

# Re: Man-Rating Atlas V

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2006-10/msg00117.html>

---

- *From:* "Jeff Findley" <[jeff.findley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jeff.findley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 3 Oct 2006 16:08:00 -0400
- 

"Glen Overby" <[coreSPAMsample@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:coreSPAMsample@xxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message [news:8ke8v3-pi03.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:8ke8v3-pi03.ln1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

lou@cadence wrote:

No, the Atlas that is proposed to be man-rated is the 401 variant, with just one core engine, a single centaur, and no solids. See <http://www.lockheedmartin.com/data/assets/13344.pdf> where this is very explicit. This is because this is the simplest configuration, with the least to go wrong, and has the most experience

That document was very interesting reading. It is interesting to see how LM is using the fruits of old cancelled projects to evaluate the Atlas 5.

I found one glowing problem area: that of crew ingress and egress. They assert that in an emergency using the pad abort system to launch the capsule away from the rocket is a better approach than exiting the capsule.

Yes, except ... in the case of a capsule fire.

Did you see the recent article that showed a proposed roller coaster type escape system for CEV? I have a feeling that just about any new emergency egress system planned for Ares I/CEV could also be implemented for Atlas/CEV for a similar cost. In other words, NASA's got to pay for that system no matter what the launcher.

Jeff

--

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety"

– B. Franklin, Bartlett's Familiar Quotations (1919)

Re: Man-Rating Atlas V