
Subject: interesting energy info
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 01:24:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.msnbc.com/modules/eoe/energy.asp>

click on the top tab on the right, then get the details from the tab underneath it. It looks to be pretty accurate as far as O & G is concerned, at least from my experience in the industry (which is considerable in some aspects).

;o)

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [Sarah](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 03:48:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Pretty cool little map. I had no idea we had that much nuclear happening.

My hometown is right in the middle of the biggest blob on the oil map . . . eastern Montana, near the North Dakota border. There was quite an oil boom up there in the '70s, my little town doubled in size to about 12,000. Now it's dwindled down to about 4,000.

S

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:4664bd13@linux...
> <http://www.msnbc.com/modules/eoe/energy.asp>
>
> click on the top tab on the right, then get the details from the tab
> underneath it. It looks to be pretty accurate as far as O & G is
> concerned, at least from my experience in the industry (which is
> considerable in some aspects).
>
> ;o)
>
>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [rick](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 08:55:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

yeah i'm sittin' on 20 million metric tons of coal about 35' down here...except it's a high sulfur never to be used variety

On Mon, 4 Jun 2007 19:24:44 -0600, "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com>
wrote:

><http://www.msnbc.com/modules/eoe/energy.asp>

>

>click on the top tab on the right, then get the details from the tab

>underneath it. It looks to be pretty accurate as far as O & G is concerned,

>at least from my experience in the industry (which is considerable in some

>aspects).

>

>;o)

>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info

Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 14:02:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We had a presentation by an energy group talking about imports. His claim was that if after the 1973 oil shock the US had mandated that cars become one percent more efficient across the board (no more light truck exemption) we wouldn't need to import a drop of oil from anywhere other than Canada and Mexico, and we'd need even less than them. He also argued persuasively that this would not involve any wacky technology, the tech was and is purely off the shelf stuff, fully engineered and all of it is currently used in at least some cars.

Here's a New Scientist story about the impact on the economy were we to start such a program now.

<http://www.americanscientist.org/template/AssetDetail/assetid/40799?fulltext=true>

But the iconic post 9-11 image of America has been a big freakin Chevy Blazer motoring down a mountain valley with a half dozen American flags stuck in and on it, stuffing money into the pockets of Saudi plutocrats who pay shakedown money to real crazies in the middle east.

TCB

P.S. I'm a total hypocrite, I drive a '66 Thunderbird with a 490 big block V8 and a curb weight of nearly 4500 pounds. It gets 13 MPG on a good day and needs to have premium. But I also walk to work and try to keep my electricity use reasonable.

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote:

><http://www.msnbc.com/modules/eoe/energy.asp>

>

>click on the top tab on the right, then get the details from the tab
>underneath it. It looks to be pretty accurate as far as O & G is concerned,

>at least from my experience in the industry (which is considerable in some

>aspects).
>
>;o)
>
>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [DC](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 14:31:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>We had a presentation by an energy group talking about imports. His claim
>was that if after the 1973 oil shock the US had mandated that cars become
>one percent more efficient across the board (no more light truck exemption)

The light truck exemption is problematic, yet there is little way around it.

Taking it away sounds attractive, but they are about as efficient as current tech allows and need to be able to carry things and tow and that requires power and frame strength and that means big engines and weight.

Now, the purchasing of these things by consumers is a way around CAFE but it also drives the manufacturing of them and keeps the price affordable for businesses. Restrict them to business only, and way fewer get made and the price goes nuts and businesses take the hit. Charge punitive consumption taxes; same thing.

Nonetheless, I think the applying of CAFE standards to light trucks is likely, especially if the dems get more power. This will ding small business harder than anyone else and will move small trucks and 4wd into the "rich people only" area where they will quickly become status symbols. Chrysler, whose trucks are about the only thing they actually make money on, will likely go under.

The other thing we have to look at is how long it has been since we built a refinery and why a few rich NIMBY's manage to keep us from drilling for oil so easily when it is clearly time to do so.

DC

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 14:41:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

how much of the overall "car" pollution is from 18 wheelers. they never talk about cleaning them up.

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 15:02:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>
>how much of the overall "car" pollution is from 18 wheelers. they never talk
>about cleaning them up.

Surprisingly little. Big trucks and buses, surprisingly, account for only six percent of total highway miles driven. Their main pollution problem is soot and particulate matter they spit out, which they do rather a lot.

<http://go.ucsusa.org/publications/nucleus.cfm?publicationID=182>

TCB

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [John \[1\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 15:55:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It appears smaller but 25% is half of what cars contribute so smog according to that chart right ?

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:
>>
>>how much of the overall "car" pollution is from 18 wheelers. they never
>talk
>>about cleaning them up.
>
>Surprisingly little. Big trucks and buses, surprisingly, account for only
>six percent of total highway miles driven. Their main pollution problem
is
>soot and particulate matter they spit out, which they do rather a lot.
>
> <http://go.ucsusa.org/publications/nucleus.cfm?publicationID=182>

>
>TCB

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 16:09:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's mostly the particulate matter and soot.

I'm not saying diesel engines and heavy iron shouldn't be more human friendly on emissions, I'm just saying they're not as bad as a lot of people think.

TCB

"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>
>It appears smaller but 25% is half of what cars contribute so smog according
>to that chart right ?

>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>
>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>>>
>>>how much of the overall "car" pollution is from 18 wheelers. they never
>>talk
>>>about cleaning them up.

>>
>>Surprisingly little. Big trucks and buses, surprisingly, account for only
>>six percent of total highway miles driven. Their main pollution problem
>is
>>soot and particulate matter they spit out, which they do rather a lot.

>>
>> <http://go.ucsusa.org/publications/nucleus.cfm?publicationID=182>

>>
>>TCB

>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [JeffH](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 16:26:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://www.innovations.harvard.edu/news/24571.html>

I got to do a ridealong on one of the new ones a couple weeks back. It still has the power to pull but runs much cleaner. It does, however use more fuel.

Jeff

TCB wrote:

> That's mostly the particulate matter and soot.

>

> I'm not saying diesel engines and heavy iron shouldn't be more human friendly

> on emissions, I'm just saying they're not as bad as a lot of people think.

>

>

> TCB

>

> "John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>

>>It appears smaller but 25% is half of what cars contribute so smog according
>>to that chart right ?

>>

>>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>>"John" <no@no.com> wrote:

>>>

>>>>how much of the overall "car" pollution is from 18 wheelers. they never

>>>

>>>talk

>>>

>>>>about cleaning them up.

>>>

>>>Surprisingly little. Big trucks and buses, surprisingly, account for only
>>>six percent of total highway miles driven. Their main pollution problem

>>

>>is

>>

>>>soot and particulate matter they spit out, which they do rather a lot.

>

>

>>> <http://go.ucsusa.org/publications/nucleus.cfm?publicationID=182>

>>>

>>>TCB

>>

>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info

Posted by [Graham Duncan](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 18:08:28 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

DC wrote:

> Now, the purchasing of these things by consumers is a way around CAFE
> but it also drives the manufacturing of them and keeps the price affordable
> for businesses. Restrict them to business only, and way fewer get made
> and the price goes nuts and businesses take the hit. Charge punitive
> consumption taxes; same thing.

Isn't this what tax credits for businesses are all about? At a certain point vehicles could cost too much for any small business to afford, but there are tons of breaks (see tax code fore mileage, hybrids, or for f-ing SUVs).

> The other thing we have to look at is how long it has been since we
> built a refinery and why a few rich NIMBY's manage to keep us from
> drilling for oil so easily when it is clearly time to do so.

My guess is refinery construction stays low so that prices go up. Shocking! :) As for oil drilling, I don't think oil is the solution for our energy needs. Save it for plastics. I find it horribly short-sighted of us to find ways to use all the oil as quickly as possible. If China and India start using oil in ways we do, it's gone.

So we must find another source of energy.

IMO.

Graham

Subject: Re: interesting energy info

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 18:41:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's Clinton's fault.....;oD

(ducking for cover)

;o)

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:4664dec1@linux...

> Pretty cool little map. I had no idea we had that much nuclear happening.

>

> My hometown is right in the middle of the biggest blob on the oil map . .

> . eastern Montana, near the North Dakota border. There was quite an oil

> boom up there in the '70s, my little town doubled in size to about 12,000.

> Now it's dwindled down to about 4,000.
>
> S
>
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> wrote in message news:4664bd13@linux...
>> http://www.msnbc.com/modules/eoe/energy.asp
>>
>> click on the top tab on the right, then get the details from the tab
>> underneath it. It looks to be pretty accurate as far as O & G is
>> concerned, at least from my experience in the industry (which is
>> considerable in some aspects).
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 19:09:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Graham Duncan <graham@grahamduncan.com> wrote:

>Isn't this what tax credits for businesses are all about? At a certain
>point vehicles could cost too much for any small business to afford, but
>there are tons of breaks (see tax code fore mileage, hybrids, or for
>f-ing SUVs).

i would hate to see small businesses relying on tax breaks for basics like vehicles. I think the truck exemption is going to be hard to eliminate.

>My guess is refinery construction stays low so that prices go up.
>Shocking! :)

No, as I understand it, there has not been a new refinery approved in many years. It seems that everyone wants gas, but no one wants a refinery near them.

>As for oil drilling, I don't think oil is the solution
>for our energy needs. Save it for plastics. I find it horribly

>short-sighted of us to find ways to use all the oil as quickly as possible. If China and India start using oil in ways we do, it's gone.

> So we must find another source of energy.

I have heard estimates of oil reserves amounting to hundreds of years worth, and right now, there is no other usable solution.

Yes, develop alternatives. But this situation we have found ourselves in with financing these middle east satraps is so deadly that our first priority must be energy independence, not alternatives which are not ready. Too many people are trying to turn this situation into the big opportunity for alternatives. It is not, and to treat it as such when there is so much work to be done in that area yet, is pure foolishness.

BTW, there is one source for both clean electricity and hydrogen for cars... Nuclear plants, and further development of fusion power. Are you ready for it, or is it going to be another NIMBY issue?

I don't think very many people realize how serious this issue has become...

DC

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [erlilo](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 19:43:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

He too was a product of America.....;oD...ducking too.....;-o)

"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> skrev i en meddelelse news:4665b01c@linux...

> It's Clinton's fault.....;oD

>

> (ducking for cover)

>

> ;o)

>

> "Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:4664dec1@linux...

>> Pretty cool little map. I had no idea we had that much nuclear

>> happening.

>>

>> My hometown is right in the middle of the biggest blob on the oil map . .

>> . eastern Montana, near the North Dakota border. There was quite an oil

>> boom up there in the '70s, my little town doubled in size to about

>> 12,000. Now it's dwindled down to about 4,000.

>>
>> S
>>
>>
>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote in message news:4664bd13@linux...
>>> http://www.msnbc.com/modules/eoe/energy.asp
>>>
>>> click on the top tab on the right, then get the details from the tab
>>> underneath it. It looks to be pretty accurate as far as O & G is
>>> concerned, at least from my experience in the industry (which is
>>> considerable in some aspects).
>>>
>>> ;o)
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [JeffH](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 19:49:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

....And Europe is not a conglomeration of german facist vassals because
of America too....

(ducking...behind the largest object in miles ;-p

Jeff

erlilo wrote:

> He too was a product of America.....;oD...ducking too.....;-o)
>
> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> skrev i en meddelelse news:4665b01c@linux...
>
>>It's Clinton's fault.....;oD
>>
>>(ducking for cover)
>>
>>;o)
>>
>>"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:4664dec1@linux...
>>
>>>Pretty cool little map. I had no idea we had that much nuclear
>>>happening.

>>>
>>>My hometown is right in the middle of the biggest blob on the oil map . .
>>>. eastern Montana, near the North Dakota border. There was quite an oil
>>>boom up there in the '70s, my little town doubled in size to about
>>>12,000. Now it's dwindled down to about 4,000.
>>>
>>>S
>>>
>>>
>>>"DJ" <www.aarrrrggghh!!!.com> wrote in message news:4664bd13@linux...
>>>
>>>>http://www.msnbc.com/modules/eoe/energy.asp
>>>>
>>>>click on the top tab on the right, then get the details from the tab
>>>>underneath it. It looks to be pretty accurate as far as O & G is
>>>>concerned, at least from my experience in the industry (which is
>>>>considerable in some aspects).
>>>>
>>>>;o)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [TCB](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 20:13:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DC" <dc@spammersinDetroit.com> wrote:
>
>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>>
>>We had a presentation by an energy group talking about imports. His claim
>>was that if after the 1973 oil shock the US had mandated that cars become
>>one percent more efficient across the board (no more light truck exemption)
>
>The light truck exemption is problematic, yet there is little way around
>it.
>Taking it away sounds attractive, but they are about as efficient as current
>tech allows and need to be able to carry things and tow and that requires
>power and frame strength and that means big engines and weight.

I dunno, Don, I see a whole lot of Westport hedge fund wives driving around Eddie Bauer Edition SUV's that get 11 MPG. The average weight of all cars

has been going up since the 80's, mostly because of 'light' trucks. Do more people need heavy hauling/towing capacity than used to, or are people buying heavier, more powerful cars/trucks than they need?

>Now, the purchasing of these things by consumers is a way around CAFE
>but it also drives the manufacturing of them and keeps the price affordable
>for businesses. Restrict them to business only, and way fewer get made
>and the price goes nuts and businesses take the hit. Charge punitive
>consumption taxes; same thing.

I'm not one of those people who thinks that a \$2/gallon gas tax is a good thing. I think if we bomb Iran and gas goes to \$12 per gallon in the marketplace that probably would be a good thing because people would realize that we can't have a smart energy policy without a smart foreign policy. But I don't think a high gas tax would do anything significant to the behavior of the Westport hedge fund wives and I'm from the Midwest so I realize that some people have jobs where they really need to drive 100 miles per day.

That said, the question is are we making people truly pay the price for their choices. By exempting light trucks we are in essence subsidizing fuel inefficient vehicles. Does that make any sense if we are trying to use less oil? We made laws to attain that goal and I think it's a classic loophole that is letting people not pay the right price for those vehicles.

>Nonetheless, I think the applying of CAFE standards to light trucks is
>likely, especially if the dems get more power. This will ding small
>business harder than anyone else and will move small trucks and 4wd
>into the "rich people only" area where they will quickly become
>status symbols. Chrysler, whose trucks are about the only thing they
>actually make money on, will likely go under.

And if Chrysler can't make money because they can't build cars that people want to buy they should go under, just like if I can't write good enough code to do the job I should get fired. Again, it's a question of whether we're pricing things correctly. We decided that it was in the interest of everyone to have more fuel efficient vehicles, and think that's almost a statement of fact. So the people who drive less efficient cars are welcome to do so, they can pay more for their gas and more for their cars and trucks. If a person really needs the kind of towing and hauling capacity for their work then they have to build that into what they charge for a job.

>The other thing we have to look at is how long it has been since we
>built a refinery and why a few rich NIMBY's manage to keep us from
>drilling for oil so easily when it is clearly time to do so.

Are we short on refining capacity? Deej? And yes we should be seeking for domestic oil capacity, but we should be expending at least as much effort, probably more, on domestic conservation and domestic renewables. That's the

real fix, even though it's a long way off, the sooner we start the sooner we'll get there.

TCB

>DC

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 20:28:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>I dunno, Don, I see a whole lot of Westport hedge fund wives driving around
>Eddie Bauer Edition SUV's that get 11 MPG. The average weight of all cars
>has been going up since the 80's, mostly because of 'light' trucks. Do more
>people need heavy hauling/towing capacity than used to, or are people buying
>heavier, more powerful cars/trucks than they need?

Out here it's 90lb asian girls in H2's that get 8...

Really, these are cliches and while they are true in many cases, in many others they have a bunch of people in them and millions of small businesses require them.

How do you stop it without unintended consequences?

>That said, the question is are we making people truly pay the price for their
>choices. By exempting light trucks we are in essence subsidizing fuel inefficient
>vehicles. Does that make any sense if we are trying to use less oil?

Call me a libertarian, but energy conservation is bullshit...

use it use it use it.. Doing so supplies the money and science to replace it. A weakened economy with silly people putting nasty notes on the windshields of H2's (like someone does out in Santa Monica all the time) does not provide either the money, nor the motive to replace oil and to get more oil in the meantime.

BTW, I drive a certified ULEV vehicle. I just don't want people acting like nazis to others about their vehicle choice.

>We made

>laws to attain that goal and I think it's a classic loophole that is letting
>people not pay the right price for those vehicles.

Actually I totally agree. I just wonder how to do it without hammering people who do not deserve it?

>And if Chrysler can't make money because they can't build cars that people
>want to buy they should go under,

Agreed, but if enough companies go under, then even Toyota will start making horrible vehicles because there is no competition. Bail out Chrysler? Nope, but I don't want to legislate them into bankruptcy either.

>If a person really needs the kind of towing and hauling capacity for their
>work then they have to build that into what they charge for a job.

There's the problem... Eventually, my clients will stop buying. When they do, I can't pay my mechanic to fix my car, nor the roofer to fix the roof, etc etc... "The customer" does not have endlessly deep pockets.

Remember, the rich can afford whatever punitive taxes you throw at them. If they want the Eddie Bauer, they will get it. The small business gal is another question entirely...

>Are we short on refining capacity? Deej? And yes we should be seeking for
>domestic oil capacity, but we should be expending at least as much effort,
>probably more, on domestic conservation and domestic renewables.

I understand we have not built a new refinery in 20 years in the US. That's just strategic suicide. I agree on spending on alternatives but never to the detriment of the oil infrastructure.

>That's the
>real fix, even though it's a long way off, the sooner we start the sooner
>we'll get there.

Agreed. Here come the nukes...

DC

Subject: Re: interesting energy info

Posted by [erlilo](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 20:58:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Jeff, you don't need to duck at all but here it seems you have ducked wrong in the second worldwarstory;-) The big bad wolf, Sovjet did a great job too, but in a totalitarian different way, after they had lost millions of people in that war. I have read how many America lost but can't remember but I mean it was far, far from a million. So, Sovjet did the job from east so America, England and other occupied lands like Norway, could get room to do the job from west, over the English channel.

Erling

"Jeff Hoover" <jkhoover@excite.com> skrev i en meddelelse
news:4665c03e@linux...

> ...And Europe is not a conglomeration of german facist vassals because of
> America too....

>

>

> (ducking...behind the largest object in miles ;-p

>

> Jeff

>

> erlilo wrote:

>> He too was a product of America.....;oD...ducking too.....;-o)

>>

>> "DJ" <www.aarrrrggghhh!!!.com> skrev i en meddelelse

>> news:4665b01c@linux...

>>

>>>It's Clinton's fault.....;oD

>>>

>>>(ducking for cover)

>>>

>>>;o)

>>>

>>>"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message

>>>news:4664dec1@linux...

>>>

>>>>Pretty cool little map. I had no idea we had that much nuclear

>>>>happening.

>>>>

>>>>My hometown is right in the middle of the biggest blob on the oil map .

>>>>. . eastern Montana, near the North Dakota border. There was quite an

>>>>oil boom up there in the '70s, my little town doubled in size to about

>>>>12,000. Now it's dwindled down to about 4,000.

>>>>

>>>>S

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

NIMBY? Sorry, don't know that one. I assume it's a term for liberals?

Until solar and wind can increase capacity, I think nuclear is the best option. We have it. It's probably easier to find a place to dump the waste than it is to develop something new, so that's probably what will happen. Sometimes I think the US is just lazy. ;)

> I don't think very many people realize how serious this issue
> has become...

I think it's serious. It should have been serious when the oil in Texas ran dry last century. It was serious in the 70's, but people don't see much past their immediate surroundings and comforts. It's a real bummer about humanity.

And to bring us back to audio: I'm hoping to get my next studio (when I can buy a house) on solar. Should be cool...

Anyway, interesting discussion!

Graham

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [excelav](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 23:25:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We need fuel efficient cars and trucks.

As soon as everybody starts driving cars that get 50 to 100 MPG, we'll be paying \$20.00 to \$100.00 for a quart of oil, and \$20.00 for a gallon of gas.

They will have some new excuse for why they are screwing us. I think you'll see demand for gas go down if we have more fuel efficient cars, but I'll bet prices will go up. They're playing us now, they'll be playing us then.

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>>I dunno, Don, I see a whole lot of Westport hedge fund wives driving around

>>Eddie Bauer Edition SUV's that get 11 MPG. The average weight of all cars

>>has been going up since the 80's, mostly because of 'light' trucks. Do

more

>>people need heavy hauling/towing capacity than used to, or are people buying

>>heavier, more powerful cars/trucks than they need?

>

>Out here it's 90lb asian girls in H2's that get 8...

>

>Really, these are cliches and while they are true in many
>cases, in many others they have a bunch of people in them and
>millions of small businesses require them.
>
>How do you stop it without unintended consequences?
>
>
>
>>That said, the question is are we making people truly pay the price for
>their
>>choices. By exempting light trucks we are in essence subsidizing fuel inefficient
>>vehicles. Does that make any sense if we are trying to use less oil?
>
>Call me a libertarian, but energy conservation is bullshit...
>
>use it use it use it.. Doing so supplies the money and science
>to replace it. A weakened economy with silly people putting
>nasty notes on the windshields of H2's (like someone does out
>in Santa Monica all the time) does not provide either the
>money, nor the motive to replace oil and to get more oil
>in the meantime.
>
>BTW, I drive a certified ULEV vehicle. I just don't want people
>acting like nazis to others about their vehicle choice.
>
>>We made
>>laws to attain that goal and I think it's a classic loophole that is letting
>>people not pay the right price for those vehicles.
>
>Actually I totally agree. I just wonder how to do it without
>hammering people who do not deserve it?
>
>>And if Chrysler can't make money because they can't build cars that people
>>want to buy they should go under,
>
>Agreed, but if enough companies go under, then even Toyota
>will start making horrible vehicles because there is no
>competition. Bail out Chrysler? Nope, but I don't want to
>legislate them into bankruptcy either.
>
>
>>If a person _really_ needs the kind of towing and hauling capacity for
>their
>>work then they have to build that into what they charge for a job.
>
>There's the problem... Eventually, my clients will stop buying.
>When they do, I can't pay my mechanic to fix my car, nor the
>roofer to fix the roof, etc etc... "The customer" does not have

>endlessly deep pockets.
>
>Remember, the rich can afford whatever punitive taxes you throw
>at them. If they want the Eddie Bauer, they will get it. The small
>business gal is another question entirely...
>
>
>>Are we short on refining capacity? DeeJ? And yes we should be seeking for
>>domestic oil capacity, but we should be expending at least as much effort,
>>probably more, on domestic conservation and domestic renewables.
>
>I understand we have not built a new refinery in 20 years in the
>US. That's just strategic suicide. I agree on spending on
>alternatives but never to the detriment of the oil infrastructure.
>
>
>>That's the
>>real fix, even though it's a long way off, the sooner we start the sooner
>>we'll get there.
>
>Agreed. Here come the nukes...
>
>DC
>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 23:28:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm looking into electric cars.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

James McCloskey wrote:

> We need fuel efficient cars and trucks.
>
> As soon as everybody starts driving cars that get 50 to 100 MPG, we'll be
> paying \$20.00 to \$100.00 for a quart of oil, and \$20.00 for a gallon of gas.
> They will have some new excuse for why they are screwing us. I think you'll
> see demand for gas go down if we have more fuel efficient cars, but I'll
> bet prices will go up. There playing us now, they'll be playing us then.
>
> "DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:
>> "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>
>>> I dunno, Don, I see a whole lot of Westport hedge fund wives driving around
>>> Eddie Bauer Edition SUV's that get 11 MPG. The average weight of all cars
>>> has been going up since the 80's, mostly because of 'light' trucks. Do
> more
>>> people need heavy hauling/towing capacity than used to, or are people buying
>>> heavier, more powerful cars/trucks than they need?
>> Out here it's 90lb asian girls in H2's that get 8...
>>
>> Really, these are cliches and while they are true in many
>> cases, in many others they have a bunch of people in them and
>> millions of small businesses require them.
>>
>> How do you stop it without unintended consequences?
>>
>>
>>
>>> That said, the question is are we making people truly pay the price for
>> their
>>> choices. By exempting light trucks we are in essence subsidizing fuel inefficient
>>> vehicles. Does that make any sense if we are trying to use less oil?
>> Call me a libertarian, but energy conservation is bullshit...
>>
>> use it use it use it.. Doing so supplies the money and science
>> to replace it. A weakened economy with silly people putting
>> nasty notes on the windshields of H2's (like someone does out
>> in Santa Monica all the time) does not provide either the
>> money, nor the motive to replace oil and to get more oil
>> in the meantime.
>>
>> BTW, I drive a certified ULEV vehicle. I just don't want people
>> acting like nazis to others about their vehicle choice.
>>
>>> We made
>>> laws to attain that goal and I think it's a classic loophole that is letting
>>> people not pay the right price for those vehicles.
>> Actually I totally agree. I just wonder how to do it without
>> hammering people who do not deserve it?
>>
>>> And if Chrysler can't make money because they can't build cars that people
>>> want to buy they should go under,
>> Agreed, but if enough companies go under, then even Toyota
>> will start making horrible vehicles because their is no
>> competition. Bail out Chrysler? Nope, but I don't want to
>> legislate them into bankruptcy either.
>>
>>
>>> If a person really needs the kind of towing and hauling capacity for

> their
>>> work then they have to build that into what they charge for a job.
>> There's the problem... Eventually, my clients will stop buying.
>> When they do, I can't pay my mechanic to fix my car, nor the
>> roofer to fix the roof, etc etc... "The customer" does not have
>> endlessly deep pockets.
>>
>> Remember, the rich can afford whatever punitive taxes you throw
>> at them. If they want the Eddie Bauer, they will get it. The small
>> business gal is another question entirely...
>>
>>
>>> Are we short on refining capacity? Deej? And yes we should be seeking for
>>> domestic oil capacity, but we should be expending at least as much effort,
>>> probably more, on domestic conservation and domestic renewables.
>> I understand we have not built a new refinery in 20 years in the
>> US. That's just strategic suicide. I agree on spending on
>> alternatives but never to the detriment of the oil infrastructure.
>>
>>
>>> That's the
>>> real fix, even though it's a long way off, the sooner we start the sooner
>>> we'll get there.
>> Agreed. Here come the nukes...
>>
>> DC
>>
>

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 23:42:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Graham Duncan <graham@grahamduncan.com> wrote:

>So... when do you propose we START pouring resources into alternatives?

Now! We should be doing both. There is no reason we cannot do both, and now.

> I'd say it's as good an opportunity as any. Imagine if we put all the

>billions we've spent in Iraq into energy research. You want something
>fast, blow a lot of money into it.

if there is never a democracy in Iraq, I would agree. If there is, it was worth it.

>NIMBY? Sorry, don't know that one. I assume it's a term for liberals?

Not In My Backyard, and they run the gamut politically. They move into areas where there are airports and try to close the airport down because of the noise. They vote "lawnorder" and protest a new prison. They bitch about gas prices and veto drilling off "their" coast to protect their view and property values. Ted Kennedy got wind turbines taken down because they were in view of his estate! That sort of sh*t...

NIMBY's have prevented us from building any new refineries for 20 years.

>Until solar and wind can increase capacity, I think nuclear is the best

>option. We have it. It's probably easier to find a place to dump the >waste than it is to develop something new, so that's probably what will

>happen. Sometimes I think the US is just lazy. ;)

The others aren't ready and might not be ready in our lifetime no matter the investment. The materials cost for photovoltaic cells does can be more than the cost of the energy they replace...

There are alternatives and we need to really work on them, and now. I like the mirrors and steam generator thing they are trying out in the desert up here.

And drlll drill drill and build refineries...

>And to bring us back to audio: I'm hoping to get my next studio (when I

>can buy a house) on solar. Should be cool...

We want the details when you do!

best

DC

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Tue, 05 Jun 2007 23:48:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote:

>There playing us now, they'll be playing us then.

Nonsense! Every collusion, every attempt to corner a market, every artificially inflated price, is a wonderful opportunity for someone to come and eat their lunch.

We do it in my business. There is a big sound company that does nice work. They charge an enormous amount for their good work. We do better work. If they bid 300K on a job, we bid 198K, and make money hand over fist! We eat their lunch all the time.

The problem with oil is the bottleneck at the refineries and suppliers. If we can deal with the NIMBY's we can make the Sheiks and Bigballs Chavez eat their damn oil. We just don't have the national will for it. We are lazy, self-centered, weak and comfortable. Scary huh?

DC

Subject: Re: interesting energy info
Posted by [Graham Duncan](#) on Wed, 06 Jun 2007 00:20:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> Now! We should be doing both. There is no reason we cannot
> do both, and now.

Agreed!

> Not In My Backyard, and they run the gamut politically.

Gotcha.

> There are alternatives and we need to really work on them,
> and now. I like the mirrors and steam generator thing they
> are trying out in the desert up here.

>
> And drlll drill drill and build refineries...

Yeah, there are some cool developments. We could probably augment drilling with better fuel efficiency and importing from Russia as well.

I'm really all for helping other countries find their democratic roots -- but I do have issues with the conflation of foreign policy with energy policy in our choices of when & where. See: Africa.

<http://www.theonion.com/content/node/31374>

>> And to bring us back to audio: I'm hoping to get my next studio (when I >> can buy a house) on solar. Should be cool...

>

> We want the details when you do!

:) Depending on where it is, there may be wind + geothermal involved too. The newer power amps from Flying Mole & the like would help since they're so efficient. I'll have to keep some serious capacity for all my tube amps and class A mic pres though... so it may take years before I can afford it.

Graham
