

What did stakeholders say about: **CONSISTENCY WITH ESTABLISHED PROCESS?**

... NASA is in violation of the spirit and intent of NEPA to provide an open and public decision-making process. (1) Los Angeles-Ventura Cultural Research Alliance (LanVen)

... [B]oth NEPA and CEQA set standards for environmental considerations that must be addressed ..., and contracts that are inconsistent with that [requirement] do not trump NEPA and CEQA (1.e) Santa Susana Mountain Park Association (SSMPA)

Considering environmental impacts *after* a decision has been made defeats NEPA's purpose of considering impacts in preparing to make decisions. (3) Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians (SYBCI)

... we are witnessing what appears to be a decision-making process that is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of power, or otherwise not in accordance with law. (2.6) San Fernando Valley Audubon Society (SFVAS)

... NASA was politically pressured to only consider two alternatives ... (1) LanVen

"[I]nput," from a U.S. Senator, biases the NEPA process towards a particular outcome that tends to favor certain groups while others, possibly representing a majority of constituents, are effectively excluded. (3.2) SFVAS

SSMPA advocates a cleanup based on scientific results, testing and standards, not political pressures. (1.f) SSMPA

[E]xplain why the public should pay for a cleanup that is inconsistent with the law... (3.d) SSMPA