#### 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

#### **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

OF

MICHAEL J. SETTLAGE

November 15, 2019

1	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
2	A.	My name is Michael J. Settlage. I am a Lead Pricing Analyst for Public Service
3		Company of New Mexico ("PNM"). My business address is 414 Silver Avenue
4		SW, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102.
5		
6	Q.	HAVE YOU FILED PRIOR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
7	А.	Yes. I filed direct testimony in support of PNM's Consolidated Application on
8		July 1, 2019.
9		
10	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
11	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to provide comments and background on PNM's
12		proposed Energy Transition Act cost recovery. This rebuttal testimony is
13		submitted in response to direct testimony filed by New Mexico Affordable
14		Reliability Energy Alliance ("NM AREA") Witness James R. Dauphinais on
15		October 18, 2019, to direct testimony filed by New Mexico Public Regulation
16		Commission Utility Division Staff ("Staff") Witness Anthony R. Sisneros on
17		October 18, 2019, and to direct testimony filed by Western Resource Advocates
18		("WRA") Witness Douglas J. Howe.
19		

1	Q.	DID YOU REVIEW THE DIRECT TESTIMOMY OF STAFF WITNESS
2		SISNEROS AND WRA WITNESS HOWE?
3	A.	Yes. On page 14 through page 16 of his direct testimony, Staff Witness Sisneros
4		discusses the Energy Transition Charge types. On pages 6 and 7, WRA Witness
5		Howe discusses Energy Transition Charges for Residential 1A customers.
6		
7	Q.	DOES STAFF RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF PNM'S PROPOSED
8		CHARGE TYPES?
9	A.	Yes. On Page 14, lines 1-15, Staff Witness Sisneros recommends that if the
10		Energy Transition Act is applicable, PNM's proposed charge types be approved.
11		
12	Q.	BOTH STAFF WITNESS SISNEROS AND WRA WITNESS HOWE
13		DISCUSS PNM'S PROPOSED CHARGE TYPE FOR RESIDENTIAL 1A
14		CUSTOMERS. WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF A BLOCK
15		CHARGE COMPARED TO A NON-BLOCK CHARGE?
16	А.	Residential 1A customers do not typically have demand metering, thus a demand
17		based charge is not feasible. Some Residential 1A customers have distributed
18		generation and have zero or negative consumption some months and would
19		bypass consumption based charges in those months. PNM's proposed block
20		customer charge balances simplicity and customer understanding with non by-
21		passability and Energy Transition Charge recovery that increases with high
22		monthly usage.

23

1	Q.	STAFF WITNESS SISNEROS SUPPORTS PNM'S PROPOSED
2		CUSTOMER BLOCK CHARGE. WRA WITNESS HOWE
3		RECOMMENDS A SINGLE PER CUSTOMER CHARGE FOR
4		RESIDENTIAL 1A CUSTOMERS. PLEASE COMPARE PNM'S
5		PROPOSAL TO A SINGLE CUSTOMER CHARGE.
6	A.	While simpler, a single non-block customer-based charge where every customer
7		would pay the same charge would not reflect any differences in usage within the
8		customer class. A single non-block charge would be higher than the proposed
9		first block charge and would result in higher cost for low usage customers.
10		
11	Q.	WRA WITNESS HOWE STATES THAT THE PROPOSED BLOCK
12		CHARGE IS A NEW TARIFF METHODOLOGY FOR PNM. HOW DOES
13		PNM'S BLOCK CHARGE COMPARE TO THE RESIDENTIAL 1A
14		TARIFF METHODOLOGY?
15	A.	PNM's Residential 1A customers have been served by a three-block system since
16		Case No. 07-00077-UT became effective in 2008. The 450 kWh size blocks have
17		been used since Case No. 10-00086-UT. PNM's proposed block charge uses the
18		existing kWh block sizes, and with one step, is simpler than the Residential 1A
19		rate structure that has two steps. PNM's proposed block charge follows the
20		existing block structure to which Residential 1A customers are accustomed.
21		
22	Q.	STAFF NOTES CONCERNS ABOUT THE AVAILIABILTY OF
23		EXISTING COMMISSION AND STAFF RESOURCES TO REVIEW

3

1		TRUE-UPS IN STAFF WITNESS SISNEROS TESTIMOMY ON PAGE 19.
2		WHAT DOES PNM PROPOSE TO ADDRESS THESE CONCERNS?
3	А.	Once the true-up process is established, the Energy Transition Charge true-up
4		process will be similar to other periodic adjustments, such as the fuel clause.
5		These reviews are formulaic in nature to ensure accurate mathematical
6		calculations. To assist these reviews, PNM will provide the functional electronic
7		work papers. Providing functional electronic workpapers allows Staff to easily
8		check the formulas and calculations that support the revisions to the customer
9		charges.
10		
11	Q.	DID YOU REVIEW THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF NM AREA
12		WITNESS DAUPHINAIS WHO COMMENTS ON PNM'S PRPOSED
13		RIDER TO RECOVER ENERGY TRANSITION ACT COSTS?
14	А.	Yes. In his direct testimony on page 31 line 17 through page 32 line 2, he
15		expresses a concern that PNM's proposal does not provide detail about how it will
16		develop its forecast billing determinants.
17		
18	Q.	HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO NM AREA WITNESS DAUPHINAIS'
19		CONCERN ABOUT PNM'S ENERGY TRANSITION CHARGE
20		PROPOSAL?
21	A.	As described in my direct testimony on pages 16 through 25, PNM's proposed
22		Energy Transition Charge recovery process uses the most recent approved
23		production allocation methodology approved by the Commission to allocate the

4

1		periodic revenue requirement for the charges, in accordance with Section 62-18-
2		6(A) of the Energy Transition Act. Each time PNM updates the customer
3		charges, PNM will use its most current forecast of customer class and rate
4		schedule energy and customer counts. These are the same forecasts that PNM
5		uses for other annual processes such as the Renewable Energy Rider 36 filing.
6		The Energy Transition Charge is subject to adjustment every six months, which
7		will account for over- or under-collections that result from differences between
8		forecasted and actual usage over time. The use of the most current data in the
9		adjustment process mitigates swings in charges and accommodates shifts in cost
10		allocations between customer classes.
11		
12	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

- 13 A. Yes, it does.
- 14

GCG#526359

#### **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

#### **AFFIDAVIT**

STATE OF NEW MEXICO	)
	) ss
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO	)

MICHAEL J. SETTLAGE, Lead Pricing Analyst with Public Service Company of New Mexico, upon being duly sworn according to law, under oath, deposes and states: I have read the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony of Michael J. Settlage and it is true and correct based on my personal knowledge and belief. SIGNED this <u>|</u> <u>|</u> day of November, 2019.

Mal

MICHAEL J. SETTLAGE

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 14th day of November, 2019.

Dona

NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

My Commission Expires:

1.21.2020