

From: anne.moore@faa.gov
To: Pam.Underwood@faa.gov
Subject: RE: Camden County
Date: Friday, February 01, 2019 8:24:10 AM

Pam, Lorelei can chat at 9:30. Thanks. I actually slept fine last night, so apparently I am better at blocking out work than I thought.

Lorelei's number is (202) 267-3134. Chat soon.

From: Underwood, Pam (FAA)
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 8:16 PM
To: Moore, Anne (FAA) <anne.moore@faa.gov>
Subject: Re: Camden County

Hi Anne -

Yes. Absolutely. Let's chat in the AM. Does 9:30 or 10 work for you?

Yes. To verify Ec we need to understand the population they provide. The firefighting mitigations are also important for the Ec analysis because typically there is first responder capabilities that mitigate secondary effects from launch hazards (fires). Without firefighting mitigation's any secondary effects would also contribute to Ec. Both of those items are needed for AST to evaluate the launch site location review provided in their application and ensure compliance with Ec. All well within the current 420 regulation.

The individual risk is NOT part of 420, but a special term and condition AST believes should be impose due to the unique public safety hazards for the size and trajectories of this vehicle proposed from this location.

Hope this helps!! Please don't keep you up all night!!

Let me know if you have time to chat in the AM.

Thank you!!
Pam

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 31, 2019, at 5:21 PM, Moore, Anne (FAA) <anne.moore@faa.gov> wrote:

Pam,

This issue is just going to be running round my brain all night. If I don't sleep, it's on you. I am trying to figure out the end game of asking for the three items: (1) verifiable population data; (2) firefighting mitigation plan; and (3) individual risk analysis for the

concept vehicle. So, we have a part 420 basis to ask them for the verifiable population data because we cannot assess collective risk without accurate information (right?). If we ask for (2) and (3), two things can happen. They say yes and provide us the information or they say no we are not giving you that information because it's irrelevant to the part 420 requirements. If they say yes, then we are left to grant or deny the application based on our analysis of the information they provided. We would have to lay out the reason for the denial – which there is no specific regulatory requirement for – darn 420. If they tell us to pound sand on the requested information, we would also have to grant or deny the application and state our reasons. Oy vey.

I find it odd that Spaceport Oklahoma probably gave us some BS unproven concept vehicle and got itself a launch site license, but we are denying Camden County because they actually gave us an established vehicle that we are 99.9% sure could never be launched from the site even though a different vehicle might be able to meet the part 417 requirements at that site. Ahhhhhhhh! It seems like we should be able to issue a license and state that one of the proposed vehicles is a non-starter. Now, of course, this doesn't solve any problems because the Islanders don't want anything to launch from the site and we are doing a lot of leg work to issue a launch site license that may never support a launch. Sigh.

Just trying to play this one out in my head.

If you have time in the morning, I may want to chat again – and invite Lorelei.

Thanks.

Anne

