

# Re: Man-Rating Atlas V

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-10/msg00103.html>

---

- *From:* "Jonathan Goff" <jongoff@xxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* 2 Oct 2006 22:28:45 -0700
- 

Will,

On the other hand, NASA was probably correct in believing that, all other things being equal, the fewer launches the better.

But alas, all other things *\*aren't\** equal. In fact they are unequal to the tune of \$20B or more. That buys a lot of experience with on-orbit assembly, propellant transfer, and a boatload of commercial launches.

If you replace the stick with the simplest Atlas V, then a two-launch mission becomes a three-launch mission. This mission should be compared with other three-launch options, and so on.

Personally, I'm a fan of missions that involve dozens of launches. So long as it drives the cost per pound down, and doesn't require NASA to build and operate it's own vehicles at great expense. I get the feeling that this design path that is supposedly the "quickest way to get back to the moon" will not only cost more, and deliver less than a more sensible, less NASA-centric implementation of the Vision, but it will also take far longer, and in the end be less safe, and less dependable.

~Jon

.