

Re: Replace Hard Drive After 3.5 Years?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.repair/2005-03/2454.html>

From: Vlad (*Bla_at_dot.com*)

Date: 03/29/05

Date: Tue, 29 Mar 2005 16:16:08 -0500

On 29 Mar 2005 09:41:55 -0800, "Keith Jewell" <implode@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>Attach bullseye here wrote:

>> Until recently, I've gotten away with using a Conner Peripherals hard
>drive

>> of ~820 MB and even a 127MB drive from a PC/AT and the current stable
>is 2/3

>> 1998 and before and includes ISA cards in some cases. I believe the
>high

>> RPMs and increased stress brought along by improved storage
>technologies

>> bring on an earlier demise. Few of my devices or cards are newer than
>1999

>> or 2000. I've never had a CD data backup fail. and I believe such
>problems

>> are analogous to the CD rot troubles of the commercial audio
>industry. I am

>> certainly not so cavalier as to leave them out and about like some
>audio CD

>> consumers. I HAVE had CD failure and haven't gotten around to
>investigating

>> it with the mfg. That disc took about 8 years to fail also. Proper

>> maintenance is always a good thing but proper selection of suitable

>> equipment seems more so.

>

>CD-R quality really does matter. I haven't had any problems with the

>gold discs I bought for a dollar a piece 8 years ago, but a few of the

>silver uncoated ones that friends have given me have become completely

>blank. Also, had my first DVD-R fail the other day, a cheap unbranded

>one that someone sent me. Those are supposed to be more durable because

>they're enclosed entirely in acrylic.

>

>However, as to hard disks, I'll take the faster, fails more often

>drives any day. For one, I've got 400 gigs of data online (entire CD

>collection ripped losslessly, digital photos), and that's just not

>possible with the smaller drives. But for two, the new drives are so

sci.electronics.repair: Re: Replace Hard Drive After 3.5 Years?

>fast and so cheap – most of the new motherboards will do hardware
>mirroring, so for around \$100 you can have 40 gigs of totally
>redundant, very fast storage (2x40g 7200rpm drives). They don't even
>use a proprietary format, so if the motherboard dies, you can retrieve
>the data with any machine, since each hard disk is just a duplicate of
>the other. And by fast, I mean transfer rates 10x faster or more than
>those old drives, and seek times almost twice as fast. But they do fail
>more often. Still, using RAID and decent backup strategies, I haven't
>lost a significant amount of data since I was using a 2gig HP SCSI hard
>disk.
>
>–Keith

I just got a Maxtor 120 GB 5200 for about \$30.00 from Tiger. Low speed but probably more reliable then a 7200. Ideal for an image HD
Vlad