

---

*The following myths and facts are provided in response to Yukon Energy Corporation's (YEC) statements to media and the public this week.*

*Each of the following **myths** are misinformation or a misrepresentation of facts, as presented by Yukon Energy. Champagne and Aishihik First Nations (CAFN) is providing **facts** below each myth that give a fuller picture of the details and context on the current status of work on the Aishihik license renewal.*

---

**MYTH** CAFN and YEC "could not reach agreement" on the Aishihik license proposal.

**FACT** **Yukon Energy made a decision BEFORE we could discuss bilaterally how we could get to an agreement.**

CAFN identified a preferred option and general support for an alternative that provides some water storage outside of the natural range during the multi-party discussions. We acknowledged that our preferred option could not be implemented immediately and expressed our belief that it is attainable over time.

We recognize that there are other alternatives that may help us find common ground. However, Yukon Energy closed that door by moving forward with their 'business as usual' option.

---

**MYTH** The cost to supplement Aishihik with diesel and LNG if it is run CAFN's way is \$10 to 11 Million.

**FACT** **Under CAFN's preferred options, Aishihik can actually generate more electricity than the average generation over the past five years. Even with Yukon Energy's preferred option, it expects to have to burn a lot of diesel and LNG to meet the energy demand.**  
As stated before, CAFN is supportive of more than one option, at least in the short term as new renewables can be developed.

---

**MYTH** YEC has invested millions in this process to date and has contributed more than \$600,000 to CAFN over the last 2.5 years on this project.

**FACT** **Yukon Energy didn't "contribute" money to CAFN. This money was to pay for studies and community engagement.**

Yukon Energy paid for some studies, but not all of the work related to these studies. CAFN has also invested a large amount of its own resources to support co-management process. We have spent over \$450,000 in the past two and a half years for Aishihik contracts, studies and other expenses.

CAFN shared significant technical (e.g., biostatistician, river and ice hydrology expertise) and traditional expertise with Yukon Energy and these experts assisted Yukon Energy in their research as well.

---

**MYTH** CAFN wants pre-dam conditions and the cost to replace the Aishihik plant is \$100M. Returning the lake to natural levels would essentially eliminate the Aishihik facility as the primary storage of water to provide generation in the winter when demand is highest.

**FACT** **This is a gross exaggeration. No one has asked YEC to replace the generating facility. CAFN is not asking to "close down" Aishihik.**

In fact, with CAFN's preferred alternatives, Aishihik can generate more electricity than the average generation over the past five years. Some options that CAFN considers acceptable would result in a reduction of less than 3% in generating capacity. Yukon Energy would **absolutely not be losing** all generating capacity.

This is about more than the bottom line. This is about working together in good faith to find solutions.

---

**MYTH** YEC and CAFN agreed on downstream adaptive management and eliminating aesthetic flows at Otter Falls.

**FACT** **No "agreement" was reached because YEC ended the process. Yukon Energy has picked areas of common interest and called**

**them an agreement. THAT IS NOT AN AGREEMENT and CAFN is firm on that matter.**

There were opinions expressed at a technical options evaluation workshop, along with the opinions of other Aishihik Advisory Committee members like Yukon Conservation Society and the Chamber of Commerce. In CAFN's view, an agreement would be comprehensive.

---

**MYTH** We must take the interests of all our ratepayers and Yukoners into consideration in making this decision. YEC has to continue with running a cost-effective business and consider the cost of power.

**FACT** **CAFN Citizens also pay for our electricity and we are Yukoners too. Like all Yukoners, Champagne and Aishihik First Nations want responsible and clean energy. We want to be part of the solution when it comes to Aishihik and when it comes to creating a long-term vision for developing and managing renewable energy in the Yukon.**

In spite of known energy forecasts and growing demand, Yukon Energy has failed to address the energy shortfall we are going to experience in the near future because they have not developed any new environmentally, socially and economically responsible energy projects.

All Yukoners and the environment are now paying for this!

---

**MYTH** Yukon Energy has said there is no time for them to have further meaningful discussion with CAFN because their water license expires at the end of 2019.

**FACT** **This is a misleading claim because Yukon Energy knows they can apply for an extension to their current license. For example, during the last Aishihik license renewal, Yukon Energy applied for and was granted a short license extension. Yukon Electrical (YECL, ATCO) applied for multiple extensions of**

**the Fish Lake hydro license to allow for full and complete planning, and was granted extensions for up to three years.**

There is flexibility for license extensions in order to accommodate needs for full and complete planning before long term licenses are issued.

---

**MYTH**

The Aishihik facility reduces our reliance on diesel and LNG, which decreases GHG emissions and fuel costs. If we returned the lake to levels before the dam was built, YEC would need to burn more than \$10 million/year in LNG and diesel in the short term, in order to make up for the lost energy. This would emit an additional 33 kilotons of GHGs annually relative to our current emissions. Note that currently, our entire operation only creates 5 kilotons of GHGs each year.

**FACT**

**In fact, the options we prefer can produce as much power or a little bit more power than Aishihik has generated in the last five years. Our long-term goal is to see the lake go back to more natural levels, but we have also said that alternatives may be acceptable that would allow greater power generation and still start to take the pressure off Aishihik and decrease the lower storage range at the lake.**

We have done our due diligence and believe some of the figures about total cost to Yukoners are inflated and misleading.

Most of the increased costs to Yukoners will come from the current situation we find ourselves in. In spite of known energy forecasts and growing demand, Yukon Energy has failed to address the energy shortfall the Yukon is going to experience in the near future because they have not developed any new clean energy projects. There is no easy or inexpensive solution to generating power, but to point the finger at CAFN and make our Government and people look like the bad guys is disrespectful. What we are looking for is reasonable and practical.

Aishihik has been pushed beyond its reasonable limits and it is time to give the lake a rest.

**MYTH** The science shows that the lake and the fish in the lake are healthy. There are no key drivers that we can point to in the scientific research that convince us we should significantly change the lake operation. There are no major environmental impacts.

**FACT** **Our observations are different. CAFN Citizens and others who use and appreciate Aishihik Lake can clearly see that things have changed. Photographic records support this. To state that the lake and fish are healthy is an exaggeration and takes a narrow view of “health”.**

The lake is not healthy and there are clearly visible environmental impacts. The fact that there are no water and no fish in places they used to be is real.

---

**MYTH** The parties (CAFN and YEC) views are too far apart to reach agreement.

**CAFN does not share this opinion and in fact we never had an opportunity to bilaterally discuss our views after we had the critical information from multi party discussions.**

We expected to continue to work on this together until we reached common ground and agreement. Yukon Energy’s statement that our views are too far apart indicates that they are simply not willing to work with us anymore.

---

**MYTH** It is a dilemma to reconcile western science with traditional knowledge.

**FACT** **Our First Nation’s traditional knowledge is integral to assessing the impacts of the Aishihik hydro facility. Incorporating traditional knowledge is now commonplace in project development and considered an important element in any good project proposal. Traditional Knowledge should be upheld as equal to scientific knowledge, particularly given it’s continuity’.**

**In our view, traditional knowledge is an essential element of good science. In this case, the people who know the lake best do not consider it healthy.**

Objective 2.6 of the Protocol Agreement is to 'Ensure Traditional Knowledge is fully integrated into the Project definition and field studies'. Principles co-developed by CAFN and YEC talk about respectful relationships, responsibility, and 'seek to integrate information and observations from both TK and science, recognizing these two streams can offer unique but complementary knowledge'

First Nations peoples' connection to and understanding of the land are part of a healthy environment and ecosystem.

---

**MYTH** CAFN and YEC have continued to communicate, though there hasn't been a formal response to Chief Smith's letter.

**FACT** **We are open to reconvening our work with Yukon Energy under the Aishihik Power Generation License Renewal Co-Management Protocol Agreement. We are still willing to work with YEC on completing this work, but it has to be under a respectful and mutually agreeable relationship based on the original principles laid out in the Protocol Agreement. That needs to include discussions about how we can adjust the time line so that we have time to complete our discussions.**