

## Kim Pritchard

---

**From:** Richard Suitor [rsuitor@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 30, 2009 11:16 AM  
**To:** Kim Pritchard  
**Subject:** Re: FW: comments

Comments on 20 yr draft

Many of the following are nits. I bring them up, but leave their resolution to the authors.

Jargon - fail to converge - put reference on first occurrence

p5 Phase angle regulator "ran out of angle" I suppose the fact that we have a regulator implies that "out of angle" is not good, but an informative footnote would help. "unable to reduce PV-20 flow below 114 MW" Oh, dear. Footnote for implication?

Maybe a glossary of terms somewhere? (maybe there is already, haven't got that far yet) Put "reactive reinforcement" in.

Future of Highgate Converter: description of current contracts is reasonable. I note a lot of political talk about new HQ, and, in fact, talks occur. I have no objection to the position of this draft, but does it require a word or two about what might occur? Or why it isn't part of the scenario? Some sort of renewal is an event several politicians have said will happen. As I understand it, this scenario is a "what-if" scenario, as is the "Yankee-decommissioned" scenario: things that might well happen, but we don't know now. Maybe a few words about the nature and reasons for "what-if" scenarios, so that partisans don't get panicked or over-excited?

p6 bottom .95 pu I can guess, but I'm not familiar with that usage.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify the system manager. Please note that any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company. Finally, the recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. The company accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.