



SAA 200 118440000

reply refer to: WX-5-80-630
 Mail stop: 780

November 3, 1980

Mr. Michael Q. Guy
 Weapons Production Division
 U. S. Department Of Energy
 Albuquerque Operations Office
 P. O. Box 5400
 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87115

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW	
1ST REVIEW DATE: 5/19/91	DETERMINATION (CIRCLE NUMBERS)
AUTHORITY: 2000 <input type="checkbox"/> DD	1. CLASSIFICATION RETAINED
NAME: Jim Henry	2. CLASSIFICATION CHANGED TO:
2ND REVIEW DATE: 9/20/98	3. CONTAINS NO DOE CLASSIFIED INFO
AUTHORITY: DD	4. COORDINATE WITH:
NAME: Nazir Khalil AL	5. CLASSIFICATION CANCELED
	6. CLASSIFIED INFO BRACKETED
	7. OTHER (SPECIFY):

Dear Sir:

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO YOUR TWX OF OCTOBER 3, 1980, REGARDING
 BRUSH WELLMAN LETTER AND ALSO PROPOSED BERYLLIUM
 PROGRAM. (U)

REFERENCE:

1. Proposal of Brush Wellman Inc. for upgrading of Beryllium Metal Plant at Elmore, Ohio, July 28, 1980.
2. Memorandum, R. E. Caudle to H. E. Roser, "Beryllium Supply Program", DP-252, September 12, 1980.
3. TWX, H. E. Roser to Rockwell International, Rocky Flats, "Beryllium Supply Program," September 8, 1980.
4. Letter, Brush Wellman Inc. (M. B. Powers) to M. Q. Guy, reiterating Brush Wellman Inc. position and stating certain demands, August 29, 1980.
5. Letter, T. C. Jones to Maj. Gen. W. W. Hoover stating "AL's position in regard to the Brush letter and beryllium", September 17, 1980.
6. TWX, M. Q. Guy to distribution, requesting comments on References 3, 4, and 5, October 3, 1980.
7. Letter, Seymour Sack, LLNL, to M. Q. Guy, responding to References 5 and 6, October 14, 1980.
8. Letter, R. O. Williams, Jr., AI,RF, to H. E. Roser, discussing References 4 and 5.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

RESTRICTED DATA

This document contains Restricted Data as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Unauthorized disclosure subject to Administrative and Criminal Sanctions.

let Y

78 SA 200 11844000253

November 3, 1980

The above long list of references has been reviewed and digested at LASL within the past few days. It is obvious to any reader that there are differing and conflicting opinions presented; further, there are contradictory positions within some of the organizations involved in the beryllium supply situation. There are, indeed, differences of opinion within LASL as to the need for either beryllium metal or its oxide; however, there is a policy that was spelled out on August 2, 1979, by the Associate Director for National Security Programs, R. D. Baker. This policy has been neither modified nor rescinded.

In essence the LASL policy is:

1. Weapons have been designed, tested, and entered into stockpile, that contain no beryllium or beryllium compounds.
2. LASL is designing future weapons to use as little of beryllium products as possible, but probably we can not eliminate their use completely in the near term, i.e., for current production.
3. LASL is pursuing investigations of alternate materials, to beryllium and beryllium oxide, not desperately, but as a part of the responsible action that should be undertaken by a laboratory concerned about a possible supply problem of any material that is used in nuclear weapons.
4. LASL supports and encourages the investigation of effective utilization of scrap beryllium product; it recommends serious consideration of reactivating the ingot sheet program at AI,RF. In particular, the reclamation of beryllium materials that have been surface contaminated by contact with radioactive materials and of beryllium materials, which contain activated impurities resulting from irradiation, should be investigated.

It appears from Reference 2 that ALO was charged with developing a comprehensive program management plan to address future beryllium materials needs for weapons, to consider all options including alternate materials, and to include serious consideration of Brush Wellman Inc. proposals as part of the plan. Reference 3, which requests that Rockwell International "establish a program function to provide management and technical support to the AL Program Manager" is a first step in responding to MA. Reference 5 does no such thing and seems to be a complete and utter capitulation to Brush Wellman Inc. Fortunately it was followed by Reference 6, to which this letter purports to respond.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

November 3, 1980

They particularly do not want to deal with Rockwell on this matter and, from a word-of-mouth report, they do not want SNLL in on it either. They politely refused any technical assistance from "experts" in DOE or any of its contractors. Surely such a program should be monitored, both for technical content and for financial accountability. The question naturally arises as to the adequacy of General Accounting Office auditing of Brush Wellman Inc. when, or if, the government does agree to the \$3.6 M transaction. LASL believes representatives of DOE should monitor and audit any such program as the above.

Yours truly,

John E. Hockett
J. E. Hockett
Group WX-5

JEH:rg/edt

Distribution:

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
R. D. Baker, ADNRP
J. J. Wechsler, WX-DO
R. W. Selden, X-DO
D. N. Bryson, MAT-DO
S. S. Hecker, CMB-DO
CRMO (2)
E. H. Plassmann, WX-5
J. E. Hockett, WX-5

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~