

## Launch Final Rule Issue Clarification Record

<b>1. Date:</b>
1-15-03
<b>2. Subgroup/FAA Person Seeking Clarification:</b>
FSO
<b>3. Company/Industry Person Contacted:</b>
Lou Gomez, New Mexico Spaceport (505 521-3407)
<b>4. Issue:</b>
<p>The FAA is seeking clarification on what New Mexico Spaceport means by their statement “launch, flight, and landing and ground and flight safety methods is expected to be somewhat different from the philosophy of ELV’s and unguided rockets. The old flight safety method was a reactive system while the new RLV system is expected to be more proactive.” It is the FAA’s belief that the planning and preparation done by the FSO can be termed proactive. Because New Mexico Spaceport views an ELV flight safety system differently than the FAA does, this difference is a source of confusion.</p>
<b>5 Discussion:</b>
<p>Lou Gomez clarified his point to say that most ELVs developed are designed to have one mission that succeeds, or uses a flight destruct system. An RLV is designed so you are able to fly the vehicle back and will not have a destruct system. An RLV will be designed so there is a safety margin for return flight. Proactive is a term used to mean the vehicle’s design incorporates margins that will allow fly-back capability where reactive means the system is designed to be blown up. The only option in a reactive system is to blow it up. RLV, a proactive system, is designed to come back again. Mr. Gomez cited as an example the Shuttle where there are various failure modes that allow it to come back in. An example of an expendable ELV with a proactive system is the Lockheed Martin VentureStar that is supposed to come back safely without destroying the payload.</p> <p>Mr. Gomez further commented that most of the [AST] regulations are mainlined to ELVs, yet RLVs will be different systems.</p>
<b>6. Conclusion:</b>