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Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Steven M. Bean. I am the Manager of Energy Efficiency Programs for Public Service Company of New Mexico ("PNM" or "Company"). My business address is Public Service Company of New Mexico, Alvarado Square – MS-0510, Albuquerque, NM 87158.

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

A. Yes. I filed Direct Testimony on September 15, 2008 and Rebuttal Testimony on February 9, 2009 in support of PNM’s Application in NMPRC Case No. 08-00204-UT.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY?

A. I will describe the agreements reached among PNM, Staff, CCAE and CANM regarding aspects of PNM’s 2008 Plan. I will also provide the information required by the Commission’s Energy Efficiency Rule as to the 2008 Plan amendments agreed to by the parties. PNM Witness James Mayhew will provide supplemental testimony regarding the revisions to the Program Tariff Rider resulting from the amendments.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE PARTIES REACHED THE AGREEMENTS TO THE AMENDMENTS OF THE 2008 PLAN.

A. At the hearing on February 19, 2009, the parties asked the Hearing Examiner for an opportunity to discuss possible resolution of some of the issues that had been raised in the pre-filed testimony. The hearing was recessed and the parties, the witnesses and counsel engaged in settlement discussions which resulted in agreement among the parties on the disputed issues.

Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE PROGRAMS BEING AMENDED BY THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS.

A. The parties agreed to amendments to the following programs:

i. The Comprehensive Energy Efficiency program;

ii. The School CFL Exchange program;

iii. The Refrigerator Replacement and CFL Installation program;

iv. The Energy Star Home program;

v. Energy Wise program; and

vi. Changes to some of the savings assumptions in the Refrigerator Recycling and Energy Saver programs.
Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM.

A. CCAE recognized the small business segment of customers as a "hard to reach" segment and recommended that PNM offer additional incentives to small businesses to encourage them to participate. CCAE recommended an increase to the annual budget for this program of about $1,000,000 in order to more effectively target the small business class in addition to medium and large commercial customers. PNM had opposed this proposal for the 2008 Plan.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS TO THE COMMERCIAL COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM.

A. The parties agreed that this program would be amended as follows:

i. Additional funding not to exceed $1,000,000 will be added to the program in order to develop a component of the program targeting the small business sector and offering special incentives to small business customers;

ii. The launch date for this new part of the program will be no later than November 1, 2009. PNM requires the additional time in order to fully develop the program in collaboration with its third-party contractor, KEMA Services, Inc. If this date is delayed, PNM will
notify all the parties stating the reasons for the delay and requesting a variance;

iii. PNM will make a compliance filing after entry of a Final Order that will update the 2008 Program Plan to reflect the agreements of the parties regarding the small business component of the Comprehensive Commercial Program, as well as the amendments to other programs I describe in my Supplemental Testimony.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE SMALL BUSINESS COMPONENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM.

A. The parties agreed that small business customers are much less likely to participate in energy efficiency programs because of many factors such as: many small businesses lease their buildings; they have very short investment timeframes, no expert staff available to evaluate alternatives and are too busy with day-to-day activities; and the market is not attractive to contractors because of high marketing costs and relatively low profit potential. In order to overcome these barriers additional incentives and delivery mechanisms are required. The additional components of the Comprehensive Energy Efficiency Program applicable to small business customers will be:

i. Higher incentive levels intended to cover between 60% and 80% of the incremental cost to install energy efficiency measures;
ii. Recruitment of contractors that will specialize in the small business market;

iii. Incentive payments will be made to the contractors based on the measures installed. The contractors will collect the balance of their costs from the participants.

Q. WHAT CHANGES TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM TARGETS AND BUDGET RESULT FROM THE ADDITION OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INCENTIVES?

A. The savings and budget estimates for the Comprehensive Energy Efficiency Program will increase compared to what PNM originally proposed. The energy savings targets and program budget that PNM proposed in its original Plan filed in September 2008 were based primarily on the proposal provided by KEMA Services, Inc., the third-party contractor PNM has chosen to help implement the program. The savings targets developed by KEMA were based on the savings potential identified in PNM’s potential study. PNM and KEMA have reexamined the targets and budget in light of the proposed addition of the small business incentives and current economic conditions. Due to current economic conditions, PNM expects that participation by medium and large commercial customers will be somewhat less than originally predicted and that this shortfall will be made up by participation of smaller businesses.
responding to the more attractive small business incentives. Consequently, taking both the agreed upon $1,000,000 increase in the budget and the reduced participation expectations for medium and large commercial customers, the annual savings target for the first year increases from 16.8 GWH to 18.5 GHW and the first year annual budget increases from $2,940,571 to $3,432,032.

PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS TO THE SCHOOL CFL EXCHANGE.

A. PNM had recommended discontinuance of this program. CCAE opposed discontinuing the program and recommended that it be continued with a funding level of $200,000 for distribution of 64,000 CFLs.

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS TO THE SCHOOL CFL EXCHANGE.

A. The parties agreed that the program would be continued as it is currently configured, at a funding level of not more than $100,000 for distribution of approximately 32,000 CFLs. Sierra Club volunteers will continue to provide educational information regarding electric energy efficiency and distribute the CFLs at schools and community events. At the end of the coming program year, the program will be terminated without further action by PNM, the parties or the Commission. A letter from the Sierra
Club stating its readiness, willingness and ability to function as the entity responsible for delivery of the program is attached as Exhibit SMB-1S.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS TO THE ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM.

A. CCAE had recommended that PNM provide a third tier of incentives for homes that achieve a HERS rating of 50 or less in addition to the two levels of incentives that PNM proposed for homes that meet a HERS rating of 85 or 70. PNM had opposed this proposal for the 2008 Plan.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS TO THE ENERGY STAR HOMES PROGRAM.

A. The parties agreed to add a third tier of incentives for this program that would provide a $1,000 incentive for each home that achieves a HERS rating of 50 or less. The parties agreed that although the third tier incentive is important to encourage super-efficient homes, there will be very few homes built in the next year that meet the HERS 50 rating and this change could be incorporated into the program without changing the budget level, TRC calculations, participation estimates or other program elements.
Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS TO THE LOW INCOME REFRIGERATOR REPLACEMENT AND CFL INSTALLATION PROGRAM.

A. PNM had projected a participation level of 1,000 for this program, with 500 refrigerators replaced and 10,000 CFLs installed. CANM questioned PNM's participation estimates and budget due to increased funding for weatherization expected to be received by MFA under the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act ("Stimulus"), which CANM estimated might double or triple the number of homes weatherized by MFA in PNM’s service territory. PNM indicated that it did not intend the projected participation level and budget amount for the program to constitute caps, but rather that PNM intended to provide funding under the program for all homes weatherized in PNM’s service territory, with the expectation that if the expenses of the program exceed the approved budget due to an increase in participation level, the cost overruns would be considered deferred costs recoverable under NMAC 17.7.7.12.D(6). Staff expressed reservations with this approach and with PNM’s proposed carrying charge applied to over or under collected program costs.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS TO THE LOW INCOME REFRIGERATOR REPLACEMENT AND CFL INSTALLATION PROGRAM.
A. MFA advised the parties that its total funding level for performing weatherization services is expected to increase by at least 100% due to disbursement of funds from the Stimulus. MFA anticipates that the number of homes it will weatherize with the increased funding will also increase by at least 100%. The parties agreed that PNM will fund replacement of all refrigerators and CFLs in weatherized homes in PNM’s service territory under this program; accordingly, the parties agreed to initially increase both the budget and estimated participation level in the program by 100 percent. If MFA’s weatherization of homes in PNM’s service territory exceeds the increased participation level, cost overruns will be recoverable as provided in NMAC 17.7.7.12.D(6). The parties agreed that if the program budget exceeds the amended level by more than 25%, PNM will file a request for program budget modification pursuant to NMAC 17.7.2.14.C.

In conjunction with the agreed amendments to this program, the parties also agreed that PNM will apply a carrying charge to under and over recoveries of 2008 Plan costs equal to PNM’s weighted average cost of capital approved in its last rate case or fuel clause case, which is 11.66% and is discussed further in the testimony of James Mayhew.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES’ INITIAL POSITIONS AS TO THE ENERGY WISE PROGRAM.
A. PNM proposed a new low income program designed to distribute CFLs and low flow showerheads to a targeted 7,500 participants. The program TRC was 4.51. CANM questioned the projected participation levels and savings for Energy Wise and recommended that, if it is implemented, the participation and budget levels should be reduced to 25% of the levels proposed in the 2008 Plan. CCAE and Staff supported the program as proposed by PNM.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS TO THE ENERGY WISE PROGRAM

A. The parties agreed that the program should be implemented as proposed by PNM. However, PNM agreed to lower the expected installation rate from eight CFLs per participant to six CFLs. The program will, of course, be subject to M&V and to any modifications that might be appropriate based on the M&V results.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS TO THE REFRIGERATOR RECYCLING PROGRAM.

A. The target participation level that PNM projected for the Refrigerator Recycling program was 12,000 participants. This would be a 20% increase over the current target and was reasonable at the time of PNM's filing. However, PNM has seen a decrease in participation in similar
programs at other utilities due to economic conditions and no longer
believes that 12,000 participants is an accurate estimate. The parties
agreed to lower the participation target to 10,000.

Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED REVISED PARTICIPATION TARGETS,
TRC RATIOS, ENERGY SAVINGS ESTIMATES AND PROGRAM
COSTS TO REFLECT THE AMENDMENTS TO THE
PROGRAMS AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES?

A. Yes. The following tables provide the revised TRC ratios, participation
targets, energy savings and program costs incorporating all the
amendments to the programs agreed to by the parties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>TRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator Recycling</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Lighting</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Homes</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Refrigerator and CFL</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Energy Wise</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Comprehensive</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Load Management</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Load Management</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Customers</th>
<th>Unit Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator Recycling</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Lighting</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Homes</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Refrigerator and CFL</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Energy Wise</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Comprehensive</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Load Management</td>
<td>15,625</td>
<td>18.75 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Load Management</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>26.25 MW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Annual kW Saved</th>
<th>Annual kWh Saved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator Recycling</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>6,169,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Lighting</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>29,506,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Homes</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>415,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Refrigerator and CFL</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2,126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Energy Wise</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2,160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Comprehensive</td>
<td>3,142</td>
<td>18,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Technology</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Load Management</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Load Management</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,067</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,937,740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator Recycling</td>
<td>$1,847,587</td>
<td>$1,530,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Lighting</td>
<td>$1,571,884</td>
<td>$1,559,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY STAR Homes</td>
<td>$520,192</td>
<td>$516,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Refrigerator and CFL</td>
<td>$482,972</td>
<td>$956,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI Energy Wise</td>
<td>$594,916</td>
<td>$592,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Comprehensive</td>
<td>$2,940,571</td>
<td>$3,432,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Transformation</td>
<td>$621,006</td>
<td>$620,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Load Management</td>
<td>$2,006,773</td>
<td>$2,001,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Load Management</td>
<td>$2,799,067</td>
<td>$2,790,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,384,948</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,000,678</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above table reflects changes to the three programs agreed to by the parties. Budgets for all programs changed slightly due to re-allocation of administrative costs based on the revised total direct costs of each program.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Incentives</td>
<td>$5,955,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Admin.</td>
<td>$1,090,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Party Delivery</td>
<td>$5,910,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;V</td>
<td>$533,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,000,678</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES’ INITIAL POSITIONS AS TO THE RECOGNITION OF SAVINGS UNDER THE PROPOSED MARKET TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM FOR PURPOSES OF CALCULATING AND RECOVERING INCENTIVES AND DISINCENTIVES.

A. PNM proposed that savings attributable to participation in the residential and commercial indirect cooling programs, which PNM proposed to be included as an emerging technology measure under the Market Transformation Program, should be included as annual savings under the
2008 Plan. Staff recommended that, before any savings attributed to the Market Transformation program are recognized, PNM clearly identify and define the nature of the savings and the activities leading to the savings and that any savings attributed to the Market Transformation program be subject to independent measurement and verification. Staff also expressed concerns about how long an immature or underperforming measure should be allowed to remain under the Market Transformation Program.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS TO THE MARKET TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM.

A. The parties agreed that PNM will offer indirect cooling incentives as an emerging technology measure under the Market Transformation Program until PNM’s next Program Plan filing after the program has been in effect for at least one full program year. At that time, PNM will have to seek further Commission approval to continue to offer incentives for indirect cooling as an emerging technology and PNM will provide justification for either continuing the measures, ending the incentives or moving the measures into a stand-alone program. The parties also agreed that any savings attributed to indirect cooling would be subject to M&V. PNM may include savings from indirect cooling for purposes of calculating and recovering disincentives and incentives.
Q. ARE THE COSTS TO IMPLEMENT THE 2008 PLAN AS AMENDED BY THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS REASONABLE?

A. Yes. The proposed amendments to the 2008 Plan represent only a four percent increase compared to the initial funding level proposed by PNM. The amended 2008 Plan meets the cost effectiveness test as required by the Energy Efficiency Act and Rule and the resulting savings are achieved at a lower cost than meeting those needs through traditional investment in supply side resources. This will result in lower total bills to customers in the long run.

Q. IS THE VALUE OF THE ENERGY SAVINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROGRAMS GREATER THAN THE COST TO IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAMS?

A. Yes. The value of the savings is determined by multiplying the avoided cost of energy times the energy saved over the expected lifetime of each measure. The net present value of the lifetime savings from the programs proposed in the Plan is $96,315,766 and the net present value of the costs, including the costs borne by the participants, is $56,687,027. The difference between savings and costs is the net savings which is $39,628,739.
Q. WHY DOES PNM BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT TO EXPAND THE PROGRAM BUDGET AND INCREASE THE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS ABOVE THE CURRENT LEVEL OF FUNDING AND PROGRAM OFFERINGS?

A. The cost-benefit analysis shows that cost-effective energy efficiency programs are a good investment for our customers. In addition, PNM is obligated to do its best to achieve the energy savings targets mandated in the Energy Efficiency Act. In order to meet those targets, PNM must increase the level of savings achieved above what is currently projected for the existing programs.

Q. SHOULD THE 2008 PLAN AS AMENDED BY THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS BE APPROVED?

A. Yes. The amended 2008 Plan meets the requirements of the Energy Efficiency Act and Rule. The 2008 Plan also helps PNM meet its statutorily mandated energy efficiency levels by 2014. In order to achieve the level of savings mandated for 2014, PNM must begin now to invest resources in programs that will require several years to reach their cumulative high level of savings. The parties have agreed that the amendments provide additional benefits to PNM customers and help achieve higher energy savings. For these reasons the 2008 Plan as amended by the agreement of the parties should be approved.
Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes, it does.
March 1, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is to certify the commitment of the Sierra Club in implementing the CFL School and Community Event Program for the 2009-2010 school year.

The Sierra Club has contributed significant staff and volunteer resources to successfully implement the CFL School and Community Event Program in previous years (Fall 2007-Present). Other entities and associations, namely NM Interfaith Power & Light, have also contributed organizational resources to ensure successful completion of the program.

The Sierra Club would like to take this opportunity to stress the importance of the CFL School and Community Event Program, which includes education on energy efficiency in addition to direct energy savings through the distribution of CFLs.

Sincerely,

Michael Casaus
Regional Field Organizing Manager
Sierra Club
Albuquerque, NM
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