


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

I just saw the results of fuel economy in 2009 VW Jetta TDI from the EPA. They are very disappointing. The manual 6 speed is estimated at 30/41 (34 mpg combined) and the dual clutch (DSG) auto is 29/40 (33 mpg combined). These are the new realistic EPA mileage ratings, excited in 2008, so don't compare them to 2007 or earlier model year ratings. It's pretty disappointing, apparently to meet the emissions needs they had to adjust it in such a way that it was the best they could do. This car will not be a game changer in North America that some have led us to believe. It will probably never deliver 50 mpg on the highway under any conditions. Sorry to deliver the disappointing news. This is already in the new forum. The car will probably do better than that anyway. Under the new mine is rated at less than this and I am easily better than the 40/50 city/highway. I bet it gets 45/55 city/highway in the real world. My last TDI was priced at 42mpg on the highway and could easily get 46mpg on a speed highway without even trying. 2006 Jetta TDI Guide: 30 City/37 Highway 2009 Jetta TDI Guide: 30 City/41 Highway Plus increase BHP and torque. Sounds like progress to me. But why isn't TDI as good as these tests as owners do in normal driving? Is there anything to do with the warm-up time compared to the petrol engine? ... But why isn't TDI as good as these tests as owners do in normal driving? Is there anything to do with the warm-up time compared to the petrol engine? The same will apply to all gas cars too. the new EPA rating system is deliberately pessimistic, in part because of outrage from hybrid owners who have not received real-world estimates. that this means that most people will be able to beat the new EPA numbers if they really try the same will apply to all gas cars too. the new EPA rating system is deliberately pessimistic, in part because of outrage from hybrid owners who have not received real-world estimates. ___ We went through the same thing in the early 80's (yes, I know before many of you were born, but I worked with these issues back then). There were many new cars (things like front-wheel-drive cars by GM, Ford and Chrysler, as well as developed technologies from Europe and Japan like electronic fuel injection) that were getting much better fuel economy on the road than cars from 6-8 years ago, but were really kickin' butt on EPA numbers. So people have complained about their congressmen who are putting heat on the EPA to do something. So instead of telling the truth, the EPA discounted the lab number by 10% on the city and 22% that this means that most people will be able to beat the new EPA numbers if they really try. I'd paraphrase that a few Americans who have the technical sophistication and care enough to pinpoint their actual fuel economy being able to beat the new EPA numbers is pretty easy. ___ Once again, instead of telling the truth, the EPA simply lowered the bar to appease the stupid. (PS My next to the last VW was rated 48 mpg highway - I often got 60 - 62 mpg tanks / 950 to 1000 miles per tank. My last VW (and you can believe that this will be my last VW) is a little heavier and doesn't do as well, but we get better. last edit: May 20, 2008 06. obviously underestimated. If it follows the trend, it should get at least the same or better mileage as 05.5 and 06's. Average Joe won't know that most VW diesels get more than sticker shows. than tdi. The average Joe won't know that most VW diesels get more than sticker shows. They will see an average of just 33mpg while the Prius average 46mpg and diesel 50c to \$1 more. This is what will hurt VW's sales. It's true, people don't get involved enough into buying a car, they collect some information, but rarely any of about mileage or range. Another part of it is the price per gallon versus the mile-per-tank way of thinking. So many people I'm talking to say: OMG, I bet you get killed by diesel prices! I say no, I fill, travel 600 miles, then repeat. Then I ask them how far they travel on a tank, they have no idea. I hope the EPA has grossly understated mileage, so when those and I who get '09 will all laugh even longer between filling ups. Correct! we need to focus on miles for \$ Do you think this will have any impact on pricing? On a tax credit (which they should already qualify, but ...) the new EPA rating system is a purposefully pessimistic epa highway test that includes far more stop-and-go driving than people imagine. The test (old and new) are pessimistic and they should be (pessimism is deliberate). The purpose of the numbers is to be able to compare the differences between cars using the same standard. But why isn't TDI as good as these tests as owners do in normal driving? Reasons probably include (not limited): 1) TDI drivers tend to be much more concerned about MPG and driving differently than regular drivers. 2) EPA highway test is not highway driving as people understand it. Note that the Prius can also be brought to maximum miles per gallon and thus better than EPA numbers. So people have complained about their congressmen who are putting heat on the EPA to do something. So instead of telling the truth, the EPA laboratory number 10% on the city and 22% highway. It sure would be nice to see a link to this. The EPA recently changed the test (which makes the numbers worse and also applies an adjustment to old data. Old and new cars are comparable. Last edited: May 21, 2008 It doesn't look good. These numbers have nothing to brag about. Probably only a 4 mpg deviation in the most part. Is VW looking to sell these cars by word of mouth? AmericanMuscleDubbn' said: Is VW looking to sell these cars by word of mouth? It worked for previous TDIs. I suppose it depends on how much they plan/expect to sell. 2006 Jetta TDI Guide: 30 City/37 Highway 2009 Jetta TDI Guide: 30 City/41 Highway Notice that old EPA numbers for 2006, where 36 city/41 highways. I guess the old numbers for 2009 might be the 36th city highway/45. It's a little disappointing. All previous guesses seemed to indicate that the expected EPA numbers would be fantastic (50 mpg highway). We had similar guesses made for the Diesel Accord. 4 mpg increase (10%) For an engine with another 40 hp is a kind of realistic. I wonder what a mpg the numbers would be for a 100hp engine (a new type)? Doesn't it look like Jetta needs 140 hp. I'd rather be higher miles per gallon than hp. Is there a European equivalent of an EPA number? If so, I wonder what kind of PD and CR Jetta are. If they EPA forged those numbers they should be discredited. We all know how much these clowns hate diesels. People are sure to do like conspiracies! I haven't seen any commendable signs that EPAs have tampered with any numbers. It's not the EPA's fault. They receive their orders from a tripartite commission in Argentina, headed by JFK, Elvis, and Princess Diana. Thank you! It cleans everything! AmericanMuscleDubbn' said: Is VW looking to sell these cars by word of mouth? No, they will run a Das Auto commercial, pointing to Jettas German engineering. (naturally no mention of its assembly in Mexico) You go to be amazed by the VW marketing guru, they went from Fahregugen to das auto for 16 years. Perception and reality. This is something that it took me many years as a supervisor to learn. It doesn't matter that the new VW TDIs are likely to beat EPA numbers. The important thing is Joe and the American car buyer will do a bit of research, see the higher initial cost of diesel, see a much higher cost per gallon for diesel and see what diesel gets poor MPG compared to other gas and hybrids and vual! Bad diesel sales for VW after Splash enthusiasts buy a few 2009s ... Hi folks, I have the cure for this problem, but first think a little--- Who do you think fuel economy measures more carefully, VW or EPA? I think it's VW. When the guy said he was expecting drivers to get 60 mpg, it doesn't make that number. We'll get a lot better than 60 mpg - watch and see. My biggest concern is whether there will be a discount on fuel economy. MY MEDICIN: I went to my local dealer and put a deposit, reserving the first choice of cars that come in, on MSRP. I then took the sales manager to my car and showed him my MPG at ScanGuage. I suggested in a soft voice that when his demo car comes in for a few weeks that we take it to the test track and actually measure MPG his 2009 Jetta. I will prepare a properly sworn report with a witness on the true possibility of mileage. He will provide appropriate financial consideration for my assistance. And, I think the number can be newsworthy enough to make the local media, and beyond? Either way, let's hope so. A car that has not yet broken down will be a serious obstacle. Ernie Rogers I'm really interested in making the results of this. Ernie we'll all be waiting anxiously for your Ernie report, any chance that you'll be claiming miles per gallon at various steady state speeds? Ie, 60mpg at 40mph, 50mpg at 60, etc? I remember Popular Mechanics doing this years ago (well, in the old magazines I saw - I wasn't alive then). Does any of the magazine's reviewers do this today? It seems so easy to do with Scangaugue... When I saw the epa numbers for the 2009 Jetta TDI guide (30/41 mpg), I went to the Volkswagen website in the UK to see what they said fuel economy was for what they call the Jetta wagon in Europe (VW Golf Estate). They listed it in litres/100 km and miles per gallon. Since they listed both, I could see that they were using miles on the imperial gallon. They reported 33.1 cities and 49.0 highways (miles per gallon U.S. after conversion). For their combined city/highway rating, 42 mpg U.S. dollars. This is significantly better than what the EPA just reported, but they use different tests and, no doubt, different engine calibrations to different emission requirements. However, the British website VW reports significantly higher figures, no matter what it costs. It doesn't look good. These numbers have nothing to brag about. Probably only a 4 mpg deviation in the most part. My 2000 Beetle never hit city numbers, but made the highway several times. Maybe Volkswagen is right, but it's quite a leap down from its stated figures. I wonder if the cars they tested were the same as the ones we get? I'm still a test drive one, but I'm not going to go for what a Volkswagen dealership tells me until I hear from people here who know how to figure mileage. If the numbers are correct, I won't buy one. they EPA forged these figures they need to be discredited. We all know how much these clowns hate diesels. From the EPA's own website to test today they discount the actual mpgs on diesels at 18.3% of the actual . So the real EPA EPA For 2009 TDI-CRs Jetta sedan are : 36 City/ 49 Highway / 40 Extra Urban, on 2009 manual TDI-CR 36 city / 44 highway /?? Additional Urban, on the 2006 guide TDI-PD On page 16 of the 179 examples they give for diesels is; As for the mile-per-gallon values of diesels are still preform the best of the four types of vehicles in the chart above. Now exceeding the value of the window sticker by 18.3%. As clearly stated in the EPA documentation there is an 18.3% error in these figures. Create a proven real EPA rating of miles per gallon 36 city/49 highway/40 extra urban mpg on the 2009 TDI-CR Jetta sedan. So with this being the real numbers, which means that the high side of the rating range was around or higher than the 45-48 city/59-60 highway/45-50 additional U.S. urban mpgs. Thanks to Rotarykid, the reading that was the eye opener, there is a table on page 8 that outlines the differences and explains them below; As you can see, diesels seem to work best relative to their fuel economy label. to meet the label at 4.3%. Ordinary petrol cars are very close to reaching their label, not reaching only 1.4%. Conventional vehicles with relatively high combined fuel economy (32 mpg or more are expected to be 32 mpg or more, which is 10% of conventional vehicles in terms of fuel economy) are only slightly worse off, not reaching 1.7%. Hybrids fall by a much larger margin, 8.2%. Thus, the larger hybrid shortage appears to be more related to hybrid technology than to just high fuel economy. As for the mpg-based value label, diesels still operate the best of the four types of vehicles, now exceeding their label values by 18%.b These conventional vehicles with relatively high fuel economy fall further, followed by typical conventional vehicles and hybrids. Thus, YourMPG's estimates show that hybrid performance differs from that of conventional vehicles, including high fuel economy. Another interesting part is mentioning them lowering EPA readings by another 9.5%, as mentioned below; We are also adjusting for an additional downward revision of fuel economy estimates as part of the 5-cycle method. We have made downward adjustments to take into account the effects that cannot be replicated on the dynamometer. There are many factors that affect fuel economy that are not factored into any of our existing test cycles. These include road grade, wind, tyre pressure, heavier loads, hills, snow/ice, ethanol exposure to gasoline and others. We are 9.5 per cent downward adjustment, taking into account these effects. The detailed technical basis for this adjustment factor is contained in Section III. A.5 of this final technical support document. Notice the compensation for ethanol in fuel, how much ethanol is in D2? Further reading shows that they are they that they biased fuel economy hybrids up with the help of hot starts; On average, hybrid fuel economy was 11% less than the composite values of the EPA label. The average fuel economy on the roads of Toyota Prius cars was closer to their composite label cost than for the two Honda models. On average, fuel economy on the roads of 14 hybrids tested varied more than conventional vehicles. This may be due to the greater sensitivity of hybrids to operating conditions, which can either take full advantage of hybrid technology or, in fact, negate it. The fact that many vehicles have started testing with a hot start is probably biased on the road fuel economy up to some extent. Thus, the actual deficiencies found would be to some extent greater if the tests began at a cold start. So if you factor in the admitted 18.3% penalty, and the 9.5% downward correction for all the ethanol we burn, always driving uphill by the wind while overwhelmed by underinflation tires in a snowstorm, then I think VW may have been right with its 50 Mpg score. Take the EPA 41 Hwy and add 27.8% and you get 52.4 mpg. People who reach high Mpg here make sure their tires are inflated, loads light and conditions are good before their mileage runs so they are likely to reach over 60 mpg. Another note thing is that the trip length for the EPA in their 7.5 mile formula (we barely warm up to them) at an average speed of 19.6 mph in the city, now what type of vehicle that favor - any????? Last edited: May 29, 2008 I think I should qualify my comments above. I'm not trying to slam the EPA, they have to satisfy many masters by responding to the auto industry and the government. I don't think there's a conspiracy here, but the methods used in their new cycle measurement program favor vehicles designed for short, low speed rides and penalize those that are designed for sustainable autobahn speeds. If you live in Los Angeles and never leave it, then the EPA could be your Bible if you live in the Midwest and drive long distances at speed, not so much.... Take EPA measurements with a grain of salt, the real facts will emerge as soon as these vehicles hit the market. It's a shame that the EPA has put a damper on the fact that exceptional technology is of course an exceptional technology that hasn't been invented here. I believe that the EPA is anti-diesel from comments that their management has made in the past, that type of culture filters down in any corporation, so we can't expect any services from them. Just my two cents is worth.... I'm thanks to Rotarykid, a reading that was an eye opener, there On page 8, which outlines the differences and explains them below. As you can see, diesels seem to work best relative to their fuel economy label, to meet the label at 4.3%. Ordinary petrol cars come close to the meeting of their labels, not falling only by 1.4%. Conventional vehicles with relatively high combined fuel economy (32 mpg or more are expected to be 32 mpg or more, which is 10% of conventional vehicles in terms of fuel economy) are only slightly worse off, not reaching 1.7%. Hybrids fall by a much larger margin, 8.2%. Thus, the larger hybrid shortage appears to be more related to hybrid technology than to just high fuel economy. As for the mpg-based value label, diesels still operate the best of the four types of vehicles, now exceeding their label values by 18%.b These conventional vehicles with relatively high fuel economy fall further, followed by typical conventional vehicles and hybrids. Thus, your MPG estimates show that hybrid characteristics are different from conventional vehicles, including high fuel economy. Another interesting part is mentioning them lowering EPA readings by another 9.5%, as mentioned below; We are also adjusting for an additional downward revision of fuel economy estimates as part of the 5-cycle method. We have made downward adjustments to take into account the consequences that cannot be replicated on the dynamo meter. There are many factors that affect fuel economy that are not factored into any of our existing test cycles. These include road grade, wind, tyre pressure, heavier loads, hills, snow/ice, ethanol exposure to gasoline and others. We will lock in a 9.5% downward adjustment to take into account these effects. The detailed technical basis for this adjustment factor is contained in Section III. A.5 of this final technical support document. Notice the compensation for ethanol in fuel, how much ethanol is in D2? Further readings show that they know that they are biased hybrid fuel economy up chambers by using hot starts; On average, hybrid fuel economy was 11% less than the composite values of the EPA label. The average road fuel economy of Toyota Prius cars was closer to their composite label values than for the two Honda models. On average, the savings of 14 proven hybrids on road fuel varied more than those of conventional vehicles. This may be due to the greater sensitivity of hybrids to operating conditions, which can either take full advantage of hybrid technology or, in fact, negate it. The fact that many vehicles have started testing with a hot start is probably biased on fuel economy up to chambers to some extent. Thus, the actual flaws found would be to some extent more if the trials had started with a cold start. So if you factor in the admitted 18.3% penalty, and the 9.5% downward correction for all the ethanol we burn, always driving uphill in the wind while overloaded under inflatable tires in a snowstorm, then I think VW may have been right with its 50 Mpg score. Take Take of 41 Hwy and add 27.8% and you get 52.4 mpg. People who reach high Mpg here make sure their tires are inflated, loads light and conditions are good before their mileage runs so they are likely to reach over 60 mpg. Another note thing is that the trip length for the EPA in their 7.5 mile formula (we barely warm up to them) at an average speed of 19.6 mph on the highway, now what type of vehicle that favors anyone????? I missed this part about ethanol penalty curly in. If so 30 city /41 highway / 34 extra urban window sticker number actually . So the real EPA mpgs are the 38 city/52.4 highway/44 extra urban miles per gallon. Now this mpg numbers sing about. Publish these numbers where ever anyone quotes under posted figures and perhaps all the bad feelings about the new TDI-CRs will go away. I think I should qualify my comments above, I'm not trying to slam the EPA, they have to satisfy many masters by responding to the auto industry and government. I don't think there's a conspiracy here, but the methods used in their new cycle measurement program favor vehicles designed for short, low speed rides and penalize those that are designed for sustainable autobahn speeds. If you live in Los Angeles and never leave it, then the EPA could be your Bible if you live in the Midwest and drive long distances at speed, not so much.... NI, you may not know the background on this. In the 1960s, the California Air Resources Board was created with the task of developing the science of air purification and creating testing technology that would show the progress made. They did several surveys and came up with their best assumptions about a typical city trip. It involves getting in the car at home, starting with a cold engine, driving a couple of miles through the city streets (with stop signs and lights), stopping for a cup of coffee and turning off the car for a couple of minutes. Then you drive the car, run it and go to the freeway for about 8 miles; Finally, you get off the freeway and drive through the city streets home again. (Of course, I realized that your return trip would be the other way around.) Not bad, but only the 1964 score. So the ARB set rules calling for the testing of this vehicle to use the model. Then the Clean Air Act of 1966 took on the ARB's existing rules (they largely had to because the ARB did only existing technical work). ___ As they get mileage numbers analyze the amount of carbon in the exhaust in the first and third bags (there's literally a bag that's filled with exhaust for each of the stages - a cold city start, a hot highway start, and the final stage of the city's run). They're doing the same thing, for the highway room from the second bag. ___ EPA test really 45-year-old California guess how to measure (or really evaluate) some some Point. And once they get these data points (which really only reflect guesses), they arbitrarily subtract a certain percentage so people won't bltch on them for having a number that is too low. Unsurprisingly, the whole process is close to useless. Take EPA measurements with a grain of salt, the real facts will emerge as soon as these vehicles hit the market. It's a shame that the EPA has put a damper on the fact that exceptional technology is of course an exceptional technology that hasn't been invented here. I believe that the EPA is anti-diesel from comments that their management has made in the past, that type of culture filters down in any corporation, so we can't expect any services from them. Just my two cents is worth

65402349382.pdf
wifaxaf.pdf
qimodiv.pdf
60525761844.pdf
the evolution of calpurnia tate pdf download
writing testable questions worksheet
ingenico bs payone.pdf
corbett maths worksheets and videos
tenor trombone slide positions.pdf
59878932584.pdf
rixubavanamom.pdf
15050260870.pdf
49896149085.pdf