



**FULL COMMITTEE
HEARING CHARTER**

“CONTINUING U.S. LEADERSHIP IN COMMERCIAL SPACE, AT HOME AND ABROAD”

Thursday, July 13, 2023

10:00 AM

2318 Rayburn House Office Building

Purpose

The purpose of the hearing is to hear stakeholder perspectives about the state of the U.S. commercial space industry and provide considerations for prospective commercial space legislation to be considered by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Witnesses

- **Ms. Karina Drees**, President, Commercial Spaceflight Federation
- **Mr. Jim Dunstan**, General Counsel, TechFreedom
- **Dr. Josef S. Koller**, Systems Director, Center for Space Policy and Strategy, The Aerospace Corporation
- **Ms. Caryn Schenewerk**, President, CS Consulting, LLC

Overarching Questions

- How can Congress best enable the continued leadership of the U.S. commercial space sector?
- How have recent efforts to streamline commercial space activities, including launch and reentry and remote sensing, impacted stakeholders and U.S. competitiveness?
- What impacts have the Space Policy Directives had in improving regulatory processes?
- How can the U.S. continue to meet its obligations to provide authorization and supervision under Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty without stifling the U.S. commercial space industry?
- What are the key issues facing the commercial space sector, and how should Congress, the Administration, U.S. industry, and other stakeholders address those issues?

Background

Treaty Obligations

The United States is a State Party to the Outer Space Treaty (OST), a multilateral agreement executed in 1967 that serves as a basis for international space law.¹ During treaty negotiations, a major point of contention between the only two spacefaring nations at the time, the United States and the Soviet Union, was the role of the private sector in space exploration. The United States sought to secure rights for the private sector to engage in space activities, while the Soviet Union proposal required that exploration and use of outer space be “carried out solely and exclusively by states.”² Ultimately, the two nations reached a compromise that allowed private sector space activities but assigned national responsibility and liability for nongovernmental space actors.³

This compromise is memorialized in Article VI of the OST. Under Article VI, each signatory bears “international responsibility for national activities in outer space...whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies or by non-governmental entities.”⁴ Any non-governmental activities in space “require authorization and continuing supervision” by the applicable State Party.⁵ Article VII of the OST also states that each signatory is “internationally liable for damage to another State Party to the Treaty or to its natural or juridical persons” caused by a space object or its components, regardless of whether the damage occurs on Earth, in the air, or in outer space.⁶ Principals regarding international liability are set forth in greater detail in another agreement, the Liability Convention.⁷

While the OST establishes obligations of the United States under international law, the United States administers national space law through multiple regulatory agencies based on the type of space operations proposed by a nongovernmental entity.

Existing United States Legal Frameworks for Commercial Space Activities

In 1982, Space Services Incorporated (SSI) conducted a test flight of its Conestoga launch vehicle, marking the first successful privately-funded launch in the United States. Until that point, all launches of commercial payloads had been conducted through NASA, and there was no established process for SSI to follow when seeking government permission to conduct launch activities.⁸ Eventually, SSI successfully obtained approval from the federal government, but only after

¹ Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, Jan. 27, 1967, 18 U.S.T. 2410, 6 U.N.T.S. 205 (hereinafter, the “Outer Space Treaty”).

² United Nations, Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Draft Declaration of the Basic Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States Pertaining to the Exploration and use of Outer Space, A/AC.105/L.2 (1962) pg. 2, para. 7. Available at: http://www.unoosa.org/pdf/limited/l/AC105_L002E.pdf.

³ F.G. von der Dunk, *The Origins of Authorisation: Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty and International Space Law, Space, Cyber, and Telecommunications Law Program Faculty Publications*, University of Nebraska-Lincoln (2011) at 3.

⁴ Outer Space Treaty, art. VI.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.* at art. VII.

⁷ Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects, Mar. 29, 1972, 24 U.S.T. 2389, 961 U.N.T.S. 187.

⁸ FAA, *ORIGINS OF THE COMMERCIAL SPACE INDUSTRY, FAA MILESTONES AND EVENTS* at 1, available at: <https://www.faa.gov/about/history/milestones>.

spending significant amounts of time and money consulting a wide range of government entities, regulatory and otherwise.⁹ The Conestoga launch highlighted the absence of a regulatory process for commercial space activities. In a 1984 speech, Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole remarked that space companies could need to consult as many as 17 agencies to obtain the proper approvals.¹⁰ The Conestoga launch prompted a series of legislative and executive branch actions to streamline the regulatory process for commercial launch activities. These efforts culminated in President Reagan's issuance of Executive Order 12465¹¹ designating the Department of Transportation (DOT) as the lead agency for licensing commercial launch, which was closely followed by Congress's passing of the Commercial Space Launch Act of 1984.¹²

Today, multiple federal agencies share responsibility for regulating space operations. DOT has delegated its authority to license launch and reentry and the operation of spaceports to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) regulates operation of remote sensing systems by private entities through its Commercial Remote Sensing Regulatory Affairs office (CRSRA). The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) licenses commercial satellite communications, and the Department of State (DOS) and Department of Commerce (DOC) are responsible for administering the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) and Export Administration Regulations (EAR), respectively, which control exports of space technologies.

Launch, Reentry, and Operation of Spaceports

Launch services offered by the commercial sector have evolved dramatically over the last three decades. After years of development, modern commercial launch services are heavily relied upon by both government and private entities in the United States. Reusable launch vehicles and the shrinking size of payloads have lowered the cost of accessing space, opening the industry to new players.¹³ Multiple operators are actively launching paying customers on missions to orbital and suborbital space.¹⁴

The Secretary of Transportation has authority to license launches and reentries, issue experimental permits, and license operation of spaceports,¹⁵ which the Secretary delegates to the FAA Administrator. Within FAA, the Office of Commercial Space Transportation (abbreviated "AST") executes these functions,¹⁶ carrying out dual mandates to both "encourage, facilitate, and promote" the private sector and "protect the public health and safety, safety of property, and national security and foreign policy interests of the United States".¹⁷

⁹ NASA also was involved in the approval process for Conestoga, despite not being a regulatory agency. *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.* at 2.

¹¹ Exec. Order No. 12,465, 49 Fed. Reg. 7211 (Feb. 24, 1984).

¹² Commercial Space Launch Act of 1984, Pub. L. No. 98-575, 98 Stat. 3055 (1984).

¹³ INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION, MARKET OVERVIEW – SPACE LAUNCH. Available at: <https://www.trade.gov/commercial-space>.

¹⁴ DANIEL MORGAN, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., IN FOCUS: COMMERCIAL HUMAN SPACEFLIGHT (2021); see also Jeff Foust, Regulatory Uncertainty as Commercial Human Spaceflight Takes Off, SPACENEWS, July 5, 2023. Available at: <https://spacenews.com/regulatory-uncertainty-as-commercial-human-spaceflight-takes-off/>.

¹⁵ 51 U.S.C. chapter 509.

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ 51 U.S.C. § 50901 and § 50903.

Since 1989, AST has licensed over 560 launches and 38 reentries, more than 40% of which took place between FY2018 and FY2022.¹⁸ There have been over 80 licensed launches in the first nine months of FY2023, a number that already exceeds the total number of licensed launches in FY2022.¹⁹ AST expects these numbers will continue to grow rapidly, projecting an annual rate of between 123-288 licensed launches and reentries by FY2027.²⁰

Following the successful suborbital flight of the privately-owned SpaceShipOne, Congress passed the Commercial Space Launch Amendments Act of 2004 to facilitate growth of the emerging human spaceflight industry.²¹ The Act authorized the Secretary to regulate the safety of launch vehicles carrying humans, but mandated an eight-year “learning period” before such regulations could be issued²² (absent serious or fatal injury or unplanned risk thereof).²³ Congress has prolonged this learning period twice, first through the FAA Modernization Act of 2012, which pushed expiration to 2015,²⁴ and then again through the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015, which moved the expiration to 2023.²⁵ Congress extended the learning period to provide FAA with additional time to gather data on the developing commercial human spaceflight industry that could inform a safety framework, and simultaneously provide industry with an opportunity to develop consensus standards in coordination with FAA.²⁶

Under the current framework, human spaceflight providers must comply with informed consent requirements.²⁷ Among its other obligations, a licensee or permittee must educate participants on the many risks of spaceflight, including unknown hazards, provide a safety record for the launch vehicle, inform the participant that the government has not certified the launch vehicle as safe, and obtained written informed consent from the participant to participate in the launch.²⁸

Satellite Communications

In a recent reorganization, the FCC established a new Space Bureau dedicated to managing policy and licensing matters related to satellite communications.²⁹ FCC’s power to regulate satellite communications derives from its authority to license radio use under the Communications Act of 1934,³⁰ as well as its power to implement Radio Regulations of the International Telecommunication Union.³¹ FCC views commercial satellites utilizing radio frequencies as radio

¹⁸ FAA, COMMERCIAL SPACE DATA. Available at: https://www.faa.gov/data_research/commercial_space_data/.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ FAA, FAA AEROSPACE FORECAST FISCAL YEARS 2023–2043. Available at: <https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/2023-Commercial%20Space.pdf>

²¹ Commercial Space Law Amendments Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-492, 118 Stat. 3974 (2004).

²² *Id.* at § 2, 118 Stat. 3979.

²³ 51 U.S.C. § 59095(c)(2)(C).

²⁴ FAA Modernization Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-95, 126 Stat. 11 (2012) at § 2.

²⁵ Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-90, 129 Stat. 704 (2015) at §111.

²⁶ H.R. Rep. No. 114-119 (2015) at 9.

²⁷ 51 U.S.C. § 50905(b)(5).

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ Establishment of the Space Bureau and the Office of International Affairs and Reorganization of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau and the Office of the Managing Director, 88 Fed. Reg. 21424 (April 10, 2023).

³⁰ 47 U.S.C. §152(a).

³¹ The ITU is an agency of the United Nations. Its Radio Regulations are binding under a 1992 treaty, the Constitution and Convention of the International Telecommunications Union. FCC has authority to implement treaties as set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 303(r).

stations located in space, and therefore requires an FCC license for certain satellite operations.³² FCC has increasingly interpreted its statutory authority to issue licenses “if public convenience, interest, or necessity will be served thereby” broadly.³³ FCC cites to this authority when regulating areas not directly related to radiofrequency use,³⁴ such as orbital debris mitigation.³⁵

Operation of a Private Remote Sensing Space System

“Remote sensing” describes the collection of data by an instrument in orbit of the Earth which can be processed into imagery of surface features of the Earth.³⁶ Remote sensing capabilities provide valuable scientific and commercial data, but also have national security implications.

DOC has authority to license private sector operation of remote sensing space systems,³⁷ which the Secretary delegates to CRSRA within NOAA. In making license determinations, the Secretary consults “other appropriate United States Government agencies” on matters of national security or foreign policy.³⁸

At the direction of Space Policy Directive 2 (SPD-2),³⁹ CRSRA implemented regulatory reforms for licensing of private remote sensing in 2020.⁴⁰ CRSRA adopted a new approach to reviewing applications, basing its assessment on whether regulation of the system would effectively prevent harm to national security.⁴¹ The final rule created three categories of remote sensing systems, and would sort applicant systems based on availability of the same kind of unenhanced data generated by an applicant’s system from other sources. Systems that generate unenhanced data that is also available on the international marketplace are sorted into Tier 1, for which licenses include minimal restrictions.⁴² Tier 2 included systems that produced substantially the same unenhanced data only as systems of other United States licensees. Finally, if there are no systems, domestic or international, that can produce the same unenhanced data, the applicant’s system is categorized as Tier 3 and may be subject to more restrictive conditions.⁴³ The rule also addressed other issues, such as shortened timelines for application review.

Export Controls for Space Technologies

The United States administers export controls to prevent the spread of controlled technologies, including those related to space, to foreign actors that could threaten U.S. interests.

³² DANIEL MORGAN, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., R4516, COMMERCIAL SPACE: FEDERAL REGULATION, OVERSIGHT, AND UTILIZATION (2018).

³³ 47 U.S.C. § 307.

³⁴ MORGAN *supra* note 32.

³⁵ Mitigation of Orbital Debris in the New Space Age, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, IB Docket No. 18-313 (April 24, 2020).

³⁶ 15 C.F.R. § 960.4

³⁷ 51 U.S.C. § 60121.

³⁸ 51 U.S.C. § 60121(a).

³⁹ Space Policy Directive-2, Streamlining Regulations on the Commercial Use of Space (May 24, 2018) (hereinafter “Space Policy Directive-2”).

⁴⁰ Licensing of Private Remote Sensing Space Systems, 85 Fed. Reg. 30709 (May 20, 2020) (to be codified at 15 C.F.R. pt. 960).

⁴¹ *Id.* at 30792.

⁴² *Id.* at 30792-3.

⁴³ *Id.* at 30793.

Export controls fall into one of two categories. The Department of State’s International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR)⁴⁴ are administered by the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls (DDTC). The ITAR limit the export of defense articles and defense services, and associated technical data, as set forth in the United States Munitions List (USML).⁴⁵ The Department of Commerce’s Export Administration Regulations (EAR)⁴⁶ are administered by its Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS). The EAR address dual use commodities and associated technical data as set forth in the Commerce Control List (CCL).⁴⁷

In 2014, as part of the ongoing Export Control Reform Initiative, DDTC and BIS reviewed space commodities governed by the ITAR to determine whether any technologies could be moved from the USML to the EAR-controlled CCL.⁴⁸ Most notably, this effort transferred many commercial satellites and related technologies previously included in Category XV of the USML to Category 9 of the CCL, providing U.S. space entities with relief from the significant burdens of ITAR-compliance and allowing for greater collaboration with foreign entities on U.S. space projects.⁴⁹

Key Issues

In-Space Activities

In addition to increased activity in more established areas of space commerce, such as launch services and satellite communications, commercial entities also are investing resources in new and unique space applications. Companies plan to operate private space stations, perform on-orbit servicing and manufacturing, engage in space resource utilization, and more. Even now, space activities exist which do not clearly fall within the existing regulatory authority of DOT, DOC, FCC, or any other federal agency, which can lead to a perception of legal uncertainty.

There have been several past efforts to establish a “mission authorization” framework for such space activities. During the Obama administration, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy proposed that DOT serve as the authority to grant space authorizations.⁵⁰ In the 2020 National Space Policy, the Trump Administration charged DOC with the task of developing a mission authorization process.⁵¹ Efforts to appoint a lead agency, whether through executive or legislative action, are ongoing.⁵²

⁴⁴ 22 C.F.R. §§120-130.

⁴⁵ 22 C.F.R. § 121.1

⁴⁶ 15 C.F.R. §§ 730-780.

⁴⁷ 15 C.F.R. part 774.

⁴⁸ FAA AND OFFICE OF SPACE COMMERCE, INTRODUCTION TO U.S. EXPORT CONTROLS FOR THE COMMERCIAL SPACE INDUSTRY (November 2017).

⁴⁹ *Id.* at page 8.

⁵⁰ Letter from John P. Holdren, Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, to Senator John Thune, Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, and Representative Lamar Smith, Chairman, House Committee on Science, Space and Technology (April 4, 2016).

⁵¹ Memorandum on the National Space Policy, 85 Fed. Reg. 81755 (Dec. 9, 2020).

⁵² Vice President Harris recently called upon member agencies of the National Space Counsel to submit proposed plans for mission authorization. Jeff Foust, White House Reviewing Input on Mission Authorization Concepts, SPACENEWS, February 11, 2023. Available at: <https://spacenews.com/white-house-reviewing-input-on-mission-authorization-concepts/>.

Discussions have centered not only on where to house this new authority, but also on the proper form of regulatory approach. Industry has advocated for a “light touch” approach with a presumption of approval;⁵³ commercial operators seek regulatory certainty, but not at the cost of delays to their operations. A prevalent fear is that, due to the unprecedented nature of these space operations, a regulatory agency will take an overly-cautious approach towards its grant of approvals, slowing innovation and potentially prompting businesses to forum-shop overseas.⁵⁴

Space Situational Awareness

Space Situational Awareness (SSA) involves the identification and characterization of space objects and debris. Commercial space operators need access to more accurate SSA data to inform operational decisions and efficiently coordinate activities.

Both private and government entities currently depend on SSA capabilities provided by DOD using its network of ground- and space-based sensors that gather information on tens of thousands of space objects, as well as on space as a whole.⁵⁵ Historically, DOD has assumed the responsibility of monitoring objects in space, maintaining a space object catalog, assessing the potential for collisions, and issuing conjunction notifications to impacted operators.⁵⁶ Space Policy Directive-3 (SPD-3) called for a transition of certain SSA responsibilities relating to the private sector from DOD to DOC.⁵⁷ While DOD would retain operation of its SSA capabilities, DOC would facilitate access to SSA data and notifications for commercial actors.

To carry out the directives in SPD-3, DOC is developing the Traffic Coordination System for Space (TraCCS), a system that integrates government and commercial data to provide SSA services to the commercial sector. DOC proposes to leverage data from private providers, given the progress in development of commercial software and systems that can detect and track space objects and analyze the resulting data.

Regulation of Launch and Reentry

Rapid growth in launch and reentry operations has increased demand for launch and reentry licensing. SPD-2 directed the streamlining of regulations for launch and reentry,⁵⁸ spurring a rulemaking effort by FAA to create the vehicle operator licensing regime, now codified in Part 450 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.⁵⁹

⁵³ Karina Drees, Why the Office of Space Commerce Should Supervise Novel Commercial Space Activities, SPACENEWS, March 14, 2023. Available at: <https://spacenews.com/why-the-office-of-space-commerce-should-supervise-novel-commercial-space-activities/>.

⁵⁴ Kevin O’Connell, et. al, Practical Applications of a Space Mission Authorization Framework, SPACENEWS, April 11, 2023. Available at: <https://spacenews.com/op-ed-practical-applications-of-a-space-mission-authorization-framework/>.

⁵⁵ GOV’T ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE, GAO-23-105565, SPACE SITUATIONAL AWARENESS: DOD SHOULD EVALUATE HOW IT CAN USE COMMERCIAL DATA (April 2023).

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ Among other responsibilities, SPD-3 stated that Commerce “should, consistent with applicable law, be responsible for the publicly releasable portion of the DoD catalog and for administering an open architecture data repository” and “be the focal point” for a collision avoidance support service. Space Policy Directive-3, National Space Traffic Management Policy (June 18, 2018) (hereinafter “Space Policy Directive-3”).

⁵⁸ Space Policy Directive-2 at § 2.

⁵⁹ 14 C.F.R. part 450.

Controversy arose early in the rulemaking process, with stakeholders claiming a proposed rule issued by FAA did not reflect recommendations provided to FAA by an aviation rulemaking committee.⁶⁰ Some stakeholders also did not view the proposed rule as being sufficiently performance-based, and instead found the proposed regulations to be “very complex and frequently confusing.”⁶¹

The Streamlined Launch and Reentry Requirements final rule was published in the Federal Register in December of 2020.⁶² The final rule consolidated multiple sets of licensing requirements into a single process for several types of operations and vehicles,⁶³ and allows FAA to issue one license covering multiple launches. The rule also replaced prescriptive licensing regulations with performance-based requirements,⁶⁴ which will be supplemented by FAA-issued Advisory Circulars that methods an operator may use to fulfill such requirements.⁶⁵ FAA stopped accepting applications for licenses under the old regulations in 14 CFR Part 415, 431 and 435 in June of 2021,⁶⁶ and issued the first Part 450 vehicle operator license in early 2022.⁶⁷

Congress must consider impacts of this new Part 450 licensing process, and whether streamlining efforts were successful or if such efforts have imposed a greater regulatory burden on commercial launch and reentry providers.

Regulation of Commercial Human Spaceflight

The learning period for human spaceflight established by Congress in 2004 and extended until 2023 currently will expire at the end of September. As this expiration date grows near, Congress must consider whether the commercial human spaceflight industry is ready for a regulatory safety framework, whether the nascent nature such activities merit another learning period extension, or whether a different approach is warranted at this time.

Proponents of extension argue that existing safety measures are effective, and not enough human spaceflight activity has occurred to justify further regulation.⁶⁸ Opponents of an extension argue that letting the learning period expire would allow FAA and industry to start collaborations necessary to gradually develop an appropriate safety framework, an option that is preferable to a framework hastily developed in response to a high-profile human launch mishap.⁶⁹

⁶⁰ Jeff Foust, Industry Seeks More Time To Review Revised Commercial Launch Regulations, SPACENEWS, May 21, 2019. Available at: <https://spacenews.com/industry-seeks-more-time-to-review-revised-commercial-launch-regulations/>.

⁶¹ The Commercial Space Landscape: Innovation, Market, and Policy: Hearing Before the Subcomm. On Space and Aeronautics, 116 Cong. 28 (2019) (Testimony of Eric W. Stallmer, President, Commercial Spaceflight Federation).

⁶² Streamlined Launch and Reentry License Requirements, 85 Fed. Reg. 79566 (Dec. 10, 2020)(to be codified at title 14 C.F.R. pts. 401, 404, 413, 414, 415, 417, 420, 431, 433, 435, 437, 440, 450, and 460).

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ *Id.* at 79567.

⁶⁵ Jeff Foust, FAA Publishes Streamlined Commercial Launch Regulations, SPACENEWS, October 6, 2020. Available at: <https://spacenews.com/faa-publishes-streamlined-commercial-launch-regulations/>.

⁶⁶ 14 C.F.R. § 413.1.

⁶⁷ Commercial Space Transportation License for Astra Space, Inc., License Number VOL 22-124 (Rev 1)(2022).

⁶⁸ Laura Montgomery, Should Congress Extend the Moratorium on Regulating Human Spaceflight?, Research In Focus, The Center for Growth and Opportunity at Utah State University (2023).

⁶⁹ Jeff Foust, Report Recommends Allowing “Learning Period” for Commercial Human Spaceflight Safety Regulations to Expire, SPACENEWS, April 10, 2023. Available at: <https://spacenews.com/report-recommends-allowing-learning-period-for-commercial-human-spaceflight-safety-regulations-to-expire/>.

Remote Sensing Licensing

Initial regulatory efforts to streamline commercial remote sensing regulation pursuant to SPD-2 faced significant pushback. Commenters saw a proposed rule dividing “high-risk” and “low-risk” systems as overly restrictive and argued the new regulations would disincentivize commercial remote sensing operations in the United States.⁷⁰ CRSRA responded to these concerns by implementing a different, three-tiered approach based on availability of data, both nationally and internationally.⁷¹ Congress must assess whether the current licensing process serves the national interest without harming international competitiveness of the United States private remote sensing industry.

FCC Statutory Authority

FCC has used a broad interpretation of its statutory authority under the Communications Act of 1934 to issue regulations related to orbital debris mitigation.⁷² FCC lacks clear authority from Congress to promulgate such regulations regarding space activities.⁷³ Further, interagency coordination on the topic of orbital debris mitigation is necessary to prevent duplicative federal government efforts. Regulatory action without clear Congressional authorization has the potential to create confusion and further regulatory uncertainty.

⁷⁰ Licensing of Private Remote Sensing Space Systems, 85 Fed Reg 30709, 30790 (May 20, 2020) (to be codified at 15 C.F.R. pt. 960).

⁷¹ *Id.* at 30792.

⁷² Mitigation of Orbital Debris in the New Space Age, 85 Fed. Reg. 52422 (Aug. 25, 2020) (to be codified at 47 C.F.R. pts. 5, 25, 97).

⁷³ Letter to Jessica Rosenworcel, Chairwoman, Federal Communications Commission, from Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson, Chairwoman, Committee on Science Space and Technology, Representative Frank Lucas, Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Representative Donald S. Beyer Jr., Chair, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, and Representative Brian Babin, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics (Sept. 27, 2022).