

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE)	
COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO’S)	
ABANDONMENT OF SAN JUAN)	Case No. 19-00018-UT
GENERATING STATION UNITS 1 AND 4)	
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>)	

FINAL ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DECISION WITH ADDITIONS

THIS MATTER comes before the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (the “NMPRC” or the “Commission”) upon (“RD”) issued by the hearing examiners Anthony F. Medeiros and Ashley Schannauer on June 18, 2022(the “RD”) which made a decision on the February 28, 2022, Joint Motion for Order to Show Cause and Enforce Financing Order and Supporting Brief (“Joint Motion”) filed by Western Resource Advocates (WRA), Coalition for Clean Affordable Energy (CCAIE) and Prosperity Works (collectively “Joint Movants”). The Joint Motion requests that the Commission order Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM or “Company”) to show cause why its rates should not be reduced at the time the San Juan Generating Station (“San Juan” or SJGS) is abandoned and to otherwise enforce the April 1, 2020 Final Order on Request for Issuance of a Financing Order (hereinafter, collectively with the February 21, 2020 Recommended Decision on Financing Order, the “Financing Order”) in this case; wherefore, being duly advised in the premises;

THE COMMISSION FINDS AND CONCLUDES:

1. The Joint Motion asserted that, under the Energy Transition Act (ETA) and the Financing Order issued pursuant to the ETA, PNM is authorized to issue low-cost bonds to recover PNM’s undepreciated investments in San Juan Units 1 and 4 (collectively “Units”). The Joint Movants allege that the Financing Order requires PNM to issue the bonds at the time PNM

abandons Units 1 and 4, that the Financing Order requires PNM to reduce its rates to remove the costs of the Units upon the issuance of the bonds, and that PNM is unlawfully delaying the issuance of the bonds to avoid reducing its rates until after the Commission rules on a rate case that PNM intends to file in December 2022. The Joint Movants argue that PNM's plan will withhold a roughly ten percent rate decrease (i.e., an annual savings to ratepayers of \$94 million) that its customers are entitled to receive when the Units close in July and October of this year. The Joint Movants state that PNM's plan will enable PNM to collect all of its San Juan costs in rates, even though the plant is no longer serving PNM customers and PNM is no longer incurring costs to operate the plant. The delay will also allow the Company to:

- 1) recover its stranded San Juan investment at its full cost of capital, which includes a shareholder profit, for an additional 18 months;
- 2) recover for an additional 18 months non-existent O&M and other San Juan expenses, such as wages and benefits for employees that no longer work at the plant;
- 3) deprive communities impacted by San Juan's closure of \$28.2 million in transition funding for 18 months after the closure date;
- 4) double-recover its undepreciated San Juan plant balance through the ETA bond issuance starting in 2024;
- 5) also recover from customers during the 18-month delay the costs of San Juan replacement power, which are automatically charged to customers through PNM's fuel and purchased power cost adjustment clause ("fuel clause"); and
- 6) jeopardize the Company's ability to secure a low-cost bond issuance, given that interest rates are expected to rapidly rise over the next couple years – having a long-term negative impact on PNM customers for the next 20-25 years.

2. The Joint Motion requested that the Commission to take the following actions:

- 1) issue an order to PNM to show cause why it should not provide the rate credit to its customers (totaling \$94 million/year), to commence on the anticipated abandonment dates of San Juan Units 1 and 4;
- 2) order PNM to provide the rate credits described in the Financing Order to its customers, reflecting the removal of all costs of San Juan Units 1 and 4 when those units stop serving PNM customers;
- 3) require PNM to report to the Commission on the status and progress in obtaining any Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and rating agency approvals necessary to issue the bonds authorized by the Financing Order; and
- 4) require PNM to explain the prudence of delaying its bond issuance beyond the San Juan abandonment dates, and what actions, such as hedging interest rates, PNM will take to protect its customers from interest rate increases incurred as a result of PNM's intended bond issuance delay.

3. On March 4, 2022, the Commission issued an Order requiring PNM to file a response to the Joint Motion in accordance with 1.2.2.12(C) NMAC and that replies would be timely if filed within ten days of the filing of PNM's response.

4. PNM filed a Verified Response to the Joint Motion on March 14, 2022. PNM argues that the Financing Order requires the removal from rates of the costs of San Juan Units 1 and 4 at the time PNM issues the bonds and starts charging customers for the costs of bonds. PNM argues that the Financing Order does not require the rate reduction upon the abandonment of the units and that the Financing Order provides PNM the flexibility to delay the issuance of the

bonds to the conclusion of PNM's next rate case. PNM states that it intends to file the rate case in December 2022.

5. Replies to PNM's Response were timely filed by the Joint Movants, Bernalillo County ("County"), and New Mexico Affordable Reliable Energy Alliance (NM AREA) (filing a joint reply). The Office of the New Mexico Attorney General ("Attorney General" or OAG), New Energy Economy (NEE), and the Utility Division Staff (Staff) of the Commission filed motions to file replies out of time.

6. On March 30, 2022, the Commission issued an Order Appointing Hearing Examiners on Joint Motion for Order to Show Cause and Enforce Financing Order.

7. The Commission's March 30 Order directed the hearing examiners expedite a Commission decision in this matter.

8. On May 19, 2022, the Hearing Examiners presided over a public comment hearing via the Zoom videoconferencing platform.

9. The evidentiary hearing in this matter was held on May 23-26, 2022 via the Zoom videoconferencing platform.

10. Pursuant to the Briefing Order issued by the Hearing Examiners on May 26, 2022, the following parties filed Briefs in Chief ("Br.") on June 3, 2022: Bernalillo County and the Attorney General (filing jointly); CCAE, NEE, Prosperity Works, and Sierra Club (also filing jointly and referred to hereinafter as "CCAIE et al."); PNM; NM AREA; WRA; and Staff. Response Briefs ("Resp.") were filed on June 9, 2022 by PNM, CCAE et al., and WRA.

11. The Hearing Examiners recommended that the Commission find and conclude as follows:

1. PNM provides retail electric utility service to members of the public within the State of New Mexico and, therefore, PNM is a public utility subject to the jurisdiction of the

- Commission under the Public Utility Act. As a public utility, PNM is required to furnish adequate, efficient and reasonable service at just and reasonable rates in conformity with NMSA 1978, §§ 62-8-1 and 62- 8-2.
2. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this case.
 3. Reasonable, proper, and adequate notice of this matter has been given.
 4. The Financing Order provides for the removal of the San Juan energy transition costs through the issuance of securitized bonds upon or shortly after the abandonment of San Juan Units 1 and 4.
 5. Under its new plan, PNM states that the Company intends to issue the energy transition bonds in January or February 2024, at least 18 months after the abandonment of Unit 1 and 15 months after the abandonment of Unit 4.
 6. PNM's new plan severs the fundamental linkage in the Energy Transition Act between a qualifying generating facility's abandonment and the securitization of energy transition costs and imposition of ETCs.
 7. The Financing Order does not contemplate or establish any remedy to address the de-linkage of the abandonment from the energy transition bond issuance and imposition of ETCs that PNM is now planning.
 8. The materially changed circumstances revealed in the Commission's investigation in this proceeding require the Commission, acting pursuant to its supervisory authority over the rates and service of jurisdictional utilities, to issue an Order that addresses the de-linked scenario and establishes a remedial mechanism that ensures the rates charged to PNM customers are fair, just, and reasonable and protects customers from the double recovery and other potential harms resulting from the de-linkage PNM conceived and opted to execute without this Commission's prior authorization.
 9. PNM's new plan constitutes a moral hazard that, without the remediation ordered herein, threatens substantial and potentially irreparable harm to ratepayers.
 10. PNM should be directed to transfer the Section 16 payments due and owing to the Indian Affairs Fund, the Economic Development Assistance Fund, and the Displaced Workers Assistance Fund within thirty days of the abandonment of San Juan Unit 1.
 11. It is in the best interests of ratepayers and the public interest for the Commission to evaluate the prudence of any unreasonable delay in financing San Juan costs beyond the dates of abandonment. The Commission's evaluation should examine, at a minimum, any increased interest rate that PNM's bonds incur as a result of the delay, whether PNM shareholders should be responsible for such added costs, whether PNM's delay beyond the dates of abandonment is outside the authority provided the Company in the Financing Order, and whether such delay impaired or might impair the marketability of any energy transition bonds PNM has issued or eventually issues. PNM therefore should include in its next base rate case application filing an explanation and defense of the prudence of delaying its bond issuance beyond the San Juan abandonment dates and what actions PNM may take or has taken to protect customers from interest rate increases incurred as a result of PNM's intended bond issuance delay and to ensure the continued marketability of any energy transition bonds issued by the Company.
 - 12.

12. The RD recommended that the Commission adopt the following

DECRETAL PARAGRAPHS:

The Commission, having adopted and approved the findings of fact and conclusions of law as stated above, ORDERS that:

- A. The findings, conclusions, analyses, determinations, and rulings made and construed herein are hereby adopted and approved as the findings, conclusions, analyses, determinations, and rulings of the Commission.
- B. PNM shall file an Advice Notice by July 1, 2022 that revises PNM's rates to remove all of the costs of San Juan Unit 1 from rates and issues rate credits to customers using the allocation and rate design methodology approved for the ETCs in the Financing Order, as described above.
- C. PNM shall file an Advice Notice by October 1, 2022 that revises PNM's rates to remove all of the costs of San Juan Unit 4 and the San Juan common facilities from rates and issues rate credits to customers using the allocation and rate design methodology approved for the ETCs in the Financing Order, as described above.
- D. PNM shall transfer the payments due and owing under NMSA 1979, § 62-18-16 to the Indian Affairs Fund, the Economic Development Assistance Fund, and the Displaced Workers Assistance Fund within thirty days of the abandonment of San Juan Unit 1.
- E. PNM shall include in its next base rate case application filing an explanation and defense of the prudence of delaying its bond issuance beyond the San Juan abandonment dates and what actions PNM may take or has taken to protect customers from interest rate increases incurred as a result of PNM's intended bond issuance delay and to ensure the continued marketability of any energy transition bonds issued by the Company.

13. NEE filed Exceptions on June 22, 2022. NEE asserted that the failure to include a requirement that PNM be required to track all of its costs of this proceeding, the prudence of which the Commission expressly reserves the right to review in PNM's next general rate case. NEE is asking that the Commission uphold the Recommended Decision in full and add a requirement that PNM is to track all of its costs of this Show Cause Proceeding so if PNM seeks cost recovery in PNM's next general rate case that the prudence of those costs will be known and be subject to review. In support of its Exception request, NEE concurred with the RD that it rightfully recommended that a rate credit be issued and that Section 16 funds be awarded upon SJGS abandonment and correctly recommended that a prudence hearing in PNM's next rate case be conducted to determine if any increased interest rate is incurred by ratepayers as a result of

PNM's bond-issuance delay if this difference be absorbed by shareholders and "whether PNM's delay beyond the dates of abandonment is outside the authority provided the Company in the Financing Order, and whether such delay impaired or might impair the marketability of any energy transition bonds PNM has issued or eventually issues." However, NEE excepted to the fact that the RD did not recommend that PNM "track all of its costs of this Show Cause Proceeding the prudence of which the Commission expressly reserves the right to review in PNM's next general rate case" as was requested by CCAE et al. in our Post Hearing Brief at p. 37, ¶10. According to NEE, PNM ratepayers should not have to pay for this enforcement action to obtain results that were already determined and appealed and according to NEE, a tracking mechanism will preserve its right to challenge PNM's future attempt for cost recovery, including but not limited to the \$150,000 fee for PNM expert Charles Atkins, in PNM's next general rate case. These are the reasons why NEE requested the Commission uphold the RD in full and add a requirement that PNM is to track all of its costs of this Show Cause Proceeding so if PNM seeks cost recovery in PNM's next general rate case that the prudence of those costs will be known and be subject to review.

14. Also on June 22, 2022, PNM filed Exceptions which, in large part, repeated its assertions made in the public hearing, filed testimony, and all of its previously filed pleading. PNM's first exception is that the ETA is the governing statute for ratemaking associated with the abandonment of SJGS and that the Commission is not authorized by the ETA to impose a rate credit based upon the fact that the SJGS abandonment will occur prior to the issuance of the ETA bonds. According to PNM, the ETA specifies when a reduction in the cost-of-service is to be implemented, which is when PNM begins collecting Energy Transition Charge, not at the time of abandonment. In addition, PNM asserts that the Financing Order does not authorize any rate

adjustment based on San Juan abandonment prior to the issuance of the ETA bonds. PNM asserts that the Hearing Examiners' conclusion that the ETA does not address every potential ratemaking scenario is contradictory to the scope of the ETA as determined by the New Mexico Supreme Court. PNM's Exception #2 requests the Commission to reject the RD's interpretation of the ETA that the issuance of the ETA bonds was meant to occur near the time of the abandonment based upon Section 62-18-16 (J) given that the RD noted that other sections of the ETA, Sections 62-18-4(B)(7), (10) provide for flexibility and the purpose of Section 62-18-16 will be met in this case.¹ PNM's Exception #3 asserts that the RD recommended that the Commission engage in piecemeal ratemaking by imposing a rate credit and the justification of a "moral hazard" is not recognized in New Mexico administrative law and is based on facts not in evidence regarding alleged double recovery of SJGS costs and overearning and that customers would not receive the saving intended by the ETA. The facts in evidence do not support the Hearing Examiners' attempt to justify piecemeal ratemaking or any other "remedial mechanism" to ensure just and reasonable rates. PNM's Exception #4 objects to the RD's recommendation for an evaluation of the prudence of PNM's timing of the issuance of the bonds is an unauthorized hindsight review. In addition, this assumes that the ETA requires the issuance of the bonds upon abandonment. PNM asserts that

¹ Section 62-18-16(J) of the Energy Transition Act states that "[w]ithin thirty days of receipt of energy transition bond proceeds, a qualifying generating facility located in New Mexico shall transfer the following percentages of the financed amount of energy transition bonds" to three transition funds – 0.5% to the Indian Affairs Department for the Energy Transition Indian Affairs fund; 1.65% to the Economic Development Department for the Energy Transition Economic Development Assistance Fund; and 3.35% to the Workforce Solutions Department for the Energy Transition Displaced Worker Assistance Fund."

NMSA 1978, § 62-18-4(B)(7) (requiring only "an estimate of timing of the issuance and term of the energy transition bonds or series of bonds; provided that the scheduled final maturity for each bond issuance shall be no longer than twenty-five years[.]"). Section 62-18-4(B)(10) of the ETA states that an application for a financing order shall include inter alia "a description of a proposed ratemaking process to reconcile and recover or refund any difference between the energy transition costs financed by the energy transition bonds and the actual final energy transition costs incurred by the qualifying utility or the assignee." NMSA 1978, § 62-18-4(B)(10).

the hearing examiner acknowledge that the Commission lacks authority to order the issuance of the bonds at that time nor does the ETA require bonds to be issued at any specific time.

15. On June 24, 2022, NEE filed Responses to PNM Exceptions. NEE disagrees with PNM's argument that the RD is wrong where it states that there is no provision of a mechanism for ratemaking associated with the abandonment of San Juan Generating Station Units 1 and 4. NEE argues that the ETA provides a comprehensive framework for San Juan abandonment, which does permit the Commission to authorize an immediate rate adjustment in this case. PNM cannot use the ETA as a shield to prevent ratepayer protection. NEE stated: "The ETA and Financing Order are quite clear – the ETA is about the transition from coal; rate adjustment and securitized financing occurs at the time of abandonment. Everyone, including the Commission, relied on PNM's representations, at the time of their Notice, Application and testimony and argument to the NM Supreme Court. Everyone believed that rate adjustment and securitized financing was pegged to abandonment. Everyone believed that customer savings were to accrue: San Juan was going to close and ratepayers would save money from its closure and those savings would be promptly reflected in rates. The testimony adduced at hearing also confirms that the ETA and Financing Order contemplated that San Juan Generating Station ("San Juan" or "SJGS") rate adjustment and securitized financing was pegged to SJGS abandonment. 1. Mr. Monroy admitted that: "that at the time it filed its Consolidated Application for the Financing Order that it anticipated it would issue the energy transition bonds near the time of the abandonment of San Juan." 2. Ms. Sanchez, attorney, ETA co-author, and policy lead for PNM testified: "the primary purpose or one of the major goals of the ET A was transitioning out of coal. ... [T]he utility had an interest in recovering stranded costs, and securitization was a low-cost mechanism to do that with." 3. Sanchez testified: "I think there was an expectation, an intent, a plan, if you will [to file a rate case and to coordinate

that with the energy transition bonds].” 4. Sanchez testified: “we had many conversations and discussed throughout all of our discussions that there [would be] customer savings.” 5. Sanchez testified: that the ETA definition of energy transition costs are undepreciated investments “as of the date of abandonment on the qualifying utility’s books and records; right.” 6. Sanchez testified: that the ETA definition of financing costs is “the costs, fees, and expenses [that] can also be attributed to obtaining an order approving abandonment of a qualified generating facility.” 7. When asked about to which coal facilities does the ETA apply, Sanchez testified: “if operated by a qualifying utility prior to the effective date of the Energy Transition Act, is to be abandoned prior to January 1, 2023. ... That has been interpreted to apply to San Juan Generating Station.” 8. Ms. Sanchez was asked: “All of the definitions regarding financing costs and the purpose of the Energy Transaction Act refer to PNM abandonment of San Juan and Four Corners; is that – that’s what it’s pegged back to?” Ms. Sanchez answered: “I don’t think that’s been in dispute. We’ve been talking about abandonment.” “ NEE asserts that PNM didn’t follow the ETA and Financing Order and the Hearing Examiners had no choice but to protect ratepayers from PNM’s attempt to charge customers millions of dollars in “costs” on PNM’s customers, that don’t exist after abandonment of Units 1 and 2 and provide PNM with “undeserved, unearned and unlawful profits, contrary to the Financing Order approved in this docket. According to NEE: “PNM’s decisions deprive customers out of their benefit of the bargain in the Financing Order approved by the Commission but also violate the Public Utility Act, the ETA, and the most fundamental precepts of monopoly utility regulation, including the requirement that a utility’s customers can only be charged fair, just and reasonable rates.”

16. Also, on June 24, 2022, the New Mexico Attorney General and Bernalillo County filed Joint Responses to PNM Exceptions and CCAE and Prosperity Works filed Responses to

PNM's Exceptions. All parties urged the Commission to adopt the RD's Decretal Paragraphs. Specifically, the Attorney General and Bernalillo County encourage the Commission to: (1) to reject PNM exception 1 and issue a rate credit to consumers which is in the commission's authority and which is not prohibited by the ETA. (2) To reject PNM exception 2 and require PNM to issue the securitization bonds for Units 1 and 4 as soon as possible and to reject PNM's requested exception to issue bonds at its convenience. Specifically, to require that securitization bonds be issued and financed as close to the date(s) of abandonment of Units 1 and 4 as possible, with the effective date being the date of abandonment; (3) reject PNM's exception 4 that defers the issuance of the bonds until after the next rate proceeding, and to issue the bonds at the time of abandonment.

17. The Commission concurs with NEE, the NMAG and Bernalillo County, and agree with the Hearing Examiners in their RD, where they state, on pages 9 and 10:

The new plan enables a double recovery of costs by PNM. PNM ratepayers would pay and PNM shareholders would be able to continue to recover approximately \$134 million of costs for the San Juan units – facilities that are no longer providing service to PNM customers – plus the costs of other resources that replace the San Juan units until the conclusion of the promised rate case in January or February 2024. Then, after the issuance of bonds in 2024, PNM ratepayers would pay and PNM shareholders would also recover the full amount of the abandoned plants measured at their value on the dates of their abandonment in June and September 2022 – without a credit resulting from ratepayers' payment of costs for Units 1 and 4 between the dates of the abandonments and the conclusion of the promised rate case in 2024.

And where they further explain, at footnote 146:

[T]he Commission's authority to address the ratemaking treatment of the abandonment of San Juan Units 1 and 4 is neither limited by nor founded in the ETA, where, as under PNM's new plan, the abandonments are taking place independent from the securitization process established in the ETA. Therefore, PNM's arguments that an order requiring PNM to implement a remedy like a rate credit or regulatory liability in this proceeding would (i) be unlawful because the Commission cannot do indirectly that which the ETA does not permit directly, (ii) would constitute an illegal amendment to the Financing Order, or (iii) would violate the irrevocability of the Financing Order are unavailing and utterly misplaced.

In short, the materially changed circumstances revealed in this proceeding require the

Commission to issue a new order grounded in the Commission's rate-setting authority under the Public Utility Act ["PUA"], an order that addresses the extraordinary circumstances and establishes a remedial mechanism that ensures the rates charged to PNM customers are just and reasonable and protects customers from the double recovery and other potential harms resulting from the de-linkage PNM conceived and opted to execute without this Commission's prior authorization.

18. The Commission is persuaded by NEE's Exception and finds that PNM should be ordered to track all of its costs incurred in this proceeding so that the prudence of those costs will be known and be subject to review.

19. In addition, the Commission further finds that the prudency review in this case should include a compliance filing in this docket for a review of the prudence of PNM's change made after the Financing Order that delayed bond issuance beyond the dates of the San Juan abandonment of Units 1 and 4. Two benchmark dates should be established, to be able to compare the date the interest rates that exist at the times of abandonment compared to the dates of actual bond issuance. Benchmark date #1 should be set at 30 days following the abandonment of Unit 1. Benchmark date #2 should be set at 30 days following the abandonment of Unit 4. Such compliance filings should be filed in this docket no later than October 15, 2022.

20. The Commission finds the RD is supported by substantial evidence in the record and results in fair, just and reasonable rates and therefore incorporates the RD in its entirety by reference as if fully set forth in this Order, and the statement of the case, discussion, and all findings of fact and conclusions of law and decretal paragraphs contained in the RD, are ADOPTED, APPROVED, and ACCEPTED as Findings and Conclusions and Decretal Paragraphs of the Commission in their entirety with additions set forth herein.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

A. The findings of fact and conclusions of law and decretal paragraphs contained in the RD are ADOPTED, APPROVED, and ACCEPTED as orders of the

Commission in their entirety.

B. With the following additions, the RD is ADOPTED, APPROVED and ACCEPTED in its entirety: a) NEE's Exception is hereby adopted and PNM shall file a report in this docket no later than October 15, 2022, that contains a record of all of its costs incurred in this show cause proceeding so that the prudence of those costs will be known and be subject to review in PNM's forthcoming rate case; b) in addition the prudency review shall include a compliance filing in this docket to enable a review of the prudence of PNM's new changed plan made after the Financing Order that decided to delay bond issuance beyond the dates of the San Juan abandonment of Units 1 and 4. The two benchmark dates shall establish the interest rates that are in existence at the times of abandonment compared to the dates of actual bond issuance. Benchmark date #1 shall be set at 30 days following the date of abandonment of Unit 1. Benchmark date #2 shall be set at 30 days following the abandonment of Unit 4. Such compliance filings shall be filed in this docket no later than October 15, 2022; c) an immediate rate credit by PNM as set forth in the Decretal Paragraphs of the RD is required to ensure "fair, just, and reasonable" rates, based upon the preponderance of the evidence in the record, that upon the abandonment of Units 1 and 4, PNM's rates are not (and will not be or shall not be) fair, just, and reasonable if the immediate rate credit is not issued to ratepayers so that the Units' costs are no longer in rates; and d) to Decretal Paragraph D. add the phrase "as set forth in the Table on page 101 of the RD."

C. Any matter not specifically ruled on during the hearing or in this Final Order is disposed of consistently with this Final Order.

D. This Order is effective immediately.

E. This docket is closed.

F. Copies of this Order shall be e-mailed to all persons on the attached Certificate of Service if their e-mail addresses are known, and otherwise shall be sent via regular mail.

ISSUED under the Seal of the Commission at Santa Fe, New Mexico, this 29th day
of June, 2022.

NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

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

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

/s/ Joseph M. Maestas, electronically signed
JOSEPH M. MAESTAS, 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)
ABANDONMENT OF SAN JUAN)
GENERATING STATION UNITS 1 AND 4)**

Case No. 19-00018-UT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that on this date I served upon the individuals listed below, via e-mail only, a true and correct copy of the *Final Order Adopting Recommended Decision with Additions* issued on this date.

Stacey Goodwin	Stacey.goodwin@pnmresources.com ;
Richard Alvidrez	Ralvidrez@mstlaw.com ;
Debrea M. Terwilliger	dterwilliger@wbkllaw.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 ;
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 ;
Jody García	JGarcia@stelznerlaw.com ;
Andrew Harriger	akharriger@sawvel.com ;
Donald E. Gruenemeyer	degruen@sawvel.com ;
Steven S. Michel	stevensmichel@comcast.net ;
April Elliott	April.elliott@westernresources.org ;
Pat O'Connell	pat.oconnell@westernresources.org ;
Cydney Beadles	cydney.beadles@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
Peter J. Gould
Kelly Gould
Jim Dauphinais
Michael Gorman
Randy S. Bartell
Sharon T. Shaheen
John F. McIntyre
Marvin T. Griff
David Ortiz
Jennifer Breakell
Lorraine Talley
Anna Sommer
Chelsea Hotaling
Tyler Comings
Don Hancock
Stephen Curtice
Shane Youtz
James Montalbano
Barry W. Dixon
Kyle J. Tisdell
Erik Schlenker-Goodrich
Thomas Singer
Mike Eisenfeld
Carol Davis
Robyn Jackson
Thomas Manning
Debra S. Doll
Katherine Coleman
Thompson & Knight
Julie Park
Larry Blank, Ph.D.
Saif Ismail
Germaine R. Chappelle
Senator Steve Neville
Senator William Sharer
Rep. James Strickler
Rep. Anthony Allison
Rep. Rod Montoya
Rep. Paul Bandy
Patrick J. Griebel
Richard L. C. Virtue
Carla R. Najjar
Philo Shelton
Robert Cummins
Kevin Powers

Vortiz@montand.com;
peter@thegouldlawfirm.com;
kelly@thegouldlawfirm.com;
jdauphinais@consultbai.com;
mgorman@consultbai.com;
rbartell@montand.com;
sshaheen@montand.com;
jmcintyre@montand.com;
Marvin.Griff@thompsonhine.com;
DOrtiz@montand.com;
jbreakell@fmtn.org;
ltalley@montand.com;
ASommer@energyfuturesgroup.com;
CHotaling@energyfuturesgroup.com;
tyler.comings@aeclinic.org;
sricdon@earthlink.net;
stephen@youtzvaldez.com;
shane@youtzvaldez.com;
james@youtzvaldez.com;
bwdixon953@msn.com;
tisdell@westernlaw.org;
eriksg@westernlaw.org;
Singer@westernlaw.org;
mike@sanjuancitizens.org;
caroljdavis.2004@gmail.com;
chooshgai.bitsi@gmail.com;
cfreccleanenergy@yahoo.com;
Debra@doll-law.com;
Katie.coleman@tklaw.com;
Tk.eservice@tklaw.com;
jpark@cabq.gov;
lb@tahoeconomics.com;
sismail@cabq.gov;
Gchappelle.law@gmail.com;
steven.neville@nmlegis.gov;
bill@williamsharer.com;
jamesstrickler@msn.com;
Anthony.Allison@nmlegis.gov;
roddmontoya@gmail.com;
paul@paulbandy.org;
patrick@marrslegal.com;
rvirtue@virtuelaw.com;
Csnajjar@virtuelaw.com;
Philo.Shelton@lacnm.us;
Robert.Cummins@lacnm.us;
Kevin.Powers@lacnm.us;

Steven Gross
Martin R. Hopper
Gideon Elliot
Sydnee Wright
Andrea Crane
Douglas Gegax
Cara Lynch
Keven Gedko
Michael C. Smith
Judith Amer
Bradford Borman
John Bogatko
Jack Sidler
Milo Chavez
Marc Tupler
Georgette Ramie
Ana Kippenbrock

gross@portersimon.com;
mhopper@msrpower.org;
gelliot@nmag.gov;
swright@nmag.gov;
ctcolumbia@aol.com;
dgegax@nmsu.edu;
lynch.cara.nm@gmail.com;
kgedko@nmag.gov;
Michaelc.smith@state.nm.us;
judith.amer@state.nm.us;
Bradford.Borman@state.nm.us;
John.Bogatko@state.nm.us;
Jack.Sidler@state.nm.us;
Milo.Chavez@state.nm.us;
Marc.Tupler@state.nm.us;
Georgette.Ramie@state.nm.us;
Ana.Kippenbrock@state.nm.us;

DATED this **June 29, 2022**.

NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

Ana C. Kippenbrock

Ana C. Kippenbrock, Law Clerk