

Allen Elliott

SSFL Program Director

NASA MSFC ASO1, Building 4494

Huntsville, AL 35812

SUBJECT: COMMENTS on SSFL Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Elliot,

I'm disturbed with your draft statement. You spent more time justifying why you shouldn't cleanup .NASA has polluted our community through irresponsible environmental behavior and created a toxic mess .NASA needs to get their toxic contamination out of our community! Live up to the agreement that you signed! Do NOT break your word! Stop dragging your feet! Now is the time to fully cleanup SSFL. If test stands have to come down to cleanup contaminated soil beneath them, then they need to be removed. If trucks have to take contaminated soil out of our community, then that must be done. It is time to fully clean up SSFL. Follow the recommendations by Committee to Bridge the Gap and So Cal Federation of Scientists!!

Sincerely,



9485 HART ST.

WINNETKA, CA. 91345

Comments on the DEIS Issued by NASA For Area II and Part of Area I of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory



Providing only two alternatives, clean up to background or no cleanup is not appropriate, other alternatives need presented such as a clean up to suburban residential or recreation standard.



The DEIS is flawed since the level of cleanup is not balanced against costs, cultural impacts, and environmental impacts, required by NEPA and CEQA.



Protection needs to be established before the cleanup for archaeological sites, such as the Burro Flats site VEN-1072 and any other archaeological sites on the property.



Protection needs to be established before the cleanup for structures such as Alpha, Bravo, and Coca rocket test stands and their related structures, eligible for protection as historic structures and districts.



Moving contaminated soil, and only replacing 1/3 of the removed soil is bad for the community that will receive the water runoff and bear the burdens of 80,000 trips carrying contaminated and new soil over two years, just from the 450 acre NASA site.



Alternative clean up methods to clean up soil on site, even if recovery in 10 years occurs, needs considered due to reduced environmental impacts in neighboring community.



The 2017 deadline is an artificial one not based on science, but creates an "emergency" type pressure that seems to be causing creation of environmental decision documents prior to completion of studies or input from DTSC that needs to interpret vague language that controls many sensitive decisions about historic properties. Adequate studies and interpretations must be provided to have a valid decision making document.



Pressure to complete the cleanup to meet the 2010 AOC deadline by 2017 may cause illegal destruction of historic and archaeological resources on the property. Removal of key cultural resources likely will significantly decrease interest in the property from state and federal park agencies, generally identified as the likely optimum long term holder of the property.



The long term use of the property needs to be considered in the cleanup approach, and the 2017 AOC deadline may need to be extended to prepare adequate foundation for the cleanup.



Additional comments I WANT TO SAVE AS MANY OF THE MAN MADE STRUCTURES AS POSSIBLE AS A LIVING MUSEUM TO THE SPACE RACE & OTHER SCIENTIFIL RESEARCH DEVELOPED ON THE PROPERTY ALONG WITH THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES.

Mr. Allen Elliott - SSFL Project Director

NASA MSFC ASO, Building 4494, Huntsville, AL 35812

msfc-ssfl-eis@mail.nasa.gov

Signature

Printed Name

Address

Date

Barry SELBERT

WEST HILLS, CA

9-18-13

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Issued by NASA For Area II and Part of Area I of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL)

The boxes checked below are items that I am concerned with related to the NASA cleanup at the SSFL; the DEIS has not provided enough information to be a decision making document.



Providing only two alternatives, clean up to background or no cleanup is not appropriate, other alternatives need to be presented such as a clean up to suburban residential or recreation standard.



The DEIS is flawed since the level of cleanup is not balanced against costs, cultural impacts, and environmental impacts, required by NEPA and CEQA.



Protection needs to be established before the cleanup for archaeological sites, such as the Burro Flats site VEN-1072 and any other archaeological sites on the property.



Protection needs to be established before the cleanup for structures such as Alpha, Bravo, and Coca rocket test stands and their related structures, eligible for protection as historic structures and districts.



Moving contaminated soil, and only replacing 1/3 of the removed soil is bad for the community that will receive the water runoff and bear the burdens of 80,000 trips carrying contaminated and new soil over two years, just from the 450 acre NASA site.



Alternative clean up methods to clean up soil on site, even if recovery in 10 years occurs, needs to be considered due to reduced environmental impacts in neighboring community.



The 2017 deadline is an artificial one not based on science, but creates an "emergency" type pressure that seems to be causing creation of environmental decision documents prior to completion of studies or input from the California Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) that needs to interpret vague language that controls many sensitive decisions about historic properties. Adequate studies and interpretations must be provided to have a valid decision making document.



Pressure to complete the cleanup to meet the 2010 Administrative Orders on Consent (AOC) deadline by 2017 may cause illegal destruction of historic and archaeological resources on the property. Removal of key cultural resources likely will significantly decrease interest in the property from state and federal park agencies, generally identified as the likely optimum long term holder of the property.



The long term use of the property needs to be considered in the cleanup approach, and the 2017 AOC deadline may need to be extended to prepare adequate foundation for the cleanup.



add item available

The AOC represents an illegal end run around the NEPA process. It is driven by political interference that is a violation of the constitutional separation of powers

Signature

Mark B. Osokow

Printed Name

Mark B. Osokow

Address

e-mail mark.osokow@sfsfaudubon.org

Date

9-18-13

Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Issued by NASA For Area II and Part of Area I of the Santa Susana Field Laboratory (SSFL)

The boxes checked below are items that I am concerned with related to the NASA cleanup at the SSFL; the DEIS has not provided enough information to be a decision making document.



Providing only two alternatives, clean up to background or no cleanup is not appropriate, other alternatives need to be presented such as a clean up to suburban residential or recreation standard.



The DEIS is flawed since the level of cleanup is not balanced against costs, cultural impacts, and environmental impacts, required by NEPA and CEQA.



Protection needs to be established before the cleanup for archaeological sites, such as the Burro Flats site VEN-1072 and any other archaeological sites on the property.



Protection needs to be established before the cleanup for structures such as Alpha, Bravo, and Coca rocket test stands and their related structures, eligible for protection as historic structures and districts.



Moving contaminated soil, and only replacing 1/3 of the removed soil is bad for the community that will receive the water runoff and bear the burdens of 80,000 trips carrying contaminated and new soil over two years, just from the 450 acre NASA site.



Alternative clean up methods to clean up soil on site, even if recovery in 10 years occurs, needs to be considered due to reduced environmental impacts in neighboring community.



The 2017 deadline is an artificial one not based on science, but creates an "emergency" type pressure that seems to be causing creation of environmental decision documents prior to completion of studies or input from the California Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) that needs to interpret vague language that controls many sensitive decisions about historic properties. Adequate studies and interpretations must be provided to have a valid decision making document.



Pressure to complete the cleanup to meet the 2010 Administrative Orders on Consent (AOC) deadline by 2017 may cause illegal destruction of historic and archaeological resources on the property. Removal of key cultural resources likely will significantly decrease interest in the property from state and federal park agencies, generally identified as the likely optimum long term holder of the property.



The long term use of the property needs to be considered in the cleanup approach, and the 2017 AOC deadline may need to be extended to prepare adequate foundation for the cleanup.



add item available

Signature Michael W. Kuhn

Printed Name Michael W. Kuhn

Address 2345 E. Brower Street, Simi Valley, CA 93065

Date 9-18-13