

## NASA SSFL Section 106 Consulting Party Meeting, November 1, 2013

**ATTENDEES:**

William Preston Bowling/Consulting Party	Merrilee Fellows/NASA
Gary Brown/Consulting Party	Jennifer Groman/NASA, Host
Sam Cohen/Consulting Party	Pete Zorba/NASA
Wayne Fishback/Consulting Party	Randy Dean/CH2M HILL
Elizabeth Harris/Consulting Party	Phil Reid/CH2M HILL
Nancy Kidd/Consulting Party	
Christian Kiillkkaa/Consulting Party	<b><i>Via Teleconference:</i></b>
Al Knight/Consulting Party	Michael Collins/Consulting Party
John Luker/Consulting Party	Dan Larson/Consulting Party
Mark Osokow/Consulting Party	Bruce Rowe/Consulting Party
Alan Salazar/Consulting Party	Chris Rowe/Consulting Party
Margie Steigerwald/Consulting Party	Clark Stevens/Consulting Party
Barbara Tejada/Consulting Party	Abe Weitzberg/Consulting Party
Christina Walsh/Consulting Party	Kirstin Kulis/ACHP
David Dassler/Boeing	Tom McCulloch/ACHP
Stephanie Jennings/DOE	Jane Lehman/GSA
Jon Jones/DOE	Rebecca Karberg/GSA
Allen Elliot/NASA	Susan Stratton/SHPO
	Sara Orton/CH2M HILL

**PREPARED BY:** CH2M HILL

**DATE:** December 23, 2013

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) held a Section 106 Consulting Party meeting on November 1, 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.

### Welcome

Jennifer Groman/NASA began the meeting by welcoming the attending parties. She provided an introduction to the meeting and described the meeting objectives as well as the Section 106 process for new Consulting Parties as it applies to SSFL. Ms. Groman discussed the outcomes of the last Consulting Party meeting, held September 20, 2013, as well as some of the possible adverse effects on cultural resources caused by soil remediation at SSFL, as outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which was made available for public review in August 2013. Ms. Groman summarized the previous meeting and stated that a Programmatic Agreement (PA) would be used as the agreement document, rather than the Record of Decision (ROD) as previously planned. Ms. Groman stated that a draft PA would be generated and sent to Consulting Parties for comment. Ms. Groman requested everyone's "wish list" in order to generate a PA that would include appropriate mitigation measures and what resources each party recommends saving.

### Discussion of Appropriate Mitigation Measures for Architectural Resources

Ms. Groman explained that some National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible structures would have to be demolished in order for NASA to complete its mandatory cleanup of SSFL. It is NASA's responsibility to clean up contaminated soils at SSFL, which could require the demolition of some of the NRHP-eligible structures. The General Services Administration (GSA) is responsible for the land transfer after the cleanup is complete. Ms. Groman stated that NASA could not put a covenant on the property in order to preserve the architectural resources located on them. She went on to say that it may be feasible to save a test stand and a control house

depending on the results of the FS6 sampling program. The demolition of the Alpha and Bravo test stands may be deferred until this testing is completed.

A consulting party asked why the Coca test stands could not be preserved as well. Ms. Groman replied that the Coca test stands were the most highly contaminated and would be the costliest to maintain. The area is also within view of a sensitive Native American site and one of the tribes would prefer the buildings at Coca be removed. Two consulting parties suggested that the prehistoric astronomical use of the area by local tribes and the modern space program use of the area dovetail together and only a small part of the Coca facility is visible from the Native American solstice viewing area.

Multiple parties suggested the Coca stands are the most historically significant; since both the Apollo and Space Shuttle programs tested engines there, it is the pinnacle of research at SSFL. Another party stated that none of the test stands could be saved since they are all contaminated and could possibly contaminate the Los Angeles River and thus the city of Los Angeles, and that the test stands represent a safety risk as they could fall down and injure someone. Ms. Groman suggested that the results of the FS6 sampling program will influence which test stands and control houses would need to be demolished. Susan Stratton/SHPO stated the cleanup and demolition schedule at SSFL may be affected by the Department of Toxic Substances Control's (DTSC) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Ms. Groman stated that the schedule is also being impacted by the Administrative Order on Consent's (AOC) mandated 2017 completion date.

Ms. Groman stated that a decision will have to be made about which of the other test stands would be saved since it is unlikely all of them can be kept; she asked how a decision could be reached. Kirstin Kulis/ACHP suggested it would be helpful if GSA could perform a market study to find out what an end user might want regarding the architectural resources on the property. Another party reiterated that the structures cannot be saved due to contamination.

## **Discussion of Appropriate Mitigation Measures for Archeological Resources**

The discussion turned to the topic of archeological resources. Some parties stated they have contacted NPS requesting information about a possible partnership in order to turn the area into a park. NPS stated that the creation of a park would be largely a political decision. NASA stated that it is not within their purview to seek out partnerships or future owners for the SSFL property. Another party suggested that in talking about the preservation of the archeological site, the tribe wants to restrict access to the area, and not have it become part of a joint exhibit with the Coca test stands. A "best case" scenario would be for there to be no access to the archeologically sensitive area, but to have a separate interpretive center away from the sensitive area.

A consulting party suggested a risk analysis and asked what the standard for cleanup of a sacred site is since the tribe is a possible end user of the property but had no input in the AOC. Ms. Groman replied that there is no standard, but the tribe did have input in the EIS on mitigating damage to cultural resources.

Another party asked if NASA is going to remediate soils within the archeologically sensitive area and what that would do to the archeologically sensitive area. NASA replied it will remediate soils in the archeologically sensitive area if the AOC requires it, but NASA is consulting with DTSC regarding clarification of the Native American artifact clause in the AOC. The PA will define mitigation measures for the site and other measures, including working with SHPO and tribes to locate areas for the extended Phase I investigations.

A consulting party asked if the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has input into this process. NASA stated that although EPA does have an opinion, the AOC is between the State of California and NASA. Several parties expressed concern over the level of damage the soil remediation activities would cause to cultural resources at SSFL. NASA stated that consultations with DTSC are ongoing to determine how the Native American artifacts clause in the AOC will affect the level to which the Burro Flats area needs to be cleaned up. Another consulting party stated that there is an "uncomfortable" lack of information regarding the Burro Flats archeological site and its boundaries as well as how the cleanup levels have been established for this area.

Several parties expressed interest in seeing the PA as soon as possible.

## Next Steps

- Finalize the PA (December 2013)
- Publish the Final EIS (targeted for January 2014)
- Publish the ROD (targeted for February 2014)

## Action Items

- Consulting parties will send written recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures to NASA:

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)

- NASA will send the draft PA to the consulting parties for their review and comment.

## Agenda for Consulting Party Meeting for NASA's SSFL

Friday, November 01, 2013, 11:00 am

- Welcome: Jennifer Groman
- Roll call: Sara Orton
- Meeting Objectives: Resolve adverse effects: Discuss appropriate measures to mitigate the adverse effects from the Proposed Action.
- Discussion of appropriate mitigation measures to address the adverse effects on architectural resources.
- Discussion of appropriate mitigation measures to address the adverse effects on archeological resources.

### NOTE: Consulting Party Meeting Ground Rules

- a. Mute phone unless speaking
- b. Notes are being taken and will be distributed (no court reporter or transcript)
- c. Please limit comments to 3 minutes and allow others to comment.
- d. We want to make sure everyone gets a chance to speak. We will call on people who were identified in roll call.
- e. Please be courteous and patient.

*For those attending in person, please sign the circulated Sign-In Sheet for today's meeting.*