

Re: Question about FAEs

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy.hydrogen/2004-09/0743.html>

From: Dan Bloomquist (EXTRApblic21_at_lakeweb.com)

Date: 09/25/04

Date: Sat, 25 Sep 2004 03:55:14 GMT

jimp@specsol-spam-sux.com wrote:

> In sci.physics Bill Ward <bwardREMOVE@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>

>>On Sat, 25 Sep 2004 00:01:34 GMT, Dan Bloomquist

>><EXTRApblic21@lakeweb.com> wrote:

>

>

>><snip>

>>

>>>It doesn't look like, at least the fuselage, has slowed much. So I would
>>>have to say the ignition came from sparks. If the velocity was 450 fps,
>>>I get a temp rise of 130f for water, so four times that for aluminum. (I
>>>don't have the specific heat for kerosene but imagine it would be higher
>>>than aluminum.) I'll have to confirm the velocity. But the kinetic
>>>energy of any mass that contributes to the explosion would have to come
>>>to a complete stop in the building. Apparently, only the wings could
>>>have possibly contributed. That KE would go primarily into heating and
>>>if there isn't enough heat, no contribution to an explosion.

>>>

>>

>

>>If you can figure out a way to keep a fuel fire from
>>starting during a crash, you will have the eternal gratitude
>>of a whole lot of people. All it takes is atomized fuel and
>>a ignition source to turn a survivable crash into a tragedy.

>

>

>>Even at landing speeds, a sliding impact will concentrate a
>>lot of energy into a small region. Think of a chunk of iron
>>against a grinding wheel. I don't see the relation of the
>>specific heat of anything to the issue. It only takes one
>>small spark, which happens quite often. That's why even gear
>>up landings on runways are always attended by a bunch of
>>fire equipment.

g