

From: Welch, Thomas L
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 1:52 PM
To: Woodcock, Patrick C
Subject: RE: transmission math

Thanks. I've said we are OK with those numbers, but need to ponder anything more on the TR.
TW

From: Woodcock, Patrick C
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 1:47 PM
To: Welch, Thomas L
Subject: RE: transmission math

Governor is good with 1BCF/2400MW.

Patrick C. Woodcock
Governor's Energy Office

From: Welch, Thomas L
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 1:35 PM
To: Woodcock, Patrick C
Subject: RE: transmission math

Yes. MA has described its overall approach (2400 or 3600 MW in TR, 1bcf new pike, i.e. 660 above AIM).
TW

From: Woodcock, Patrick C
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 1:28 PM
To: Welch, Thomas L
Subject: RE: transmission math

Interesting. We should go through this as we finalize it.
I'm getting delayed getting on the call – are you on it?

Patrick C. Woodcock
Governor's Energy Office

From: Welch, Thomas L
Sent: Tuesday, December 10, 2013 11:08 AM
To: Woodcock, Patrick C
Subject: transmission math

I've been doing some back of the envelop calculations with respect to transmission lines for zero carbon resources, and using some plausible assumptions, the cost to Maine would be very small (or even zero) once the LMP price suppression and carbon cost avoidance (using RGGI projections), plus socialized property tax revenues to the towns hosting the transmission, impacts

are taken into account. That reinforces my judgment that the package envisioned by MA is pretty good, since 1bcf additional gas should have a very good impact on gas basis differential for at least the intermediate term.

Tom Welch
Maine PUC
207-287-1361