

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

# Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-09/msg01873.html>

---

- *From:* MooseFET <[kensmith@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:kensmith@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 11 Sep 2007 06:02:54 -0700
- 

On Sep 10, 9:17 pm, Eeyore <[rabbitsfriendsandrelati...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rabbitsfriendsandrelati...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Eeyore wrote:

Simon S Aysdie wrote:

I have heard it claimed that a passenger jet — if fully or near fully booked — is in the same neighborhood for energy/beeLine as the average passenger car (w/ one person).

Depending on your choice of car for comparison (and I don't mean SUVs) etc, it may actually be more like 1/2 what a car would consume for the same length journey.

[A380] the plane's fuel consumption will be 2.9 liters (0.76 gallon) per passenger per 100 kilometers (60 miles)[http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2005/01/0118\\_050118\\_airbus.html](http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2005/01/0118_050118_airbus.html)

That's 79 mpg (US).

I gather the 787 will have similar figures. This article says Boeing claim even better <http://www.greencarcongress.com/2007/07/boeing-rolls-ou.html> Boeing calculates that the 787 will deliver fuel consumption of approximately 2.4 l/100 passenger-kilometers, assuming average modal load factors.

That's 95 mpg (US).

Yes, if you want to stop global warming and save the planet, everyone

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

should drive a 787. :)

The Boeing design is a lot more streamlined than the Airbus. The difference isn't in the engines which can be easily changed as newer and better ones come along. I remember some years back reading that a small plane got about 125MPG.

.