

Your editorial, “What’s Green? What’s the Deal?” (February 24, 2019) would have proponents pushing for a decarbonization of our economy embrace nuclear power and carbon capture and sequestration (CCS). You say that “many experts” say these are necessary for a successful strategy. You will find many more experts working on providing clean, safe, reliable, and cost-effective power who reject both the building of new nuclear plants and the boondoggle of CCS. The cost of running existing nuclear power plants has been leading utilities to shutter these facilities at an ever-increasing pace and the extraordinary expense in building new nuclear has kept the industry from opening new plants, save for the one plant to come on line three years ago – 23 years after its sister plant, the last plant before it, opened. CCS is another example of another technology that promises “carbon-free” power but at what cost? The energy requirement for capturing the carbon dioxide is one third as much as the output of the power plant and there has been no viable solution given for safely storing the millions of tons of CO<sub>2</sub> envisioned for this scheme. Fugitive carbon dioxide could potentially asphyxiate any people living near where it’s to be stored.

Nuclear power has only ever been generated on a foundation of extravagant, wasteful price supports, including allowing industry to escape the costs of indemnifying itself against disasters. CCS cannot even get off the ground without massive public subsidy and gouging rate-payers.

So why not spend all that valuable money, not to mention engineering expertise, on energy systems that have public support, are safe, can be deployed infinitely more quickly, have no fuel costs, are continuing to come down in price, and are increasingly bankable? That’s where the smart money is going so let’s make public policy accord with the environmental, public health, and market realities.