

# Reducing Energy

December 29<sup>th</sup> 2008

5<sup>th</sup> December 2008

Hi all

Quick link below re: more of the IMO major changes going on in the relations between commerce and the state:

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/cbb080d2-c22a-11dd-a350-000077b07658.html>

[The above is a Financial Times article].

If it's true that the some of the execs are offering to only draw \$1 salaries I think it says that faced with extreme circumstances people will make changes.

Re: Jim's question on the possible savings from improved energy efficiency I think we could perhaps halve energy consumption with a similar standard of living. No doubt there will be studies only a Google away on that. I was struck by the reference to the power consumption of the south Humber bank oil industries - Immingham is one of the industrial CHP sites highlighted by Poyry in their recent report. From memory the Pelec out = 850MW and they'd identified UK potential of approx 16GB at similar locations. 16GB is approx 20% of UK grid peak demand (please check my figures).

Using the example of the US car industry again I think the American Physical Society is calling for the US car fleet to achieve 35mpg by 2020. IMO this is very unambitious - with no new/different technology just more appropriate design we are already producing cars like the wildly over specced BMW 730d which does 40mpg average. I need to check the churn figures for the US base to see if that is why they are saying it'll take them 12 years to still be 10% worse than this! And if they went for something more appropriate to a country with a 55mph top speed limit (say VW Passat 1.9Tdi) they already be getting on for twice their target - I feel a letter coming on!:

[http://www.whatcar.com/search/mpg+heroes/News/AR\\_DateTimePublished!1/abn/](http://www.whatcar.com/search/mpg+heroes/News/AR_DateTimePublished!1/abn/)

Re: wind energy - I've had a look at the Crown Estates Round 3 off shore bidding process and it *does* include the block off the Sussex coast. Apologies - some time ago I looked at this and was under the impression Round 3 was east coast only. Links here to more info. including the Crown Estate attendance lists for London and Edinburgh events:

[http://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/our\\_portfolio/marine/energy\\_telecoms/offshore\\_wind\\_energy/round3.htm](http://www.thecrownestate.co.uk/our_portfolio/marine/energy_telecoms/offshore_wind_energy/round3.htm)

Regards

[a contributor]

---

6<sup>th</sup> December 2008

“Jim's question on the possible savings from improved energy efficiency I think we could perhaps halve energy consumption with a similar standard of living”.

I have read all sorts of conflicting information on how much you can improve efficiency. The consensus seems to be that reducing energy consumption around 20% is very doable, but beyond that there are all sorts of conflicting opinions. Reducing by

half is definitely something that a significant group of people doubt is possible with current standards of living... then, different people have different ideas of what keeping current standards of living would be.

Cheers,

Doly

---

7<sup>th</sup> December 2008

Hi Doly

Fair point re: "standard of living" definition. Maybe "quality of life" would be better? I think One Planet Living is taking the approach for Europeans we need to reduce our resource use by 66% and for North Americans by 80%.

<http://www.oneplanetliving.org/index.html>

So maybe 50% energy reduction ought to be possible but will try and look into the reports you mention - any leads to start with?

Just in the areas of transport and domestic energy use I'm sure a 50% reduction is possible for many people but I haven't looked into the demographics.

Regards

[a contributor]

---

7<sup>th</sup> December 2008

Hi All,

Actually, the "Hair-shirt Brigade" of Greens has got it wrong on "Reducing our resource use by 65%". Nope.

In ideal reality, instead: increasing our recycling rate by 65% or more, and increasing our energy efficiency rate by 65%. Same result (crudely).

It's like people in a leaky lifeboat, who are told to increase drastically their baling rate.

Actually, they should be controlling the leaks, first of all.

Our society "Leaks" about 70% of its energy, and about half or more, (average) of resources.

The book, published years ago, called "Fourfold", pretty much proved that an efficient society, recycling, conserving, etc, (minimum leaks) needs minimum life boat bailing, (inputs). Standards of living and consumption remain the same. But four times more efficiently, using just 25% of current consumption. A 75% "Cut". No hair shirts.

**In the Third World, with it's huge, booming population, it's not about consumption, but sheer survival. Some cuts of consumption here, (about 50%) of non-essentials that are energy and resources max, and replacement by others that are resource/energy minimum (software, for example) and an extensive program of Third World development, (Real development, not the Oxfam International Aid industry model) is essential.**

**If people think Westerners are resource and energy wasteful, just visit the Third World. People there burn entire forests just to cook lunch, or grow a few vegetables. The entire ecology of the Third World is being trashed, or has been trashed. Since they are 80% of the World population, that's the place to really start!!....**

**Regards**

**Graham Ennis**

---

7<sup>th</sup> December 2008

Hi Graham

The points you make re: energy waste in the developed world I fully agree with (that's why I think a 50% reduction in energy use should be possible - lets face it we simply throw this away as BAU!) but I'm afraid I can't accept the developing world are the major resource consumers on the planet.

Yes there is much that could be done by improving technology transfer to improve quality of life but the idea a "whole forest would be felled" just to cook lunch is surely impossible? The energy input to fell, chop and transport the forest would far outweigh the energetic value of lunch. If there is truth in this statement I suspect it is more in line with supporting the meat rich lunches which the developed world enjoys.

There are detailed stats on resource use (converted to a land area basis) in the One Planet Living 2006 report:

[http://assets.panda.org/downloads/living\\_planet\\_report.pdf](http://assets.panda.org/downloads/living_planet_report.pdf)

Re: successful, foolproof models for aid and development - I think this beats everyone? Look at Zimbabwe post "power sharing" - issues of resource use, efficiencies and quality of life are intractable in that political climate:

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-12/07/content\\_10469373.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-12/07/content_10469373.htm)

Regards

[a contributor]