shown on page 2 of Exhibit No. DCP-3.
3	•	
4		VII. COST OF EQUITY
5		
6	Α.	Selection of Proxy Companies
7		
8	Q.	How have you estimated the cost of common equity for PSE?
9	A.	PSE is not a publicly-traded company. Consequently, market information is not
10		available for PSE's common stock, and it is not possible to directly apply cost of
11		equity models using that information. Moreover, PSE's parent is not publicly-
12		traded. As a result, it is generally preferable to analyze groups of comparison or
13		"proxy" companies as a substitute for PSE to determine its cost of common equity.
14		The use of proxy companies is also preferable to use of only a single company,
15		because a group of companies provides for a balancing or averaging of statistics for
16		multiple companies deemed to be of similar risk to the subject company.
17		Therefore, I examined three proxy groups for comparison to PSE. I selected
18		one group of electric utilities similar to PSE using the criteria listed on my Exhibit
19		No. DCP-10. These criteria are as follows:
20 21 22 23 24 25 26	,	 Net Plant of \$1 billion to \$10 billion; Electric revenues 50% or greater; Common equity ratio 40% or greater; S&P and Moody's bond ratings of BBB; S&P stock ranking of B or B+; and, Has paid dividends for 5 years.

Second, I conducted studies of the cost of equity for the two proxy groups selected by PSE's witness Dr. Morin. It is my intention that, by using both my own proxy group and Dr. Morin's proxy groups, the proxy group selection does not form a major controversy in the cost of equity estimation process. I note, on the other hand, that I regard my proxy group to be more appropriate than Dr. Morin's proxy groups since my group was selected based on risk and operating characteristics more directly reflective of PSE.

B. Discounted Cash Flow Analysis

A.

11 Q. What is the theory and methodological basis of the discounted cash flow model?

The discounted cash flow (DCF) model is one of the oldest, as well as the most commonly-used, models for estimating the cost of common equity for public utilities. It is my understanding that the Commission's policy is to place primary reliance on DCF results in setting the cost of capital for the utilities it regulates. The DCF model is based on the "dividend discount model" of financial theory, which maintains that the value (price) of any security or commodity is the discounted present value of all future cash flows.

The most common variant of the DCF model assumes that dividends are expected to grow at a constant rate. This variant of the dividend discount model is known as the constant growth or Gordon DCF model. In this framework cost of capital is derived by the following formula:

$$K = \frac{D}{P} + g$$

1 2 where: K = discount rate (cost of capital)3 P = current price 4 D = current dividend rate 5 g = constant rate of expected growth 6 This formula essentially recognizes that the return expected or required by investors 7 is comprised of two factors: dividend yield (current income) and expected growth in 8 dividends (future income). 9 10 Q. Please explain how you have employed the DCF model. 11 I have utilized the constant growth DCF model. In doing so, I have combined the A. current dividend yield for each group of proxy utility stocks described in the 12 13 previous section with several indicators of expected dividend growth. 14 How did you derive the dividend yield component of the DCF equation? 15 Q. 16 A. There are several methods that can be used for calculating the dividend yield 17 component. These methods generally differ in the manner in which the dividend rate 18 is employed; i.e., current versus future dividends or annual versus quarterly 19 compounding of dividends. I believe the most appropriate dividend yield component 20 is the version listed below: $Yield = \frac{D_0(1+0.5g)}{P_0}$ 21 This dividend yield component recognizes the timing of dividend payments and 22 dividend increases. 23

1		The P ₀ in my yield calculation is the average (of high and low) stock price for
2	·	each proxy company for the most recent three month period (August-October, 2009).
3		The D_0 is the current annualized dividend rate for each proxy company.
4		
5	Q.	How have you estimated the dividend growth component of the DCF equation?
6	A.	The dividend growth rate component of the DCF model is usually the most crucial
7		and controversial element involved in using this methodology. The objective of
8	•	estimating the dividend growth component is to reflect the growth expected by
9		investors that is embodied in the price (and yield) of a company's stock. As such, it
10		is important to recognize that individual investors have different expectations and
11		consider alternative indicators in deriving their expectations. This is evidenced by
12		the fact that every investment decision resulting in the purchase of a particular stock
13		is matched by another investment decision to sell that stock. Obviously, since two
14		investors reach different decisions at the same market price, their expectations differ.
15		A wide array of indicators exists for estimating the growth expectations of
16		investors. As a result, it is evident that no single indicator of growth is always used
17		by all investors. It therefore is necessary to consider alternative indicators of
18		dividend growth in deriving the growth component of the DCF model.
19		I have considered five indicators of growth in my DCF analyses. These are:
20 21		1. 2004-2008 (5-year average) earnings retention, or fundamental growth (per Value Line);
22 23 24 25 26		2. 5-year average of historic growth in earnings per share ("EPS"), dividends per share ("DPS"), and book value per share ("BVPS") (per Value Line);

1 2 3			2009, 2010, a (per Value Li		4 projection	s of earning	gs retention	growth				
4 5		4. 2006-2008 to 2012-2014 projections of EPS, DPS, and BVPS (per Value Line); and										
6 7 8	•		5-year project Finance).	tions of EPS	growth as r	eported in F	irst Call (pe	r Yahoo!				
9		I believe this co	ombination of	growth indic	cators is a re	epresentativ	e and appro	priate set				
1		with which to begin the process of estimating investor expectations of dividend										
2		growth for the	groups of pro	xy companie	s. I also be	lieve that the	ese growth					
3		indicators reflect the types of information that investors consider in making their										
4		investment decisions. As I indicated previously, investors have an array of										
15		information available to them, all of which should be expected to have some impact										
.6		on their decision	n-making pro	ocess.			-					
7												
.8	Q.	Please describ	e your initial	DCF calcul	ations.							
.9	A.	Exhibit No. DO	CP-11 present	s my DCF an	alysis. Pag	e 1 shows tl	he calculation	on of the				
20		"raw" (i.e., prio	or to adjustme	ent for growth	n) dividend	yield for ea	ch company	in the				
21		proxy groups.	Pages 2 and 3	show the gr	owth rate fo	or the group	s of proxy c	ompanies.				
22		Page 4 shows the "raw" DCF calculations, which are presented on several bases: mean,										
23		median, and his	gh values. Th	nese results c	an be summ	arized as fo	llows:					
24 25		· ,										
26					Me		Med					
27 28 29		Proxy Group S&P Group Integrated	Mean 10.0% 11.3% 10.4%	Median 9.6% 11.1% 10.0%	Low 8.5% 10.4% 9.6%	High 12.3% 12.8% 11.9%	Low 7.7% 10.6% 9.1%	High 11.2% 11.5% 11.1%				
U		Group										

1		I note that the individual DCF calculations shown on Exhibit No. DCP-11 should not
2		be interpreted to reflect the expected cost of capital for the proxy groups; rather, the
3		individual values shown should be interpreted as alternative information considered
4		by investors. The individual DCF calculations also demonstrate how the focus on a
5		single growth rate, i.e. EPS projections, can produce a DCF conclusion that is not
6		reflective of a broader perspective of available information.
7		The DCF results in Exhibit No. DCP-10 indicate average (mean and median)
8		DCF cost rates of 9.6 percent to 11.3 percent. The "high" DCF rates (i.e., using the
9		highest growth rates only) are 11.9 percent to 12.8 percent on an average basis and
10		11.1 percent to 11.5 percent on a median basis, while the "low" DCF rates (i.e., using
11		the lowest growth rates only) are 8.5 percent to 10.6 percent.
12		
13	Q.	What do you conclude from your DCF analyses?
14	A.	This DCF analysis indicates a range of 9.6 percent to 11.3 percent for the proxy
15		groups. This is approximated by the average/mean values. I give less weight to the
16		lower end of the DCF results, as well as significantly less weight to the extreme
17		upper ends of the groups (which are impacted by outlier results).
18		
19	Q.	Which portion of the DCF range do you recommend at this time?
20	A.	I believe that the lower portion of the 9.6 percent to 11.3 percent currently reflects
21		the proper DCF cost for PSE. I specifically recommend 10.0 percent, because the
22		DCF results are presently upwardly influenced by recent stock prices (i.e., higher
23		yield).

Exhibit No. DCP-8 Dockets UE-090704 and UG-090705 Witness: David C. Parcell

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

٧.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

DOCKET UE-090704

DOCKET UG-090705

EXHIBIT TO TESTIMONY OF

DAVID C. PARCELL

ON BEHALF OF STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PSE Capital Structure Ratios 2004-2008

Exhibit No. DCP-8 Page 1 of 2

PUGET SOUND ENERGY CAPITAL STRUCTURE RATIOS 2004 - 2008 (\$000)

YEAR	COMMON EQUITY	PREFERRED SECURITIES	LONG-TERM DEBT	SHORT-TER DEBT
		OLOGINILO		
2004	\$1,592,433	\$282,139	\$2,095,360	\$150,000
	38.7%	6.8%	50.9%	3.6%
	40.1%	7.1%	52.8%	•
2005	\$1,986,621	\$239,639	\$2,264,360	\$41,000
•	43.8%	5.3%	50.0%	0.9%
	44.2%	5.3%	50.4%	
2006	\$2,092,283	\$39,639	\$2,733,360	\$352,358
	40.1%	0.8%	52.4%	6.8%
	43.0%	0.8%	56.2%	
2007	\$2,504,091	\$1,889	\$2,858,360	\$276,252
	44.4%	0.0%	50.7%	4.9%
	46.7%	0.0%	53.3%	
2008	\$2,249,186	\$1,889	\$2,678,860	\$990,753
	38.0%	0.0%	45.2%	16.7%
	45.6%	0.0%	54.3%	

Note: Percentages may not total 100.0% due to rounding.

Source: Response to WUTC Data Request No. 028

Exhibit No. DCP-8 Page 2 of 2

PUGET ENERGY CAPITAL STRUCTURE RATIOS 2003 - 2006 (\$000)

YEAR	COMMON EQUITY	PREFERRED SECURITIES	LONG-TERM DEBT	SHORT-TERI DEBT
2003	\$1,622,276	\$282,139	\$2,100,360	\$150,000
	39.0%	6.8%	50.6%	3.6%
	40.5%	7.0%	52.4%	
2004	\$2,027,047	\$239,639	\$2,264,360	\$41,000
	44.3%	5.2%	49.5%	0.9%
	44.7%	5.3%	50.0%	
2005	\$2,116,029	\$39,639	\$2,733,360	\$328,055
	40.6%	0.8%	52.4%	6.3%
	43.3%	0.8%	55.9%	
2007	\$2,521,954	\$1,889	\$2,858,360	\$260,486
	44.7%	0.0%	50.7%	4.6%
	46.9%	0.0%	53.1%	
2008	\$2,273,201	\$1,889	\$2,678,860	\$964,700
	38.4%	0.0%	45.3%	16.3%
	45.9%	0.0%	54.1%	

Note: Percentages may not total 100.0% due to rounding.

Source: Response to WUTC Data Request No. 028

Exhibit No. DCP-11 Dockets UE-090704 and UG-090705 Witness: David C. Parcell

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

DOCKET UE-090704

DOCKET UG-090705

EXHIBIT TO TESTIMONY OF

DAVID C. PARCELL

ON BEHALF OF STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Comparison Companies Dividend Yield

Exhibit No. DCP-11 Page 2 of 4

COMPARISON COMPANIES RETENTION GROWTH RATES

COMPANY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Average	2009	2010	'12-'14	Averag
ROXY GROUP										
llegheny Energy	5.0%	8.8%	15.3%	15.3%	10,3%	10.9%	10.0%	9.0%	8.5%	9.2%
wista Corp	1.4%	2.4%	4.9%	0.8%	3,7%	2.6%	4.0%	3.5%	3.0%	3.5%
Neco Sap	3.9%	4.1%	3.0%	2.6%	4.5%	3.6%	4.5%	4.5%	4.0%	4.3%
mpire District Electric	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.0%	1.5%	3.0%	1.8%
Great Plains Energy	5.1%	3,2%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	1.8%	1.5%	2.5%	2.0%	2.0%
lawallan Electric Industries	1.1%	1.5%	0.7%	0.8%	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%	1.5%	3.0%	1.5%
innacle West Capital	2,3%	1.0%	3.4%	2.5%	0.3%	1.9%	1.0%	2.0%	3.0%	2.0%
ester Energy	3.2%	4.3%	5.5%	4.3%	1.2%	3.7%	2.5%	3.0%	3,0%	2.8%
verage				-: :: ::		3.2%				3.4%
S&P Electric Utilities						·				
llegheny Energy	5.0%	8.8%	15.3%	15.3%	10,3%	10.9%	10.0%	9.0%	8.5%	9.2%
merican Electric Power	5.7%	5.2%	5.7%	5.1%	5.1%	5.4%	4.5%	4.5%	5.0%	4.7%
meren	0.9%	1.7%	0.2%	1.3%	1.0%	1.0%	3.5%	3.0%	3,5%	3.3%
MS Energy	6.2%	9.9%	6.4%	5.1%	8.4%	7.2%	7.0%	6.5%	5.0%	6.2%
CenterPoint Energy	7.5%	7.8%	15.7%	10.0%	9,9%	10.2%	3.5%	4.0%	6.0%	4.5%
Consolidated Edison	0.8%	2,6%	2.6%	3.9%	3.1%	2.6%	2.0%	2.0%	3,5%	2.5%
Constellation Energy	7.7%	7.7%	9.1%	8.9%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	10.5%	8.5%	6.39
TE Energy	1.6%	3.7%	1.2%	1.5%	1,7%	1.9%	2,5%	3.0%	3.5%	3.0%
ominion Resources	4.8%	1.1%	5.6%	5.0%	8.4%	5.0%	7.5%	7.0%	6.5%	7.09
ommon Resources Ouke Energy			4.1%	2.0%	0.6%	2.2%	1.0%	1.0%	1.5%	1.29
Edison International	0.0%	12.2%	10.1%	9.2%	8,6%	8.0%	5.5%	6.0%	7.5%	6.39
	5.8%	6.0%	8.3%	8.0%	8.1%	7.2%	8.0%	9.0%	8.0%	8.39
ntergy xelon	10.7%	11,9%	13.0%	15.3%	12.5%	12.7%	11,5%	10.0%	11.5%	11.0
	5.6%	4.2%	6.9%	6.1%	7.9%	6.1%	7.5%	8.5%	7.5%	7.89
PL Group	4,9%	4.2%	7.4%	7.7%	8.1%	6.5%	5.0%	4.5%	7.0%	5,5%
irstEnergy Corp		5.3%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	1.0%	2.0%	1.09
ntegrys Energy	6,6%	7.7%	6.8%	6.0%	6.8%	7.5%	5.5%	5,5%	6.0%	5.79
PG&E	10.3%	8.8%	9.3%	10.0%	8.5%	9.2%	1.0%	11.0%	10.0%	7.39
PL Corp	9.3%			2.3%	4.2%	2.6%	0,5%	2,5%	3,0%	2.0%
Pepco Holdings	2.5%	2.4%	1.5% 3.4%	2.5%	0.3%	1.9%	1.0%	2.0%	3.0%	2.09
Pinnacle West Capital	2.3%	1.0%		0.7%	1.5%	. 1.3%	2.0%	2,5%	3.0%	2.59
Progress Energy	2.6%	1.7%	0.0%		10.5%	6.9%	10.0%	10.0%	9,0%	9.7%
Public Service Enterprise	3.5%	5.3%	5.3%	9.9%	9.7%	11,1%	9.0%	9.0%	8.0%	8.79
Sempra Energy	14.9%	10.1%	11.0%	9.7%			3.0%	3.5%	4.0%	3.5%
Southern Company	4.7%	4.6%	3.8%	4.3%	3.5%	4.2%	2.5%	3.5%	4.5%	3,5%
TECO Energy	0.0%	3,3%	5.0%	5.1%	0.0%	2.7%	6.0%	7.0%	6.0%	6.39
Visconsin Energy Kcel Energy Inc.	4.9% 3.9%	7.5% 2.9%	7.1% 3.6%	7.1% 3.1%	7.0% 3.8%	6.7% 3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	5.0%	4.0%
Average	,				,	5.7%				5.3%
ntegrated Electric Utilities										
Allegheny Energy	5.0%	8.6%	15,3%	15.3%	10.3%	10.9%	10.0%	9.0%	8.5%	9.29
ALLETE	4.7%	5.2%	5.0%	5.8%	3,9%	4.9%	0.5%	1.5%	2.5%	1.59
merican Electric Power	5.7%	5.2%	5.7%	5.1%	5.1%	5.4%	4.5%	4.5%	5.0%	4.79
Ameren	0.9%	1.7%	0.2%	1.3%	1.0%	1.0%	3.5%	3,0%	3.5%	3.39
Dieco	3,9%	4.1%	3.0%	2.6%	4.5%	3.6%	4.5%	4.5%	4.0%	4,39
OPL Inc	9.8%	0.8%	1.7%	11.4%	12.6%	7.3%	10,5%	13.5%	13.5%	12.5
Ouke Energy		_	4.1%	2.0%	0.6%	2.2%	1.0%	1.0%	1.5%	1,29
Edison International	0.0%	12.2%	10.1%	9.2%	8.6%	8.0%	6.5%	6.5%	8.0%	7.0
mpire District Electric	0.0%	0.0%	0,8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.0%	1.5%	3.0%	1.69
Intergy	5.8%	6.0%	8.3%	8.0%	6.1%	7.2%	8.0%	9.0%	8.0%	8.3
indrgy IrstEnergy	4.9%	4.2%	7.4%	7.7%	6.1%	6,5%	5.0%	4,5%	7.0%	5.59
PL Group	5.6%	4.2%	6.9%	6.1%	7.9%	6.1%	7.5%	8.5%	7.5%	7.89
ławaijan Electric	1.1%	1.5%	0.7%	0,8%	0.5%	0.9%	0.0%	1.5%	3.0%	1.59
DACORP	2.7%	1.3%	4.3%	2.4%	3.4%	2.8%	4.0%	4.0%	3.5%	3,89
	4.8%	4.0%	9.0%	5.4%	4.1%	5.5%	3.0%	4.5%	4.5%	4.09
NV Energy	10,3%	7.7%	6.8%	6.0%	6.8%	7.5%	5.5%	5,5%	6.0%	5.79
G&E	7.2%	5.3%	3.5%	6.6%	2.0%	4.9%	2.5%	3.0%	3.5%	3.09
Portland General		1.7%	0.0%	0.7%	1.5%	1.3%	2.0%	2.5%	3.0%	2.5
Progress Energy	2.6%		3.8%	4.3%	3.5%	4.2%	3.0%	3.5%	4.0%	3,5
Southern Co.	4.7%	4.6%		3.9%	0.0%	3,5%	7.0%	6.5%	5.5%	6.3
JniSource Energy Koel Energy Inc.	4.1% 3.9%	3.2% 2.9%	6,1% 3.6%	3.1%	3.8%	3,5%	3.5%	3.5%	5.0%	4.0
				·····						4.8

Exhibit No. DCP-11 Page 3 of 4

COMPARISON COMPANIES PER SHARE GROWTH RATES

		Year Historic		Est'd '06-'08 to '12-'14 Growth Rates				
COMPANY	EPS	DPS	BVPS	Average	. EPS	DPS	BVPS	Averag
PROXY GROUP								
Allegheny Energy		-24.5%	-2.0%	-13.3%	7,5%	30.0%	10.0%	15.8%
Avista Corp	4.0%	5.0%	3.0%	4.0%	6.5%	11.5%	3.5%	7.2%
Cleco	0.5%	0.5%	9.0%	3.3%	9.5%	10.0%	4.5%	8.0%
Empire District Electric	3.5%	0.0%	1.5%	1.7%	6.0%	1.5%	2.0%	3.2%
Great Plains Energy	-4.5%	0.0%	7.0%	0.8%	0.5%	-6.5%	3.0%	-1.0%
Hawaiian Electric Industries	-6.0%	0.0%	1.0%	-1.7%	7.0%	0.0%	2.0%	3,0%
Pinnacle West Capitel	-1.0%	5.0%	3.0%	2.3%	3.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.7%
Westar Energy	21.5%	-0.5%	1.0%	7.3%	4.5%	4.5%	6.0%	5.0%
Average				0.6%				5.4%
PPD Electric Hauston						•		
S&P Electric Utilities								
Allegheny Energy		-24.5%	-2.0%	-13,3%	7.5%	30,0%	10.0%	15.8%
American Electric Power		-6.0%	2.5%	-1.8%	3.0%	3.0%	5.0%	3.7%
Ameren	-1.5%	0.0%	5.0%	1.2%	1.0%	-6.5%	2.5%	-1.0%
CMS Energy	, –,	-26.0%	-1.0%	-13.5%	10.0%	27.5%	6.0%	14.5%
CenterPoint Energy	-2.0%	-7.5%	-13.0%	-7.5%	3.0%	5.5%	8.6%	5.7%
Consolidated Edison	1.5%	1.0%	3.5%	2.0%	3.0%	1.0%	3.5%	2.5%
Constelletion Energy	3.5%	16.0%	-	9.8%	2.5%	-6.0%	0.0%	-1,2%
DTE Energy	-2.5%	0,5%	4.0%	0.7%	7.5%	3.0%	2.5%	4.3%
Dominion Resources	5.5%	2.5%	1.5%	3,2%	8.0%	7.0%	8.0%	7.7%
Duke Energy					5.0%	NMF	-0.5%	2.3%
Edison international	13.5%	-	14.5%	14.0%	4.5%	4.5%	7.0%	5,3%
Entergy	10.5%	13.0%	3.0%	8.8%	6.0%	5.5%	6.5%	6.0%
Exelon	10.5%	15.0%	4.5%	10.0%	6.0%	4.5%	10.5%	7.0%
FPL Group	9.5%	7.0%	8.0%	8,2%	9.5%	6.0%	8.5%	8.0%
FirstEnergy Corp	12.5%	6.5%	3.0%	7.3%	4.0%	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%
Integrys Energy	-1.5%	3.5%	10.0%	4.0%	5.5%	1.5%	-0.5%	2.2%
PG&E	NMF	_	18.0%	18.0%	6.5%	7.5%	6.5%	6.8%
PPL Corp	7.5%	12.5%	13.5%	11.2%	7.5%	7.5%	6.0%	7.0%
Pepco Holdings	-2.0%	17.5%	1.6%	5.7%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	1.3%
Pinnacie West Capital	-1.0%	5.0%	3.0%	2.3%	3.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.7%
Progress Energy	-6.5%	2.0%	2.5%	-0.7%	6.0%	1.0%	2.0%	3.0%
Public Sarvice Enterprise	5.5%	2.0%	7.0%	4.8%	7.5%	8.0%	9.0%	7.5%
Sempra Energy	9.0%	5.0%	16.0%	10.0%	5.5%	8.5%	8.5%	7.5%
Southern Company	4.0%	3.0%	5,5%	4.2%	4.5%	4.0%	5.0%	4.5%
TECO Energy	-5.0%	-9.0%	-6.5%	-6.8%	4.5%	2.5%	4.5%	3.8%
Wisconsin Energy	6.0%	4.5%	7.5%	6.0%	8.0%	13.5%	6.0%	9.2%
Kcel Energy Inc.	1.0%	-4.0%	1.0%	-0.7%	6.5%	3.0%	4.5%	4.7%
Average				3.3%				5.3%
integrated Electric Utilities				•				
Allegheny Energy	Les .	-24,5%	-2,0%	-13.3%	7.5%	30.0%	10.0%	15.8%
ALLETE		z1, -0 /6		. 5.6.0	-1.0%	3.0%	3.0%	1.7%
American Electric Power	_	-6.0%	2.5%	-1.8%	3.0%	3.0%	5.0%	3.7%
Ameren	-1.5%	0.0%	5.0%	1.2%	1.0%	-6.5%	2.5%	-1.0%
Claco	0.5%	0.5%	9.0%	3.3%	9.5%	10.0%	4.5%	8.0%
OPL inc	7.0%	2.0%	2.5%	3,8%	8.5%	3.5%	5.0%	6.7%
Ouke Energy	-				5.0%	NMF	-0.5%	2.3%
Edison International	13.5%	_	14.5%	14.0%	4.5%	4,5%	7.0%	5.3%
Empire District Electric	3.5%	0.0%	1.5%	1.7%	6.0%	1,5%	2.0%	3.2%
Entergy	10.5%	13.0%	3.0%	8.6%	6.0%	5.5%	6.5%	6.0%
IrstEnergy	12.5%	6.5%	3.0%	7.3%	4.0%	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%
PL Group	9.5%	7.0%	8.0%	8.2%	9.5%	6.0%	8,5%	8.0%
lawallen Electric	-6.0%	0.0%	1.0%	-1.7%	7.0%	0.0%	2.0%	3.0%
DACORP	1.5%	-6,0%	3.0%	-1.2%	4,5%	2.5%	5.0%	4.0%
V Energy	_	-3.5%	-2.0%	-2.8%	4.5%	NMF	4.5%	4.5%
G&E	NMF	_	18.0%	18.0%	6.5%	.7.6%	6.5%	6.8%
Portland General		_	-		3.5%	5,5%	2.5%	3.8%
Progress Energy	-6.5%	2.0%	2.5%	-0.7%	6.0%	1.0%	2.0%	3.0%
Southern Co.	4.0%	3.0%	5.5%	4.2%	4.6%	4.0%	5.0%	4.5%
JnlSource Energy	-1,5%	12.5%	6.5%	5.8%	17.5%	10.0%	7.0%	11.5%
(cei Energy Inc.	1.0%	-4.0%	1.0%	-0.7%	6.5%	3.0%	4.5%	4.7%
werage				3.0%				5.2%

Source: Value Line investment Survey.

Exhibit No. DCP-11 Page 4 of 4

COMPARISON COMPANIES DCF COST RATES

COMPANY	ADJUSTED YIELD	HISTORIC RETENTION GROWTH	PROSPECTIVE RETENTION GROWTH	HISTORIC PER SHARE GROWTH	PROSPECTIVE PER SHARE GROWTH	FIRST CALL EPS GROWTH	AVERAGE GROWTH	DCF RATES
PROXY GROUP		*************************************	**************************************					
-ROAT GROOF								
Allegheny Energy	2.5%	10.9%	9.2%	4.0%	15.8% 7.2%	15.3% 8.7%	12.8% 5.2%	15.3% 9.6%
kviste Corp . Deco	4.4% 3.8%	2.6% 3.6%	3.5% 4.3%	3.3%	8.0%	12.5%	6.4%	10.1%
Empire District Electric	7.0%	0.2%	1.8%	1.7%	3.2%	6.0%	2.6%	9.6%
Breat Plains Energy	4.9%	1.8%	2.0%	0.8%	3.0%	2,0% 3.0%	1.7%	8.5% 9.1%
lawallen Electric Industries Innacle West Capitel	7.0% 6.5%	0.9% 1.9%	1,5% 2.0%	2,3%	1.7%	5.5%	2.1% 2.7%	9.1%
Vester Energy	6,0%	3.7%	2.8%	7.3%	5.0%	3.0%	4.4%	10.4%
lean	5.3%	3.2%	3.4%	3,3%	6.3%	7.0%	4.7%	10.0%
Madien .	5.4%	2.3%	2.4%	2.8%	5.0%	5.8%	3,5%	9.6%
Composite-Mean		8.5%	8.7%	8.5%	11.5%	12.3%	10.0%	
omposite-Median		7.7%	7.9%	8.3%	10.4%	11.2%	9.0%	
&P Electric Utilities								
Ilaghany Energy	2.5%	10.9%	9.2%		15.8%	15.3%	12.8%	15.3%
marican Electric Power	5.4% 6.0%	5.4% 1.0%	4.7% ,3.3%	1.2%	3.7%	3.8% 3.0%	4.4% 2.1%	9.8% 8.1%
meren :MS Energy	3.9%	7.2%	6.2%	1,470	14.5%	6.3%	8.5%	12.4%
enterPoint Energy	6.4%	10.2%	4.5%		5.7%	18.0%	9.6%	15.9%
Consolidated Edison	5.9%	2.6%	2.5%	2.0%	2.5%	3.4%	2.6% 9.4%	8.5% 12.6%
constellation Enargy	3.2% 5.9%	6.7% 1.9%	6.3% 3.0%	9.8% 0.7%	4,3%	14.6% 2.5%	2.5%	8.4%
ominion Resources	5.3%	5.0%	7.0%	3.2%	7.7%	6.5%	5.9%	11,1%
luke Energy	6.2%	2.2%	1.2%		2.3%	3,2%	2.2%	8.4%
dison international	3.9%	8.0%	6.3%	14.0% 8.8%	5.3% 6,0%	3.0% 8.5%	7.3% 7,8%	11.2% 11.7%
ntergy xelon	3.9% 4.4%	7.2% 12.7%	8.3% 11.0%	10.0%	7.0%	4.5%	9.0%	13.5%
PL Group	3.7%	6.1%	7.8%	8.2%	8.0%	8.7%	7.8%	11,4%
irstEnergy Corp	5.1%	6.5%	5.5%	7.3%	4.3%	5.0%	5.7%	10.8%
legrys Energy	8.1% 4.2%	3.1% 7.5%	1.0% 5.7%	4.0% 18.0%	2.2% 6.8%	26.2% 6.8%	7.3% 9.0%	15.4% 13.2%
G&E Pl.Com	4.6%	9.2%	7.3%	11.2%	7.0%	12.5%	9.4%	14.1%
epco Holdings	7.6%	2.6%	2,0%	5.7%	1.3%	5.5%	3.4%	11.0%
innacle West Capital	6.5%	1.9%	2.0%	2.3%	1.7%	5,5%	2.7%	9.2% 9.4%
rogress Energy ublic Service Enterprise	6.6% 4.4%	1.3% 6.9%	2.5% 9.7%	4.8%	3,0% 7.5%	4.4% 5.3%	2.8% 5.6%	11.2%
empra Energy	3.2%	11.1%	8.7%	10.0%	7.5%	6,3%	8.7%	11.9%
outhern Company	5.5%	4.2%	3,5%	4,2%	4.5%	5.0%	4.3%	9.8%
ECO Energy	8.0%	2.7% 6,7%	3.5% 6,3%	6.0%	3.8% 9.2%	8.4% 8.7%	4.8% 7.4%	10.6% 10.5%
Visconsin Energy icel Energy Inc.	3.2% 5.1%	3.5%	4.0%	0.074	4.7%	7.4%	4.9%	10.0%
fean .	5.1%	5.7%	5,3%	8.9%	5.9%	7.7%	6.3%	11.3%
fedien	5,1%	6.1%	5.5%	6.0%	5.3%	8.3%	6.8%	11.1%
composite-Maan		10.8%	10.4%	12.0%	10.9%	12.8%	11.3%	·
composite-Madlan		11,3%	10.6%	11,1%	10.5%	11,5%	12.0%	
ntegrated Elactric Utilities								
llegheny Energy	2.5%	10.9%	9.2%		15.6% 1.7%	15,3% 6.0%	12.8% 3.5%	15.3% 8.9%
LLETE mancan Electric Power	5.3% 5.4%	4.9% 5,4%	1.5% 4.7%		3.7%	3.8%	4.4%	9.8%
meren	8.0%	1.0%	3.3%	1.2%		3.0%	2.1%	8.1%
teco	3.8%	3.6%	4.3% 12.5%	3.3% 3.8%	8.0% 5.7%	12.5% 9.4%	6.4% 7.7%	10.1% 12.4%
PL inc luke Energy	4.7% 8.2%	7.3% 2,2%	12.5% 1.2%	3,0%	2.3%	3.2%	2.2%	8.4%
dison international	3.9%	8.0%	7.0%	14.0%	5.3%	3.0%	7.5%	11.4%
mpire District Electric	7.0%	0.2%	1.8%	1.7%	3.2%	8.0%	2.6%	9.6%
nlergy	3.9% 5.1%	7.2% 6.5%	6.3% 5.5%	8.8% 7.3%	6.0% 4.3%	8.5% 5.0%	7.8% 5.7%	11.7% 10.6%
irslEnergy PL Group	5.1% 3,7%	6.1%	7.8%	8.2%	8.0%	8.7%	7.8%	11.4%
aweilan Electric	7.0%	0.9%	1.5%		3.0%	3.0%	2.1%	9.1%
DACORP	4.3%	2.6%	3.8%		4.0%	5.0% 10.0%	3.9% 6.0%	8.3% 9.5%
V Energy G&E	3.6% 4.2%	5.5% 7.5%	4.0% 5.7%	18.0%	4.5% 6.8%	10.0% 6.8%	9.0%	13.2%
G&E ortland General	5.3%	4.9%	3.0%	10.070	3.8%	7.4%	4.8%	10.1%
rograss Energy	8.6%	1.3%	2.5%		3.0%	4.4%	2,8%	9.4%
Southern Co.	5.6%	4.2%	3.5%	4.2% 5.8%	4.5% 11.5%	5.0% 5.0%	4.3% 6.4%	9.6% 10.5%
iniSource Energy (cel Energy Inc.	4.1% 5.1%	3.5% 3.5%	6.3% 4.0%	9.070	4.7%	7.4%	4.9%	10.0%
Asan '	4.9%	4.6%	4,8%	6.9%	5.5%	6.6%	5.5%	10.4%
/edian	5.1%	4.9%	4.0%	5.8%	4.5%	6.0%	4.9%	10.0%
Composite-Maen		9.5%	9.8%	11.9%	10.4%	11.5%	10.1%	
Composite-Median		10.0%	9,1%	10.9%	9,6%	11.1%	10.0%	
A CONTRACTOR AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY.								

Sources: Prior pages of this schedule.

Exhibit No. DCP-17 Dockets UE-090704 and UG-090705 Witness: David C. Parcell

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON STATE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,

Respondent.

DOCKET UE-090704

DOCKET UG-090705

EXHIBIT TO TESTIMONY OF

DAVID C. PARCELL

ON BEHALF OF STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

PSE Rating Agency Ratios

Exhibit No. DCP-17

50 - 60 %

PUGET SOUND ENERGY RATING AGENCY RATIOS

ITEM	PERCENT	COST RATE	WEIGHTED COST	PRE-TAX COST	
Short-Term Debt	3.95%	2.47%	0.10%	0.10%	
Long-Term Debt	51.05%	6.45%	3.29%	3.29%	
Common Equity	45.00%	10.00%	4.50%	6.92%	_(1)
TOTAL CAPITAL	100.00%		7.89%	10.31%	

(1) Post-tax weighted cost divided by .65 (composite tax factor)

Pre-tax coverage =

10.21%/(0.17%+3.12%)

3.04 X

Standard & Poor's Utility Benchmark Ratios:

	BBB
Pre-tax coverage (X)	
Business Position:	
5	2.4 - 3.5 x

Total Debt to Total Capital (%)
Business Position

5

Note: Standard & Poor's no longer employs the pre-tax coverage ratios as one of its qualitative ratings criteria. The above-cited S&P benchmark ratios reflect the 1999 criteria reported by S&P.