

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Docket Nos. UE-090704 and UG-090705  
Puget Sound Energy, Inc.'s  
2009 General Rate Case**

**PUBLIC COUNSEL DATA REQUEST NO. 579**

**PUBLIC COUNSEL DATA REQUEST NO. 579:**

Reference page 13 of Mr. Garratt's rebuttal testimony. Is it correct that all of the listed factors were considered in evaluating the system production cost benefits of scenarios with Mint Farm and with the referenced competing PPA bid? If not, please explain why not.

**Response:**

The list provided on page 13 of the Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony of Roger Garratt, Exhibit No. RG-53HCT, is a representative list of costs that Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("PSE") considers when evaluating proposals. Not all costs listed were relevant to the Mint Farm and PPA proposals referenced in Exhibit No. RG-53HCT. Specifically, PSE did not evaluate renewable energy credits, transmission system upgrades and cost of credit facilities. Both bids were for natural gas facilities and, therefore, were not eligible for renewable energy credits. Cost of credit facilities and transmission system upgrades were not applicable to either transaction. PSE considered all other costs identified in the list provided on page 13 of Exhibit No. RG-53HCT.