

ECONOMIC CASE

For Divesting From Fossil Fuels

Garvin Jabusch, Chief Investment Officer

March 7, 2014

ABSTRACT

The fossil fuels industry, big oil, big coal, natural gas, and its allied sectors, including some large financial institutions, will not quietly or willingly retire into the history of ideas whose time has passed. That fossil fuels represent the single greatest systemic risk to our collective economic wellbeing, however obvious to increasing numbers of fiduciariesⁱ, is not a consideration for the industry's plutocrats. A divestiture campaign to get money out of fossil fuels stocks has emerged, indicating an emerging popular awareness that we must and will transform our energy society into one that can coexist with and even thrive on a finite earth. That a massive global transition away from fossil fuels and towards renewable energies, led by solar, also means that there are and will continue to be competitive investment returns earned from carefully selected investment exposure to the sector.

Fossil fuels firms will soon be on the decline. Predictions as to when oil, gas and coal will become smaller investment sectors in favor of renewables (such as solar, wind and ocean energies) vary, ranging from 2060 on the long side (this prediction from oil industry powerhouse Shellⁱⁱ) to as soon as 2030 (Bloombergⁱⁱⁱ). But so far, markets appear to be mispricing the risk this presents to fossil fuels companies, and their share prices for now remain more or less stable, if not the growth engines they once were. In our opinion, it's far from too soon to consider divesting from fossil fuels while one might

still recover significant value. It is important to note that the fossil fuels industry has been "waging a war on renewables that could one day disrupt their profitable businesses". Their tactics include media disinformation campaigns about both climate science and renewable energies, influencing elections and heavy handed lobbying. This creates confusion for many, but for those looking past say-anyting punditry, the early signs of fossil fuels' decline are clear.

Investor Jeremy Grantham, Co-Founder of GMO, LLC, who "began his investing career as an economist at Royal Dutch Shell" (from Mr. Grantham's bio on GMO's website^{iv}), discussed signs of this in his most recent shareholder letter,

"The potential for alternative energy sources, mainly solar and wind power, to completely replace coal and gas for utility generation globally is, I think, certain...That we will replace oil for land transportation with electricity or fuel cells derived indirectly from electricity is also certain, and there, perhaps, the timing question is whether this will take 20 or 40 years. To my eyes, the progress in these areas is accelerating rapidly and will surprise almost everybody, I hope including me. Because of this optimism concerning the technology of alternative energy, I have felt for some time that new investments today in coal and tar sands are highly likely to become stranded assets, and

everything I have seen, in the last year particularly, increases my confidence... Even when considering oil, with enough progress in alternatives and in electric vehicles one begins to wonder whether this year's \$650 billion spent looking for new oil will ever get a decent return... The real oil problem is its cost -- that it costs \$75 to \$85 a barrel from search to delivery to find a decent amount of traditional oil when as recently as 15 years ago it cost \$25. And fracking is not cheap. The fact that increased fracking has been great for creating new jobs should give you some idea: it is both labor- and capital-intensive compared to traditional oil. Also, we drill the best sites in the best fields first, so do not expect the costs to fall per barrel (although the costs per well drilled certainly will fall with experience, the output per well will also fall). No, fracking, like extracting tar sands, yields a relatively costly type of oil that you resort to only when the easy, cheap stuff is finished. Fracking wells also run off fast...[and] are basically done for in three years."^v

Small wonder then that economists at Bloomberg New Energy Finance are predicting that "By 2030, the growth in fossil fuel use will almost have stopped," and subsequently that, "[e]nergy growth will continue, just not fossil fuels' contribution. Investment in new energy capacity will double by 2030. About 73 percent of that investment, or \$630 billion annually, will be devoted to renewable energy."^{vi} One can't help but notice that this will not leave much capital capacity to support the share prices of either fossil fuels or nuclear power firms.



By 2030, the growth in fossil fuel use will almost have stopped.

Meanwhile, on the regulatory side, the risks of remaining invested in fossil fuels are no longer going unnoticed. As former SEC Commissioner Bevis Longstreth^{vii} recently wrote:

"For fiduciaries, the planet's present condition and trajectory pose major, and growing, portfolio risks.

Prudence requires that they be well informed about these risks and act with the requisite caution and care...fiduciaries have a compelling reason on financial grounds alone to divest these holdings before the inevitable correction occurs. I'm certain any reputable investment manager, if directed by an endowment to accept that assumption, would agree with this conclusion... Anticipatory divestment in recognition that at some unknown and unknowable point down the road, markets will suddenly adjust the equity price of fossil fuel company shares downward to reflect the swiftly changing future prospects of those companies, however wise today, is probably not yet compelled in the exercise of prudence. At some point down the road towards the red light of 2 Degrees Centigrade, however, *it is entirely plausible, even predictable, that continuing to hold equities in fossil fuel companies will be ruled negligence.*" (Italics mine.)

All these respectable sources feel this way because recent innovation in renewable energy and its efficiencies and cost gains are dramatically changing the energy landscape. **Our Next Economy thesis asserts that the energy and material resources we need to host an indefinitely thriving economy presently exist in more than sufficient quantities (particularly energy), if we collect and use them in smart and efficient ways. The innovations required to put world economies on a long-term sustainable path largely exist today.** For example, the various forms of solar energy collection have become so efficient over the last 20 years that all of civilization's energy requirements could presently be met by covering 0.3% of the earth's land surface with solar^{viii} panels and concentrated solar thermal systems.

A recent case study in the outcomes of these developments comes to us from Texas, where City-owned Austin Energy has just signed "a 25-year PPA [power purchase agreement] with Sun Edison for 150 megawatts of solar power at "just below" 5 cents per kilowatt-hour." This is remarkable in that this "5-cent price falls below Austin Energy's estimates for natural gas at 7 cents, coal at 10 cents

and nuclear at 13 cents.”^{ix} (Disclosure, SunEdison is a Green Alpha Advisors holding.)

Resting on inputs like these, our investment models insist that through promoting true sustainability solutions in materials and energy, we can indeed maintain a healthy, thriving biosphere, all while growing our economies and potentially improving standards of living everywhere, for everyone.

This in mind, here are 10 primary reasons why fossil fuels investments, in *Next Economy* terms and indeed in general economic terms, no longer appear to offer the attractive risk-adjusted returns they have historically enjoyed, and are becoming economically subprime.

1. Fossil fuels have the capacity to threaten basic systems.

This is the primary macroeconomic and ecological reason that fossil fuels and the shares of the companies that exploit them will continue to diminish in scale and importance. Warming and the ramification of severe weather, droughts, floods, frequent and intense storms and attendant uncertainties undermine our basic economic foundations. A recent World Bank report conceded that “There is ... no certainty that adaptation to a 4° C world is possible,” referring to a global average temperature increase of 7.2 degrees Fahrenheit from pre-industrial times that is considered likely by scientists over the next few decades if fossil fuels’ use is not soon severely limited. To rephrase, the traditionally conservative World Bank believes that *human economies may not be able to adapt to a world that has on average warmed four degrees Celsius or more*. Note that the global temperature has risen nearly one degree Fahrenheit* since 1975.

On this key point we want to be absolutely clear: if fiduciaries own fossil fuels, they own global warming, meaning they own the primary systemic risk to the long-term well-being of the global economy and civilization, and moreover, they own a power source that is having an increasingly tough time competing. This runs

exactly contrary to the fiduciary responsibility to safeguard their members’ economic security.

Millions of pages have been written on the underlying reason for the unsustainability of fossil fuels. Their power to disrupt basic climate and therefore world societies is vast, complicated and is a topic best left to specialists. I suggest to the interested reader the works of Dr. James Hansen,^{xi} Lester Brown^{xii} and Bill McKibben^{xiii}.

2. Fossil fuel assets present asset abandonment risk.

Fossil fuels companies are now confronted by the risk that many of the still-in-the-ground assets they count on their balance sheets and/or in their future revenue projections may never be recovered or realized. As this becomes apparent, their asset valuations and revenue guidance may be revealed as currently far too high, and the values of their companies and stocks overvalued. Citing abandonment risk, Bloomberg^{xiv} has stated, “Investors in carbon-intensive business could see \$6 trillion wasted as policies limiting global warming stop them from exploiting their coal, oil and gas reserves.” Carbon Tracker reports^{xv} “Between 60-80% of coal, oil and gas reserves of publicly listed companies are ‘unburnable’ if the world is to have a chance of not exceeding global warming of 2°C.”



Between 60-80% of coal, oil and gas reserves of publicly listed companies are “unburnable” if the world is to have a chance of not exceeding global warming of 2C.

The Australian press is reporting that “Australian based analysts at Citigroup say fossil fuel reserves in Australia face significant value destruction in a carbon constrained world, with the value of thermal coal reserves likely to be slashed dramatically if governments get serious about climate action...Fossil fuel asset owners could be best

advised to dig the resource up as quickly as they can.”^{xvi}

HSBC has released a similar report, encompassing a global scale, essentially saying don’t count all the fossil fuel reserves on firms’ balance sheets because it is unlikely that they will burn them all and therefore “**Oil and gas majors, including, BP, Shell and Statoil, could face a loss in market value of up to 60 percent should the international community stick to its agreed emission reduction targets.**”^{xvii} (It may be unlikely that policymakers in governments around the world currently have the wherewithal to honor their various carbon reduction treaties, but that may not matter. Peak oil demand is upon us because the alternatives are simply becoming far more competitive and awareness of fossil fuels’ dangers is rapidly advancing.)

What Bloomberg, Citi and HSBC are saying, in sum, is that infinite growth of a known harmful asset – in this case an asset with the ability to disrupt climate and civilization – must come to an end, and soon. Shares of the firms exploiting this asset are at risk. Most recently, Bloomberg has gone as far as to launch an online “BLOOMBERG CARBON RISK VALUATION TOOL” in order to “illustrate the potential impact of stranding on a company’s earnings and share price.”^{xviii} Bloomberg economists have used this new tool to speculate that “Exxon could be worth 45% less in a carbon-stranding scenario.”^{xix}

3. Renewables are becoming too competitive for fossil fuels.

We saw above how cheap solar PV on a utility scale can be. In more general terms, Rick Needham, director of energy and sustainability at Google has said, “While fossil-based prices are on a cost curve that goes up, renewable prices are on this march downward.”^{xx} In just the last five years, solar photovoltaic module prices have fallen 80 percent^{xxi} and wind turbines have become 29 percent less expensive. Moreover, after the initial investment, renewables such as wind and solar, having no cost of fuel, will prove far too competitive for fossil fuels

no matter how cheap those may appear to be. Cheap fuel is still more expensive than free fuel.

One of the first major investors to recognize this was Warren Buffett. Via his MidAmerican Energy subsidiary, he has quietly made Berkshire-Hathaway America’s single largest owner of both solar and wind electrical power generation capacity. Patrick Goodman, Buffett’s CFO of MidAmerican said simply “We believe renewables is the better investment right now.”^{xxii} Warren Buffet, who believes that once a good investment has been identified it’s time to “back up the truck,” is showing no signs of giving up his leader status on solar, having begun construction on the “largest solar plant in the world.”^{xxiii}


The rate at which solar PV is falling in price is nothing short of astonishing. “Between 2009 and 2014, HSBC estimates, the difference between the median levelized cost of electricity (LCOE) of solar and conventional coal has fallen by around 80 percent...This, it notes, is a global average, and even includes regions with poor solar resources.”^{xxiv}

Thin-film PV industry leader First Solar, Inc., recently punctuated this by announcing that they expect their solar module prices to drop nearly in half in the next five years. As a story in Renew Economy states, “[s]olar companies are meeting those [mandated, inexpensive] PPA prices – not making a whole lot of profit, but with costs to come down as dramatically as SunPower, SunEdison and First Solar have suggested, they are making enough to secure their future. *Gas developers can simply no longer compete because the forward gas prices are pushing gas generation costs well beyond this.*”^{xxv} (Italics mine; Disclosure: SunPower, SunEdison and First Solar are all Green Alpha Advisors’ holdings.)

All this is happening now, today, with today’s technologies and today’s economics. That the smart money already sees renewable energies as more competitive long term than fossil fuels is obvious. The ‘smart money,’ by the way means individuals as well as institutions. Solar crowdfunding pioneer Mosaic in April of 2013 sold

out the first tranche of \$100 million in solar project investments to Californians in just hours^{xxvi}.

Further technological advances aren't required to make renewables competitive, but advances are occurring nevertheless. Fossil fuels will represent only a small percentage of all energy investments in just a few years for a simple reason: few will want to invest in the less profitable technologies of the past.



Energy supply mix through 2050 for California, America's largest economy.^{xxvii}

4. Fossil fuels firms are beginning to have to pay for their externalities.

Fossil fuels companies historically never had to pay for their economic externalities such as pollution, warming, health effects and contaminated water and farmland. There are signs that this is beginning to change, and firms will increasingly be liable for taxes and damages in the tens if not hundreds of billions, and with good reason. A 2013TEEB For Business Coalition Study found that “[t]he value of the Top 100 externalities [arising from the use of fossil fuels] is estimated at US\$4.7 trillion.”^{xxviii} That’s \$4.7 trillion in externalities currently borne by taxpayers, health care systems, insurers and so on.

One high profile example not directly related to carbon emissions is BP’s Deepwater Horizon spill, the worst oil spill in U.S. history. BP has already been required to set up a US\$20 billion fund to cover cleanup and damage costs, and perhaps far more significantly, is facing potentially “tens of billions” in additional damage payments pending the outcome of what the *Financial Times* calls the “trial of the century,”^{xxix} now underway in Louisiana. The *FT* also reports that BP is facing an additional 2,200 lawsuits related to the spill. Even if BP should prevail in most or even all of these suits, the massive costs of these litigations will start to become a drag on the firms’ traditionally easy profitability.

Newsweek details additional BP liabilities including, “That BP lied about the amount of oil it discharged into the gulf is already established. Lying to Congress about that was one of 14 felonies to which BP pleaded guilty last year in a legal settlement with the Justice Department that included a \$4.5 billion fine, the largest fine ever levied against a corporation in the U.S.”^{xxx} BP’s continuing potential liabilities from this one incident, including “uncapped class-action settlements with private plaintiffs^{xxxi}” and “civil charges brought by the Justice Department” and “a gross negligence finding [that] could nearly quadruple the civil damages owed by BP under the Clean Water Act to \$21 billion,” show the danger to shareholders. Any representative of an asset class carrying this kind of risk can justifiably be labeled a subprime investment.

Other firms facing liability issues surrounding the dangerous nature of their products include Chevron, which has had to abandon Ecuador altogether to avoid paying a \$US19 billion settlement there in a “nightmare case^{xxxiii}” that threatens to drag on around the world as Ecuador seeks payment via Chevron’s assets in other nations.

5. Fossil fuels are likely to face carbon taxes.

There will be carbon taxes in many if not most countries that will directly impact the profit margins of fossil fuels firms. *The New York Times* Op-Ed framed the argument in the following way: “Substituting a carbon tax for some of our current taxes — on payroll, on investment, on businesses and on workers — is a no-brainer. Why tax good things when you can tax bad things, and increase long-run growth by nudging the economy away from consumption and borrowing and toward saving and investment.”^{xxxiv}

Economists too largely recognize that the global economy would benefit from taxes on carbon, especially as opposed to taxes on labor income, and would raise much needed revenue that could be used to lower other taxes or develop infrastructure, for example. A December 2012 poll of economists by the University of Chicago’s Booth School found that 86%, across backgrounds and political orientations, agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The Brookings Institution recently described a US carbon tax of \$20 per ton, increasing at 4% per year, which would raise an estimated \$150 billion per year in federal revenues over the next decade. Given the negative externalities created by carbon dioxide emissions, a federal carbon tax at this rate would involve fewer harmful net distortions to the US economy than a tax increase that generated the same revenue by raising marginal tax rates on labor income across the board.”^{xxxv}

And it’s not just economists who see the value in a carbon tax. A 2013 Yale University survey found that 61% of Americans favor “Requiring fossil fuel companies to pay a carbon tax and using the money to pay down the national debt.”^{xxxvi}



61% of Americans favor requiring fossil fuel companies to pay a carbon tax and using the money to pay down the national debt.

The usual rejoinder here is that carbon taxes will result in loss of jobs and slow the economy. However, research indicates the opposite effect. According to a recent analysis of California’s economy, even at a very high tax rate of \$200 per ton of carbon emissions, a “tax swap” [wherein income tax is reduced by the amount of carbon taxes collected] could mean 300,000 more jobs in the state by 2035, an extra \$18 billion in GDP, an additional \$16 billion in annual income, and carbon emissions less than 75% of 1990 levels.”^{xxxvii}

Acknowledging these realities, nations have begun to act. Australia became the first major economy to impose a carbon tax in 2012, and the Senate there recently voted down a measure to remove it.^{xxxviii} Right behind Australia, according to the World Bank, Mexico and other nations appear poised to act on a carbon tax.^{xxxix} Significantly, overall global greenhouse gas emissions leader China has implemented a seven-city pilot cap-and-trade system for carbon, “as a foundational element in its war on pollution.”^{xxxx}

A carbon tax is good for everyone but fossil fuels companies, who will see their profits reduced (or attempt to pass the costs on to consumers, reducing demand for their products further). So far, several nations, provinces and individual municipalities have implemented a carbon tax, and many others have carbon trading schemes (the Carbon Tax Center^{xl} is a good resource for keeping up with these). Carbon taxes can raise revenues, shrink deficits, and move tax burden away from citizens, all while slowing the worst effects of warming. And even if we discount the benefits of avoiding the worst effects of global warming, placing a tax on

carbon emissions would still reduce non-greenhouse gas pollution, and promote energy independence.

As the think tank Carbon Tax Center put it, “[a] carbon tax will do everything the clean-energy credits will do, and much more. While simplifying and rationalizing the current hodgepodge of energy subsidies is all to the good, only a carbon tax can course through our entire economy and reward energy efficiencies and conservation along with low-carbon production.”^{xli}

6. Fossil fuels will soon face diminishing governmental subsidies and benefits.

Fossil fuels have received as much as half a trillion dollars per year in subsidies from the U.S. alone.^{xlii}. To the extent that austerity or desires to balance budgets, combined with legislation to limit greenhouse gas emissions, reduce the scale of this windfall, the seemingly easy profitability of these companies will be undermined. Further, there is growing acknowledgement that, as Fatih Birol, Chief Economist at International Energy Agency has said, “Fossil fuel subsidies are the no.1 enemy to sustainable development.”^{xliii} A report from the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) has gone so far as to recommend that the G20 phase out subsidies altogether by 2020. “This is a reckless use of public money at a time when people are very concerned about energy costs,” Kevin Watkins, executive director of the ODI, commented to BBC News.^{xliv}

Venerable journal *The Economist* concurs, writing, **“MOST economists agree that fossil-fuel subsidies are a bad idea. They promote a misallocation of resources in the economy, namely, the over-consumption of fossil fuels. They can be a burden on the public finances.** What's more, this waste increases global carbon emissions. Some countries have already wised up to the foolhardy nature of energy subsidies and have sought to trim them back. Over the past year or so, Jordan, Morocco, Indonesia and Malaysia have all cut subsidies and raised fuel prices.”^{xlv} Here we note

that the U.S. has yet to act on removing subsidies, but even here, there are signs of momentum, such as Sen. Bernie Sanders' sponsored “End Polluter Welfare Act of 2013,” which “would remove tax breaks, close loopholes, end taxpayer-funded fossil fuel research and prevent companies from escaping liability for spills or deducting cleanup costs.”^{xlvi}

These and other leading economists and policymakers are making no excuses for the fossil fuels industry anymore. Perhaps the best summation to the mainstreaming of momentum to withdraw subsidies from fossil fuels companies has been articulated by International Monetary Fund chief Christine Lagarde in a speech in February 2014: “Overcoming climate change is obviously a gigantic project with a multitude of moving parts. I would just like to mention one component of it—making sure that people pay for the damage they cause.



We are subsidizing the very behavior that is destroying our planet, and on an enormous scale.

Both direct subsidies and the loss of tax revenue from fossil fuels ate up almost \$2 trillion in 2011—this is about the same as the total GDP of countries like Italy or Russia.”^{xlvii}

7. There is growing global institutional belief that transition to renewables solves climate AND economy.

We've already seen the dire warnings about warming coming from the World Bank, and discussed the positions of Bloomberg, Citi and HSBC. These institutions are far from alone. The International Monetary Fund, in calling for “Energy Subsidy Reform,”^{xlviii} calculated that between directly lowered prices, tax breaks, and the failure to properly price carbon, the world subsidized fossil fuel use by over \$1.9 trillion in 2011 — or eight percent of global government revenues, representing a huge drag on economies. The United States taxpayer is fossil fuels' largest benefactor at

\$502 billion in 2011. China came in second at \$279 billion, and Russia was third at \$116 billion. For perspective, that \$502 billion is just over 3% of the US economy, currently being given away to big fossil fuels companies.

The IMF concluded that the “link between subsidies, consumption of energy, and climate change has added a new dimension to the debate on energy subsidies.” The IMF’s solution to both economic and climate risk is in two simple parts: “end fossil fuel subsidies and tax carbon.^{xlix}” The solution to both climate and economy is worldwide conversion from fossil fuels to renewables.

In aggregate there are now 66 countries, those responsible for approximately 88 percent of total world greenhouse gas emissions, that have completed or pending legislation governing climate plans, according to a study by Globe International.^l Climate change news website *Responding to Climate Change* (RTCC) quoted UN climate chief Christiana Figueres as saying of the study, “Domestic legislation is critical because it is the linchpin between action on the ground and the international agreement. At the national level, it is clear that when countries enact clean energy policies, investment follows. At the international level, it is equally clear that domestic legislation opens the political space for international agreements and facilitates overall ambition.” RTCC also writes of Globe International’s report that “the UN says is the most comprehensive analysis to date of the reach and depth of national climate change laws around the world.”^{li} The study is important, because it shows the breadth of efforts around the world to begin reining in greenhouse gasses and addressing warming and climate. In our view, this clearly indicates a high probability of a stranded assets scenario for fossil fuels.

8. Fossil fuels are the ultimate non-circular: they’re completely consumed upon first use, so more primary source extraction is required.

As mentioned above, to get global economies on an indefinitely sustainable foundation, we need to make far more efficient use not only of energies but

also of raw materials. Fossil fuels represent both raw resources and energy sources, and they represent the worst of both. **Smart, efficient use of materials means reusing nearly everything at the end of its lifecycle to repurpose into something else we need. For a thriving, sustainable long-term economy, we need to get close to perfect recycling of resources of all kinds so we can minimize our depletist impacts on earth and avoid the basic environmental degradations that go along with those.**

This approach excludes fossil fuels and other resources that are consumed entirely on their first use. Raw materials can keep economies growing for a long time if we preferentially mine our huge stockpiles of already extracted resources and minimize extraction from primary, geological sources. But fossil fuels, unlike materials used to make solar panels and wind turbines, don’t work like that. Since they are consumed entirely on their first use, reuse is impossible and we have to literally go back to the well for more. This means ever more greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere, ever more degrading of the local environments where extraction takes place, ever more risk of accidents, and the possibility of eventually exhausting the resource completely.

9. Distributed renewable energy grid is more secure than traditional hub and spoke systems, even those powered by domestic fossil fuels.

It’s as simple as this: “Destroy nine interconnection substations and a transformer manufacturer and the entire United States grid would be down for at least 18 months, probably longer,” as Federal Energy Regulatory Commission analysts wrote recently.^{lii} FERC Chairman Jon Wellinghoff similarly concluded, “It wouldn’t take that much to take the bulk of the power system down. If you took down the transformers and the substations so they’re out permanently, we could be out for a long, long time,^{liii} and “A more distributed system is much more resilient...Millions of distributed generators

can't be taken down at once."

The idea of a resilient, distributed electrical power grid is common sense. And short of equipping every home and business with its own diesel or natural gas generator – which of course would be disastrous for local areas' air quality – fossil fuels can never offer anything like the kind of security and resilience that distributed renewables like rooftop and local solar can. This is the key reason that the U.S. military has embraced renewable energies and local base-only power micro-grids. "The United States Department of Defense's (DOD) interest in improving energy security through microgrid technology stems from its heavy reliance upon all forms of fossil fuels, often imported from regions of the world hostile to U.S. interests. Microgrids can shrink the amount of fossil fuels consumed to create electricity by networking generators as a system to maximize efficiency. They can also be used to help integrate renewable energy resources (such as wind and solar) at the local distribution grid level. Simultaneously, microgrids enable military bases – both stationary and forward operating bases – to sustain operations, no matter what is happening on the larger utility grid or in the theater of war," according to analysts at Navigant Research.^{lv} Referring back to Jeremy Grantham's 4th quarter 2013 investor letter, his wry comment on this topic was, "[w]ho would have guessed that on several vital long-term issues the military here and in the U.K. seems to have the most sensible views of any establishment entity?" Well, considering that the military's primary power goals are reliability and defensibility from attack, we would have. The same benefits and economic stability that accrue to military installations apply equally to civilian power generation from distributed renewables and can never be matched by centralized wheel-and-spoke coal or gas generation.


10. Renewables will counter fossil fuels' endless 'boom and bust' economic cycles.

The price of oil and other fossil fuels has, at least since World War II, been the main control knob permitting expansion and causing contraction of

world economies. It's widely known that peaks in oil prices preceded 10 of the last 11 major recessions, including the great recession of 2008.^{lv} Rising oil prices are inflationary, adding to the costs of almost everything from transportation to fertilizers to plastics, and they therefore cause demand for all these affected items to become depressed, slowing economic production. Renewables, relying as they do on free fuels like sunlight, present no such economic pressures, and as they become an ever-larger percentage of our energy mix, fossil fuels' huge GDP drag will begin to disappear.

Conclusion

What then is the future for fossil fuels versus renewables? Fossil fuels have already begun to rapidly lose market share. In 2012, most new electricity-generating capacity brought online in the United States was from renewables^{lvi}, and in January, March and November 2013, *all* new U.S. electrical generating capacity was provided by renewables^{lvi}. 2014 is off to a booming start for renewables with renewable sources accounting for virtually 100% of all new electric generating power generating capacity installed in the U.S. in January.^{lvii} So where is this headed?



Destinations of new energy investments in the U.S.

we see few options for risk mitigation.^{lxiv}

through 2030; Image courtesy BNEF^{lix}

Bloomberg New Energy Finance (BNEF) has calculated that “70% of new power generation capacity added between 2012 and 2030 will be from renewable technologies (including large hydro). Only 25% will be in the form of coal, gas or oil.”^{lxv} BNEF CEO Michael Liebreich stated “I believe we’re in a phase of change where renewables are going to take the sting out of growth in energy demand,”^{lxvi} which goes to our thesis that we can both lighten our ecological footprint and increase our standards of living.

So add Bloomberg to the growing group of financial analysts warning that fossil fuel investments are poised to become a bad bet.^{lxvii}

Citibank, in its note about the Australian coal industry, went as far as to warn investors that it will be difficult to extract value from their still-in-the-ground resources as action on climate change advances, stating, “If the unburnable carbon scenario does occur, it is difficult to see how the value of fossil fuel reserves can be maintained, so

Well, with all due respect to Citi, I can think of one option: we, like Buffett and Google, can instead invest in civilization’s non-carbon sources of power. As the IMF pointed out, the solution to both climate and economy is worldwide conversion from fossil fuels to renewables. This massive conversion program will lead to powerful economic growth, less economic drag from energy costs, higher revenue for treasuries, and strong employment drivers.

As fiduciaries, it is paradoxical for us to attempt to mitigate portfolio risks by remaining invested in fossil fuels, which themselves represent perhaps our greatest systemic risk. What we do now will bring about the future for better or worse. If we’re to emerge from our destructive 19th century energy system into a new paradigm of energy generation that will permit economies to persist indefinitely, it must be us, today, who set that emergence in motion via our portfolio allocations. Leave fossil fuels and their attendant risks for those who prefer to look backwards.

ⁱ Longstreth, Bevis, Huffington Post. “The Financial Case for Divestment of Fossil Fuel Companies by Endowment Fiduciaries.” HUFF

ⁱⁱ Hussain,Yadullah. “Solar power may eclipse oil in fifty years: Shell.” The Financial Post. February 28, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.

ⁱⁱⁱ Randall , Tom. “Peak Fossil Fuels’ Is Closer Than You Think: BNEF.” Bloomberg Sustainability. April 24, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.

^{iv} http://www.gmo.com/America/About/People/_Departments/BoardofDirectors.htm

^v Grantham, Jeremy, GMO Quarterly Letter. “Year-End Odds and Ends.” February 2014

^{vi} Randall , Tom. “Peak Fossil Fuels’ Is Closer Than You Think: BNEF.” Bloomberg Sustainability. April 24, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.

^{vii} Longstreth, Bevis, Huffington Post. “The Financial Case for Divestment of Fossil Fuel Companies by Endowment Fiduciaries.” HUFF POST POLITICS. November 2, 2013.

^{viii} Naam, Ramez. “The Limits of the Earth, Part 2: Expanding the Limits.” Scientific American. April 18, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.

^{ix} Wesoff, Eric, “Cheapest Solar Ever? Austin Energy Buys PV From SunEdison at 5 Cents per Kilowatt-Hour.” greentechsolar, March 10, 2014

^x “Earth Observatory; World of Change.” NASA. <http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/WorldOfChange/decadaltemp.php> Web. February 28, 2014.

^{xi} Dr. Hansen, James. Columbia University, Earth Institute. <http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/>

^{xii} Brown, Lester. Earth Policy Institute. http://www.earth-policy.org/about_edi/C32

^{xiii} McKibben, Bill. Author and Environmental Advocate. <http://www.billmckibben.com>

^{xiv} Bakewell, Sally. “Carbon-Intensive Investors Risk \$6 Trillion ‘Bubble,’ Study Says.” Bloomberg Sustainability. Apr 18, 2013. Web. February 28, 2014.

^{xv} Leaton, Ranger, Ward, Sussems, Brown. “Unburnable Carbon 2013: Wasted capital and stranded assets.” CarbonTracker.org 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.

^{xvi} Parkinson, Giles. “Dig, baby, Dig! Citi says coal investments at risk.” ReNew Economy. April 9, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.

-
- ^{xvii} Nichols, Will. "HSBC: BP, Shell, Statoil at risk from 'unburnable' reserves." *Green Biz*. January 30, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xviii} "BLOOMBERG CARBON RISK VALUATION TOOL," <http://about.bnef.com/white-papers/bloomberg-carbon-risk-valuation-tool-2/>
- ^{xix} Randall, Tom, "High Cost of Climate Earns Exxon Rare Environmental Win." *The Grid*, Bloomberg News. May 21, 2014
- ^{xx} Kanellos, Michael. "Google Explains Why The Future Of Energy Is Green." *Forbes*. March 20, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxi} Shahan, Zachary. "Solar PV Module Prices Have Fallen 80% Since 2008, Wind Turbines 29%." *Clean Technica*. April 17, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxii} Johnsson, Julie & Buhayar, Noah. "Buffett Power Unit Targets Renewables for Acquisitions." *Bloomberg Sustainability*. Nov 13, 2012 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxiii} Duffy, Aimee & Crowe, Tyler. The Motley Fool. "Warren Buffett and the Largest Solar Plant in the World." *Daily Finance*. May 1st 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxiv} Parkinson, Giles, greentechsolar. "Why the Solar Sector Is Outshining All Other Stocks." *ARTICLES: SOLAR FINANCE & VC*. March 19, 2014.
- ^{xxv} Parkinson, Giles, "Solar costs to halve as gas prices surge." *RenewEconomy*. March 21st, 2014.
- ^{xxvi} Meehan, Chris. "Mosaic offers Californians \$100 million in solar investments, sells out first in hours." *Clean Energy Authority*. April 08, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxvii} Jacobson, Mark Z., et al., "A Roadmap for Repowering California for all Purposes with Wind, Water, and Sunlight." Stanford University. March 11, 2014
- ^{xxviii} Trucost PLC, "NATURAL CAPITAL AT RISK: THE TOP 100 EXTERNALITIES OF BUSINESS." *TEEB for Business Coalition*. April 2013.
- ^{xxix} "BP Trial Special Section;" *Financial Times*. April 13, 2014 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxx} Hertsgaard, Mark. What BP Doesn't Want You to Know About the 2010 Gulf Spill." *Newsweek*. April 22, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxxi} Baltimore, Chris & Ingram, David. "BP Oil Spill Settlement: Fine For Deepwater Horizon Disaster May Be Largest Criminal Penalty In U.S. History." *Reuters/Huffington Post Green*. November 15, 2012 Web. February 28, 2014
- ^{xxxii} Pino, Isaac. "Chevron Under Attack in the Ecuadorian Legal Battle." *Motley Fool*. April 15, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xxxiii} Bauman, Yoram & Hsu, Shi Ling. "The Most Sensible Tax of All." *New York Times*. July 4, 2012 Web. February 28, 2014
- ^{xxxiv} Chicago Booth, "Carbon Taxes II." *Initiative on Global Markets*. December 4th, 2012.
- ^{xxxv} Yale Project on Climate Change Communication, "Public Support for Climate & Energy Policies in April 2013." April, 2013.
- ^{xxxvi} Nystrom, Scott & Zaidi, Ali. "ENVIRONMENTAL TAX REFORM IN CALIFORNIA: ECONOMIC AND CLIMATE IMPACT OF A CARBON TAX SWAP." *Regional Economic Models, Inc (REMI)*. March 3rd, 2014
- ^{xxxvii} Griffiths, Emma, "Senate votes to block carbon tax repeal legislation." *ABC News Online*. March 20th, 2014.
- ^{xxxviii} World Bank, "Getting Nations Ready for Carbon Markets." World Bank Group. March 3rd 2014.
- ^{xxxix} Burger, Andrew, "New Study Reveals the Workings of China's Pilot Emissions Cap-and-Trade Systems." *Triple Pundit*. March 24th, 2014.
- ^{xl} Carbon Tax Center, <http://www.carbontax.org/progress/where-carbon-is-taxed/>
- ^{xli} Komanoff, Charles, Carbon Tax Center. "CTC Tells Senate Finance Committee: Carbon Tax Beats Clean-Energy Subsidies, Hands Down." January 31st, 2014
- ^{xlii} Plumer, Brad. "IMF: Want to fight climate change? Get rid of \$1.9 trillion in energy subsidies." *Washington Post*. March 27, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014
- ^{xliii} International Energy Agency, "World Energy Outlook 2013." November 12th, 2013.
- ^{xliv} McGrath, Matt, "Fossil fuel subsidies 'reckless use of public funds'." *BBC News Online*. November 6th, 2013.
- ^{xlv} C.R., "The green-growth twofer." *The Economist*. January 10th, 2014.
- ^{xlivi} "Legislation to End Fossil Fuel Tax Breaks Introduced by Sen. Sanders, Rep. Ellison." Posted on sanderson.senate.gov. November 22nd, 2013.
- ^{xlvii} King, Ed, "IMF chief Lagarde warns of "merciless" climate change." *RTCC*. February 5th, 2014.
- ^{xlviii} Lipton, David. First Deputy Managing Director. "Energy Subsidy Reform: The Way Forward." *International Monetary Fund*. March 27, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{xlix} Colman, Zack. "IMF: End fossil fuel subsidies, tax carbon." *The Hill*. March 27, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^l Nachmany, M., Fankhauser, S., Townshend, T., Collins, M. Landesman, T., Matthews, A., Pavese, C., Rietig, K., Schleifer, P. and Setzer, J. "The GLOBE Climate Legislation Study: A Review of Climate Change Legislation in 66 Countries. Fourth Edition." *London: GLOBE International and the Grantham Research Institute, London School of Economics*. February, 2014.
- ^{li} King, Ed, "Global climate laws now cover nearly 90% of carbon pollution." *Responding to Climate Change (RTCC)*. February 27th, 2014.
- ^{lii} Shahan, Zachary, "Terrorists Could Put US Out Of Electricity For 1½ Years, Solar Power Could Help Grid Security Considerably." *CleanTechnica*. March 23rd, 2014.

-
- ^{lvi} Martin, Christopher. "Rooftop Solar Seen Protecting U.S. Power Grid From Attack." *Bloomberg News*. Apr 23, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014
- ^{lvii} Navigant Research, "Military Microgrids." 4Q, 2012
- ^{lviii} Therramus, Tom, OIL_PRICE.NET. "Oil Caused Recession, Not Wall Street." January 20, 2010;
- Lenzner, Robert, Forbes. "The Recessions of 1973, 1980, 1991, 2001, 2008 Were Caused By High Oil Prices." *Forbes Investing*. September 1, 2013
- ^{lx} Peixe, Joao. "Renewable Energy Accounts for 50% of all New Energy Installations in US." *Oil Price*. January 20, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{lxii} Bossong, Kenneth. "Wind, Solar, Biomass Provide All New U.S. Electrical Generating Capacity in January 2013." *Climate Progress*. February 24, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014; "Renewable Energy Provides 100% of All New US Electrical Generating Capacity in November 2013." December 20th, 2014.
- ^{lxvii} Danko, Pete, "Renewable Energy: 100% of New US Generating Capacity in January." *Greentech Media*. February 27th, 2014.
- ^{lxviii} Randall, Tom. "Peak Fossil Fuels' Is Closer Than You Think: BNEF." *Bloomberg Sustainability*. April 24, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{lxix} Isola, James. "Strong Growth for Renewables Expected Through to 2030." *Bloomberg New Energy Finance*. 22 April 2013 Web. February 28, 2014
- ^{lxii} McDonnell, Tim. "Charts: The Smart Money Is on Renewable Energy." *Mother Jones*. April 22, 2013 Web.
- ^{lxvii} Carrington, Damian. "Carbon bubble will plunge the world into another financial crisis – Trillions of dollars at risk as stock markets inflate value of fossil fuels that may have to remain buried forever, experts warn." *The Guardian*. April 18, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.
- ^{lxviii} Carrington, Damian, The Guardian. "Carbon Bubble May Plunge the World into Financial Crisis." *Climate Central*. April 20, 2013 Web. February 28, 2014.

While much of the content of this paper is original, significant elements have been taken from the author's blog, Green Alpha's Next Economy, appearing on sierraclub.org, and from comments prepared for his public speeches.

Green Alpha Advisors, LLC. Green Alpha is a registered trademark of Green Alpha Advisors, LLC.

Nothing contained in this whitepaper should be used or construed as an offer to sell, a solicitation of an offer to buy, or a recommendation for any security. Nor is it intended as investment, tax, financial or legal advice. Investors should seek such professional advice for their particular situation.

This paper is published in the United States for residents of the United States. Investors outside of the United States are subject to securities and tax regulations within their applicable jurisdictions that are not addressed on this site. Nothing on this site should be considered a solicitation to buy or an offer to sell shares of any Green Alpha investment in any jurisdiction where the offer or solicitation would be unlawful under the securities laws of such jurisdiction.

Green Alpha investments are not deposits or obligations of, or guaranteed or endorsed by, any bank, and are not federally insured or guaranteed by the U.S. government, the FDIC, the Federal Reserve Board or any other agency. Some Green Alpha products invest in international securities, which can involve different risks than U.S. investments. These risks include political or economic instability, difficulty in predicting international trade patterns, lack of publicly available information about foreign companies, changes in foreign currency exchange rates and the possibility of adverse changes in investment or exchange control regulations.

Green Alpha's investment strategies are based partially on Jeremy Deems and Garvin Jabusch's personal opinions and personal economic forecasts which may not occur. His views may be considered outside of the mainstream of current economic thought. Investors should carefully consider these facts before considering an investment in any Green Alpha investment products.