

## NASA SSFL Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting, September 20, 2013

**ATTENDEES:**

Nancy Kidd/Consulting Party	<b><i>Via Teleconference:</i></b>
Dan Larson/Consulting Party	Harry Butowsky/Consulting Party
John Luker/Consulting Party	Nicole Doner/Consulting Party
Gwen Romani/Consulting Party	Luhui Isha/Consulting Party
Margie Steigerwald/Consulting Party	Bruce Rowe/Consulting Party
Clark Stevens/Consulting Party	Mati Waiya/Consulting Party
Barbara Tejada/Consulting Party	Abe Weitzberg/Consulting Party
Christina Walsh/Consulting Party	Carol Roland-Nawi/SHPO
Ronald Ziman/Consulting Party	Susan Stratton/ SHPO
Merrilee Fellows/NASA	Tom McCulloch/ACHP
Jennifer Groman/NASA, Host	James Biederman/GSA
Tom Hayes/NASA	Rebecca Karberg/GSA
Pete Zorba/NASA	Sara Orton/CH2M HILL
Randy Dean/CH2M HILL	

**PREPARED BY:** CH2M HILL

**DATE:** May 27, 2014

NASA held a Section 106 Consulting Party meeting on September 20, 2013, from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL) in NASA's large conference room. Consulting parties and agencies attended in person or via teleconference and LiveMeeting. Prior to the meeting, those in attendance took a tour of the Alfa, Bravo, and Coca historic districts. Notes were not taken during this tour.

### Welcome

Jennifer Groman/NASA began the meeting with a welcome to the attending parties. She provided an introduction to the meeting and described the meeting objectives, which include discussion of mitigation measures for adverse effects on architectural resources. Ms. Groman presented a few slides about the Nike Site Summit project located outside Anchorage, Alaska. The project proposed the demolition of the buildings on site, but the federal agency was able to defer the demolition to give interested parties time to raise funds to preserve and restore some of the buildings.

### Open Discussion on Architectural Resources

Ms. Groman explained that NASA must carry out the cleanup on SSFL and some demolition of National Register of Historic Places-eligible structures will be necessary to accomplish that cleanup. At this point it is not known which buildings may have to be removed as part of the soil cleanup. Ms. Groman discussed the factors working against preserving the three historic districts. One is the cleanup requirements, which may trigger demolition. A second factor is the transfer of the property after the cleanup is complete; the next owner may not be willing to assume the burden of maintaining any or all of the buildings in the three districts. A third factor is the ongoing consultations with the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians, who have expressed a desire to have the buildings in Coca removed. In the end, NASA (in conjunction with DTSC) will have to balance all these factors to determine which if any buildings can remain on the site.

Several parties felt that the actions were out of order, that NASA should determine the end user and the ultimate uses of the land prior to demolishing the structures. If the end user were known, then NASA could leave the buildings desired by the future owner.

NASA recognizes that many of the consulting parties feel NASA is moving too fast. Ms. Groman said NASA is now considering a phased Programmatic Agreement (PA) instead of having mitigation commitments stipulated in the

Record of Decision (ROD). NASA is considering deferring demolition on the Alfa and Bravo historic districts until additional information is available about the need for demolition required for cleanup. NASA will likely move forward with the demolition of Coca, as it is the most contaminated of the three districts. If additional demolition is required in order to excess the property, NASA would demolish those buildings required for property transfer. In this case, NASA would write a phased, contingent PA that would include milestones for decision-making and mitigation measures in the event the demolition of a building or district cannot be deferred or prevented.

One consulting party recommended that when a building that contributes to one of the historic districts is demolished, NASA write a check for the value of the building and deposit the check in an endowment. This would provide funds in perpetuity to maintain the buildings that remain.

Ms. Groman clarified that prices provided at the previous meeting were for containment of contaminants, not abatement. Abatement is cost prohibitive. The prices given were for encapsulation.

One party said NASA needs to consider known and unknown cultural resources and how they will be treated. He asked questions about the condition of artifacts that may be found during demolition and cleanup; where they would go, and what would NASA do with artifacts (both contaminated and not)? Ms. Groman indicated the artifacts would be curated according the Code of Federal Regulations Title 36, Part 79 (36 CFR 79, "Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archaeological Collections"). NASA is open to suggestions about where and how to best curate any artifacts that may be found during data recovery or cleanup.

Another person said there are collections of artifacts from previous investigations. Some are curated at the Autry Museum. Other collections have not been completely analyzed and have not yet been curated. Ms. Groman suggested that a possible mitigation measure could be to analyze and curate the remaining artifacts from the previous archeological investigations.

NASA discussed the PA process and what would be included. Ms. Groman recommended that consulting parties include suggestions and solutions with their complaints and comments. She invited the parties to send comments and suggestions on the tiered process, on which buildings to defer, on which district is most significant, and on appropriate mitigation measures for buildings that may be demolished. The PA can include extra items as well; NASA is open to suggestions. NASA asked for letters in writing containing suggestions of items to include in the PA. The PA must be executed prior to issuance of the ROD, but does not have to be complete prior to completion of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

## **Open Discussion on Archeological Resources**

Once the discussion on architectural resources was concluded, the meeting moved to the topic of archeology. The next consulting party meeting will be devoted to archeological resources.

NASA does not want to conduct any soil-disturbing activities within the Burro Flats archeological resource management boundary (which includes a buffer area). Additionally, the tribes do not want NASA to conduct soil-disturbing activities. However, there are soils within the archeological resource management boundary that are contaminated. If NASA is required to carry out the cleanup in this area, NASA will create a data recovery plan for the archeological resource management area in consultation with the tribes and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). This plan would be included in the PA.

Concerns were expressed about the Phase I investigations that have been carried out. Participants noted that what has been done may not be sufficient to fully identify historic properties. Section 106 identification should be carried out first, and an inadvertent recovery plan should be a last resort.

Several consulting parties suggested NASA analyze impacts to archaeological resources on all of SSFL, not just the NASA-administered portion of SSFL. It was suggested that SSFL be analyzed for impacts as a single holistic site. The areas of NASA, The Boeing Company (Boeing), and the Department of Energy are linked geographically and should be discussed as a whole. Ms. Groman acknowledged this comment and indicated NASA had begun conversations with Boeing recently to discuss cultural resources. SHPO requested an evaluation of a potential archeological district.

## Next Steps

- Draft EIS Public Comment Period (through October 1)
- NASA review and incorporation of public comments (September to October 2013)
- Additional Consulting Party Meetings (to be determined)
- Publish the Final EIS (targeted for November 2013)
- Publish the ROD (targeted for December 2013)

## Action Items

- NASA will hold another consulting party meeting in roughly 2 weeks to discuss impacts to archeological resources and appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse effects.
- Consulting parties will send written comments regarding the Draft EIS to NASA by October 1, 2013:

Allen Elliott  
SSFL Program Director  
NASA MSFC AS01  
Building 4494  
Huntsville, AL 35812  
[msfc-ssfl-eis@mail.nasa.gov](mailto:msfc-ssfl-eis@mail.nasa.gov)