Subject: : Conservation
Topic: : State Rep. White Accused Of Attacking Shale Supporters Online
Re: State Rep. White Accused Of Attacking Shale Supporters Online
Author: : pcray1231
Date: : 2013/6/14 8:14:14
URL:

Quote:

> Unless with a straight face you can claim there is no environmental risk.

Jack, nobody would claim that, I don't think. But the part that you miss is that having some environmental risk doesn't equate to "stop until you work out every issue".

Here's the thing. We need energy. There is no form of energy that carries zero environmental risk. It's not even a theoretical possibility to get to that level. Solar, nuclear, biofuel, oil, gas, nuclear, coal, hydro, you name it. Every single one of them has SOME environmental impact, and "risk" of more should things go wrong. And no amount of "improvement" can change this fact.

So, you:

1. Pick the form that results in the least amount of impact per unit of energy produced. In reality, we need multiple forms, but you can favor some over others on a % basis.

2. Through research, regulation, etc., take reasonable efforts to minimize that impact, keeping in mind that requiring too much can stop things. That may not sound like such a bad thing, but it is if it grandfather's dirtier practices, or throws the power gen responsibility to a less desirable form, negating #1. For instance, perhaps you don't like nuclear, but do you like drilling better? Now that you've stopped nuclear, you try to stop the drilling. Do you like coal better? It's real easy for good intentions to hurt their own cause. We're going to generate enough power to meet the demand, there's nothing that can stop that. And there ain't no perfectly clean way to do it. So it's a very clear case of "pick your poison".