

Subject: YEC 2017-2018 GRA Yukon Energy responses to John Maissan IRs
Date: 2017-10-03 15:53
From: John.Maissan@northwestel.net
To: yub@utilitiesboard.yk.ca

To Mr. Robert Laking, Chair YUB

Sir,

I respectfully request more complete answers from Yukon Energy on the following IRs:

JM-YEC-1-5 (e): This question has not been answered. Senior Yukon Energy officials were quoted in the radio and print media as saying that there was an adequate supply of power available from the grid to supply Victoria Gold. It is appropriate for Yukon Energy to explain to the YUB and all parties just what that means in terms of energy and capacity.

JM-YEC-1-6 (c): Yukon Energy's response indicates that they have misread the question, there was no reference in the question to recent year spilled hydro energy. Part (a) provides the LTA spilled hydro energy and part (b) provides the forecasted secondary sales which, based on a YUB order must be based on LTA hydro, and which by definition must be surplus hydro. So part (c) of the question is asking if the LTA surplus hydro is the sum of these two. Unless I am missing something it should be so but a suitable answer is not provided.

JM-YEC-1-10 (b) v and vi: The answer provided is not relevant to these two parts. Regardless of whether or not YEC intentionally provides spinning reserves when running hydro only, these two sub-questions can be answered. I submit that the answers are very relevant when discussing grid reliability and related matters.

JM-YEC-1-12 (b): A single sentence is an inadequate discussion. Surely Yukon Energy must have some more detailed information on how fast diesel generators and LNG generators can pick up load based on the governors (governor alternatives or options?); how much faster one is than the other, etc. This is all very relevant when selecting various fuel options for future thermal generation which the grid requires and Yukon Energy is now working on.

JM-YEC-1-21: The question appears to have been misread, the question asked for the impact with Victoria Gold load added and did not ask to have the Minto mine excluded. Please answer the question accordingly.

JM-YEC-1-24 (b): The answer provided did not address the question asked. We know that the approved depreciation rate is 72 years, the question was given that the original steel lasted substantially less than 72 years, how can Yukon Energy justify a 72 year depreciation on the replacement. This is very relevant to intergenerational fairness.

JM-YEC-1-31 (e): The question did not ask for the levelized costs of capacity but for the incremental cost of capacity for each of the two battery options. For example for lead-acid batteries what is the cost per MW to go up from 4 MW to some higher capacity; and similarly for the lithium-ion battery what is the cost per MW to go from 8 MW to a higher capacity?

Respectfully submitted,

John Maissan

Phone: 867-668-7774

Email: John.Maissan@northwestel.net