Re: Oil replacement

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2005−05/msg00206.html

- *From*: "Brad Guth" <ieisbradguth@xxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: 20 May 2005 10:15:24 −0700

Alex Terrell,
Of what our existing power grids can potentially manage (though not hardly);
The currently out−of−production Corbin Sparrow offers one example of what's suitable for 80% of our driving needs, although if such transportation were given away for free I'd bet not more than 10% would dare utilize such. The Topaz as offering two seats could entice perhaps 20% usage, whereas the Sparrow is limited to one soul that doesn't have to go too far.

These are conventionally all−electric and usually having been configured as operating upon the likes of the Optima or some other lead/acid/gell batteries that are relatively of poor energy density and even a wee bit pathetic on cycles (I'd say two years worth at best), thus intended for the RV consumer or light commercial applications can be greatly expanded upon by switching over to the H2O2/aluminum battery that actually shouldn't require all that much space nor battery mass. Thereby the little Sparrow or anything similar should be able to sustain 65+mph (even on most grades) and still obtain a good 200 mile range with loads of reserve capacity from a 30 kwh energy storage resource that should only demand 18 amps at 120 VAC in order to fully recharge the H2O2 within 16 hours. That's not half bad from less than a 70 lb. battery instead of the Optima alternative of 600+lbs. With 530 lbs less weight and of lots more energy density offering 6~8 times the usable capacity and hardly none of the detrimental cycling compromises should make the likes of the new and improved Sparrow/H2O2 worth investing into. From there a new and improved inverter and better 3 phase or some other multi−pole altenrnative electric motor should deliver this 200 mile range per 30 kwh battery charge that might even become less discharged and/or travel further if it's been averaging along at less than 3 kw for most of the local driving conditions being somewhat less than 60 mph.

Remember that it was originally taking out roughly 3.9 KW in order to apply 3.25 KW to the wheel for getting 60 miles down the straight and narrow road while sustaining 60 mph from essentially little more than 4.4 shp while having to haul about those extra 530 lbs, and per such speed and range the entire capacity of battery energy was spent, thus few honestly counted upon getting half that mileage. However, even a

to/from capability of 30 miles per recharge should still have provided a good portion of driving needs for local usage that might suit a good portion of our driving needs.

Even though the 13 units of Optima battery are supposedly rated for better than 10 kwh, in reality as for a 1 hour rate of discharge should plan upon not more than 4 kwh, a 3 hour discharge rate and you'll be doing good to obtain 5 kwh, not to mention the fact that with the alternative H2O2/aluminum battery you'll avoid ripping the very heart out of those 65 Ahr phony baloney rated Optimas, whereas the H2O2/aluminum battery should perform best while being kept self−regulated as toasty warm from discharging and otherwise not internally self−destructing due to frequent cycling, especially if the recharge cycle is kept to roughly a 4:1 ratio, meaning a 2 hr drive at full 65+ mph could be followed up with an 8 hour recharge cycle, although a 2:1 ratio of 4 hours worth wouldn't cause excessive heat nor battery damage if there's an available 25 amp 240 VAC power source (30 amp clothes dyer receptacle) for plugging into.

The notion of the Sparrow or whatever similar all−electric car was also intended to save upon a great deal of road and parking space (4 Sparrows per Hummer/SUV) in addition to offering zero pollution as well as contributing almost zero noise. Of course the Sparrow isn't nearly as aerobreaking by design nor nearly as intimidating, thus road−rage might become a little embarrassing if it's emanating from the birdy−like cockpit of your otherwise silent Sparrow. So, at best the small all−elelectrics might only suit 10% of the driving force that's intent upon causing as much polluted grid−lock and road−rage at the same time each of those aerobreaking 9 mpg Hummers are most often accommodating one extremely arrogant owel eating and tree burning soul that could otherwise care less as to how many Muslims must die and/or suffer per mile. Perhaps we should change our standard of mpg to mpm, meaning miles per Muslim.

The Ultimate FAQ for Deep Cycle Battery Basics and Information; this external page offers nothing about the H2O2/aluminum batteries, but otherwise is simply one of the better links to battery types and usage: http://www.windsun.com/Batteries/Battery_FAQ.

A few of perhaps hundreds of available pages on the hydrogen peroxide and aluminum (h2o2/aluminum) power/fuel cells or battery that's anything but unimpressive:
http://www.purdue.edu/UNS/html4ever/9912.Rusek.peroxide.html
http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1999/12/991215072333.htm
http://www.zpenergy.com/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=717

BTW; there is another perfectly viable hybrid Hummer option that's offering a 100 KW H2O2/C12H26 IRRCE plus having the additional 100 KWh worth of H2O2/aluminum battery as power to spare, that'll combine as to apply 400 kw on demand for laying serious rubber of 0−60 in less than 4 seconds and, it'll still exceed 100 mpg as taken from that spendy

gallon of diesel(C12H26) without ever taking in a single m3 worth of atmosphere. That's hauling 7 folks down the pike in good style, thus making for 700 PMPG (is that good passenger miles per gallon or what?).

The cleanest engine in town that still kicks butt;
The IRRCE (Internal Rotary Rocket Combustion Engine) was somewhat re−invented out of extremely thin air because, it seems I'd been getting myself into the weird and thereby unassisted notion of how to sufficiently power my robust LM−1 (Lunar Metro bus) about the surface of our moon, but that was before I've since learned as to how horrifically dust loaded and in places quite deep with said moon−dust the physical environment actually is. Not that whatever dust is the least bit of a problem for the IRRCE that's running entirely upon H2O2/C12H26, however as for whatever surface track drives that may have to be significantly modified to something less than a few kg/m2, which I'm fairly certain can not be accommodated. Thus perhaps my LM−1 needs to include the functionality as a moon−dust submarine, as this might have to suffice since the LM−1 shell needs to remain fairly robust in case something comes along that's arriving at 30+km/s (combined with our 30 km/s represents that it's entirely possible to encounter a few 100+km/s items). Since there's no point in having bus windows (only cameras), I suppose various ground penetration radars and sonar like methods might tell the bus driver of what's ahead while the entire unit has to navigate and manage to propel itself through such deep piles and composite layers of carbon, titanium and basalt moon−dust as otherwise having a good base layer of meteorites and impact related shards as strewn upon the actual lunar bedrock. I'll also have to reconsider traction could still become a nasty problem should that moon−dust represent some form of non−compacting lubrication and/or possibly even a bone−dry buoyancy factor, although I'd planned upon a lunar bus mass of 100 tonnes (600 Earth tonnes) which should offer plenty of traction as to climb out of any hole or ocean of such dust. Of course, now that I'm being informed there's 0.03 psi (0.002 bar) worth of an atmosphere available and that more atmosphere can be artificially created, I believe that's actually getting sufficient for accommodating a hot−tipped gyrocopter sort of lander as the above surface transporter that's also H2O2/C12H26 powered.

It's too bad that not even − The Washington Post − nor − The New York Times − can work with the whole truth and nothing but the truth about our moon, but then even NOVA, NPR and PBS are about to become 'Skull and Bones' moderated to death as to information having been excluded as to the physical moon environment that doesn't entirely match the rather unusually low solar influx and thereby total lack of any nasty radiation and thereby somehow sharing off much less of the secondary/recoil levels of most other such photons from hard−X−ray to those of the UV−a and Near−UV of blacklight near−blue photons that apparently didn't coexist, or as to avoiding whatever's conflicting with their rather bright/55% albedo and of their extremely thin layer of clumping moon−dust that our NASA/Apollo teams reported and supposedly photographed via their unfiltered Kodak eye, with never once

so much as noticing an arriving dust−bunny, much less observing any debris or small meteors passing by or otherwise impacting within their supposed 3e−15 bar (near absolute vacuum) atmosphere where even such small impacts should have been rather horrific visual events and at such a slight gravity of 1.623 m/s/s becoming quite dusty at that, and somehow out of their 6 missions still not having established one interactive instrument, camera, SAR image receiving aperture, transponding strobe or interactive laser to work with, at least there's been absolutely nothing by which independent scientist and/or amateur astronomers could have utilized for learning so much other important moon and Earth hard−science from. Even their most recent NASA/ESA SMART−1 mission having been moderated to near death so as to avoid disclosing upon anything that's the least bit contrary to any of those original NASA/Apollo missions where all of their cold−war cows (meaning hard−evidence and mission fly−by−rocket engineering) vanished into thin air.

Thus whatever fuel consumption may have to remain as another one of those 'so what's the difference' qualifiers as for those WMD that simply didn't exist. Perhaps we can run our cars and toys upon spare Muslim body parts.
~

The GUTH Venus township, bridge and ET Park−n−Ride tarmac:
http://guthvenus.tripod.com/gv−town.htm
The Russian LSE−CM/ISS (Lunar Space Elevator)
http://guthvenus.tripod.com/lunar−space−elevator.htm
A few of my other testy topics by; Brad Guth / GASA−IEIS
http://guthvenus.tripod.com/gv−topics.htm

.

- ***References***:
  - ***Oil replacement***
    - *From:* Chris
  - ***Re: Oil replacement***
    - *From:* Mel
  - ***Re: Oil replacement***
    - *From:* tesseract
  - ***Re: Oil replacement***
    - *From:* Chris
  - ***Re: Oil replacement***
    - *From:* bill
  - ***Re: Oil replacement***
    - *From:* Tim Keating
  - ***Re: Oil replacement***
    - *From:* Tim Keating
  - ***Re: Oil replacement***
    - *From:* Alex Terrell

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Oil replacement***
- Next by Date: ***Re: Why Can't A Fuel injected Petrol Engine be as Efficient as a Diesel?***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Oil replacement***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Oil replacement***
- Index(es):
    - ***Date***
    - ***Thread***