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#### Abstract

Operating costs for conventional lighter than air craft are presented, based upon data of actual and proposed airships. An economic comparison of LTA with the $B-747 \mathrm{~F}$ is shown. A brief discussion of possible LTA economic trends concludes the paper.


## INTRODUCTION

In the field of Lighter Than Air, there is a wealth of performance data and a dearth of economic data. Thus it is not surprising that most discussions about the potential of LTA end in agreement chat an airship of a given size could carry cut some specific mission, but in disagreement as to how much it would cost. Since commercial airship operations have not been undertaken for almost forty years, this paucity of data is not surprising, and any new proposal for LTA--as far as its economic viability--runs into immediate suspicion. It is not the intent of this paper to review the overall economics of LTA, but rather simply to present the supply (cost) side of the equation.
*Associate Director, Flight Transportation Laboratory, Massachusetts
Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

## AIRSHIP ECONOMICS

The unit cost of an airship is the first in a series of unknowns in an economic analysis of LTA. This cost is determined by four basic variables: total development cost (non-recurring costs), the anticipated airship production run (required to allocate the development cost to each airship), the construction cost (recurring costs). and engine cost. Engine costs would be known before construction was undertaken--the other variables are largely unknown. (Also unknown are such operational factors as need for hangars, mooring masts, terminal buildings, as well as airspace utilization problems, etc.). Estimates of development costs vary from $\$ 50$ million to $\$ 500$ million; the number of airships needed ranges from 1 to 200; and construction zust estimates range from $\$ 0.50$ per cubic foot to $\$ 4.00$ per cubic foot. Clearly no definitive answer can be given to the question of "How much will an airship cust?"

Given some purchase price, the airship will be depreciated by the operator over its useful life. If the price of the ship is $\$ 20$ million and assuming a life of 10 years, straight line depreciation results in annual ownership costs of $\$ 2$ million. In U.S. scheduled airline operations depreciation typically amounts to $10 \%$ of total operating costs (direct and indirect). A possible annual operating cost of the airship could be $\$ 20$ million. However, consider ocean tanker operations; here depreciation is typically $50 \%$ of direct operating costs, resulting in direct operating costs of $\$ 4$ million. Adding $50 \%$ for indirect costs, total annual airship operating costs amount to $\$ 6$ million. Until airships have been in commercial operation for some time, it is hard to judge whether airships will be more like shippiny fleet or airline operations.

However, it is possible to take a look to the past when transport airships were in operation. This perspective should provide at least an outline of the likely cost structure should LTA become a commercial possibility.

Table 1 presents a detailed breakdown, in CAB Form 41 style (1931 dollars), of the pro forma costs for a metalclad airship of about the same size as the Navy's Akron/Macon ${ }^{1}$. Depreciation was projected to be $20 \%$ cf tutal costs, about in line with airline costs; indirect operating cost was $50 \%$ of DOC; about the same as current freight airline experience.

The total projected costs of the MC-72 were probably unduly conservative. They were higher than those experienced by three commercial transports, the Bodensee, Graf zeppelin and the Hindenburg, as is shown in Table $21,2,3,4,5$. The Hindenburg was practically a twin for the MC-72, and achieved about $16 \% / a v a i$ able seat mile, compared to the projected 36 /asm for the $\mathrm{MC}-72$.

Figure 1 shows the improvement in productivity and decrease in costs achieved by the Zeppelins as their capacity increased. The Goodyear
airship design of 1945 appeared to be a realistic follow-on to the Zeppelin line.

Table 1
Projected Operating Costs - Airship MC72 (1931 Dollars)
Fased on: Block Speed 68 mph ; Pavload 20 tons; Utilization 3,000 hours; Available Seats 50 ; Volume 7.26 M cu.ft.; Average Stage Length 3,300 miles; Airship Cost $\$ 5 \mathrm{~m}$.
Airship Operating Expenses (Per Block Hour)

| Flying Operations |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crew | 59.0 |
| Fuel and Oil | 11.0 |
| Helium (at \$0.40/cu.ft.) | 100.0 |
| Insurance | 204.0 |
| Other | 58.0 |
| Total Flying Operations | 432.0 |
| Maintenance-Flight Eruipment | 135.0 |
| Depreciation |  |
| Airframe | 170.0 |
| Engines | 79.0 |
| Total Depreciation | 249.0 |
| Total Airship Operating Expenses | 8.15 .0 |
| Per Airship Mile (\$) | 12.0 |
| Per Available Ton Mile ( $¢$ ) | 60.0 |
| Per Available Seat Mile (c) | 24.0 |
| Indirect Operating Costs (Per | Hour) 408.0 |
| Total Operating Costs (Per Hour) | 1,224.0 |

Figure 1
Productivity and Operating Costs of Commercial Dirigibles


| TABLE 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Economic Comparison of Various Airships, Actua 1 and Prorosed (*) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Airship | LZ 120 <br> Bodensee | $12127$ <br> Graf Zeppelin | LZ 129 <br> Hindenburg | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MC-72 } * \\ & (\text { Metalclad) } \end{aligned}$ | Goodyear* '45 Dirigible | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCACI* } \\ & \text { AMC } 7.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Gas Volume (M cu.ft.) | 0.812 | 3.708 | 7.062 | 7.26 | 10 | 7.4 |
| Max. Payload (tons) | 3.2 | 14.8 | 20.4 | 20 | 70 | 60 |
| Block speed (mph) | 61 | 61 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 100 |
| Available Seats | 30 | 20 | 50 | 50 | 112-288 | 250 (est.) |
| Av. Stage Length (miles) | 400 | 3,060 | 3,500 | 3,500 | 4.000 | 2,000 |
| Money value (Dollars) <br> Total Operating costs | $\begin{array}{r} 1935 \\ : \quad \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1935 | 1935 | 1931 | 1946 | 1974 |
| 1. $¢ / a v a i l a b l e ~ s e a t ~$ mile | 30 | 24 | 16 | 36 | 9-4 | 3 (est.) |
| 2. $\$ / \mathrm{mile}$ | 9.0 | 4.8 | 8.0 | 18.0 | 10.0 | 7.1 |
| 3. \$/hour | 549 | 292 | 544 | 1.224 | 680 | 707 |
| 4. ¢/available ton mile | 282 | 32 | 39 | 90 | 24 | 13 |
| 5. \$/seat hour | 18.3 | 14.6 | 10.9 | 24.5 | 6.1-2.4 | 2.8 (est.) |

Moving forward some forty years to Table 3, a similar breakdown of costs is shown for two of the Southern California Aviation Council, Inc. proposed airships ${ }^{4}$. The AMC-7.4 is about the same size as the MC-72, and it is interesting to note that although the dollar's value has decreased by a factor of akout 3 since the mid-thirties, the operating expenses for the airship are assumed to have gone down while the unit price of the airship has more than doubled. Depreciation of the newer airships is aboui $30 \%$ of total operating costs, some'rhat closer to ship operations, while indirect costs are assumed to average only about $10 \%$ of DOC.

Table 4 provides the operating expenses for a B-747 freighter flying in the United states ${ }^{6}$. A comparison of the airship and aircraft operating cost indicates that the aircraft costs are below those anticipated for all the 7 million cu. feet airships shown in Table 2only at. the super-airship sizes do costs become competitive with the $B-747$. Then the insurance premiums of the large airships become the dominating operating expense.

Although Table 2 shows the costs at current dollars, the actual value of the dollar has deflated by $300-400 \%$ from the mid-thirties. However it is not totally unreasonable to assume that airship expenses would in fact decrease. The average U.S. scheduled airline cost. per available seat mile i. 1939 was $5.54,7$ while in 1970 it had decreased to $3.6 \% / \mathrm{asm}$. However, the available seat miles during this period grew from $1,067,793.000$ to $264,903,850,000$, and the economics of scale, operating experience and increased safety which the airlines gained during this period of 30 years have all contributed to reducing costs. Clearly airships have not had the benefit of a similar learning period, and it is not quite correct to extrapolate directly from airline data. Only after some years of actual airship operations will it be possible to determine if similar trends will hold.

Table 3
Projected Operating Costs - SCACI Airships (1974 Dollars)
Based on: Airborne Speed 100 mph ; Stage Length 2,000 miles, Utilization 4,000 hours.

Airship Operating Expenses
(Per Airborne Hour)

```
    Flying operations
```

    Flying operations
    crew
    crew
        Fuel and Oil
        Fuel and Oil
        Helium
        Helium
        Insurance
        Insurance
        Other
        Other
    Total Flying Operations
    Total Flying Operations
    Maintenance
    Maintenance
    Depreciation
    ```
    Depreciation
```

AMC-7.4
(Cost \$13M, Payload 60 tone)

AMC-42
(Cost $\$ 74 \mathrm{M}$, payload 804 tons)

| 143.0 | 154.0 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 52.0 | 163.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 189.0 | 1.125 .0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 384.0 | 1.442 .0 |
| 58.0 | 95.0 |
| 167.0 | 903.0 |


| Total Airship Operation Expenses | 609.0 | 2.440 .0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Per Airship Mile ( $\$$ ) |  |  |
| Per Available Ton Mile ( () | 6.0 | 24.0 |
| Indirect Operation Costs (Per Hour) | 10.0 | 3.0 |
| Total Operating Costs (Per Hour) | 707.0 | 206.0 |


| Estimated B-747F Operating Costs (1972 Dollars) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Based on: Block Speed 500 mph ; Stage Length 2,000 miles; Utilization 3,000 hours; Payload 100 tors. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Aircraft Operating Expenses (Per Block Hour) |  |  |
| Flying operations |  |  |
| crew | 300.0 |  |
| Fuel and Oil | 400.0 |  |
| Insurance | 50.0 |  |
| Total Flying Operations | 750.0 |  |
| Maintenance | 500.0 |  |
| Depreciation | 500.0 |  |
| Total Aircraft Operating Expenses 1,750.0 |  |  |
| Per Airship Mile (\$) | 3.5 |  |
| Per Available Ton Mile ( $¢$ ) | 3.5 |  |
| Indirect Operating costs (Per | 900.0 |  |
| Total Operating Costs (Per Houn | , 650.0 |  |
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