
Subject: OT: Gas hostages

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 06:02:55 GMT

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

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protest_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI

A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station did this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone is doing something.

It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah, right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game is one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it - twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).

I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after* a full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in time for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything" solution.

And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the hands that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them go bankrupt.

Sorry for the rant.

If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages

Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 09:12:23 GMT

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

the sun has something to do with daylight?????? damn.

On Fri, 25 May 2007 00:02:55 -0600, Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>
> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI

>
>A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station did
>this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone
>is doing something.

>
>It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits
>every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game is
>one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it -
>twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).

>
>I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to
>ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after* a
>full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in time
>for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>(after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>solution.

>
>And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean
>steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
>fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the hands
>that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them go
>bankrupt.

>
>Sorry for the rant.

>
>If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)

>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages

Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 10:24:05 GMT

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

rick wrote:

> the sun has something to do with daylight?????? damn.

>

>

I also heard the sun had something to do with the weather.

Subject: Re: Gas hostages

Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 12:35:44 GMT

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

I have been affecting change in my own way to some degree, and having fun while doing it. It takes almost \$50 to fill my jap car, and that is NUTS. My bike, on the other hand will run over a 100 miles on about \$7. Which one do you think I drive daily when weather permits?

AA

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

news:C27BD82F.A11A@dterry@keyofd.net...

>

> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protest_8;_ylt=Aht

> vulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAl

>

> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station

> did

> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least

> someone

> is doing something.

>

> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record

> profits

> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,

> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game

> is

> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it -

> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil

> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).

>

> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to

> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after* a

> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in

> time

> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into

> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
> solution.
>
> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean
> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
> hands
> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them go
> bankrupt.
>
> Sorry for the rant.
>
> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 13:50:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

what is this...make rick look dumb day? so how does it do that??? i
tried looking at it directly but all i got was a headache and a trip
to the doctors.

On Fri, 25 May 2007 06:24:05 -0400, Don Nafe <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>rick wrote:
>> the sun has something to do with daylight?????? damn.
>>
>>
>
>I also heard the sun had something to do with the weather.

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 13:56:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I've never quite understood the American rage at fuel prices. I'm finishing off my first iced tea of the day, which is water plus leaves grown in a third world country and shipped here. I pay \$2.12 for a 16 ounce plastic cup of it. Take out a nickel for the cup, a quarter for the tea (very generous), and a dime for overhead and I'm paying 1.72 for water. That's not too far off what bottled water costs. 128 ounces in a gallon, so I'm paying 13.75 for water. In addition this water is from naturally replenishing aquifers relatively near me, and to turn it into drinkable water some minor filtering and sterilizing has to happen.

Compare that with gasoline. It has to be dug out of the ground using some pretty wild technology, and depending on where it comes from it will need either a great deal of refining (Saudi crude) or an unbelievable nearly magic amount of refining (Canadian oil sands). Unlike water it's highly volatile, so it needs all kinds of fancy equipment to keep it from blowing up at every stage of the refining process. Then it has to be trucked or shipped around in very specialized containers and stored in extremely expensive (and regulated) tanks before I can use it. And when I pull up to the pump in my '66 Thunderbird I'm paying less than 4.00/gal for premium. Seems to me the gas should cost more than the water.

TCB

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>

> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protest_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI

>

>A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station did

>this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone >is doing something.

>

>It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits >every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah, >right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game is

>one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it - >twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil >industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).

>

>I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to >ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after* a

>full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in time

>for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into

>believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore

>(after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>solution.
>
>And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean
>steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
>fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the hands
>that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
go
>bankrupt.
>
>Sorry for the rant.
>
>If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 14:19:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I for one am incredibly pissed. A couple of years ago I saw the writing on the wall and at considerable expense converted my cars engine to run on whole milk. Have you guys seen the price of a gallon of milk lately?

Chuck

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>
> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>
>A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station did
>this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone
>is doing something.
>
>It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits
>every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game is
>one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it -

>twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>
>I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to
>ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>a
>full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in
>time
>for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>(after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>solution.
>
>And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean
>steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
>fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the hands
>that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>go
>bankrupt.
>
>Sorry for the rant.
>
>If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 14:32:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I see your point Thad, but the difference is when looking at the "record profits" side of this. I don't see Starbucks (for example) making record profit every quarter, though I'm not following them regularly - they are growing and doing quite well, as one would expect of a profitable business, but they also aren't raising prices every day because a tea leaf farmer in China got the 24-hour flu. They also add new products and services to entice customers, and run specials, promotions, etc. When is the last time you got a 2 for 1 coupon for gas in the mail? Never? Same here.

If oil companies were reporting steady profits or a small loss here or there followed by a good quarter the next to balance it or better even, then fine, that's economics (doesn't mean I have to like the way they are going about

it), but they aren't. Profits for the oil industry are in the trillions. Profits, not income. That means the cost of "water" for them is either going down, or they are just raising prices because consumers have no choice but to pay it. In most industries that's considered price gouging and monopolization (as an industry since there are "competing" companies that happen to be linked by a single oil-price fixing organization).

Of course oil companies "have to" report a profit to keep investors happy, so it's really a shell game to improve profitability, not provide a service or product at a reasonable price over costs.

Also take into account that Starbucks' retail outlets are actually making a profit on the tea they sell, and coffee, scones, etc. Local gas station owners aren't. They make most of their money on food and other goods. The only real loss the owner in the linked article really faced was not making up his cost in buying the gas to begin with. \$3.48 in cost means these guys are making pennies at best - some may even take a loss to compete with other stations. The only reason to own a gas station is to sell cokes, candy, and snacks, not gas - gas is just a guaranteed customer magnet. Gasoline isn't a retail profit industry but a distributor/developer profit industry. Most retail markets have the greatest markup at the retailer, not before. The oil industry is one of the few that's the other way around. That's the difference between the oil industry and Starbucks, or (pick your favorite tea/coffee shop).

Dedric

On 5/25/07 7:56 AM, in article 4656eb0b\$1 @linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>
> I've never quite understood the American rage at fuel prices. I'm finishing
> off my first iced tea of the day, which is water plus leaves grown in a third
> world country and shipped here. I pay \$2.12 for a 16 ounce plastic cup of
> it. Take out a nickel for the cup, a quarter for the tea (very generous),
> and a dime for overhead and I'm paying 1.72 for water. That's not too far
> off what bottled water costs. 128 ounces in a gallon, so I'm paying 13.75
> for water. In addition this water is from naturally replenishing aquifers
> relatively near me, and to turn it into drinkable water some minor filtering
> and sterilizing has to happen.
>
> Compare that with gasoline. It has to be dug out of the ground using some
> pretty wild technology, and depending on where it comes from it will need
> either a great deal of refining (Saudi crude) or an unbelievable nearly magic
> amount of refining (Canadian oil sands). Unlike water it's highly volatile,
> so it needs all kinds of fancy equipment to keep it from blowing up at every
> stage of the refining process. Then it has to be trucked or shipped around

> in very specialized containers and stored in extremely expensive (and
> regulated)
> tanks before I can use it. And when I pull up to the pump in my '66
> Thunderbird
> I'm paying less than 4.00/gal for premium. Seems to me the gas should cost
> more than the water.
>
> TCB
>
> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>
>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>
>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
> did
>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone
>> is doing something.
>>
>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits
>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game
> is
>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it -
>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>
>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to
>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
> a
>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in
> time
>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>> solution.
>>
>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean
>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the hands
>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
> go
>> bankrupt.
>>

>> Sorry for the rant.
>>
>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 16:16:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Take a look at these two charts. I'll write more later, busy day at work.

Gasoline prices adjusted for inflation

http://oregonstate.edu/Dept/pol_sci/fac/sahr/gasol.htm

Oil prices adjusted for inflation

http://inflationdata.com/inflation/images/charts/Oil/Inflation_Adj_Oil_Prices_Chart.htm

Crude is north of \$60 right now.

TCB

Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>I see your point Thad, but the difference is when looking at the "record
>profits" side of this. I don't see Starbucks (for example) making record
>profit every quarter, though I'm not following them regularly - they are
>growing and doing quite well, as one would expect of a profitable business,
>but they also aren't raising prices every day because a tea leaf farmer
in
>China got the 24-hour flu. They also add new products and services to
>entice customers, and run specials, promotions, etc. When is the last time
>you got a 2 for 1 coupon for gas in the mail? Never? Same here.
>
>If oil companies were reporting steady profits or a small loss here or there
>followed by a good quarter the next to balance it or better even, then fine,
>that's economics (doesn't mean I have to like the way they are going about
>it), but they aren't. Profits for the oil industry are in the trillions.
>Profits, not income. That means the cost of "water" for them is either
>going down, or they are just raising prices because consumers have no choice
>but to pay it. In most industries that's considered price gouging and
>monopolization (as an industry since there are "competing" companies that
>happen to be linked by a single oil-price fixing organization).

>
>Of course oil companies "have to" report a profit to keep investors happy,
>so it's really a shell game to improve profitability, not provide a service
>or product at a reasonable price over costs.
>
>Also take into account that Starbucks' retail outlets are actually making
a
>profit on the tea they sell, and coffee, scones, etc. Local gas station
>owners aren't. They make most of their money on food and other goods.
The
>only real loss the owner in the linked article really faced was not making
>up his cost in buying the gas to begin with. \$3.48 in cost means these guys
>are making pennies at best - some may even take a loss to compete with other
>stations. The only reason to own a gas station is to sell cokes, candy,
and
>snacks, not gas - gas is just a guaranteed customer magnet. Gasoline isn't
>a retail profit industry but a distributor/developer profit industry. Most
>retail markets have the greatest markup at the retailer, not before. The
>oil industry is one of the few that's the other way around. That's the
>difference between the oil industry and Starbucks, or (pick your favorite
>tea/coffee shop).
>
>Dedric
>
>
>On 5/25/07 7:56 AM, in article 4656eb0b\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
>wrote:
>
>>
>> I've never quite understood the American rage at fuel prices. I'm finishing
>> off my first iced tea of the day, which is water plus leaves grown in
a third
>> would country and shipped here. I pay \$2.12 for a 16 ounce plastic cup
of
>> it. Take out a nickel for the cup, a quarter for the tea (very generous),
>> and a dime for overhead and I'm paying 1.72 for water. That's not too
far
>> off what bottled water costs. 128 ounces in a gallon, so I'm paying 13.75
>> for water. In addition this water is from naturally replenishing aquifers
>> relatively near me, and to turn it into drinkable water some minor filtering
>> and sterilizing has to happen.
>>
>> Compare that with gasoline. It has to be dug out of the ground using some
>> pretty wild technology, and depending on where it comes from it will need
>> either a great deal of refining (Saudi crude) or an unbelievable nearly
magic
>> amount of refining (Canadian oil sands). Unlike water it's highly volatile,
>> so it needs all kinds of fancy equipment to keep it from blowing up at

every
>> stage of the refining process. Then it has to be trucked or shipped around
>> in very specialized containers and stored in extremely expensive (and
>> regulated)
>> tanks before I can use it. And when I pull up to the pump in my '66
>> Thunderbird
>> I'm paying less than 4.00/gal for premium. Seems to me the gas should
cost
>> more than the water.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>
>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAl
>>>
>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>> did
>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone
>>> is doing something.
>>>
>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits
>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game
>> is
>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it
-
>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>
>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
to
>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>> a
>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
in
>> time
>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>> solution.
>>>
>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
mean

>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
to
>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
hands
>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>> go
>>> bankrupt.
>>>
>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>
>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 16:19:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I turn on the tap and get water. It doesn't cost anything like 1.72/gal.
It's at least several orders of magnitude less expensive than that.
Whatever you're paying for in your tea product, Thad, it's not the
water, primarily.

Gas prices are destined to rise for several reasons.

- 1) There is only so much oil. Google "peak oil."

- 2) Rising worldwide demand. For example, growing economies in China and India are becoming big consumers.

- 3) Rising US demand. Energy policy here has been generally shortsighted over the last quarter century, at least, from the leadership down to the consumer level.

For example, by now we could have had MUCH more efficient vehicles on average, but we don't.

Meanwhile the population is growing. So we merrily burn up record amounts of petroleum products. Blame goes to leadership; the domestic car/truck industry; and consumers.

4) OPEC. 2/3 of the world's reserves and 40+% of production.

5) Consolidation in the oil industry. There is less competition. (Blamers, you may blame both Clinton and Bush.) It's easier to keep prices high when there are fewer major players involved.

Whether there is direct collusion is difficult to prove, the FTC who regulates and allows the current state of consolidation is very defensive about it, but their figures don't jive with the GAO's. The GAO sees evidence that mergers have helped drive up gasoline prices at the pump.

"In 2004, the five largest refiners controlled 56 percent of the gasoline refined in the United States and the 10 top companies controlled 85 percent, according to a study by Public Citizen, a private advocacy group.

Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter, R-Pa., said he hopes to soon consider legislation to strengthen antitrust laws on oil company mergers to allow closer scrutiny of their impact on competition..

The legislation also would make it illegal for companies to hold back refining crude oil -- or diverting or exporting refined products such as gasoline -- when supplies are short in a region in order to hold up prices. Some refiners in the past have been accused of diverting supplies despite supply shortages in a region.

"It isn't illegal just to be big," said Sen. Mike DeWine, R-Ohio, chairman of the Judiciary antitrust subcommittee. "What is not legal is when a company abuses its size or uses unfair tactics to shut out its competitors or harm competition."

State prosecutors from California and Wisconsin testified that current federal antitrust laws hinder prosecution for price gouging and excessive concentration in the refining and retail oil and gas industry."

<http://www.casperstartribune.net/articles/2006/03/14/news/national/cac5cd1d8b24f5598725713100660cb4.txt>

(written 2004) "Domestic refining and transportation costs account for

determined by the major oil companies operating in the United States. This share of company costs tacked on to the price of gasoline has been increasing. In November 2000, crude oil prices were at the same level they are today (more than \$36 per barrel), but retail gas prices today (\$1.78 per gallon) are 17 percent higher than they were then (\$1.55 per gallon). Most of this difference has been realized in higher profits

from the new mega-companies that have merged since 2000.

domestic oil production, half of all domestic refinery capacity, and nearly two-thirds of the retail market.

"The fact that a handful of companies control half of the domestic oil production is particularly significant given that the United States is

wonder that the market leader, ExxonMobil, posted after-tax profits of \$21.5 billion in 2003. When you control the market, you can manipulate the system to ensure enormous profits."

<http://www.citizen.org/pressroom/release.cfm?ID=1660>

6) Lack of refinery capacity in the USA. The oil industry has not seen fit to invest in increased refining capacity. Maybe Deej has some insights here.

"Until the mid-1990s, the United States had significant spare refining capacity. But because of consolidation in the industry, the number of refineries declined while unprofitable operations were shut. As demand grew, however, and capacity remained flat, the picture changed. In recent years, refineries in the United States have been running at or close to full capacity.

Domestic refineries can now process about 17.5 million barrels of crude oil each day, much of it imported. But with consumption now close to about 21 million barrels a day, more imports of refined products are also needed.

In recent weeks, refiners point out that they have been increasing output: gasoline production in the United States is at its highest level ever, 8.85 million barrels a day.

Also, by increasing output from existing refineries, oil companies say they have expanded their production by 200,000 barrels a day since last year. Expansion of existing plants has added the equivalent of 10 new refineries over the last 10 years.

main trade group.

But demand is outstripping supply. In the first three quarters of the

Domestically produced supplies, though, have increased by only 0.5 percent a year on average."

<http://www.wilmingtonstar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070524/ZNYT01/705240315/1002/business>

Consumer advocate Mark Cooper questioned at the House hearing whether the industry may be keeping supplies tight on purpose.

"By creating a situation of extremely tight supply, the oil companies gain control over price at the wholesale level," said Cooper, who monitors energy industries at the Consumer Federation of America. Despite huge increases in refinery profits, there have been no investments in refinery capacity, he argued.

http://www.examiner.com/a-731938~Lawmakers_ask_whether_oil_industry_investments_drive_up_prices.html

7) Refineries off line for maintenance. Take a bottleneck and squeeze further, apparently that's the situation here. Oil companies say this is not deliberate.

8) Complexity of refining different fuel blends.

9) Damage to infrastructure from Katrina and Rita.

9a) Aging infrastructure. Underfunded maintenance.

"BP Plc shut down a quarter of its 400,000 barrels-per-day Prudhoe Bay oil field in Alaska after finding a leaky water pipe on Monday, a company spokesman said.

BP workers shut down about 100,000 bpd of the field's production after finding water leaking from a 12-inch pipeline inside a processing facility that separates water from crude oil, said BP spokesman Ronnie Chappell.

Fewer than 20 barrels of water were spilled and never escaped the facility, Chappell said.

"We expect the facility to be down a few days while repairs are made," he said.

U.S. Rep. Bart Stupak, who heads the investigations arm of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, said the spill was a further sign that BP cost cutting was to blame for the poor state of infrastructure at Prudhoe Bay.

Stupak's subcommittee is probing a March 2006 oil spill at Prudhoe Bay, the biggest U.S. oil field. Internal corrosion in a pipeline that had been poorly maintained by BP was blamed for the spill, which dumped at least 200,000 gallons of crude oil onto the tundra.

A criminal investigation into the spill has been under way since last year. No charges have been laid.

Stupak has said that budget cuts at the London-based energy giant were to blame for past incidents, and said he will continue to investigate.

"While I have not seen all the facts on this most recent leak, it appears to be yet further evidence that BP's cost-cutting culture has put our nation's economy at risk," he said.

At a hearing last week, BP America Chief Executive Bob Malone conceded that "there were extreme budget pressures at Prudhoe Bay," which affected maintenance work.

BP operates Prudhoe Bay on behalf of its partners ConocoPhillips and ExxonMobil Corp."

<http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?enewsid=73940>

10) Fear of competition from ethanol. Apparently some oil executives are blaming oil industry foot dragging to increase refinery capacity on fear of competition from the mention of ethanol in Bush's state of the union speech in January. Or perhaps they are firing warning shots in an attempt to fend off competition.

"In hearings before Congress last year, oil executives outlined plans to increase fuel production by expanding existing refineries. Those plans would add capacity of 1.6 million to 1.8 million barrels a day over the next five years, for an increase of 10 percent, according to the National Petrochemical and Refiners Association.

But those plans have since been scaled back to more than one million barrels a day, according to the Energy Information Administration, an arm of the federal government.

in the biofuels industry, this is a disincentive for those making

investment decisions on expanding capacity in oil products and

<http://www.wilmingtonstar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070524/ZNYT01/705240315/1002/business>

11) This list goes to 11!

Bottom line, for a variety of reasons prices are going up and the oil industry is very profitable right now.

"Oil companies today are enjoying record profits, and while they could use those profits to invest in more production capacity, instead they use the money to buy back shares in the markets," complained Rep. John Conyers Jr., D-Mich., the panel's chairman.

Exxon Mobil Corp. and Chevron Corp., the nation's largest oil companies, earned a combined \$14 billion in the first quarter. Exxon bought Mobil in 1999, while Chevron acquired Texaco in 2001."

<http://www.grandhaventribune.com/paid/318406294137734.bsp>

Hey, it could be a lucrative industry for your next IT job, Thad:

<http://www.expresscomputeronline.com/20070528/oilenergy01.shtml>

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Dedric Terry wrote:

> I see your point Thad, but the difference is when looking at the "record
> profits" side of this. I don't see Starbucks (for example) making record
> profit every quarter, though I'm not following them regularly - they are
> growing and doing quite well, as one would expect of a profitable business,
> but they also aren't raising prices every day because a tea leaf farmer in
> China got the 24-hour flu. They also add new products and services to
> entice customers, and run specials, promotions, etc. When is the last time
> you got a 2 for 1 coupon for gas in the mail? Never? Same here.

>

> If oil companies were reporting steady profits or a small loss here or there
> followed by a good quarter the next to balance it or better even, then fine,

> that's economics (doesn't mean I have to like the way they are going about
> it), but they aren't. Profits for the oil industry are in the trillions.
> Profits, not income. That means the cost of "water" for them is either
> going down, or they are just raising prices because consumers have no choice
> but to pay it. In most industries that's considered price gouging and
> monopolization (as an industry since there are "competing" companies that
> happen to be linked by a single oil-price fixing organization).

>
> Of course oil companies "have to" report a profit to keep investors happy,
> so it's really a shell game to improve profitability, not provide a service
> or product at a reasonable price over costs.

>
> Also take into account that Starbucks' retail outlets are actually making a
> profit on the tea they sell, and coffee, scones, etc. Local gas station
> owners aren't. They make most of their money on food and other goods. The
> only real loss the owner in the linked article really faced was not making
> up his cost in buying the gas to begin with. \$3.48 in cost means these guys
> are making pennies at best - some may even take a loss to compete with other
> stations. The only reason to own a gas station is to sell cokes, candy, and
> snacks, not gas - gas is just a guaranteed customer magnet. Gasoline isn't
> a retail profit industry but a distributor/developer profit industry. Most
> retail markets have the greatest markup at the retailer, not before. The
> oil industry is one of the few that's the other way around. That's the
> difference between the oil industry and Starbucks, or (pick your favorite
> tea/coffee shop).

>
> Dedic

>
>
> On 5/25/07 7:56 AM, in article 4656eb0b\$1@linux, "TCB" <nobody@ishere.com>
> wrote:

>
>> I've never quite understood the American rage at fuel prices. I'm finishing
>> off my first iced tea of the day, which is water plus leaves grown in a third
>> world country and shipped here. I pay \$2.12 for a 16 ounce plastic cup of
>> it. Take out a nickel for the cup, a quarter for the tea (very generous),
>> and a dime for overhead and I'm paying 1.72 for water. That's not too far
>> off what bottled water costs. 128 ounces in a gallon, so I'm paying 13.75
>> for water. In addition this water is from naturally replenishing aquifers
>> relatively near me, and to turn it into drinkable water some minor filtering
>> and sterilizing has to happen.

>>
>> Compare that with gasoline. It has to be dug out of the ground using some
>> pretty wild technology, and depending on where it comes from it will need
>> either a great deal of refining (Saudi crude) or an unbelievable nearly magic
>> amount of refining (Canadian oil sands). Unlike water it's highly volatile,
>> so it needs all kinds of fancy equipment to keep it from blowing up at every
>> stage of the refining process. Then it has to be trucked or shipped around

>> in very specialized containers and stored in extremely expensive (and
>> regulated)
>> tanks before I can use it. And when I pull up to the pump in my '66
>> Thunderbird
>> I'm paying less than 4.00/gal for premium. Seems to me the gas should cost
>> more than the water.
>>
>> TCB
>>
>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protest_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>
>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>> did
>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone
>>> is doing something.
>>>
>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits
>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game
>> is
>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it -
>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>
>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to
>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>> a
>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in
>> time
>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>> solution.
>>>
>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean
>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the hands
>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>> go
>>> bankrupt.
>>>
>>> Sorry for the rant.

>>>
>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: Gas hostages
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 17:25:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow, where do you buy biodiesel? Sounds really cool!

Chuck

Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:

>
>OK, I'll guess.... The bike!
>
>Out here in the middle of nowhere, it's drive not at all (work at
>home) or 25 miles to the nearest town. Got an 02 Jetta Wagon last
>summer -- a TDI diesel. Terrific car. Gets over 40 MPG -- on
>biodiesel. No petroleum necessary, no conversion, nada. Just put the
>stuff in and go. 550 miles to the tank. \$3.05 a gallon. Technology
>has been around for a hundred years.
>
>With all the problems we have in the world today due to our dependence
>on oil, it's more than a little bit mind-boggling that more people
>haven't gotten around to this... There's nothing to develop, no big
>invention to prove out, no "breakthrough" to wait for: the vehicles
>exist and so does the fuel... What in the hell is it going to take?
>
>-- see you on the road -- chas.
>
>
>
>On Fri, 25 May 2007 07:35:44 -0500, "Aaron Allen"
><know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>
>>I have been affecting change in my own way to some degree, and having fun

>>while doing it. It takes almost \$50 to fill my jap car, and that is NUTS.
My
>>bike, on the other hand will run over a 100 miles on about \$7. Which one
do
>>you think I drive daily when weather permits?

>>
>>AA
>>
>>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>news:C27BD82F.A11A%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>
>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>
>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station

>>> did
>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>>> someone
>>> is doing something.
>>>
>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>>> profits
>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game

>>> is
>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it
>>> -
>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>
>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
>>> to
>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>>> a
>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
>>> in
>>> time
>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>> solution.
>>>
>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
>>> mean
>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
>>> to
>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the

>>> hands
>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
go
>>> bankrupt.
>>>
>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>
>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Don Nafe](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 17:25:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

chuck duffy wrote:

> Well, I for one am incredibly pissed. A couple of years ago I saw the writing
> on the wall and at considerable expense converted my cars engine to run on
> whole milk. Have you guys seen the price of a gallon of milk lately?

>
> Chuck

>
>
> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI

>>
>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
> did
>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone
>> is doing something.

>>
>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits
>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game
> is
>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it -
>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).

>>
>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to
>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
> a

>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in
> time
>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>> solution.
>>
>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean
>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the hands
>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
> go
>> bankrupt.
>>
>> Sorry for the rant.
>>
>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>
>>
>
Converted mine to run on urine...have you seen the price of beer lately

Subject: Re: Gas hostages
Posted by [duncan](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 17:40:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

OK, I'll guess.... The bike!

Out here in the middle of nowhere, it's drive not at all (work at home) or 25 miles to the nearest town. Got an 02 Jetta Wagon last summer -- a TDI diesel. Terrific car. Gets over 40 MPG -- on biodiesel. No petroleum necessary, no conversion, nada. Just put the stuff in and go. 550 miles to the tank. \$3.05 a gallon. Technology has been around for a hundred years.

With all the problems we have in the world today due to our dependence on oil, it's more than a little bit mind-boggling that more people haven't gotten around to this... There's nothing to develop, no big invention to prove out, no "breakthrough" to wait for: the vehicles exist and so does the fuel... What in the hell is it going to take?

-- see you on the road -- chas.

On Fri, 25 May 2007 07:35:44 -0500, "Aaron Allen"
<know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>I have been affecting change in my own way to some degree, and having fun
>while doing it. It takes almost \$50 to fill my jap car, and that is NUTS. My
>bike, on the other hand will run over a 100 miles on about \$7. Which one do
>you think I drive daily when weather permits?

>

>AA

>

>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message

>news:C27BD82F.A11A%dterry@keyofd.net...

>>

>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=Aht

>> vulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI

>>

>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station

>> did

>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least

>> someone

>> is doing something.

>>

>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record

>> profits

>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,

>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game

>> is

>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it -

>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil

>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).

>>

>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation to

>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after* a

>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in

>> time

>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into

>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore

>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping

>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"

>> solution.

>>

>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative

>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even

>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits mean

>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated

>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need to
>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
>> hands
>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them go
>> bankrupt.
>>
>> Sorry for the rant.
>>
>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 18:11:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's some impressive research Jamie - thanks for posting.

Regards,
Dedric

Btw - I'm converting my cars to run on air. Have you seen the price of tacky air fresheners lately? ;-)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:46570dec@linux...

>
> I turn on the tap and get water. It doesn't cost anything like 1.72/gal.
> It's at least several orders of magnitude less expensive than that.
> Whatever you're paying for in your tea product, Thad, it's not the water,
> primarily.
>
> Gas prices are destined to rise for several reasons.
>
> 1) There is only so much oil. Google "peak oil."
>
>
> 2) Rising worldwide demand. For example, growing economies in China and
> India are becoming big consumers.
>
>
> 3) Rising US demand. Energy policy here has been generally shortsighted
> over the last quarter century, at least, from the leadership down to the
> consumer level.
>
> For example, by now we could have had MUCH more efficient vehicles on

> average, but we don't.
>
> Meanwhile the population is growing. So we merrily burn up record amounts
> of petroleum products. Blame goes to leadership; the domestic car/truck
> industry; and consumers.
>
>
> 4) OPEC. 2/3 of the world's reserves and 40+% of production.
>
>
> 5) Consolidation in the oil industry. There is less competition. (Blamers,
> you may blame both Clinton and Bush.) It's easier to keep prices high when
> there are fewer major players involved.
>
> Whether there is direct collusion is difficult to prove, the FTC who
> regulates and allows the current state of consolidation is very defensive
> about it, but their figures don't jive with the GAO's. The GAO sees
> evidence that mergers have helped drive up gasoline prices at the pump.
>
> "In 2004, the five largest refiners controlled 56 percent of the gasoline
> refined in the United States and the 10 top companies controlled 85
> percent, according to a study by Public Citizen, a private advocacy group.
>
> Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter, R-Pa., said he hopes to soon
> consider legislation to strengthen antitrust laws on oil company mergers
> to allow closer scrutiny of their impact on competition..
>
> The legislation also would make it illegal for companies to hold back
> refining crude oil -- or diverting or exporting refined products such as
> gasoline -- when supplies are short in a region in order to hold up
> prices. Some refiners in the past have been accused of diverting supplies
> despite supply shortages in a region.
>
> "It isn't illegal just to be big," said Sen. Mike DeWine, R-Ohio, chairman
> of the Judiciary antitrust subcommittee. "What is not legal is when a
> company abuses its size or uses unfair tactics to shut out its competitors
> or harm competition."
>
> State prosecutors from California and Wisconsin testified that current
> federal antitrust laws hinder prosecution for price gouging and excessive
> concentration in the refining and retail oil and gas industry."
>
> <http://www.casperstartribune.net/articles/2006/03/14/news/national/cac5cd1d8b24f5598725713100660cb4.txt>
>
> (written 2004) "Domestic refining and transportation costs account for

> determined by the major oil companies operating in the United States. This

> share of company costs tacked on to the price of gasoline has been
> increasing. In November 2000, crude oil prices were at the same level they
> are today (more than \$36 per barrel), but retail gas prices today (\$1.78
> per gallon) are 17 percent higher than they were then (\$1.55 per gallon).
> Most of this difference has been realized in higher profits from the new
> mega-companies that have merged since 2000.
>

> oil production, half of all domestic refinery capacity, and nearly
> two-thirds of the retail market.
>
> "The fact that a handful of companies control half of the domestic oil
> production is particularly significant given that the United States is the

> that the market leader, ExxonMobil, posted after-tax profits of \$21.5
> billion in 2003. When you control the market, you can manipulate the
> system to ensure enormous profits."

>
> <http://www.citizen.org/pressroom/release.cfm?ID=1660>

>
>
> 6) Lack of refinery capacity in the USA. The oil industry has not seen fit
> to invest in increased refining capacity. Maybe DeeJ has some insights
> here.

>
> "Until the mid-1990s, the United States had significant spare refining
> capacity. But because of consolidation in the industry, the number of
> refineries declined while unprofitable operations were shut. As demand
> grew, however, and capacity remained flat, the picture changed. In recent
> years, refineries in the United States have been running at or close to
> full capacity.

>
> Domestic refineries can now process about 17.5 million barrels of crude
> oil each day, much of it imported. But with consumption now close to about
> 21 million barrels a day, more imports of refined products are also
> needed.

>
> In recent weeks, refiners point out that they have been increasing output:
> gasoline production in the United States is at its highest level ever,
> 8.85 million barrels a day.

>
> Also, by increasing output from existing refineries, oil companies say
> they have expanded their production by 200,000 barrels a day since last
> year. Expansion of existing plants has added the equivalent of 10 new
> refineries over the last 10 years.
>

- > group.
- >
- > But demand is outstripping supply. In the first three quarters of the

- > Domestically produced supplies, though, have increased by only 0.5 percent
- > a year on average."
- >
- > <http://www.wilmingtonstar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070524/ZNYT01/705240315/1002/business>
- >
- > Consumer advocate Mark Cooper questioned at the House hearing whether the
- > industry may be keeping supplies tight on purpose.
- >
- > "By creating a situation of extremely tight supply, the oil companies gain
- > control over price at the wholesale level," said Cooper, who monitors
- > energy industries at the Consumer Federation of America. Despite huge
- > increases in refinery profits, there have been no investments in refinery
- > capacity, he argued.
- >
- > http://www.examiner.com/a-731938~Lawmakers_ask_whether_oil_industry_investments_drive_up_prices.html
- >
- >
- > 7) Refineries off line for maintenance. Take a bottleneck and squeeze
- > further, apparently that's the situation here. Oil companies say this is
- > not deliberate.
- >
- >
- > 8) Complexity of refining different fuel blends.
- >
- >
- > 9) Damage to infrastructure from Katrina and Rita.
- >
- >
- > 9a) Aging infrastructure. Underfunded maintenance.
- >
- > "BP Plc shut down a quarter of its 400,000 barrels-per-day Prudhoe Bay oil
- > field in Alaska after finding a leaky water pipe on Monday, a company
- > spokesman said.
- >
- > BP workers shut down about 100,000 bpd of the field's production after
- > finding water leaking from a 12-inch pipeline inside a processing facility
- > that separates water from crude oil, said BP spokesman Ronnie Chappell.
- >
- > Fewer than 20 barrels of water were spilled and never escaped the
- > facility, Chappell said.

>
> "We expect the facility to be down a few days while repairs are made,"
> he said.
>
> U.S. Rep. Bart Stupak, who heads the investigations arm of the House
> Energy and Commerce Committee, said the spill was a further sign that BP
> cost cutting was to blame for the poor state of infrastructure at Prudhoe
> Bay.
>
> Stupak's subcommittee is probing a March 2006 oil spill at Prudhoe Bay,
> the biggest U.S. oil field. Internal corrosion in a pipeline that had been
> poorly maintained by BP was blamed for the spill, which dumped at least
> 200,000 gallons of crude oil onto the tundra.
>
> A criminal investigation into the spill has been under way since last
> year. No charges have been laid.
>
> Stupak has said that budget cuts at the London-based energy giant were
> to blame for past incidents, and said he will continue to investigate.
>
> "While I have not seen all the facts on this most recent leak, it
> appears to be yet further evidence that BP's cost-cutting culture has put
> our nation's economy at risk," he said.
>
> At a hearing last week, BP America Chief Executive Bob Malone conceded
> that "there were extreme budget pressures at Prudhoe Bay," which affected
> maintenance work.
>
> BP operates Prudhoe Bay on behalf of its partners ConocoPhillips and
> ExxonMobil Corp."
>
> <http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?enewsid=73940>
>
>
> 10) Fear of competition from ethanol. Apparently some oil executives are
> blaming oil industry foot dragging to increase refinery capacity on fear
> of competition from the mention of ethanol in Bush's state of the union
> speech in January. Or perhaps they are firing warning shots in an attempt
> to fend off competition.
>
> "In hearings before Congress last year, oil executives outlined plans to
> increase fuel production by expanding existing refineries. Those plans
> would add capacity of 1.6 million to 1.8 million barrels a day over the
> next five years, for an increase of 10 percent, according to the National
> Petrochemical and Refiners Association.
>
> But those plans have since been scaled back to more than one million
> barrels a day, according to the Energy Information Administration, an arm

> of the federal government.

>

> in the biofuels industry, this is a disincentive for those making

> said John D. Hofmeister, the president of the Shell Oil Company.

>

> <http://www.wilmingtonstar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070524/ZNYT01/705240315/1002/business>

>

>

> 11) This list goes to 11!

>

>

> Bottom line, for a variety of reasons prices are going up and the oil
> industry is very profitable right now.

>

> "Oil companies today are enjoying record profits, and while they could use
> those profits to invest in more production capacity, instead they use the
> money to buy back shares in the markets," complained Rep. John Conyers
> Jr., D-Mich., the panel's chairman.

>

> Exxon Mobil Corp. and Chevron Corp., the nation's largest oil companies,
> earned a combined \$14 billion in the first quarter. Exxon bought Mobil in
> 1999, while Chevron acquired Texaco in 2001."

>

> <http://www.grandhaventribune.com/paid/318406294137734.bsp>

>

>

> Hey, it could be a lucrative industry for your next IT job, Thad:

>

> <http://www.expresscomputeronline.com/20070528/oilenergy01.shtml>

>

> Cheers,

> -Jamie

> www.JamieKrutz.com

>

>

>

> Detric Terry wrote:

>> I see your point Thad, but the difference is when looking at the "record
>> profits" side of this. I don't see Starbucks (for example) making record
>> profit every quarter, though I'm not following them regularly - they are
>> growing and doing quite well, as one would expect of a profitable
>> business,
>> but they also aren't raising prices every day because a tea leaf farmer
>> in

>> China got the 24-hour flu. They also add new products and services to
>> entice customers, and run specials, promotions, etc. When is the last
>> time
>> you got a 2 for 1 coupon for gas in the mail? Never? Same here.
>>
>> If oil companies were reporting steady profits or a small loss here or
>> there
>> followed by a good quarter the next to balance it or better even, then
>> fine,
>> that's economics (doesn't mean I have to like the way they are going
>> about
>> it), but they aren't. Profits for the oil industry are in the trillions.
>> Profits, not income. That means the cost of "water" for them is either
>> going down, or they are just raising prices because consumers have no
>> choice
>> but to pay it. In most industries that's considered price gouging and
>> monopolization (as an industry since there are "competing" companies that
>> happen to be linked by a single oil-price fixing organization).
>>
>> Of course oil companies "have to" report a profit to keep investors
>> happy,
>> so it's really a shell game to improve profitability, not provide a
>> service
>> or product at a reasonable price over costs.
>>
>> Also take into account that Starbucks' retail outlets are actually making
>> a
>> profit on the tea they sell, and coffee, scones, etc. Local gas station
>> owners aren't. They make most of their money on food and other goods.
>> The
>> only real loss the owner in the linked article really faced was not
>> making
>> up his cost in buying the gas to begin with. \$3.48 in cost means these
>> guys
>> are making pennies at best - some may even take a loss to compete with
>> other
>> stations. The only reason to own a gas station is to sell cokes, candy,
>> and
>> snacks, not gas - gas is just a guaranteed customer magnet. Gasoline
>> isn't
>> a retail profit industry but a distributor/developer profit industry.
>> Most
>> retail markets have the greatest markup at the retailer, not before. The
>> oil industry is one of the few that's the other way around. That's the
>> difference between the oil industry and Starbucks, or (pick your favorite
>> tea/coffee shop).
>>
>> Dedic

>>
>>
>> On 5/25/07 7:56 AM, in article 4656eb0b\$1@linux, "TCB"
>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>> I've never quite understood the American rage at fuel prices. I'm
>>> finishing
>>> off my first iced tea of the day, which is water plus leaves grown in a
>>> third
>>> world country and shipped here. I pay \$2.12 for a 16 ounce plastic cup
>>> of
>>> it. Take out a nickel for the cup, a quarter for the tea (very
>>> generous),
>>> and a dime for overhead and I'm paying 1.72 for water. That's not too
>>> far
>>> off what bottled water costs. 128 ounces in a gallon, so I'm paying
>>> 13.75
>>> for water. In addition this water is from naturally replenishing
>>> aquifers
>>> relatively near me, and to turn it into drinkable water some minor
>>> filtering
>>> and sterilizing has to happen.
>>>
>>> Compare that with gasoline. It has to be dug out of the ground using
>>> some
>>> pretty wild technology, and depending on where it comes from it will
>>> need
>>> either a great deal of refining (Saudi crude) or an unbelievable nearly
>>> magic
>>> amount of refining (Canadian oil sands). Unlike water it's highly
>>> volatile,
>>> so it needs all kinds of fancy equipment to keep it from blowing up at
>>> every
>>> stage of the refining process. Then it has to be trucked or shipped
>>> around
>>> in very specialized containers and stored in extremely expensive (and
>>> regulated)
>>> tanks before I can use it. And when I pull up to the pump in my '66
>>> Thunderbird
>>> I'm paying less than 4.00/gal for premium. Seems to me the gas should
>>> cost
>>> more than the water.
>>>
>>> TCB
>>>
>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=Aht

>>>> vulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>>
>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>>> did
>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>>>> someone
>>>> is doing something.
>>>>
>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>>>> profits
>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with
>>>> it...yeah,
>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell
>>>> game
>>> is
>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for
>>>> it -
>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>
>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
>>>> to
>>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>>> a
>>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in
>>> time
>>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad
>>>> anymore
>>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>>> solution.
>>>>
>>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an
>>>> alternative
>>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale),
>>>> even
>>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
>>>> mean
>>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
>>>> to
>>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
>>>> hands
>>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>>> go
>>>> bankrupt.
>>>>

>>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>>
>>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>>
>>>>
>>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 18:22:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Don,

Holy shit, hahaha. If we can't figure out a way to make cars run on urine then I don't think we should be allowed to continue as a species. Talk about renewable resource! Think of the endless possibilities for 'filling station' gags.

Chuck

Don Nafe <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:

>chuck duffy wrote:

>> Well, I for one am incredibly pissed. A couple of years ago I saw the writing

>> on the wall and at considerable expense converted my cars engine to run on

>> whole milk. Have you guys seen the price of a gallon of milk lately?

>>

>> Chuck

>>

>>

>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=Aht

>>> vulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI

>>>

>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station

>> did

>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least someone

>>> is doing something.

>>>

>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record profits

>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,

>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game

>> is

>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it

-

>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>
>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
to
>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>> a
>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
in
>> time
>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>> solution.
>>>
>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
mean
>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
to
>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
hands
>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>> go
>>> bankrupt.
>>>
>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>
>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>
>>>
>>
>Converted mine to run on urine...have you seen the price of beer lately

Subject: Re: Gas hostages

Posted by [chuck duffy](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 18:30:04 GMT

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

Wow, that is really cool. I'll be googling shortly. Thanks for the info.

Chuck

Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:

>
>It's all over the place on this coast -- from San Diego to Seattle,
>first at specialty fuel places, and now more and more at regular "gas
>stations..." I get it in two different pumps in this county (central
>coast of CA). There's a big independent fuel retailer in the cities
>(maybe national, I don't know) called USA -- that has 100% biodiesel
>at the pump, right next to the regular petro-diesel, unleaded gas,
>etc. Others are doing the same. The number of retailers is growing
>exponentially -- it was harder to find a year ago than now, and next
>year it will be still easier to find...
>
>Also -- for the geek inclined -- it is incredibly easy to brew your
>own, from any number of local sources (used cooking oil, etc.) -- do
>a little google searching and see what happens...
>
>Maybe I'll get busy later and post a few links, but it's really very
>easy to find info about this stuff...
>
>-- Chas.
>
>On 26 May 2007 03:25:10 +1000, "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:
>
>>
>>Wow, where do you buy biodiesel? Sounds really cool!
>>
>>Chuck
>>
>>
>>Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:
>>>
>>>OK, I'll guess.... The bike!
>>>
>>>Out here in the middle of nowhere, it's drive not at all (work at
>>>home) or 25 miles to the nearest town. Got an 02 Jetta Wagon last
>>>summer -- a TDI diesel. Terrific car. Gets over 40 MPG -- on
>>>biodiesel. No petroleum necessary, no conversion, nada. Just put the
>>>stuff in and go. 550 miles to the tank. \$3.05 a gallon. Technology
>>>has been around for a hundred years.
>>>
>>>With all the problems we have in the world today due to our dependence
>>>on oil, it's more than a little bit mind-boggling that more people
>>>haven't gotten around to this... There's nothing to develop, no big
>>>invention to prove out, no "breakthrough" to wait for: the vehicles
>>>exist and so does the fuel... What in the hell is it going to take?
>>>
>>>-- see you on the road -- chas.
>>>
>>>

>>>
>>>On Fri, 25 May 2007 07:35:44 -0500, "Aaron Allen"
>>><know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>
>>>>I have been affecting change in my own way to some degree, and having
fun
>>
>>>>while doing it. It takes almost \$50 to fill my jap car, and that is NUTS.
>>My
>>>>bike, on the other hand will run over a 100 miles on about \$7. Which
one
>>do
>>>>you think I drive daily when weather permits?
>>>>
>>>>AA
>>>>
>>>>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:C27BD82F.A11A%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>
>>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>>>
>>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>>
>>>>> did
>>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least

>>>>> someone
>>>>> is doing something.
>>>>>
>>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record

>>>>> profits
>>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell
game
>>
>>>>> is
>>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for
it
>>-
>>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>>
>>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
>>to
>>>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>>a

>>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
>>in
>>>> time
>>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country
into
>>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>>> solution.
>>>>
>>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale),
even
>>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
>>mean
>>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
>>to
>>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
>>
>>>> hands
>>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of
them
>>go
>>>> bankrupt.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>>
>>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say,
oil
>>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 19:08:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks Dedic.

One more for the mix: the instability in major oil producing regions. As tight as the system is running right now it wouldn't take much of a supply interruption to spike prices much higher.

For example, by invading Iran. Or with further political instability in Nigeria.

"LONDON: Crude oil prices rose Friday amid worries about supply after Nigeria's powerful oil unions went on strike and gunmen kidnapped oil workers in the nation's south. Concern about more tensions with Iran was also a factor.

supplies and are buoying prices after a sharp drop-off Thursday, analysts said."

<http://www.iht.com/articles/ap/2007/05/25/europe/EU-FIN-MKT-Oil-Prices.php>

"Traders and analysts fear any conflict with Iran could result in the closure of the Strait of Hormuz, through which tankers ship about 17 million barrels of crude oil a day, according to the U.S. Energy (nasdaq: USEG - news - people) Information Administration.

Also keeping Brent crude prices high is political tension in Nigeria. Oil worker unions started striking at Nigeria's state-owned oil company Thursday, and meanwhile, five gunmen kidnapped a Polish worker. It was the latest kidnapping in this year's spate of more than 100 seizures of foreign workers in Africa's largest oil producing nation."

<http://www.forbes.com/feeds/ap/2007/05/24/ap3756103.html>

So yeah, it would be smart to run our cars on something other than gasoline. I'm leaning toward electric.

But since you brought up air cars, here's an interesting prototype that runs on compressed air:

http://www.isa.org/InTechTemplate.cfm?Section=InTech_Home1&template=/ContentManagement/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=60544
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QmqpGZv0YT4>

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKruz.com

Dedric Terry wrote:

> That's some impressive research Jamie - thanks for posting.

>

> Regards,
> Dedic
>
> Btw - I'm converting my cars to run on air. Have you seen the price of
> tacky air fresheners lately? ;-)
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:46570dec@linux...
>> I turn on the tap and get water. It doesn't cost anything like 1.72/gal.
>> It's at least several orders of magnitude less expensive than that.
>> Whatever you're paying for in your tea product, Thad, it's not the water,
>> primarily.
>>
>> Gas prices are destined to rise for several reasons.
>>
>> 1) There is only so much oil. Google "peak oil."
>>
>>
>> 2) Rising worldwide demand. For example, growing economies in China and
>> India are becoming big consumers.
>>
>>
>> 3) Rising US demand. Energy policy here has been generally shortsighted
>> over the last quarter century, at least, from the leadership down to the
>> consumer level.
>>
>> For example, by now we could have had MUCH more efficient vehicles on
>> average, but we don't.
>>
>> Meanwhile the population is growing. So we merrily burn up record amounts
>> of petroleum products. Blame goes to leadership; the domestic car/truck
>> industry; and consumers.
>>
>>
>> 4) OPEC. 2/3 of the world's reserves and 40+% of production.
>>
>>
>> 5) Consolidation in the oil industry. There is less competition. (Blamers,
>> you may blame both Clinton and Bush.) It's easier to keep prices high when
>> there are fewer major players involved.
>>
>> Whether there is direct collusion is difficult to prove, the FTC who
>> regulates and allows the current state of consolidation is very defensive
>> about it, but their figures don't jive with the GAO's. The GAO sees
>> evidence that mergers have helped drive up gasoline prices at the pump.
>>
>> "In 2004, the five largest refiners controlled 56 percent of the gasoline
>> refined in the United States and the 10 top companies controlled 85
>> percent, according to a study by Public Citizen, a private advocacy group.

>>
>> Judiciary Committee Chairman Arlen Specter, R-Pa., said he hopes to soon
>> consider legislation to strengthen antitrust laws on oil company mergers
>> to allow closer scrutiny of their impact on competition..

>>
>> The legislation also would make it illegal for companies to hold back
>> refining crude oil -- or diverting or exporting refined products such as
>> gasoline -- when supplies are short in a region in order to hold up
>> prices. Some refiners in the past have been accused of diverting supplies
>> despite supply shortages in a region.

>>
>> "It isn't illegal just to be big," said Sen. Mike DeWine, R-Ohio, chairman
>> of the Judiciary antitrust subcommittee. "What is not legal is when a
>> company abuses its size or uses unfair tactics to shut out its competitors
>> or harm competition."

>>
>> State prosecutors from California and Wisconsin testified that current
>> federal antitrust laws hinder prosecution for price gouging and excessive
>> concentration in the refining and retail oil and gas industry."

>>
>> <http://www.casperstartribune.net/articles/2006/03/14/news/national/cac5cd1d8b24f5598725713100660cb4.txt>

>>
>> (written 2004) "Domestic refining and transportation costs account for

>> determined by the major oil companies operating in the United States. This
>> share of company costs tacked on to the price of gasoline has been
>> increasing. In November 2000, crude oil prices were at the same level they
>> are today (more than \$36 per barrel), but retail gas prices today (\$1.78
>> per gallon) are 17 percent higher than they were then (\$1.55 per gallon).
>> Most of this difference has been realized in higher profits from the new
>> mega-companies that have merged since 2000.

>>

>> oil production, half of all domestic refinery capacity, and nearly
>> two-thirds of the retail market.

>>
>> "The fact that a handful of companies control half of the domestic oil
>> production is particularly significant given that the United States is the

>> that the market leader, ExxonMobil, posted after-tax profits of \$21.5
>> billion in 2003. When you control the market, you can manipulate the
>> system to ensure enormous profits.""

>>
>> <http://www.citizen.org/pressroom/release.cfm?ID=1660>

>>

>>

>> 6) Lack of refinery capacity in the USA. The oil industry has not seen fit
>> to invest in increased refining capacity. Maybe DeeJ has some insights
>> here.

>>
>> "Until the mid-1990s, the United States had significant spare refining
>> capacity. But because of consolidation in the industry, the number of
>> refineries declined while unprofitable operations were shut. As demand
>> grew, however, and capacity remained flat, the picture changed. In recent
>> years, refineries in the United States have been running at or close to
>> full capacity.

>>
>> Domestic refineries can now process about 17.5 million barrels of crude
>> oil each day, much of it imported. But with consumption now close to about
>> 21 million barrels a day, more imports of refined products are also
>> needed.

>>
>> In recent weeks, refiners point out that they have been increasing output:
>> gasoline production in the United States is at its highest level ever,
>> 8.85 million barrels a day.

>>
>> Also, by increasing output from existing refineries, oil companies say
>> they have expanded their production by 200,000 barrels a day since last
>> year. Expansion of existing plants has added the equivalent of 10 new
>> refineries over the last 10 years.

>>

>> group.

>>

>> But demand is outstripping supply. In the first three quarters of the

>> Domestically produced supplies, though, have increased by only 0.5 percent
>> a year on average."

>>

>> <http://www.wilmingtonstar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070524/ZNYT01/705240315/1002/business>

>>

>> Consumer advocate Mark Cooper questioned at the House hearing whether the
>> industry may be keeping supplies tight on purpose.

>>

>> "By creating a situation of extremely tight supply, the oil companies gain
>> control over price at the wholesale level," said Cooper, who monitors
>> energy industries at the Consumer Federation of America. Despite huge
>> increases in refinery profits, there have been no investments in refinery
>> capacity, he argued.

>>

>> http://www.examiner.com/a-731938~Lawmakers_ask_whether_oil_i

ndustry_investments_drive_up_prices.html

>>

>>

>> 7) Refineries off line for maintenance. Take a bottleneck and squeeze
>> further, apparently that's the situation here. Oil companies say this is
>> not deliberate.

>>

>>

>> 8) Complexity of refining different fuel blends.

>>

>>

>> 9) Damage to infrastructure from Katrina and Rita.

>>

>>

>> 9a) Aging infrastructure. Underfunded maintenance.

>>

>> "BP Plc shut down a quarter of its 400,000 barrels-per-day Prudhoe Bay oil
>> field in Alaska after finding a leaky water pipe on Monday, a company
>> spokesman said.

>>

>> BP workers shut down about 100,000 bpd of the field's production after
>> finding water leaking from a 12-inch pipeline inside a processing facility
>> that separates water from crude oil, said BP spokesman Ronnie Chappell.

>>

>> Fewer than 20 barrels of water were spilled and never escaped the
>> facility, Chappell said.

>>

>> "We expect the facility to be down a few days while repairs are made,"
>> he said.

>>

>> U.S. Rep. Bart Stupak, who heads the investigations arm of the House
>> Energy and Commerce Committee, said the spill was a further sign that BP
>> cost cutting was to blame for the poor state of infrastructure at Prudhoe
>> Bay.

>>

>> Stupak's subcommittee is probing a March 2006 oil spill at Prudhoe Bay,
>> the biggest U.S. oil field. Internal corrosion in a pipeline that had been
>> poorly maintained by BP was blamed for the spill, which dumped at least
>> 200,000 gallons of crude oil onto the tundra.

>>

>> A criminal investigation into the spill has been under way since last
>> year. No charges have been laid.

>>

>> Stupak has said that budget cuts at the London-based energy giant were
>> to blame for past incidents, and said he will continue to investigate.

>>

>> "While I have not seen all the facts on this most recent leak, it
>> appears to be yet further evidence that BP's cost-cutting culture has put

>> our nation's economy at risk," he said.

>>

>> At a hearing last week, BP America Chief Executive Bob Malone conceded
>> that "there were extreme budget pressures at Prudhoe Bay," which affected
>> maintenance work.

>>

>> BP operates Prudhoe Bay on behalf of its partners ConocoPhillips and
>> ExxonMobil Corp."

>>

>> <http://www.turkishdailynews.com.tr/article.php?enewsid=73940>

>>

>>

>> 10) Fear of competition from ethanol. Apparently some oil executives are
>> blaming oil industry foot dragging to increase refinery capacity on fear
>> of competition from the mention of ethanol in Bush's state of the union
>> speech in January. Or perhaps they are firing warning shots in an attempt
>> to fend off competition.

>>

>> "In hearings before Congress last year, oil executives outlined plans to
>> increase fuel production by expanding existing refineries. Those plans
>> would add capacity of 1.6 million to 1.8 million barrels a day over the
>> next five years, for an increase of 10 percent, according to the National
>> Petrochemical and Refiners Association.

>>

>> But those plans have since been scaled back to more than one million
>> barrels a day, according to the Energy Information Administration, an arm
>> of the federal government.

>>

>> in the biofuels industry, this is a disincentive for those making

>> said John D. Hofmeister, the president of the Shell Oil Company.

>>

>> <http://www.wilmingtonstar.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070524/ZNYT01/705240315/1002/business>

>>

>>

>> 11) This list goes to 11!

>>

>>

>> Bottom line, for a variety of reasons prices are going up and the oil
>> industry is very profitable right now.

>>

>> "Oil companies today are enjoying record profits, and while they could use
>> those profits to invest in more production capacity, instead they use the
>> money to buy back shares in the markets," complained Rep. John Conyers
>> Jr., D-Mich., the panel's chairman.

>>
>> Exxon Mobil Corp. and Chevron Corp., the nation's largest oil companies,
>> earned a combined \$14 billion in the first quarter. Exxon bought Mobil in
>> 1999, while Chevron acquired Texaco in 2001."
>>
>> <http://www.grandhaventribune.com/paid/318406294137734.bsp>
>>
>>
>> Hey, it could be a lucrative industry for your next IT job, Thad:
>>
>> <http://www.expresscomputeronline.com/20070528/oilenergy01.shtml>
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKruz.com
>>
>>
>>
>> Dedic Terry wrote:
>>> I see your point Thad, but the difference is when looking at the "record
>>> profits" side of this. I don't see Starbucks (for example) making record
>>> profit every quarter, though I'm not following them regularly - they are
>>> growing and doing quite well, as one would expect of a profitable
>>> business,
>>> but they also aren't raising prices every day because a tea leaf farmer
>>> in
>>> China got the 24-hour flu. They also add new products and services to
>>> entice customers, and run specials, promotions, etc. When is the last
>>> time
>>> you got a 2 for 1 coupon for gas in the mail? Never? Same here.
>>>
>>> If oil companies were reporting steady profits or a small loss here or
>>> there
>>> followed by a good quarter the next to balance it or better even, then
>>> fine,
>>> that's economics (doesn't mean I have to like the way they are going
>>> about
>>> it), but they aren't. Profits for the oil industry are in the trillions.
>>> Profits, not income. That means the cost of "water" for them is either
>>> going down, or they are just raising prices because consumers have no
>>> choice
>>> but to pay it. In most industries that's considered price gouging and
>>> monopolization (as an industry since there are "competing" companies that
>>> happen to be linked by a single oil-price fixing organization).
>>>
>>> Of course oil companies "have to" report a profit to keep investors
>>> happy,
>>> so it's really a shell game to improve profitability, not provide a

>>> service
>>> or product at a reasonable price over costs.
>>>
>>> Also take into account that Starbucks' retail outlets are actually making
>>> a
>>> profit on the tea they sell, and coffee, scones, etc. Local gas station
>>> owners aren't. They make most of their money on food and other goods.
>>> The
>>> only real loss the owner in the linked article really faced was not
>>> making
>>> up his cost in buying the gas to begin with. \$3.48 in cost means these
>>> guys
>>> are making pennies at best - some may even take a loss to compete with
>>> other
>>> stations. The only reason to own a gas station is to sell cokes, candy,
>>> and
>>> snacks, not gas - gas is just a guaranteed customer magnet. Gasoline
>>> isn't
>>> a retail profit industry but a distributor/developer profit industry.
>>> Most
>>> retail markets have the greatest markup at the retailer, not before. The
>>> oil industry is one of the few that's the other way around. That's the
>>> difference between the oil industry and Starbucks, or (pick your favorite
>>> tea/coffee shop).
>>>
>>> Detric
>>>
>>>
>>> On 5/25/07 7:56 AM, in article 4656eb0b\$1@linux, "TCB"
>>> <nobody@ishere.com>
>>> wrote:
>>>
>>>> I've never quite understood the American rage at fuel prices. I'm
>>>> finishing
>>>> off my first iced tea of the day, which is water plus leaves grown in a
>>>> third
>>>> world country and shipped here. I pay \$2.12 for a 16 ounce plastic cup
>>>> of
>>>> it. Take out a nickel for the cup, a quarter for the tea (very
>>>> generous),
>>>> and a dime for overhead and I'm paying 1.72 for water. That's not too
>>>> far
>>>> off what bottled water costs. 128 ounces in a gallon, so I'm paying
>>>> 13.75
>>>> for water. In addition this water is from naturally replenishing
>>>> aquifers
>>>> relatively near me, and to turn it into drinkable water some minor
>>>> filtering

>>>> and sterilizing has to happen.
>>>>
>>>> Compare that with gasoline. It has to be dug out of the ground using
>>>> some
>>>> pretty wild technology, and depending on where it comes from it will
>>>> need
>>>> either a great deal of refining (Saudi crude) or an unbelievable nearly
>>>> magic
>>>> amount of refining (Canadian oil sands). Unlike water it's highly
>>>> volatile,
>>>> so it needs all kinds of fancy equipment to keep it from blowing up at
>>>> every
>>>> stage of the refining process. Then it has to be trucked or shipped
>>>> around
>>>> in very specialized containers and stored in extremely expensive (and
>>>> regulated)
>>>> tanks before I can use it. And when I pull up to the pump in my '66
>>>> Thunderbird
>>>> I'm paying less than 4.00/gal for premium. Seems to me the gas should
>>>> cost
>>>> more than the water.
>>>>
>>>> TCB
>>>>
>>>> Dedric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_proutest_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>>>
>>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>>>>> did
>>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>>>>> someone
>>>>> is doing something.
>>>>>
>>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>>>>> profits
>>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with
>>>>> it...yeah,
>>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell
>>>>> game
>>>>> is
>>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for
>>>>> it -
>>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>>
>>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
>>>>> to

>>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>>>> a
>>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just in
>>>> time
>>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad
>>>> anymore
>>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>>> solution.
>>>>
>>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an
>>>> alternative
>>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale),
>>>> even
>>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
>>>> mean
>>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
>>>> to
>>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
>>>> hands
>>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>>>> go
>>>> bankrupt.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>>
>>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>>
>>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Gas hostages

Posted by [duncan](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 19:18:42 GMT

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

It's all over the place on this coast -- from San Diego to Seattle, first at specialty fuel places, and now more and more at regular "gas stations..." I get it in two different pumps in this county (central coast of CA). There's a big independent fuel retailer in the cities (maybe national, I don't know) called USA -- that has 100% biodiesel at the pump, right next to the regular petro-diesel, unleaded gas, etc. Others are doing the same. The number of retailers is growing exponentially -- it was harder to find a year ago than now, and next

year it will be still easier to find...

Also -- for the geek inclined -- it is incredibly easy to brew your own, from any number of local sources (used cooking oil, etc.) -- do a little google searching and see what happens...

Maybe I'll get busy later and post a few links, but it's really very easy to find info about this stuff...

-- Chas.

On 26 May 2007 03:25:10 +1000, "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>

>Wow, where do you buy biodiesel? Sounds really cool!

>

>Chuck

>

>

>Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:

>>

>>OK, I'll guess.... The bike!

>>

>>Out here in the middle of nowhere, it's drive not at all (work at
>>home) or 25 miles to the nearest town. Got an 02 Jetta Wagon last
>>summer -- a TDI diesel. Terrific car. Gets over 40 MPG -- on
>>biodiesel. No petroleum necessary, no conversion, nada. Just put the
>>stuff in and go. 550 miles to the tank. \$3.05 a gallon. Technology
>>has been around for a hundred years.

>>

>>With all the problems we have in the world today due to our dependence
>>on oil, it's more than a little bit mind-boggling that more people
>>haven't gotten around to this... There's nothing to develop, no big
>>invention to prove out, no "breakthrough" to wait for: the vehicles
>>exist and so does the fuel... What in the hell is it going to take?

>>

>>-- see you on the road -- chas.

>>

>>

>>

>>On Fri, 25 May 2007 07:35:44 -0500, "Aaron Allen"

>><know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:

>>

>>>I have been affecting change in my own way to some degree, and having fun

>

>>>while doing it. It takes almost \$50 to fill my jap car, and that is NUTS.

>My

>>>bike, on the other hand will run over a 100 miles on about \$7. Which one

>do
>>>you think I drive daily when weather permits?
>>>
>>>AA
>>>
>>>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>news:C27BD82F.A11A%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>
>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_p otest_8;_ylt=Aht
>>>> vulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>>
>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>
>>>> did
>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>>>> someone
>>>> is doing something.
>>>>
>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>>>> profits
>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell game
>
>>>> is
>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it
>-
>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>
>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
>to
>>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>a
>>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
>in
>>>> time
>>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad anymore
>>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>>> solution.
>>>>
>>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an alternative
>>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale), even
>>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
>mean
>>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need

>to
>>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
>
>>>> hands
>>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>go
>>>> bankrupt.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>>
>>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>

Subject: Re: Gas hostages
Posted by [duncan](#) on Fri, 25 May 2007 21:11:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Here's a link or two to get you started:

<http://www.biodiesel.org/buyingbiodiesel/retailfuelingsites/default.shtm>

-- national map of retail places, and links to lots of other info.

-- and another general site with many links:

<http://www.biodieselnow.com/content/links.aspx>

Chuck -- I know the stuff is available in Virginia and maryland; don't know about DC, but it will inevitably be available in all metro areas. And the VW's from the last few years are really cool cars -- stuff your little family (and your keyboards) into a late model Passat, for instance, running on 100% not petroleum, and see if you don't find yourself smiling...

-- maybe too late for the world, but it's a pleasant way to go, for now -- good luck -- chas.

On 26 May 2007 04:30:04 +1000, "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>
>Wow, that is really cool. I'll be googling shortly. Thanks for the info.
>
>

>Chuck

>Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:

>>

>>It's all over the place on this coast -- from San Diego to Seattle,
>>first at specialty fuel places, and now more and more at regular "gas
>>stations..." I get it in two different pumps in this county (central
>>coast of CA). There's a big independent fuel retailer in the cities
>>(maybe national, I don't know) called USA -- that has 100% biodiesel
>>at the pump, right next to the regular petro-diesel, unleaded gas,
>>etc. Others are doing the same. The number of retailers is growing
>>exponentially -- it was harder to find a year ago than now, and next
>>year it will be still easier to find...

>>

>>Also -- for the geek inclined -- it is incredibly easy to brew your
>>own, from any number of local sources (used cooking oil, etc.) -- do
>>a little google searching and see what happens...

>>

>>Maybe I'll get busy later and post a few links, but it's really very
>>easy to find info about this stuff...

>>

>>-- Chas.

>>

>>On 26 May 2007 03:25:10 +1000, "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>>

>>>

>>>Wow, where do you buy biodiesel? Sounds really cool!

>>>

>>>Chuck

>>>

>>>

>>>Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>OK, I'll guess.... The bike!

>>>>

>>>>Out here in the middle of nowhere, it's drive not at all (work at
>>>>home) or 25 miles to the nearest town. Got an 02 Jetta Wagon last
>>>>summer -- a TDI diesel. Terrific car. Gets over 40 MPG -- on
>>>>biodiesel. No petroleum necessary, no conversion, nada. Just put the
>>>>stuff in and go. 550 miles to the tank. \$3.05 a gallon. Technology
>>>>has been around for a hundred years.

>>>>

>>>>With all the problems we have in the world today due to our dependence
>>>>on oil, it's more than a little bit mind-boggling that more people
>>>>haven't gotten around to this... There's nothing to develop, no big
>>>>invention to prove out, no "breakthrough" to wait for: the vehicles
>>>>exist and so does the fuel... What in the hell is it going to take?

>>>>

>>>>-- see you on the road -- chas.

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>On Fri, 25 May 2007 07:35:44 -0500, "Aaron Allen"
>>>><know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>I have been affecting change in my own way to some degree, and having
>fun
>>>
>>>>>while doing it. It takes almost \$50 to fill my jap car, and that is NUTS.
>>>My
>>>>>bike, on the other hand will run over a 100 miles on about \$7. Which
>one
>>>do
>>>>>you think I drive daily when weather permits?
>>>>>
>>>>>AA
>>>>>
>>>>>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>news:C27BD82F.A11A%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>>>
>>>>>> did
>>>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>
>>>>>> someone
>>>>>> is doing something.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>
>>>>>>> profits
>>>>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with it...yeah,
>>>>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell
>game
>>>
>>>>>>> is
>>>>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for
>it
>>>-
>>>>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>>>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
>>>to

"Chas. Duncan" <duncan5199ATsbcglobalIDOTnet@> wrote in message news:isje53pg0vbeu9g3r1mjpg477831fcm5g93@4ax.com...

>
> Here's a link or two to get you started:
>
> <http://www.biodiesel.org/buyingbiodiesel/retailfuelingsites/default.shtm>
>
> -- national map of retail places, and links to lots of other info.
>
> -- and another general site with many links:
>
> <http://www.biodieselnow.com/content/links.aspx>
>
> Chuck -- I know the stuff is available in Virginia and maryland; don't
> know about DC, but it will inevitably be available in all metro areas.
> And the VW's from the last few years are really cool cars -- stuff
> your little family (and your keyboards) into a late model Passat, for
> instance, running on 100% not petroleum, and see if you don't find
> yourself smiling...
>
> -- maybe too late for the world, but it's a pleasant way to go, for
> now -- good luck -- chas.

>
> On 26 May 2007 04:30:04 +1000, "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:

>
>>Wow, that is really cool. I'll be googling shortly. Thanks for the info.

>>
>>
>>Chuck

>>Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalIDOTnet@> wrote:

>>>
>>>It's all over the place on this coast -- from San Diego to Seattle,
>>>first at specialty fuel places, and now more and more at regular "gas
>>>stations..." I get it in two different pumps in this county (central
>>>coast of CA). There's a big independent fuel retailer in the cities
>>>(maybe national, I don't know) called USA -- that has 100% biodiesel
>>>at the pump, right next to the regular petro-diesel, unleaded gas,
>>>etc. Others are doing the same. The number of retailers is growing
>>>exponentially -- it was harder to find a year ago than now, and next
>>>year it will be still easier to find...

>>>
>>>Also -- for the geek inclined -- it is incredibly easy to brew your
>>>own, from any number of local sources (used cooking oil, etc.) -- do
>>>a little google searching and see what happens...
>>>

>>>Maybe I'll get busy later and post a few links, but it's really very
>>>easy to find info about this stuff...
>>>
>>>-- Chas.
>>>
>>>On 26 May 2007 03:25:10 +1000, "chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>>Wow, where do you buy biodiesel? Sounds really cool!
>>>>
>>>>Chuck
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Chas. Duncan <duncan5199ATsbcglobalDOTnet@> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>OK, I'll guess.... The bike!
>>>>>
>>>>>Out here in the middle of nowhere, it's drive not at all (work at
>>>>>home) or 25 miles to the nearest town. Got an 02 Jetta Wagon last
>>>>>summer -- a TDI diesel. Terrific car. Gets over 40 MPG -- on
>>>>>biodiesel. No petroleum necessary, no conversion, nada. Just put the
>>>>>stuff in and go. 550 miles to the tank. \$3.05 a gallon. Technology
>>>>>has been around for a hundred years.
>>>>>
>>>>>With all the problems we have in the world today due to our dependence
>>>>>on oil, it's more than a little bit mind-boggling that more people
>>>>>haven't gotten around to this... There's nothing to develop, no big
>>>>>invention to prove out, no "breakthrough" to wait for: the vehicles
>>>>>exist and so does the fuel... What in the hell is it going to take?
>>>>>
>>>>>-- see you on the road -- chas.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>On Fri, 25 May 2007 07:35:44 -0500, "Aaron Allen"
>>>>><know-spam@not_here.dude> wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>I have been affecting change in my own way to some degree, and having
>>fun
>>>>>
>>>>>>while doing it. It takes almost \$50 to fill my jap car, and that is
>>>>>>NUTS.
>>>>>My
>>>>>>bike, on the other hand will run over a 100 miles on about \$7. Which
>>one
>>>>>do
>>>>>>you think I drive daily when weather permits?
>>>>>>

>>>>>AA
>>>>>
>>>>>"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message
>>>>>news:C27BD82F.A11A%dterry@keyofd.net...
>>>>>>
>>>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=Aht
>>>>>> vulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAl
>>>>>>
>>>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every
>>>>>> station
>>>>>>
>>>>>> did
>>>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>>>>>>
>>>>>> someone
>>>>>> is doing something.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>>>>>>
>>>>>> profits
>>>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with
>>>>>> it...yeah,
>>>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell
>>game
>>>>>>
>>>>>> is
>>>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for
>>it
>>>>>>-
>>>>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the
>>>>>>> oil
>>>>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some
>>>>>>> legislation
>>>>>>>to
>>>>>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great,
>>>>>>> *after*
>>>>>>>a
>>>>>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
>>>>>>>in
>>>>>>> time
>>>>>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country
>>into
>>>>>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad
>>>>>>> anymore
>>>>>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by
>>>>>>> hoping

>>>>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do
>>>>>> anything"
>>>>>> solution.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an
>>>>>> alternative
>>>>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale),
>>even
>>>>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
>>>>mean
>>>>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a
>>>>>> repeated
>>>>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers
>>>>>> need
>>>>to
>>>>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite
>>>>>> the
>>>>
>>>>>> hands
>>>>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of
>>them
>>>>go
>>>>>> bankrupt.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say,
>>oil
>>>>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Aaron Allen](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 02:23:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ahh, finally. There will be a real reason for the rancid rotton egg smell coming from the catalytic convertor on the car in front of you.

AA

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote in message news:46572966\$1@linux...
>

> Don,
>
> Holy shit, hahaha. If we can't figure out a way to make cars run on urine
> then I don't think we should be allowed to continue as a species. Talk
> about
> renewable resource! Think of the endless possibilities for 'filling
> station'
> gags.
>
> Chuck
>
> Don Nafe <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>chuck duffy wrote:
>>> Well, I for one am incredibly pissed. A couple of years ago I saw the
> writing
>>> on the wall and at considerable expense converted my cars engine to run
> on
>>> whole milk. Have you guys seen the price of a gallon of milk lately?
>>>
>>> Chuck
>>>
>>>
>>> Dedic Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>>
>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>>>> did
>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>>>> someone
>>>> is doing something.
>>>>
>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>>>> profits
>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with
>>>> it...yeah,
>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell
>>>> game
>>>> is
>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it
> -
>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>
>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
> to
>>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>>> a

>>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
> in
>>> time
>>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad
>>>> anymore
>>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>>> solution.
>>>>
>>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an
>>>> alternative
>>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale),
>>>> even
>>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
> mean
>>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
> to
>>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
> hands
>>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>>> go
>>>> bankrupt.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>>
>>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>Converted mine to run on urine...have you seen the price of beer lately
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 02:30:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"chuck duffy" <c@c.com> wrote in message news:46572966\$1@linux...
>
> Don,
>
> Holy shit, hahaha. If we can't figure out a way to make cars run on urine
> then I don't think we should be allowed to continue as a species. Talk
> about
> renewable resource! Think of the endless possibilities for 'filling

> station'
> gags.
>
> Chuck
>
> Don Nafe <dnafe@magma.ca> wrote:
>>chuck duffy wrote:
>>> Well, I for one am incredibly pissed. A couple of years ago I saw the
> writing
>>> on the wall and at considerable expense converted my cars engine to run
> on
>>> whole milk. Have you guys seen the price of a gallon of milk lately?
>>>
>>> Chuck
>>>
>>>
>>> Detric Terry <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:
>>>> http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070525/ap_on_re_us/gas_price_protect_8;_ylt=AhtvulXvkv9kQ0cba2FtBdQL1vAI
>>>>
>>>> A good idea in theory, but I doubt it would help, even if every station
>>> did
>>>> this, since demand will just make up for it the next day. At least
>>>> someone
>>>> is doing something.
>>>>
>>>> It is getting old being held hostage by oil companies making record
>>>> profits
>>>> every quarter and claiming gas prices have nothing to do with
>>>> it...yeah,
>>>> right, and the sun has nothing to do with day and night. The shell
>>>> game
>>> is
>>>> one of the oldest cons in the book. Even Congress has "fallen" for it
> -
>>>> twice I believe (2 investigation into price fixing exonerated the oil
>>>> industry...so where's the profit coming from? ...and going).
>>>>
>>>> I hear our illustrious new congress plans to attempt some legislation
> to
>>>> ease the problem... at the end of the summer they say... great, *after*
>>> a
>>>> full season of skyrocketed gas prices, more record profits, and just
> in
>>> time
>>>> for prices take their token "drop" in the fall to lull the country into
>>>> believing someone actually did something, and \$3.75 isn't so bad
>>>> anymore

>>>> (after we see \$4.50+). Yet another "we'll solve the problem by hoping
>>>> everyone will forget about it so we don't actually have to do anything"
>>>> solution.
>>>>
>>>> And no, the solution isn't as easy as saying "let's go find an
>>>> alternative
>>>> fuel source"...and new modes of transportation on a massive scale),
>>>> even
>>>> though that is the only ultimate solution. Remember, record profits
> mean
>>>> steady or falling costs, rising prices, and rising demand on a repeated
>>>> basis, even in Economics 101. In the meantime, we the consumers need
> to
>>>> fight back. If we don't, the oil companies will continue to bite the
> hands
>>>> that feed them until the country falls into depression and half of them
>>> go
>>>> bankrupt.
>>>>
>>>> Sorry for the rant.
>>>>
>>>> If I were President, this would not be a problem. Needless to say, oil
>>>> execs would *not* be voting for me. ;-)
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>Converted mine to run on urine...have you seen the price of beer lately
>

File Attachments

1) [Beer_1.jpg](#), downloaded 151 times



Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Kateeba](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 13:43:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't know if anyone saw this, but I was sent a 3mb video that shows a guy who invented a way to use water to make a gas that burns as hot as the sun. He also uses this method to power his car. A car that works on water. It seems really legit.

I don't have a link, since it was sent to me. It was shown on Fox News. I went to Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. This guy supposedly is in negotiations with one major car manufacturer, and said he has been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't something like this sort of change the world??

I would love to show this video so you guys can see it but I am not sure if I can post a 3mb video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is interested, I could email it to you.

Lou

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Kateeba](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 14:11:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I still can't find a link to the video, but I found the place that invented the technology. Here are two links to the company:

http://www.supplemental-hydrogen.com/?gclid=CJyVzrf_q4wCFQcf_gAod9iTKJQ

<http://hytechapps.com/>

"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>

>I don't know if anyone saw this, but I was sent a 3mb video that shows a guy

>who invented a way to use water to make a gas that burns as hot as the sun.

> He also uses this method to power his car. A car that works on water.

> It seems really legit.

>

>I don't have a link, since it was sent to me. It was shown on Fox News.

> I went to Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. This guy

>supposedly is in negotiations with one major car manufacturer, and said he

>has been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't something like this sort of change the world??

>

>I would love to show this video so you guys can see it but I am not sure

>if I can post a 3mb video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is interested,

>I could email it to you.

>

>Lou

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Kateeba](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 14:13:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ahhhhhh I FOUND the video!!!!!! Actually there seems to be several. This page has the one I got that Fox news showed. Here:

<http://hytechapps.com/company/press>

Lou

"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>

>I still can't find a link to the video, but I found the place that invented
>the technology. Here are two links to the company:

>

> http://www.supplemental-hydrogen.com/?gclid=CJyVzrf_q4wCFQcf_gAod9iTKJQ

>

><http://hytechapps.com/>

>

>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>>

>>I don't know if anyone saw this, but I was sent a 3mb video that shows

a

>guy

>>who invented a way to use water to make a gas that burns as hot as the
>sun.

>> He also uses this method to power his car. A car that works on water.

>

>> It seems really legit.

>>

>>I don't have a link, since it was sent to me. It was shown on Fox News.

>> I went to Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. This

>guy

>>supposedly is in negotiations with one major car manufacturer, and said

>he

>>has been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't something

>>like this sort of change the world??

>>

>>I would love to show this video so you guys can see it but I am not sure

>>if I can post a 3mb video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is interested,

>>I could email it to you.

>>

>>Lou

>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages

Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 16:55:45 GMT

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

I saw that also. I know a guy in this area who is an engineer (perhaps a

paranoid eccentric.perhaps not) who has a similar prototype sitting in a barn/workshop down on the New Mexico border. He claims that he has been threatened that if he publiizes this, he will *disappear*.

Deej

"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote in message
news:4658407a\$1 @linux...

>
>
> Ahhhhhh I FOUND the video!!!!!! Actually there seems to be several.
> This
> page has the one I got that Fox news showed. Here:
>
>
> <http://hytechapps.com/company/press>
>
>
> Lou
>
>
>
> "Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:
>>
>>I still can't find a link to the video, but I found the place that
>>invented
>>the technology. Here are two links to the company:
>>
>> http://www.supplemental-hydrogen.com/?gclid=CJyVzrf_q4wCFQcf_gAod9iTKJQ
>>
>><http://hytechapps.com/>
>>
>>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>I don't know if anyone saw this, but I was sent a 3mb video that shows
> a
>>guy
>>>who invented a way to use water to make a gas that burns as hot as the
>>>sun.
>>> He also uses this method to power his car. A car that works on water.
>>
>>> It seems really legit.
>>>
>>>I don't have a link, since it was sent to me. It was shown on Fox News.
>>> I went to Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. This
>>guy
>>>supposedly is in negotiations with one major car manufacturer, and said
>>he

>>>has been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't
>>>something
>>>like this sort of change the world??
>>>
>>>I would love to show this video so you guys can see it but I am not sure
>>>if I can post a 3mb video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is
>>>interested,
>>>I could email it to you.
>>>
>>>Lou
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 17:26:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I called these guys and left a message. I also e-mailed them inquiring about how to buy stock.

Deej

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:46586e29\$1@linux...

>
> I saw that a couple of years ago. I hope something happens soon. I think
> the oil companies will keep this from happening, besides if it did we'd be
> paying a hundred dollars for a quart of oil. We'd quickly see their
> supply
> and demand excuse, is a farce.

>
> "Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>>
>>
>>Ahhhhhh I FOUND the video!!!!!! Actually there seems to be several.

> This
>>page has the one I got that Fox news showed. Here:

>>
>>
>><http://hytechapps.com/company/press>

>>
>>
>>Lou

>>
>>
>>
>>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>>>
>>>I still can't find a link to the video, but I found the place that
>>>invented
>>>the technology. Here are two links to the company:
>>>
>>> http://www.supplemental-hydrogen.com/?gclid=CJyVzrf_q4wCFQcf_gAod9iTKJQ
>>>
>>><http://hytechapps.com/>
>>>
>>>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>I don't know if anyone saw this, but I was sent a 3mb video that shows
>>>a
>>>guy
>>>>who invented a way to use water to make a gas that burns as hot as the
>>>sun.
>>>> He also uses this method to power his car. A car that works on water.
>>>
>>>> It seems really legit.
>>>>
>>>>I don't have a link, since it was sent to me. It was shown on Fox News.
>>>> I went to Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. This
>>>guy
>>>>supposedly is in negotiations with one major car manufacturer, and said
>>>he
>>>>has been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't
>>>>something
>>>>like this sort of change the world??
>>>>
>>>>I would love to show this video so you guys can see it but I am not sure
>>>>if I can post a 3mb video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is
>>>>interested,
>>>>I could email it to you.
>>>>
>>>>Lou
>>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 17:28:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I saw that a couple of years ago. I hope something happens soon. I think the oil companies will keep this from happening, besides if it did we'd be paying a hundred dollars for a quart of oil. We'd quickly see their supply and demand excuse, is a farce.

"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:
>
>
>Ahhhhhh I FOUND the video!!!!!! Actually there seems to be several.
This
>page has the one I got that Fox news showed. Here:
>
>
><http://hytechapps.com/company/press>
>
>
>Lou
>
>
>
>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:
>>
>>I still can't find a link to the video, but I found the place that invented
>>the technology. Here are two links to the company:
>>
>> http://www.supplemental-hydrogen.com/?gclid=CJyVzrf_q4wCFQcf_gAod9iTKJQ
>>
>><http://hytechapps.com/>
>>
>>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:
>>>
>>>I don't know if anyone saw this, but I was sent a 3mb video that shows
>a
>>guy
>>>who invented a way to use water to make a gas that burns as hot as the
>>sun.
>>> He also uses this method to power his car. A car that works on water.
>>
>>> It seems really legit.
>>>
>>>I don't have a link, since it was sent to me. It was shown on Fox News.
>>> I went to Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. This
>>guy
>>>supposedly is in negotiations with one major car manufacturer, and said
>>he
>>>has been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't something
>>>like this sort of change the world??
>>>
>>>I would love to show this video so you guys can see it but I am not sure
>>>if I can post a 3mb video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is interested,
>>>I could email it to you.
>>>

>>>Lou
>>
>

Subject: Re: OT: Gas hostages
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 17:42:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_013F_01C79F8A.E38A66B0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Here's another perspective

<http://www.groupsrv.com/science/about156295.html>

this partiular post caught my eye:

>HHO is total and utter bullshit, caused by gross incompetence of the=20
purported researchers.=20

There is no difference whatsoever in any way shape or from between=20
Brown's Gas and a standard stoichiometric mix of normal hydrogen and=20
oxygen.=20

The energy density of normal hydrogen by volume is 2.7 watthours per STP =
liter electrically recoverable or 3.3 watthours total available. This=20
compares to gasoline at 9000 wh/l.=20

The energy density of normal hydrogen by weight is meaningless for=20
terrestrial apps, because any CONTAINED hydrogen energy density is MUCH=20
LESS than gasoline.=20

See <http://tinaja.com/glib/muse120.pdf> for an accurate and detailed=20
analysis of the Brown's Gas ludicosity.=20

BUT -- Credible peer reviewed mainstream research shows that modest (5%) =
injection of hydrogen into a conventional ICE can in fact produce=20
significant improvements in performance and pollution reduction. The=20
huge Gotcha is whether any new engine loads, compatibility with other=20
new ICE developments, and per-mile amortization costs can allow a net=20
benefit.=20

Anything involving on-board electrolysis certainly can not. Per=20
<http://www.tinaja.com/glib/muse153.pdf>=20

Anything involving an ordinary fan belt certainly can not. Per=20
<http://www.tinaja.com/whtnu06.asp> and earlier.=20

Energy fundamentals are found at <http://www.tinaja.com/glib/energfun.pdf> =

--=20

Many thanks,=20

Don Lancaster voice phone: (928)428-4073=20
Synergetics 3860 West First Street Box 809 Thatcher, AZ 85552=20
rss: <http://www.tinaja.com/whtnu.xml> email: don@tinaja.com=20

Please visit my GURU's LAIR web site at <http://www.tinaja.com><

and also this one:

>This stuff is dangerous. If you aspirate even a small amount, it can =
kill=20
you. If you abstain from any use of it, however, you will solve at least =
one=20
problem in the universe.<

so perhaps this bears some further scrutiny.....

;o)

"James McCloskey" <excelsm@hotmail.com> wrote in message =
news:46586e29\$1@linux...

>=20

> I saw that a couple of years ago. I hope something happens soon. I =
think

> the oil companies will keep this from happening, besides if it did =
we'd be

> paying a hundred dollars for a quart of oil. We'd quickly see their =
supply

> and demand excuse, is a farce.

>=20

> "Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>>

>>

>>Ahhhhhh I FOUND the video!!!!!! Actually there seems to be several. =

> This

>>page has the one I got that Fox news showed. Here:

>>

>>

>><http://hytechapps.com/company/press>

>>

>>

>>Lou

>>

>>

>>

>>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>>>

>>>I still can't find a link to the video, but I found the place that =
invented

>>>the technology. Here are two links to the company:

>>>

>>> http://www.supplemental-hydrogen.com/?gclid=3DCJyVzrf_q4wCFQ_cfgAod9iTK=JQ

>>>

>>><http://hytechapps.com/>

>>>

>>>"Louis Guarino Jr." <kateeba@snet.net> wrote:

>>>>

>>>>I don't know if anyone saw this, but I was sent a 3mb video that =
shows

>>a

>>>guy

>>>>who invented a way to use water to make a gas that burns as hot as =
the

>>>>sun.

>>>> He also uses this method to power his car. A car that works on =
water.

>>>

>>>> It seems really legit.

>>>>

>>>>I don't have a link, since it was sent to me. It was shown on Fox =
News.

>>>> I went to Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. =

This

>>>guy

>>>>supposedly is in negotiations with one major car manufacturer, and =
said

>>>he

>>>>has been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't =
something

>>>>like this sort of change the world??

>>>>

>>>>I would love to show this video so you guys can see it but I am not =
sure

>>>>if I can post a 3mb video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is =
interested,

>>>>I could email it to you.

>>>>

>>>>Lou

>>>

>>

>

-----=_NextPart_000_013F_01C79F8A.E38A66B0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">

<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.6000.16414" name=3DGENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

<DIV>Here's another perspective</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV><FONT =
face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>http://www.groupsrv.com/science/about156295.html</DIV=

>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>this partiular post caught my =
eye:</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>>HHO is total and utter bullshit, =
caused by=20

gross incompetence of the
purported researchers.

There is no =

difference whatsoever in any way shape or from between
Brown's Gas =
and a=20

standard stoichiometric mix of normal hydrogen and
oxygen. =

The=20

energy density of normal hydrogen by volume is 2.7 watthours per STP =

liter=20

electrically recoverable or 3.3 watthours total available. This =

compares to=20

gasoline at 9000 wh/l.

The energy density of normal hydrogen by =

weight=20
is meaningless for
terrestrial apps, because any CONTAINED hydrogen =
energy=20
density is MUCH
LESS than gasoline.

See <A=20
href=3D"http://tinaja.com/glib/muse120.pdf" target=3D_blank><FONT=20
face=3DArial>http://tinaja.com/glib/muse120.pdf</=
A><FONT=20
face=3DArial> for an accurate and detailed
analysis of the =
Brown's Gas=20
ludicrousity.

BUT -- Credible peer reviewed mainstream research =
shows=20
that modest (5%)
injection of hydrogen into a conventional ICE can =
in fact=20
produce
significant improvements in performance and pollution =
reduction. The=20

huge Gotcha is whether any new engine loads, compatibility with =
other=20

new ICE developments, and per-mile amortization costs can allow a =
net=20

benefit.

Anything involving on-board electrolysis certainly =
can not.=20
Per
<A =
href=3D"http://www.tinaja.com/glib/muse153.pdf"=20
target=3D_blank><FONT=20
face=3DArial>http://www.tinaja.com/glib/muse153.pdf</FON=
T><FONT=20
face=3DArial>

Anything involving an ordinary fan belt =
certainly=20
can not. Per
<A =
href=3D"http://www.tinaja.com/whtnu06.asp"=20
target=3D_blank><FONT=20
face=3DArial>http://www.tinaja.com/whtnu06.asp</A=
><FONT=20
face=3DArial> and earlier.

Energy fundamentals are found =
at=20
<A href=3D"http://www.tinaja.com/glib/energfun.pdf"=20
target=3D_blank><FONT=20
face=3DArial>http://www.tinaja.com/glib/energfun.pdf</FO=
NT><FONT=20
face=3DArial>

--
Many thanks,

Don Lancaster =
voice=20
phone: (928)428-4073
Synergetics 3860 West First Street Box 809 =
Thatcher, AZ=20
85552
rss: <A =
href=3D"http://www.tinaja.com/whtnu.xml"=20
target=3D_blank><FONT=20
face=3DArial>http://www.tinaja.com/whtnu.xml<=
FONT=20

ess
>>
>>
>>Lou
>>
>>
>=
;>>
>>"Louis=20
Guarino Jr." <<FONT =
face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>kateeba@snet.net>=20
wrote:
>>>>
>>>>I still can't find a link to the =
video,=20
but I found the place that invented
>>>the technology. =
Here=20
are two links to the=20
company:
>>>
>>>>http://www.supplemental-hydrogen.=
com/?gclid=3DCJyVzrf_q4wCFQcfgAod9iTKJQ
>>>>
>>>>ht=
tp://hytechapps.com/
>>>>
>>>>"Louis=20
Guarino Jr." <<FONT =
face=3DArial=20
size=3D2>kateeba@snet.net>=20
wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>I don't know if anyone saw =
this,=20
but I was sent a 3mb video that=20
shows
>>a
>>>>guy
>>>>>who invented a =
way to=20
use water to make a gas that burns as hot as=20
the
>>>>sun.
>>>>> He also uses this method to =
power=20
his car. A car that works on=20
water.
>>>
>>>> It seems really=20
legit.
>>>>
>>>>>I don't have a link, since =
it was=20
sent to me. It was shown on Fox News.
>>>> I =
went to=20
Fox news to try to find a link, but couldn't find it. =20
This
>>>>guy
>>>>>supposedly is in negotiations =
with=20
one major car manufacturer, and =
said
>>>he
>>>>has=20
been to a meeting with congress. Now, if this is true, couldn't=20
something
>>>>>like this sort of change the=20
world??
>>>>
>>>>>I would love to show this =
video=20
so you guys can see it but I am not sure
>>>>>if I can =
post a 3mb=20
video here. Is there a way?? If anyone is=20
interested,
>>>>>I could email it to=20
you.
>>>>>
>>>>>Lou
>>>
>>>=

>></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_013F_01C79F8A.E38A66B0--

Subject: Re: OT: Guess I don't qualify
Posted by [Deej \[4\]](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 18:20:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Reply to my inquiry about investing in the company:

Greetings,

Thank you for contacting Hydrogen Technology Applications, Inc. (HTA). You mentioned that you have potential investment interest. As we are a private company, there are many state and federal laws with which we must comply. Additionally, we are a growing company and have limited resources, thus, we cannot reply to most inquiries, no matter how sincere.

At this time, HTA is not currently raising any capital. From time to time, HTA raises capital, but only from "accredited investors." If you are unfamiliar with this term, please visit www.sec.gov/answers/accred.htm - #6 and #7.

Rule 501 states that you are an "Accredited Investor" if you are "a natural person who has individual net worth, or joint net worth with the person's spouse, that exceeds \$1 million at the time of the purchase" or "a natural person with income exceeding \$200,000 in each of the two most recent years or joint income with a spouse exceeding \$300,000 for those years and a reasonable expectation of the same income level in the current year".

If you are an accredited investor, please reply to this email (to InvestorRelations@HyTechApps.com) sending us the information at the bottom of the page. Your information will be stored in our database, and you may be contacted if we have any further private rounds.

If you are not an "Accredited Investor", please do not reply to this email. If you have already told us on www.HyTechApps.com whether you would like to be a part of a periodic newsletter once it is available, we have your data; if you have not signed up on our website, please do so as we would like to keep you aware of our progress.

If you have an R&D project that you wish to propose to HTA, please go back to the web and input your interest as "Professional (Scientific / Engineering)" or "Technology R&D Project".

Please know that it is NOT our policy to sell the data you provide.

Many thanks,

Hydrogen Technology Applications, Inc.

Researchers, Developers & Providers of

Subject: Re: OT: Guess I don't qualify

Posted by [excelav](#) on Sat, 26 May 2007 19:44:14 GMT

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

So unless you are wealthy you are not allowed by our government to invest to get wealthy. In other words getting rich is only allowed for the rich.

The rich get richer and the rest of us don't qualify. And they say this is a free country.

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

>Reply to my inquiry about investing in the company:

>

>

>Greetings,

>

>Thank you for contacting Hydrogen Technology Applications, Inc. (HTA). You

>mentioned that you have potential investment interest. As we are a private

>company, there are many state and federal laws with which we must comply.

>Additionally, we are a growing company and have limited resources, thus, we

>cannot reply to most inquiries, no matter how sincere.

>

>At this time, HTA is not currently raising any capital. From time to time,

>HTA raises capital, but only from "accredited investors." If you are

>unfamiliar with this term, please visit www.sec.gov/answers/accred.htm -

#6

>and #7.

>

>Rule 501 states that you are an "Accredited Investor" if you are "a natural

>person who has individual net worth, or joint net worth with the person's

>spouse, that exceeds \$1 million at the time of the purchase" or "a natural

>person with income exceeding \$200,000 in each of the two most recent years

>or joint income with a spouse exceeding \$300,000 for those years and a

>reasonable expectation of the same income level in the current year".

>

>If you are an accredited investor, please reply to this email (to

>InvestorRelations@HyTechApps.com) sending us the information at the bottom
>of the page. Your information will be stored in our database, and you may
be
>contacted if we have any further private rounds.
>
>If you are not an "Accredited Investor", please do not reply to this email.

>If you have already told us on www.HyTechApps.com whether you would like
to
>be a part of a periodic newsletter once it is available, we have your data;

>if you have not signed up on our website, please do so as we would like
to
>keep you aware of our progress.
>
>If you have an R&D project that you wish to propose to HTA, please go back

>to the web and input your interest as "Professional (Scientific /
>Engineering)" or "Technology R&D Project".
>
>Please know that it is NOT our policy to sell the data you provide.
>
>Many thanks,
>
> Hydrogen Technology Applications, Inc.
>
> Researchers, Developers & Providers of
>
> Aquygen Fuel & Additive Applications
>
>
>
