

**CITIZENS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO RADIOACTIVE DUMPING
CONCERNED CITIZENS FOR NUCLEAR SAFETY
LOS ALAMOS STUDY GROUP**

For Immediate Release Monday, March 17, 1997

**Groups Notify DOE of Intent To Reopen Landmark Lawsuit,
Charge DOE's Environmental Analyses of New Bomb
Facilities are Grossly Deficient or Non-Existent**

Contact: Janet Greenwald, CARD, 505-266-2663

Jay Coghlan, CCNS, 505-986-1973

Greg Mello, LASG, 505-982-7747

Three New Mexico citizens' organizations are joining more than two dozen organizations nationwide in formally notifying Secretary Pena of their intent to reopen a 1989 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lawsuit that forced the Department of Energy (DOE) to conduct environmental analyses of its plans to rebuild and clean up the U.S. nuclear weapons complex. The groups charge that the agency has failed to comply with the terms of the Federal Court stipulation that ended the earlier case.

The groups, representing communities near nuclear weapons sites across the nation, charge that DOE's programmatic environmental impact statements (PEISs), required under the 1990 agreement, are either grossly defective, inconsistent, or non-existent.

According to the groups, DOE's "Stockpile Stewardship and Management" (SS&M) PEIS fails to properly evaluate alternatives to the agency's plan to spend \$40 billion over the next decade on nuclear weapons research and production and entirely excludes analysis of many already-constructed facilities. Those facilities include plutonium storage, processing, and production facilities at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), as well as advanced nuclear weapon design facilities like the Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrotest (DARHT) Facility at which DOE plans to detonate mock nuclear weapons in giant steel bottles using a special isotope of plutonium to avoid a nuclear explosion. DARHT, now under construction, was delayed over a year by a successful legal challenge brought by CCNS and LASG.

In settling the 1989 case, DOE promised to conduct two PEISs. One was to cover plans to construct new nuclear weapons R&D facilities and production plants and consolidate existing facilities; the other was to focus on environmental issues stemming from radioactive and chemical contamination, such as waste management and clean-up programs. The promised PEIS on Environmental Remediation, a program expected to cost between \$100 and \$300 billion, was never conducted. DOE's Draft Waste Management PEIS, released in 1995, has been widely criticized for relying on inaccurate, if not fraudulent, data. Its data do not match current DOE plans and its status is unclear.

Jay Coghlan of CCNS noted, "Between 1995 and now the budget for nuclear weapons programs at Los Alamos has gone up by 46% while environmental restoration has gone down

62%. Given the choice, would the taxpaying public choose to fund pork-barrel nuclear weapons programs producing more nuclear waste or would it choose clean-up programs protecting the environment and future generations? Federal decision-makers are already choosing more nuclear weapons. Through this legal action we are forcing the issue of nuclear weapons versus clean-up on the responsible government officials. We think taxpayers are due the peace dividend they paid for long ago."

Greg Mello of LASG adds: "What is really shocking is that only a small portion of LANL's enormously expensive, dangerous, and environmentally-destructive program is actually necessary to maintain the vast U.S. arsenal of 10,000 nuclear weapons. Most of it is simply gold-plated makework. With this lawsuit we are issuing a clarion call: '*Wake up, New Mexico!*' We are trying to stop LANL's plans to expand its nuclear dump, to produce plutonium "pits" (thermonuclear "triggers"), and to process and store more than 10 tons of plutonium in Lab buildings located dangerously close to, if not directly on top of, an active earthquake fault. What is more, this entire program violates long-term U.S. treaty obligations, and in the process erodes real national security."

Janet Greenwald of CARD emphasizes that, "There is no safe means of disposal for the radioactive waste that will be generated by this unnecessary program, which would make LANL's facilities the only producers of transuranic waste in the U.S. The stated plan to ship the waste to WIPP is speculative, as that facility has yet to be approved and may well be found to be unusable. Until the waste disposal problem is solved, the wisest course is to cease production of transuranic wastes."

Following the ten-day notice period required by the 1990 settlement, the groups will ask Federal District Court Judge Stanley Sporkin to block planned DOE actions such as construction of the controversial National Ignition Facility (NIF), upgrade of LANL's plutonium facilities to handle the production of thermonuclear weapons "pits," and other facilities until the terms of the 1990 settlement are properly implemented.

The groups listed in the "Notice of Intent to Enforce Stipulation" delivered to Secretary Pena include: Atomic Mirror, Bay Area Nuclear Waste Coalition, Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping, Citizens Opposed to a Polluted Environment, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, East Bay Peace Action, Friends of the Earth, Hayward Area Peace and Justice Fellowship, Lane County American Peace Test, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, Livermore Conversion Project, Los Alamos Study Group, Nashville Peace Action, Natural Resources Defense Council, Neighbors in Need, Nevada Desert Experience, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance, Peace Farm of Texas, Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center, San Jose Peace Center, Seattle Women Act for Peace/Women Strike for Peace, Shundahai Network, Sonoma County Center for Peace and Justice, Tri-Valley CARES, Western States Legal Foundation, Women Concerned/Utah United, and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

ENDS

1990 Stipulation and "Notice to Enforce Stipulation" available on request.

Los Alamos Study Group

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release May 14, 1997

Contact: Greg Mello or Todd Macon (at phone number below)

LANL PLAN TO DETONATE PLUTONIUM POSES RISKS TO REGION

1970 LANL MEMO CITES HAZARD TO LOS ALAMOS RESIDENTS

The Study Group today announced results of their analysis of the effects of an accidental plutonium explosion at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). The accident scenario we examined leads to widespread plutonium contamination, economic impact, and fatal cancers. The postulated accident results from the planned use of plutonium in above-ground experimental detonations at LANL's so-called "hydrotesting" facilities--DARHT (the Dual-Axis Hydrotest Facility, now under construction) and/or PHERMEX (an older facility with the same purpose, already in use).

"What has not been adequately recognized up to now is that these activities could have economic fallout prior to any accident," says the Study Group's Mello, the engineer who conducted the analysis. The *threat* of accident alone--realistic, given the history of accidents at LANL, Rocky Flats, and elsewhere--could affect the attractiveness of our region as a tourism, business, and residential destination."

The accident analyzed is unlikely but possible. In 1970, long before the current planned "shots," LANL itself undertook an analysis of what could happen. What the Lab found was disturbing enough to cause LANL (then LASL), to "reevaluate" the need for the program (the 1970 technical memo is available upon request). LANL and DOE recently updated the earlier analysis, using better methodology, but the details are in a classified section of the DARHT Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) has also been evaluating the risk and hazard from such an accident. Statements from LANL that this accident is not "credible" are belied by all this study, as well as by common sense.

This accident is only one scenario, however, among many. LANL is embarked on a dramatic increase in its storage, transportation, processing, fabrication, and explosive testing of plutonium and plutonium weapon components that greatly increase the variety and likelihood of possible accidents. We believe that, in addition to routine nuclear waste production and increased worker exposures, accidents, small or large, are not at all unlikely in the long run. Rocky Flats, which conducted some of these activities in the past, was subject to hundreds of fires.

LANL has recently been the subject of scathing safety reviews by DOE and internal investigators following serious accidents. The Study Group suggests that these investigation results support aspects of what is known as "normal accident theory," which postulates that organizational and sociological factors place an upper limit on the safety that can be achieved by real institutions that use complex and dangerous technologies, especially in a democratic society.

Los Alamos Study Group

MEDIA ALERT

For Immediate Release June 6th, 1997

Contact: Cathie Sullivan (982-7144) or Greg Mello (982-7747)

Free Speech Activists Return To LANL's Bradbury Museum

Supporters of the Los Alamos Study Group anticipate arrest or citation by Los Alamos National Laboratory security forces at Bradbury Science Museum when they peacefully begin handing out anti-nuclear leaflets to Museum visitors at 1 pm Saturday afternoon. The leafleting will be similar to an April 19 incident which resulted in the arrest of two other Study Group members for leafleting at the same location. LANL officials have told the Study Group that anyone who leaflets will be arrested.

Cathie Sullivan, arrested on April 19th along with Greg Mello, said the current leafleting, is intended to try to focus attention on the free speech issue at the Museum. Although the two were arrested well over a month ago and are out on \$300 bail, no date has been scheduled for their trial. According to Mello, "This delay defers our leafleting for no good reason and prevents us from offering visitors an alternative to the Museum's pro-nuclear propaganda. Leafleting at the Museum is a free speech activity protected by the United States Constitution."

The Bradbury Science Museum, part of the Laboratory's public relations effort, has an annual budget of almost 1 million dollars and claims 130,000 visitors per year. "We intend to pursue this issue until citizens presenting their opinions on nuclear weapons are welcome at the Bradbury," said Sullivan.

At the last minute, LANL has offered "mediation" if leafleting is postponed, proposing the DOE Office of Dispute Resolution as a neutral forum, and hinting that charges against Sullivan and Mello might be dropped if attempts to leaflet were halted. Mello and Sullivan have told the Lab that constitutional rights are not subject to mediation by the DOE or anyone, and that it is the Laboratory, not they, who have broken the law.

****ENDS****

Los Alamos Study Group

PRESS RELEASE

June 24, 1997

Contact: Greg Mello

On Tuesday, June 23, the Department of Energy rejected a compromise proposal to settle the suit filed on May 2, 1997, by the Natural Resources Defense Council and 38 other groups from across the nation in Federal District Court of Washington, D. C., seeking to enjoin the DOE from pursuing certain elements of their Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program until an adequate environmental assessment is completed. Los Alamos Study Group is among the plaintiffs in the suit.

The negotiations, ordered by Judge Stanley Sporkin on June 17, 1997, in an effort to reach an out-of-court settlement, attempted to reach an agreement that would remove the need for a preliminary injunction to stay construction of the National Ignition Facility at Livermore, CA, and the Pit Production Facility at Los Alamos, NM. The plaintiffs challenge these and other facilities in the DOE complex on the grounds that they are being constructed without adequate environmental impact assessment, as required by the National Environmental Protection Act.

The parties return before Judge Stanley H. Sporkin today at 4:00 EDT.

END

Los Alamos Study Group

Press Release

July 10, 1997
For Immediate Release

Contacts: Greg Mello or Todd Macon
(505)982-7747

Group Implores Secretary Peña to Investigate Leafleting Arrests at Los Alamos National Laboratory

The Los Alamos Study Group, a Santa Fe-based nuclear watchdog organization, has written Secretary of Energy Federico Peña asking him to investigate the arrest of nine of its members and supporters for attempting to distribute leaflets--including the Bill of Rights--outside Los Alamos' Bradbury Science Museum. The arrestees were attempting to compensate for the museum's lack of an exhibit portraying the social, ethical, and environmental consequences of nuclear weapons.

No trial date has been set.

The letter was also sent to New Mexican Senators Pete Domenici and Jeff Bingaman, Congressman Bill Redmond, and Bradbury Museum Director John Rhoades.

*****ENDS*****

Two Pages Follow

**Los Alamos Study Group
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety**

Press Release

August 11, 1997

Contact: Jay Coghlin (CCNS 982-5611) or Todd Macon (LASG 982-7747)

**STATEMENT OF PLAINTIFFS IN REACTION TO THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
DECISION IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL LAWSUIT AGAINST U.S. NUCLEAR WEAPONS
PROGRAMS**

Judge Sporkin granted our motion in part and denied it in part. We are pleased that he recognized the legitimacy of plaintiffs' concerns about the environmental, health and safety risks of the Stockpile Stewardship & Management (SS&M) program. Based on these concerns, he ordered the Department of Energy to disclose more information about its plutonium pit remanufacturing plans and the National Ignition Facility, as well as alternatives to the SS&M program.

However, we regret that Judge Sporkin did not issue a preliminary injunction, which would have immediately suspended these activities pending resolution of the case. The case will now proceed to a full airing of the issues on the merits. We shall continue to oppose the wasteful, provocative and environmentally dangerous Stockpile Stewardship & Management program in every possible venue.

****Ends****

Los Alamos Study Group

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release 9/25/97
Contacts: Greg Mello (982-7747, 988-3133, 820-7822)
Cathie Sullivan (982-7144)

Lab Drops Charges Against Leafletters As First Amendment Trial Approaches

Today the Santa Fe County District Attorney Henry Valdez dropped all charges against nine leafletters arrested in April and June for distributing the Bill of Rights and educational literature outside Los Alamos Lab's Bradbury Museum. All nine had been released on bail (\$300 each) pending their September 30 trial before a Los Alamos magistrate judge. The group was represented *pro bono* by attorneys John Boyd and John Cline of the Friedmann, Boyd, and Daniels firm in Albuquerque, well-known for its civil rights work.

"We were surprised that the Laboratory arrested us, since U.S. law clearly provides for leafleting in situations like ours. We have long suspected that they no intention of actually appearing in court to defend their actions," said Study Group Director and arrestee Greg Mello.

The group's court date was set just two weeks before the statutory limit for prosecution of such cases. Because of the arrests, the Study Group's leafletting project was effectively stopped for five months.

"We told the Lab we could not negotiate regarding other Museum issues while the threat of a jail sentence and fine hung over our heads," said Study Group board member and arrestee Cathie Sullivan, and are very pleased that charges have been dropped."

ENDS

To: Keith Easthouse, John Fleck, Ian Hoffman, Steven Shankland, Larry Spohn

From: Greg Mello

For immediate release Tuesday, October 28, 1997

For further information: Barbara Finamore, NRDC (202) 289-2371
Bob Schaeffer, MPN (617) 489-0461
Jay Coghlan, CCNS (505) 986-1973
Greg Mello, LASG (505) 982-7747

**ENERGY DEPT. AGREES TO SUPPLEMENT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS
OF NATIONAL IGNITION FACILITY (NIF)
AFTER DISCOVERY OF WASTE DUMP UNDER CONSTRUCTION SITE;
COURT INVITES "CONTEMPT MOTION" ON LACK OF DOE CLEAN-UP REVIEW**

To settle a legal action brought by a coalition of 39 environmental and peace groups, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) agreed in federal court to prepare a supplement to its Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (SSM PEIS), which will evaluate the impacts of continuing to construct and operate the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. At the same time, Federal District Court Judge Stanley Sporkin urged plaintiffs to file an "order to show cause" why DOE should not be held in contempt and subject to sanctions for its failure to honor a prior commitment to complete a PEIS on clean-up standards and intersite transportation of wastes from its environmental restoration program.

In the NIF case, plaintiffs claimed DOE had failed to adequately analyze and disclose the risks of building the facility in an area that may contain buried hazardous, toxic or radioactive wastes. Last month NIF construction workers unearthed more than 100 microwave-sized capacitors contaminated with toxic polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and 75 corroded waste drums marked "radioactive." Approximately 784 tons of soil contaminated with PCBs, chromium, mercury, molybdenum, and other toxic chemicals were removed from the site.

The Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is already on the Superfund list of the country's most contaminated sites. According to DOE, the three-story deep pit being dug for NIF will come within five feet of a contaminated groundwater aquifer.

The agreement, which was approved and signed by Judge Sporkin, requires DOE to review documents and interview employees regarding possible contamination at the site and, if necessary, conduct additional investigations using such technologies as ground penetrating radar, soil borings and groundwater monitoring wells. DOE will then prepare and circulate for public review and comment a supplement to the SSM PEIS "which evaluates the reasonably foreseeable significant adverse environmental impacts of continuing to construct and of operating NIF at LLNL with respect to any potential or confirmed contamination by hazardous, toxic and/or radioactive materials or contaminated groundwater."

"This agreement demonstrates that DOE ignored significant environmental hazards in its rush to build the NIF," explained Marylia Kelley of Tri-Valley Citizens Against a Radioactive Environment in Livermore. "Now we can expect a more thorough review of this unnecessary

facility's true threat to workers, neighbors and the surrounding environment."

On the larger issue, Barbara Finamore, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) attorney who represents the plaintiffs, explained, "DOE claims that it does not have to complete a PEIS on its environmental clean-up program, but can merely address it on a site-by-site basis. We have argued that, at a minimum, the issues of intersite transport and clean-up standards must be analyzed on a programmatic basis under the National Environmental Policy Act. Clearly Judge Sporkin found our arguments persuasive, and told DOE that such a review would benefit the nation by avoiding problems such as those that occurred at NIF."

In a 1990 stipulation signed by Judge Sporkin, DOE had agreed to complete a PEIS on its environmental restoration and waste management programs. To date, only the waste management PEIS has been issued.

Judge Sporkin set December 18, 1997 as the date for plaintiffs to file their "order to show cause" and scheduled a hearing on January 20, 1998.

ENDS

Los Alamos Study Group

PRESS ADVISORY

December 4, 1997

Bottomless "Pits": The Cost of Establishing Plutonium Manufacturing at Los Alamos Has Tripled

Work Now To Include Uranium Processing, Small-Scale Manufacture of *All* H-Bomb Parts

New Mexico Solidifies Its Dominance In Weapons of Mass Destruction

Contact: Greg Mello at 505-982-7747

SANTA FE--The estimated initial cost of producing plutonium "pits," the fissile component in the initial or "primary" stage of each U.S. thermonuclear weapon, has at least tripled in the last 13 months.

This new mission will establish at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) a smaller version of the capability that existed until 1989 at the Rocky Flats Plant near Denver. That plant was closed after a history of fires, accidents, and environmental violations.

While cost overruns are commonplace in defense contracting, this particular escalation is breathtaking, especially given that work on the controversial project has barely begun. Cost estimates that in retrospect appear "low-balled" may have made it easier for the Department of Energy, which runs the Lab, to choose LANL for the pit manufacturing mission over the Savannah River Site (SRS) in South Carolina.

Another contributing factor in the rise may be the rapid escalation in overall stockpile stewardship and management (SS&M) program cost, which rose 6% from FY97 to FY98 and is expected to rise an additional 9% next year as a result of negotiations between the White House and the Senate over the cost of ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Cost escalation aside, there is no unclassified evidence that the project need begin before 2005, if it is needed at all, in order to maintain all the weapons in the U.S. arsenal.

One reason for the cost escalation appears to be LANL's acquisition of new manufacturing capability, not just for pits but for *all* the nuclear components of nuclear weapons, a closely-guarded secret until today. The capability to make a complete "physics package," as nuclear weapons innards are euphemistically called, duplicates the work of the Y-12 plant in Tennessee. Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California will also duplicate this work, as well as provide back-up pit prototyping capability.

The U.S. now has about 12,000 nuclear weapons, and plans to retain more than 9,000 indefinitely, about half of which cannot be deployed under the START II treaty.

In addition, there are more than 10,000 extra plutonium pits in storage at the Pantex Plant in Texas, many of which can be recycled into stockpile weapons if needed.

LANL Nuclear Materials Program Director Paul Cunningham has repeatedly told the

Study Group that there are no known aging mechanisms that could affect the reliability of well-made stockpiled pits for the first several decades after manufacture.

"Why are we doing this?" asked Study Group Director Greg Mello. "Just this week, Boris Yeltsin offered to dismantle one-third of the Russian arsenal. The U.S. will not be abiding by its commitments in the Nonproliferation Treaty if it does not first negotiate deep cuts in its arsenal, and then in due course end our dependence on weapons of mass destruction altogether. We cannot keep breaking our treaty commitments forever without some very serious consequences. In any case, no one has ever explained to us why this pit-making capacity is needed now."

Current facilities at Los Alamos can make about 20 pits/year.

Background

In July of 1996, DOE, using information provided by LANL, estimated that the total cost to increase LANL's pit manufacturing capacity from 20 to 50 pits/year (with a "sprint" capacity of 80 pits/yr), was \$310 million (M).¹

In February of 1997, DOE estimated that the project designed to create this new capacity, called the "Capability Maintenance and Improvement Project" (CMIP), would cost \$601 M.²

In April, 1997, LANL issued a report estimating a total capital cost for the pit manufacturing upgrades of \$749M.³

In August, 1997, DOE sent a report to Congress which gave a total cost of \$1,084.4 for its "baseline" pit production plan, including the operating costs required to bring the new equipment on line.⁴ The term "baseline" is necessary because this report says DOE also has a "contingency" plan to provide for the manufacture of up to 500 pits annually.

The real cost, however, of the pit production facilities is likely to be higher than \$1.1 billion, for two reasons.

First, the \$1.1 billion does not include all the projects necessary for the pit production mission--projects which are, either wholly or in part, not otherwise required. Inclusion of these projects appears to push the total cost of the pit production upgrades to the vicinity of \$1.4 billion. These include:

- Phase II of the CMR Building Upgrades (current cost, \$122.5M plus about a \$29M share of so-called "other project costs"; Congress has put this project on hold pending

¹ *Analysis of Stockpile Management Alternatives*, USDOE Albuquerque Operations Office, July 1996, p. 8-1.

² *FY1998 Congressional Budget Request (CBR)*, USDOE, Vol. I, p. 211.

³ "Alternatives for Increasing the Nuclear Materials Processing Space at Los Alamos for Future Missions," LANL-UR-97-1000, April 25, 1997, p. 37.

⁴ "Report on Plutonium Pit Production and Remanufacturing Plans," Secretary of Energy, July 1997 (submitted to Congress on August 18, 1997).

- investigation of spending overruns and/or improprieties in Phase I);⁵
- The Upgrade of the Nuclear Materials Storage Facility (NMSF) (current cost, \$56.7M);⁶
- The Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility (current cost, \$38M);⁷ and
- A variety of smaller new capital projects, facility upgrades, and infrastructure upgrades, which may or may not be included in DOE's \$1.1 billion figure.⁸

The second reason the pit-production-related construction is likely to cost more than \$1.1 billion is that all this construction will not be completed until 2005. It is very unusual for DOE or LANL to complete a major construction project "on budget," especially one that lasts for so many years.

There appear to be two components of the observed cost escalation. One is that individual projects are escalating in cost.

- The CMR Upgrade was estimated by DOE in March of 1993 to cost \$195M for all three phases of the project.⁹ Today, the first two phases alone are expected to cost \$224M, approximately twice the original cost.
- The "Nonnuclear Reconfiguration Project" at LANL, much of which is devoted to pit manufacturing work, was estimated by DOE in 1995 to cost \$23M (including both pit- and non-pit-related projects).¹⁰ By early 1997, the same activities were estimated to cost \$32M.¹¹ By August of 1997, however, the DOE's report to Congress on establishing pit production shows \$118M for "nonnuclear" capabilities for the years FY1996-FY2003, at least five times the original cost. The escalation factor is even higher if one assumes that these costs do not include the non-pit-related portions of the "nonnuclear" mission (i.e. detonators and neutron generators), which were included in the earlier estimates.
- The cost of the NMSF project has likewise skyrocketed, from an estimated \$10M in 1992¹² to \$57M today--not counting \$19M (in 1987 dollars) sunk into the original facility, which was designed so incompetently that it could not be used without complete

⁵ *FY1998 Congressional Budget Request*, USDOE, pp. 286-293.

⁶ *FY1998 Congressional Budget Request*, USDOE, pp. 254-259.

⁷ *LANL Capital Assets Management Process [CAMP] 98*, p. A-85.

⁸ A list of pit-related projects totalling \$1.3 billion is available from the Study Group.

⁹ *CMR Upgrades Project--Project Execution Plan*, LANL, September 1995, Attachment E.

¹⁰ *FY1995 Congressional Budget Request*, USDOE, pp. 94-96.

¹¹ *FY1998 Congressional Budget Request*, Vol. I, USDOE, pp. 329-331.

¹² Estimate of June 22, 1992 by the nine-member NMSF Task Group of LANL managers.

reconstruction.

- Although not directly part of the pit production mission, the Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrotest (DARHT) facility has increased in cost from \$53M (1993)¹³ to at least \$250M today.¹⁴

We believe a second reason costs have risen is that it has not been politically expedient to include all the necessary projects in one budget up to now. Until the Record of Decision (ROD) on the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (SS&M PEIS) and subsequent DOE and congressional commitments, LANL had to prove that it could make pits better and cheaper than the Savannah River Site.

Neither, we believe, was it convenient to include in the SS&M PEIS the complete scope of work involved in the upgrades, including the waste-producing demolition and reconstruction, lest the perceived environmental impact grow too large, or troubling questions arise regarding the scope of the new mission.

As it turns out, the scope of LANL's new manufacturing mission is not confined to pits, neutron generators, and detonators. In July, 1996--just as DOE was publishing its first, lowest estimate of pit production costs, based on LANL submittals--LANL issued a nuclear facilities "master plan" based on an expansion of its nuclear manufacturing mission--including *but not limited to* pit manufacture. The new mission includes making *all* the parts of thermonuclear "secondaries" and "radiation cases," involving a variety of processing and fabrication steps not just for plutonium but for uranium and other components as well.¹⁵ LANL describes this

¹³ *FY1993 Congressional Budget Request, Vol. I*, USDOE, pp. 113-115

¹⁴ Funding for DARHT is now fragmented, and includes: the facility itself, as if both axes were identical (\$199.2M *FY1998 CBR*); additional funding for redesign of second axis (anything up to \$100M; *LANL Weapons Insider*, October 1996, p. 2); funding for the containment facilities (a few tens of millions, reference not available as of this writing). A design contract worth \$43 million has been offered Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory to assist with the design of the second axis (*Oakland Tribune*, 12/3/97, p. A-1); it is not clear to what extent, if any, these design costs are included in previous budgeted amounts.

¹⁵ *Los Alamos National Laboratory Nuclear Facilities Master Plan for Stockpile Stewardship and Management Support*, July 1996; see p. 4-1. This document is key to understanding the diversity of nuclear materials missions in existence and planned for LANL.

See also "Uranium Fab and Process Capability, Project Description," at <http://www/doe.gov/md/data/42080.html>.

For the most definitive and recent statement of a DOE mandate for this broad mission, see "AL Program Guidance for the FY98-FY00 Los Alamos National Laboratory Core Stockpile Management Program," October 3, 1997, p. 3, under "major objectives:"

Maintain a laboratory-based nuclear weapons production competence. This requires that the nuclear laboratories [plural in original] will capture and maintain expertise and competency in all the processes and technologies required to build

mission as "a major redirection at LANL."¹⁶

From the documents cited today and from many other documents, it is clear that the dominant driver in these and other new missions at LANL is the acquisition of capability to "modify" existing, and design new, weapons under a CTBT. Once safely ensconced in the laboratories-*cum*-production plants, new weapon development can be hidden from public, and indeed congressional, review by inclusion in broad "core" stewardship and management programs.

The strategy for complete "physics package" manufacture had been a nascent part of LANL's plans since its January, 1993 *Strategic Plan*, although it had never been made public or included in any public environmental analysis, and the extent to which its hopes had been fulfilled by DOE remained unclear.¹⁷

The DOE maintains a large capacity to make secondaries and other uranium components at the large Y-12 facility in Tennessee.

All documents cited are available from the Study Group; further references available upon request. All costs are in current (i.e. then-year) dollars.

ENDS

a complete physics package.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 4-6.

¹⁷ See, for example, "The Los Alamos Alternative: Meeting the Challenges of Future Stockpile Stewardship by Integrating Design, Engineering, and Manufacturing Capabilities at the Laboratory," Larry Austin, et. al., LANL, LA-UR 95-2793.