



### ***Not under my basement!***

Proposals for carbon storage locations include underground depleted oil and gas fields, unmineable coal seams, and even in our oceans. Underground storage of the 1.9 billion tons of CO2 waste produced annually by U.S. coal plants is hugely problematic and likely impossible. Carbon dioxide is a colorless, odorless gas that can be fatal to humans exposed to high concentrations. In 1986, a CO2 leak killed nearly 1,800 people instantly in Lake Nyos, Cameroon. The leak was but a tiny fraction of the amount of CO2 we would need to store annually from coal plants.

### ***Inefficient and polluting***

According to estimates, using CCS on a typical plant would require a 40 percent energy increase. So, even if carbon emissions could be captured and stored, other air pollutants would actually increase due to the additional fuel being burned.

### ***Don't bank on it***

In 2006, the Environmental Protection Agency estimated that capturing 90 percent of CO2 emissions from IGCC plants would increase the total cost of electricity by 38 percent. The EPA's definition of "capture" does not include transportation of gas, storage, or the monitoring needed at storage sites for decades to come. Some estimates that include both capture and storage predict a doubling of the cost of electricity, which would make CCS prohibitively expensive.

### ***Who will be liable?***

Who pays if sequestered carbon leaks and causes fatalities or other damages? Even proponents of CCS have said the technology won't go ahead unless the federal government assumes full liability. If that happens, our tax dollars would be spent protecting utility companies from bearing both the risk and the cost of coal.

**Currently, CCS remains a "smoke and mirrors" show – keeping attention away from real solutions. With global warming accelerating, we need to make smart energy choices now. Keeping fossil fuels in the ground is key to stopping climate change.**

## **REAL SOLUTIONS FOR REDUCING CARBON EMISSIONS:**

- **We can dramatically reduce our energy needs through energy efficiency and conservation, ending the need for new coal plants altogether.**
- **It will cost less and provide far greater returns to our environment to replace dirty fossil fuels with clean, renewable sources of energy such as solar and wind.**
- **Rather than investing billions to maintain our dependence on an unsustainable and inherently dirty energy source, we should build a clean energy future immediately.**

Why waste billions of dollars to research an uncertain technology when safer, cleaner energy solutions already exist? Even if we could capture coal's dangerous emissions, why create such massive waste streams in the first place? All fossil fuels, including coal, are running out. The longer we keep relying on them, the worse off our environment, climate and society will be.

The fact is, coal will never be sustainable or clean – so don't let the coal industry con you with slick slogans and marketing. Every dollar spent on coal is a dollar better spent on smart energy solutions. Major Wall Street banks like Citi and Bank of America are determining our collective fate by continuing to fund dirty energy. It's time to hold Wall Street accountable for financing climate change, and it's up to us to take the power back. Together, we can build a clean energy future.

**COAL IS OVER.  
FUND THE FUTURE.**

**[www.DirtyMoney.org](http://www.DirtyMoney.org)**

<sup>3</sup> EPA Report, "Emissions of Greenhouse Gases in the United States 2005," November 2006. Report #: DOE/EIA-0573(2005)

<sup>4</sup> EPA Final Report, "Environmental Footprints and Costs of Coal-Based Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle and Pulverized Coal Technologies," July 2006, EPA-430/R-06/006, p. ES-6.

<sup>5</sup> Cost figures have been gleaned from the following sources, among others: Parsons, "Coal-Based Power Generation for California with CO2 Removed for Use in Enhanced Oil Recovery," 2002; Rich Ferguson, "Risky Diet 2005: Global Energy Resource Adequacy," Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies, June 2005, p. 54; Socolow, op. cit. note 5, 52; Jim Lacy, "Update on IGCC" in PacificCorp, IRP Public Input Meeting, November 10, 2004, p. 10.

**RAINFOREST ACTION NETWORK**

**221 Pine Street | 5th Floor | San Francisco, CA | 94104 | Tel (415) 398-4404 | Fax (415) 398-2732 | RAN.org**

**PRINTED ON 100% POST-CONSUMER RECYCLED PAPER**