## N76-15021

f

ŧ.

SOME ECONOMIC TABLES FOR AIRSHIPS

Richard D. Neumann\*

くっていたい ときまたいちん うちま 読むし ひってる しましん

ひんごひ みじ

ABSTRACT: During the course of the Southern California Aviation Council study on Lighter Than Air it was determined that some form of economic base must be developed for estimation of costs of the airship. The tables are part of this paper.

During the course of the first study on Lighter Than Air by the Southern California Aviation Council, Inc. it was determined rather quickly that little material was available to make a proper economic determination of the airship. What does exist is fragmentary, cr ancient and not applicable.

Application of construction techniques and manpower, materials, powerplants and personnel if considered in current technology, would leave the airship as only an anachronism. It was, therefore, essential to determine some of the characteristics of the airship as it will be in the immediate future and its method of manufacture, operation, and administration.

\*Chairman, Lighter Than Air Committee, Southern California Aviation Council, Inc., Lighter Than Air Technical Task Force, Pasadena, California, U.S.A.

4 . 15 -

The following tables were developed and used as guides to the overall study of the airship's economics. We have not provided the entire study since it is weighted by many conclusions of the SCACI group that others may not agree with. In determining manufacturing costs the use of cubic displacement was applied rather than cost per pound and ton of airframe. The latter may also be acceptable and use of both could provide an excellent cross check of the manufacturing economics.

いうちょう うちまい

÷

Carl Service

{ }

Crew costs were not included because SCACI operations and flight people have very definite ideas of what would comprise a crew and what would not and these estimates would certainly not agree with what has been past practice or suggested by airship proponents of late. GSA and general operational practices are considered closer to seagoing operations than to air transport, but this too may not agree with preconceived ideas, and was not included.

We hope that these tables will act as a guideline and permit further efforts to go forward to truly provide a reasonable economic basis upon which the airship can be viewed objectively. One need only remember that air transportation and global access in hours has only existed for the 16 years since the jet transport.

We have a long way to go in aviation and it may be fitting that the airship will be among those future advances. Future passenger exposure to the airship will certainly have a bearing on its future, as profoundly as the ability of the jet to eliminate vibration and give the feeling of living-room comfort at 450 mile per hour speeds.

It has been man's dream and also his major necessity to develop transportation and communications as vital to his well being and survival. The airship appears to offer massive gains if it can be adequately managed to reduce transportation costs measurably and at the same time provide greater operating freedoms and access to cargo or passengers than any other form we use today, airplanes, truck, ships, helicopters and barges.

Arguements over the questions of the handling, mooring survivability and applications of the airship belie that innate ability that lies within the aerospace industry worldwide to solve problems of immense magnitude and achieve great advances which have led to space, the moon and now the galaxies. If the economics are correct or within reason then it is necessary to get on with the job and prove it by an operating product on which further refinements can be made and determined.

日本を聞いたいたい そうざい かまいたい うまい 話し しんしゅう しゅうしゅう n, a. € }.' : 1 . .....

....

	Useful Payload Lift-Tone	77717	275.74	ET 017		4 1 000 4 1 000 8 0 1	1.07.4	
TUL LIT	Gross LAP	105.6	184.5	257.07	1.904	1,524	527.6	
S LITT/USE	Percent Meleft	X814	yot	2	3.8	355	XEE	XII.
AIRSHIP CRO	Gross Eff in Tons • 955 purity. (61.51be per 100007)	11.022	461.25	676.5	1,0%.5	1, 291.5	1,599.0	1,691,25
	Halling Rolling (@ 95% Purity) Cuthic feet	7,400,000	15,000,000	22,000,000	35,000,000	42,000,000	52,000,000	55,000,000
		NC-7.4	HC-15	<b>NC-</b> 22	<b>K</b> -35	27-31	2-23	C-55

ង

KEPRODUCIBILITY OF THE ORIGINAL PAGE IS POOR

and the second second

y

ł

and the second of the second o 1 ア・ ・ ・ く

1

4

•

Ċ

isternel Aller

,'

AIRSHIP CHARACTERISTICS WHICH DETERMINE COSTS

					I		
ITBA:	HC-7.4	<u>NC-15</u>	MD-22	<u>NC-35</u>	<u>MC-42</u>	<u>HC-52</u>	<u>MC-55</u>
Length:(feet)	712'7"	<b>\$</b> 05"	1,02418"	"4'961 <b>°</b> 1	1,271'3"	1,36516"	1,39017"
Diametar:	"2121	18014"	20419"	23912"	25412"	"L'E72	"L'872
Yolume-Helium(10) <sup>6</sup>	7.4	15	ส	35	3	52	55
Pineness ratio:	2	\$	ŝ	ŝ	ŝ	\$	Ś
Horsepower 0 - 50 MPH	2,500	4,,000	7,500	10,000	13,500	18,000	27 <b>,</b> 000
Rorsepower 51 - 100 MPH	5,000	7,500	<b>000</b> °6	000 <b>'</b> टा	<b>16,000</b>	23,000	27,000
Horsepower 101 - 200 MPH	30,000	71,000	84,000	95,000	<b>118,000</b>	130,000	000,111
Puel Consumption - 50 MPH 0	усг	301	90 F	Cac	100		
Prinds/Hour	2 2 2 2 2	វ័ត្	1 1 280	250 250	335		530
.20t per gallon(\$)	25.8	22,00	37.60	50.02	67.00	83.00	166.00
.30¢ per gallon	37.50	37.60	56.40	75.00	100.50	124.50	159.00
.40¢ per gallon Thei foremention = 100 MBH	8.8	8.8	75.20	100,00	134.00	00 <b>•</b> 99T	272.00
Gallons/Hour	325	<b>8</b> 81	622	310	407	582	655
Pounds/Hour	750	1,128	1.374	1,860	2.412	3.992	3,930
.20¢ per gallon	25 <b>.</b> 00	37.60	45.80	62.00	81.40	116.40	131.00
.30¢ per gallon	37.50	56.40	68.70	93 <b>.</b> 00	122.10	194.60	196.50
.40¢ per gallon	20.02	75.20	91.60	00.121	162.80	232.80	262.00
Furt votauption - 200 Min	750	5	2 175	346 0	200 C	010	
	28				× × × ×	062.6	
				16,250	17,622	19,500	89° 12
204 per gallon	170.00		423°50	475-00	587.40	650 <b>.</b> 00	720.08
	8.00	80.08	850.00	20.05	08.171.10	9/2.00 1,300.00	1,440.00

1/ Specific Fuel consumption is projected at 25 petcent higher then currently obtainable with current powerplants.
2/ Fuel weight is computed at 6 pounds per gallon rather then at actual weight of 5.8 pounds/gallon.

~\*.

\*

~

. Ľ,

ſ٤ ۲

\*\*\*

:

é,

4

• • • • •

. . .

المعلى المحافظ والمسالي المحافظ المحافظ

1 1 4

- - · · · · · ·

. . . . . .

:

e

ł

DEPRECIATION SCHEDULE AIRSHIP

Ż

11

and the second construction of the second

÷ .

A CARLON AND AND THE AND AND

This could be the second second second

A CAR WARDER

Keyes. A subscription of

たいちゅう 御を見いまう 小子 あたいちしい

「「「ないない」 ゆいとうがくのないね ちっと いいた

. .

The depreciation schedule applies a 15 per cent(15%) and a 5 per cent (5%) residual value at 16 years and at 25 years. The utilization schedule A and D column allow for the highest depreciation costs and lowest depreciation costs based on speeds of 100 and 200 Miles Per Hour. Estimated Life of a metal type Airship Hull based on physical experience is set at 25 to 30 years. Residual value may be considered the scrap value of the retal content and component systems values. ASSURPTIONS:

						;			
AIRSHLP	Residual Value 15% (0)	Residu Valye		ociation residual	Pull Depreciation 5% residual	16 Tear De 15% Residu Annual Cha	preciation al - 5% Residua rge off (a Column)	2) 1987 June 1 Annual Ch Schedule	precision 1 - 5% Residual LTGE off (D Column)
			à			(158)	(28)	(15%)	(28)
MC-7.4	1,890	630	<b>г,</b> аг	9	п, 570	669,300	748,125	428,400	477,200
NC-15	3,937	1,312	16"77	2	24,937	1,394,531	1,558,593	892,500	997 <b>,</b> 500
MC-22	5,775	1,925	32,57	75	36,575	2,015,312	2,285,937	1,310,080	1,463,000
NC35	781,9	3,062	52,0	3	58,188	3,253,906	3,636,750	2,082,500	2,324,752
2-2	μ,25	3,675	62,2	75	69,875	3,892,187	4,367,187	2,491,000	2,799,000
8-5	13,650	4,550	77,3	20	86,450	4,209,375	5,403,125	3,094,000	3,458,000
MC-55	34,450	4,817	8,8	4	91, 533	5,118,513	5,720,812	3,275,900	3,661,320
	놰	XXX Hour	1 Annual	AIR 0t111 cat1on	SHIP UTILIZATI	CON VERSUS DET 5000 Hour Ar	RECIATION COST Unual Utilization	n Cod tim	D Column
	Cost/Hc 16Tear/	্য মূর্	lost/Hour 61 ser/55	Cost/Hour 257ear/15	Cost/Hnur 25Tear/52	Cost/Hr Lost/Hr 16I ear/155	Cost/Hour 25Iear/5% /3	M.P.H. 100 - 200	M.P.H. 100 - 200
NC-7-4	167.5	8	187.03	107.99	06.911	<b>111.55</b>	79-53	1.115557	795 - 397
NC-15	348.6	22	398.64	223.12	249.37	232.42	166.25	2.324 - 1.162	1.162831
NC-22	ä	ž	572.48	327.50	365.75	34.0.88	243.61	3.408 - 1.704	2.436 - 1.218
HC-35	813.4	17	90 <b>9.</b> 18	526.25	581.88	542.31	387.47	5.423 - 2.711	3.874 - 1.937
21-2	)*i06	г ₹	62.160,1	622.75	699.75	64.8.69	466.50	6.486 - 3.243	4.665 - 2.332
MC-52	1,052.	ר ג	1,350.78	773.50	864.50	701.56	576.33	7.015 - 3.007	5.763 - 2.881
M-55	1,279.6	n tr	1,430.23	818.97	615.43	EN-161	610.22	7.314 - 610.22	6,102 - 3,051

REPRODUCIBILITY OF THE ORIGINAL PAGE IS POOR

ł

ł

ja r

*#*|

, 1

٩,

• 1

1.

\$, Ă

.

•

Ŷ . , · 🌴 🚽 🖓 🖓 🗤

·\*\*\* \*\*\*\*

. . . . .

Ą

ì

į

•;

.

. f

Ì

1 ł

1 1

ŧ

į

י ג

s d

•

## AIRSHIP INSURANCE AMALTSIS (Hull, Public Liability & Property Damage)

ASSUMPTION:

The calculations expressed herein are based on typical airframe costs of fixed wing aircraft using a higher value to qualify the experience rate applied to new operations. It is significant to note that <sup>German</sup> Commercial Airship insurance rates of the 1930's era were less then One per cent (1 %) of hull value based on performance and safety. A probable rate will be in the 2.5 to 3 per cent range.

								ŀ	)	
AIRSHIP SERIES	Hull Value • \$1.75 CP. ] (A) (0)3	Hull Value V 51.50 cr (B) (0) <sup>5</sup>	Hull Value • \$1.25 CF (C) (0)	Hull Value \$ 1.00 GP (0) (0)	Cost • 6% of A (A-1)	Cost 6 6% of 9 ( <u>A-2</u> )	Cost <b>6</b> 45 of <u>A(A-3)</u>	Cost • 45 of D (A-4)	Cost 0 2 % of A (A-5)	Cost <b>e</b> 2 % Of D (A-6)
NC-7.4	009 <b>°</b> त	10,600	<b>000</b>	7,400	(0)3 7:56	() () () ()	૽ૼૺૺૹૺ	(0)3 588 588	(0) <sup>3</sup> 252	ê <b>a</b>
NC-IS	26,250	22,500	18 <b>,</b> 750	15,000	1,575	ğ	1,070	<b>8</b> 9	525	ğ
MC-22	38,500	33,020	27,500	22,000	2,310	1,320	075°1	880	<u>0</u> 22	077
MC-35	61,250	52,500	43,750	35,000	3,675	2,100	2,450	1,400	1,225	<b>00</b> 2
21-26	73,500	63,000	52,500	42,000	0[4,4	2,520	2,940	1,680	1,470	840
MC-52	91,000	78,000	65,000	52,000	5,460	3,120	3,640	2,080	1,820	1,040
<b>36-55</b>	<b>96,</b> 350	82,500	68, 750	55,000	5,781	3,300	3,854	2,200	1,927	1,100
			UTILIZATION	COST BREAKDO	N-INSUBLAN	刔				
	4000 Hours	- cost per hou	5 6000 Her	urs - cost pe	r hour		COST PE	R MILE @	100 & 20	H M O
	Based	on Columns	B	ed on Column				Besed o	n Columna	
	7-1	<u>A-6</u>	1-V	A-6			V-1	A-6	A-1	<b>A-6</b>
					1		100 H.	P.H	200 N	. P. H.
FC-7.4	00°63T	36.00	126.00	24.00			1.850 -	.240	.945	021
KG-15	393.75	75.00	262.50	8.05			3.937 -	50	1.968	250
¥6-2	577.50	110.00	385.00	73.33			5.77 -	.733	2.887	366
M-35	918.75	175.00	612.50	379.911			- 781.9	1.166	4.593	583
5-5	1,125.00	20.00	735.00	00°07T			11.250 -	1.400	5.625	202
MC52	1,365.00	260.00	00°016	173.33			13.655 -	1.73	6.825	8666
<b>JC-</b> 55	1,445.25	275.00	963.50	183.33			14.45 -	1,833	7.226	916

J C.F. = Cubic foot displacement of vahicle

1 413.

1

ź

1 🗭

٢

۱

ζ

.

58

ļ

ALC: NO.

1

9209

2

きゅう いいていゆう 書

ŧ

200 M. P.H	174 Rts A4 Rts		FUEL/PAYLOAD	(cost/RAN	명보		<u>Assumpt</u> Karo ba As at 5 average	Lons: Post an for tun -10-74, d	sil fuels rbine oper cestic co C.A.B. No	of JP-4, ation. at per gallon athly report.
SHIP SMISS	Cost per Hour	195 196 197 197	Fuel Weight-Lae 2,000 Hile Range: LOOMPH-20Mre 200MDH-LUMre	Tuel Notet Tome	Crev Helett	Reserve Pointent Pounte	Crew, Puel & Res. Puel weight-Tone	Paylond 2000 St. Milas Tona	Cost per Tom Hile	Assuming a 1005 error- Cost per uils/T
Leh Speed200MPH 3 -200 per gallen 3 -300	150.00 225.00 <b>300.00</b>		80°50°	223	8. <b>.</b>	8 8	\$6.5	g	025 031 031	.025 .038 .050
ow Speed -100 MFH .204 per gallom .404 per "	33.8 8.8 8.8	ર્ય દુ: છે.	15,000	7.5	•••	5,00 1.00	12.5	ğ	00148 00375	.00296 .00750 .010
<u>C-15</u> 14h Speed - 200 MPH • 200 per gallem • 2004 - 100 MPH • Speed - 100 MPH	80888 8088 8088 80888 80	888	120,000 	8 t		بر 80.1 80.2	्र हा व्या	8. 	15100° 6610° 87100°	.0198 .0296 .0388 .0302
	3.8	32	<u> </u> 				• •		00.26 00.39	.004.32 .00578
E-22 Migh Speed - 200 MFM 0.204 per gallem 0.304 * *	637.50 837.50	2.125 31.15 31.15	127,500	63.7		25,500	£	3		.0125 .0187 .0250
Low Speed - 100 MPM • 204 per gallen • 104 per gallen • 404 per gallen	8-54 69-83 69-69 69-69	821. 196. ÀIQ.	27,400	ų	• • •	5,496	ğ	§	2100- 17100- 17100-	.0029 4200 82400

X

٩Ŋ

ŦĘ.

ł

and the second second

41, 1 K B

ŝ

1

2 4

ł

.

. . .

\* \* \*

1

;

1

.

į

; 1

Ñ
Share
1
PLANCE
(001)
<b>T</b>
EV-
TEL S

<u>VC-15</u>										
E.20t per gallon	12.00	2.375	162,500	81,25		32,500	. <b>§</b> *	567	00,18 75,400	00836
6 .206 · .	950-00	1.75	•						00837	01674
0 .204 per gallen	62.00 61 00	•62 94	008-126	<b>39°9</b> ″		2,400	<b>3</b> .77	<b>7</b> 3"	.000965 001110	6100°
	8.121	1.2	•	2	E	Ŧ		2	66100	(3CO.
<u>VC-/2</u> Kitch Speed - 200 XPH										
a .20t per gallen	587.40	2.937	176,220	ด์ <b>ก</b> . ซี	8.	35,244	210.73	924	0700°	.00806
	1,174.80	5.874	. 1	3	z	T	: :	<b>*</b>		01612
Low Speed - 100 NPH 6 .204 per gallon	61.40	12.	078'87	01 21 12	. 8	9,768	2	ర్	totoo.	.00202
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	01.221	1.22	8 1		# 1	• •	- *		00151 00202	8030 80 0 90 0 90 0 90 0 90 0 90 0 90 0 90
<u>310-52</u> 11 ch Smart - 200 1021										
201 per gellem	650.00 975.00	3.25	195,000	<b>8</b> .5		39,500	<u>द्व</u> -	8. K	57(00- 11200-	0000
1.04 - 100 VE	1,300.00	6.50		Ŧ	•	•	*		.00684	01368
.20 per gallen	07-911	1.946	<b>77</b> , 640	39.92		15,968	8.2. 8	1,018	1100°	.00228
	232.80	2.32	•			×			.00227	8
<u>NC-55</u> Hieh Seed -200 NFN										
a .20¢ per gallen	720.00	899 899	279°900	ğ		002 (?) 	9• <b>7</b> 67	1,032	00348	010496
Low Sevel - 100 101	10°011°1		ľ	E		8		•	-00e97	16ETO-
. 20t per gallen	8.81	17 17 18 17	009°#	5.65		n, 720	<b>N</b> .3	<b>ית</b> ינ	00117 00176	00234
· · · · · ·	362.00	3.2	•	•	-	•	•		,10235	2.100

ters,

•

;

ζ

.

BOUNDRY LAYER CONTROL-ECONOMIC SFFICIENCY

. 🌮

A STATISTICS OF THE AVE

こうちょう ちょうちょう しょうしん ひっちょうちょう

÷ #

i. F ) 7 i

ş

٠. 129100ŝ

1917 B

: : :

5

ł

<u>Astruptions:</u> Boundry Layer Control is believed applicable to large airships without the attendent penalties that are imposed on fixed wing aircraft. This study believes that BLC will improve the efficiency by 50 per cent (\$). MASA estimates indicate BLC on a cylindrical airform will increase the efficiency by 58 per cent( 56%). The study may therefore be as much an 20% understated as to BLC efficiency.

INSHIP SENES:	Horsepower	Harsepower/	Fuel in	Puel in	Cost Par	· hour e 20	O M.P.H.
	Conventional Design 200 M.P.H.	But Design 200 N.P.H.	rounds/vals Conventional	Pourds/vale BLC Desten	501102	2 2 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	404 PC
NC - 7.4	30,000	15,000	4,500/750	2,250/375	75.00	112.50	150,00
MC - 15	71,000	35,500	12,000/2000	5 <b>,</b> 310/885	177.00	265.50	354.00
K 23	84,000	12,000	12,750/2,125	6,360/1050	212.00	318.00	00.121
NC - 35	95 <b>,</b> 000	47,500	16,250/2375	1,122/1187	237.40	356.10	478.80
NC - 42	000,8LL	29,000	17,622/2937	8,100/1350	270.00	00°50†	240.00
<b>K</b> - X	130,000	65,000	19,500/3250	9,750/1625	325.00	487.50	650.00
JIC - 55	000,441	22,000	23,600/3600	0502/000*21	00"017	615.00	සංස

264.5

REPRODUCIBILITY OF THE ORIGINAL PAGE IS POOR

• "¥"

13.

.....

.

i.,