Re: Is conversion of biomass to h/carbons CO2 neutral ?

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2007−11/msg00163.html

- *From*: "Bill Reif" <billreif@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>

- *Date*: Tue, 27 Nov 2007 06:28:53 GMT

"ivk" <ivk2000@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:9b1c023d−c334−4e98−ade6−4bfddb52196c@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> My understanding is that a conversion of a biomass to hydrocarbons,
> assisted with extra hydrogen (and potentially extra energy) generated
> from nuclear plants, should be CO2 neutral. So wouldn't it resolve
> both the shortage of fossil fuel and CO2 pollution ? Why then all
> these futuristic "hydrogen economy", "ammonia economy", etc are
> needed ?

because the creation of the biomass is not CO2 nutral. The creation of Ethynol actually uses more fuel than its burning saves us, due to the fuel necessary to create the fertilizer, the demands of transportation and soil preparation, and the inefficiencies of the decomposition process. (We would gain some efficiency by simply mixing our coal and other carbon−based trash with the tons of coal put into our power plants.) Furthermore: the farming industry results in much much methane and nitrisoxide in the atmosphere, both of which, along with increased water vapor farms generate, trap several times the heat as does CO2. I believe that the nitrogen product decay components also stay in the atmosphere a lot longer than does CO2, which plants are taking up at much greater rates as we've made it more available. As oil availability decreases, it will be food production that takes the hit. That doesn't leave much fertilizer to squander on biomass production.

Bill

.