BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE 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,

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW
MEXICO,

Applicant.

Case No. 12-00317-UT

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
R. DWIGHT LAMBERSON

ON BEHALF OF

UTILITY DIVISION STAFF

January 23, 2012
Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is R. Dwight Lamberson. My business address is the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission (“NMPC” or “Commission”), 1120 Paseo De Peralta, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH THE NMPC?

A. I am the Director of the NMPC Utility Division.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.

A. I received a Master of Science degree in Regional and Resource Economics from New Mexico State University in 1982. I also received a Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental and Resource Economics from New Mexico State University. I have been employed by the Commission since January 2008.

My experience includes 28 years of gas and electric utility industry employment at the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission, Public Service Company of New Mexico (“PNM” or “Company”), and Plains Electric Generation and Transmission Cooperative, Inc. My experience spans the areas of financial forecasting, financial analysis, corporate strategy, wholesale power marketing, rate case filings, litigation, financial modeling, budgeting, capital budgeting and generation planning activities, as well as regulatory and accounting activities. My resume is attached as Staff Exhibit RDL-1.
Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMISSION?

A. Yes. Please see Appendix A for a list of cases in which I have provided testimony or affidavits.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. My testimony summarizes Staff’s recommendations regarding PNM’s Application for Approval of 2012 Electric Energy Efficiency and Load Management Program Plan and Revisions to Program Tariff Rider No. 16 (the “2012 Plan” or “Plan”). I will also introduce the other Staff witnesses presenting testimony. Specifically, my testimony addresses the Commission’s directive in Case No. 11-00123-UT for Commission Staff to develop the expertise to analyze PNM’s avoided costs for purposes of total resource cost (“TRC”) test evaluation; the policy supporting Staff’s recommendations; and Staff’s recommendation for the Commission to initiate a proceeding to establish a uniform methodology for calculating the benefit side of the TRC test.

Q. WHO ARE THE OTHER STAFF WITNESS SUBMITTING TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF STAFF’S RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PNM’S 2012 PLAN?

A. Mr. Bruno Carrara, Electrical Engineering Bureau Chief for the NMPRC’s Utility Division, presents Staff’s analysis, conclusions and recommendations regarding PNM’s avoided cost calculations; he also presents Staff’s analysis, conclusions and recommendations regarding PNM’s application of avoided cost benefits in the TRC test;
he presents an overall cost benefit analysis of PNM’s proposed 2012 Plan; and he
presents the methodology and calculations supporting Staff’s incentive proposal. Mr.
John Reynolds, Utility Economist, summarizes PNM’s 2012 Plan Application and
presents Staff’s analysis, conclusions and recommendations regarding PNM’s proposed
programs and tariff revisions. Mr. Jim Brack, Economist Bureau Chief for the NMPRC’s
Utility Division, presents Staff’s discount rate for TRC test purposes and Staff’s incentive
proposal.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE STAFF’S PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS
CASE.

A. Staff makes the following primary recommendations regarding PNM’s 2012 Plan
Application:

- For the Commission to reduce PNM’s deferred capacity value as presented by Mr.
  Carrara;

- For the Commission to reject PNM’s avoided cost calculations for purposes of
  incentives because it is fundamentally flawed as presented by Mr. Carrara;

- For the Commission to approve a modified 2012 Plan which meets a TRC test
  corrected by Staff and which incorporates Staff’s recommended program
  modifications and program terminations as specifically presented by Mr.
  Reynolds.

- For the Commission to reject PNM’s incentive proposal and implement a Staff
  incentive proposal presented by Mr. Brack, with supporting calculations
  presented by Mr. Carrara, for purposes of this case; and
For the Commission to direct a process to establish a uniform methodology for calculating the benefits associated with energy efficiency programs, an evaluation of the effectiveness of using only the TRC test and to incorporate other more appropriate tests into the process.

Q. WHAT DID THE COMMISSION DIRECT IN CASE NO. 11-00123-UT REGARDING STAFF VERIFICATION OF PNM’S AVOIDED COST CALCULATIONS?

A. Case No. 11-00123-UT was docketed by the Commission to consider revisions to PNM’s energy efficiency Program Cost Tariff Rate Riders No. 16 and PNM-Texas New Mexico Power Services Rate Rider No. 1 proposed by PNM Advice Notice No. 416 (PNM) and Advice Notice No. 44 (PNM-TNMP) to reconcile PNM’s energy efficiency rate riders, an annual requirement of the EUEA. In that proceeding, the Commission examined a number of issues including Measurement and Verification (M&V) of PNM’s avoided costs by the Commission’s statutory independent evaluator, ADM. Recommended Decision (RD), pp. 73-76. In this section of the RD, the Commission specifically examined whether ADM performed an independent analysis of PNM’s avoided cost calculations. In doing so, the Commission determined “that ADM was not required to review PNM’s avoided costs within the scope of its contract with PNM or the study of plans approved by the Evaluation Committee.” RD. P. 76. Further, ADM is quoted as having “…stated that it does not have the skills for reviewing utility avoided costs” (RD, pp. 74-75); and NMIEC’s argument is quoted that the record “continues to show
that both Staff and the independent evaluator have adopted, without question or
independent verification, the avoided cost figures provided by PNM.” RD. p. 76.

In this case, the Commission adopted a NMIEC recommendation that the “Commission
develop the expertise, either on its own Staff or through contract consultants, to perform
a truly independent analysis of PNM’s avoided cost calculations.”” RD, p. 75. In doing
so, the RD “recommends that the Commission take steps to develop the expertise, either
on its own Staff or through contract consultants, to enable the Commission to perform a
truly independent analysis of utility avoided cost calculations. Recommended Decision,
p. 76. Staff has interpreted this language from Case No. 11-00123-UT as Commission
instruction for Staff to develop the expertise to perform a “truly independent analysis of
utility avoided cost calculations”. Staff’s review of PNM’s Application in this case is
Staff’s first attempt to comply with the Commission’s order.

Q. SUMMARIZE THE STEPS STAFF HAS TAKEN TO COMPLY WITH THE
COMMISSION’S DIRECTIVE IN CASE NO. 11-00123-UT AND PRESENT
STAFF’S ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
REGARDING PNM’S AVOIDED CAPACITY COST CALCULATIONS.

A. Staff has taken a number of steps in this case to perform an independent analysis of
PNM’s avoided cost calculations building upon Staff’s review of the various avoided cost
processes employed in renewable energy cases. First, Staff has studied a variety of
methods to address avoided capacity and energy costs. Staff witness Carrara will testify
to the analysis he has completed of the avoided cost calculations presented by PNM in
this case and his conclusion that PNM’s deferred capacity value should be reduced in this
case for purposes of evaluating the cost effectiveness of PNM’s proposed, energy
efficiency programs and the overall benefits to customers of PNM’s proposed 2012 Plan.

It is clear from Mr. Carrara’s analysis that the methodology used by PNM in this
Application has not been rigorously tested and contains presumptions and assumptions
that may not accurately reflect likely proposed program benefits. Based on Staff’s review
and analysis, Staff does not believe that PNM’s avoided cost methodology represents an
adequate and reasonable foundation from which to calculate an incentive. Accordingly,
Staff proposes an alternative incentive approach for this case as well as reduced incentive
amount.

Q. HAS STAFF IDENTIFIED OTHER SPECIFIC CONCERNS WITH PNM’S
AVOIED COST CALCULATIONS?

A. As testified to by Mr. Carrara, Staff has identified a number of issues, including
misalignment of costs and benefits, out of period assignment of benefits, the inclusion of
future, unknown environmental costs, and the inclusion of avoided natural gas
consumption by program participants.

Q. WHAT IS STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE INCLUSION OF
AVOIED NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION BY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS?

A. Staff questions the appropriateness for natural gas benefits to be included in the TRC test
and believes it is inappropriate to include avoided natural gas consumption by program
participants in the calculation of an incentive and in the overall cost/benefit analysis of
PNM's proposed 2012 Plan. In the Final Order in Case No. 10-00280-UT, page 8, paragraph 15, the Commission determined that natural gas benefits should not be included in the calculation of Interim and Reduced Adders. Natural gas savings or benefits are not the objective of electric energy efficiency programs. Any benefits that reduce gas consumption are a benefit to program participants and should rightly be considered ancillary to the incentives awarded to the electric utility as a result of electric energy efficiency programs. Such benefits should not accrue to an electric program targeting electric program reductions. To the extent energy efficiency programs provide significant reductions in natural gas consumption, those benefits as well as the program costs should be borne or shared by both the electric and gas utilities. However, because this is an open issue before the Commission and because the Commission previously has considered programs with TRCs including natural gas derived benefits, Staff recommends PNM's programs that rely on avoided natural gas consumption for cost effectiveness be approved for one program year only and that second year approval require a cost sharing arrangement proposal with a gas utility or be cancelled if the TRC test does not pass without the inclusion of the natural gas benefits. Staff witness Reynolds will address this issue in detail.

Q. WHAT IS STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE INCLUSION OF CO₂ CREDITS IN PNM'S AVOIDED COST CALCULATIONS.

A. It is Staff's position that CO₂ credits should not be considered when estimating program benefits for any purpose in this Application. PNM assumes that some kind of CO₂ regulations will be in place by 2018. As a matter of policy, the inclusion of CO₂ benefits
or costs would seem appropriate in light of pending legislation or if there were actual
costs being incurred or expected to be incurred as a result of existing or pending CO₂
legislation, neither is the case. It is not reasonable to incorporate costs that are so
speculative when there is no pending activity. For this reason, it is not reasonable to
consider these costs or benefits associated with CO₂ in this analysis.

For these reasons, Staff has performed the analysis which includes the removal of gas
benefits and the CO₂ for purposes of calculating Staff’s incentive and overall cost benefit
analysis.

Q. WHY IS IT APPROPRIATE POLICY FOR THE COMMISSION TO APPROVE
A MODIFIED 2012 PLAN?

A. Staff, through a review both the 2012 Plan and of the methodology provided by PNM, is
not attempting to delay the implementation of the proposed energy efficiency programs.
Rather, it is Staff’s objective to provide to the Commission information in compliance
with the Commission’s directive to Staff in Case No. 11-00123-UT, so the Commission
may conduct an appropriate review of the programs and calculations provided by PNM in
this proceeding. To the extent Staff has detected issues, it will provide the revised
analysis and approach to determine which programs satisfy the criteria and should be
allowed to proceed.

Q. WHY IS IT APPROPRIATE POLICY FOR THE COMMISSION TO CONSIDER
AN OVERALL COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF PNM’S 2012 PLAN
APPLICATION IN ADDITION TO THE TRC TEST WHEN EVALUATING
PNM’S 2010 PLAN APPLICATION?
A. While the statute, NMSA 62.17.4.C, states that "cost-effective means that the energy efficiency or load management program meets the total resource cost test", it does not state nor does it require that this be the only test or criteria required for evaluating energy efficiency program effectiveness. As a policy decision it would be short sited to rely on a single test such as the TRC in order to evaluate the impacts of energy efficiency programs because no single test can capture all the information appropriate to a decision regarding programs costs and benefits. Staff believes that at least one alternative test, such as the utility cost test, should be performed from the perspective of the impact on all customers; any perspective representing participating customers only fails to address cost impacts borne by all ratepayers. Not all ratepayers are beneficiaries of all energy efficiency programs, it is imperative that any complete evaluation of energy efficiency programs include all program costs, the TRC falls short in that respect. Accordingly, Staff witness Carrara has performed an overall analysis of benefits of PNM’s proposed 2012 Plan based on my previous recommendations.

Q. EXPLAIN THE BASIS OF STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION FOR THE COMMISSION TO DIRECT A PROCESS TO IMPLEMENT A UNIFORM METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING THE BENEFIT SIDE OF THE TRC TEST.

A. Staff believes that each of the IOU’s have taken a different approach to evaluating program benefits. The result is that some programs have been implemented that were marginal, from a TRC calculation perspective, and had to be discontinued at a later date. Staff believes that programs should be evaluated using some form of risk analysis to
further assure positive program performance and reduce risk to ratepayers for unnecessary program expenditures. If all energy efficiency programs were evaluated using the same criteria, they would have a much greater chance of approval and success.

Q. DOES STAFF HAVE ANY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE SHORTFALLS LISTED ABOVE?

A. Yes, Staff believes that the issues mentioned above should be addressed further, and guidance provided in the development of the pending Commission rulemaking to resolve the issue and status of Rule 17.7.2 NMAC. As addressed by Staff Witness Reynolds, the status of Rule 17.7.2 NMAC is unclear, and both the 2007 and 2010 versions of Rule 17.7.2 NMAC are silent on some of the issues listed. Clarity in evaluating program review, program results and calculating incentives would benefit not only Commission Staff, but all stakeholders in this process. The complexity of the process could further be minimized by the development of appropriate rule revisions and perhaps enhance and speed up the program approval process.
Q. ARE THERE ANY OTHER OBSERVATIONS YOU CAN MAKE?

A: Yes. It is clear, given all the above that relying on the deferred capacity method as proposed by PNM in this case is not a valid foundation for establishing an incentive. That the methodology proposed by Staff provides a structure and approach to determine what Staff believes to be an adequate incentive amount for purposes of this case.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A: Yes.
### Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NMPRC Case No.</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-00131-UT</td>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Filing, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-00219-UT</td>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Filing, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-00047-UT</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>Energy Efficiency Program and Incentive Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-00218-UT</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Rulemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-00265-UT</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Filing, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-00263-UT</td>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Report, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-00018-UT</td>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>PNM Sky Blue Replacement Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-00200-UT</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Report, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-00037-UT</td>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>Revised 2010 Renewable Stipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-00266-UT</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>Incentives and Disincentives Associated with Energy Efficiency and Load Management Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-00373-UT</td>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>Revised 2011 Renewable Stipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-00388-UT</td>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>Review and Approval of Cielo Wind PPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-00315-UT</td>
<td>PHUC</td>
<td>Financing and Construction of a Sewage Discharge Line And Other Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-00260-UT</td>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Report, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-00259-UT</td>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>Renewable Portfolio Standard Report, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-00354-UT</td>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>General Rate Adjustment; Request for Expedited Interim Relief Authorizing Recovery of Capacity Related Costs Associated With the New Hobbs Generating Station, General Rate Adjustment; Prudence of Purchased Power Agreement General Rate Adjustment; Prudence of Purchased Power Agreement General Rate Adjustment; Water and Sewer Rates Renewable Portfolio Standard Report, 2008 Renewable Portfolio Standard Report, 2008 Voluntary Renewable Energy Program Service Agreement between SPS and Central Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. Oshara Village Certificate of Convenience and Necessity, and Tariffs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPE</td>
<td>El Paso Electric Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHUC</td>
<td>Picacho Hills Utility Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNM</td>
<td>Public Service Company of New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>Southwestern Public Service Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE PROFILE – Division Manager/Economist/Financial Manager

Expertise includes:
- Managing Technical Staff
- Testimony Preparation
- Renewable Energy Policy & Regulation
- Strategic & Financial Planning
- Budgeting & Forecasting
- Economic Analysis
- Capital Appropriations
- Determination of Regulatory Policy
- Regulatory Policy & Rulemaking
- Generation Planning & System Integration
- Policy Analysis & Negotiations
- Environmental Regulations
- Integrated Resource Planning
- Expert Witness

EXPERIENCE

NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION – Utility Division Director 2012 to present
Responsible for electric, gas, water, wastewater, and telecommunications regulation group, management of technical staff of 22 economists, engineers and accountants, and provide policy direction. Assist with regulatory support for the NMPRC Commissioners. Continue to act as policy witness, establish regulatory direction and support in a variety of cases, provide direction and support in renewable energy, energy efficiency, Integrated Resource Planning, rate cases, asset acquisitions and other utility issues. Support the Commission in the analysis of regulatory issues, policy direction and issue resolution with regard to regulated utilities.

NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION – Economist 2008 to 2012
Accounting Bureau, Utility Division
Primary Renewable Energy Policy Analyst for 4 years, providing regulatory support and testimony in a variety of renewable energy cases. Leads regulatory policy development, analysis, and litigation support as well as providing written testimony and testifying as a Staff policy witness in cases involving; renewable energy, Integrated Resource Planning, energy efficiency, electric rate cases, electric generation acquisition, and production cost analysis. Actively supports the accounting, economics and engineering divisions in regulatory compliance and rate filings that have included water, sewer, gas and electric utilities.

PNM RESOURCES, Senior Financial Analyst 1992 to 2007
Product Pricing and Evaluation, Financial Planning, Planning and Investor Relations
Provided key support for regulatory filings and rulemakings, regulatory issues analysis, economic analyses, capital appropriations analysis, generation planning and review. Partnered with other departments to insure appropriate and coordinated analysis and reporting of legal, tax, retemaking, regulatory, budget and misc. issues as needed. Supported inter and intra-departmental issues and analysis, including mergers and acquisitions, marketing, budget, policy changes, accounting issues and impacts, electric utility deregulation and capital appropriations process review.
- Negotiated with NMPC staff and intervener groups in the development of a reasonable approach to Carbon Pricing in a response to a NOPR (notice of proposed rulemaking) by the NMPC.
- Managed 3-year litigation at FERC (Federal Electric Regulatory Commission) to resolve significant billing issues with another electric utility regarding a purchase power agreement rate issue. This required FERC intervention in several cases, PNM filing a complaint at the FERC; and FERC litigation, hearings, and settlement discussions.
- Developed forecasts and maintained financial models, responsible for fuels forecasts, generation dispatch, capital evaluation models, revenue requirements models and many other systems. Ad hoc
tools were developed on as needed basis, drawing on strong skills using financial modeling software, spreadsheets, SAS, etc.

- Strategized and evaluated marketing options and approaches to enhance profitability of wholesale power marketing options in conjunction with various opportunities and new business initiatives.
- Ensured adequate revenue recovery. Assessed rate impacts and alternatives for various electric rate schedules including time of use rates, irrigation rates, interruptible rates and rebate programs.
- Analyzed, coordinated and assimilated effects of policy and regulatory change on PNM and the industry, including impacts on individual power providers, rate payers and shareholders.

PLAINS ELECTRIC GENERATION & TRANSMISSION COOPERATIVE 1985 to 1992

Supervisor of Forecasting and Modeling
Supported 13 - rural electric member cooperatives in financial forecasting and modeling activities. Conducted financial and load forecasting, IRP and DSM (Demand Side Management) analysis, and financial analysis.

- Lead for IRP and DSM impact and analysis internally, researching and examining conservation and renewable energy alternatives.
- Developed capital appropriations analysis, established, policies and analytical models, led budgeting process and market analysis.
- Played key role in survey development, rate and regulatory filing support.
- Worked with WAPA, REA, and NMPUC in examining impacts of IRP, in examining impacts and rate alternatives resulting from changes in energy consumption.
- Consulted and educated co-op members on priorities of load and financial forecasting activities.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO 1984 to 1985

Economist, Bureau of Business and Economic Research
Managed research regarding electric utility service areas in New Mexico and developed econometric modeling for NMPUC.

Education & Training
Master of Science, Agricultural Economics, January, 1983
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM
Major area of study: Regional and Resource Economics.

Bachelor of Science, Environmental and Resource Economics, May, 1981
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM

Technical Skills
Excel, Word, PowerPoint, Access; SAS; Financial modeling and budgeting; Capital budget analysis and review. Ad hoc model building skills which include knowledge of accounting, project valuation, regulatory process & policy, utility planning, budgeting, capital appropriations, and electric rate making.

In Addition
Board member, past president, Amigos de las Americas, 2004 – 2012.
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