nuclear watch new mexico

National Nuclear Security Administration 2015 Budget Request

Nuclear Weapons Budget Surpasses Cold War Record
Bomb with New Military Capabilities up 20%
Dismantlements Cut By Nearly Half
Nonproliferation Programs Down 21%, Cleanup Funding Flat
Nuclear Facility Safety Potentially Compromised

The Obama Administration has finally released its detailed budget for fiscal year 2015, which starts October 1. By law the president's proposed budget is required to be released not later than the first Monday of February. [1]

Contrary to President Obama's rhetoric about a future world free of nuclear weapons, most famously expressed in his April 2009 speech in Prague, the President is asking for a 7% increase for nuclear weapons research and production programs under the Department of Energy's semi-autonomous National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). [2] NNSA's "Total Weapons Activities" are slated to rise to $8.3 billion in FY 2015, and to $9.7 billion by FY 2019, 24% above this current fiscal year 2014.

The Obama Administration asserts that its FY 2015 budget request meets the two-year budget agreement reached with Congress in last December's *Bipartisan Budget Act*. However, the Administration is also proposing a $56 billion Opportunity, Growth and Security Initiative (OGSI), that it claims is fully paid for through "a balanced package of tax loophole closers and spending reforms." [3] OGSI will be split evenly between defense and non-defense spending, out of which $504 million will go to NNSA nuclear weapons programs "to accelerate modernization and maintenance of nuclear facilities" and $96 million to nonproliferation programs. [4] With that, Obama's FY 2015 budget request sets a new record for Department of Energy nuclear weapons spending, even exceeding the Cold War high point in 1985 under President Reagan's military buildup. [5]

Of particular interest is the hands-on nuclear weapons work in the budget category "Directed Stockpile Work," increased by $305 million (or 12.5% above FY 2014), whose overwhelming focus is Life Extension Programs (LEPs). President Obama wants $634 million (+20%) for the B61 nuclear bomb LEP, which will transform it into the world's first nuclear "smart" bomb, for delivery by future super-stealthy aircraft. [6] This Life Extension Program has already exploded in costs from an originally estimated $4 billion to more than $10 billion. Each bomb will end up costing more than twice its weight in gold.

Given budget caps, the Obama Administration is paying for increased funding for programs that will extend the service lives of existing nuclear weapons for decades, while giving them new military capabilities, while robbing from virtually all other programs. Increased nuclear weapons funding will be paid for off the back of nonproliferation and dismantlement programs, cut 21% and 45% respectively; by keeping cleanup funding flat, even as cost estimates of genuine cleanup rise; and potentially cutting funding for nuclear facility safety when "the decrease is to reduce base operational costs and funds higher NNSA priorities." [7] NNSA has made explicit what its higher priorities are: The B61 and subsequent Life Extension Programs.

National Nuclear Security Administration FY 2015 Budget Request

(All numbers in thousands of US dollars)

Nuclear Weapons Programs[8]	*FY 2013 Enacted*	*FY 2014 Enacted*	*FY2015 Request*	*FY14-FY15 ±%*
NNSA Total Weapons Activities	6,966,855	7,781,000	**8,314,902**	6.9%
Opportunity, Security and Growth Initiative			**504,000**	
Total - - Exceeds Cold War High			**8,818,902**	
NNSA Total Weapons Activities	**6,966,855**	**7,781,000**	**8,314,902**	**6.9%**
Directed Stockpile Work	**1,930,057**	**2,442,033**	**2,746,604**	**12.5%**
B61 Life Extension Program[9]	324,320	537,044	643,000	19.7%
W76 Life Extension Program	218,286	248,454	259,168	4.3%
W78/88-1 Life Extension Program[10]	-	38,000	0	-100.0%
W88 ALT 370	-	169,487	165,400	-2.4%
Cruise Missle Warhead Life Extension Program[11]	-	-	9,418	-
Stockpile systems[12]	**511,335**	**454,488**	**531,107**	**16.9%**
B61 Stockpile Systems	60,222	83,536	109,615	31.2%
W76 Stockpile Systems	46,713	47,187	45,728	-3.1%
W78 Stockpile Systems	94,151	54,381	62,703	15.3%
W80 Stockpile Systems	43,728	50,330	70,610	40.3%
B83 Stockpile Systems	61,410	54,948	63,136	14.9%
W87 Stockpile Systems	72,336	101,506	91,255	-10.1%
W88 Stockpile Systems	132,775	62,600	88,060	40.7%
Weapons Dismantlement and Disposition[13]	**40,736**	**54,264**	**30,008**	**-44.7%**
Stockpile Services	**835,380**	**940,296**	**1,108,503**	**17.9%**
Plutonium Sustainment[14]	123,807	125,048	144,575	15.6%
Tritium Readiness	59,904	80,000	140,053	75.1%
Campaigns	**1,531,188**	**1,658,327**	**1,841,347**	**11.0%**
Science Campaign	**321,220**	**369,723**	**456,430**	**23.5%**
Advanced Certification	39,922	58,747	**58,747**	0.0%
Primary Assessment Technologies	86,212	92,000	112,000	21.7%
Dynamic Materials Properties[15]	89,301	104,000	117,999	13.5%
Advanced Radiography[16]	27,129	29,509	79,340	168.9%
Secondary Assessment Technologies	78,656	85,467	88,344	3.4%
Engineering Campaign	**124,414**	**149,911**	**136,005**	**-9.3%**
Enhanced Surety	40,080	51,771	52,003	0.4%
Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition & High Yield Campaign	**456,676**	**513,957**	**512,895**	**-0.2%**
Ignition	83,789	80,245	77,994	-2.8%
Support of Other Stockpile Programs[17]	15,503	15,001	23,598	57.3%
Diagnostics, Cryogenics and Experimental Support	82,263	59,897	61,297	2.3%
Facility Ops and Target Production (NIF, OMEGA, & Z)	262,092	345,592	335,882	-2.8%
Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign	**513,567**	**569,329**	**610,108**	**7.2%**
Readiness Campaign[18]	**115,311**	**55,407**	**125,909**	**127.2%**

(All numbers in thousands of US dollars)

NNSA Total Weapons Activities (continued)	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY2015 Request	FY14-FY15 +%
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF)	**2,089,417**	**2,067,425**	**2,055,521**	**-0.6%**
Operations of Facilities[19]	**1,422,709**	**984,455**	**896,000**	**-9.9%**
Kansas City Plant (KCP) Total	155,506	135,834	125,000	-8.7%
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	165,142	77,287	71,000	-8.9%
Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)	368,991	213,707	198,000	-7.9%
Los Alamos Pueblo Project[20]	~ 800	~ 800	~ 800	0.0%
Nevada National Security Site	112,132	100,929	89,000	-13.4%
Pantex	163,446	81,420	75,000	-8.6%
Sandia National Laboratory	143,458	115,000	106,000	-8.5%
Savannah River Site	103,925	90,236	81,000	-11.4%
Y-12 National Security Complex	210,109	170,042	151,000	-12.6%
Program Readiness[21]	109,044	67,259	136,700	50.8%
Material Recycle and Recovery	109,895	125,000	138,900	10.0%
Maintenance and Repair of Facilities	0	227,591	205,000	-11.0%
Construction Projects	**398,976**	**442,028**	**417,733**	**-5.5%**
LANL TRU Waste Facilities	25,226	30,315	10,518	-65.3%
LANL TA-55 Reinvestment Phase II	9,277	32,462	12,125	-62.6%
LANL TA-55 Reinvestment Phase III[22]	500	4,000	19,062	376.6%
LANL Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility	1,640	47,293	3,000	-93.7%
LANL TRU Liquid Waste Facility[23]	-	12,244	15,654	27.9%
Y-12 Uranium Processing Facility[24]	312,783	309,000	335,000	8.4%
LANL Environmental Testing Facilities ARMAG Upgrade[25]	-	-	3,000	-
LANL CMRR-Nuclear Facility[26]	0	0	0	0.0%
Secure Transportation Asset	**201,533**	**210,000**	**233,813**	**11.3%**
Nuclear Counterterrorism Incident Response	**220,855**	**221,243**	**166,845**	**-24.6%**
Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs	**0**	**0**	**76,901**	**-**
Site Stewardship	**69,496**	**87,326**	**82,449**	**-5.6%**
Defense Nuclear Security	**653,463**	**664,981**	**618,123**	**-7.0%**
IT & Cybersecurity (NNSA CIO Activities in FY 2013)	**151,184**	**145,068**	**179,646**	**23.8%**
Legacy Contractor Pensions	**170,191**	**279,597**	**307,058**	**9.8%**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,237,420**	**1,954,000**	**1,555,156**	**-20.4%**
Global Threat Reduction Initiative	**462,892**	**442,102**	**333,488**	**-24.6%**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D	**420,509**	**398,838**	**360,808**	**-9.5%**
Nonproliferation and International Security	**143,106**	**128,675**	**141,359**	**9.9%**
Int. Nuclear Materials Protection and Cooperation	**527,925**	**419,625**	**305,467**	**-27.2%**
Fissile Materials Disposition	**663,754**	**585,300**	**311,125**	**-46.8%**
MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility at the Savannah River Site[27]	400,990	402,743	196,000	-51.3%
Waste Solidification Building	48,404	0	5,125	-
Uranium Disposition	23,958	25,000	25,000	0.0%
Legacy Contractor Pensions	**51,438**	**116,566**	**102,909**	**-11.7%**
Total, Naval Reactors[28]	**994,118**	**1,095,000**	**1,377,100**	**25.8%**
Total, Federal Salaries and Expenses[29]	**377,457**	**377,000**	**410,842**	**9.0%**
Total, NNSA	**10,575,789**	**11,207,000**	**11,658,000**	**4.0%**

Note: Columns do not add up to totals because not all budget subcategories are included here, including Use of Prior Year Balances

(All numbers in thousands of US dollars)

Other Department of Energy Programs	*FY 2013 Enacted*	*FY 2014 Enacted*	*FY2015 Request*	*FY14-FY15 +%*
DOE Defense Environmental Cleanup	**4,627,054**	**5,000,000**	**5,327,538**	**6.6%**
DOE Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	**1,691,757**	**1,900,641**	**2,316,749**	**21.9%**
DOE Nuclear Energy	**708,429**	**888,376**	**863,386**	**-2.8%**
DOE Science	**4,681,195**	**5,066,372**	**5,111,155**	**0.9%**

Source: http://energy.gov/cfo/downloads/fy-2015-budget-justification

Five-Year Projection NNSA Nuclear Weapons Activities

(in billions of dollars)

	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Weapons Activities Total Including DoD Funds	8.32	8.91	9.26	9.48	9.69
Department of Defense Support for Weapons Activities	0	1.13	1.13	1.27	1.29

Source: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2015/assets/doe.pdf, pg. 383

Projected Total NNSA Funding Levels

(Budget Authority in billions of dollars)

year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2015-2019	2015-2024
NNSA	10.5	11.0	10.6	11.2	11.7	10.8	11.1	11.3	11.5	11.8	12.1	12.4	12.7	13.0	56.4	118.3

http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2015/assets/tables.pdf, Table S-1 Pg. 203

(All numbers in thousands of US dollars)

NNSA Site Tables	*FY 2013 Current*	*FY 2014 Enacted*	*FY2015 Request*	*FY13-FY14 +%*
Kansas City Plant	**471,116**	**563,952**	**613,274**	**8.75%**
Weapons Activities	468,676	562,096	610,464	8.60%
Directed Stockpile Work	215,272	283,555	341,859	20.56%
Site Stewardship	0	3,867	4,715	21.93%
Nonproliferation	2,435	1,846	2,800	51.68%
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	**1,182,099**	**1,130,071**	**1,158,957**	**2.56%**
Weapons Activities	1,016,701	997,945	1,033,374	3.55%
Directed Stockpile Work	116,553	112,645	133,443	18.46%
Site Stewardship	2,381	24,794	26,397	6.47%
Nonproliferation	80,179	65,457	70,154	7.18%
Cleanup	1,998	1,476	1,366	-7.45%
Los Alamos National Laboratory	**1,876,818**	**1,931,884**	**1,919,878**	**-0.62%**
Weapons Activities	1,331,473	1,418,802	1,417,592	-0.09%
Directed Stockpile Work	367,182	409,978	453,501	10.62%
Site Stewardship	1,929	2,150	3,060	42.33%
Nonproliferation	204,550	190,305	185,428	-2.56%
Cleanup	192,033	224,789	224,617	-0.08%
Nevada National Security Site	**381,725**	**358,811**	**336,899**	**6.11%**
Weapons Activities	261,772	247,810	243,748	-1.64%
Directed Stockpile Work	38,740	37,871	39,493	4.28%
Nonproliferation	74,002	69,175	48,735	-29.55%
Cleanup	60,795	61,897	64,851	4.77%
NNSA Albuquerque Complex	**450,628**	**640,187**	**566,345**	**-11.53%**
Weapons Activities	350,773	459,143	469,788	2.32%
Directed Stockpile Work	10,088	164,114	163,375	-0.45%
Secure Transportation Asset	153,593	166,113	192,311	15.77%
Nonproliferation	83,393	153,826	86,462	-43.79%

(All numbers in thousands of US dollars)

NNSA Site Tables (continued)

	FY 2013 Current	*FY 2014 Enacted*	*FY2015 Request*	*FY13-FY14 +%*
Pantex Plant	**537,406**	**590,827**	**612,179**	**3.61%**
Weapons Activities	536,642	590,459	611,719	3.60%
Directed Stockpile Work[30]	190,212	229,757	230,261	0.22%
Site Stewardship	0	15,475	13,082	-15.46%
Nonproliferation	759	358	450	25.70%
Sandia National Laboratories[31]	**1,329,472**	**1,400,949**	**1,405,106**	**0.30%**
Weapons Activities	1,267,716	1,409,520	1,530,470	8.58%
Directed Stockpile Work	694,002	837,805	934,065	11.49%
Site Stewardship	820	6,233	7,463	19.73%
Nonproliferation	150,250	155,349	141,269	-9.06%
Cleanup	2,588	2,814	2,801	-0.46%
Savannah River Site	**1,329,472**	**1,400,949**	**1,405,106**	**0.30%**
Weapons Activities	178,990	222,582	239,938	7.80%
Directed Stockpile Work	46,987	76,484	99,771	30.45%
Site Stewardship	915	355	0	-100.00%
Nonproliferation	66,311	32,773	26,075	-20.44%
Cleanup	1,214,284	1,255,430	1,282,302	2.14%
University of Rochester[32]	**1,500**	**64,375**	**63,500**	**-1.36%**
Weapons Activities	1,500	64,375	63,500	-1.36%
Inernal Confinement Fusion Ignition High Yield Campaign	1,500	64,375	63,500	-1.36%
Washington Headquarters[33]	**3,289,952**	**4,156,237**	**5,191,542**	**24.91%**
Weapons Activities	379,669	493,597	755,710	53.10%
Directed Stockpile Work	27,051	16,801	82,671	392.06%
Site Stewardship	4,760	5,325	5,093	-4.36%
Nonproliferation	266,781	251,825	198,253	-14.95%
Y-12 National Security Complex	**922,774**	**969,600**	**996,981**	**2.82%**
Weapons Activities	870,408	928,581	962,095	3.61%
Directed Stockpile Work	216,513	252,639	249,224	-1.35%
Site Stewardship	49,216	27,484	19,815	-27.90%
Nonproliferation	52,366	41,019	34,886	-14.95%

Source: http://energy.gov/cfo/downloads/fy-2015-budget-justification
NNSA FY 2015 Congressional Budget request (PDF Pages 427 - 440) and
DOE FY 2015 Congressional Budget Request Volume 5

A PDF is of this compilation and analysis is available for download at:
http://nukewatch.org/economics/FY2015_NNSA_Budget_Print.pdf

Nuclear Watch New Mexico • 903 W. Alameda #325, Santa Fe, NM 87501 • Voice and fax: 505.989.7342
info@nukewatch.org • www.nukewatch.org • http://www.nukewatch.org/watchblog/
http://www.facebook.com/NukeWatch.NM

Notes.

Unless stated otherwise, **all page numbers cited below are PDF page numbers from the NNSA FY 2015 Congressional Budget Request** (subtract 6 for narrative page numbers).

1. For budget release requirement not later than the first Monday of February see U.S. Code, Title 31, Subtitle II, Chapter 11, § 1105, "Budget contents and submission to Congress."

2. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is the semi-autonomous nuclear weapons agency within the Department of Energy (DOE), created in 2000 largely to address security issues. Since then NNSA has acquired an unparalleled track record of cost overruns, schedule delays and increasingly serious security issues. Two different congressionally empanelled commissions are considering recommendations on NNSA's future.

3. See "Opportunity, Growth, and Security Initiative: Securing Our Nation's Future" http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget

4. <http://www.slideshare.net/energy/fy-2015-budget-rollout-secretary-moniz-presentation-to-press-and-stakeholders>, DOE FY 2015 Budget Overview, March 4, 2014, slide 14.

5: We calculate it as the highest DOE nuclear weapons budget ever using data from *Atomic Audit*, Brookings Institute, 1998, Stephen Schwartz editor. Table A-2 gives the cost of 1985, the Cold War high point under Ronald Reagan's military build up, as $3,992.1 billion for DOE nuclear weapons research, production and testing programs. Defense Dept. economic deflators calculate that as between $7.59 and $7.69 billion in 2014 dollars. The NNSA's $8.3 Congressional Budget Request for Total Weapons Activities, possibly augmented with $504 million from the Opportunity, Growth and Security Initiative (OSGI), far exceeds that.

6. For example, see groundbreaking work by Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists: **"**General Confirms Enhanced Targeting Capabilities of B61-12 Nuclear Bomb," January 23, 2014**,** blogs.fas.org/security/2014/01/b61capability

7. "Operations of Facilities," which "also provides for costs associated with regulatory compliance and environment, safety, health and quality." NNSA FY 2015 Congressional Budget Request, PDF pages 211 -213.

8. The NNSA FY 2015 Congressional Budget Request (CBR) is available at http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/03/f12/Volume_1_NNSA.pdf

9. Slated to rise to an annual appropriation of $726 million by FY 2019 (more than double FY 2013). Total estimated costs for the B61 Life Extension Program have exploded from $4 billion to more than $10 billion, and each bomb will end up costing more than twice its weight in gold. In addition to extending the service life of the bomb by decades, this Life Extension Program will combine three tactical or "battlefield" variants and one strategic variant together into one all-purpose nuclear bomb. The LEP will also transform the B61 from a simple analogue bomb into a digital bomb that interfaces with future super-stealthy fighter aircraft, which themselves will cost an astronomical $1 trillion (although most will not be assigned to a nuclear mission). A separate $1.8 billion Defense Department program for a new tail fin guidance kit will transform the B61 into the world's first nuclear smart bomb. Despite all this, the U.S. government denies that it would ever endow existing nuclear weapons with new military capabilities. On top of explicit B61 LEP costs are annual Stockpile Services costs ($109.6 million in FY 2015), and large (but unspecified) campaign and facility costs directly in support of the B61 LEP.

10. NNSA requested a new budget line item for FY 2014 of $72.7 million for the W78/W88

Life Extension Program. This was a scheme to produce an "interoperable warhead" for ICBM and sub-launched missiles, using features of both W78 ICBM and W88 sub-launched warheads, and existing and/or newly manufactured plutonium pits from a third warhead, the W87. It was central to NNSA's "3+2 strategy," which the nuclear weapons labs pushed heavily (especially Livermore), for three interoperable missile warheads and two revamped air-delivered bombs/warheads (the B61-12 and an air-launched cruise missile warhead).

While the Air Force seemed to go along with the concept of the labs-proposed interoperable warhead, the Navy never fully bought into it (and reportedly was strongly opposed to it behind closed doors). Congress cut requested W78/W88 LEP funding to $38 million in the FY 2014 Omnibus Appropriations Act. After that, NNSA suddenly announced that new data indicated that the W78 was aging gracefully and didn't need a LEP anytime in the near future. Hence, the agency did not ask Congress for any money for it in FY 2015.

As NNSA now describes it, "The W78-1 LEP decrease of $38.0M [from FY 2014 to no request in FY 2015] is due to delayed implementation of the 3+2 nuclear strategy and defers the program beyond the FYNSP [a five year budget projection under Futures Year Nuclear Security Plan]. Closeout of the program will occur in FY 2014." P. 88. Thus NNSA's "3+2 strategy", the much-heralded centerpiece of its FY 2014 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan, is probably dead.

11. "The Cruise Missile Warhead program will enter into Phase 6.1 for the weapon development cycle." P. 84. This program is slated to jump to $225 million in FY 2019, with a First Production Unit "no later than FY 2027." P. 70. Eventually, the Cruise Missile Warhead, either a revamped W80 or W84 warhead (the B61-12 has been eliminated as a candidate), will be a "stand-off" nuclear weapon for a future fleet of up to 100 Long Range Strike Bombers, costing at least $550 million each. This begs the question of why the U.S. needs both the B61-12 bomb for air defense-penetrating stealthy fighters and a standoff nuclear cruise missile warhead for future heavy bombers.

12. "Stockpile Systems… directly executes sustainment activities for all enduring weapons systems in the stockpile (B61, W76, W78, W80, B83, W87, and W88)." P. 83. We argue this is all that is really needed, that is conservative, prudent maintenance that sticks to tested and trusted designs. Life Extension Programs are not only unnecessary and exorbitantly expensive, but could undermine stockpile reliability through the numerous changes they intentionally introduce.

13. Dismantlement work at the Pantex Plant will be cut by 40%. Ironically, much of the dismantlement work that remains is "to provide parts for the life extension programs (B61 and W80-1)." Dismantlements will continue at the same rate at the Y-12 Plant, but its primary aim is to produce "feedstock [highly enriched uranium] for internal and external customers (e.g. Naval Reactors)." Dismantlements are described as a "a workload leveler across all programs," indicating that instead of being a prioritized step toward a future world free of nuclear weapons, it is merely filler work in between rebuilding nuclear weapons during LEPs. P. 109.

14. Plutonium Sustainment's mission includes "Fabrication of design definition development pits that explores design changes for possible surety-related or other desirable features." P. 114. Despite the 5-year deferral of the W78/88 "interoperable warhead" that will use W87 pits, the Los Alamos National Laboratory still plans to "Build W87-design developmental pits each year to sustaining [sic] fabrication capability." P. 117. NNSA has given up on the controversial "Nuclear Facility" for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) Project for expanded plutonium pit production, but plans to raise the amount of plutonium used in the already constructed Rad Lab and pursue "pre-conceptual design efforts for the modular

acquisition concept" to substitute for the CMRR Nuclear Facility. P. 219. NNSA still plans to "Execute a plutonium strategy [at LANL] that achieves a 30 pit per year capacity by 2026," for which it gives no clear requirement or reason. P. 70.

15. "The increase supports the diagnostic development and execution of plutonium experiments at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS). These experiments provide data on materials properties at high pressure and validation of models for the performance of design options considered for future LEPs, in particular qualification of reused components and remanufacturing options." Dynamic Materials Properties is slated to rise to $210 million in FY19.

16. "Increases in this subprogram include the development of an enhanced radiographic system to diagnose subcritical experiments at U1a located at NNSS [Nevada National Security Site]. This radiographic system is in alignment with DSW [Directed Stockpile Work] objectives, such as support of modernized surety, pit reuse and remanufacturing options for LEPs, and assessments of aging stockpile systems." P. 132. Advanced Radiography is slated to climb to $114 million in FY 2016.

17. Increased funding for "Support of Other Stockpile Programs" is indicative of the failure of the over-budget National Ignition Facility at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory to achieve ignition. NNSA is therefore increasingly relying on the Omega Reactor at the University of Rochester, NY, and the Z-Facility at the Sandia National Laboratories. Indeed, Livermore's future in nuclear weapons programs will likely be questioned by the recently congressionally-empaneled Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories.

18. "The Readiness Campaign develops and deploys manufacturing capabilities to meet current and future nuclear weapon design and production needs of the stockpile." P. 199. The large increase is likely attributable to the B61 LEP.

19. Operations of Facilities "also provides for costs associated with regulatory compliance and environment, safety, health and quality… the decrease is to reduce base operational costs and funds higher NNSA priorities." Pages 211 -213. NNSA's highest priorities are the Life Extension Programs, especially the B61 LEP, which is beginning to rob funds from critically needed programs, including E,S&H. That is clearly ill advised, especially after the closure of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant due to a radiological release, which could be attributable to a declining safety culture.

20. The Los Alamos Pueblo Project annually gives ~$200,000 each to the neighboring Pueblos of San Ildefonso, Santa Clara, Jemez and Cochiti, reportedly for environmental monitoring. We are not aware of any publicly released data from that monitoring.

21. "Program Readiness will continue to modernize capabilities supporting the current and future stockpile." P. 218. "…funding for the Chemistry and Metallurgical Research Facility (CMR) Transition activities, Nuclear Criticality Safety Program (NCSP) and Nuclear Safety Research and Development (NSR&D) activities has been included under the Program Readiness subprogram. CMR Transition is a new effort focusing activities to lower programmatic and safety risk in existing plutonium facilities. CMR Transition contains more comprehensive activities than in previous budgets requests, incorporating some of the previously proposed metal processing work, but is mainly focused on the reestablishment of inherent capabilities now in CMR into existing plutonium facilities. To achieve the NNSA's commitment to cease programmatic operations in the CMR facility in FY 2019, capabilities such as analytical chemistry (AC) and material characterization (MC) must be re-established in the Radiological Laboratory Utility Office Building (RLUOB) and the Plutonium Facility (PF-4)." P. 207. Program Readiness will jump to $211 million by FY 2019.

22. Major operations at LANL's main plutonium facility, PF-4, have been suspended since the end of June 2013 because of criticality safety issues, which should raise serious questions over taxpayer compensation for substandard contractor performance. According to NNSA's FY15 CBR, "TRP III addresses the balance of the 20 critical safety systems in TA-55 Plutonium Facility and implements Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendations that were approved as part of the mission need and not previously executed as part of TRP I and TRP II." However, TRP III is not scheduled for completion until FY 2022 for a total project cost of $169.6 million. Pages 272 - 276.

23. The Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility (RLWTF) upgrade has been all over the map in terms of costs and schedules (at one point LANL estimated its costs at $300 million, which NNSA HQ rejected). "The TLW [TRU Liquid Waste] Facility was a subproject under project 07-D-220 Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility Upgrade Project (RLWTF). However, the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Omnibus Appropriation created a separate line item for the TLW… This project will design and construct a new facility to treat transuranic liquid waste mostly generated at the Plutonium Facility (PF-4), the only facility in the nation capable and designated to produce pits for the enduring stockpiles." P. 313. This accounts for the decrease in funding for the RLWTF, and demonstrates congressional concern about yet another runaway NNSA project.

24. The construction of the Uranium Processing Facility at the Y-12 plant is capped at $6.5 billion. A recent study by the Pentagon's Office of Cost Assessment and Project Evaluation predicted that this exorbitant facility, originally estimated by NNSA at ~$600 million, would cost between $12 to 19 billion. To bring it in at $6.5 billion NNSA has cut out all dismantlement and HEU downblending operations, making it a production-only nuclear weapons plant. Pages 319-323.

25. This upgrade, implemented as a General Plant Project at LANL under $5 million (hence not a specific budget line item), could be programmatically significant. "Environmental testing" in this case means testing of nuclear weapons components to see whether they can withstand the extreme stresses of the Stockpile to Target Sequence (which, for example, can include leaving and reentering the atmosphere). NNSA proposes to ship plutonium pits back and forth from LANL to the Livermore Lab for environmental testing, which is crazy for cost reasons and the fact that Livermore has lost its Security Category I/II clearance. Upgrades to LANL's environmental testing facilities could make that plan even more unnecessary, and would further decrease LLNL's role in nuclear weapons programs.

26. The CMRR-Nuclear Facility was to directly support expanded production of up to 80 plutonium pits per year. Compelled by fiscal constraints and runaway costs to choose between the Uranium Processing Facility or the CMRR-Nuclear Facility, the Obama Administration decided in its FY 2012 budget to defer the later for five years, effectively meaning its cancellation. NNSA has struggled since then to articulate a coherent "alternative plutonium strategy," which its FY 2015 Congressional Budget Request fails to make explicit as well. However, bits and pieces are sprinkled through the NNSA request, pointing to a smaller, modular successor to the Walmart-sized CMRR-Nuclear Facility, and a goal of future production at 30 pits per year, for which there is still no clear programmatic need. For more, see Notes 14 and 21.

27. In one piece of good news the NNSA is finally putting the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina in "cold standby." The MOX program is a failed attempt in the laudable goal of disposing of 34 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium. The MOX Program's life cycle costs have exploded to an estimated $30 billion, and

NNSA is now studying cheaper alternatives. This has major positive impacts on the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), which was slated to process 2.5 metric tons of plutonium every year as feedstock for the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility. It also further undermines the need to build massive new plutonium facilities at LANL.

28. The increase in Naval Reactors is largely due to new-design reactor development for a new generation of strategic submarines carrying nuclear-armed missiles. The 12 new subs will cost ~$6 billion each.

29. Formerly the NNSA budget category "Office of the Administrator."

30. As previously noted, dismantlement work under Directed Stockpile Work will be cut by 40% at Pantex, while the tempo of Life Extension Programs will increase.

31. It should be noted that the Sandia Labs have the largest nuclear weapons budget at a FY 2015 request of $1.53 billion, compared to LANL's $1.42 billion and Livermore's $1 billion. This is contrary to the fact that the Sandia Labs fly largely under the public's radar, while the Los Alamos and Livermore Labs are well known as nuclear weapons labs. Sandia recently overtook LANL in nuclear weapons programs because of Life Extension Programs, especially the B61.

32. The ~50-fold increase from FY 2013 to FY 2014 in nuclear weapons program funding for the University of Rochester's Omega Laser is indicative of the failure of the Livermore Lab's National Ignition Facility to achieve ignition by the end of FY 2012 as promised.

33. The 53% increase from FY 2014 to FY 2015 in nuclear weapons funding at NNSA's Washington, DC, headquarters, accompanied by a 15% decrease in nonproliferation programs, more clearly exposes the Obama Administration's real priorities than we ever could.

In conclusion, the National Nuclear Security Administration's FY 2015 Congressional Budget Request (CBR) is the beginning of huge amounts of money that the U.S. government will spend on nuclear weapons "modernization," while cutting domestic services such as public education and environmental protection. In December 2013 the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) released its study *Projected Costs of Nuclear Forces 2014 -2023*. Its stunning conclusion was that estimated costs for maintenance and "modernization" of the nuclear weapons stockpile, delivery systems, and research and production complex would total $355 billion over the next decade. The CBO also reported that costs after 2023 would increase yet more rapidly since "modernization" is only now beginning. The report did not attempt to project costs for maintenance and modernization of nuclear forces over the planned period of the next thirty years, but given current trends it will easily exceed one trillion dollars. [For the CBO report, please see http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/12-19-2013-NuclearForces.pdf]

Nuclear Watch New Mexico is hopeful that an informed citizenry would help reverse these priorities. Beware of entrenched interests that profit from a never-ending cycle of Life Extension Programs. They seek to not only extend the service lives of existing nuclear weapons by decades, but also endow them with new military capabilities, despite denials at the highest levels of government. Further, while profiting from nuclear weapons work, they may actually undermine stockpile reliability by profoundly changing tested, true designs. Citizens should demand instead prudent maintenance of the stockpile, better aligned with consistent progress toward a future world free of nuclear weapons.

903 W. Alameda #325, Santa Fe, NM 87501 • Voice and fax: 505.989.7342
info@nukewatch.org • www.nukewatch.org • http://www.nukewatch.org/watchblog/
http://www.facebook.com/NukeWatch.NM