

The specific IRs that are the subject of Mr. Yee’s motion, together with the submissions of both YEC and Mr. Yee are set out in the tables that follow. The Board’s findings in respect of each challenged IR response are stated immediately following the tables.

IR Number	IR	YEC Response	Yee Motion and Submissions	YEC Response	Yee Reply to YEC
<p><b>NY-YEC-1-2(a) and (b)</b></p>	<p>(a) Please provide an updated and complete YIS Generation Inventory that includes the rentals (and spares) for 2023-24.</p> <p>Format should be the same as “Appendix A: Existing Resources Technical Attributes” on p. 71 of the 10-Year Renewable Electricity Plan from 2020.</p> <p>(b) Please provide the same table updated for 2024-25.</p>	<p>Please see NY-YEC-1-2 Attachment 1 prepared based on 2023/24 GRA assumptions, including new diesel replacements and diesel rentals.</p>	<p>The generation inventory was provided, but I need confirmation that the data is correct.</p> <p>Issue: The dependable capacities have increased for all YEC diesels. This seems to be an error or oversight as there was no mention of uprating all of the installed diesels in the GRA.</p> <p>Please provide a table with corrected dependable capacities or confirmation and documentation supporting that all YEC diesel has been uprated since 2021.</p> <p>Dawson is provided as an example. Surprised that DD2 and DD5 are uprated before being retired? If running as new, why retire?</p>	<p>The information was provided based on the IR question that requested the updated list of YIS generation inventory. The dependable capacities for the diesel units provided in the response are the latest information based on review by Operations.</p>	<p>Issue from Motion: It is notable that every installed diesel in YEC’s fleet has been uprated since the last GRA, some even beyond nameplate capacity. Without these convenient upratings, YEC does not meet N-1 criteria for either of the test years. In asking for an updated generation inventory, I had not expected to see that every diesel generator had been uprated, as this would typically require an overhaul for each. In my motion, as shown below, I asked YEC to correct the dependable capacity totals or to provide documentation supporting that every diesel has been uprated.</p> <p>YEC’s response to my motion acknowledged that all capacity has been uprated but provided no documentation. It is quite reasonable for me to ask about this, as the GRA does not indicate any cost to inspect or overhaul every (or any) diesel generator. That YEC uprated the entire diesel fleet to reach N-1 criteria – with no cost or mention of it in the GRA is definitely worthy of further questioning. If YEC has no documentation indicating why each of the 14 uprated generators was uprated, it’s hard to see how accepting the new capacities in the GRA would be reasonable or prudent.</p> <p>I repeat what I asked in my motion, that YEC provide documentation for each unit that was uprated. YEC should be quite proud of being able to restore old generators to nameplate capacity or more at no cost, if this is what has occurred. Curious that the good news of uprated capacities is only reflected in response to this IR and does not appear in any other documents.</p>

**Board Ruling**

1. In respect of IR NY-YEC-1-2(a) and (b), and having considered the submissions summarized in the table above, the Board finds as follows:

In a GRA the Board considers the prudence of expenditures and system reliability. YEC’s response to this IR brings into question the reliability of the diesel units under a sustained N-1 condition as no evidence has been provided regarding the changed capacity of all diesel generator units. As a result, the Board directs YEC to provide either documentation or reasons that justify the changing of the dependable capacities for the diesel generator units.

IR Number	IR	YEC Response	Yee Motion and Submissions	YEC Response	Yee Reply to YEC
<p><b>NY-YEC-1-04</b></p>	<p>Please provide the stacking order for thermal generation – two separate lists:                      a) for 2023-24                      b) for 2024-25).</p>	<p>The generation stacking order changes based on available information at the time of generation, including demand, available resources, system stability requirements, etc.</p> <p>The following shows the approximate stacking order of thermal units. The stacking order for the 2024/25 winter will be revisited closer to the winter of 2024/25 based on available resources, system stability and condition of thermal units. [the table is large and omitted from this document]</p> <p>The stacking order is subject to (a) total thermal operation at each site not exceeding air emissions permit under normal operation conditions and (b) where feasible, maintain each rental operational hours under 500 hrs/28 days allowance as per contract. It is also important to note that the thermal units are only run when it is required if the other resource options are not adequate to meet the demand on the system.</p>	<p>Stacking order table provided in response to this IR is incomplete. Please indicate relevant capacity limits for each in the Notes column.</p>	<p>The IR question did not request capacity limits for the stacking order. Information on capacity for diesel and LNG units is also provided separately in other IR responses, e.g., see response to NY-YEC-1-2.</p> <p>As indicated in the response, the stacking order will be continuously revisited by YEC based on the availability of resources, system stability and condition of thermal units. In addition to this, it is also important to note that the revenue requirements in the Application are set based on LTA thermal generation and that stacking order does not impact the LTA thermal volumes.</p> <p>Accordingly, YEC submits no further response is required to this IR.</p>	<p>Issue from Motion: Please include relevant capacity limits with the stacking order. It is integral to the validity of the stacking order, particularly with the rentals. How many Whitehorse rentals can be running before Faro rentals begin, and how many Faro rentals are running before Mayo begins, and how many Mayo, etc. YEC must maintain this information in order to have a valid stacking order, and is wasting everyone’s time in not providing it.</p>

**Board Ruling**

- In respect of IR NY-YEC-1-04, and having considered the submissions summarized in the table above, the Board finds that Mr. Yee’s request to put the relevant capacity limits with the stacking order will provide information useful to the Board. Therefore, the Board directs YEC to reproduce the stacking order with the relevant capacity limits for each of the units referenced.

IR Number	IR	YEC Response	Yee Motion and Submissions	YEC Response	Yee Reply to YEC
<p><b>NY-YEC-1-13</b></p>	<p>(c) What are the generating efficiencies of the installed diesels compared to the rentals? Please provide a comparison of fuel consumption at 9.55 MW using the installed/permanent generators vs fuel consumption of the rentals to produce the same output? Fuel usage per MWh would also be useful.</p> <p>(d) Please provide a comparison of NO2 and other pollutants at similar capacities – Installed vs rental units.</p>	<p>(c) Summary of Pre-Tier and Tier 2 Fuel Efficiency [table is omitted]</p> <p>(d) Summary of WRGS Generator Emission Factors (g/kwh) [table is omitted].</p>	<p>Tables were provided, but without any reference to data sources. Please provide the full reports that include this data, or at least links to the full reports. Without context the data is not meaningful.</p>	<p>YEC fully responded to the question as asked. The NY motion is requesting further information which was not requested in the original IR question. The information provided in the IR response is calculated from Yukon Energy’s submissions under the National Pollutant Release Inventory Program. The reports are publicly available.</p> <p>YEC noticed that there was an error in response to (c). Please see the following revised average fuel efficiency numbers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average Pre-Tier Engines (WD4-7) at 617 L/MWh</li> <li>• Average Tier 2 Engines (Rental Units) at 268 L/MWh</li> </ul>	<p>Issue from Motion: YEC had provided a table of data with no mention of where this data came from. Without context the data is not meaningful. In my motion I asked YEC for data sources, either to provide the full report(s) or at least links to the full reports.</p> <p>They have provided neither, only stating that “The information provided in the IR response is calculated from Yukon Energy’s submissions under the National Pollutant Release Inventory Program. The reports are publicly available.”</p> <p>YEC has not provided their calculations made in response to my original IR, nor have they provided the source reports. These calculations and the source reports need to be provided to make the data meaningful. YEC has these calculations and reports at hand, as they are supposedly the basis of their IR response. Withholding information that they have readily available and have used in an IR response is once again wasting everyone’s time.</p> <p>Additionally the table includes WD8 and WD9, which I doubt have been included in YEC’s submissions to the National Pollutant Release Inventory Program, since they do not yet exist. Please provide data sources and relevant calculations for these also. Again not difficult since YEC made these calculations to answer the IR. I simply ask that they show their work.</p>

**Board Order**

3. In respect of IR NY-YEC-1-13, and having considered the submissions summarized in the table above, the Board finds that YEC has responded to this IR. Mr. Yee’s motion is for follow-up information that was not included in the original IR. No further action is required from YEC.

IR Number	IR	YEC Response	Yee Motion and Submissions	YEC Response	Yee Reply to YEC
<p><b>NY-YEC-1-014 (a) and (b)</b></p>	<p>a) Please provide all plans, layouts, specifications, studies (noise, emissions, etc) and all other documentation relating to the modifications (2023 and 2024) to the FGS. This would also include plans, requirements and instructions given to contractors and subcontractors. Also please provide a list of contractors and subcontractors and RFPs.</p> <p>b) Please provide all correspondence between YEC and the Department of Environment concerning the 2023 and 2024 modifications to the FGS.</p>	<p>(a) YEC is installing two Tier 4 engines of 2.5MW each. The layout of the site is as follows [the layout is omitted].</p> <p>Contractors and subcontractors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Contractor (general construction, supervision, mechanical install, civil construction) – Wildstone Construction Group;</li> <li>• Major Equipment Supplier and Commissioning Agent – Finning;</li> <li>• Electrical Subcontractor – Westpark;</li> <li>• Tank and mechanical material supplier – Keller;</li> <li>• Formwork and reinforcing steel subcontractor – A&amp;T;</li> <li>• Concrete supplier – General Enterprises;</li> <li>• Concrete finishing subcontractor – JLB;</li> <li>• Containment subcontractor – Albarrie;</li> <li>• Fencing subcontractor – Olson Fencing.</li> </ul> <p>(b) The 2023 email thread between T. Ritchie (YEC) and Elizabeth Barker (Yukon Government) regarding the FGS is included as NY-YEC-1-14(b) Attachment 1. The 2023 email thread between T. Ritchie (YEC) and Emily Sessford (Yukon Government) is included as NY-YEC-1-14(b) Attachment 2.</p>	<p>(a) Issue1: The provided layout is too small, to be readable and when enlarged, too blurry. Please provide a higher resolution version of the layout. Also, please provide the 2023 and 2024 layouts, which are different. This one being too small, I am not sure which year it represents – or if both layouts are somehow shown. Issue2: Please provide model code and specifications of the 2.5 MW generators as requested. Issue3: Please provide sound and emissions / dispersion reports if available, otherwise indicate that none have been done. Issue4: I had also requested plans, requirements and instructions provided to contractors and subcontractors – and none have been provided.</p> <p>(b) Issue 1: Missing document: On pdf p.65, The email dated May 31, 2023 concerns an attachment 20230510-Inspection-report-es.pdf, however this document is not included. The document is also the subject of the email on pdf p. 67. Please include this document and any further correspondence. Issue 2: At the top of pdf p. 66, a “approved Complaint Management System for the FGS” is mentioned. Please provide any documentation and correspondence associated with the “approved Complaint Management System”. Issue 3: Construction has started, and pads for FD8 &amp; FD9 have been poured. Has YEC informed the Regulator, as required according to the emails provided? Please provide any documentation. Issue 4: In the email chain provided, YEC has not informed the Regulator of the 2024-25 20.6 MW configuration described in the GRA. Please provide documentation of YEC informing the Regulator of this configuration.</p>	<p>(a) The additional detailed information requested by NY goes far beyond what YEC can reasonably be expected to provide for the current GRA, and will not be of assistance to the YUB in its review of YEC’s 2023 and 2024 revenue requirements.</p> <p>(b) Issues 1 and 2: These are matters between YEC and a separate regulator (Environment Yukon). These questions may be directed to Environment Yukon, but they are not relevant to the current YUB revenue requirement review.</p> <p>Issue 3: Approval will be sought as required prior to regulated activity being commenced (i.e., before emissions are produced). YEC is installing cleaner and quieter units, and therefore does not anticipate any approval issues.</p> <p>Issue 4: The regulator has been informed as required regarding the 15.5 MW installation that is permitted. NY is confusing the air emission permit for normal operations with the total available capacity for emergency purposes. As reviewed with the Board in the 2021 GRA, permitting constrains normal operation but does not constrain YEC’s ability to have additional diesel generating capacity available for use if needed in emergency conditions. Please see response to NY-YEC-1-12(a) for additional details on this matter.</p>	<p>Issue from Motion: Thermal replacement in Faro is by far the most expensive capital project in the GRA, and yet in response to IRs, YEC has failed to provide such basics as site layouts and specifications of the generators. This GRA is the time to review YEC’s plans for this project and determine if the costs involved in this project are prudent. If YEC is unable to provide basic information of what they are doing with the 18.176 million, it is difficult to have any confidence that these costs are prudent.</p> <p>Again, YEC does have this information, and did provide a site layout in response to my IR but it had been reduced in size to the point of being illegible. In less than the time required to read these two sentences, YEC could have sent out the original document.</p> <p>And we can assume or at least hope that YEC knows more about the generators being installed than the information provided. I asked for full specifications and model numbers, and I got was “YEC is installing two Tier 4 engines of 2.5MW each.” If this is all they know, supporting the project at this time is not prudent. If they do know more, the information requested could have been provided in less than the time it has taken to read this paragraph.</p> <p>I also asked about correspondence between YEC and the Regulator. This is relevant because YEC has claimed that no YESAA assessment will be required, and to confirm this it is important to know what YEC has told the Regulator about the project. In what was supposedly full correspondence, YEC has failed to include reports and documents referenced in the provided emails. Again, simply sending requested information that is in YEC’s possession would take less time than reading this paragraph. If it is not relevant, as YEC claims, I will have wasted my time reading it and it will not be used in my argument. That would be more efficient than these exchanges and would not be wasting everyone’s time. Is YEC refusing to supply complete information helping to make a more efficient process?</p> <p>YEC should be directed to provide the information requested in the IR and asked again in the motion. I am only asking YEC to supply missing documents that already exist, and this should take very little time. Again, this is YEC’s largest capital project in this GRA, so some scrutiny is justified.</p>

**Board Ruling**

4. In respect of IR NY-YEC-1-014 (a) and (b), and having considered the submissions contained in the table above, the Board finds as follows:

Part (a): The Board finds that Mr. Yee’s request is reasonable, and the information requested may be of assistance to the Board. The Board therefore directs YEC to produce a higher resolution copy of the site layout as requested by Mr. Yee. Further, if YEC has the information on the specifications and model number of the generators to the FGS, it shall provide that response to Mr. Yee. If YEC does not have the specifications and model numbers, then it shall confirm that fact.

Part (b): The Board agrees with YEC that these are matters between YEC and a separate regulator. Unless Mr. Yee can show that the impugned information has a prudency effect on YEC’s revenue requirement for the 2023 and 2024 test years, no further action is required from YEC for this IR response.

IR Number	IR	YEC Response	Yee Motion and Submissions	YEC Response	Yee Reply to YEC
<b>NY-YEC-1-015 (b) and (e)</b>	<p>b) Please provide the sound modelling report for the modifications to the Faro facility. This report was referenced by YEC in the January of 2023 meeting in Faro. I requested it from YEC on February 7 and was informed by YEC that “The full report is not yet available. The results of the sound modelling were shared ahead of the full report so they could be presented at the January meeting in Faro.” I requested the full report again in June and August, and still nothing. Is the full report finally available?</p> <p>e) Please provide a comparison of the efficiencies of the proposed diesel replacement generators and the rentals at 5MW output. Fuel usage at 5MW, Fuel usage per MWh, and NO2 and other emissions compared.</p>	<p>(b) The referenced sound modelling is being developed and used on an iterative basis to support preliminary and final engineering design of potential sound mitigation devices. This design work is still in progress. As such, a final report has not yet been completed. In the meantime, a summary memo has been prepared to support the response to this information request and is attached as NY-YEC-1-15(b) Attachment 1.</p> <p>(e) Please see response to NY-YEC-1-13(f) and NY-YEC-1-13(d).</p>	<p>(b) The GRA has two different configurations for Faro, one for 2023-24 and a different one for 2024-25. The summary memo prepared in response to the IR does not address the 2024-25 configuration providing 20.6 MW dependable capacity, as described in the GRA – though it does address configurations that YEC has not proposed. At a minimum, the “summary memo” should address the two scenarios described in the GRA. Please provide an updated “summary memo” with relevant information.</p> <p>(e) NY-YEC-1-13 addresses Whitehorse. The Faro installed diesels are not addressed in the Whitehorse answers. Please answer the question with data relevant to Faro as requested and provide sources of data.</p>	<p>(b) The summary memo provides requested current information on scenarios approximating the 15.5 MW permitted capacity at Faro for normal diesel operations. The memo addresses change in noise emissions expected with different diesel unit configurations under permitted normal operations.</p> <p>Noise permitting assessments have not examined potential additional diesel operation under emergency conditions. Such potential emergency operation in winter 2024/25 up to 20.6 MW has therefore not been considered in the noise assessments. (See response to motion regarding NY-YEC-21-14(b) for review of differences between normal permitted versus emergency diesel generation.)</p> <p>e) Whitehorse and Faro units have the same configurations [i.e., FD7 and WD7, rentals at both locations are the same, and the proposed FD8/9 and WD8/9 are the same units]. Therefore, the information provided in responses to NY-YEC-1-13 fully address what was requested.</p>	<p>b) I find it concerning that YEC is refusing to consider sound and emissions for the proposed 2024 configuration of 20.1 MW, but accept their answer that they are not doing any analysis of the 2024 configuration. Reply to motion is sufficient.</p> <p>Issue from Motion: In e) I asked for comparisons of efficiencies between rentals and installed generators in Faro, and was referred to Whitehorse answers.</p> <p>In their answer to the motion, YEC claims that FD7 and WD7 have the same specifications. They do have different nameplate capacities, so this is not true, though I accept that they may be similar.</p> <p>For FD8 and FD9 YEC says that these are the same as WD8 and WD9 – the future diesel replacements in Whitehorse. This is meaningless, as YEC has refused to provide model numbers and specifications for these generators as requested in NY-YEC-14 a)</p>

**Board Ruling**

5. In respect of IR NY-YEC-1-015 (b) and (e), and having considered the submissions contained in the table above, the Board finds as follows:

Part (b): Given the comment provided by Mr. Yee, no further response from YEC is required.

Part (e): The direction for this response is addressed in the Board ruling for IR NY-YEC-1-14(a).