

March 4, 2014

Dear SSFL/ CAG,

Though John Luker raises many provocative issues in his Open Letter (February 28, 2014) -- it does not represent the feelings and thoughts of US all.

Any letter from us/the SSFL/CAG (see below\*\*) should have been vetted through input from the entire SSFL/CAG. So far only a few members have had input. This is the precedent that we have set and has served us well these early months. We have signed on via e-mail (very efficient) and has allowed for disagreements and modifications.

The current letter (as of 10:30 am 4 March 2014) on the website seems to be the original version, with a change in the original banner headline. I still see the claims in the body of the letter that it comes from Our, US and WE.

The body of the letter does not convey that at this point it contains the personal ideas of John Luker, or John's sub-committee.

**I do want to ask these four questions:**

1. Who and where did the "gravel for fill" proposal come from?

I do not want to spread false information. But if true, then a very bad practice but what/ where is the attribution?

*"NASA will not be returning the land to its original topography. Since no appropriate soils are available, the deepest pits will be filled with gravel. "*

2. Who has decided "the community must raise a \$20 million endowment"?

A SSFL Park might need a \$20 million endowment but who developed this cost estimate and for what time frame does it cover park operating costs??

3. Who decided that a SSFL Park may need to be supplemented by appropriate commercial development, patterned after hotels like...?"

*"The National Parks Service has spoken publicly and stated in their comments on the NASA DEIS that they look to acquire "Nationally Significant Properties." They cannot take contaminated land, but, if all the test stands and archaeology are removed, the significance of the property disappears and a multi-year, multi-million dollar weed abatement and re-vegetation project will be needed. NPS will not want the property under those circumstances. Who will want it? "*

*"The community needs to do several things before January 2016. Since parks agencies are in financial straits, representatives of these agencies ask a common question, "How will you pay for it?" Parks in the future will be run on "Enterprise Model". No longer will a beneficent government finance park creation and operations just because it's the right thing to do. The parks will need to pay for themselves. We need a \$20 million endowment to provide the income to finance continued preservation and maintenance of a post-cleanup parkland at SSFL. The endowment may need to be supplemented by appropriate commercial development, patterned after hotels like the Ahwahnee in Yosemite Valley, Old Faithful Lodge in Yellowstone, or Asilomar Conference Center, owned by California State Parks in Pacific Grove, CA."*

4. When did WE and US, the SSFL/CAG, decide to do this project?

I do not think it is at all feasible for the SSFL/CAG to raise \$20 million, nor to push through the cleanup and the development of Hotels, Conference Centers, etc. in the next year and a half. Realistically the SSFL/ CAG can respond to requests from Responsible Parties for input on Scoping, Preliminary and Final EIR, EIS, and decisions on the preservation of archaeological and cultural/historical structures.

*"Our community has a year and a half to accomplish those goals. We need your help. We need the rest of the community to join us in this important endeavor. Your office can help enormously in that effort. "*

*\*\*"Please respond by sending us (mail@ssflcag.net) contact information for the appropriate member(s) of your staff who will engage with us."*

Diana Dixon-Davis