

**COMMENTS Yukon Utility Board Public Meeting on LNG**

Greetham [greetham@northwestel.net]

**Sent:** March 29, 2014 2:50 PM**To:** Yukon Utilities Board

---

 Yukon Utility Board Public Meeting on LNG  
 Monday, March 31st, 7pm

This project is not in the public interest.

- It will entrench and expand the Yukon's reliance on fossil fuels, leaving us exposed to the escalating financial costs of finite fossil fuels as well as the environmental costs of extracting and burning them.
- Spending \$40 million of public funds on a fossil fuel facility will mean fewer financial resources are available to develop renewable energy and implement other solutions to the Yukon's challenges of an isolated grid and a cold climate
- LNG is not a suitable backup fuel because it is not stable in storage (boil off gas must be vented, flared or burned whether the energy is needed or not), whereas diesel fuel is stable in storage.
- The primary component of natural gas is methane, a potent greenhouse gas. The extraction, processing, liquefaction, transportation and combustion of liquefied natural gas leaks, releases and emits methane that worsens climate change - the economic and environmental costs of which will be high.
- The safety risk of having LNG offloading, storage, vaporization including flaring, and combustion infrastructure close to the dam, the airport, Riverdale, the south access to Downtown is unacceptable.

This project will have negative impacts and no benefit to the public

- It will have the effect of introducing a New Industry to Yukon with old technology instead of ensuring our investment in new technology for a sustainable energy future.
- The massive public investment will create a barrier to the development of renewable energy.
- The claims that we will experience cost savings from the difference between LNG and diesel fuel are very short sighted and simplistic. When LNG is exported from BC, the cost of this fuel will spike.

Ratepayers will be on the hook

with this stranded asset.

- This project will justify local gas extraction activity that would require fracking - a wasteful and polluting process that removes vast quantities of water from the ecosystem and returns it forever contaminated.

YUB should recommend to government that YEC's LNG project not proceed.

- YUB should recommend to government that YEC needs to be held accountable for financial commitments already made to this project in the absence of any regulatory approvals, and that YEC has manufactured urgency for this project that is not warranted and unproven.
- At the very least, the YUB should recommend to government that the project be deferred until we have a better understanding of where natural gas and LNG prices are going, and until reasonable alternatives to the project have been fairly and adequately considered and investigated.

There are far better alternatives to the LNG project that have not been fairly or adequately considered or investigated.

- Load management technologies that shift electrical demand away from peak times and maximize the use of available renewable energy on the grid will reduce our backup capacity requirements.
- Construct a wind project on Mount Sumanik to meet winter energy requirements.
- For emergency backup, the preferred alternative is to replace the two aging diesel generators with two

new efficient diesel generators in the same diesel plant, instead of constructing an entirely new facility in a new location with unknown infrastructure to accommodate a new fuel type.

- Diesel is more complementary to efficiency and conservation programs that would include load management to reduce the peak electricity demand thus reducing our requirement for backup capacity.

It is not prudent to construct this facility at this time.

- YEC has presented questionable economics from its rosy and short term forecasts for fuel pricing and overstated load forecasts that support the manufactured urgency that YEC has associated with this project.
- The selected location for this storage facility, on a range of 1-10, ten being the worst, is a 12. The catastrophic accident potential at close proximity to the Dam is ideal for wiping Whitehorse off the river and devastating high density neighbourhoods.

Who performed the site location risk assessment for this proposed development. I would like to see every detail of the full site selection approvals for this project before any steps are taken.

The economic risks are clear, but the risks and costs of this project to our climate, water, land, air and communities are not accounted for in this or any process reviewing this project. This is wrong and must stop. The YUB must incorporate the fact that harming the environment has economic costs associated with.

Yukon has a very small population to supply with energy. Yukon has an opportunity to be a leader in renewable energy at minimal cost.

Let's see a cost benefit for all of our energy options including our environment and all of the associated risks.

Regards

Sue Greetham, Resident

Marsh Lake

867 660-4106

March 29, 2014