

Thank you for your comment, John Gasell.

The comment tracking number that has been assigned to your comment is SolarS50002.

Comment Date: May 31, 2008 18:03:17PM
Solar Energy Development PEIS
Comment ID: SolarS50002

First Name: John
Middle Initial:
Last Name: Gasell
Organization:
Address: 3506 Creekmur Lane
Address 2:
Address 3:
City: Lakeland
State: FL
Zip: 33812
Country: USA
Email:
Privacy Preference: Don't withhold name or address from public record
Attachment:

Comment Submitted:

I believe our energy needs for the near term will be most economically met with nuclear, coal, geothermal, hydroelectric , removal of drilling restrictions, and to a lesser degree, solar and wind. The wasteful, expensive, polluting , and immoral food crop conversion to ethanol should BE STOPPED by ceasing the payment of all subsidies. There is absolutely no truth in stating there is an energy gain when fossil fuels are used to make ethanol. Where does the extra energy come from. Why are subsidies needed. The DOE budget is about \$28B per year. In the past 30 years DOE has not come up with a single KWH of new energy. Now that most government officials and the educated public realize the folly of crops to ethanol myths it seems like the DOE is creating a new diversion in solar power . Presently there are many solar projects underway. CA Edison, for example, has reconstituted a DOE 1970 solar array experiment which employed 25KW Stirling motor/generators. This is a typical DOE operating scheme. It was a failure in the 1970s and it is not practical in 2008. I recommend ceasing all subsidies to ethanol and biodiesel from food crops. I recommend ceasing all "mandates" requiring use of subsidised fuel. I recommend cutting the DOE budget except for limited basic research on new energy systems with their own forces.