BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO'S APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT, OWN, AND OPERATE, LOCATION APPROVAL, AND RIGHT-OF-WAY DETERMINATION FOR THE MID-STATE 345 KV TRANSMISSION PROJECT	)	**Docket No. 26-0000XXX**
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO,	)	
Applicant.	)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

ADAM J. ALVAREZ

October 30, 2026

NMPRC DOCKET NO. 26-0000XXX
INDEX TO THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ADAM J. ALVAREZ

WITNESS FOR
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE 1
II. OVERVIEW OF FILING 3
III. REQUEST FOR CCN 7
IV. LOCATION CONTROL 12
V. DETERMINATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH 15
VI. AUTHORIZATION TO ACQUIRE THE LINE 16
VII. RATE RECOVERY AND FUTURE TREATMENT 18
VIII. BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT 20
IX. REGULATORY STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH PROCESS 20
X. CONCLUSION 21

SPONSORED EXHIBITS

PNM Exhibit AJA-1	Educational Background and Relevant Employment Experience

Affidavit

DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF ADAM J. ALVAREZ
NMPRC DOCKET NO. 26-0000XXX

I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Q. Please state your name, position, and business address.

A. My name is Adam J. Alvarez. I am the Director of Regulatory Policy and Case Management for Public Service Company of New Mexico ("PNM" or "Company"). My business address is PNM, 414 Silver Avenue SW, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102. I am testifying on behalf of PNM.

Q. Please summarize your educational background and professional qualifications.

A. My educational background and professional experience are summarized in PNM Exhibit AJA-1.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. My testimony supports PNM's requests for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CCN"), location control, and a determination of a right-of-way ("ROW") width in excess of 100 feet pursuant to Section 62-9-3.2 (collectively, the "Application"). The Project includes transmission-line segments and facilities to be constructed, owned, and operated by PNM in central New Mexico, principally within Torrance, Socorro, and Valencia Counties, extending from the Western Spirit Switching Station to the Hidden Mountain Substation. I will

identify the approvals requested in PNM's Application, discuss the statutory and regulatory framework for PNM's request, and describe PNM's compliance with the requirements.

Q. How is your testimony organized?

A. Following this introduction, my testimony provides an overview of the filing and addresses PNM's requests for a CCN, location approval, a ROW-width determination in excess of 100 feet, and, if required, authorization to acquire the completed transmission line. I also discuss future rate recovery and regulatory treatment, Project benefits, regulatory stakeholder outreach, and PNM's requested relief.

Q. Who are the other witnesses providing direct testimony in this case on behalf of PNM?

A. PNM has five additional witnesses, and they will attest to the following:

- Kelsey L. Martinez, Director of Regional Markets and Transmission Strategy, will address the Project overview and need, transmission studies and alternatives, coordination with PNM's resource planning and other transmission projects, customer and public benefits, estimated Project cost, and anticipated in-service date.

- Adam K. McClellan, Senior Manager of Land Services, will address the Routing Study, the Proposed Route, land ownership and crossings, acquisition of ROW and easements, co-location with existing facilities, land permits and authorizations, stakeholder outreach, and ROW notification.
- Cathy Newby, Director of Tribal Governance and Customer Engagement, will address PNM's outreach to and engagement with Tribal governments and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, the comments and requests received through that outreach, and PNM's responses and follow-up activities.
- Ian Evans, Environmental Senior Manager for Pattern Group LP ("Pattern"), will address the Transmission Study Corridor, the Environmental Report, agency consultation, environmental protection measures and Project commitments, potential environmental impacts, land use, and compliance with the Location Statute and Location Rule.
- Gregory Parent, P.E., S.E., P.Eng., Principal of Transmission Line Engineering for Exo Inc., will address the engineering analysis supporting PNM's requested determination that a 200-foot ROW width is necessary for the Project.

II. OVERVIEW OF FILING

Q. What Commission approvals are PNM requesting within this filing?

A. PNM is requesting Commission approval of: (1) a CCN for the Mid-State 345 kV Transmission Project ("Mid-State Transmission Project" or "Project") pursuant to Section 62-9-1 (the "CCN statute") and Section 62-9-6 of the Public Utility Act, (2) location approval under Section 62-9-3 and 17.9.592 NMAC because the transmission line is being constructed in connection with a plant designed for or capable of operation at a capacity of greater than 300 MW, (3) a determination of a ROW width of 200 feet, which is in excess of 100 feet, pursuant to Section 62-9-3.2; and (4) should the Commission deem it necessary, express written authorization to acquire the line once it is constructed, pursuant to Section 62-6-12(A)(4).

PNM is not requesting ratemaking treatment at this time and will defer any ratemaking determinations to a future PNM general rate case when the project is put into service.

Q. How do the four approvals requested in this proceeding relate to one another?

A. The four requests address distinct regulatory determinations. The CCN request addresses whether PNM should be authorized to construct, own, and operate the Project. The location-control request addresses whether the proposed location satisfies the applicable location-approval standard. The ROW request asks the Commission to determine that a ROW width greater than 100 feet is necessary for

the Project. The authorization to acquire the constructed transmission line relates to the way the development and construction agreement is structured. Although the requests involve different legal standards, they concern the same proposed facilities and rely on a coordinated evidentiary record.

Q. Are there any statutory deadlines applicable to this filing?

A. Yes. The Application requests three forms of Commission approval that implicate statutory decision deadlines: a determination of the necessary ROW width, a certificate of public convenience and necessity, and approval of the transmission-line location.

First, under Section 62-9-3.2(F), the Commission must issue an order granting or denying the application for a ROW width greater than 100 feet within six months from the date the application is filed. If the Commission does not issue an order within that period, the ROW-width application is deemed approved.

Second, under Section 62-9-3(K), the Commission may approve an application for location approval without a formal hearing if no protest is filed within 60 days after notice is given that the application has been filed.

Because PNM is filing an application for both a CCN and approval of the transmission-line location, Section 62-9-3(K)(1) requires the Commission to issue an order granting or denying those requests within nine months from the date it is filed. The Commission may extend the time for granting approval by an additional six months for good cause shown.

Q. Is PNM requesting that the Commission act within a certain time?

A. Yes. PNM respectfully requests that a final order be issued no later than July 30, 2027, based on a nine-month time frame.

PNM also requests that, if no protest is filed within the applicable 60-day period, the Commission act on the requested approvals within six months. In all events, PNM requests that the Commission establish a procedural schedule that preserves the six-month deadline applicable to the ROW-width request and the nine-month deadline applicable to the CCN and location-approval requests. If protests are filed and a consolidated procedural schedule would prevent the Commission from meeting the six-month ROW-width deadline, PNM requests that the Commission bifurcate the ROW-width issues from the CCN and location-approval issues as necessary to permit timely decisions.

A final order from the Commission by July 30, 2027, will allow the construction and development to proceed on a timeframe to meet the necessary in-service date.

Q. Given the different statutory deadlines, why is PNM presenting its requests in one Application?

A. The requests concern the same Project, route, facilities, construction schedule, and supporting record. Presenting them together permits the Commission, Staff, and other parties to evaluate the Project through one coordinated proceeding, reduces unnecessary duplication, and allows the technical, environmental, land, and regulatory evidence to be considered as an integrated record. PNM is not aware of a requirement that these requests be presented in separate applications.

If a consolidated procedural schedule would prevent the Commission from meeting the six-month deadline applicable to the ROW-width request, PNM does not oppose bifurcation of that request, provided that the procedural schedule also permits the Commission to issue a final order on the CCN and location-approval requests by July 30, 2027.

III. REQUEST FOR CCN

Q. Please identify and explain the statutory and regulatory standards the Commission applies when deciding whether to issue a CCN for new electric transmission lines.

A. The Commission applies the CCN statute found in the Public Utility Act, Section 62-9-1, which requires a public utility to obtain a CCN before constructing or operating any public utility plant or system that is not in the ordinary course of business. In determining whether to issue a CCN, the Commission applies a public interest standard that requires a finding of a net benefit and takes into consideration the need for additional capacity and whether the project is the most cost-effective among reasonable alternatives.[1]

Q. Has the Commission specified certain criteria that PNM must address when requesting a CCN for new transmission lines?

A. Yes. In Case No. 10-00086-UT, PNM's 2010 general rate case, the Commission imposed certain conditions on PNM regarding the recovery of transmission costs to ensure that retail customers benefit from the construction of transmission that is included in PNM's cost of service. Previously, in Case No. 2382, regarding the Ojo Line Extension Project (referred to hereinafter as the "OLE Case"), the

[1] Case No. 18-00243-UT (Request for CCN for BB2 Line), Recommended Decision (March 11, 2019) at p. 15.

Commission denied the requested CCN and provided a list of questions for PNM to address in any subsequent transmission line proceeding.

Q. What conditions from Case No. 2382 (the OLE Case) does the Commission require PNM to address when requesting a CCN for new transmission lines?

A. In the OLE Case, the Commission ordered PNM to address several specific issues in future applications for approval to construct major transmission system additions. To the extent that the requirements from the OLE Case are still applicable, PNM is providing information on the issues enumerated in the Commission's decision as follows:

1. All efforts to collaborate with interested constituents and reach a consensus, and the results of such efforts (PNM witness McClellan and PNM witness Newby).
2. The ramifications of any increase in PNM's ability to wheel into its service area (PNM witness Martinez).
3. The current status of any other projects or planned projects which would significantly affect the transmission grid, and how such projects affect the current application (PNM witness Martinez).
4. The current status of any plans to change the ownership or operation of significant portions of the New Mexico transmission grid and how such change would affect the current application (PNM witness Martinez).

5. How PNM's transmission needs have been integrated with PNM's generation/power purchase plans and needs, including how such transmission will affect or be affected by present or future generation configurations (PNM witness Martinez).

6. Not Applicable: If the project is to benefit the U.S. Department of Energy, Los Alamos National Laboratory or Los Alamos County, updates to their load growth or shrinkage.

7. Progress on and analysis of all reasonable alternatives to the current application (PNM witness Martinez).

8. All assumptions to which PNM's proposal is significantly sensitive (PNM witness Martinez).

Q. Has the NMPRC Utility Division Staff ("Staff") also specified certain information that is useful in reviewing CCN applications?

A. Yes. As summarized by Staff witness Jack Sidler in NMPRC Case No. 17-00143-UT, Staff takes the following information into consideration when reviewing CCN applications:

(a) Information or studies showing the need or use for the facility being proposed;

(b) Information providing specific cost information for the facility being proposed;

(c) Environmental, ecological, and/or cultural impact studies for the facility being proposed; and

(d) Specific information demonstrating that the proposed facility is the most economical choice among any feasible alternatives.

In Case No. 13-00004-UT (PNM's request for a generating unit CCN to purchase the Delta Person Station), Staff also considered the extent of public opposition and possible mitigation of any valid public concerns associated with that generation. PNM witness McClellan and PNM witness Newby describe the outreach conducted to date, the comments and concerns received, and PNM's efforts to evaluate and respond to stakeholder input.

Q. Has PNM addressed the factors that Staff considers in evaluating a CCN?

A. Yes. All of the necessary information is contained or addressed in the Direct Testimonies and Exhibits of PNM's witnesses included in PNM's Application.

Q. How does the Project address the unnecessary-duplication and economic-waste considerations identified in Section 62-9-6?

A. The Project does not unnecessarily duplicate existing or planned transmission facilities. As explained by PNM witness Martinez, PNM's existing eastern New Mexico transmission system is fully committed under the studied N-1 conditions

and has identified thermal and transient-stability constraints. PNM evaluated continued reliance on operational measures and remedial action schemes, lower-voltage improvements, and related planned facilities. Those alternatives and measures did not provide the same studied transfer capability and reliability performance as the proposed 345 kV reinforcement.

The Project also will not result in economic waste. Its estimated cost is supported by the Development and Construction Agreement ("DCA") between PNM and Mid-State Transmission LLC (a Pattern affiliate) and PNM's detailed cost estimate. As discussed by PNM witness Martinez, the Project provides the required transfer capability and reliability performance, integrates with existing and planned transmission facilities, and is the preferred reasonable and economic alternative among the options and sensitivities evaluated.

IV. LOCATION CONTROL

Q. Why does the Mid-State 345 kV Transmission Project require Commission location approval?

A. The Project includes transmission facilities designed to operate at 345 kV and will be constructed in connection with, and to transmit electricity from, the new Palomas wind generation facilities "designed for or capable of operation at a capacity of

three hundred thousand kilowatts or more."[2] Accordingly, the Project requires Commission location approval under Section 62-9-3 and 17.9.592 NMAC before construction begins.

Q. What standard does the Commission apply when deciding whether to approve the proposed location?

A. Under Section 62-9-3, the Commission shall approve the proposed location unless it finds that the location will unduly impair important environmental values or that operation of the proposed transmission line will unduly impair power-system reliability. Important environmental values include the environmental and land-use resources identified in Section 62-9-3 and 17.9.592 NMAC.

Q. Has PNM provided the Project information required by 17.9.592.10 NMAC?

A. Yes. The Application, supporting direct testimony, and exhibits provide the required description and maps of the Project; the proposed route and total line length; land-ownership and crossing information; a description of the interconnection facilities; a schematic showing the Project's interconnection to the transmission grid; the applicable land-use requirements and compliance status; the environmental documentation applicable to the Project; the status of required

[2] NMSA 1978, § 62-9-3(B).

environmental authorizations and, where applicable, proof of application; testimony addressing important environmental values; the expected online date; and proof of service required by 17.9.592.10(I) NMAC. PNM witnesses McClellan, Evans, Parent, and Martinez provide this information and sponsor the related exhibits.

Q. Has PNM addressed applicable land-use and environmental requirements?

A. Yes. PNM witnesses Evans and McClellan identify the applicable land-use requirements, land permits, and environmental authorizations and explain the status of approvals that remain pending. PNM witness Evans also provides the Environmental Report and explains the status of the environmental review and the measures proposed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects.

Q. Will the proposed location unduly impair important environmental values or will operation of the Project unduly impair power-system reliability?

A. No. As explained by PNM witness Evans, the environmental review evaluates the important environmental values identified in Section 62-9-3 and 17.9.592 NMAC, and the Project incorporates measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential effects. Based on that review, the proposed location will not unduly impair important environmental values. In addition, the transmission-planning and

engineering analyses sponsored by PNM witness Martinez support a determination that operation of the Project will not unduly impair power-system reliability.

Q. Has PNM satisfied the requirements for approval of the proposed location?

A. Yes. PNM has provided the information, testimony, and exhibits required by 17.9.592 NMAC. The evidentiary record demonstrates that the proposed location will not unduly impair important environmental values and that operation of the Project will not unduly impair power-system reliability. PNM therefore requests that the Commission approve the location of the Mid-State 345 kV Transmission Project pursuant to Section 62-9-3 and 17.9.592 NMAC.

V. DETERMINATION OF RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH

Q. Will this project require Commission determination of the necessary ROW width to construct and maintain the transmission line as required by Section 62-9-3.2?

A. Yes. PNM is seeking approval of a ROW width of 200 feet for this project. The Direct Testimony of PNM witnesses McClellan and Parent support PNM's request for the Commission to make a determination that this Project requires a ROW width in excess of 100 feet, pursuant to Section 62-9-3.2.

VI. AUTHORIZATION TO ACQUIRE THE LINE

Q. Why does PNM seek prior express authorization to acquire the constructed transmission line?

A. Section 62-6-12(A)(4) requires prior express authorization for a utility to acquire any public utility plant or property constituting an operating unit or system or any substantial part thereof. The DCA is structured such that Mid-State Transmission LLC will own the line during the design and construction phases, after which PNM will acquire the line. For this reason, PNM includes a request for express, written authorization from the Commission to acquire the line once it is constructed, pursuant to Section 62-6-12(A)(4). The DCA is further discussed in the direct testimony of PNM witness Martinez and is included as PNM Exhibit KLM-2.

Q. Is prior Commission authorization under Section 62-6-12(A)(4) required for PNM to acquire the completed transmission line?

A. The applicability of Section 62-6-12(A)(4) to this transaction is ultimately for the Commission to determine. The Commission could determine that prior authorization is not required because Mid-State Transmission LLC will not place the line into service before transferring it to PNM; therefore, the completed line does not constitute a "public utility plant or property constituting an operating unit or system or any substantial part thereof" under the meaning of Section 62-6-12.

Moreover, the last clause of 62-6-12(A)(4) states "this paragraph shall not be construed to require authorization for transactions in the ordinary course of business." If the Commission determines that acquisition of the line post-construction is a transaction in the ordinary course of business, it would not need to issue express authorization for the transaction.

PNM includes this request so that, if the Commission determines that Section 62-6-12(A)(4) does apply to this transaction, PNM will have requested the necessary prior express authorization.

Q. If the Commission determines that Section 62-6-12(A)(4) applies, what standard governs approval of the proposed transaction?

A. Pursuant to Section 62-6-13, "unless the commission shall find that the proposed transaction is unlawful or is inconsistent with the public interest, it shall give its consent and approval in writing."

Q. Does this transaction meet that standard?

A. Yes. There is nothing unlawful about PNM purchasing a completed transmission line, and the transaction is in the public interest for all the reasons articulated in PNM's request for a CCN. Functionally, PNM contracting to have the line constructed and then acquiring it once it is completed is no different than PNM

utilizing a contractor to construct the line on its behalf. The only distinction is when PNM takes title to the line.

VII. RATE RECOVERY AND FUTURE TREATMENT

Q. Is PNM seeking cost recovery in this proceeding?

A. No. PNM is not seeking cost recovery in this proceeding. Although Section 62-9-1(B) of the CCN statute allows a utility to include a request for a determination of the ratemaking principles and treatment that would be applied in the future, PNM is not requesting that the Commission establish a specific ratemaking principle or treatment. PNM will seek authorization to recover the actual cost of the Project, with the reasonableness of the final actual costs subject to Commission review and determination in a future general rate case and subject to 17.3.580 NMAC.

Q. Has PNM estimated the cost for the Project?

A. Yes. The cost estimate for the Project is approximately $595 million. PNM witness Martinez provides a detailed breakdown of the Project costs. Under the Commission's Cost Overrun Rule for new generating facilities, 17.3.580 NMAC, a utility may request that the Commission certify the estimated cost of a generation project for which a CCN is granted. In instances where there is a cost overrun as defined in the rule, the utility then must demonstrate that the difference between

the estimated and actual cost was prudently incurred. While the Cost Overrun Rule is directed to generation, the Commission has also applied this principle to non-generation projects such as energy storage and transmission. Similarly, for this Project, if the actual cost is more than the estimated cost, PNM will include in any future request for rate recovery an explanation of any material differences between the estimated and actual costs of the Project and the prudence of those costs.

Q. Is PNM requesting that the Commission apply the Cost Overrun Rule?

A. Yes. However, PNM is not requesting that the Cost Overrun Rule apply to the approximately $570.9 million purchase price under the DCA, which is subject to the adjustments specified in the DCA. PNM requests that the Commission apply the cost-overrun treatment only to the approximately $24.1 million of additional PNM work included in the current Project-cost estimate.

Q. Is PNM asking the Commission in this proceeding to establish the final jurisdictional or customer-class allocation of Project costs?

A. No. PNM is not requesting a final jurisdictional allocation or retail customer-class allocation in this proceeding. Those issues will be addressed, as applicable, in the appropriate future proceeding based on the Project's in-service costs and the governing allocation methodology.

VIII. BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Q. How will the Project benefit PNM customers?

A. The Mid-State 345 kV Transmission Project will strengthen and modernize PNM's transmission system, improve reliability and resilience, provide the capacity needed to serve growing customer demand, and enable delivery of the 800 MW wind project that was included in PNM's 2029-2032 Resource Application in Docket No. 26-0000114. Enabling the delivery of 800 MW of wind generation resources onto PNM's system represents a major step towards zero-carbon resources supplying 100 percent of PNM's retail sales by 2045.

Q. When does PNM anticipate that it will need to place the Project in service?

A. As explained in the Direct Testimony of PNM witness Martinez and PNM witness Evans, the proposed in-service date for the Project is at the end of 2029.

IX. REGULATORY STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH PROCESS

Q. Please describe the outreach process around the Project that PNM engaged in with its regulatory stakeholders.

A. During bi-weekly calls with PNM stakeholders, PNM has discussed this project at a high level and has made parties aware of the need, purpose, and timing of this

application. This is in addition to the public outreach that PNM Witnesses McClellan and Newby discuss in their direct testimonies.

X. CONCLUSION

Q. Is PNM required to provide service to retail customers within its jurisdictional service territory and does the Project directly benefit PNM retail customers?

A. Yes. PNM is required to provide electric service to its customers in its jurisdictional territory pursuant to the Public Utility Act[3] and NMPRC regulations.[4] The Project will support PNM's ability to meet its obligation to provide reliable service to retail customers within its jurisdictional service territory and to deliver additional emission-free generation to those customers.

Q. In conclusion, what is PNM requesting in this case?

A. PNM requests that the Commission: (1) grant a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity authorizing PNM to construct, own, and operate the Mid-State 345 kV Transmission Project; (2) approve the proposed location of the Project pursuant to Section 62-9-3 and 17.9.592 NMAC; (3) determine, pursuant to Section 62-9-3.2, that a 200-foot ROW width is necessary for the Project; and (4) if the Commission determines authorization is required, grant PNM prior express written

[3] NMSA 1978, § 62-8-2.
[4] *See, e.g.*, 17.9.560 NMAC.

authorization pursuant to Section 62-6-12(A)(4) to acquire the completed transmission line. The evidentiary record demonstrates that the Project responds to identified system reliability requirements and increasing customer demand, will support PNM's ability to provide safe and reliable service, will provide benefits to customers, and is in the public interest. Accordingly, PNM respectfully requests that the Commission approve the Application and grant the requested relief.

Q. Please summarize how PNM has met the Commission's requirements for the approvals listed in this Application?

A. Through supporting testimonies, PNM has presented an integrated evidentiary record supporting each requested approval. For the CCN, PNM provides evidence concerning Project need, customer and system benefits, costs, alternatives, and the public interest. For location approval, PNM provides the Project and route description, land information, environmental review, authorization status, mitigation evidence, anticipated in-service date, and testimony addressing important environmental values and power-system reliability. For the ROW width determination, PNM provides land, design, safety, construction, operation, and maintenance evidence supporting the requested 200-foot width. For the request for prior express authorization of the Commission to acquire the constructed transmission line, PNM has provided evidence indicating the transaction is not unlawful and it is not inconsistent with the public interest.

PNM is not requesting current rate recovery or specific ratemaking treatment, and any future request for retail cost recovery will be addressed in an appropriate future proceeding once the Project is placed into service.

Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A. Yes.

GCG#535980

Adam J. Alvarez's Educational Background and Relevant Employment Experience

PNM Exhibit AJA-1

Is contained in the following 1 page.

ADAM J. ALVAREZ

EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY

Name: Adam J. Alvarez

Address: Public Service Company of New Mexico
414 Silver Avenue SW
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Position: Director, Regulatory Policy and Case Management

Education: Bachelor of Accountancy, New Mexico State University, 2006
Master of Arts in Economics, emphasis in Public Utility Regulation, 2008

Employment: Employed by Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM) since 2018

Positions held within the Company include:
Director, Regulatory Policy and Case Management (2024-Present)
Manager, Federal Regulatory Policy and Standards of Conduct (2022-2024)
Senior Regulatory Project Manager (2018-2022)

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (2009-2018)
Energy Industry Analyst

Testimony:

Before the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission	
25-00059-UT	PNM's Application for Approval of an Accounting Order Governing PNM's Investment and Expenditures to Join the Extended Day-Ahead Market
25-00088-UT	PNM's Application for Approval of Two Economic Development Projects and Issuance of an Accounting Order Governing the Treatment of Costs Related to Those Projects
26-0000041	PNM's Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct, Own, and Operate the Rio Puerco to Pajarito to Prosperity 345 kV Transmission Project

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO'S APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT, OWN, AND OPERATE, LOCATION APPROVAL, AND RIGHT-OF-WAY DETERMINATION FOR THE MID-STATE 345 KV TRANSMISSION PROJECT	)	
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO,	)	**Docket No. 26-0000XXX**
Applicant.	)	

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

ADAM J. ALVAREZ, Director of Regulatory Policy and Case Management, for Public Service Company of New Mexico, upon being duly sworn according to law, under oath, deposes and states: I have read the foregoing **Direct Testimony of Adam J. Alvarez,** and it is true and accurate based on my own personal knowledge and belief.

Dated this 30th day of October, 2026.

/s/ *Adam J. Alvarez*
ADAM J. ALVAREZ

GCG # 535972