

Submission re: Yukon Energy Corporation Application to build a LNG plan

Aileen McCorkell [afmccorkell@klondiker.com]

Sent: March 31, 2014 10:55 PM**To:** Yukon Utilities Board

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to express my concern and lack of support for the application by Yukon Energy Corporation (YEC) to replace two of the diesel generators with a new liquefied natural gas (LNG) facility. I attended most of the public presentation this evening (March 31) and agree with the speakers that I heard before I had to leave. Along with them, I do not think that this proposal is a prudent one in that it does not demonstrate care and thought for the future nor does it demonstrate shrewdness in financial terms.

- My major concern is the lack of vision in this proposal. Replacing fossil fuel with fossil fuel seems rather counterproductive. The amount of money involved could be used to better effect by investing in renewable energy. If this money is used to build a LNG plant, it will become justification to go further along this dead-end route. We have to begin preparing for a future in which we can no longer depend on fossil fuels. Presently, a lot of energy is wasted in the Yukon through lack of insulation, overheating, lights left on all the time and other reasons. It is my understanding that Energy Solutions has a map showing buildings that are leaking energy. Along with investing in renewable energy, I think we as a territory should take the use of energy more seriously and stop the wastage and make energy consumers more aware of wastage and its consequences. The almost 40 million dollars to build a natural gas facility would more prudently be spent on tightening efficiencies within the present system, making the system smarter, exploring a partnership with Skagway (as our peak energy times are different) and investing in renewable energy.
- Another concern is the problem of leakage issue all along the supply chain with LNG. If we look at the whole supply chain, LNG is equivalent to diesel in production of greenhouse gases. The leakage issue also results in a large amount of wastage of gas and, therefore, of money. Again, not very prudent.

- The proposed location of this plant is another concern. It continues to place the majority of our electrical production in one spot adjacent to one of the two entrances/exits to Whitehorse. I don't need to remind you that we live in a river valley and any major leaks will stay in the valley. I am not convinced that the proposed fence will be adequate protection. It is also very close to a major recreation area with baseball diamonds, a campground, the Millennium and other trails.
- Part of the rationale for the LNG plant is saving money. At this moment in time, it might be cheaper to burn LNG than diesel but, given supply and demand principles, this finite resource will rise in price when the easily extracted gas has been used up. This would not be the case with renewable energy. After the infrastructure costs have been paid for the cost of wind, solar and hydro should be almost negligible.
- The LNG is proposed as a backup fuel and, hopefully, not needed. Because of the nature of LNG storage, gas must be regularly vented, flared or burned, whether electricity is needed at the time or not. This can result in wasted energy or, as pointed out above, emissions in the Yukon River valley. As one of the speakers this evening pointed out, natural gas is not suitable for long term storage which is what we need for backup fuel.
- The proposal includes the use of specially designed oversized trucks to bring LNG to the proposed facility. Again, I point out the location of the proposed facility adjacent to one of the two entrances/exits to Whitehorse. In addition, I expect that this sort of truck would probably be harder on our highways and would be an additional cost to the taxpayers of the Yukon.

For the reasons stated above, I do not support this application. I missed the beginning of the meeting this evening and do not know whether the Yukon Utilities Board (YUB) will include fracking or out of the Yukon impacts in their assessment but, as responsible energy consumers, we should consider the impacts on other areas of

our energy use. We should also consider the possibility that, should the LNG plant be built, it would be used as a justification for the possible introduction of fracking in the Yukon at a later date.

I do not think that YEC has given enough consideration to other more sustainable energy options . I do not think that YEC has presented adequate evidence to convince me that this is a prudent, socially, environmentally and economically sustainable project. I hope that the YUB will agree with me and send this proposal back to YEC with the request that it look for more sustainable energy sources.

Yours sincerely,

Aileen McCorkell