

Re: Ares vs DIRECT

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-12/msg00146.html>

- *From:* fairwater@xxxxxxxxxx (Derek Lyons)
 - *Date:* Thu, 06 Dec 2007 00:06:24 GMT
-

"Jeff Findley" <jeff.findley@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"Fred J. McCall" <fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:n06cl3ti8ostg7gno7kmgbasv4lll4io0h@xxxxxxxxxx

As long as we keep Shuttle-derived vehicles we will keep the Shuttle
'standing army' and the costs will stay high.

This is the best argument against any shuttle derived launch vehicle.

Other than the fact that the argument is nonsense.

A shuttle derived vehicle locks NASA into a system that has very little
potential for future cost savings.

Yes, of course, a program can never evolve in the direction of being
cheaper.

NASA looked really hard at extending SSME installed life, and rejected
it favor of continuing to remove and nearly completely dismantle after
every flight. NASA has rejected outright every possible way of saving
man hours or reducing associated costs on Shuttle refits (like
electrical APUs or flyback boosters). They insist on keeping
expensive old cockpit systems in place (along with a dedicated
production line to supply them) rather than installing simpler and
lighter glass cockpits...

D.

--

Touch--twice life. Eat. Drink. Laugh.

<http://derek11963.livejournal.com/>

Re: Ares vs DIRECT

–Resolved: To be more temperate in my postings.
Oct 5th, 2004 JDL