BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO'S CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION FOR APPROVALS FOR THE ABANDONMENT, FINANCING, AND RESOURCE REPLACEMENT FOR SAN JUAN GENERATING STATION PURSUANT TO THE ENERGY TRANSITION ACT	))))))	**Case No. 19-00195-UT**

ORDER ON RECOMMENDED DECISION ON REPLACEMENT RESOURCES - PART II

THIS MATTER comes before the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission ("Commission" or "NMPRC") on the June 24, 2020 Recommended Decision on Replacement Resources – Part II issued by Hearing Examiners Ashley Schannauer and Anthony Medeiros (the "HEs") on Public Service Company of New Mexico's (PNM) July 1, 2019 Consolidated Application for Approvals for the Abandonment, Financing, and Resource Replacement for San Juan Generating Station pursuant to the Energy Transition Act ("Application"). The Commission, having reviewed the pleadings, evidentiary record, and Recommended Decision Part II, and being otherwise duly informed, **FINDS:**

1) The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this case.

2) The statement of the case, discussion, findings of fact, conclusions of law, and decretal paragraphs set forth in the Recommended Decision Part II (RD2), filed in the records of the Commission on June 24, 2020, (a copy of which is not attached hereto due to its length) should be ADOPTED, APPROVED, and ACCEPTED as the Order of the Commission and incorporated by reference except to the extent such are otherwise expressly modified or disapproved herein.

3) Exceptions to the RD were filed on July 7, 2020 by applicant PNM and intervenors the New Mexico Attorney General ("NMAG"); the Sierra Club; Western Resource Advocates (WRA); New Mexico Affordable Reliable Energy Alliance and Special Participant Greater Kudu,

LLC (together "NM AREA"); Interwest Energy Alliance ("Interwest"); Westmoreland Mining Co, LLC (Westmoreland); Board of County Commissioners for the County of San Juan, the City of Farmington, the Central Consolidated School District and the San Juan Legislative Delegation, (collectively, the "SJC Entities").

4) Responses to the Exceptions were filed by PNM, the Sierra Club, WRA; Coalition for Clean Affordable Energy (CCAE); Bernalillo County ("Bernalillo") and the City of Albuquerque (County/City); Southwest Generation (SWG); New Energy Economy; Westmoreland and the SJC Entities.

The San Juan County Entities' Exception 1

5) The SJC Entities argue Section 62-18-3(A) requires that a ***minimum*** of 450MW of replacement resources must be located in the CCSD and any proposed portfolios that do not meet this threshold must be rejected.

6) The SJC Entities argue that the "mandate of Section 3(A) that PNM, as the qualifying utility, "**shall**, no later than one year after approval of the abandonment, apply for commission approval of competitively procured replacement resources" must be read in conjunction with the economic development and jobs creation emphasis found in Section 3(A) and the locational preference for the Central Consolidated School District ("CCSD") in Section 3(F) defining "replacement resources." The SJC Entities conclude that all portfolios proposed by PNM must incorporate a minimum of 450 MW of replacement resources sited in the CCSD.

7) The RD notes most parties take the position that Section 62-18-3(A) reflects "a legislative intent to benefit the affected school district, but it does not require any particular amount of capacity to be located there – that resources can also be proposed outside the affected school district to replace the abandoned capacity."

8) The RD finds that Section 3 should be interpreted as setting a maximum of 450 MW of resources, defined as "replacement resources," to be located in the school district in which the abandonment of a qualifying generating facility is approved, but that an amount less than 450 MW will also qualify as replacement resources.

9) The RD's analysis is correct. The statutory intent is evident. As noted, other provisions indicate an intent to offset tax base reduction resulting from the closure of the qualifying facility through the placement of "replacement resources" in the affected school district. Section 3(E) confirms that "replacement resources shall be subject to local property taxes or a binding commitment to make an equivalent payment in lieu of taxes."

10) Section 3(B) similarly acts to install a preference for resources able to reduce the cost of reclamation and use for lands previously mined within the county of the qualifying generating facility" while Section 3(C) encourages the "use of workers residing in New Mexico to the greatest extent practicable."

11) Section 3 (D) further relaxes the normal requirement that resources be selected on the basis of "cost effectiveness" and facilities approval of resources located in the school district by providing: "The commission shall not disallow recovery of reasonable costs associated with requirements as to where the resources are located."

12) The SJC Entities argue that the RD's holding means the utility would be free to simply ignore the mandate of Section 3(A) and propose the placement of all resources outside the CCSD. However, Section 3(A) clearly places a duty on the utility to file proposals for placement of resources in the school district.

13) Nonetheless, as the RD notes, Section 3 does not specify any minimum amount of resources to be located in the CCSD, only a maximum. The statute maintains the requirement that

any resource located in the CCSD be necessary to maintain reliable service, thereby restricting any argument that all proposed resources may be "replacement resources" located in the CCSD no matter how inappropriate such resource types or the placement of the resource might otherwise be. Section 3(B) further confirms that resource placement in the school district adhere to the ETA's progression toward a 100% zero carbon resource portfolio by requiring that preferred replacement resources be those "with the least environmental impacts" and "those with higher ratios of capital costs to fuel costs."

14) In their exceptions to the Recommended Decision Part I (RD 1), the SJC Entities acknowledge that location of "replacement resources" in the CCSD is subject to the requirements that those resources be reliable and in the public interest and that such requirements are intended to "strike a balance to prevent exorbitant costs from being imposed on the ratepayers or an impairment of system reliability."

15) The key to Section 3 is the interplay between the provisions of section 3 (F) and 3(D). Section 3(F) vests the Commission with the authority and responsibility for determining whether placement of a resource in the school district is in the public interest as informed by the various provisions of Section 3. Section 3(D) provides that for replacement resources "the commission shall not disallow recovery of reasonable costs associated with requirements as to where the resources are located."

16) The statute requires the Commission to exercise discretion under these standards in choosing among proposed "replacement resources. As the RD correctly notes, Section 3 does not specify that any minimum amount of resources to be located in the CCSD; it only identifies a maximum. This is because the statute maintains a base requirement that any "replacement

resource" be located in the CCSD, be necessary to maintain reliable service and be in the public interest as determined by the Commission.

17) These base requirements thereby restricts any argument that ***any or all*** proposed resources must be accepted as "replacement resources" merely if they are proposed to be located in the CCSD, no matter how inappropriate such resources may otherwise be from an engineering perspective, or how in appropriate such resources may be when examined in accordance with the other statutory criteria, including the Commission's traditional focus on and consideration of cost-effectiveness to the extent the cost of a "replacement resource" may be deemed unreasonable.

18) Instead, the statute accomplishes the goal of encouraging the placement of resources in the CCSD as "replacement resources" in order to replenish the lost tax base by relaxing the normal reliance on low cost under the normal standard of most cost-effective resource. The 450 MW statutory "cap" is not intended to cap the amount of generation resources that could be placed in the CCSD. Instead, what the statutory cap restricts is the amount of "replacement resources" proposed for the CCSD that the Commission must accept under the relaxed cost standard of Section 3(D) even if those resources are not the most cost-effective resources, provided such additional costs are not unreasonable. While NM AREA complains that the RD fails to harmonize the ETA with traditional analysis under the NMPUA, the interplay between these two statutes is not contradictory, but complementary as the more specific considerations of Section 62-8-3 apply by their terms to replacement resources.

19) By not mandating any specific amount of resources be located in the school district, the legislature avoided dictating any specific result itself and transferred to the Commission the responsibility of balancing the need to replace the CCSD tax base with the various factors set out in Section 3 with little instruction other than restricting further utilization of coal, oil or gas based

generation. To the extent the CCSD is not an ideal location for renewable resources compared to other locations, the legislature has stated that the PRC may not reject up 450MW worth of otherwise qualified "replacement resources" by relying on its normal "most cost-effective resource" requirement.

The San Juan County Entities' Exception 2

20) The SJC Entities argue that PNM's competitive procurement process, including that by which the Jicarilla and Arroyo projects were selected, violated Section 62-18-3(A) by failing to comply with the requirement that "projects shall be ranked based on their cost, economic development opportunity and ability to provide jobs with comparable pay and benefits to those lost due to the abandonment of a qualifying generating facility."

21) Section 62-18-3(A) provides, in pertinent part:

> As part of that competitive procurement, and in addition to the criteria set forth in Subsections B and C of this section, projects shall be ranked based on their cost, economic development opportunity and ability to provide jobs with comparable pay and benefits to those lost due to the abandonment of a qualifying generating facility. The qualitative and quantitative data and analysis used to establish the ranking shall be available for review by parties to the commission proceeding.

Section 62-18-3(B) provides:

> In determining whether to approve replacement resources, the commission shall prefer resources with the least environmental impacts, those with higher ratios of capital costs to fuel costs and those able to reduce the cost of reclamation and use for lands previously mined within the county of the qualifying generating facility.

Section 62-18-3(C) provides:

> In considering ***responses*** to requests for proposals for replacement resources pursuant to this section, a qualifying utility shall inform prospective bidders that it promotes and encourages the use of workers residing in New Mexico to the greatest extent practicable and shall take that use into consideration in evaluating proposals.

22) The SJC Entities argue that PNM issued the request for proposals in 2017, prior to the enactment of the ETA, and therefore the proposals had been sorted and ranked before the ETA was even enacted. They assert that PNM therefore analyzed the bids produced by the RFP for purposes of reliability and cost and the bids could not have been ranked in accordance with the economic development and jobs creation criteria of Section 3(A) because the bidders were not asked to supply that information.

23) They therefore conjecture that the procurement process therefore may have excluded solar/battery projects located in the CCSD which are every bit as cost-effective and consistent with the goals of the ETA as the Jicarilla and Arroyo projects but PNM took no action to obtain updated and additional bids in light of the requirements of Section 3(A).

24) The SJC Entities acknowledge the Arroyo and Jicarilla projects are not sited in the CCSD and therefore do not qualify as "replacement resources." Accordingly, the statutory evaluation and ranking provisions in Section 62-18-3 that the SJC Entities rely on apply only those resources located in the CCSD, not the Arroyo and Jicarilla projects.

25) The SJC Entities argue there is still an opportunity for the Commission to require PNM to conduct a new procurement for the replacement resources located in the CCSD even if the Commission approves either the CCAE 1 portfolio or the Sierra Club Tier 2-4 portfolio, because the RD contemplates a further Commission proceeding to approve the PPA contracts that will need to be negotiated.

26) The SJC Entities assert Enchant Energy is ready to submit a proposal now that the financial phase of the FEED study has been completed and should have the opportunity to submit a cost competitive purchase power proposal structured to supply the firming capacity that PNM needs to balance the power supplied by its renewable resources such as the proposed Piñon gas

plant or the battery storage facilities would provide. The SJC Entities argue that the Commission should require the term of the PPAs solicited in that new RFP to be changed from 20 years so as to not exclude Enchant.

27) The SJC Entities further argue that certainty about the cost of the natural gas turbines proposed for the Pinon gas plant to be located at the SJGS site included in the Sierra Club Tier 2-4 portfolio would also benefit from this renewed procurement process because PNM would have an opportunity to obtain a determination from the New Mexico Environment Department ("NMED") on the extent and cost of air quality controls that will be required for that plant. The SJC Entities note that PNM currently assumes no emissions controls such SCR will be required to put the Piñon gas plant into operation, but has not yet obtained a determination from the NMED and if that assumption is erroneous, the cost of operating that plant will increase substantially.

28) While Westmoreland also believes a supplemental RFP should be issued for the "replacement resources" in the CCSD, it recognizes that approval of the Arroyo and Jicarilla Projects may be warranted. Westmoreland ultimately takes the pragmatic view that the Commission's action should not foreclose the viability of the Enchant project. For that reason, Westmoreland supports the CCAE-1 portfolio because approval of any gas turbines at the SJGS site would likely prevent the success of Enchant and prevent its goal of preserving 1450 full time jobs at eth SJGS plant. Westmoreland acknowledges that the Enchant project would benefit from a PPA with PNM, but also asserts that it is a viable on a stand-alone basis provided future PNM use of the SJGS site does not impair the project. Westmoreland notes that the cost differential between CCAE-1 and Sierra Club Tier 2-4 is questionable because it does not take into consideration the potential extra costs of installing SCR pollution control technology or delays in

bringing the proposed gas turbines online due to environmental permitting and the conflicting claims to use of the SJGS site.

29) The RD acknowledged that PNM did not prepare a ranking of bids in a format that focused "***singularly"*** on the factors in Section 3(A). However, that statement is not a concession that PNM necessarily violated the requirements of the statute as the SJC Entities assert.

30) The RD found that PNM's application presented four different scenarios based on PNM's assessment of the various statutory criteria. As PNM notes, Scenario 2 specifically maximized local jobs and economic development opportunities by locating all resources in CCSD. PNM's Scenarios 3 and 4 were evaluated toward portfolios with the least environmental impact and with higher ratios of capital costs to fuel costs.

31) The RD further found that the evidentiary record as a whole was sufficient to enable the Commission to evaluate and make decisions under the standards of the ETA as required by Section 62-18-3(A)'s requirement that "The qualitative and quantitative data and analysis used to establish the ranking shall be available for review by parties to the commission proceeding."

32) PRC Staff was able to prepare and introduce into evidence the number of PNM employees, estimated construction jobs in the CCSD and the State, estimated long-term jobs in the CCSD and the State, capital investments, and property taxes for each PNM portfolio compiled from the supporting information provided by PNM.

33) As the RD notes, while the SJC Entities had the access to the same data, they neither offered nor point to any evidence in support of their claim that there may have been overlooked projects in the CCSD that were equally cost-effective that should have been considered.

34) As to the requests to require a new RFP, the RD correctly notes; "The Hearing Examiners do not recommend this approach. Issuing an order now requiring PNM to restart the

entire RFP process from a new beginning creates risks in a palpably uncertain economic climate. PNM may not be able to conduct the RFP process in sufficient time to acquire the replacement resources before PNM abandons the units. And a large question exists whether the results of the new RFP would be better than the responses currently before the Commission. The tax credits available for wind and solar projects are gradually expiring, and the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic creates a risk for future pricing that is impossible to determine at this date."

35) The SJC Entities' request that the Commission essentially restart the process for the benefit of a proposed bidder who was not prepared or able to submit a bid when the RFP process was initiated, at the time the RFP process was concluded, or even as of the current date, should be denied.

PNM exception asserting CCAE-1 is unreliable and too costly

36) PNM argues that system reliability should not be evaluated on a scale not equal to the other factors that Section 3 requires the Commission to consider in weighing which resources should be located in the CCSD under Subsection 3(F). PNM argues that reliability must be prioritized because it is a cornerstone in providing "adequate, efficient and reasonable service."

37) PNM asserts the Commission should instead approve Sierra Club Tier 2-4 because it is not only reliable, but more cost-effective and balanced.

38) The Commission will not reiterate here the detailed analyses set forth in the RD and the responses to PNM's exceptions. The Commission notes that the structure of Section 3 reflects the legislature's recognition of reliability as a threshold requirement for the approval of a proposed resource by listing it as one of the essential criteria for designation as a "replacement resource" under Section 61-18-(3F).

39) At the same time, the Commission does not interpret the analysis employed by the RD as in any way diminishing the importance of reliability on the scale of concerns that must be satisfied in approving replacement resources. The RD treats reliability as a threshold consideration and finds that CCAE-1 satisfies the threshold requirement that a replacement resource be reliable. Consideration of the remaining factors under Section 3 confirm that CCAE-1 should be the preferred resource among the reliable resources presented for consideration by the Commission.

40) The RD found that that based on the PNM's Loss of Load Event (LOLE) reliability metric of 0.2 LOLE (two events in ten years), CCAE 1, PNM Scenario 2 and Sierra Club Tier 2-4 all meet the threshold standard that the proposed resources be reliable,

41) PNM disputes the RD's acceptance of CCAE 1's calculation of its LOLE at .14. which would satisfy the LOLE reliability standard of 0.2. PNM instead claims CCAE's modeling assumptions were faulty and that under its own modeling assumptions, CCAE 1's LOLE is 0.63.

42) PNM argues that the Commission should therefore reject the RD's selection of CCAE 1 and instead approve Sierra Club Tier 2-4 because it has a LOLE of 0.17 and therefore meets the established reliability standard of .02 LOLE per year.

43) The RD correctly found that the evidence concerning CCAE-1's reliability presented by other non-PNM expert witnesses, including expert witness O'Connell (PNM's own former resource planner) was credible and demonstrated that the assumptions underlying the modeling for CCAE 1 were reasonable even though they were less conservative than PNM's parameters. That same testimony and evidence demonstrated that PNM's own assumptions were unsupported.

44) PNM also disagrees with the RD's conclusion that the benefits of locating resources in the CCSD and lower emissions justify the higher cost of CCAE 1. PNM asserts the cost of

CCAE 1 could be as much as $242 million more than Sierra Club Tier 2-4 on a net present value ("NPV") basis over the twenty-year planning period. PNM claims the modeling assumptions used to support the selection of CCAE 1 are "over-optimistic" but still show Sierra Club Tier 2-4 to be $142 million less expensive.

45) The RD notes that the cost of CCAE 1 results in an additional annual revenue requirement of $8.344 million higher than PNM Scenario 2 and higher than Sierra Club Tier 2-4

46) The RD notes that when put in perspective, the difference to rate payers is not as significant as it may appear and under CCAE 1 the rate increase would be approximately $0.56 cents more per month for a residential customer paying $70 per month than PNM's preferred portfolio Scenario 1.

47) The RD also notes that this cost difference may be further reduced by up to $17.5 million if the signatories to the Stipulation in 13-00390-UT agree to waive certain renewable energy certificate (REC) purchases PNM is required to make under that stipulation, the cost of which would otherwise be recovered in rates.

48) The RD concludes that the apparent additional cost of prioritizing the placement of renewable resources in the CCSD may be reduced by the avoided "social costs of the CO_2 emissions that would be incurred with the 11 new natural gas units in PNM Scenario 2 or any of the other portfolios that incorporate natural gas turbines. "The RD notes that PNM justifies its resistance to large scale battery storage beyond 40MW for several reasons, including concerns that the current price point will decrease. In response, the RD notes that under the ETA, PNM has a continuing need for more storage and will be in a position to take advantage of future price reductions in storage as they develop.

49) The RD also notes that tax credits associated with the hybrid solar/battery storage facilities form part of the basis for the extremely low pricing for the Arroyo and Jicarilla solar PPA projects outside the CCSD and PNM has cited the gradual reduction in those tax credits as negatively affecting the economic pricing of PPAs unless they are locked in now. The RD therefore concludes the loss of these tax credits may offset or slow the declining cost of battery storage that PNM argues as a reason to defer meeting current storage needs with battery storage.

50) However, the RD notes that the potential for increased cost in comparison to natural gas generation was contemplated and addressed by the ETA. Section 62-8-3 expressly provides for a preference for portfolios both located in the CCSD and which have lesser environmental impacts and 62-8-3(D) diminishes the normal priority of cost-effectiveness and elevates the priority of location in the CCSD by providing: "The commission shall not disallow recovery of reasonable costs associated with requirements as to where the resources are located."

51) As the RD notes, the use of natural gas turbines is also inconsistent with the ETA's policy of transitioning away from fossil fuel resources and reducing CO_2 emissions through graduated increases in non-carbon generation up to 2040 under the revised Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS). CCAE 1's 650 MW of solar resources would more than double PNM's existing renewable resources and may satisfy the 40% RPS for 2025 without the additional cost of procuring additional renewable resources beyond those approved in this case. All of the other proposed resource portfolios would still require the addition of substantial renewables to meet the 2025 RPS.

52) The RD further notes that PNM proposes to operate the natural gas turbines for substantially less time than their useful lives and would seek accelerated depreciation over 18 years, essentially incorporating and passing future stranded costs to PNM ratepayers. Because the

units would still have a substantial usable life upon retirement by PNM, there would the potential of continued CO_2 emissions after 2040 if the units, with their 22 remaining years of service life, are transferred to another owner.

Exceptions concerning RD analysis of PNM SCENARIO 2

53) Several parties, including the New Mexico Attorney General (NMAG), Interwest, and the Sierra Club took exception with the RD's characterization of PNM Scenario 2 as the "second highest ranking portfolio" which could be approved as a policy choice. They argues this conclusion would be contrary to the ETA's dictate that "the commission *shall prefer* resources with the least environmental impacts, those with higher ratios of capital costs to fuel costs and those able to reduce the cost of reclamation and use for lands previously mined within the county of the qualifying generating facility." NMSA 1978, § 62-18-3(B).

54) The RD compares CCAE 1 to the 11 natural gas turbine PNM Scenario 2 because PNM Scenario 2 is the only portfolio that would locate more capacity and potentially more capital investment in the CCSD. PNM described Scenario 2 as intended to maximize economic development opportunity by locating all resources and construction jobs in the CCSD

55) As the NMAG acknowledges, the RD does NOT recommend approval of PNM Scenario 2. As the RD states: "PNM Scenario 2, however, would install 11 new natural gas turbines, an approach that is inconsistent with the ETA's and REA's joint policy of transitioning away from fossil fuel resources and reducing CO_2 emissions. The 11 natural gas units would also not satisfy the preferences in Section 3(B) for resources with the least environmental impacts and with higher ratios of capital costs to fuel costs."

56) Indeed, Section 62-18-3 (B) requires that, all things equal with respect to reliability and the ability "to reduce the cost of reclamation and use for lands previously mined," the

Commission must "prefer" those "resources with the least environmental impacts" and "those with higher ratios of capital costs to fuel costs."

57) The RD therefore correctly finds that because CCAE-1 is a reliable resource and will have no CO_2/pollutant emissions and no fuel costs, these preferences require selection of CCAE 1 as a non-polluting resource with the highest possible ratio of capital costs to fuel costs.

Proposed Waiver of 40 of Modified Stipulation in Case No. 13-00390-UT

58) As discussed in the RD, the Hearing Examiners issued a Briefing Order after the close of the case asking the Signatories participating in the case to state their willingness to waive the requirement of Paragraph 40 the Modified Stipulation in Case No. 13-00390-UT and the terms they require to do so.

59) Based on those responses, the Hearing Examiners recommend that the requirement of Paragraph 40 be waived. The Commission agrees.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

A. The Recommended Decision on Replacement Resources – Part 2 including the Statement of the Case, Discussion, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, Decretal Paragraphs is well taken and are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth in this Final Order, and are ADOPTED, APPROVED, and ACCEPTED as the Findings, Conclusions and Orders of the Commission.

B. All exceptions, pending motions, requests or any other matter not expressly ruled on or addressed in the hearing or in the discussion of this Final Order herein are hereby deemed denied and disposed of consistent with the discussion of this Final Order.

C. The Commission grants in part PNM's request for the Commission for an extension of the time recommended by the RD for PNM to file an application, in a separate docket, seeking approval of proposed final, executed contracts for any replacement resources approved by the Commission that are not currently in evidence within thirty days after entry of this final order, PNM shall file the required application within sixty days of the entry of this order.

D. This Order is effective immediately.

E. Copies of this Order shall be served on all persons listed on the attached Certificate of Service, via e-mail to those whose e-mail addresses are known, and otherwise via regular mail.

ISSUED under the Seal of the Commission at Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 29th day of July 2020.

NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

/s/ Cynthia B. Hall, electronically signed
CYNTHIA B. HALL, COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 1

/s/ Jefferson Byrd, electronically signed
JEFFERSON L. BYRD, COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 2

/s/ Valerie Espinoza, electronically signed
VALERIE ESPINOZA, COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 3

/s/ Theresa Becenti-Aguilar, electronically signed
THERESA BECENTI-AGUILAR, COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 4

/s/ Stephen Fischmann, electronically signed
STEPHEN FISCHMANN, COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 5

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO'S CONSOLIDATED APPLICATION FOR APPROVALS FOR THE ABANDONMENT, FINANCING, AND RESOURCE REPLACEMENT FOR SAN JUAN GENERATING STATION PURSUANT TO THE ENERGY TRANSITION ACT	))))))	**Case No. 19-00195-UT**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Order on Recommended Decision on Replacement Resources – Part II** issued by the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission on July 29th, 2020, was sent via email to the parties indicated below:

Stacey Goodwin	Stacey.Goodwin@pnmresources.com;
Ryan Jerman	Ryan.Jerman@pnmresources.com;
Richard Alvidrez	Ralvidrez@mstlaw.com;
Robert Edwards	Bob.Edwards@troutman.com;
Dan Akenhead	DAkenhead@mstlaw.com;
Mark Fenton	Mark.Fenton@pnm.com;
Carey Salaz	Carey.salaz@pnm.com;
Steven Schwebke	Steven.Schwebke@pnm.com;
Heather Allen	Heather.Allen@pnmresources.com;
Mariel Nanasi	Mariel@seedsbeneaththesnow.com;
Joan Drake	jdrake@modrall.com;
Lisa Tormoen Hickey	lisahickey@newlawgroup.com;
Jason Marks	lawoffice@jasonmarks.com;
Matthew Gerhart	matt.gerhart@sierraclub.org;
Katherine Lagen	Katherine.lagen@sierraclub.org;
Ramona Blaber	Ramona.blaber@sierraclub.org;
Camilla Feibelman	Camilla.Feibelman@sierraclub.org;
Michel Goggin	MGoggin@gridstrategiesllc.com;
Nann M. Winter	nwinter@stelznerlaw.com;
Keith Herrmann	kherrmann@stelznerlaw.com;
Dahl Harris	dahlharris@hotmail.com;
Peter Auh	pauh@abcwua.org;
Jody García	JGarcia@stelznerlaw.com;
Andrew Harriger	akharriger@sawvel.com;
Donald E. Gruenemeyer	degruen@sawvel.com;
Joseph A. Herz	jaherz@sawvel.com;
Steven S. Michel	smichel@westernresources.org;

April Elliott	April.elliott@westernresources.org;
Pat O'Connell	pat.oconnell@westernresources.org;
Douglas J. Howe	dhowe@highrocknm.com;
Bruce C. Throne	bthroneatty@newmexico.com;
Rob Witwer	witwerr@southwestgen.com;
Jeffrey Albright	JA@Jalblaw.com;
Amanda Edwards	AE@Jalblaw.com;
Michael I. Garcia	mikgarcia@bernco.gov;
Greg Sonnenfeld	greg@sonnenfeldconsulting.com;
Charles F. Noble	Noble.ccae@gmail.com;
Stephanie Dzur	Stephanie@Dzur-law.com;
Vicky Ortiz	Vortiz@montand.com;
Peter J. Gould	pgouldlaw@gmail.com;
Kelly Gould	kellydarshan@gmail.com;
Jim Dauphinais	jdauphinais@consultbai.com;
Michael Gorman	mgorman@consultbai.com;
Randy S. Bartell	rbartell@montand.com;
Sharon T. Shaheen	sshaheen@montand.com;
John F. McIntyre	jmcintyre@montand.com;
Marvin T. Griff	Marvin.Griff@thompsonhine.com;
David Ortiz	DOrtiz@montand.com;
Jennifer Breakell	jbreakell@fmtn.org;
Lorraine Talley	ltalley@montand.com;
Peggy Martinez-Rael	Peggy.Martinez-Rael@state.nm.us;
Elizabeth Ramirez	Elizabeth.Ramirez@state.nm.us;
Anna Sommer	ASommer@energyfuturesgroup.com;
Chelsea Hotaling	CHotaling@energyfuturesgroup.com;
Tyler Comings	tyler.comings@aeclinic.org;
Don Hancock	sricdon@earthlink.net;
Stephen Curtice	stephen@youtzvaldez.com;
Shane Youtz	shane@youtzvaldez.com;
James Montalbano	james@youtzvaldez.com;
Barry W. Dixon	bwdixon953@msn.com;
Kyle J. Tisdel	tisdel@westernlaw.org;
Erik Schlenker-Goodrich	eriksg@westernlaw.org;
Thomas Singer	Singer@westernlaw.org;
Mike Eisenfeld	mike@sanjuancitizens.org;
Carol Davis	caroljdavis.2004@gmail.com;
Robyn Jackson	chooshgai.bitsi@gmail.com;
Thomas Manning	cfrecleanenergy@yahoo.com;
Debra S. Doll	Debra@doll-law.com;
Katherine Coleman	Katie.coleman@tklaw.com;
Thompson & Knight	Tk.eservice@tklaw.com;
Jane L. Yee	jyee@cabq.gov;
Larry Blank, Ph.D.	lb@tahoeconomics.com;
Saif Ismail	sismail@cabq.gov;

David Baake	david@baakelaw.com;
Germaine R. Chappelle	Gchappelle.law@gmail.com;
Senator Steve Neville	steven.neville@nmlegis.gov;
Senator William Sharer	bill@williamsharer.com;
Rep. James Strickler	jamesstrickler@msn.com;
Rep. Anthony Allison	Anthony.Allison@nmlegis.gov;
Rep. Rod Montoya	roddmontoya@gmail.com;
Rep. Paul Bandy	paul@paulbandy.org;
Richard L. C. Virtue	rvirtue@virtuelaw.com;
Carla R. Najjar	Csnajjar@virtuelaw.com;
Philo Shelton	Philo.Shelton@lacnm.us;
Robert Cummins	Robert.Cummins@lacnm.us;
Kevin Powers	Kevin.Powers@lacnm.us;
Steven Gross	gross@portersimon.com;
Martin R. Hopper	mhopper@msrpower.org;
Cholla Khoury	ckhoury@nmag.gov;
Gideon Elliot	gelliot@nmag.gov;
Robert F. Lundin	rlundin@nmag.gov;
Elaine Heltman	Eheltman@nmag.gov;
Andrea Crane	ctcolumbia@aol.com;
Douglas Gegax	dgegax@nmsu.edu;
Susan C. Kery	susan@uttonkery.com;
Michael C. Smith	Michaelc.smith@state.nm.us;
Bradford Borman	Bradford.Borman@state.nm.us;
Jack Sidler	Jack.sidler@state.nm.us;
John Bogatko	John.Bogatko@state.nm.us;
Milo Chavez	Milo.Chavez@state.nm.us;
Marc Tupler	Marc.Tupler@state.nm.us;
Beverly Eschberger	Beverly.Eschberger@state.nm.us;
Georgette Ramie	Georgette.Ramie@state.nm.us;
Dhiraj Solomon	Dhiraj.Solomon@state.nm.us;
Anthony Medeiros	Anthony.Medeiros@state.nm.us;
Ashley Schannauer	Ashley.Schannauer@state.nm.us;

DATED this 29th day of July, 2020.

NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

/s/ Isaac Sullivan-Leshin, electronically signed
Isaac Sullivan-Leshin, Paralegal