

Citizens' Initiatives in Germany
Against CO2 Injection, Fracking, Fossil and Atomic Energy
For Full Energy Supply by Renewables Incl. Storage and Smart Grids

Kein CO2-Endlager e.V. Schleswig-Holstein

Bürgerinitiative CO2ntra Endlager Neutrebbin/Märkisch-Oderland

Bürgerinitiative Kein CO2-Endlager Altmark

Bürgerinitiative für Ostrhauderfehn

CO2-Endlager Stoppen e.V. Beeskow

Bürgerinitiative Saubere Luft e.V. Duisburg

Bürgerinitiative für ein lebenswertes Korbach

**Bürgerinitiative für Lebensqualität und Umweltschutz - BLU -
(45721 Haltern am See)**

BI kein frack in wf (38162 Hemkenrode)

BI FrackingFreies Hamburg

Arbeitskreis Fracking Braunschweiger Land

Interessengemeinschaft Gegen Gasbohren Hamminkeln/Niederrhein

Bundesverband Bürgerinitiativen Umweltschutz e.V. (BBU)

Contact Address:

Dr. Christfried Lenz

Rittleben 8, D- 38486 Apenburg-Winterfeld

lenz@kein-co2-endlager-altmark.de

08/01/2014

To the Members of the European Parliament

Regarding:

**Debate and vote on 13 and 14 January 2014 in the European Parliament on the
"Implementation report 2013: Developing and applying carbon capture and storage
technology in Europe"**

(2013/2079 (INI))

Dear Madam or Sir,

the senders request Members of the European Parliament to reject the presented report on the introduction of CCS in Europe, for the following reasons:

1.) Critical inputs from the consultation process were ignored completely:

The predominantly critical reviews of CCS technology as they were expressed in the consultation process have not been considered. In particular, the numerous objections of citizens and public institutions, as well as the German Alliance of Public Water Management (AöW , falsely classified under industry) or the German Bundesrat should have lead to an alternative proposal instead of application of CCS technology. (http://ec.europa.eu/energy/coal/ccs_de.htm) .

2.) Outdated data base leads to misjudgment:

The report of Chris Davies standing ready for EU Parliament debate and vote (see above) is based in every respect on an outdated data base, as it is borrowed from the Green Paper on Energy and EC Communication on the future of CCS in Europe (both March 2013) [1] :

- By neglecting established facts and dates the role of fossil fuels and atomic power in the future is overrated.
- From the outdated stock of coal power plants it is concluded to build new ones, in fact they can be better and cheaper replaced by plants for energy from renewable sources. [2]
- Cost development of fossil fuels and atomic energy is calculated too low.
- External costs as climate damage, social costs and other non-insurable damage from use of fossil fuels and atomic energy as well as their ongoing subsidization are not considered.
- Because of out-dated base data costs for renewable energy deployment are calculated too high (costs of solar and wind power have decreased remarkably).
- The actual speed of the development of decentralized renewable energy is estimated to be lower in both, the European and the global context.

<http://www.climateblog.ch/2013/12/31/schiefergas-und-ccs-bleiben-weit-unter-den-erwartungen-sonnen-wind-und-bio-energie-wachsen-exponentiell-und-ueber-den-erwartungen/>

3.) CCS-deployment would lead to environmental damage instead of climate protection - Liability exemption for companies is unacceptable:

- There is no 100% tightness of storage option (we remind also of “Asse” , the mine for storing nuclear waste in Germany, which was declared safe during decades and is now wrecked).
- Regarding the often positively mentioned “Sleipner” CO2 storage area (North Sea, Norway): 25% of the injected CO2 cannot be detected by seismic measurements, what indicates leakage.
- On 14 May 2008, produced water* originating from the Tordis field was being injected into the Utsira formation by StatoilHydro for EGR. Workers on the Gullfaks platform noticed oily water at the sea surface. On 30 May, the source of the oily water was found to be a leaking crater on the seabed floor. The exact amount of the leaked material is unknown; the company estimates that between 48 and 175 m3 of oil escaped the storage formation. [5]

- In November 2012 CO₂ injection in In Salah was temporarily suspended, <http://www.zeroco2.no/projects/in-salah> as well as earthquakes caused by Gas injection in “Castor” (Spain) are further indications for the insecurity of geological CO₂ storage.
- Damage caused by lateral and vertical movement of the liquefied CO₂ –waste-gases in the underground over miles, mining induced earthquakes [6], contamination of drinking-water reserves [3], etc. isn’t covered by any insurance company because of the prospectively ever lasting damage. [7] This means that all costs, as they arise through leakage or in case of irreversible groundwater contamination, would have to be shouldered by the citizens, while businesses secure their profits.
- Chris Davies himself confirms the insecurity of geological CO₂-storage as he demands in points 24 to 28 (“Storage liabilities”) of his report to transfer responsibility concerning the integrity of storage sites and costs in case of CO₂-leakage from the CCS-operator to the Member State.

This makes clear that potential CCS operators expect many and heavy leakages and estimate that so caused CO₂ emission will be too expensive if they have to carry them themselves.

- Supposed CO₂ remains 100% underground, even then a carbon plant with CCS has higher emissions of greenhouse gas than a plant using fracking-free natural gas.
- The use of CO₂ for enhanced gas recovery (EGR) and enhanced oil recovery (EOR) does not lead to the reduction of greenhouse gases, but to an increase [4].
- EC recommends EGR/EOR – and thus shows that it has little concern for the climate. This is also expressed in the introduction to the “Consultative Communication...”, where the aim of CCS is defined as “to enable fossil fuels to remain an integral part of the energy mix in the EU”. - One who works for reducing greenhouse gas, does not recommend EGR/EOR nor wants fossil fuels to remain an integral part of the energy mix. (http://ec.europa.eu/energy/coal/ccs_de.htm)
- That CCS anyway is not truly meant to protect the climate has led to remove “climate protection” from the German CCS-law as ratio legis.

4.) No public money for outdated technology! Only a rapid and total turn to renewable energies contains a chance to retard climate change:

- Coal-burning with CCS means 30 to 50 % higher demand for coal. That brings an accordingly higher harm to environment and social circumstances of mining (e.g. forced replacement of people, harm for health) that is neither up to date, nor morally acceptable.
- The implementation of CCS consumes enormous resources of money. By CCS coal power plants become even more inflexible and are not useful for equalization of fluctuating renewable energy systems.
- Already, the supply from renewable energy is cheaper than coal and nuclear power (Warsaw Resolution of the leading scientists, September 2013), in terms of risks to men and the environment the renewables are better anyway.
- The technical requirements to make the renewable energy base load are ready for use e.g. "Power to Gas " (dena proposes to build energy storage capacities by 2022 for 1000 MW Power and estimates the total expenditure for 1.7 billion Euros), as well as smart grids, especially in consumption–close generating units.

5.) Industries must be supported to implement existing and newly invented methods:

- Most of industrial emissions result from provision of warmth for processes by using fossil fuels. This can be done by renewables as well.
- Remaining emissions will be around 6% (Germany) of today's over all emissions (incl. power plants, heating, mobility, industrial).
- If steel production is changed into direct reduction method (by using hydrogen from wind- or solar-driven electrolysis) there will be left only about 2-3% of today's over all emissions.
<http://www.kobelco.co.jp/p108/dri/indexe.htm>
http://www.siemens.com/press/en/presspicture/?press=/en/presspicture/2010/industry_solutions/is09076661-01.htm
<http://bsee.baosteel.com/english/tech1.htm>
<http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0803/0803.2831.pdf>
- Implementing CCS for industrial processes just would eat the investment, which is needed anyway in the first place to transform the industrial system.

6.) Subsidiarity action could be requested:

Despite Davis mentions that states should have free choice of alternative means in climate protection (while Oettinger ponders about coercive action for CCS) this cannot be ensured by a CCS decree!

For the States it is monetarily and actually difficult to implement an intelligently managed renewable energy generating & storage system and give enough support for industrial process conversions, while being forced to waste money on CCS by companies relying on European legislation!

7.) Conclusion:

Among all these aspects, it is more than negligent to subsidize CCS with public money. Our resources of money and Know How have to be focused on rapid change from fossil and atomic energy to renewables. For employees of the coal and nuclear industry the possibility of change into the new energies has to be provided with social standards as they had before.

Keep in mind, that there had been severe crimes justified by state in the past repeatedly, which have been recognized only in retrospect as such. As just such crimes against humanity and nature the ongoing use of electricity from fossil and nuclear plants will be assigned in the not too distant future.

On 13/14 January reject the Davies-Report!

**With your vote you take the moral responsibility
for the possible development on this planet –
for yourselves and your children!**

Stop the polluting and dangerous fossil power plant generation by 2030 and the use of atomic energy immediately !

Money which is designed for CCS redirect for the rapid establishment of a decentralized full supply from renewable energy sources in conjunction with energy storage and intelligent power management!

With kind regards on behalf of the Citizen's Initiatives:

Christfried Lenz

*Produced water is oil-polluted water that often comes up with oil extraction. In the past, this had often been released to sea, but now it is often re-injected to avoid pollution.

[1] http://www.diw.de/documents/publikationen/73/diw_01.c.424632.de/13-29-1.pdf

Wochenbericht des DIW Berlin 29 / 2013:

„Europäische Stromerzeugung nach 2020: Beitrag erneuerbarer Energien nicht unterschätzen“

Christian von Hirschhausen, Claudia Kemfert, Friedrich Kunz, Roman Mendelevitch

[2] <http://www.europeanclimate.org/de/news/ecf-wissenschaftler-erklarung>

[3]

http://www.energie.brandenburg.de/media/bb1.a.2865.de/26012011Diskussionsbeitrag_Dr_Krupp.pdf

[4] https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&ved=0CCoQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fbund-sachsen-anhalt.de%2Ffileadmin%2Fdownload_pdfs%2FCCS-Michel-Stellungnahme-Magdeburg07032013.pdf&ei=0_alUq6HLYPgyAPxuoHABg&usg=AFQjCNFr0pHDTXMzlgDzKV6f4miD6MdTgg&bvm=bv.57752919,d.bGQ

http://www.aftenbladet.no/energi/olje/933702/Ingen_garanti_mot_CO2-lekkasjer.html
http://www.aftenbladet.no/energi/olje/1127594/Dette_er_gropen_ved_Veslefrikk.html
http://www.aftenbladet.no/energi/olje/1126719/Oljerester_lekkes_fra_Statoil-broenn.html

[5]

StatoilHydro. 2008. "Corporate Audit. Discharge of oil-containing water and loss of injection well." EPNOWE SNO/ Tordis, 11 August 2008 (Available in full from Greenpeace)

Stavanger Aftenblad. 2008, "No guarantee against CO2 leakage" 22 October 2008,

http://www.aftenbladet.no/energi/olje/933702/Ingen_garanti_mot_CO2-lekkasjer.html

http://www.aftenbladet.no/energi/olje/1127594/Dette_er_gropen_ved_Veslefrikk.html

http://www.aftenbladet.no/energi/olje/1126719/Oljerester_lekkes_fra_Statoil-broenn.html

[6] "Impact of CO2 geological sequestration on the nucleation of earthquakes", F. Cappa und J. Rutqvist; Geophysical Research Letters, doi:10.1029/2011GL048487

[7] See declaration of "Gesamtverband der deutschen Versicherungswirtschaft e.V." from 13 April 2011 that geological storage of CO2 is „versicherungstechnisch schlichtweg nicht absicherungsfähig“.