

Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2005-10/msg01008.html>

- *From:* "Len" <len@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 23 Oct 2005 14:59:05 -0700
-

Pete Lynn wrote:

> "Fred J. McCall" <fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> news:a5vil1p203v26arp7v4e1ncvu62232k5c3@xxxxxxxxxxx

.....

>> Otherwise, one is probably going to have to count on
>> flying the prototypes as the operational vehicles as
>> well
>
> It would be silly for initial prototypes not to be operational vehicles,
> and vice versa. An operational vehicle which is not a prototype is a
> wasted opportunity.

Of course. I have never thought that the first commercial space transports would be anything but "operational prototypes." IMO, Clipper Ships are a better economic model. The potential economic justification for Clipper Shippes only allowed for designing and building one at a time. In this sense, I will concede that Pete has a good point that perhaps experience with the first (operational) prototype should influence the design and construction of the next. However, I still think the money should be there for the second and third prototypes. Otherwise, a fluke accident would likely end the program: An accident leading to a total loss of a prototype would not be the best circumstances to get additional money.

.....

>> Why would you want a 'passenger' to be able to link
>> into it at all? Either it can adequately be controlled
>> remotely or it cannot. If it cannot, letting a passenger
>> with a laptop tinker isn't going to help you.
>
> Because the passenger would be a pilot.

I personally would not consider designing a space tourism vehicle without a pilot, co-pilot and flight attendant. Accordingly, I would not think less than four of five passengers would make sense. Our current design accommodates eight passengers--plus pilot, co-pilot and attendant--on an

eleven-orbit flight at a proposed price that is a good deal less than others are planning for a short sub-orbital flight. The co-pilot position is also a training position.

The cargo version has only one pilot plus about 1500 kg of payload. IMO, a pilot makes development easier and cheaper and does not seriously compromise cargo payload at the size vehicle that I think is appropriate to avoid extreme sensitivity of performance to size.

>

>

> It is quite sufficient. The Wright flier and those which followed were > not four person aircraft.

However, I would hope that the first commercial space transport would be a little further down the space path than the Wright Flyer was down the aviation path.

>

>> I think you better plan on being able to put up at least >> 4, even if a couple of those are kids.

>

> There will be a lot of developmental water under the bridge before kids > are on the cargo manifesto. Kid proofing a space station is non trivial > and will come much later. Initial passengers will be competent and > trained individuals.

>

>> Plus cargo space for luggage and all supplies needed >> to sustain the group for however long they'll be up.

The passenger version of the Space Van 2010 is designed to accommodate eight passengers plus attendant and second pilot for less than a one-day flight, in lieu of 1500 kg of cargo--so go figure. Moreover, at least one crew member would likely be a female to help the overall mass budget.

>

> This can more sensibly go up on separate unmanned flights.

The important parameter is cost. Lowest cost is not necessarily manned or unmanned--discounting NASA experience as irrelevant to what can really be done.

.....

>

> Pete.

Best regards,
Len (Cormier)
PanAero, Inc.

x@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx (change x to len)

<http://www.tour2space.com>

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Henry Spencer
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Pete Lynn
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Fred J . McCall

• *References:*

- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Josh Hill
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Rand Simberg
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Len
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Tom Cuddihy
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Len
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Dr John Stockton
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Len
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Dr John Stockton
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Pete Lynn
- ◆ *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
 ◇ *From:* Pete Lynn

- Prev by Date: *Re: Lunar Lander in a 5.2m faring?*
- Next by Date: *Re: Sex in space*
- Previous by thread: *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
- Next by thread: *Re: Space Access Update #112 9/19/05*
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*