(464

DO NOT REMOVE
FROM READING ROOM

DOE/EIS-0236

# *Stockpile Management Preferred Alternatives Report*

***July 1996***

*In support of the*
*Stockpile Stewardship and Management*
*Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*

United States Department of Energy

DOE
Box 67
Item 1

PROPERTY OF
U.S. GOVERNMENT

# Table of Contents


I. Introduction ---------- 1

II. Capacity Requirements ---------- 6

III. Rationale for Preferred Alternatives ---------- 10

A. Pit Mission ---------- 10

B. Secondary Factory Mission ---------- 16

C. High Explosives Mission ---------- 17

D. Nonnuclear Mission ---------- 21

E. Weapons Assembly/Disassembly Mission ---------- 23

IV. Description of Planned Action for LANL ---------- 25

V. Description of Planned Action for LLNL ---------- 28

VI. Description of Planned Action for SNL ---------- 30

VII. Description of Planned Action for Kansas City ---------- 31

VIII. Description of Planned Action for Pantex ---------- 33

IX. Description of Planned Action for Y-12 ---------- 36

X. Description of Planned Action for Savannah River Site ---------- 39

XI. Composite Cost Analysis ---------- 41

Nuclear weapon secondaries consist of highly enriched uranium, lithium compounds, and other materials. Historically, most of these materials have been fabricated and assembled at the Oak Ridge, Y-12 Plant. Limited fabrication and processing capabilities for these materials have existed at both LANL and LLNL. The expansion of each of these laboratory capabilities to meet future production requirements was considered as an alternative in addition to the downsizing of Y-12 operations.

For nonnuclear component manufacturing, a large capability exists at the Kansas City Plant, and smaller capabilities exist at each weapon laboratory for the nonnuclear components for which the laboratory has design responsibility. Because most of the products manufactured at the Kansas City Plant are designed by Sandia National Laboratories, most nonnuclear manufacturing would be considered for relocation to Sandia for the laboratory production alternative.

For weapon assembly and disassembly operations, a large modern capability exists at the Pantex Plant near Amarillo, Texas. A new device assembly capability was built to support the nuclear test program at the Nevada Test Site. Options for future weapon assembly and disassembly operations were limited to these sites.

The SSM PEIS is also assessing alternative sites for the storage of the strategic reserves of plutonium (in the form of pits) and highly enriched uranium (in the form of secondaries). Plutonium pits and secondaries are considered for potential storage at either of the weapon assembly/disassembly alternative sites. Secondaries are also considered for storage at the Y-12 Plant, should it be the chosen site for secondary and case fabrication. Strategic reserve storage at other candidate sites is also being considered in the DOE Storage and Disposition of Weapons-Usable Fissile Materials PEIS. Decisions on strategic reserve storage are not expected to be made until both PEISs are completed.

The detailed operating data and facility information from the analysis of these siting alternatives are presented in a July 1996 DOE, Albuquerque Operations Office report entitled, *Analysis of Stockpile Management Alternatives.* A draft version of that report was released in February 1996 to support the March 1996 draft SSM PEIS. This Preferred Alternatives Report derives data for its conclusions and recommendations from that analysis. The cost and technical justification for the Stockpile Management preferred alternatives along with an overview of the schedule for implementation are presented in subsequent sections of this report.

## B. A New Operating Environment

Before describing specific site-by-site plans for the conduct of the Stockpile Management program, it is necessary to first describe the new operating environment which will govern future production activities. In the past, DOE was able to sustain critical capabilities in both Stockpile Stewardship and Stockpile Management with an ongoing program of new weapon development and production and with the ability to

## A. Alternatives Considered

Two general types of alternatives were considered by DOE: downsizing of existing plants or relocation of the plant functions to a laboratory. The DOE has always retained a relatively small fabrication and assembly capability for unique nuclear weapons production technologies at its design laboratories to support research, development, and test activities. Alternative future configurations for Stockpile Management considered the expansion of these small fabrication and assembly capabilities sufficient to support future production needs. An obvious second alternative for each major mission was to downsize existing production facilities to a size appropriate to the future workload. Alternatives were sought which minimized construction of new facilities. Alternatives which required the establishment of facilities and capabilities where none historically existed were, therefore, considered unreasonable.

The alternatives considered are shown below.

**Stockpile Management Alternatives**

| | *Site Alternatives* | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Technology*** | PX | Y-12 | KCP | SRS | LANL | SNL | LLNL | NTS |
| Pit Fabrication | | | | * | * | | | |
| Pit Requalification and Reuse | * | | | | | | | * |
| HE Fabrication | * | | | | * | | * | |
| Secondary and Case Fabrication | | * | | | * | | * | |
| Nonnuclear Component Fabrication | | | * | | * | * | * | |
| Weapon Assembly and Disassembly | * | | | | | | | * |

The DOE closed its plutonium component (pit) manufacturing capability at the Rocky Flats Plant in 1992 without establishing a replacement capability. It is expected that, for the next ten or more years, most, but not all, plutonium pit requirements can be satisfied through the requalification and reuse of existing pits. Therefore, alternatives which provided a full capability, but limited capacity, for pit manufacturing were considered. A capable plutonium research and development facility exists at Los Alamos National Laboratory which has produced pits for the nuclear test program and currently is used to perform pit surveillance. It was considered to be an obvious alternative. In addition, the Savannah River Site in South Carolina has a capable infrastructure for plutonium processing, and was considered a reasonable alternative.

High explosive components for nuclear weapon assemblies have been fabricated at the Pantex Plant, though large capable facilities exist at LANL and LLNL for the fabrication of high explosive components for their development activities. All three of these capabilities were considered reasonable for future production needs.

perform underground nuclear tests as a confirmation tool. These conditions do not exist today; therefore it is essential that positive measures be taken to increase program confidence in the new operating environment. To provide increased confidence that critical technical capabilities are maintained for both Stockpile Stewardship and Stockpile Management, positive measures will be implemented which seek to integrate production and laboratory technical capabilities and interject greater teaming to accomplish program needs.

The DOE is also developing an enhanced surveillance program to improve the ability to predict material and component defects. The present surveillance program has been successful in finding problems through testing, but has not always been successful in anticipating problems. In the past when problems were found, the DOE always had people and facilities which could be redirected from other weapon development or production activities to address the problem. Therefore, maximum warning time of problems was not a program priority. In the future, DOE will not always have ongoing weapons development and production activities from which to redeploy resources for stockpile concerns. Therefore, an enhanced surveillance program focused on providing increased warning time is being developed. Additional teaming and integration of plant and laboratory capabilities are judged to be essential to provide maximum benefit from current surveillance testing and from the new enhanced surveillance program.

Finally, decisions made today relative to the future of dedicated production facilities would need to be revisited should future arms reduction initiatives result in a significantly smaller nuclear weapon stockpile. Therefore, positive measures are necessary today to reduce the technical risk should future stockpile reductions make additional work consolidation necessary.

The following two specific positive measures are planned which will address these concerns and affect the future operating environment of the weapons production facilities.

(1) Extended weapon lifetime requirements and the associated potential effects on weapon safety, performance, and reliability will increasingly challenge the Stockpile Stewardship program. For this reason, it is judged by DOE to be imperative that a closer linkage between the weapon laboratories and the associated weapon surveillance activities at the production plants be established. Assignment of responsibility to the laboratories for oversight of the surveillance testing activities at the production plants is judged to be an effective means to assure this linkage. The important traditional surveillance role of the production facilities in surveillance testing will continue at about the same level. With the development and implementation of enhanced surveillance testing, overall surveillance activities are expected to increase with some of this increase performed at the responsible weapon laboratory. The

In addition, the NPR had specific recommendations for DOE in terms of Stockpile Stewardship and Management requirements. These requirements are summarized below:

- Maintain nuclear weapon capability (without underground nuclear testing or fissile material production)
- Develop stockpile surveillance engineering base
- Demonstrate capability to refabricate and certify weapon types in the enduring stockpile
- Maintain capability to design, fabricate, and certify new warheads
- Maintain science and technology base
- Ensure tritium availability
- No new-design nuclear warhead production

The NPR specifically left open future options for decreasing or increasing the size of the weapons stockpile in response to changing international environments.

**Production Workload Assumptions**

For purposes of assessing alternative configurations for the Stockpile Management program, the strategy of the NPR was used, i.e. a START II-sized stockpile while retaining both a lead and a hedge capability. The stockpile composition for 2004 and beyond was based on the 1995 Draft Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum (A review of the 1996 NWSM indicates no significant changes which would affect the conclusions of this analysis). The considerations for developing a production workload based on the assumed stockpile level include national security policy, historical stockpile defect and change data, and the quantities and types of weapons in the future stockpile. The assumed Stockpile Management workload was developed by representatives of DOE, the three weapons laboratories, and the four production plants. Assistance was provided by a representative from the Office of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy (ATSD (AE)).

The DOE approach for supporting the stockpile consists of three essential parts:

- Repair defects as required to maintain safety and reliability requirements. Defects are identified through surveillance testing activities and the inspection of weapons during routine maintenance.

- Requalify components for use in the stockpile beyond their originally certified design life. Traditionally, weapon systems were replaced with new systems for reasons other than age before they reached their certified lifetime.

- Replace components, or complete weapons, on a scheduled replacement interval to prevent component failure from adversely affecting the availability, reliability, safety or security of weapons in the future stockpile. Weapon surveillance programs are relied upon to provide adequate warning time for a timely response.

"We will retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter any future hostile foreign leadership with access to strategic nuclear forces from acting against our vital interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile. Therefore, we will continue to maintain nuclear forces of sufficient size and capability to hold at risk a broad range of assets valued by such political and military leaders."

Due to their strategic importance, the numbers and types of nuclear weapons in the United States inventory are carefully established and reviewed annually by the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, and approved by the President.

**Nuclear Posture Review**

The Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) was a ten month, comprehensive review of nuclear forces and policies led by the Department of Defense (DOD) Joint Chiefs of Staff that looked at doctrine, force structure, operations, safety and security, and arms control. A major conclusion was that while reductions in Russian nuclear forces have allowed great strides to be made in reducing U. S. nuclear forces, the U. S. must continue to be prepared for a potential reversal of trends within Russia. In light of this uncertain future, the NPR recommended that the U. S. maintain its flexibility, a hedge, to reconstitute nuclear forces if required.

The NPR recommended a realignment of nuclear forces. Strategic forces were to be aligned as follows:

- Possess no more than 20 B-2 bombers
- Reduce the B-52 bomber force from 94 to 66 aircraft
- Reduce the Trident submarine force from 18 to 14 submarines and equip all submarines with D-5 missiles
- Maintain up to 500 single warhead Minuteman III ICBMs
- Maintain flexibility to reduce forces further or reconstitute

Nonstrategic forces were to be aligned as follows:

- Maintain European commitment at current level
- Eliminate nuclear weapons capability from U. S. Navy surface ships
- Retain nuclear cruise missile capability on submarines
- Retain land-based dual-capable nuclear aircraft capability

In addition, the NPR recommended downward flexibility in the size of nuclear forces should faster and deeper arms reductions be negotiated--the "lead" option. Positive measures were to be established to allow a flexible response to achieve a smaller U. S. stockpile.

The President endorsed the recommendations of the NPR in September 1994, and indicated that nuclear weapons would remain a part of the post Cold War U. S. national security environment.

Because these operations would not involve work with uncased plutonium, they could be performed in specially equipped bays at Pantex or at the Device Assembly Facility (DAF) at the NTS. Capability to perform requalification and reuse of pits would inherently also provide capability for requalification of secondaries, should that capability be needed. A qualified Class I plutonium facility would not be needed. For reasons of cost and technical risk,

*The preferred alternative is to assign the pit requalification and reuse production mission to the Pantex Plant.*

## 2.1 Net Present Value Costs

A net present value (NPV) cost analysis was performed to assess the merits of the two siting options. The costs consisted of (1) capital investment to install a capability for pit reuse and (2) cost of steady-state operations. In addition, an analysis was performed of the cost to install and operate a capacity for both higher and lower levels of workload to judge the relative sensitivity of the two site alternatives to workload changes. As the following figure indicates, assigning this mission to Pantex is the lower cost alternative.



have been made in process technology since the construction of Rocky Flats, however significant technological advances have not been made in facility design, layout, and operation.

DOE believes that improvements are possible in these areas which would significantly affect new plutonium facility size, cost, and environmental impact. DOE further believes that development and demonstration work should be performed on alternative facility concepts prior to making large financial and programmatic commitments, particularly in light of the small near term requirement for pit production. Significant time exists before a larger plutonium fabrication facility could be required. This time should be used to develop and demonstrate alternative concepts to help guide future decision makers regarding plutonium facility design and construction.

For these reasons, this programmatic analysis limits plutonium fabrication facility analysis to a facility sized to meet expected programmatic requirements over the next ten or more years. Should a life-limiting problem be found for plutonium pits in the future stockpile, a larger facility would be required. DOE will perform development and demonstration work at its operating plutonium facilities over the next five years to study alternative facility concepts which could be utilized in the future in the construction of a larger fabrication capacity. Environmental analysis of this larger capacity is not planned at this time because of the uncertainty in the need for such a capacity and the uncertainty in the facility technology that would be utilized. Should a larger pit production capacity be required in the future, appropriate environmental and siting analysis would be performed at that time. Existing DOE nuclear facilities, such as those at SRS, would be the expected candidates for siting of this larger capacity.

### 1.4 Other Considerations

The SRS alternative proposes to utilize facilities that currently are free of plutonium contamination, whereas the proposed option for LANL is currently in full operation as a qualified Class I plutonium facility. Assignment of the pit fabrication mission to SRS would increase the future cost of decontamination and decommissioning of plutonium facilities. This cost was neither analyzed nor included in the estimates.

The SRS alternative is less constrained by space limitations than the LANL alternative, and consequently has a larger ultimate capacity.

## 2.0 Requalification of Intact Pits and Nonintrusive Pit Modification Reuse

Two sites were considered as reasonable alternatives for requalification of intact pits and nonintrusive pit modification reuse: (1) the Nevada Test Site (NTS) which historically has provided the support for nuclear explosive testing by the weapons laboratories, and (2) the Pantex Plant which currently performs all assembly/disassembly functions including pit recertification. Either site would only be assigned this mission if they were assigned the weapon assembly/disassembly mission.

## B. Secondary Factory Mission

### 1. Preferred Alternative for Secondary Fabrication

Three alternative sites were considered for the future secondary factory: the Y-12 Plant, LANL, and LLNL. In addition, a no action alternative (at Y-12) was considered for comparative purposes. For reasons of cost, technical risk, and capacity flexibility,

*The preferred alternative is to retain the secondary production mission in a downsized Oak Ridge Y-12 Plant.*

### 2. Net Present Value Costs

The cost analysis determined the net present value (NPV) for investment and operating costs for a 25 year period. The results of this analysis are shown below.




The highest net present value of costs is associated with the status quo of not downsizing the Y-12 Plant, i.e., the no action alternative. The alternatives which would transfer production responsibility to either of the two weapon laboratories are lower cost than no action, but are more expensive than downsizing the Y-12 Plant due to their large investment and other transition costs.

### 3. Technical Risks

Technical risks associated with each alternative site were assessed by rating each alternative in the areas of basic production capabilities and the production infrastructure capability. The results of the technical risk assessment are shown below.

## 2.2 Technical Risks

Technical risk associated with each alternative was assessed by comparing the relative experience of each site in the pertinent areas of basic production and production support infrastructure. The pit reuse and pit requalification requirements are being developed, consequently neither site has experience in all operations. However, Pantex has supported LLNL in developing one type of pit reuse workstation and is familiar with its design and function. In addition, Pantex has routinely performed gas analysis and limited pit diagnostics as part of its weapons surveillance mission. Although the NTS has supported work involving assembly of pits into nuclear explosive devices, these operations were performed by weapon laboratory personnel, consequently there is no experience at the NTS associated with pit modification and inspection operations.

The following table provides the numeric ranking for the two measures of technical risk and the numeric measure of relative cost.

| Ranking Criteria | Score | |
|---|---|---|
| | NTS | Pantex Plant |
| Basic Production Capability | 50 | 85 |
| Capability of Production Infrastructure | 50 | 100 |
| Minimize Cost | 51 | 100 |

## 2.3 Capacity Assumptions and Contingency Options

A basic capability for pit requalification and reuse provides sufficient operating capacity to support the low case or the base case stockpile levels (up to about 150 units per year). This capacity could be doubled for the high case stockpile by operation of a fourth weapon assembly bay at an additional cost of about $6 million per year.

## 2.4 Other Considerations

As described in Section III. E., the Pantex Plant is the recommended preferred alternative for the weapons assembly/disassembly mission. The DOE desire to colocate pit reuse/requalification with weapons assembly contributes to the selection of Pantex for this mission.

The NTS does not have existing facilities in which to house the pit modification and inspection operations. Consequently, a construction project would be required to build an addition to the DAF for these operations. This project cost was included in the analysis.

| Ranking Criteria | Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Y-12 | LANL | LLNL |
| Basic Production Capability | 98 | 87 | 88 |
| Capability of Production Infrastructure | 100 | 80 | 78 |
| Minimize Cost | 100 | 94 | 88 |

### 4. Capacity Assumptions and Contingency Options

As with plutonium pit production workload, the projected workload for secondary fabrication, after near term planned work is accomplished, is projected to be mainly that associated with the replacement of secondaries destroyed during routine surveillance testing. However, unlike pits, secondaries contain organic compounds which can deteriorate with age. The capability to fabricate all secondary and case parts provides an inherent capacity to produce up to 50 sets of weapon components per year. This capacity is sufficient for either the low case or the base case stockpile levels. For the high case stockpile, a factory with a single shift capacity of 100 units per year was assessed. The added investment cost for the higher capacity ranged from $5 million at LANL or Y-12 to $70 million at LLNL. Because of this relatively small investment required for a relatively large contingency capacity, an operational single shift capacity of 100 secondaries per year is assumed to be maintained. At Y-12, an added single shift capacity of 200 secondaries per year can be maintained in a standby mode at minimal cost. This option adds to the attractiveness of the Y-12 alternative. Multiple shift operations would add to these capacity levels.

## C. High Explosives Mission

### 1. Preferred Alternative for High Explosive Production

The High Explosives (HE) production mission includes HE procurement, formulation, synthesis, component fabrication, characterization, surveillance, disposal, and storage. Three DOE sites (LANL, LLNL, and Pantex) have fully capable existing HE capabilities. Alternatives involving these three sites were considered, i.e. to transfer all or a portion of the work to LANL and/or LLNL, or to retain the mission at a downsized Pantex. For reasons of cost and technical risk,

*The preferred alternative is to retain the high explosives production mission in a downsized Pantex Plant.*

DOE believes it is essential to assure core competency maintenance for HE research, development, and production while achieving cost efficiencies. Assigning the HE production mission to Pantex provides assurance that competency for production will be maintained, but does not yield assurance that competency for stockpile stewardship is retained. DOE will continue to seek solutions to this concern.

The assumed production capacities for HE components for the alternative stockpile sizes were:

| | |
|---|---|
| Low Case | 50 sets per year |
| Base Case | 150 sets per year |
| High Case | 300 sets per year |

These production capacities are in addition to the required capacity to fabricate replacement components for those lost in surveillance testing (up to 50 sets per year)

The transition costs as well as the annual operating costs were found to be relatively insensitive to these alternative capacities. Therefore, to assure adequate contingency capacity, single shift production capacity of about 300 component sets per year is planned. LANL and LLNL would each have sufficient capacity within existing facilities to support this production rate. Pantex facilities would be downsized to this lower operating capacity. In addition, as a contingency, DOE could retain some existing high explosive buildings at Pantex in a safe shutdown mode at minimal costs under any alternative. These facilities could be reactivated should future requirements exceed established capacities.

**5. Other Considerations**

For all portions of the Stockpile Management program, DOE has sought to address the level of expected future production requirements, and whether this level of work is sufficient to maintain competence. This issue is particularly appropriate to high explosive production since DOE has three large existing capabilities (at LLNL, LANL, and Pantex), and the future component workload for both development and production is relatively small. Maintaining competence at three separate facilities with a small combined workload challenges DOE in maintaining competence for both Stockpile Management and Stockpile Stewardship. For example, weapon stockpile reductions (with no new weapons production) have resulted in a ten fold decrease at Pantex in expected high explosive production levels compared to historical production levels. Similar reductions in the fabrication of high explosive parts for research and development have occurred at LANL and LLNL.

This maintenance of competency issue is not unique to DOE. In the past, the Department of Defense (DOD) and other federal agencies bought products and services from DOE high explosive facilities to meet unique program needs. This work could contribute to DOE competency maintenance if it were to continue at historical levels. However, major reductions in requirements for energetic material research, development, test, and production are also occurring at DOD laboratories and at industrial research and development facilities throughout the U.S. This decreasing workload presents a severe challenge to the maintenance of essential capabilities and the retention of critical core competencies in energetic materials research, development, and production.

### 3. Technical Risks

All technologies required for the HE mission have been previously demonstrated at LANL and LLNL. Both have in the recent past produced HE components in numbers greater than and at specifications comparable to those required for future production. No deviations from the current baseline technologies used at Pantex would be required. Approved procedures are in place for transporting HE from the laboratory to the assembly site. Therefore, the technical risk is low for either laboratory.

However, both laboratories require significant effort to establish the production support infrastructure needed to sustain production. This is a limitation that DOE has successfully addressed in the past at the weapon laboratories, however. In addition, LANL is currently establishing a production infrastructure for the manufacture of detonators and other assigned weapon components, and LLNL has had a limited production infrastructure in place in the recent past.

The technical risk of downsizing and remaining at Pantex would be low. Facilities and equipment are modern, well maintained, and capable.

The following table provides the technical risks and relative cost ranking for each alternative.

| Ranking Criteria | Score | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pantex | LANL | LLNL | Two-Lab |
| Capability of Process Technologies | 100 | 96 | 92 | 94 |
| Capability of Production Support Infrastructure | 100 | 70 | 65 | 68 |
| Minimize Cost | 100 | 100 | 100 | 77 |

### 4. Capacity Assumptions and Contingency Options

Because high explosives contain organic compounds that decompose with age, high explosive replacement is expected to be required for stockpile weapons as they age beyond their originally intended minimum design life. This replacement will require the weapon to be returned to the weapon assembly site for refurbishment. To minimize overall transportion and refurbishment costs and risks, most weapons returned to Pantex in the future for surveillance or general refurbishment may be returned to the stockpile with new high explosive parts. This refurbishment activity is expected to provide an onging low level of production demand. In addition, increasing quantities of weapons are expected to be selected for surveillance testing to provide data to more confidently predict safety or performance problems. Fabrication of replacement parts to allow rebuild of the surveillance weapons will be required.

The DOE sought future weapon complex configurations that simultaneously maintained technical competence, minimized technical risk, and minimized costs. It was recognized that in some cases these would be competing objectives where the minimum risk alternative might not be the minimum cost alternative. Due to all of these considerations, DOE proposes to maintain its predominant HE production mission at the Pantex Plant.

## D. Nonnuclear Mission

### 1. Preferred Alternative for Nonnuclear Component Fabrication

There were two alternatives considered for the nonnuclear manufacturing mission of the Kansas City Plant (KCP). One involves downsizing the KCP and the other involves transferring the production responsibility to the three weapons laboratories which have design responsibility for the products manufactured at KCP. The laboratory alternative had four options (listed in the analysis as Lab A, Lab B, Lab C, and Lab D) to be evaluated. These four options involved various combinations of production assignment to the three laboratories. The reader is referred to the previously referenced *Analysis of Stockpile Management Alternatives* for a detailed description of each laboratory alternative. For reasons of cost and technical risk,

*The preferred alternative is to retain the nonnuclear production mission in a downsized Kansas City Plant.*

### 2. Net Present Value Costs

The following chart shows the cumulative cost net present value (NPV) for the downsized KCP and the Lab A (the most cost competitive of the four laboratory options) alternatives. The chart also includes the NPV for the no-action alternative at KCP. Downsizing the KCP has the lowest cost NPV.

new processes; however, there would be minor risk because personnel and processes would need to be relocated and requalified.

The assembly of nuclear test devices was accomplished in the past by personnel from the weapon laboratories, not by personnel from the NTS. Therefore, additional risk is added to this option due to: the support that would be required from the laboratories to assist in the qualification of the production operations, the uncertainty associated with the availability of laboratory personnel to provide this support, the significant amount of construction required on a very aggressive schedule, and the one year gap in operations. A summary of the relative rankings is shown below.

| Ranking Criteria | Score | |
|---|---|---|
| | Pantex Plant | NTS |
| Basic Production Capability | 100 | 80 |
| Capability of Production Infrastructure | 100 | 60 |
| Minimize Cost | 100 | 73 |

**4. Capacity Assumptions and Contingency Options**

Annual weapon operations workload was assumed to range from 280 weapons per year for the low case stockpile to 580 weapons per year for the high case stockpile. These weapon operations would include a mix of weapon refurbishments and weapons disassembled and reassembled for surveillance testing. The costs to downsize Pantex would be relatively insensitive to the level of assumed weapon operations (about $15 million for each case). Because of the large construction activity required, the NTS costs were sensitive to the assumed stockpile level. NTS construction costs would range from $215 million for the low case to $313 million for the high case.

The Pantex Plant would be downsized consistent with the assumed workload for the high case stockpile. This alternative provides maximum flexibility to respond to future larger or smaller stockpile levels at a reasonable cost. Depending on the weapon type, additional capacity could be added through multi-shift operations to meet unforeseen program demands. A feature that adds to the attractiveness of Pantex is that for minimal additional cost, some existing facilities at Pantex could be maintained in a safe shutdown mode. Should future requirements dictate a larger assembly or disassembly capacity (such as might occur in subsequent arms reduction treaties) some of these facilities could be reactivated. This provides the DOE programmatic flexibility that cannot be reasonably attained with the NTS option.

## E. Weapons Assembly/Disassembly Mission

### 1. Preferred Alternative for Weapons Assembly and Disassembly

Two sites were considered as reasonable alternatives for the assembly/disassembly mission: (1) the Nevada Test Site (NTS) which has been the site for assembly and testing of nuclear test devices and (2) the Pantex Plant which currently performs assembly, disassembly, and surveillance of nuclear weapons. For reasons of cost, technical risk, and program flexibility,

*The preferred alternative is to retain the weapons assembly/disassembly mission in a downsized Pantex Plant.*

### 2. Net Present Value Costs

For all workloads, the downsizing of Pantex requires very little investment for construction and transition costs. Alternatively, the relocation of the mission to NTS requires substantial funding in these areas. Coupled with similar annual operating costs for both sites, the NPV analysis illustrated in the figure below ndicates that over the twenty-five year period considered, the option to downsize Pantex results in the better cost alternative. It is also more cost effective than taking no action.




### 3. Technical Risks

Technical risk was assessed by comparing the relative capabilities of each alternative in the areas of basic production capability and production infrastructure. Since Pantex is currently performing the A/D mission, downsizing can be accomplished without interruption to operations.

The technologies that would be transferred and established at NTS are identical to those currently at Pantex. Therefore, there would be no technical risk associated with developing

Existing facilities and staff would be utilized in concert with technology and surveillance programs at Savannah River, Pantex, and Y-12 plants to support these missions. Appropriate LANL staff may be located at these sites to work with the plant staff for accomplishment of these joint missions.

## 2. Costs and Schedules

The annual budgets necessary to establish the new missions and to continue existing missions are depicted below. The transition costs include the costs to relocate missions and to make facility modifications at LANL. Annual operating costs are shown for the plutonium mission and the other Stockpile Management missions that have been assigned to LANL.




A transition cost of $312 Million supports a combined project to extend the useful life of the electrical and mechanical systems of the TA-55 plutonium facility and to reconfigure one wing for pit manufacturing. Most of the existing pit fabrication equipment has a useful life of an additional 15 years and does not need replacement at this time. In FY 1996 and FY 1997 transition costs are shown for conceptual design to secure project funding in FY 1998. The annual operating cost for the LANL plutonium mission after taking on the pit manufacturing mission will grow from about $95 million to about $125 million.

As part of the Nonnuclear Reconfiguration Program, LANL is currently establishing the capabilities to support high power detonators, calorimeters, neutron tube target loading, beryllium technologies, pit support components, etched bridges, and cables. These costs are shown as Other Stockpile Management Operating Costs.

# IV. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY (LANL)

## 1. Description of Planned Actions

Activities

The following Stockpile Management activities would be assigned to LANL:

- Manufacture of pits and intrusive reuse of plutonium components
- Plutonium fabrication and processing technology development with support from LLNL
- Oversight of secondary surveillance testing for LANL-designed weapons
- Oversight of tritium reservoir surveillance, testing, and tritium recycle technology
- Support of high explosive safety and assembly/disassembly operations at the Pantex Plant, and
- Continuation of previous Stockpile Management assignments (pit surveillance, calorimetry, and detonator, beryllium, neutron tube target loading, and pit support component production and surveillance)

Operations and Workload

Plutonium component fabrication capacity of 50 pits per year would be established based on single-shift operations. Technology and capability for all stockpiled weapon systems and alloy types would be supported.

The preferred alternative is consistent with the DOE's investment over the last decade in plutonium fabrication and processing facilities and technology at TA-55. Technological capabilities for the remaining missions currently exist at LANL.

Facilities

The plutonium missions would be performed at TA-55 and at the CMR facility. These missions would require facility modifications and installation of new equipment in the 300 Wing of TA-55. Concurrently, LANL would complete maintenance upgrades to extend the useful life of the mechanical and electrical systems of the TA-55 plutonium facility. TA-55 has been operational without major refurbishment since 1978, and though it has been maintained in an excellent condition, there are significant maintenance upgrades that should be made in the next decade irrespective of the pit production mission.

Support of the integrated manufacturing technology and component surveillance mission would require no significant facility upgrades or expansions at LANL.

# V. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY (LLNL)

## 1. Description of Planned Actions

Activities

The following Stockpile Management activities would be assigned to LLNL:

- Oversight of secondary surveillance testing for LLNL-designed weapons
- Support of high explosive safety and assembly/disassembly operations at the Pantex Plant
- Oversight of uranium and case fabrication and processing technology with support from the Y-12 Plant and LANL, and
- Continuation of previous Stockpile Management assignments

Operations and Workload

LLNL would participate with LANL in the support of HE safety and the assembly/disassembly operations at Pantex.

LLNL would be responsible to coordinate an integrated secondary and case technology development program with Y-12 and LANL to assure capable production processes remain available at Y-12. The secondary and case technology program would be integrated with production technology work at Y-12. This integration of work would seek to provide added assurance that critical manufacturing technology will be retained and that new production technologies can be introduced without adversely affecting weapon safety or performance. The amount of production technology work at Y-12 is not expected to change significantly from current levels; however, the nature of the work will be more aligned with LLNL and LANL Stockpile Stewardship needs. LLNL and LANL employees may conduct some technology work at Y-12 and conversely Y-12 employees may conduct some technology work at the laboratories.

LANL and LLNL responsibilities in determining aging effects on secondaries would also become more integrated with surveillance activities at Y-12. Each organization possesses unique knowledge and skills that would be pooled for greatest efficiency of surveillance operations and greater confidence in predicting aging effects. This could result in laboratory employees actively participating in the surveillance testing and evaluation at Y-12, and Y-12 employees performing surveillance and aging work at the laboratories.

The schedules for establishing the pit component production capabilities are shown below.

**LANL Schedule of Activities**




## 3. Risks

The technical risk associated with assigning the pit manufacturing mission to Los Alamos is low because of LANL's:

- Previous history of making pits for nuclear testing
- Experience with technology development for the W88 pit rebuild program
- Experience with the conduct of the pit surveillance program
- Production experience for the Cassini Program
- Plutonium processing support to Rocky Flats Plant production during the 1980's

## 4. Issues and Uncertainties

There is moderate schedule and cost risk because of the high annual capital funding profile and the aggressive project schedule. An additional risk is the complexity of managing a number of concurrent LANL construction projects in a relatively short time period. The DOE will investigate improved management approaches to ensure project success.

# VI. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES (SNL)

## 1. Description of Planned Actions

Activities

Sandia National Laboratories will retain currently assigned Stockpile Management activities including:

- System and stockpile engineering support for non-nuclear components and subsystems
- Continuation of previous Stockpile Management production assignments (principally neutron generators)
- Integration of the stockpile surveillance and reliability assessment programs
- Support of assembly/disassembly operations at the Pantex Plant
- Non-nuclear manufacturing technologies, with support from the Kansas City Plant, LANL, and LLNL
- Independent assessment of nuclear explosive safety
- Quality assessment and maintenance of Primary Standards for the nuclear weapons program
- Military liaison activities including training, technical manuals, and field engineering support

Operations and Workload

Operations will remain essentially constant with nearly the same level and type of support provided to the mission areas as in the past. Facilities and processes will be developed to support emerging nonnuclear manufacturing technologies with support from sites which have nonnuclear manufacturing missions. The total work load at Sandia will remain essentially constant.

## 2. Costs

Funding is expected to increase slightly from the FY 96 level of $164 million as shown below. This increase is due to the phase in of operations for production missions (primarily neutron generator production) assigned to Sandia in previous decisions. Manpower levels remain relatively constant during this time period.

| FY 96 | FY 97 | FY 98 | FY 99 | FY 00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $164 M | $177 M | $180 M | $180 M | $180 M |

Facilities

No new facilities are expected to be added at LLNL to accommodate the technology development activities for nuclear weapon secondaries.

## 2. Costs and Schedules

Stockpile Management costs for LLNL are shown in the following chart.




Process Development costs are an estimate of the costs for LLNL to assume a leadership role in manufacturing technology associated with weapon secondaries and cases. The expanded role of LLNL in secondary and case process technology is expected to begin in FY 1997. Other Stockpile Management costs represent an estimate of ongoing costs for specific Stockpile Management projects (currently about $15 million per year). Additional costs, not shown though not expected to be large, will be required for support of Pantex assembly/disassembly operations and to support plutonium technology work at LANL.

## 3. Risks

Technical risks associated with the LLNL Stockpile Management activities are very low.

## 4. Issues and Uncertainties

There are no outstanding issues or uncertainties at LLNL associated with the technology development activities for nuclear weapon secondaries, or other assignments.

## 2. Costs and Schedules

The projected annual budget to downsize and operate the KCP is given below. The cost to transition to the downsized plant is about $90 million. Depending on future actual workload requirements, the annual Stockpile Management operating budget would decrease from the current level of $244 million to as low as $177 million after transition is complete.




The schedule for transitioning to the downsized KCP is given below.




## 3. Risks, Issues, and Uncertainties

The risk associated with downsizing the KCP is extremely low. This is because (1) there is no production program interruption, (2) an experienced work force is retained, (3) a fully capable production infrastructure is already in place, and (4) the existing process and manufacturing engineering expertise are retained.

# VII. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT THE KANSAS CITY PLANT (KCP)

## 1. Description of Planned Actions

Activities

It is DOE's preferred alternative to retain existing nonnuclear production missions at the Kansas City Plant (KCP) and to downsize it appropriately to satisfy future production needs. This optimization of the plant size would result in the least technical risk and greatest cost savings for nonnuclear manufacturing. At the same time, it is DOE's intent that SNL take a greater role and responsibility at the KCP for both nonnuclear manufacturing technology and the conduct of the weapon surveillance testing program.

Operations and Workload

The production mission of the KCP would remain unchanged. The proposed actions to downsize the KCP are driven by the lower production workload for support of the planned stockpile. Manufacturing processes and capabilities will be maintained consistent with production requirements and expected industry capabilities. KCP will continue to procure from industrial sources rather than to maintain in-house capabilities where feasible.

The preferred alternative is also consistent with the initiative started in 1993 to make KCP the Logistics and Manufacturing Center (LMC) for the DOE Weapons Complex. The LMC initiative gave the KCP a greater responsibility for nuclear weapons logistic activities.

The responsibilities assigned to SNL at the KCP will require the establishment of an integrated surveillance testing and assessment program between SNL and the KCP which takes maximum advantage of the expertise of both locations. The assignment of a nonnuclear manufacturing technology role to SNL should help assure continued competence in nonnuclear production technology at both KCP and SNL.

Facilities

Currently, the Kansas City Plant is approximately 3.2 million square feet contained primarily in three connected buildings (main manufacturing, manufacturing support and technology transfer). The manufacturing support building and technology transfer center as well as portions of the main manufacturing building would be vacated. The Kansas City Plant would be downsized to approximately 1.8 million square feet.

An additional uncertainty is associated with the elimination of projected inventories of high explosives from weapon dismantlement. There is currently no approved schedule for this activity. A completion date of FY 2000 is assumed in this report, and is considered conservative, as it allows for two additional years to complete the disposition of high explosives that would be generated at Pantex through 1998.

# IX. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT THE Y-12 PLANT

## 1. Description of Planned Actions

Activities

It is DOE's preferred alternative to retain existing weapon secondary and case fabrication missions at the Y-12 plant and to downsize it appropriately to satisfy future production needs. This optimization of the plant size would result in the least technical risk and greatest cost savings. At the same time, it is DOE's intent that LLNL and LANL take a greater role and responsibility at Y-12 for both weapon secondary and case technology and the conduct of the weapon surveillance testing program.

The responsibilities assigned to LLNL and LANL would require the expansion of their role at Y-12. A laboratory office at Y-12, jointly staffed by the laboratories, is expected.

The long-term missions that would remain at the Y-12 plant are: (1) fabrication of components for weapon secondaries; (2) assembly/disassembly and surveillance of weapon secondaries and cases; and (3) potentially, storage of the nation's strategic reserves of highly enriched uranium. The Y-12 plant could also be the site for the storage and processing of excess nuclear materials.

Operations and Workloads

Operations at Y-12 would be sized consistent with projected workload requirements. Operations would normally be performed on a single shift basis. This level of activity would support the manufacture of about 20 secondaries and cases per year. The secondaries and cases manufactured each year would be used to replace secondaries and cases destroyed by surveillance testing.

Requirements for greater production quantities would require increased production operations staff, multi-shift operations, and/or reactivation of standby facilities. Increasing the production staffing could result in a capacity of about 100 units per year on a sustained basis. Annual workload requirements greater than 100 units could be accommodated by either multi-shift operations, or by reactivation of standby capacity.




Stockpile Management operating costs are shown to decrease from over $300 million per year to less than $100 million per year by the year 2003. Downsizing costs cover the facility modification, equipment relocation, and other costs to achieve the downsized Y-12. Other program costs include work for other DOE programs and other federal agencies. These costs are assumed to continue at present levels. Not shown are the costs for D&D of facilities determined to be excess to program needs. The landlord costs for excess facilities awaiting D&D are projected to be $131 million annually until the D&D is completed, and are shown as other program costs beginning in year 2003.

The major milestones for downsizing Y-12 are shown below.

**Schedule for Downsized Y-12**




## 3. Risks, Issues, and Uncertainties

The planned downsizing of the Y-12 plant involves risk in two areas. The facilities not required for the Stockpile Management program are assumed to be transferred to D&D as the weapons program completes safe shutdown of the facilities. This transfer may not be possible as assumed. Each year of delay in transfer would move $131 million (starting in 2003) from Other Program Costs to the Stockpile Management

The reactivation of standby facilities and equipment and the hiring and training of additional production workers would require about three years. The Y-12 production activities would be performed with a small, flexible workforce.

Production process development work at Y-12 would be integrated with the LLNL and LANL secondary technology program. This integration is expected to result in greater assurance that critical manufacturing technology will be retained and that new production technologies can be introduced without adversely affecting weapon safety or performance. The amount of production technology work at Y-12 is not expected to change significantly from current levels; however, the nature of the work will be more aligned with LLNL and LANL Stockpile Stewardship needs.

Stockpile surveillance activities at Y-12 would also become more integrated with the laboratories. Each organization possesses unique knowledge and skills that will be pooled for greatest efficiency of surveillance operations and for added confidence in the prediction of aging effects. This could result in laboratory employees actively participating in the surveillance testing and evaluation at Y-12, and Y-12 employees doing the same at the laboratories.

Facilities

Y-12 would downsize and consolidate all secondary and case manufacturing processes into significantly fewer existing production buildings. Existing excess equipment that does not have to be removed to accommodate consolidation would be placed in cold standby. In addition, two production buildings would be maintained in a cold standby status as a contingency. The remaining buildings (80%-to-90% of the current floor space) would be made available to other programs, e.g. the fissile materials disposition program, if Y-12 is chosen for the fissile materials disposition mission, or brought to a safe shutdown condition and transferred to Environmental Management for decontamination and decommissioning (D&D).

**2. Costs and Schedules**

Costs of downsizing and subsequently operating Y-12 are shown below.

operating cost in the above funding chart. This issue must be worked well in advance of the time for transfer of the site landlord responsibilities scheduled for 2003.

The second risk is the implementation of the flexible workforce. The consolidated Y-12, operating at the workload described above, would require a production workforce that is capable of operating various production processes, and is therefore subject to bargaining agreements relative to labor classification.

# X. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED STOCKPILE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT THE SAVANNAH RIVER SITE (SRS)

## 1. Description of Planned Actions

Activities

The SRS tritium facilities will continue to support the nuclear weapons stockpile through the recycling of tritium from the weapons stockpile and the loading and surveillance of tritium reservoirs. The SRS would also be the site for tritium production if an accelerator is chosen as the method for tritium production. Tritium production and recycling options have been recently addressed by DOE in a separate PEIS. Tritium recycle plans are presented here for completeness because this activity is an integral portion of the weapons production complex.

A greater role for LANL in tritium recycle technology and tritium reservoir surveillance at SRS is expected. Los Alamos staff could work at SRS in these areas, and conversely it is expected that SRS staff could participate in work at LANL.

Operations and Workloads

Operations at SRS would be sized consistent with projected workload to support tritium reservoirs in the weapons stockpile. The workload level is more directly related to the size of the weapons stockpile than for any other weapon production mission because of the inherent rate of tritium decay and the associated need to replace tritium reservoirs on a scheduled basis.

Facilities

The SRS would downsize and consolidate tritium recycle and surveillance activities into fewer, newer facilities to significantly reduce operating costs. The new Replacement Tritium Facility, building 233-H, would be the principal tritium facility after consolidation.

### 3. Risks, Issues, and Uncertainties

The risk associated with consolidating tritium activities at SRS is very low. This is because (1) an experienced workforce will be retained, (2) a fully capable infrastructure is already in place, and (3) the existing process expertise is retained.

## XI. COMPOSITE COST ANALYSIS

A composite cost comparison which combines the projected cost data for the four production plants is shown in the following chart. It compares the Stockpile Management costs at these plants with no downsizing to the costs if the downsizing described in Sections VII through X is achieved.




As shown above, with no facility downsizing, workload reductions will reduce total operating costs at the four plants from the present level of about $860 million to about $670 million. By investments in facility downsizing, the total facility operating costs would further reduce to about $520 million by FY2005. These annual operating costs include $131 million in site landlord costs at the Y-12 Plant which might be transferred to the DOE Environmental Mangement organization. Stockpile Management total

costs at the four plants would be reduced to about $390 million if this transfer were to occur, though DOE total costs would be unchanged.

An investment in facility downsizing of about $170 million over the next four years results in a net savings of approximately $300 million by the end of FY2005, and net savings of nearly $1.1 billion by the end of FY2010. In addition, the initial $170 million investment will be fully recouped by the end of FY2003.