

Re: Lightbridge question

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.astro.amateur/2006-10/msg00140.html>

- *From:* "Jan Owen" <janowen1z@xxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 29 Sep 2006 14:24:46 -0700
-

"Fred Scharmann" <fjs3spam@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:aOadnVEV99b16IDYnZ2dnUVZ_smdnZ2d@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I can see a lot of positives about a lightbridge telescope, but are there any websites that tell the negatives about them?

Thanks

The reason you aren't reading a lot about how bad the LightBridge telescopes are, is because they are pretty good telescopes...

The Meade bashers, and they are legion here, would be HAPPY to be bitching about everything they could nitpick on these scopes, if there was much to nitpick... Frankly, this is a VERY good scope... As I have said before, it is not a premium scope, but it competes surprisingly well with even them...

The negatives.

There is some white paint in a few areas around the lip of the tube that roll over inside the tube, and should be flat black...

I prefer Teflon altitude bearings to felt, but these work very well... Personal preference. But NOT a fault...

I prefer Teflon azimuth bearings over roller bearings. but these rollers work just fine, and the resistance is readily adjustable. Not a fault...

The altitude bearings are a little small in diameter, to MY tastes, but work better than many of the early, REAL Dobsonians (most of today's so-called Dobsonians are bastardizations of the original Dobsonian design).

They are smooth in both axes... That's what a Dobsonian is all about... I have a lifetime supply of Teflon and started to modify my scope in both axes, but after thinking about it, I decided there was no POINT... It's just fine as it is...

I HAVE replaced the primary cell collimation springs with stronger springs.

Re: Lightbridge question

You COULD just tighten the three primary adjustment screws a full turn or two, to put more pressure on the springs (which I did with good results for several months before I actually replaced them).

I put thumb screws on the primary and secondary collimation adjustments... Just a personal preference... The original screws worked just fine...

I removed the primary locking screws after installing stronger springs... I could have left the standard screws, or installed the upgrade screws, which I HAVE, but did NOT install. No need... No need to change... The scope, as delivered, is fine. Personal preferences again...

I installed a light shroud. But here at the house, or at several remote desert viewing sites, I don't really need it, so I removed it... I still have it, so I can install it as needed.

A nice addition, but certainly NOT a deficiency, is the Scope Tote. It makes for easier handling of the OTA... Again, not a deficiency, but for someone with a bad back like me, it makes life a LOT simpler...

I happen to like Rigel QuickFinders. So I replaced the Deluxe Meade 1X finder with a Rigel... The Meade is perfectly OK... Works like a champ... The Rigel is lighter, and adjusts more quickly, but overall it's just a personal thing; NOT a deficiency...

Are you getting the picture now?

This scope, and probably the 16" that's coming to a theatre near YOU soon, is a real home run for Meade... I suspect they will sell a LOT of them... They should... It's a good scope...

Folks should pay attention to the S&T review... It said it like it is...

Now for the disclaimers... I have NO connection to either Meade or S&T... I do have over 40 years of experience in amateur astronomy, and have owned a lot of different scopes of different designs, and apertures, and have built several myself... I am somewhat of a perfectionist where optics are concerned, and don't accept poor or mediocre optics.

If you don't like what I have said here, go TRY one. You may be pleasantly surprised...

—

Jan Owen

To reach me directly, remove the Z, if one appears in my e-mail address...

Latitude: 33.6

Longitude: -112.3

<http://community.webshots.com/user/janowen21>

Re: Lightbridge question