



**Public Service
of New Hampshire**

A Northeast Utilities Company

DE 12-291

PSNH Energy Park
780 No. Commercial Street, Manchester, NH 03101

Public Service Company of New Hampshire
P.O. Box 330
Manchester, NH 03105-0330
(603) 634-2961
Fax (603) 634-2438

Matthew J. Fossum
Counsel

July 17, 2013

Debra A. Howland
Executive Director
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit St., Suite 10
Concord NH 03301

NHPUC JUL17'13 PM 3:47

Re: Docket No. DE 12-291
2013 Stranded Cost Recovery Charge
Clarification of Order No. 25,532

Dear Director Howland:

On June 27, 2013, the Commission issued Order No. 25,532 in the above-captioned docket. In the recitation of the position of Public Service Company of New Hampshire (“PSNH”) on the issues in the docket, the order states, in relevant part: “PSNH explained that in preparing the June 13, 2013 update, PSNH had mistakenly determined that only \$2.868 million of the \$8.422 million remaining in certain RRB subaccounts should be credited back to customers.” Order No. 25,532 (June 27, 2013) at 3. Respectfully, PSNH states that it did not “mistakenly” determine the amount of that credit, and submits this letter to clarify that statement.

In direct testimony, PSNH’s witness testified that:

In the June 13th proposal, we had prepared that calculation based on the Company’s view of which — what monies in those accounts were owed to customers. That was not the total amount of the monies in the accounts. And, there are some reasons related to the mechanics of the SCRC mechanism that were the reason for that.

We have proposed, in this most recent update, to flow back all of the monies that were in those accounts, and take up the issue that I was just talking about at our annual reconciliation hearing.

June 20, 2013 Transcript in Docket No. DE 12-291 (“Tr.”) at 13. In response to questioning from the Commission’s Staff, PSNH’s witnesses further clarified that:

Q. And, as you said, you agreed to include [the money from the RRB sub-accounts] in the calculation as being returned to customers now, and for further discussion during the reconciliation proceeding that would be filed around May 1st of next year to reconcile the 2013 costs, correct?

A. (Hall) Correct.

A. (Shelnitz) Yes.

Q. And, that's really because, among the people in the room, there was some difference of opinion about those two accounts?

A. (Hall) Correct.

A. (Shelnitz) Yes.

Q. But, for purposes of proceeding today, you've agreed to return the money -- or, include the money in the rate calculation, and we'll have more time to explore this issue during the reconciliation proceeding?

A. (Shelnitz) Yes.

Tr. at 23. Accordingly, PSNH's determination to credit certain amounts to customers was made in recognition of a difference of opinion about how the funds should be treated and the fact that the issue would be further explored during the upcoming reconciliation, rather than as a result of a mistake by PSNH. PSNH, therefore, seeks to clarify that it did not state that either the initial determination about the disposition of the money, or the revision to that determination, was a mistake as noted in the Order.

PSNH requests that the Commission take the actions it deems appropriate to note this correction to Order No. 25,532.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Very truly yours,



Matthew J. Fossum
Counsel

Cc: Service List (electronic only)