

## Common Sense Gresham

### **“The Common Sense of 'Green'”**

**A quick review: you're tuned in to Common Sense Gresham, and I'm George Schneider, your local guide to common sense. You may email me at the G-Mail address you see at the bottom of your screen. For now, we don't take phone calls live, but this project *MIGHT* become a talk show, and if it does, your calls will be welcomed. In the meanwhile, email me. If you don't own a computer, go to your Library, where your tax dollars have already paid for you to have access to computers. Emailing is very basic, and it is easy to learn. Library personnel will show you how to do it. Emailing is also very “green”, and “green” just happens to be today's topic.**

**More specifically, “green” needs to be analyzed as to it's common sense, because it becomes more evident by the day that powerful politicians have hi-jacked “green” to use as tool to further their political power at yours and my expense.**

**“Green” started out as a pure expression of common sense. 40 years or so ago: some peaceful people then known as “hippies” came up with a slogan to support their very elemental idea of “green”: “Reduce, reuse, recycle”. It's a good slogan, signifying simplicity and multiple use, the core of utilitarian common sense.**

**“Green” went along these lines for two decades before some greedy politicians began to see that the simple doctrine could be bent to serve their politics, and they came up with an inferential leap to support their hi-jacking of the concept of simplicity. That leap was to permanently attach “green” to both Socialist politics and the unproven theory of Anthropogenic Global Warming, that is, that the warming of the earth is man-caused and/or accelerated, and therefor a danger to the planet. The simple philosophical and utilitarian concept of Reduce, reuse and recycle” has no political element in it at all, nor does it recognize or “tag” itself with any theories of planetary climatology. The politics and the climatology are excess baggage on “reduce, reuse and recycle”, and as such, come with excess baggage fees.**

**“Reduce, reuse and recycle” is a pure, common-sense concept, and as such, is easy to understand AND it saves our society a lot of money and resources. But does the adulterated version of “green”, with it's political and climatological excess baggage lend itself to easy understanding, and does it save us any money?**

**The answer seems to be coming in at a higher and higher volume, like an annoying commercial on your TV, and that answer is a resounding “NO!”. Don't just take my word for it, though, let's look at some current examples.**

**The MOST current example is the “Solyndra Scandal”. Solyndra was a company which was set up to produce thin-film solar panels, devices for making electricity from “free” sunlight, and these new panels were supposed to be more efficient, producing more electricity per unit of space, and also they were to be flexible, so as to be attachable to odd surfaces, thereby saving space. Current solar panels are just that, flat panels, and as such, have very large space requirements for use. So, thin-film solar-panel technology was/is slated to bring solar electrical generation to all corners of the planet, large and small. A worthy company, we might surmise, but we were wrong to believe that, as it turns out. The company had problems from the start, not the least of which was the fact that it couldn't find adequate financing, and the second was a not-so-trivial matter of licensing the technology to make the thin-film panels. So, the Solyndra company, whose management had previously expressed an interest in the left side of politics, attracted an investor who “arranged” (or “fixed” would be a better word) a US-government guaranteed loan to the tune of over \$500 million dollars. Shortly after the loan was made, President Obama made a campaign appearance at the Solyndra factory, which was NOT producing anything at that point. The President made great political capital out of the fact that Solyndra had produced 1,100 “green jobs” (in reality, a completely undefined term). Shortly after, or maybe even while the President was touting Solyndra as the example of the best of “green” technology, the primary investor made 20 trips to the White House, an extraordinary number for someone merely negotiating for a standard Federally-backed loan. It turns out that the investor probably knew, at that point, that the company was going to fail, since it had spent most of the loan and had no product to show for it, so the investor connived with the White House to change the terms of the loan, so that in any future (and immediate, as it turned out) bankruptcy proceeding, the private investors, not the taxpayers, would have first dibs on the assets of the company. You know the rest. The company DID file bankruptcy, a few short months after all the Presidential ballyhoo, and just recently, in congressional hearings, all the company's major officers invoked the Fifth Amendment and refused to answer questions about their shady business dealings. Bottom line, the taxpayers are stuck with a failed company which soaked up a half-billion scarce taxpayer dollars.**

**“But it was “green” so it HAD to be tried” “The very health of the planet was at stake, so the gamble HAD to be taken”.**

**Did that gamble have to be taken? You decide, but so far, the answer is a resounding “NO!”**

**There are other examples. The rush to produce electric cars is another example of “green” excess. If all the electric vehicles are produced that the government desires, 25% of vehicle-miles driven will be electric powered by mid-century. That's a LOT**

of electricity, and the thing to note about electric vehicles is that they have to carry their own stored electric power to push themselves down the road with their loads. As more load is carried, and carried longer distances, and carried at higher speeds (highway travel), the cars have to store HUGE amounts of electricity, or they have to stop for recharging often. A current mid-sized sedan can travel 500 highway miles on a tank of fuel before having to refuel, and refueling takes five minutes, whereby another 500 miles may be driven, etc. An electric vehicle, as currently produced, can travel 100 miles on a charge, actually only 75 Sat freeway speeds of 70 mph+, and then it has to be recharged. If equipped with a fast-charger, that car can get an 80% charge in about 40 minutes. Assuming sufficient recharge points, that puts your average highway miles/speed at less than half of what a fuel-driven vehicle can do. That's unacceptable in today's terms, so electric cars and light trucks are just for around-town driving for now, and they excel at that purpose, if the daily drive is less than 100 miles or so, and recharge points are available at stops of an hour or longer. In other words, they are an alternate technology that is available now for limited use, and they'd better stay limited, because a rapid switch-over to electric vehicles would overtax our present electrical power grid, which runs at 95% or better of capacity most of the time. The Government's goal of 25% of vehicle miles powered by electricity is currently impossible, and the improvements to the grid are simply not being made in a timely manner. Ironically, much of the opposition to grid improvement comes from the same people who promote the "green" agendas, as these organizations continually file legal opposition to new transmission and generating facilities.

Common sense says you can't play both sides against the middle, but the "green" political movement does it anyway.

Let's get local.

How does the City of Gresham do "green"? Well, if you look at their website, they do it very big indeed, thank you. They have highly-paid managerial personnel on public payroll to see that City planning is done to "green" standards, and work done by or for the City must meet these standards, which raises the cost of the work. As an example, look at road improvements around town, specifically the Kane Road Project, which widened Kane Road, which needed to be done, but then added bio-swales (now called "rain gardens" by the oh-so-Green City). These bio-swales are supposed to keep oily road run-off out of the City's creeks, but the swales themselves create trip-and-fall hazards along the sidewalks, and they are VERY expensive to build, compared to a standard sidewalk and curbing. Additionally, the City has chosen bio-swale plantings to put in the "rain gardens" that will spread like noxious weeds to properties adjacent to the "rain gardens", causing additional work for the owners of those properties to control the spread of

**those unwanted plants.**

**What price is set on “green”, Gresham, and why haven't we been allowed to see the “green” price posted right alongside of the cost of improvements in the non-”green” style?**

**What else could that extra-cost “green” planning and work funding be spent on? More food for the homeless? More education for our youth? More policing to keep Gresham's crime rate (the worst in the State) under control?**

**As it stands now, “Green” makes NO sense, common or otherwise, either here or globally. As a free people, we deserve a say, and we need to raise our voices to make that say loud and clear: no more “green” unless and until that way of doing things brings actual money savings to the governments mandating it.**

**So, my friends, every time you hear “Green” ballyhooed, raise your voice and ask, “How much more for “Green” than just plain “serviceable”**

**Maybe we should modify the old saying to, “If it ain't broke, don't GREEN it!”**

**Stay loud, my friends, your voices ARE heard.**