

ORIGINAL

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| N.P.U.C. Case No. | PE 10-261 |
| Exhibit No. | TransCanada #13 |
| Witness | Panel 6 |

DO NOT REMOVE FROM FILE

Public Service Company of New
Hampshire
Docket No. DE 10-261

Data Request TC-04

Dated: 12/16/2011

Q-TC-016

Page 1 of 1

Witness: Richard L. Levitan
Request from: TransCanada

Question:

With respect to Mr. Levitan's joint testimony dated October 26, 2011 on Page 21, lines 33 – 35, lines 40 – 44, and Page 22, lines 1 – 7,

- i) what is Mr. Levitan's understanding of the term "capacity price suppression benefit" ?
- ii) does Mr. Levitan believe that buyers should properly account for portfolio benefits of actions they take in markets?;
- iii) in the Newington CUO report, didn't Mr. Levitan specifically calculate the benefit of Newington's price suppression effect to all New Hampshire customers, the majority of whom are PSNH customers?

Response:

i) As stated in the referenced part of the testimony, the term "capacity price suppression benefit" was a misnomer. By this term, LAI meant the economic benefits that redound to customers resulting from Newington Station remaining in service.

ii) Just as sellers are entitled to consider portfolio benefits of their actions in the markets, buyers may account for the benefits resulting from their actions. Mark-to-market benefits would be one of those benefits.

iii) In the CUO report, the incremental capacity costs to New Hampshire customers avoided due to delayed retirement of Newington Station were calculated, without separating PSNH and other customers.