MU’s salary situation
Some get pay raises despite budget problems.
By Janese Heavin
Sunday, November 22, 2009

Some University of Missouri faculty members and employees this year received pay raises despite budget woes that kept most salaries flat.

A Tribune comparison of September 2008 salaries and the current MU payroll showed that 228 professors received raises. Sixty of those were promoted from assistant to associate or from associate to a full professorship, which comes with either a $3,000 or $4,000 raise, said MU Budget Director Tim Rooney.

More than 80 of those who received salary increases work in health-related positions, including Jerry Rogers, who went from making $213,200 last year to $547,000 this year when he became chairman of surgery at the School of Medicine. That’s only the university’s base salary; MU doctors also receive additional income from patient care. Rooney couldn’t discuss specific employee raises because of personnel reasons, but said, in general, medical school chairs do not see patients, therefore do not get that additional salary and might actually lose income when they become chairs.

Elsewhere on campus, about a dozen engineering-related professors saw pay increases, nine in the School of Veterinary Medicine received salary increases, and eight in the Missouri School of Journalism saw their salaries increase somewhat. Twenty professors in various science-related fields received pay increases and seven in the English department and five professors in the both the School of Music and the law school saw salary bumps.

As to why some professors received pay increases, “there’s no one answer,” Deputy Provost Ken Dean said.

In some cases, emeritus professors came out of retirement to take on a class or two and their pay reflects the additional duties. In other scenarios, faculty members were promoted to assistant chairs of departments, while some were named curators’ professors or assigned to other named endowed chairs.
And in more than a handful of situations, faculty members got better offers elsewhere and were coaxed into staying at MU for better pay, Dean said. In all of those situations, the faculty member either had a written offer or an interview with another university before a counteroffer was made.

“We haven’t approved any raises just because someone is good and might leave,” Dean said. “There has to be a real imminent threat, not just the potential for someone to get a job somewhere else.”

MU spent more than $4.2 million to give out raises this year. Funding for those increases came from a variety of sources. The UM System Board of Curators had a contingency salary fund of $8 million this year for recruitment, retention and promotion purposes, according to minutes from the April meeting. Some raises also were financed with grants or from endowment fund interest or other gifts.

The increases would not have been possible had Missouri lawmakers cut core state funding to higher education, Rooney said.

Gov. Jay Nixon last year made a deal with universities to protect state funding if they, in turn, kept tuition flat. Lawmakers agreed and funded core higher education at the same level as the prior fiscal year.

Last week, Nixon announced a similar deal, promising to keep state funding to higher education at 95 percent of the current allocation in exchange for flat tuition. That deal equates to a $42 million cut to public universities, $21 million of which hurts the University of Missouri System.

It’s too early to say how that cut might affect faculty salaries next year, Rooney said. But, he said, making salaries competitive by giving merit-based raises is a budget priority.

The average salary for professors at Mizzou was $111,200 in the fall of 2008, third from the bottom when ranked with 17 peer institutions in surrounding states. MU associate professors, on average, made $75,300 last year, and assistant professors made $61,100, both of which were the lowest salaries when compared to the peer universities.

Other findings from the 2008 to 2009 payroll comparison:

- Fifty-four professors saw their pay decrease this year for a variety of reasons. Some stepped down from being department chairs or associate chairs, thus losing additional pay, while others went on sabbatical, Dean said. In some cases, emeritus professors saw salaries decrease because they lightened their course loads. Those salary decreases saved MU close to $2 million.
- Three MU employees were promoted to deans this year, receiving pay raises accordingly. They include George Justice, dean of the graduate school, whose salary increased from $91,382.88 to $120,383; Glenn Good, a professor and associate dean for research and graduate studies, who saw his salary increase from $116,793 to $120,459; and Bryan Garton, dean of agriculture, who went from making $125,400 to $145,000.
Ten academic advisers received raises over the past year, although Rooney said those increases were allocated in the fall of 2008 before the economic situation worsened. Additionally, MU added 10 academic advising positions to the payroll this year for a total of 62. The increase was needed not only to catch up with enrollment, but also to prevent high turnover, Rooney said. "We want to ensure students are successful here and can get good advice," he said.

Academic advisers earn between roughly $26,000 and $44,000.

Eight associate and assistant football coaches were among the 19 MU Athletics Department employees to see salary spikes this year. David Yost, who was promoted from an assistant coach to associate head football coach, went from making $184,090 last year to $310,000 this year. Two assistant coaches — Craig Kuligowski and Bruce Walker — each went from $184,090 to $216,000; and assistant football Coaches Cornell Ford and Robert Hill went from about $182,000 to each making $214,000. Head football Coach Gary Pinkel secured those raises as part of his contract negotiations. "Coach wanted to make sure his assistant coaches were taken care of better, to bring them more in line with the average, close to the middle of Big 12 salaries for assistant coaches," said Athletics Department spokesman Chad Molter.

The MU Athletics Department is almost entirely self-supporting and pays its salaries from revenues from ticket sales, donations and other game-related revenues, MU spokeswoman Mary Jo Banken said. However, Athletics Department salaries are still approved by the MU chancellor.

Although salaries went up for some hospital employees, some top University of Missouri Health Care administrators did not see raises this year, including CEO Jim Ross, who makes $517,920, Chief Financial Officer Kevin Necas, who makes $329,535, and Executive Administrator George Car, who's salary remained $200,606.

MU’s top earner this year is James Stannard, chairman of the School of Medicine’s Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, who makes $625,000. Stannard began Sept. 1, replacing Jason Calhoun, who made $569,219.

Other top administrators at MU did not see salary increases this year. That includes Chancellor Brady Deaton, who makes $324,383; Provost Brian Foster, who earns $255,695; and Vice Chancellor of Research Brian Duncan, who earns $195,000.

THE SYSTEM

UM System President Gary Forsee's salary remained flat at $400,000 this year. Forsee turned down a performance stipend of $100,000, which he received last year. He also gets $1,479 a month for an auto allowance and resides at university-owned Providence Point.

Of the 19 UM System employees who are making more this year than what appeared on the 2008 payroll, three actually received their fall 2008 raises late, thus not showing up on last year’s report, said Betsy Rodriguez, vice president of human resources. Three employees saw salary increases after going from parttime to fulltime.
Steve Owens, general counsel, went from making $338,000 to $375,000 this year, but that increase was part of the contract negotiated when he was hired, Rodriguez said. Owens replaced Marvin “Bunky” Wright in 2008.

Other system employees who received raises this year were also promoted. That includes David Russell, who went from being chief of staff to being senior associate vice president. That boosted his salary from $150,249 to $168,000 this year.

In mid-May, Forsee announced he would be eliminating two associate vice presidents and two assistant vice presidents. As of September, only one of those employees was off the payroll. Allen Snider, assistant vice president of government relations, retired, and the position remains unfilled.

Rodriguez wouldn’t name the other three assistant and associate vice presidents whose positions were eliminated but said they appeared on the payroll this year because they were on the tail end of their transition plans out of the university system.

The 2009 UM System payroll shows 596 employees; however, that’s a little misleading because it includes the 40 workers hired when the system took over the Missouri Virtual Instruction Program last year. State funding for that program has since been cut, meaning those employees likely won’t show up on the list next year, Rodriguez said.

The remaining number of system employees, 546, is down from 580 in 2008. The system payroll includes eMINTS, MOREnet and State Historical Society of Missouri employees.

The UM System also added two new positions to oversee e-learning and distance education. Director John March makes $125,000, and his assistant, Christa Weisbrook, makes $96,000.

Rodriguez said those positions were part of the strategic restructuring process unveiled this past spring.
Forsee criticism of scholarship plan draws fire
Access Missouri subject of spat.
Janese Heavin
Saturday, November 21, 2009

A coalition of private schools wants University of Missouri System President Gary Forsee to stop publicly denouncing a state scholarship program used to send students to both public and private colleges.

Forsee on Tuesday dubbed the Access Missouri Scholarship Program a poor public policy because it awards more state funding, dollar-wise, to a student going to a private institution than to a public one. It’s not the first time he has publicly shared his concerns about the state-funded program.

“It’s really disappointing,” said Connie Farrow, a spokeswoman for the Coalition of Independent Colleges and Universities. “This is about Missouri kids who are among the neediest in our state and who are trying to get an education at a college that best suits their needs. The higher-education landscape in Missouri needs both independent and public colleges. Not every student fits into an MU setting or will excel in an MU setting.”

Access Missouri is a need-based program that awards scholarships directly to students. More than 38,000 students used the program in its first year, and the number of applicants has risen.

This year, qualifying students attending a public two-year college could get a maximum of $780 and those who attend four-year public schools received as much as $1,680. Students at four-year private schools received as much as $3,590.

That works out to about 19 percent of public four-year tuition and 17 percent of private tuition, said Marianne Inman, president of Central Methodist University in Fayette. “I believe that is enormously fair,” she said.

Plus, Inman said, representatives from MU and other public universities were at the table when Access Missouri was designed. “What they wanted to do was devise a system that covers students proportionately,” she said. “That’s why they came up with three levels of funding, depending on what type of institution a student was attending.”

That said, public colleges at the time were expecting to get additional state funding from the sale of Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority assets. Those dollars — which were to have paid for capital improvement projects — have since been withheld.
“Public schools were supposed to receive Lewis and Clark funding, which created equality when the Access Missouri deal was brokered,” said Ally Walker, a first-year law student at MU. “Now, that’s not going to happen.”

Walker is a member of the Associated Students of the University of Missouri, which supported unsuccessful legislative efforts to equalize Access Missouri scholarships. One such bill, filed by Sen. Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia, would have made the maximum scholarship amount $2,800 to any four-year school, public or private.

“The state has a constitutional requirement to support public schools,” Walker said. “Giving equal access to school through equal funding seems logical. It could reach so many more needy students than the system currently does.”

But giving a flat amount instead of a percentage would make the playing field somewhat uneven, said David Adams, dean of enrollment management at Stephens College. He contended that students using Access Missouri scholarships at private schools come from families with lower incomes than those using the scholarships at public universities.

Plus, Adams said, if students can’t get into a specific program at a public college because enrollment is limited, they have to seek private options. “Public money is public money, and we all pay taxes,” Inman said. “Everybody ought to be eligible for a piece of that. ... It seems appropriate that the award follows the need. To me that is fair.”
Tuition freeze expands
Two-year schools join Nixon’s plan.
Saturday, November 21, 2009

JEFFERSON CITY (AP) — Community colleges have joined Missouri’s four-year colleges and universities in agreeing to freeze tuition next school year if state officials promise to nick and not slash their budgets.

Gov. Jay Nixon said yesterday that community colleges have promised to not raise tuition for in-state students if their budget cuts are limited to 5.2 percent. The state’s four-year colleges agreed earlier this week to a 5.2 percent budget cut without a tuition increase for in-state undergraduates.

In all, the agreements would allow about $50 million to be cut from higher education without Missouri students paying more for tuition.

The federal stimulus package limits how much states that receive education money can cut higher-education budgets without federal permission. Nixon said yesterday he believes Missouri’s higher-education budget could have been cut by as much as $75 million without a waiver.

The Democratic governor said the agreement with colleges and universities sets Missouri apart from states that are raising tuition. He pointed specifically to California, which has approved a 32 percent fee increase for students attending that state’s top public schools.

“We’re putting our students first. It’s not only the right thing to do for those students and families who are struggling, it’s also the smart thing to do to create a skilled work force,” Nixon said.

The agreement would affect how much money colleges and universities get starting next July and how much students pay in the school year that starts next fall. The schools can set their tuition rates, but the General Assembly must approve the state budget.

Nixon’s proposal has drawn criticism from some lawmakers.

Sen. Scott Rupp called the higher education deal a “dog and pony show” earlier this week and warned it could force deeper cuts elsewhere in the budget.
"I am disappointed that the governor has negotiated an agreement prematurely that has the potential to tie the hands of the legislature and keep them from doing what is in the best interest of taxpayers," said Rupp, R-Wentzville.
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Today's Question: What will colleges and universities cut when they tighten their belts?

By Casey Smith
November 22, 2009 | 12:01 a.m. CST

This week Gov. Jay Nixon announced an agreement with Missouri’s four-year colleges and universities that tuition fees for their in-state undergraduate students would not rise for academic year 2010-2011. In exchange for the tuition freeze, cuts to funding for higher education would be minimal.

This would be the second year in a row that tuition for in-state undergraduates has not changed. The governor’s proposed 5.2 percent budget cut to higher education institutions is about $42 million less than the 13 campuses affected are currently getting.

Both the Missouri General Assembly, which makes the state’s budget, and university and college governing boards must approve the proposal.

This freeze would not apply to out-of-state students or graduate students, both of whose tuition could go up. It also does not apply to ancillary fees like room and board, recreation fees and meals for any student. Under the current tuition freeze, cuts were made to the UM System-affiliated State Historical Society of Missouri and the Missouri Kidney Program, as well as to the MU Health Care system. MU Extension was spared from a proposed $14 million cut.

MU Faculty Council Chairwoman Leona Rubin said the extension of the current stagnant salaries and hiring freeze would be the “best-case scenario” and that less money could mean some staff will lose their jobs.

The UM System would receive about $21 million less than it did last year. UM System President Gary Forsee said he sees the agreement as one that saves higher education
from more traumatic cuts. So far this year Missouri has experienced a 14 percent decrease in revenue.

Money from the federal stimulus prevented cuts from being made to higher education last year. But that money will stop in 2012. Forsee said plans to deal with the expiration need to be made now.

MU raised its tuition each year for a decade prior to this year's freeze with 18.1 percent being the largest hike in academic year 2003-2004. Nixon said Missouri might be the only state not inflicting higher tuition on its students. The national average for tuition increases in other states' public institutions is 6.5 percent, he added.

*What will colleges and universities cut when they tighten their belts?*
Women also mooning over the teen-vampire romance 'Twilight'

By Maria Puente, USA TODAY

It has been three days since The Twilight Saga: New Moon opened, and it's increasingly obvious that adult - even mature - women are making as much noise as teen girls over this tale of a great love between a teenage girl and a vampire, with a few werewolf complications.

“We call it brain porn,” jokes Jenny West, 32, a New Jersey finance executive who co-runs an adults-only blog, Twitarded.blogspot.com. She set her boyfriend’s eyes rolling with the life-size cardboard cutout of heartthrob vamp Edward Cullen (Robert Pattinson) in her dining room.

Her blog has picked up hundreds of female followers since launching in January, ranging in age from 20s up to 60s, all of them nuts about the four-book series about Bella Swan (Kristen Stewart) and her vampire swain that has spawned two movies.

"There’s no shame in loving a book about struggling vampires,” West says.

No shame, indeed, not when there's so much money to be made. New Moon took in $140.7 million this weekend, according to studio estimates from Nielsen EDI.

But though "Twi-hard" teens have captured most of the attention since the first Twilight book was published in 2005 (86 million sold), adult women are just as smitten with New Moon.

It’s moms and grandmas standing in line at theaters, reading and rereading the books, spending big bucks on the merchandise (such as Nordstrom’s Twilight-themed apparel and jewelry) and writing reams of fan fiction (17,000 stories on just one fan-fiction site alone). They follow scores of blogs and websites, such as TwilightMoms.com, aimed at bringing together other adult fans all over the world.

“The appeal to a lot of us who are not teenagers is the community (of fellow fans) we've founded,” West says. "It has really bloomed and become huge because we feed off each other.”

Teens identify with Bella in fantasizing about their first love, says Lori Joffs, 35, a stay-at-home mom in Nashville and creator of TwilightLexicon.com. “But as an adult who has faced reality, it's escapism of a different kind, remembering those first twitches of falling in love and reliving it through Bella.”

The books and movies employ the classic romance-novel formula in scores of books from Jane Eyre to Harlequin romances, says Elisabeth Gruner, an English professor at the University of Richmond who has studied the Twilight phenomenon. "Vampire stories appeal to teens because vampires are eternal teens - they stay up late, exchange bodily fluids, engage in illicit practices and live forever, and most teens think they're immortal, too."
Also, author Stephenie Meyer added the unconventional twist that these characters are virginal – and the Cullen vampires are so-called vegans, meaning they drink animal rather than human blood. There's no sex and no sucking of human blood (long a stand-in for sex).

"Women really appreciate that because they can read them with their daughters or younger sisters and not be embarrassed," says Amanda Belcher, 27, a public-relations executive outside Scranton, Pa., who helps run TwilightMoms.com, which has 34,000 members 21 or older.

Some academics have been hooked by Twilight. Jennifer Stevens Aubrey and two colleagues at the University of Missouri's communications department are working on a book, *Bitten by Twilight: Youth Culture, Media and the Vampire Franchise*, about why so many girls and women, including themselves, are so taken with the books.

"Teens perceive Edward as an ideal romantic mate, despite being a vampire and rather controlling and what someone said is the likeliest candidate for a restraining order. He's so into her," Aubrey says. "The adults compare him to their own partners, who obviously can't match up."

Some feminists worry Twilight presents models of unhealthy relationships for girls. Debra Merskin, a journalism professor at the University of Oregon who is writing a journal article on Twilight, says Edward Cullen fits the profile of what the psychological literature calls a compensated psychopath – socially dangerous but still keeping up the appearance of normality – while Bella is always in need of rescue.

"He watches her sleep, and if that's not creepy, I don't know what is," she says. "Girls say they're turning away from Harry Potter to Edward Cullen because they think it's a more 'realistic' relationship – and he's a vampire! It's baffling."

Relationship expert Valerie Gibson, who hosts a call-in TV show in Ontario, says multi-generational mania for Twilight may be a testament to the emptiness of contemporary relationships.

"There's a loss of romance, of mystery, of the holding back of desire and cherishing of a woman," she says. "Young girls can't find swains who will adore them and worship them. It only happens in books. They long to live in an erotically charged fantasy. Older women know it doesn't happen."

But they sure like to read about it.
The workhorse of renewable fuels in Missouri may be found in its forests, farms and pastures.

Across the state, the idea of using plant waste such as wood scraps, wheat straw or tree trimmings as fuel for electricity generation is gaining steam.

In Perryville, a private developer is planning a $100 million plant that will burn wood waste from nearby forests to generate enough electricity to light 23,000 homes. The University of Missouri-Columbia is spending more than $60 million to replace a boiler at its power plant that will burn exclusively wood waste. Even the state’s largest utility is looking at how to use biomass at its power plants to displace some of its coal usage.

A combination of new and proposed state and federal policies is driving interest in renewable energy.

Among them is a ballot initiative approved by Missouri voters last fall that requires investor-owned utilities to use renewable fuels, including biomass, to generate 15 percent of their electricity by 2021.

Geography and the state’s natural resources also play a part in the emerging interest in biomass as a power plant fuel.

Missouri isn’t considered a prime candidate for commercial-scale solar projects. And wind farms have so far been limited to far northwestern Missouri. Meanwhile, the state’s forests, pasture and farmland could all be considered potential fuel sources.

By one estimate, found in a June report by the Natural Resources Defense Council, using just a fourth of the state’s agricultural and wood waste would equal 7 million tons of biomass per year — enough to generate about 10 percent of the state’s power needs.
Biomass is generally defined as any kind of plant-derived organic matter. The term often means wood waste such as mill residue from paper or pulp mills; forest residue left behind by loggers; agricultural waste such as corn cobs or any number of dense fast-growing crops such as switchgrass that's planted specifically for use as fuel.

When used to generate electricity, biomass can be burned directly to generate electricity or it can be mixed with coal, a process known as co-firing.

**Related Links**
- Get more business news, blogs and opinion

Nationwide, biomass fuels less than 1 percent of the nation's electricity. But that figure is expected to grow to 4.5 percent by 2030, according to the Energy Information Administration, the statistical arm of the Energy Department.

The use of biomass is generally embraced by environmentalists, who see potential to displace coal and help cut emissions of carbon dioxide, the main greenhouse gas linked to global warming.

Facilities that burn biomass emit only the CO2 that trees and plants absorb while they're growing. But it's the same gas that would be released when they die and decompose. Coal combustion releases CO2 that was captured millions of years ago and wouldn't otherwise be vented into the atmosphere.

The state's forest products industry also sees benefits from biomass by creating a market for agricultural and wood waste that is often left in the fields, forest floors or sent to landfills.

In the past, pulp and paper mills bought wood chips and similar byproducts. But the mills have since left Missouri, so much of timber that would have been used is instead left behind in the woods or isn't harvested, said Brandon O'Neal, director of education and government relations for the Missouri Forest Products Association, based in Jefferson City.

"We have a lot of unused timber supply," O'Neal said. "You don't want to go out and clear cut everything. But there is definitely a lot of timber out there that can be
harvested in a way that's healthy for the forest."

Compared with neighboring Illinois, Missouri is relatively rich in forest-based biomass. Missouri could produce an estimated 2.9 million dry tonnes of forest and mill residues annually, three times the volume in Illinois, according to a 2005 report by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory.

Farmers and private owners of forest land also stand to benefit under a provision in the 2008 Farm Bill that provides matching payments for feedstock that's sold to electric generators.

Advocates of the fledgling biomass industry say the emergence of a market for wood chips and energy crops in Missouri could not only displace fossil fuel use; it could improve the health of forests by selectively thinning them of dead and diseased trees and replacing them with healthy ones.

AmerenUE, which sells electricity to 1.2 million customers in Missouri, sees the potential to displace 3 percent to 10 percent of the coal used at some power stations with biomass, said Richard Wright, managing executive for renewables.

The St. Louis-based utility has already had consultants Black & Veatch study biomass opportunities, and it will probably conduct pilot projects at certain plants within a couple of years, Wright said. But there's a lot of analysis to be done before then.

"There are different barriers to being able to co-fire things other than what (the plant) is designed to burn, such as coal," he said. "First you have to decide what type of biomass is available. Then you have to look at transportation. Then you go to the next step and evaluate the facility and can your facility handle that fuel."

Making a biomass project cost-effective is another barrier. Right now, a woody biomass is still more expensive on an energy equivalent basis than coal, most of which is delivered from Wyoming's Powder River Basin, Wright said.

AmerenUE investigated the potential for burning wood at its Sioux plant in St. Charles County a few years ago after severe storms downed trees and limbs across its service area, Wright said. But the plant's coal crushing machine wouldn't take trimmings that were larger than a quarter-inch in diameter. And tree trimmers couldn't mill the fallen
limbs and branches to the required size. In the end, executives scuttled the idea.

The University of Missouri-Columbia is already meeting 10 percent of its power plant fuel needs with biomass by co-firing wood waste with coal. It's also replacing one of five coal boilers with one that exclusively burns biomass. When the project is complete in late 2012, the university will have reduced its coal purchases by about 15 percent, said Gregg Coffin, the plant's superintendent.

Over the past few years, the university has experimented with various types of feedstock, including corn cobs, storm debris, wood chips and chopped up wooden pallets. In the future, the school could look to dedicated energy crops grown in river bottoms that can't be developed or used for farming.

By the time the boiler project is finished, the school will need 100,000 "green tons" of wood waste per year. By contrast the plant proposed for Perryville would require almost 400,000 annual tons.

The university shouldn't have trouble finding enough biomass to meet its needs, Coffin said. But he and other biomass advocates agree that realizing the state's potential as a fuel supplier will take time.

Any power generator looking for a fuel supply will first look to the cheapest and easiest source. In most cases that's waste from saw mills, cabinet and flooring plants. But only about 3 percent of such mill residue goes unused in Missouri, said Hank Stelzer, a state forestry extension specialist and assistant professor at the University of Missouri.

Of course, Missouri is flush with potential fuel sources: dense hardwood forests, acres of farmland and miles of rolling prairie — a seemingly endless supply of biomass feedstock.

But logging companies working in Mark Twain National Forest lack the expensive equipment needed to harvest forest residue. Much of the rest of the state's 14 million-plus acres of forest land is divided among 350,000 or so private landowners — potentially a logistical nightmare for a plant developer trying to convince lenders that they have a sustainable fuel supply.

Location is yet another challenge. Plants that burn biomass must be near their fuel source because it's too expensive to transport thousands of tons of wood chips more
than 50 miles or so, depending on diesel prices.

They and others are concerned the biomass industry — nudged by generous incentives — will develop too quickly and with too little forethought.

"If it's done in balance, it can be a good thing," Stelzer said. "The problem we tend to have as humans is, we say, 'A little is good, so a lot is going to be really great.'"
Special interests debate likelihood of "clean coal" in Missouri

By Alanna Nunez, Matthew Reinig
November 21, 2009 | 5:32 p.m. CST

MU students promoting the Sierra Club Coal Free Campus Campaign put on a demonstration at Speaker Circle on Wednesday, Sept. 16, to educate listeners on the amount of coal the MU campus uses. The group displayed the amount of coal that the MU campus burns every second and said that last year MU burned 48,000 tons of coal. Jason Lenhart

COLUMBIA — Missouri is more than 80 percent coal dependent — or sixth in the nation in coal use — according to the National Mining Association.

The combustion of coal adds more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere per unit of heat energy than does the combustion of other fossil fuels, according to a report published in 1994 by the Energy Information Administration.

So, what if there were a way to clean up coal?
The American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, an organization that includes members of the coal industry, thinks carbon sequestration — or "clean coal" technology — is that way.

"Technology is an evolutionary thing," said Joe Lucas, senior vice president of communications for ACCCE. "It allows us to use coal in a responsible way."

Carbon sequestration involves capturing carbon dioxide emissions produced during coal combustion and permanently storing the gases underground.

But at least one risk assessment study found potential hazards from geological carbon sequestration. The study, conducted by the Berkeley Lab, found that "carbon sequestration will be neither perfectly effective nor risk free."

The National Energy Technology Lab describes carbon storage as two basic processes:

- Capturing CO2 emitted from power plants.
- Injecting and storing that carbon in underground formations, where it is monitored to ensure the gases remain underground permanently.

"When I was a kid, I was always told when you take something, you put it back where it came from," Lucas said. "That's what we're doing ... we're putting the coal back where it came from."

But opponents reject carbon capture and sequestration as a plausible alternative, citing possible ecological consequences.

The Berkeley study found that carbon capture and storage could potentially create economic, ecological and biological health-related hazards, including:

- "Injury, death or ecosystem damage caused by exposure to harmful levels of CO2;"
- "Damage to groundwater resources through direct contamination with CO2, or contamination by leaching of toxic material from surrounding rock, due to acidification of water by dissolved CO2;"
- "Damage to mineral resources through (a) contamination of natural gas or oil by CO2, (b) pressure-induced migration of mobile fossil fuels in a way that"
complicates extraction or renders it infeasible, (c) sorption of CO2 into coal, or (d) alteration of economically important ores, minerals, gravels, etc., by CO2 or by acidified water;" and

- "Induced or enhanced seismicity due to increased fluid pressure deep underground."

The risks of these hazards cannot be completely determined; they depend upon the sites used for sequestration, pipeline technologies and operating practices to detect and fix leaks, the report stated.

Additionally, gradual leakage of stored CO2 could allow buildup in topographic depressions or enclosures like basements, the report stated.

In September, the U.S. Department of Energy announced that $12.7 million will fund 43 projects for geological sequestration training and research projects, according to its official Web site. Among those recipients is Missouri State University in Springfield.

In June, the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 met approval in the U.S. House. The legislation seeks regulations on carbon capture and sequestration. While the debate over carbon sequestration has been recently revived as part of the discussion of "clean coal," the concept is not new.

Carbon dioxide, as well as other gases, has been injected into oil reservoirs in the earth for years, according to the U.S. Department of Energy. Citing a 2006 assessment, the department said processes like that create pressure in the areas surrounding an oil reservoir and push dispersed oil back to the area under a production wellbore; this could potentially recover 89 billion barrels of stranded oil in 10 U.S. regions.

According to the same assessment, however, Missouri is not within one of the regions where stranded oil could be recovered.

National environmental groups, including the Sierra Club, have come out in strong opposition to "clean coal." Locally, Sierra Club members have protested the burning of coal in all forms at MU. MU Assistant Professor of Geography Larry Brown spoke at a recent demonstration.
"Just two phrases I think need to be etched into our mind. One is, 'Coal is dirty, that’s the bottom line,'" Brown said, followed by applause. "But the other is much more difficult because that means: 'Change of lifestyle.'"

Brown ended his speech with an impassioned call for alternative energy, citing wind and solar energy as distinct possibilities.

"We can get beyond (coal)," he said. "We can go through the withdrawal processes, go into the social therapy that we need to get off our coal addiction and find something else that in the long run is far more healthful to our life, to the ecology of the planet and also in terms of our economy."

In an interview after the event, Brown said that, as a geologist, he is worried about the damaging effects of coal on the earth.

**Chelsea Maltagliati, an MU junior and member of the Mizzou College Republicans, attended the event where Brown spoke. She said she was concerned about the economic impact of taxing carbon emissions.**

"People say they don't want coal, but they don’t offer any solution other than solar panels and wind energy, which in theory sounds great," she said.

Maltagliati disagreed with the taxes outlined in the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 — or Waxman-Markey bill — which mandates that greenhouse gas emissions be reduced by 17 percent by 2020.

The bill has been set aside during Congress’ health care reform debate and has yet to reach the Senate. If that happens, it could be a tug-of-war between economy and ecology.
Student journalist barred from Boone County Courthouse

The Associated Press

COLUMBIA, Mo. A central Missouri judge has barred a newspaper photographer from a courtroom for 30 days after rejecting her written apology for photographing a jury.

Boone County Circuit Judge Gary Oxenhandler called the letter from Chris Dunn "a series of rationalizations."

A photo from Dunn that was posted on the Columbia Missourian's Web site showed the two rows of the jury in a murder trial, although jurors' faces were out of focus. Photographing jury members is prohibited in Missouri.

Dunn is a photojournalism student from Houston who is attending the University of Missouri School of Journalism. The Missourian is a publication of the journalism school.

Oxenhandler also said the court offered Dunn another chance "to write a meaningful apology" but she declined.