

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

**IN THE MATTER OF THE 2008 APPLICATION)
OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW)
MEXICO FOR APPROVAL OF ELECTRIC)
ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS AND)
PROGRAM COST TARIFF RIDER)
PURSUANT TO THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC)
UTILITY AND EFFICIENT USE OF ENERGY ACTS)**

Case No. 08-00204-UT

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF)
NEW MEXICO,)**

Applicant.)

Corrected **SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY**

OF

STEVEN M. BEAN

RECORDED 11:21:57

March 12, 2009

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS**
2 **ADDRESS.**

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

7

8 **Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?**

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

12

13 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL**
14 **TESTIMONY?**

15 **A. I will describe the agreements reached among PNM, Staff, CCAE and**
16 **CANM regarding aspects of PNM’s 2008 Plan. I will also provide the**
17 **information required by the Commission’s Energy Efficiency Rule as to**
18 **the 2008 Plan amendments agreed to by the parties. PNM Witness James**
19 **Mayhew will provide supplemental testimony regarding the revisions to**
20 **the Program Tariff Rider resulting from the amendments.**

21

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE PARTIES
2 REACHED THE AGREEMENTS TO THE AMENDMENTS OF
3 THE 2008 PLAN.

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

10
11 Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE PROGRAMS BEING AMENDED BY
12 THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS.

13 A. The parties agreed to amendments to the following programs:
14 i. The Comprehensive Energy Efficiency program;
15 ii. The School CFL Exchange program;
16 iii. The Refrigerator Replacement and CFL Installation program;
17 iv. The Energy Star Home program;
18 v. Energy Wise program; and
19 vi. Changes to some of the savings assumptions in the Refrigerator
20 Recycling and Energy ~~Saver~~ programs.

Wise

21

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS**
2 **TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAM.**

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

10

11 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS**
12 **TO THE COMMERCIAL COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY**
13 **EFFICIENCY PROGRAM.**

14 **A.** The parties agreed that this program would be amended as follows:
15 i. Additional funding not to exceed \$1,000,000 will be added to the
16 program in order to develop a component of the program targeting
17 the small business sector and offering special incentives to small
18 business customers;
19 ii. The launch date for this new part of the program will be no later
20 than November 1, 2009. PNM requires the additional time in order
21 to fully develop the program in collaboration with its third-party
22 contractor, KEMA Services, Inc. If this date is delayed, PNM will

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 notify all the parties stating the reasons for the delay and
2 requesting a variance;

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

8

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

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

21 i. Higher incentive levels intended to cover between 60% and 80% of
22 the incremental cost to install energy efficiency measures;

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

- 1 ii. Recruitment of contractors that will specialize in the small
2 business market;
- 3 iii. Incentive payments will be made to the contractors based on the
4 measures installed. The contractors will collect the balance of their
5 costs from the participants.

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

10 **A.** The savings and budget estimates for the Comprehensive Energy
11 Efficiency Program will increase compared to what PNM originally
12 proposed. The energy savings targets and program budget that PNM
13 proposed in its original Plan filed in September 2008 were based primarily
14 on the proposal provided by KEMA Services, Inc., the third-party
15 contractor PNM has chosen to help implement the program. The savings
16 targets developed by KEMA were based on the savings potential identified
17 in PNM's potential study. PNM and KEMA have reexamined the targets
18 and budget in light of the proposed addition of the small business
19 incentives and current economic conditions. Due to current economic
20 conditions, PNM expects that participation by medium and large
21 commercial customers will be somewhat less than originally predicted and
22 that this shortfall will be made up by participation of smaller businesses

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 responding to the more attractive small business incentives.
2 Consequently, taking both the agreed upon \$1,000,000 increase in the
3 budget and the reduced participation expectations for medium and large
4 commercial customers, the annual savings target for the first year
5 increases from 16.8 GWH to 18.5 GWH and the first year annual budget
6 increases from \$2,940,571 to \$3,432,032.

7
8 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS
9 TO THE SCHOOL CFL EXCHANGE.**

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

13
14 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS
15 TO THE SCHOOL CFL EXCHANGE.**

16 **A. The parties agreed that the program would be continued as it is currently
17 configured, at a funding level of not more than \$100,000 for distribution
18 of approximately 32,000 CFLs. Sierra Club volunteers will continue to
19 provide educational information regarding electric energy efficiency and
20 distribute the CFLs at schools and community events. At the end of the
21 coming program year, the program will be terminated without further
22 action by PNM, the parties or the Commission. A letter from the Sierra**

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 Club stating its readiness, willingness and ability to function as the entity
2 responsible for delivery of the program is attached as Exhibit SMB-1S.
3

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

6 **A.** CCAE had recommended that PNM provide a third tier of incentives for
7 homes that achieve a HERS rating of 50 or less in addition to the two
8 levels of incentives that PNM proposed for homes that meet a HERS
9 rating of 85 or 70. PNM had opposed this proposal for the 2008 Plan.
10

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

13 **A.** The parties agreed to add a third tier of incentives for this program that
14 would provide a \$1,000 incentive for each home that achieves a HERS
15 rating of 50 or less. The parties agreed that although the third tier
16 incentive is important to encourage super-efficient homes, there will be
17 very few homes built in the next year that meet the HERS 50 rating and
18 this change could be incorporated into the program without changing the
19 budget level, TRC calculations, participation estimates or other program
20 elements.
21

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS**
2 **TO THE LOW INCOME REFRIGERATOR REPLACEMENT AND**
3 **CFL INSTALLATION PROGRAM.**

4 **A.** PNM had projected a participation level of 1,000 for this program, with
5 500 refrigerators replaced and 10,000 CFLs installed. CANM questioned
6 PNM's participation estimates and budget due to increased funding for
7 weatherization expected to be received by MFA under the federal
8 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act ("Stimulus"), which CANM
9 estimated might double or triple the number of homes weatherized by
10 MFA in PNM's service territory. PNM indicated that it did not intend the
11 projected participation level and budget amount for the program to
12 constitute caps, but rather that PNM intended to provide funding under the
13 program for all homes weatherized in PNM's service territory, with the
14 expectation that if the expenses of the program exceed the approved
15 budget due to an increase in participation level, the cost overruns would be
16 considered deferred costs recoverable under NMAC 17.7.7.12.D(6). Staff
17 expressed reservations with this approach and with PNM's proposed
18 carrying charge applied to over or under collected program costs.

19
20 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS**
21 **TO THE LOW INCOME REFRIGERATOR REPLACEMENT AND**
22 **CFL INSTALLATION PROGRAM.**

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 **A.** MFA advised the parties that its total funding level for performing
2 weatherization services is expected to increase by at least 100% due to
3 disbursement of funds from the Stimulus. MFA anticipates that the
4 number of homes it will weatherize with the increased funding will also
5 increase by at least 100%. The parties agreed that PNM will fund
6 replacement of all refrigerators and CFLs in weatherized homes in PNM's
7 service territory under this program; accordingly, the parties agreed to
8 initially increase both the budget and estimated participation level in the
9 program by 100 percent. If MFA's weatherization of homes in PNM's
10 service territory exceeds the increased participation level, cost overruns
11 will be recoverable as provided in NMAC 17.7.7.12.D(6). The parties
12 agreed that if the program budget exceeds the amended level by more than
13 25%, PNM will file a request for program budget modification pursuant to
14 NMAC 17.7.2.14.C.

15 In conjunction with the agreed amendments to this program, the
16 parties also agreed that PNM will apply a carrying charge to under and
17 over recoveries of 2008 Plan costs equal to PNM's weighted average cost
18 of capital approved in its last rate case or fuel clause case, which is
19 11.66% and is discussed further in the testimony of James Mayhew.

20
21 **Q.** **PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS**
22 **TO THE ENERGY WISE PROGRAM.**

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 A. PNM proposed a new low income program designed to distribute CFLs
2 and low flow showerheads to a targeted 7,500 participants. The program
3 TRC was 4.51. CANM questioned the projected participation levels and
4 savings for Energy Wise and recommended that, if it is implemented, the
5 participation and budget levels should be reduced to 25% of the levels
6 proposed in the 2008 Plan. CCAE and Staff supported the program as
7 proposed by PNM.

8
9 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS**
10 **TO THE ENERGY WISE PROGRAM**

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

16
17 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS**
18 **TO THE REFRIGERATOR RECYCLING PROGRAM.**

19 A. The target participation level that PNM projected for the Refrigerator
20 Recycling program was 12,000 participants. This would be a 20%
21 increase over the current target and was reasonable at the time of PNM's
22 filing. However, PNM has seen a decrease in participation in similar

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 programs at other utilities due to economic conditions and no longer
2 believes that 12,000 participants is an accurate estimate. The parties
3 agreed to lower the participation target to 10,000.

4
5 **Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED REVISED PARTICIPATION TARGETS,
6 TRC RATIOS, ENERGY SAVINGS ESTIMATES AND PROGRAM
7 COSTS TO REFLECT THE AMENDMENTS TO THE
8 PROGRAMS AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES?**

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

Program	TRC
Refrigerator Recycling	3.36
Residential Lighting	3.63
ENERGY STAR Homes	1.68
LI Refrigerator and CFL	2.19
LI Energy Wise	3.76
Commercial Comprehensive	2.08
Res. Load Management	1.26
Comm. Load Management	1.32
Total	1.70

12

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1

Program	Number of Customers	Unit Target
Refrigerator Recycling	10,000	10,000
Residential Lighting	150,000	900,000
ENERGY STAR Homes	400	400
LI Refrigerator and CFL	1,000 2,000	21,000
LI Energy Wise	7,500	7,500
Commercial Comprehensive	400	400
Res. Load Management	15,625	18.75 MW
Comm. Load Management	263	26.25 MW

2

Program	Annual kW Saved	Annual kWh Saved
Refrigerator Recycling	812	6,169,495
Residential Lighting	1,460	29,506,254
ENERGY STAR Homes	244	415,240
LI Refrigerator and CFL	201	2,126,000
LI Energy Wise	142	2,160,000
Commercial Comprehensive	3,142	18,480,000
Emerging Technology	66	80,750
Res. Load Management	18,750	NA
Comm. Load Management	26,250	NA
Total	51,067	58,937,740

3

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1

Program	Original Budget	Amended Budget
Refrigerator Recycling	\$ 1,847,587	\$ 1,530,612
Residential Lighting	\$ 1,571,864	\$ 1,559,107
ENERGY STAR Homes	\$ 520,192	\$ 516,551
LI Refrigerator and CFL	\$ 482,972	\$ 956,906
LI Energy Wise	\$ 594,916	\$ 592,109
Commercial Comprehensive	\$ 2,940,571	\$ 3,432,032
Market Transformation	\$ 621,006	\$ 620,745
Res. Load Management	\$ 2,006,773	\$ 2,001,813
Comm. Load Management	\$ 2,799,067	\$ 2,790,800
Total	\$ 13,384,948	\$ 14,000,676

2
3
4
5
6

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

Total Incentives	\$ 5,955,874
Internal Admin.	\$ 1,050,752
Third-Party Delivery	\$ 5,910,133
Promotion	\$ 550,000
M&V	\$ 533,917
Total Cost	\$ 14,000,676

7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

- Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE PARTIES' INITIAL POSITIONS AS TO THE RECOGNITION OF SAVINGS UNDER THE PROPOSED MARKET TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM FOR PURPOSES OF CALCULATING AND RECOVERING INCENTIVES AND DISINCENTIVES.**
- A. PNM proposed that savings attributable to participation in the residential and commercial indirect cooling programs, which PNM proposed to be included as an emerging technology measure under the Market Transformation Program, should be included as annual savings under the**

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 2008 Plan. Staff recommended that, before any savings attributed to the
2 Market Transformation program are recognized, PNM clearly identify and
3 define the nature of the savings and the activities leading to the savings
4 and that any savings attributed to the Market Transformation program be
5 subject to independent measurement and verification. Staff also expressed
6 concerns about how long an immature or underperforming measure should
7 be allowed to remain under the Market Transformation Program.

8
9 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENTS OF THE PARTIES AS**
10 **TO THE MARKET TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM.**

11 **A.** The parties agreed that PNM will offer indirect cooling incentives as an
12 emerging technology measure under the Market Transformation Program
13 until PNM's next Program Plan filing after the program has been in effect
14 for ^{at} least one full program year. At that time, PNM will have to seek
15 further Commission approval to continue to offer incentives for indirect
16 cooling as an emerging technology and PNM will provide justification for
17 either continuing the measures, ending the incentives or moving the
18 measures into a stand-alone program. The parties also agreed that any
19 savings attributed to indirect cooling would be subject to M&V. PNM
20 may include savings from indirect cooling for purposes of calculating and
21 recovering disincentives and incentives.

22

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 **Q. ARE THE COSTS TO IMPLEMENT THE 2008 PLAN AS**
2 **AMENDED BY THE PARTIES' AGREEMENTS REASONABLE?**

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

10
11 **Q. IS THE VALUE OF THE ENERGY SAVINGS ASSOCIATED**
12 **WITH THE PROGRAMS GREATER THAN THE COST TO**
13 **IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAMS?**

14 **A. Yes. The value of the savings is determined by multiplying the avoided**
15 **cost of energy times the energy saved over the expected lifetime of each**
16 **measure. The net present value of the lifetime savings from the programs**
17 **proposed in the Plan is \$96,315,766 and the net present value of the costs,**
18 **including the costs borne by the participants, is \$56,687,027. The**
19 **difference between savings and costs is the net savings which is**
20 **\$39,628,739.**

21

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1 **Q. WHY DOES PNM BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT TO EXPAND**
2 **THE PROGRAM BUDGET AND INCREASE THE NUMBER OF**
3 **PROGRAMS ABOVE THE CURRENT LEVEL OF FUNDING AND**
4 **PROGRAM OFFERINGS?**

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

11
12 **Q. SHOULD THE 2008 PLAN AS AMENDED BY THE PARTIES'**
13 **AGREEMENTS BE APPROVED?**

14 **A.** Yes. The amended 2008 Plan meets the requirements of the Energy
15 Efficiency Act and Rule. The 2008 Plan also helps PNM meet its
16 statutorily mandated energy efficiency levels by 2014. In order to achieve
17 the level of savings mandated for 2014, PNM must begin now to invest
18 resources in programs that will require several years to reach their
19 cumulative high level of savings. The parties have agreed that the
20 amendments provide additional benefits to PNM customers and help
21 achieve higher energy savings. For these reasons the 2008 Plan as
22 amended by the agreement of the parties should be approved.

**SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF
STEVEN M. BEAN
NMPRC CASE NO. 08-00204-UT**

1

2 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

3 **A. Yes, it does.**

GCG# 500433



SIERRA CLUB
Southwest Region
142 Truman Street, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87108
Phone: (505) 243-7767
Fax: (505) 243-7771

March 1, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Michael Casaus
Regional Field Organizing Manager
Sierra Club
Albuquerque, NM



BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION)
OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW)
MEXICO FOR APPROVAL OF 2008)
ELECTRIC ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS)
AND PROGRAM COST TARIFF RIDERS)
PURSUANT TO THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC)
UTILITY AND EFFICIENT USE OF ENERGY ACTS) **Utility Case No. 08-00204-UT**

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF)
NEW MEXICO,)

Applicant.)

AFFIDAVIT OF STEVEN M. BEAN

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

Steven M. Bean, Manager of Energy Efficiency Programs for Public Service Company of New Mexico, upon being duly sworn according to law, under oath, deposes and states: I have read the foregoing Supplemental Testimony, including Exhibits and it is true and accurate based on my own personal knowledge and belief.

SIGNED, this 11 day of March 2009. 
STEVEN M. BEAN

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 11 day of March 2009.


**NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR
THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO**

My Commission Expires:

04.24.12

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF)
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO)
FOR APPROVAL OF 2008 ELECTRIC ENERGY)
EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS AND PROGRAM COST)
LOAD MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS AND)
TARIFF RIDERS PURSUANT TO THE NEW)
MEXICO PUBLIC UTILITY AND EFFICIENT USE)
OF ENERGY ACT)**

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF)
NEW MEXICO,)**

Applicant.)

Utility Case No. 08-00204-UT

2009 MAR 23 PM 2:57

COPIES

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of **Public Service Company of New Mexico's Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Steven M. Bean** was delivered by courier to the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission, mailed first class postage prepaid and sent electronically to the following individuals on March 23, 2009:

Benjamin Phillips, Esq.
PNM Resources, Inc.
Alvarado Square, MS-1200
Albuquerque, NM 87158-1200

Rebecca Dempsey, Esq.
Cuddy & McCarthy, LLP
PO Box 4160
Santa Fe, NM 87502-4160

Mark Fenton
PNM/Regulatory Policy
Alvarado Square, MS 0810
Albuquerque, NM 87158

Peter J. Gould, Esq.
PO Box 34127
Santa Fe, NM 87594-4127

Steven S. Michel, Esq.
Western Resource Advocates
2025 Senda de Andres
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Alletta Belin, Esq.
Steven Sugarman, Esq.
Belin & Sugarman
618 Paseo de Peralta
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Kira Jones
Community Action New Mexico
400 Central SE #101
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Margret Carde
NM Legal Aid
901 W. Alameda, Suite 20B
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Hand Deliveries:

Jeff Primm
NM Public Regulation Commission
224 East Palace Avenue – Marian Hall
Santa Fe, NM 87501

James Brack
NM Public Regulation Commission
224 East Palace Avenue – Marian Hall
Santa Fe, NM 87501

William Herrmann, Hearing Examiner
NM Public Regulation Commission
224 East Palace Avenue – Marian Hall
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dated this 23rd day of March 2009.

Dahl Harris, Staff Counsel
NM Public Regulation Commission
224 East Palace Avenue – Marian Hall
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Prasad Potturi
NM Public Regulation Commission
224 East Palace Avenue – Marian Hall
Santa Fe, NM 87501

By: Mark Fenton
Mark Fenton
Manager, Regulatory Projects
Public Service Company of New Mexico
Alvarado Square, MS-0810
Albuquerque, NM 87158
Telephone: (505) 241-2498
Mark.Fenton@pnmresources.com

#500504