

NASA Santa Susana Field Laboratory Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting, February 13, 2014

ATTENDEES:

William Preston Bowling/Consulting Party	Pete Zorba/NASA
Gary Brown/Consulting Party	Randy Dean/CH2M HILL
Carla Bollinger/Consulting Party	Phil Reid/CH2M HILL
Tim Brehm/Consulting Party	Via Teleconference:
Nancy Kidd/Consulting Party	Sam Cohen/Consulting Party
Christian Kiillkkaa/Consulting Party	Michael Collins/Consulting Party
John Luker/Consulting Party	Dan Larson/Consulting Party
Tim Miguel/Consulting Party	Freddie Romero/Consulting Party
Mark Osokow/Consulting Party	Chris Rowe/Consulting Party
Alan Salazar/Consulting Party	Jim Brandt/SHPO
Clark Stevens/Consulting Party	Mark Beason/SHPO
Gary Stickel/Consulting Party	Carol Roland-Nawi/SHPO
Barbara Tejada/Consulting Party	Richard Howe/DTSC
Patrick Tumamait/Consulting Party	Monica Strauss/GSA
Christina Walsh/Consulting Party	Allen Elliott/NASA
Ronald B. Ziman/Consulting Party	Merrilee Fellows/NASA
Jennifer Groman/NASA, Host	Sara Orton/CH2M HILL

PREPARED BY: CH2M HILL

DATE: May 23, 2014

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) held a Section 106 Consulting Party meeting on February 14, 2013, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in NASA's conference room at Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL). Consulting parties and agencies attended in person or via teleconference and LiveMeeting.

Welcome

Jennifer Groman/NASA began the meeting by welcoming the attending parties. She provided an introduction to the meeting and described the meeting objectives, to discuss the elements of the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA), as well as a quick review of the Section 106 process as it applies to SSFL. Ms. Groman thanked the consulting parties for their effort and input to the draft PA.

Discussion of the Draft Programmatic Agreement

Test Stands and Associated Support Facilities

Ms. Groman stated that the Coca Test Area buildings are scheduled for demolition after the Environmental Impact Study is complete. However, as stated in the draft PA, NASA intends to retain a test stand and control house from either the Alfa or Bravo Test Areas.

Ms. Groman stated that portions of the Coca test stands and associated facilities could be curated by NASA as artifacts and would then be made available to educational institutions and other entities. NASA defines "artifacts" as material objects that are currently without a mission and could be distributed to appropriate interested parties. A consulting party asked about which parts of the test stands would be made available. Ms. Groman replied that NASA curatorial staff will make a visit to the site and make determinations about what is appropriate to curate. A consulting party asked if consulting parties could have input on which artifacts from the Coca test stands would be curated. NASA will look into a process for selecting pieces of the Coca Test Stand for curation, which may include a site visit

Several consulting parties objected strongly to the demolition of the Coca Test Area, specifically citing its proximity to the Burro Flats site and referencing the sites archeo-astronomical aspects. Ms. Groman said that although several objections to the removal of the Coca test stands were put forward in the comments on the draft PA and earlier, NASA leadership weighed all factors but could not support retaining the structures at the Coca Test Area. Ms. Groman stated NASA wanted to discuss areas where input was accommodated beyond just the Coca Test Area.

A consulting party asked how current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) litigation for other parts of SSFL would affect the demolition of NASA structures. Allen Elliott/NASA stated that NASA's demolition is not a CEQA undertaking and that current litigation for other parts of SSFL should not affect the NASA demolition schedule.

On retaining a representative test stand and control house from Alfa or Bravo, consulting parties asked how the determination would be made for which one would be saved. Ms. Groman said this would involve testing and abatement or encapsulation of hazardous materials. A consulting party wanted to know if these costs were included in the soil remediation activities at SSFL. Mr. Elliott replied that these costs were not included, and that the cost of encapsulation or abatement and maintenance of the test stands would range from \$800,000 to \$1,000,000 every 10 years. The level of contamination will be a factor in determining which control house and test stand are to be saved.

A consulting party inquired about hazardous material evaluations; who will establish levels of intolerable contamination for structures? Mr. Elliott stated NASA determines levels for structures, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) determines levels for soil and water.

A consulting party asked about how General Services Administration (GSA) Section 106 consultation will affect the NASA Section 106 consultation. Mr. Elliott said the GSA process concerns future use, what future owners will accept after full disclosure. A consulting party stated that NASA is working under assumption that GSA will be done with their consultation prior to demolition of structures; wants NASA to combine their consultation with GSA consultation. Ms. Groman reiterated the current action and this consultation is only for the demolition of structures, and for soil and groundwater cleanup. NASA is planning to save a test stand and a control house and will be obligated to abate or decontaminate the structures. The GSA is aware of NASA's intention to save a test stand and control house and GSA will conduct their own Section 106 consultation before the property is transferred to a federal, state, or private entity. Several consulting parties expressed concern about whether potential future owners of the NASA SSFL property would want test stands and would be willing to pay to maintain them. Ms. Groman stated that the future use of the property is not part of NASA's undertaking and is a separate GSA action.

Treatment of Traditional Cultural Property

The group continued discussion of the elements of the draft PA and moved on to the section of the PA regarding treatment of the traditional cultural property. A Consulting Party asked, since SSFL is a sacred site and a traditional cultural property, how will this affect the cleanup of SSFL? Ms. Groman stated that as a stipulation in the PA, NASA will work with tribes to form a Native American Advisory Board (NAAB) with local tribal input to consult on tribal issues throughout the cleanup process.

A consulting party asked if there has been any discussion of re-vegetation with regard to traditional land use. Ms. Groman stated that the biological section of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has a re-vegetation plan and other mitigation measures. It was suggested that the revegetation plan be added to the PA.

Treatment of Archeological Properties

A consulting party suggested that culturally sensitive areas at SSFL could be contaminated, so how does NASA plan to address significant cultural sites? Ms. Groman replied that per the Administrative Order on Consent (AOC) and the PA, NASA would seek an exemption for sensitive areas from DTSC. If DTSC refuses, NASA would write a research design and carry out Phase III data recovery testing in consultation with tribes, SHPO and DTSC. As stipulated in the PA, an alternate mitigation may be necessary. Another consulting party wanted to know where any materials found through Phase III testing would be housed. Ms. Groman replied that they would be curated at the Autry Museum of the West with other existing collections from SSFL.

A consulting party expressed doubts that the AOC 2017 deadline could be met and inquired whether NASA could negotiate with DTSC for more time to complete additional consultation and remediation work. DTSC replied that although they have not seen a schedule from NASA yet, they feel the 2017 cleanup deadline is still viable.

Ms. Groman thanked the consulting parties for their input and stated they can continue submitting comments on the draft PA, but they need to be submitted soon so the document can be finalized and included with the Final EIS.

Several consulting parties were concerned that their names were listed as consulting parties in an attachment to the PA. The consulting parties asked NASA to add a disclaimer or acknowledgment that not all parties agree with the stipulations as presented in the PA. NASA agreed to add a statement in the PA that being listed as a consulting party does not indicate agreement with the stipulations contained in the PA.

Next Steps

- Publish the Final EIS (targeted for March 2014)
- Publish the Record of Decision (targeted for April 2014)

Action Items

- NASA will distribute the final PA to Consulting Parties.