

## VII. IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of this Comprehensive Site Plan will need to address short-, mid- and long-term facilities planning issues. The CSP process will seek to find resolutions to the issues. Some current implementation issues are noted in this section.

### Issues

**Dynamic and Diverse Programs:** The Laboratory's dynamic and diverse programs add complexity to the implementation of any plan. Many decision makers in both DOE and the Laboratory can potentially make choices that can alter or support the Comprehensive Site Plan (CSP). The CSP process needs to coordinate closely with the decision makers in order to revise and update the CCP.

**Unanswered Questions:** Additional study of the programs' needs and futures is needed. Throughout this plan, descriptions of future program and mission directions occasionally prompt more questions than answers. The CSP is constantly evolving. It will be more relevant and useful for implementation if site planning becomes more closely tied to program planning. Facility planning will occur more smoothly as missions and program needs are further clarified between DOE and the Laboratory.

**Additional Site Planning:** There are several areas of the site that have not been explored or planned in the degree of detail that would allow the best planning to occur. For the next several years, planning efforts will focus on better identifying and understanding existing conditions consistent with available resources and institutional priorities.

**The Changing World:** Technology and the nation's defense posture, in response to new threats and interests, are rapidly changing and evolving. These changing conditions will continue to require revised missions, and thus revised facility capabilities, in order to respond to new technologies, programs, and initiatives.

**Rapidly Aging Facilities:** Many facilities at the Laboratory were constructed in the 1950s. Other facilities were constructed with a single purpose and often with a short or temporary life expectancy. Because of age or extended use, a large number of facilities have approached, reached, or exceeded their useful life. A significant amount of time and dollars is needed for demolition, refurbishment and/or replacement of these deficient facilities. Replacing deficient facilities reduces operating costs, increases the quality of the work environment, and job satisfaction of the work force.

**Facility Budget Pressures:** The natural tendency has been and will likely continue to be, to direct program monies toward programmatic work at the expense of facility maintenance and facility construction needs. Continued pressure will be applied to reduce facility operation and maintenance budgets. To be effective,

operational budgets must continue to be applied intelligently for better alignment between facility and program priorities.

**Alternative Financing:** Limited line item monies have forced DOE and the Laboratory to continue to spend large amounts of maintenance and operation dollars on facilities that are past their useful life. Approval of alternative financing options such as third party financing would allow, over time, reduction of annual facility expenditures while increasing the value and usefulness of the facilities to meet current program requirements.

**Improved Project Delivery:** Implementation of the CSP requires efficient packaging and delivery of projects. Effective packaging of projects results in facility planning that is closely coupled with the program plans. Laboratory construction management and oversight functions need to demonstrate that they can implement a facility plan in accordance with program mission needs.

## Funding Strategies

Adequate project funding is key to implementation of the CSP. In recent years new strategies and approaches for funding facility projects--beyond the traditional line item (LI) and general plant project (GPP) mechanisms-- have been developed. The following are new funding options:

**Traditional Funding:** Traditional funding for line item construction funds will continue to be used for large and new major program initiatives, for example, for initiatives such as the facilities associated with the DOE laboratories integrated strategies. These line item requests will be independent requests through the DOE channels to Congress for funds. Conversion of program funds for GPP will continue for smaller construction projects that support ongoing and changing program requirements.

**Tri-Lab Agreement Funding:** The three weapons laboratories of LANL, LLNL, SNL plus the Nevada Test Site have an agreement that provides a total of \$100 million annually for new, refurbished, and modified defense program facilities and infrastructure. This nominally would provide \$30 million annually to Los Alamos National Laboratory for a variety of projects. However, the Strategic Computing Complex (SCC) project, funded under this agreement, commits the total of the Laboratory's share of these funds until 2005.

### **Alternative Funding to LI Funds:**

Revitalization projects, starting in the TA-03 area, are typical industry office and light laboratory facilities and associated infrastructure. Plans have been prepared and requests are being made for these types of projects to be funded by private industry development partners on DOE land. These facilities would then be purchased back over years through a lease-to-buy agreement, with the lease being paid by a combination of expense and possibly line item monies. Savings would accrue to DOE through the use of industrial partners' expertise in the construction of these types of facilities. In addition, the savings in operations and maintenance gained from replacing old facilities would offset the cost of capital and profit included in these types of lease agreements.

**Alternative Funding to GPP Funds:** Some smaller facility revitalization projects are essentially major deferred maintenance efforts. An alternative to program direct dollars being used for GPP, facility and organization taxes can be structured to generate funds from the user organizations. These funds would then be converted by the appropriate program office for use on general plant projects.

## Revitalization Strategies

Revitalization planning and implementation efforts are expected to focus on the following planning areas.

**1. Core Planning Area:** Revitalization is focused on TA-03 and encompasses the strategic computing and administration needs of the Laboratory. Many facilities in TA-03 are 40 or more years old. Tri-laboratory line item SCC and NISC funding will initiate the Core Planning Area revitalization efforts. Third party financing is being sought for building the administrative and specialized office space needed in TA-03.

**2. Pajarito Corridor West Planning Area:** Focus in and around TA-55 is on the proposed “nuclear campus” concept with shared security elements to meet the ongoing stockpile management and stewardship missions. Security costs, aging facilities, and the need to move SNM activities out of the CMR Building in TA-03, point to TA-55 as the next area for revitalization. TA-48 and TA-35 facilities would be part of this nuclear campus. Both technical areas need significant revitalization and modification to meet current and future mission requirements. The replacement CMR facility will seek LI monies. Other LI and GPP funds may be sought to refurbish facilities in the area.

**3. Experimental Engineering Planning Area:** Focus is on the areas primarily occupied by ESA Division and could include some DX Division operations as well. This area serves the engineering and administrative needs of the Advanced Hydrotest Facility (AHF) missions as set forth in the DOE laboratories integrated strategy. The facilities in this area are 40 to 50 years old and have evolved in such a manner that prevents the facility and infrastructure systems from adequately meeting the current needs of the work in the area. Some of this area may be refurbished by the new DOE integrated facilities strategy, but most revitalization is likely to come from facility operation and program monies using GPP monies.

**4. LANSCE Planning Area:** Focus is on the multimission needs of this area and on the support of the AHF. The majority of this area’s revitalization funding may come as part of, and in support of, the DOE integrated laboratories strategy.

**5. Other Sites:** Other sites to be determined include upgrades to the explosives firing sites, the waste management sites, and other experimental sites.