

From: [Steve Davis](#)
To: [Jess, Robert RJ](#); [Gardiner, Dawn](#)
Cc: [Mike Sagan](#); [Sally Weaver](#); [Steve Davis](#); [Candace Lee](#)
Subject: RE: USFWS agreement
Date: Friday, September 11, 2015 11:33:30 AM
Attachments: [REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTSpaceX 09082015.docx](#)
[REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTSpaceX 09082015 Signed.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Hi Rob,

I made the changes per the email below (and some other editorial/typo-fixing ones) in the document and have signed. I have attached:

1. The Word Doc which shows the changes
2. The signed PDF (I also initialed each page)

Can you please **either**:

1. Send us an email saying that the changes are fine and the USFWS signature is still applicable
2. Have Aaron initial the pages as I did

Also, please let me know to which address we should mail the original.

Besides that, it has been a long process, but congrats to both parties for the signed document! We are excited to work with you on this and other projects.

Thanks,
Steve

From: Jess, Robert [mailto:robert_jess@fws.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 09, 2015 2:23 PM
To: Steve Davis
Subject: Re: USFWS agreement

Steve,

With that being such a minor change, I'm not going to have Aaron re-sign the document- please just add it in and send back with all of the signatures including what Aaron has already signed- we will have a signed and completed document at that point! (we will only need one of the original signed documents)- thanks much!

rob

On Fri, Sep 4, 2015 at 2:07 PM, Steve Davis <Steve@spacex.com> wrote:
Hi Rob,

Thanks for the note.

Mike (SpaceX attorney; cc'd) looked it over and, as written, the hire could theoretically happen immediately after signature (even though I know this is neither party's intent). Thus, he recommended the change below to Section IV.A (as well as updating the date on the agreement

from last February to September 2015). Does this work for you? If so, we will sign it and send it over to you for countersigning. Note that we would like to have the LEO working early in the process, but, because we are now looking like we are not launching until early 2018 (please keep that close-hold), it seems premature to hire a LEO now. Does this seem reasonable?

Please let me know if the proposed change works for you.

Thanks,
Steve

FROM

Provide advance payment (on a rolling one-year basis) for direct costs for one law enforcement officer (1 GS 1801-5/7/9- salary plus benefits) for the term of this Agreement.

TO

Provide advance payment (on a rolling one-year basis) for direct costs for one law enforcement officer (1 GS 1801-5/7/9- salary plus benefits) beginning twelve months (or such longer period of time as may mutually be agreed in writing between SpaceX and STRC) prior to SpaceX's first launch attempt from the SpaceX Texas Launch Site.

From: Jess, Robert [mailto:robert_jess@fws.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 8:54 AM
To: Steve Davis
Cc: dawn_gardiner@fws.gov; Mike Sagan
Subject: Re: USFWS agreement

Steve,

we looked through the agreement to ensure there's no preemptive mechanism to force a hire and there's not. To us this means there's will be no hiring of anyone until we both agree to do so...

As mentioned, the biggest concern is again in the timing of hiring the law enforcement officer. I maintain that we should get the individual on as soon as possible, especially as the issues at Boca Chica continue to support the need. When we send LE to the site- its often not finding a felony issue but rather trying to determine which felony issue to address. A full time officer would alleviate the issue, especially if we developed a canine officer as I mentioned.

Either way Steve, I suggest we move ahead and sign the document...

rob

On Tue, Sep 1, 2015 at 4:41 PM, Steve Davis <Steve@spacex.com> wrote:
Hi Rob,

Thanks for chatting earlier.

Per convo, we are definitely still good on the agreement terms.

I just caught up with our launch schedulers and it looks like early 2018 is most likely for first launch (please keep this close hold). Thus, it is a bit early to hire the security person now.

Given that, what is the best path forward? We could:

1. Wait on signing (not preferable)
2. Sign an amendment saying security person not hired until we both agree w/ the intent being to activate them approx. 15 months before launch (not ideal as then there are 2 doc's)
3. Update the agreement to reflect this – we would sign and send to you (preferred of the three)
4. Other idea?

I cc'd Mike sagan, the SpaceX attorney in charge of this doc as well in case there are any questions about it.

Please let me know your preferred way forward...thanks!
Steve

Steve Davis | Director of Advanced Projects
Space Exploration Technologies (SpaceX)
1030 15th Street, NW|Suite 220 E|Washington|D.C.|20005
p: +1.202.649.2711 | c: +1.310.245.2197
steve@spacex.com | www.spacex.com

-- This Email Contains Sensitive Proprietary and Confidential Information - Not for Further Distribution Without the Express Written Consent of Space Exploration Technologies --

--

robert jess
project leader
south texas refuge complex
alamo, texas

--

robert jess
project leader
south texas refuge complex
alamo, texas