

Re: MSNBC – How a 'safe haven' could help save Hubble

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-12/1891.html>

From: Tom Kent (*teeks99stuff_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 12/09/04

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 2004 14:26:53 GMT

Bill the Cat <bill@the.cat> wrote in
news:Xns95B9E469E7398billthecat@216.196.97.130:

- > *And *any* video-based system is going to require image-recognition*
- > *software that is several orders of magnitude more complex than a*
- > *lidar-based system requires. That, not the hardware, is going to be*
- > *the main cost driver in such systems – and it's also a big source of*
- > *technical risk. So it makes a lot of sense to invest a little more in*
- > *the hardware for the gain of greatly simplifying the software.*
- >
- >> *(Not that what they go to the hubble with will*
- >> *be, but it could be.....that's kinda where dart was heading)*
- >
- > *So how about following DART's lead, and using an expendable satellite*
- > *as the target vehicle, rather than risking HST?*

Exactaly my point....don't carry big heavy hardware when you can do it with software that doesn't weigh anything. That's exactaly why we need to do this now, and why its worth \$2.2 billion, so we can have that software and use it on all sorts of future missions.

The reason to do this to HST is because it needs fixing anyway, not only are you getting a chance to test out this new software (and other pieces of the puzzle) but you get to save an asset that otherwise would be lost. Since you're going to spend the \$2.2 billion anyway, why not get something out of it?

Tom