Subject: : Conservation
Topic: : WINDMILLS II
Re: WINDMILLS II
Author: : pcray1231
Date: : 2009/12/23 13:27:35
URL:

Both are right, of course. Most of the visible "smoke" is actually steam. That picture has some color issues going on, those belches should be pretty dang white. Bad stuff does come out, but its next to invisible. On a clear day you can see a little yellow tinge above the tallest stacks, thats the bad stuff. In those pictures the stacks that don't have the billows of steam are the ones spewing the dangerous stuff. The fact that its nearly invisible doesn't make it any less dangerous.

The problem with particulate matter is not a necessary one, and a lot of progress has been made in that area, same with the sulfur dioxide. For those types of pollution, the question is simply how much are we willing to pay for better health and a better environment. We can take it to next to nothing, which makes it more similar to a natural gas plant, and still pay less than wind or solar. As for CO2, thats a tougher nut to crack, its prohibitively expensive to capture it with any of the fossil fuels. If CO2 is your primary issue, the options are nuclear and the renewables, with nuclear or increased hydro as the only one capable of carrying an appreciable percentage of the overall load. That doesn't mean solar and wind are useless, it just means they cannot form the foundation of power gen.

Riz, Horse Hollow is one of the most favorable places in the country for wind farms. Wind farms in PA would not generate nearly that much electricity per windmill or per acre. To reach 20% of the total, it's well more acreage than all of Pennsylvania. But you are forgetting about the oceans. Maximizing wind energy means using the oceans. Still, 20%, no way, not ever. The realistic numbers I've seen say solar + wind combined, with full commitment, could approach 10%. That's not the "answer" some think it is, but its nothing to scoff at either. 10% is an awful lot of energy, right now we're at fractions of a percent.