

James T. Rodier, Esq.
Attorney-at-Law
1465 Woodbury Ave., No. 303
Portsmouth, NH 03801-5918

603-559-9987
jrodier@mbtu-co2.com

June 20, 2012

Debra A. Howland
Executive Director and Secretary
State of New Hampshire
Public Utilities Commission
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301-2429



DE 11-216
Public Service Company of New Hampshire
Redesigned Alternative Default Energy Service Rate

Docket No. DE 11-216

Request for Opportunity to File Post-Hearing Brief Pursuant to Puc 203.32

Dear Ms. Howland:

On behalf of Interveners Freedom Logistics, LLC d/b/a Freedom Energy Logistics ("FEL") and PNE Energy Supply LLC d/b/a Power New England ("PNE"), I am writing pursuant to Rule Puc 203.32 to request an opportunity to file a post-hearing brief that would assist the Commission in its determination of the issues presented.

1. Rule Puc 203.32(a) provides as follows:

Upon the request of a party or on its own motion, the commission shall allow parties to submit briefs at any point in an adjudicative proceeding if the commission determines that such briefing would assist the commission in its determination of the issues presented.

2. In its Petition for Intervention in this proceeding, PNE alleged as follows:

NE is a licensed competitive supplier in New Hampshire and is currently the only competitive supplier serving a substantial number of small commercial and residential customers in New Hampshire. The extension of redesigned Rate ADE will wreak havoc and confusion on the nascent market for competitive services for small commercial and residential customers.

3. On May 4, 2012, FEL filed a Motion to Dismiss in this proceeding raising five (5) issues of law and, accordingly, contending that PSNH's revised Rate ADE was unlawful. The

DISTRICT

Commission denied the Motion to Dismiss on June 8, 2012, but did not rule on any of the issues of law raised in the Motion.

5. However, in its Order Denying Motion to Dismiss (Order No. 25, 372), the Commission did state that:

[m]any factual issues will need to be developed in order for the Commission to determine, pursuant to RSA 369-B:3, IV(b)(1)(A), RSA Chapter 374-F, and RSA 378:7, whether the proposed redesigned ADE is reasonable and serves the public interest.

6. Allowing PNE and FEL to file a Post-Hearing Brief in this proceeding would assist the Commission in its determination of the legal and many factual issues presented. Counsel for PNE and FEL intends to rigorously cross-examine PSNH witnesses and is the only party which has raised important legal issues in this proceeding. Counsel for PNE and FEL does not believe that he can adequately advocate for the interest of his clients without being able to review the transcripts after the close of the proceeding and accurately cite to the facts and opinions contained in the record.

7. PNE and FEL request the opportunity to file a Post-Hearing Brief in this proceeding no later than 7 days after transcripts become available.

I have enclosed 7 copies of this letter and I also certify that a copy of this letter has been served electronically on the persons on the Commission's service list in this docket in accordance with Puc 203.11.

Sincerely,

/s/ James T. Rodier