| <u>Slashdot</u> Stories | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------|---------|------|------------|--------|-----------|-------------------------|-----|
| Slash Boxes | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments | | | | | | | | | |
| | Search | | | | | | | | |
| | | Deals new | SlashTV | Jobs | Newsletter | Submit | khayman80 | Log | out |
| • <u>Stories</u> | | | | | | | 5 | U | |

- <u>Submissions</u>
- Popular
- Blog

Slashdot

- Build
- Ask Slashdot
- Book Reviews
- Games
- <u>Idle</u>
- YRO
- Cloud
- <u>Hardware</u>
- <u>Linux</u>
- Management
- Mobile
- <u>Science</u>
- <u>Security</u>
- Storage

This discussion has been archived. No new comments can be posted.

11 Trillion Gallons of Water Needed To End California Drought 323 More Prefs

11 Trillion Gallons of Water Needed To End California Drought

Archived Discussion Load All Comments

3 Eull 03 Abbreviated 10 Hidden

(Semments Filter:

Score:

- <u>All</u> 5
- Insightful 4
- Informative 3
- Interesting 2
- Funny 1
- 0

The Fine Print: The following comments are owned by whoever posted them. We are not responsible for them in any way.

-1 • <u>323 More Prefs</u> And on the plus side... (Score:2, Funny)

by gweihir (88907) Alter Relationship

... they are creating a nice, warm dessert there, something the planet does obviously not have enough of. Finally the decades of knowingly over-using the available water supply are going to pay off.

```
Sig under construction.
```

0

<u>Re:</u> (Score:1)

by Narcocide (102829) Alter Relationship

Nice try but most of it was already desert. They're just doing a really bad job lately of changing it into something more useful.

•

>

Re:And on the plus side... (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-12-16 23:32 (#48615125)

Nice try but most of it was already desert. They're just doing a really bad job lately of changing it into something more useful.

Nice try, but no.

That is to say, yes, the central valley was pretty much desert. But there was still groundwater.

They've been using up not just the reservoir water but ALSO the groundwater at a rate faster than it has been replenished, and they have damned well known it for decades.

There is no excuse for this, and I for one am solidly against letting them have any more water from other states.

Parent Share twitter facebook linkedin 8+

Re:And on the plus side... (Score:2)

by ChrisMaple (607946) Alter Relationship on 2014-12-19 20:34 (#48639871)

There is no excuse for this

People need food to live. Food, in the form of plants, needs water and sunshine. Oregon and Washington have lots of water and not so much sun. California has lots of sun but less water. Shipping sunshine to Oregon and Washington is not practical. Can you figure out the rest?

Parent Share twitter facebook linkedin 8+

Re:And on the plus side... (Score:2)

by Jane Q. Public (1010737) Friend of a Friend on 2014-12-21 16:06 (#48649271)

Can you figure out the rest?

Yes, I certainly can, and the answer is no.

Guess what? Oregon and Washington make use of that water. Shipping it down to California seriously diminishes quality of life for those who live there, not to mention the environmental destruction that would ensue.

Let California go broke. Hell, it is anyway. People can buy their food from elsewhere.

Parent Share twitter facebook linkedin 8+

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:2)

by <u>khayman80 (824400)</u> on 2014-12-21 18:25 (<u>#48649819</u>) <u>Homepage</u> Journal

Jane's "interest" in that NAS report evaporated after I <u>showed</u> that Jane had been fooled by <u>"Steven Goddard"</u> once again. So let's return to

Jane's confusion about basic thermodynamics.

But net radiative power out of a boundary around the source = "radiative power out" minus "radiative power in", so the equation Jane just described also says:

NO!!!!! As I have explained to you innumerable times now, you can also consider your heat source, by itself, that "sphere". The only NET radiative power out comes from the electrical power in. Further, the cooler walls do not contribute any of that NET power out. That's what net means. [Jane Q. Public, 2014-12-16]

I've already <u>pointed out</u> that Jane's hopelessly confused about the word "net", but that's just one of the mistakes Jane packed into these few sentences.

Jane's also wrong to imply that energy conservation across one choice of boundary could somehow contradict energy conservation across another boundary choice. That's impossible. Many boundary choices are **inconvenient** but they all have to be **consistent**. Otherwise, how could we possibly tell which boundary choice was correct?

So Jane can't object to the simple energy conservation equation I derived by claiming that some other boundary choice would somehow contradict my equation. That's completely impossible, and if Jane doesn't understand that point then he should learn about conservation of energy: example (backup), example (backup), example (backup).

As you can tell after reading those introductions, here's how to apply conservation of energy. Draw a boundary around the heat source:

power in = electrical heating power + radiative power in from the chamber walls power out = radiative power out from the heat source

Since power in = power out through any boundary where nothing inside is changing:

electrical heating power + radiative power in from the chamber walls = radiative power out from the heat source

I put the boundary **around** the heat source so the boundary is in vacuum. That's because radiation can't travel through opaque solids like the heat source. So the only way to obtain an energy conservation equation with radiative terms is to place the boundary **around** the heat source.

For example, I calculated the enclosing shell's inner temperature by

drawing the boundary **within** the enclosing shell. This boundary was inside aluminum, so heat transfer through it was by thermal conduction, not radiation. Notice that even this boundary choice leads to a conduction equation where electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature. That's because all boundary choices have to be consistent. They **can't** contradict each other unless one of them is wrong.

After I <u>asked</u> Jane to explain exactly where his boundary would be drawn, Jane replied:

... You can draw the boundary right around the heat source. Electric power comes in, radiative power goes out. There is no contradiction, and no inconsistency. ... *[Jane O. Public,* 2014-09-15]

Nonsense. I've repeatedly explained that my boundary is drawn **around** the heat source, so it's in vacuum and therefore contains radiative terms both for radiation going out **and** radiation going in.

Choosing to put the boundary somewhere else, like inside the heat source, leads to an energy conservation equation with conduction rather than radiative terms. But even those conduction equations agree that electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature. They can't contradict each other. Putting the boundary somewhere else might be inconvenient, but it couldn't possibly contradict the fact that electrical heating power depends on the cooler chamber wall temperature.

My energy conservation equation is this: electrical power in = (epsilon * sigma) * T^4 * area = radiant power out [Jane 0. Public, 2014-10-08]

Once again, Jane's wrong. There is literally **no choice** of boundary which will lead to his absurd equation. <u>Once again</u>, it really sounds like Jane opened a textbook and found "radiative power out per square meter = $(e^*s)^*T^4$ " and simply assumed that "radiative power out" is just a fancy way of saying "electrical heating power".

At least, that's the most charitable explanation. <u>Once again</u>, I'm trying to rule out less charitable explanations like the disturbing possibility that Jane isn't honestly confused about basic thermodynamics. Maybe Jane/Lonny Eachus has simply betrayed humanity by deliberately spreading civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

Jane/Lonny Eachus could help convince posterity that he was just honestly confused by thinking carefully about conservation of energy, explaining exactly where his boundary lies, and **carefully** listing **all** the power going in **and out** of that boundary. Or Jane/Lonny Eachus could help convince posterity that he's betrayed humanity by continuing to spread civilization-paralyzing misinformation.

Parent Share twitter facebook linkedin 8+

Jane/Lonny Eachus goes Sky Dragon Slayer (Score:2)

by <u>khayman80 (824400)</u> on 2014-12-26 10:26 (<u>#48676317</u>) <u>Homepage Journal</u> <u>Sadly, Jane/Lonny Eachus repeatedly chooses the second option.</u> <u>Once again.</u> <u>Parent Share</u> <u>twitter facebook linkedin</u>

 Slashdot

 Archived Discussion
 Moderate Moderator Help Delete

- Get 323 More Comments
- <u>Submit Story</u>

When in doubt, mumble; when in trouble, delegate; when in charge, ponder. -- James H. Boren

• <u>FAQ</u>

•

- <u>Story Archive</u>
- <u>Hall of Fame</u>
- Advertising
- <u>Jobs</u>
- <u>Terms</u>
- <u>Privacy</u>
- <u>Cookies/Opt Out</u>
- <u>About</u>
- Feedback
- •

Switch View to: Mobile Mobile View

Trademarks property of their respective owners. Comments owned by the poster. Copyright © 2014 Dice. All Rights Reserved. Slashdot is a <u>Dice Holdings, Inc.</u> service.

Close

<u>Slashdot</u>