

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

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2004-12/1966.html>

---

**From:** Brian Thorn ([bthorn64\\_at\\_cox.net](mailto:bthorn64_at_cox.net))

**Date:** 12/10/04

Date: Thu, 09 Dec 2004 22:25:17 -0600

On Thu, 09 Dec 2004 14:26:53 GMT, Tom Kent <[teeks99stuff@yahoo.com](mailto:teeks99stuff@yahoo.com)> wrote:

>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?

You're not. You're spending \$3 billion or so a year to fly five, maybe six Shuttle missions each year in support of ISS. Adding a flight to Hubble won't increase the Shuttle budget by \$2.2 billion. \$3 billion / 6 = \$.5 billion per Shuttle flight. But the incremental cost of a Shuttle flight (adding one more to a given year) is only \$100–200 million, so the Shuttle budget that year rises to \$3.2 billion instead of \$3 billion.

Really, why anyone is even \*considering\* spending \$2 billion for this stupid robot is beyond me. There are much better things NASA could do with the money right now, and if that's not argument enough, put that \$2 billion back into the treasury to help cut down the debt.

Brian