

COAL ENV. R, Y.

(8)
See Star
article (attached
for relevant part)

US

- Substitution of coal for oil and gas is a near term and intermediate term solution to the nation's oil dependency (U.S. is 47% oil-dependent)
- This is consistent with Carter's goal (NEP) of doubling the nation's coal use by 1985
(18% now, 35% in '85)
- Conversion will be in utility & industrial sectors

NE

- We in New England are particularly interested in ways of reducing our oil dependency because we're the most heavily dependent region in the U.S.
(80% of energy sources is oil)
- New England uses virtually 0 coal now, and the use of coal has inherently 2 drawbacks other regions don't have.
 - (1) high coal costs because of transportation req.
 - (2) more difficult environmental standards to meet because of already "dirtier" air than other regions of the country.

Coal conversion report discusses under one cover the significant aspects of conversion.

(1) Minimum & Maximum (range) potential of conversion

certain :	10.7 million bbl/yr	2.6% of total
probable :	21.6 "	5.3% "
max :	31.1 "	7.6% "

(2) Economics of conversion

- price competitiveness with respect to oil depends on need for scrubbers
- scrubbers may be needed to remove sulfur dioxide from burning coal.

(3) Environmental

- scrubbers are the only way at present to remove SO₂
- use of scrubbers creates difficult waste management problem -- sludge waste
- in addition, there are ash wastes

(4) Transportation ^{CO₂ scrubbing}

- not a big deal (2 coal trains/day)

(5) Supply

- not a big deal (3 to 4 mines)

CONCLUSION

Return to coal will have limited impact in reducing New England's oil dependency, there will be inevitably environmental drawbacks -- not the least of which is a waste management problem. "For every 10 trains of coal going into New England, you may have 3 to 4 cars coming back loaded with waste and ^{with} nowhere to dump it".

What we need is accelerated effort on the commercialization of solar technologies. The NESEC is a good start, but