

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

603-559-9987  
[jrodier@mbtu-co2.com](mailto:jrodier@mbtu-co2.com)

May 9, 2013

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

**PSNH Alternative Default Energy Service Rate  
DE 11-216**

Dear Ms. Howland:

I am writing on behalf of PNE Energy Supply, LLC to briefly reply to PSNH's Objection to PNE's Motion for Rehearing.

PSNH's objections are easily refuted. PSNH contends that PNE's "Motion raises no new arguments or evidence, reargues issues the Commission has already considered and rejected, and should be denied." PNE's Motion for Rehearing contends that the Commission Order No. Order No. 25, 488 contains three errors of law involving statutory interpretation. The Commission has not explicitly ruled on PNE's contentions at any point during this lengthy proceeding.

PSNH also contends that PNE's legal argument regarding the plain meaning of 374-F:2, I-a is contradicted by PNE's testimony. This is not the case. PSNH's witness was responding to a generic question in the context of availability of Rate DE, not Rate ADE. PNE has not raised any issue with respect to the availability of Rate DE. Rather, PNE has contended that availability of Rate ADE would be unlawful because its very purpose is to lure customers back to PSNH, an unlawful abuse of default service, and has nothing to do with providing a safety net for customers as required by law.

Sincerely,  
**/s/ James T. Rodier**