resources, geology and soils, biological, cultural and archeological, socioeconomic, environmental justice, health and safety, accidents, and waste management. (See Section 5.1 of the SPEIS) See also comment-response 14 for related discussion of resource issues.

## **5.C.6** The following comments were received relative to pit production at LANL:

- Given the central importance of the CMRR-NF to NNSA's preferred 50/80 pit production alternative, NNSA must clearly state the facility's ultimate proposed size;
- If the footprint of the CMRR-NF would be over 200,000 ft<sup>2</sup>, the Complex Transformation SPEIS must conduct adequate NEPA analysis for additional square footage over that analyzed in the CMRR EIS;
- NNSA would need to specify whether additional facility-specific NEPA analysis might be necessary;
- NNSA needs to explain the additional 9,000 ft<sup>2</sup> needed for the CMRR for the preferred 50/80 plutonium pit production alternative; and
- The SPEIS is confusing as to whether an additional 9,000 ft<sup>2</sup> for CMRR is needed.

Response: No footprint additions are planned beyond that already analyzed within the CMRR EIS; therefore, because there will be no change to what has already been analyzed, no further facility NEPA analysis is planned. An additional 9,000 square feet was assessed as a means to support consolidation of plutonium operations at LANL from LLNL, provide increased analytical chemistry support for increased pit production capacity, and ensure sufficient nuclear space as a contingency. Subsequent to the issuance of the Draft SPEIS, NNSA has concluded that the 9,000 additional square feet is unnecessary to support the proposed consolidation of plutonium activities and the increase in pit production capacity to 50/80 pits per year as assumed for the Preferred Alternative. Therefore, an addition of 9,000 square feet to the CMRR-NF is not being pursued. The Final SPEIS has been revised to reflect this.

## 5.D CONSOLIDATED NUCLEAR PRODUCTION CENTER

The following comments were received relative to a Consolidated Nuclear Production Center (CNPC):

- Support for the CNPC at Pantex or Y-12;
- Opposition to the CNPC at either Pantex, Y-12, or both; and
- Support for facility consolidation where appropriate.

**Response:** NNSA notes the support as well as the opposition for a CNPC at Pantex and Y-12, and the support for consolidation where appropriate. See also comment-response sections 15 and 16 for related discussion.

October 2008 3-57