

Comment on

Whitehorse Diesel-LNG Conversion Project 2013-0115

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for providing opportunity to go public with your meeting on March 31, 2014, making it possible for Yukoners to make their voice count on this significant project.

I am not an expert in energy solution, but I am a resident in the Yukon watching the political moves of our government in regards to oil and gas initiatives with growing concern. And the move from Diesel to LNG as a back-up power generation plant is a political move and has to be recognized as that.

First of all I would like to ask YUB to have a close and thorough look at the cost benefit analysis of this project. Yukon Energy is basically owned by the public, so 34 million dollars invested in a back-up system seems to be a lot of our money spent. The financial calculation as far as I can see is based on LNG prices as low as they are today. What happens if these prices will go up once the Asian market will be export accessible in the future? All indications point in this direction: pipelines built; demand met in Asia where LNG is traded higher already. Once LNG plants are built, Yukon Energy will depend on this finite commodity and LNG prices on the world market, no matter how high they are. Please take this economical aspect into consideration when assessing the project. Could there be a financially better plan in place for our energy concept in the Yukon? How much would it take to expand the lifespan of our Diesel Generators let's say for another five years and do proper research on alternatives in the meantime, if needed at all.

The environmental aspect of the project is of great concern to me. Yukon Energy is replacing fossil fuel with fossil fuel, and committing on continuing our fossil fuel dependency for another 30 years. This is great for the industry, however bad for the environment. Please have an un-biased and close look on scientific research and you will find that LNG considering the whole ecological footprint on extraction, conversion, transportation and storage has a LARGER impact on the environment than diesel if you sum things up. While diesel burns less clean, LNG actually is dirtier overall. I did hear about your message that you cannot consider the unconventional extraction method of hydraulic fracturing into your assessment, but I want to challenge that. In an analogy: When assessing for example the replacement of a heating source for your home, how can you NOT consider the origin of the fuel for your new heating system for a new home without evaluating where the fuel is coming from, and what impact it makes to extract and burn it. If you choose to install a woodstove, for example, you would need to consider if you have enough dead standing trees in the vicinity, or if you will be forced to make a clear cut in the long run, and what impact this will have on your immediate environment. Same with LNG power plants: where does LNG come from, how is it extracted, transported, what's the environmental impact. This

seems very obvious to me. Fracking is a very controversial method by the oil&gas industry which makes their business profitable, so close observation should be paid on who is giving expert advice here. Many people worldwide suffer from the effects hydraulic fracturing has on their air and drinking water quality, not to mention the enormous amount of water polluted and whole areas of wilderness used up and destroyed.

I want to keep my comment short and would like to state: LNG = Fracking = Fracking in the Yukon's shale formation = direct negative health and environmental effects on the flora and fauna, and on the population. In addition, fracking wells do leak, and they release methane into the atmosphere, and methane is an even more potent greenhouse gas driver than CO2. These are the reasons why more than 3,000 Yukoners (!) signed a petition to the Legislative Assembly last winter and requested a ban on hydraulic fracturing. YUB has an obligation to listen to those concerns from the public!

I want to close with eco-political conclusions. In times of global warming and climate change it is irresponsible to continue and invest in fossil fuel. In contrast, every measure should be taken to push for renewable energy solutions. Without being an expert, a view on what other countries are developing across the globe suggests that Yukon Energy's LNG plans, in combination with shale gas extraction plans for the Yukon by the industry, are a shame and have nothing to do with sustainability or living responsibly in perspective to our following generations. We can do better, and we should.

Thank you for opening up this conversation to the public by inviting Yukoners to submit their comments, to come out and speak, and to make their voice count. Now we count on you to make our voice heard. I am continuously watching how many smart people up here give you the same advice! Please follow the voice of the public and stop this proposal.

Yours sincerely

Tagish, March 28th, 2014

Peter Huber