

Re: GRIFFIN'S DRIVE FOR SHUTTLE-DERIVED

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-05/msg00550.html>

- *From:* John Halpenny <j.halpenny@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 24 May 2005 23:09:09 -0400
-

"Greg D. Moore (Strider)" wrote:

> "Pat Flannery" <flanner@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> news:1196hsb14c7uree@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>
>>
>> Greg D. Moore (Strider) wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>No they're not. This is the same logic that Feynman slams when the
>>>engineers saw 2/3rds of O-rings burned through and still claimed it "had
>> a
>>>safety margin" when in reality the O-ring was never supposed to even burn
> at
>>>all. So there was in reality no margin left.
>>>
>>>
>>
>> Of course in this case we are talking about a motor for use on an
>> unmanned vehicle. The SRB is a whole other ball of wax, and expected to
>> have a far higher level of reliability, even if that means overbuilding
>> it to gain reliability at the expense of performance.
>
> Really? So Boeing builds "man-rated 747s" and "cargo-rated 747s" that have
> a lower level of reliability?
>
> "I'm sorry paying customer, but your cargo landed up in the Atlantic. But
> hey it was 10% cheaper to launch. Oh and I got a great deal on my car
> insurance!"
>
>>
>> Pat

Actually, a lot of cargo 747s and other planes ARE less reliable. A large part of the freight fleet is made up of older, high time aircraft that are still technically legal but are not quite as well looked after as the latest versions. They are, of course, much cheaper.

John Halpenny

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: GRIFFIN'S DRIVE FOR SHUTTLE-DERIVED**

- ◇ *From:* Rusty

- ◆ **Re: GRIFFIN'S DRIVE FOR SHUTTLE-DERIVED**

- ◇ *From:* Rand Simberg