

## Re: Wind Power

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2004-08/1451.html>

---

**From:** Dan Bloomquist (*EXTRApUBLIC20\_at\_lakeweb.com*)

**Date:** 08/29/04

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 2004 04:08:20 GMT

Don Kelly wrote:

>

> -----

> *If you use the above figures, then what about gas turbines which are  
> cheaper yet to install.*

Coal installs for \$1.00/watt. You have to figure the lifetime cost of production. Modern wind turbines just don't fail so installed cost is lifetime cost. (Yes, they figure the value of the land, etc., into that \$.85/watt.)

> *In addition, consider the load factor of wind plant vs coal or other plant.  
> Wind doesn't replace other plant in that such plant must be available in  
> case wind production does not meet load demands. Now you have 30watts of  
> wind plant needed to effectively replace 10watts of coal plant. \$9.00 vs  
> \$3.00-5.00*

Then let us plan if wind will become a serious contributor to our grid. That is one or two decades off, we have the time. Considering how we have planned for 'peak oil', I don't have a lot of hope from here.

>

>> *Especially when you consider that wind pays its energy  
>> payback in a very short time while coal has no payback  
>> attribute at all.*

>

> -----

> *Excuse me- what school of economics did you graduate from? Who would build  
> coal plant if it did not have a payback and more during its lifetime? Ditto  
> for any source.*

Please understand my statement. 'Energy payback'. Please address that...

>

> *Economic justification for wind, all other things being equal, may not  
> actually be there. Justification in terms of deferred use of fossil fuels is  
> another matter.*

sci.energy: Re: Wind Power

Exactly. (A ten thousand word dissertation would have to follow.)

Best, Dan.

--

<http://lakeweb.net>

<http://ReserveAnalyst.com>

No EXTRA stuff for email.