

Richard Husband
10 Mallard Court
Litchfield, NH 03052

February 24, 2016

VIA E-MAIL (Executive.Director@puc.nh.gov and puc@puc.nh.gov)

Debra Howland Executive Director and Secretary
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
21 S. Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord New Hampshire 03301

**RE: DE16-241
Petition for Approval of Gas Infrastructure Contract with Algonquin
Gas Transmission, LLC**

Dear Ms. Howland:

I am a customer of Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy (“Eversource”), the petitioner in the above-referenced newly filed proceeding.

Please consider this a request for information pursuant to Puc 104 and Puc 201.07. Please also file this letter as a public comment letter.

Specifically, please consider this a request for any and all of the information redacted in the Exhibits identified as the “Confidential Attachments” in paragraph 1 of the petitioner’s “Motion for Protective Order and Confidential Treatment Regarding Proposed Contract Between Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy and Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC (the “Motion”), as well as the associated portions of the pre-filed testimony of James G. Daly, James M. Stephens and Christopher J. Goulding and Lois B. Jones discussing the same information.

The Motion claims that the purported Confidential Attachments contain “confidential prices and other terms, as well as information on the evaluation of the prices and terms. This information is competitively sensitive information that, if disclosed, could harm the competitive business position of the Eversource and its customers, as well as its contract counterparty, Algonquin.” Motion, ¶ 1.

However, the documents Bates numbered 360-366 and 373-377 within the purported Confidential Documents all contain information pertaining to the Northeast Energy Direct (“NED”) project. See “Attachment J. Stephens” at https://www.puc.nh.gov/Regulatory/Docketbk/2016/16-241/INITIAL%20FILING%20-%20PETITION/16-241_2016-02-18_PSNH_DBA_EVERSOURCE_ATT_DTESTIMONY_J_STEPHENS.PDF.

It is hard to comprehend, at least as to the information pertaining to the NED project, how the redacted information may be properly claimed to be confidential, competitively sensitive and otherwise exempt from disclosure by the petitioner: as Eversource has this information, and the NED project is competing with the project of Eversource's contract counterparty, Alonquin, the information has already been disclosed and therefore cannot be claimed to be confidential, "competitively sensitive," or otherwise involve a privacy interest of Eversource.

Moreover, it is impossible for the public to make any meaningful assessment of Eversource's petition when all of the underlying "support" for it is redacted. As the Commission knows, evidenced by its January 19, 2016 Order No. 25,865 entered in IR15-24, the proceeding *sub judice* involves determinations of great public interest, not only to the proceeding itself, but with respect to other proceedings of a like nature that may be filed.

Under the circumstances, a balancing of the harms here clearly weighs in favor of disclosure.

I look forward to the Commission's response.

Thank you for your time and courtesy.

Sincerely,

/s/Richard Husband
Richard Husband

cc: Office of the Consumer Advocate (ocalitigation@oca.nh.gov)
Attorney General Joseph Foster (attorneygeneral@doj.nh.gov)
Concerned Citizens (various e-mail addresses)