

Mary Amerongen

Box 31884, Whitehorse, YT Y1A 0A5

March 31, 2014

To the Yukon Utilities Board:

I write to oppose the construction of a new LNG facility. It does not make sense economically, but much worse, tying the Yukon further into using fossil fuels does not at all make sense for living beings here or anywhere!

In December 2007, James Hanson, then considered the leading climate scientist in the world, showed in a talk to the American Geophysical Union meeting in San Francisco that 350 parts per million of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was the maximum the Earth could have and still have this planet support life as humans have known it. (The historic level, for the last ten thousand years, was roughly 275 ppm.) By 2010 carbon in the atmosphere was at 390 parts per million; there are thousands of examples all over the world of disasters already happening because of the resulting global warming. (1)

Scientists have calculated that two degrees Celsius above normal is the maximum increase Earth can sustain and be recognizable by humans. But in 2010 the increase was already at 1.5 degrees and getting worse.

We can't turn the situation around in time to prevent major change, but we could much improve the worsening trends by reducing carbon emissions through reducing use of fossil fuels, and putting renewables in place now.

To be fully human in this time, to act with integrity and open eyes without blinders on, is to work to reduce carbon in the atmosphere, and to help people adapt to those climate changes which cannot at this point be prevented. Nothing is more important. That is what is most in the public interest which you are to assess for this project.

To add carbon to the atmosphere in the form of the potentially climate destabilizing methane, which is the primary component of LNG, to further entrench the Yukon in a carbon intensive technology by this major (for us) investment, can only be seen as madness.

Why has the YEC felt the deception necessary, of claiming that this project is urgent, when our winter diesel peaking needs have dropped in the last three years, and diesel makes up less than 1% of the grid electricity generation? There is time to put in alternative electricity sources, with support from using diesel temporarily exclusively for emergencies and backup, which would not lock us in to a new, unstable fossil fuel as this major new project would.

And why has the YEC felt necessary the further deception of saying the project is just for backup, when their projected economic savings would require the LNG generators to be used continuously for the projected economic life of the project of 40 years. But this continuous use will reduce the operating years, which should make the economic forecast of savings less rosy.

When LNG gets exported from BC, the cost of LNG will increase; the low cost being touted by proponents of the project will not continue.

Economics are to serve life, not vice versa, but even the economics don't support this project.

Did you know that dollar for dollar, money invested in renewable electrical energy provides the same number or more jobs than that invested in fossil fuel electrical energy? (2) And those dollars stay in the community. And don't cause pollution, as the fracked gas which will inevitably be used for this project will, massively.

The \$38 million would be far better used to develop Yukon's renewable energy resources to add energy capacity, and to put in place conservation strategies to reduce the peak demand for electricity. Use that money to help, not to make things worse.

We do not need to be the lemmings going over the cliff, taking many others with us. Turning around is possible. I invite you to help the Yukon do so.

Mary Amerongen

- (1) As explained in "*Eaarth*" by Bill McKibben, in Chapter 1, pages 11 to 15.
- (2) Kammen, D, K Kapadia, and M. Fripp, 2004 *Putting Renewables to Work: How Many Jobs Can the Clean Energy Industry Generate?*