

September 2, 1994

Dr. Tara O'Toole,
Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety, and Health
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20585

Mr. David Rossen
LANL SWEIS Project Director
Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185

Ms. Diana Webb
NEPA Specialist
Department of Energy
528 35th St.
Los Alamos, NM 87544

NEW MEXICO
ENVIRONMENTAL DEPARTMENT

1994 SEP -6 AM 1:02

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*file
LANL*

*FX → Bonita
Diana Webb
Done for*

*Barbara
Eter RD*

I

- RE: 1. Preliminary identification of prescoping issues for the LANL site-wide EIS**
2. Initial information request in support of that site-wide EIS

Dear Dr. O'Toole, Mr. Rossen, and Ms. Webb:

With the publication of the Advanced Notice of Intent (ANOI), the Department of Energy (DOE) has committed to an ambitious schedule for the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS). This schedule begins with a prescoping period which will address several fundamental issues. The resolution of these issues (or their lack of resolution) will be expressed in the Notice of Intent (NOI), and will heavily affect the scope, analysis, and content of the SWEIS. These issues will critically influence DOE's actual choice of alternatives for LANL.

These prescoping issues include:

- a) the overall alternatives for LANL to be proposed in the NOI and analyzed in the SWEIS, coupled with the explicit policy alternatives which drive them;¹
- b) the relationship of the SWEIS and its underlying policy choices to the Reconfiguration Programmatic EIS (R-PEIS), DOE's actual reconfiguration policy, and other related DOE programmatic and site-wide EISs and decisions;
- c) the proposed methodology of the alternatives analysis;
- d) which of the more than one hundred projects now officially planned and being considered for LANL will be part of the SWEIS analysis, and at what level of detail the SWEIS analysis will be conducted for each project or class of projects;
- e) what subsequent, more-detailed National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis will be required for specific projects;
- f) following the release of the necessary background information described below, what public process will be established for determining whether interim action is permissible for each project and which, if any, planned projects are thus permissible interim actions to be undertaken during the SWEIS process;



12535

FILED LANL GEN MISC/S

2

g) the relationship of the SWEIS's project-by-project environmental analyses to its analysis of the overall alternatives proposed by the DOE for LANL in support of national policies; and

h) the scope of Laboratory participation in the preparation of the SWEIS, especially in any hazard and risk analyses.

All these are matters which, we believe, will need to be addressed in the NOI and which therefore will require public, State, and tribal discussion and input during the prescoping phase.

In order to meaningfully address these fundamental issues during the prescoping and then the scoping period, the public, State, and tribes will need access to a variety of integrative planning and policy documents. The Appendix to this letter provides an initial listing of documents and categories of documents that will be needed. Some of these documents are classified. They should either be declassified, or excerpted as needed for public, State, and tribal use. Without access to these documents, these parties are being asked their opinion about the scope of analyses to be done for projects that implement policy alternatives which are themselves unknown and inaccessible. This is not the intent of NEPA.

We note that the ANOI commits the DOE to release "within the limits of classification," "as much information as possible." We applaud this commitment, noting that its application requires disclosure of documents previously held by DOE to be exempt from release on the grounds that they were "For Official Use Only," "Draft," "Pre-decisional," and so on. This step, the commitment to release all relevant unclassified documents, is fundamental to implementing the public involvement portion of the SWEIS, and we agree with DOE's action.

A central purpose of the SWEIS is to analyze the connections and relationships between projects. 40CFR §1508.25, which deals with the scope of NEPA analyses, requires the DOE to analyze "connected actions," "cumulative actions," and "similar actions," in addition to "unconnected single actions." The projects outlined in the ANOI, together with those in the FY96 DOE/LANL Capital Assets Management Process (CAMP 96), the LANL 1993 Strategic Plan, the LANL 1994 Institutional Plan, plus those in other documents, are all connected, cumulative, and/or similar, as these terms are defined in the passage cited. Further, the DOE must analyze not only the "direct," but also the "indirect" and "cumulative" impacts of these connected, cumulative, and similar actions. These legal requirements make it imperative that the connections and relationships between projects be made very explicit during the NEPA process. The documents listed in the Appendix under the heading "Integrative and Planning Documents Crucial to LANL Alternatives Analyses" have been named precisely because they are, to the best of our knowledge, the only official documents which can illuminate these relationships. Failure to provide these and other relevant documents will compromise the legal basis of the NEPA analysis.

The ANOI does not include formal SWEIS alternatives. Clearly, however, the array of projects now being proposed for LANL by DOE, and by LANL with DOE funding, participation, and assistance, may constitute a change of mission for the Laboratory away from the research,

development, and testing mission that has defined the core of the laboratory for the past forty years and toward an integrated nuclear weapons design, testing, maintenance, and remanufacturing mission.² As noted at 40CFR §1508.23, an agency proposal "may exist in fact as well as by agency declaration that one exists." Failure to adequately describe the DOE's de facto proposal to the public, State, and tribes, through failure to release relevant agency planning documents, will not meet the public participation requirements of 40CFR §1506.6(f), which require the release ("without charge to the extent practicable") of "any underlying documents" relative to EISs.

These "underlying documents" are all the more critical, given the failure to date of the DOE's R-PEIS process to clarify the future of the nuclear weapons complex and the role of the national laboratories, including LANL, in that complex. No authentic outside participation, let alone adequate NEPA analysis, can occur without the full disclosure of relevant documents prior to DOE decisions based on those documents. NEPA analysis, to be legally defensible, must be a pre-decisional process and is therefore, by its very nature, based on access to pre-decisional documents. After all, the primary purpose of an EIS is to serve as a device to help federal agencies, DOE in this case, make "better decisions," and its procedures "must insure that environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before decisions are made and before actions are taken" (40CFR §§1502.1 and 1500.1, emphasis added).

In addition to the broad prescoping issues mentioned above, the public, State and tribes will have to grapple soon--during the scoping period--with the more detailed environmental issues of the SWEIS, which include, but are not limited to:

- a) what levels of radioactive and hazardous waste generation and disposal are implied by
- i) the several projects, and ii) the overall alternatives, proposed by the DOE;
- b) what are the total environmental, safety, health, social, cultural, and economic impacts of each project and each overall alternative; and
- c) what will be the effect upon the global environment of each project and alternative, specifically here including the effect on the world's nonproliferation norms?

In order to reach an informed opinion on these matters and to contribute productively to the SWEIS in the manner contemplated by NEPA and the implementing regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and DOE, the public, State, and tribes will need access to information on a scale that is orders of magnitude greater than that to which DOE and LANL have been accustomed. Without this information, the DOE may well spend a large amount of money on the SWEIS without the informed guidance of outside commentators, and produce, as has often been the case in the past, a document that is ultimately of little use to DOE decision-makers or anyone else.

It cannot be emphasized enough that the greatest economy and effectiveness in the SWEIS process can only be achieved by much greater openness and release of information.

It is the purpose of this joint letter to emphasize the importance of accomplishing the needed

disclosures efficiently and promptly, to suggest a mechanism for doing so, and to make an initial identification of the categories and types of information that will be needed. As noted above, the Appendix to this letter summarizes our initial request.

We will make further, document-specific, requests as we identify relevant documents, but we very much hope that DOE will make an aggressive, independent effort to provide relevant documents without placing on the public, State, and tribes an obligation to identify and request them by name.

A Suggested Mechanism for SWEIS Information Disclosure

The above list is a daunting one, and we are cognizant both of the Departmental resources that must be committed to the disclosure process, and of the concomitant public, State, and tribal resources that must efficiently assimilate it. We suggest that the effort, on both sides, be centered at the LANL Community Reading Room with the establishment of a dedicated SWEIS file and information area and the specific tasking of Reading Room personnel with a broad mandate and authority to access the needed documents and expedite their release. This scheme will require a sincere commitment to the SWEIS information support at high levels in DOE and LANL. In fact, we expect that a written commitment to the process by the Laboratory Director will be necessary to ensure success, and we strongly urge you to obtain such a commitment. Without continuing commitment and daily operational support for SWEIS information openness at the LANL Director's level, not to mention at the Departmental offices in Los Alamos, Albuquerque, and Headquarters, the process will rapidly fail and will seriously prejudice the nature and content of public, State, and tribal participation.

This letter is intended as a first step in this very complex process. We are hopeful that the joint effort suggested herein can begin immediately so that informed participation by the public, State, and tribes, which is crucial to the success of the SWEIS, can be realized.

Sincerely,



Greg Mello
Los Alamos Study Group
212 E. Marcy St.
Santa Fe, NM 87501



Jay Coghlan
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety
107 Cienega St.
Santa Fe, NM 87501

cc: Carol Borgstrom, DOE/HQ
Harry Otway, LANL/SIO
Christina Armijo, DOE/LAAO

APPENDIX
LASG/CCNS letter to Tara O'Toole, 9/1/94

Integrative and Planning Documents Crucial to LANL Alternatives Analyses

These include, but are not limited to:

- a) the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum,
- b) any nuclear weapons posture reviews being used by the DOE for planning purposes,
- c) any DOE and/or interagency stockpile stewardship plans,
- d) the DOE National Security Strategic Plan,
- d) current DOE and LANL Strategic Plans,
- e) any current or implemented lead laboratory protocols, and
- f) any nuclear materials strategic plans developed by LANL or any such nuclear materials plans, orders, or inquiries written by DOE for LANL.

Project-specific Documents for the Large Number of Presently-Foreseen LANL Projects

The ANOI lists 23 LANL projects in its Tables 1 and 2. To this number must be added:

- 1) 3 projects not shown in the ANOI which are currently undergoing DOE/LAAO NEPA review;
- 2) 3 additional projects not shown in the ANOI which appeared on DOE HQ's April 1994 NEPA projects list;
- 3) 49 additional LANL projects, not shown in the ANOI, detailed in the CAMP 96 with start dates between now and 2007, plus 5 non-nuclear consolidation projects already analyzed in a separate Environmental Assessment (EA);
- 4) 15 more outlined in the FY93 LANL Strategic Plan (counting a group of seven infrastructure projects as an aggregate of one), also not mentioned in the ANOI; and
- 5) 19 more detailed in the CAMP 96 with start dates after 2007, likewise not in the ANOI.

The total is approximately 112 official LANL projects currently foreseen.³ Included below as Table 1 to this Appendix is a preliminary listing of these projects, organized by source of information.

In order to begin to address the questions noted in the body of the letter, the following categories and types of data will be required for each project:

- a) All applicable EAs, draft EAs, Environmental Checklists, and Memoranda To File;
- b) All applicable safety analysis reports and other accident and operations risk analyses relevant to the need for, and scope of, the project;

- c) All applicable documents describing the projects, such as, in the case of capital projects, conceptual design plans and Conceptual Design Reports (CDRs);
- d) The project history, together with all justification and need analyses, and the Key Decision (KD) status and expectations; and
- e) Projections of waste stream characteristics and amounts, together with expected treatment and disposal requirements.

Waste Stream Documentation is Critical to the SWEIS

It is obvious that no sensible conclusion or analysis of present and expected environmental impacts is possible without thorough documentation of the waste stream characteristics of present operations and those expected under various programmatic scenarios. Clearly, this data must be program-specific. This represents a level of detail of LANL waste generation reporting that has not yet, to our knowledge, been publicly disclosed, either for present or projected operations.

Two Specific Instances of Needed Data

The FY96 DOE/LANL CAMP document projects future power and water requirements for the LANL site. The data and analysis underlying these projections should be released promptly.

With respect to the LANL ER program, waste generation and treatment requirements projections have been made on the basis of assumptions regarding eventual land ownership, land use, and cleanup standards that will apply in the future. Sufficient data and analysis regarding the rationale for these projections must be made available to allow determination of the effect that variances in the underlying assumptions will have on these waste generation and treatment projections.

Notes to Letter and Appendix

1. Simplistically, and for purposes of illustration only, one could define four categories of programmatic alternatives for LANL:

1) The "shutdown and clean-up" alternative, which will represent a minimum or baseline environmental impact;

2) The "green lab plus minimal stockpile stewardship" alternative;

3) The "robust nuclear weapons research, development, and testing (NW RD&T) and expansive stockpile stewardship" alternative (much like the present scale of Laboratory operations); and

4) The "super-integrated/consolidated NW RD&T, stockpile stewardship, production, and storage complex" alternative.

The ANOI defers proposing alternatives until the NOI. Ultimately, the criteria of 40CFR §1508.25 must be met, which require the agency to propose three types of alternatives, including "other reasonable courses of action" besides the "proposed action" and the "no action" alternative.

2. The evidence for this can be found in virtually every relevant planning document, especially the 1996 Capital Assets Management Process (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan, which are DOE documents prepared by LANL with close DOE involvement. Laboratory managers are fairly explicit about this change of mission, both in writing (e.g. John Immele, writing in Los Alamos Science 93 pp. 45-49, and LANL management as a whole, in their 1993 Strategic Plan).

3. This number may decrease slightly if analysis shows redundancy of projects bearing different names in these separate documents. It is more likely to increase, since a few projects not included in these lists are shown in the LANL 1994 Institutional Plan and others appear in a memorandum showing NEPA-relevant LANL projects that was provided to the public by DOE's Albuquerque Field Office. Further disclosures could also swell this list.

Table 1: Preliminary List of Proposed LANL Projects--August 30, 1994 draft

Projects not shown on these lists can be found in lists provided to the public by DOE/AL and in LANL's 1994 Institutional Plan
 Additional cost figures can be found in the Institutional Plan

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
1	Chemistry and Metallurgy Research (CMR) Building Upgrades	(same)	(same as NOI--notes dates vary in this column)	(same as NOI)	(same) Nuclear Materials (NM) construction (C) in (FY)93	DP 9/13/93	194.8 1988 (really a new combined line item, containing Phases II and III, in FY95)
2	Transuranic (TRU) Waste Drum Staging Building, TA-55	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	DP 6/11/91	
3	Decontaminate, Decommission, and Demolish (DD&D) Bldg 86, High-Pressure Tritium Lab, TA-33	(same)	(same)	(not shown)	(not shown)	DP 11/4/91	
4	Safety Testing of Pits Under Thermal Stress, CMR Building, TA-3	Fire Resistant Pit (FRP) Test Program	FRP Project	(not shown)	(not shown) but check text for all these	DP 6/2/93	
5	High Explosive Materials Test Facility, TA-11	High Explosive Materials Test Laboratory, TA-11	(same as NOI)	(not shown)	(same) RD&T; C in 94	DP 3/10/92	
6	Isotope Separator Facility, TA-48	(same)	Construction and Operation of Isotope Sep. Bldg, 1/15/92	(not shown)	(not shown)	DP 12/10/92	
7	Low Energy Accelerator Laboratory (LEAL) (formerly Accelerator Prototype Lab), TA-53	(same)	(Accel. Prototype Lab.)	(not shown)	Is this the accel. produced tritium and ATW R&D facility?; if so: EM; design (D) in 97	DP 8/23/92	
8	(not shown)	Low Level Waste (LLW) Drum Staging Bldg, TA-16	(same as LAAO)	(not shown)	(not shown)	11/19/91	

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
9	Nuclear Mat'l's Storage Facility (NMSF) Upgrade, TA-55	(same)	NMSF (not "upgrade")	NMSF Renovation	NMSF; NM design (D) in 93	DP 8/10/93	44.98 1984 (date is for initiation of original bldg.)
10	Weapons Components Test Facility Relocation, TA-16	(same)	Modif. and Oper. of Weap. Comp. Testing Facil., 11/19/91	Weapons Component Surveillance Laboratory (is this the same project?)	not shown?	DP 11/25/92	50 2000
11	New Sanitary Landfill	(not shown)	(same as NOI)	(same)	(same); EM; D 96	DP/EM 5/9/91	9.5 1997
12	Actinide Source Term Waste Test Program, CMR Bldg., TA-3	(same)	(same)	(not shown)	(not shown)	EM 12/09/92	WIPP waste tests
13	Controlled Air Incinerator (CAI), Expanded Operations	(same)	CAI (not "expanded ops")	(not shown)	(not shown)	EM 4/5/91 (Webb); 10/20/90	
14	Expansion of Area G, Radioactive Waste Disposal Site, TA-54	Expansion of Area G, LLW Disposal Area, TA-54, And Replacement Compactor, TA-54	same with addition of Asbestos Pit	(not shown)	(not shown)	EM 10/20/90	
15	Hazardous Waste Treatment Facility and Mixed Waste Receiving and Storage Facility, TA-63	(same)	HW Treat. Facil. w/o MW Rec. and Stor. Fac.	(shown as separate projects)	MW Receiving and Storage Facility; EM C 93	EM 4/26/91	12.5 for HW Treat. Fac. (1990) and 9.6 for MW Receiving and Stor. Fac. (1993)
16	High Explosive (HE) Wastewater Treatment Facility, TA-16	(same)	(not shown)	(same)	(same) EM D 94	EM 6/29/92	6.4 1994
17	Mixed Waste Disposal Facility (MWDF), TA-67	(same)	(same)	RCRA MW Storage and Disposal Fac.	MW Storage and Disposal Facility; EM; D 93	EM 7/13/93	40.7 1995
18	(not shown)	Medical Isotope Production, CMR Bldg., TA-3	Med. Is. Prod. Project	(not shown)	(not shown)	NE 2/24/93	
19	National Biomedical Tracer Facility	(same)	(not shown)	(same)	National Biomedical Facility; Civilian; D 95	none 12/17/93	65.5 1995

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
20	Laundry	Laundry Facility	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	DP	
21	(not shown)	Jemez Tomography Experiment, Phase II	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	ER	
22	Radioactive Liquid Wastewater Treatment Facility, TA-63	(same)	(same)	(same)	(same) EM D 96	EM 2/8/93	110.0 1997
23	(not shown)	(not shown)	Fire Protection Improvements	Fire Prot. Improv.	(same); Infrastructure; D 95	DP 10/29/92	14.6 1996
24	Receipt and Storage of Nuclear Material for Criticality Experiment, TA-18	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	DP	
25	Hazardous, Low Level Radioactive, and Mixed Waste Treatment Skids	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	EM	
26	Replacement Waste Compactor, TA-54	(formerly part of Area G project)	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	EM	
27	Radioisotope Heat Source Fabrication, CMR, TA-3 and TA-55	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	Space Nuclear Fuel Users Facility?; Civilian D 98	NE	
28	(not shown)	(not shown)	Decontamination Oven	(not shown)	(not shown)	5/28/91	
29	(not shown)	(not shown)	Landfill Modification, Area J	(not shown)	(not shown)	9/18/92	
30	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrotest Facility (DARHT)	(same) RD&T C 93	WRD&T	81.4 1988 (Constr. began in FY1994)
31	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	DARHT Second Axis	(same); RD&T C 97	WRD&T	30.2 1997
32	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	Static VAR Compensator	(same); Infrastructure C 93	WRD&T	9.3 1996
33	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	Water Well Replacements	(same); Inf. D 95	WRD&T	15.0 1996

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
34	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	ATLAS (Agex II facility)	(not shown)?	WRD&T	34.5 1996
35	(not shown)	(not shown)	(not shown)	Traffic Safety Upgrades	(not shown)	WRD&T	12.5 1998
36				TA-3 Centralized Cooling Network	(same); Inf. D 97	WRD&T	14.9 1998
37				Contained Explosives Test Complex	(not shown)	WRD&T	26.6 1998
38				Central Health Physics Calibration Facility	(not shown)	WRD&T	5 1999
39				Nuclear Environments Simulation Test Facility	(not shown)	WRD&T	150 2001
40				Advanced Hydrotest Facility	High-energy Radiographic Facility?; RD&T; D 98	WRD&T	422.0 2002
41				Consolidated Tritium Complex	Tritium Laboratory; NM D 98	SS	50.0 1994
42				High-Power Detonators	Nonnuclear Consolidation; Five Subprojects; Nuclear Weapons/reconfiguration D 93	SS	9.93 1994
43				Neutron Tube Targe Loading		SS	5.1 1994
44				Calorimetry		SS	0.9 1995
45				Beryllium Technology		SS	11.1 1996
46				Pit Support Functions		SS	3.13 1996
47				Radiographic and Stockpile Support Facility	Radiographic Facility, TA-55?; NM; D 95	SS	22.5 1998
48				Nuclear Unit Evaluation Facility	(not shown)?	SS	5 2001

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
49				Industrial Waste Systems	(not shown)	EM	1.6 1990
50				Air Exhaust Modifications	Air Exhaust Modifications, TA-53; EM; C 93	EM	3.5 1992
51				Radioactive Air Emissions	(not shown)	EM	141.3
52				TRU-Waste Treatment Facility	(same); EM D 97	EM	64 1999
53				Ash Immobilization Facility	(not shown)	EM	6 2003
54				National Center for Neutron Research	1 MW neutron-scattering source, LANSCE II; Civil.; D 97	Energy Research	782.8 1998
55				Nonproliferation and Arms Control Center	(same); Defense D 95-96	IS	20.0 1999
56				Sigma/D38 Operations and ES&H Upgrades	Sigma/CMR Uranium R&D Upgrades; NM; D 97	IS	12 2001
57				LiH/LiD Component R&D Fabrication Facility	LiH/LiD Component R&D Facility; NM; D 97	Safeguards and Security	10 1997
58				Nuclear Safeguards Technology Laboratory	(same); Defense C 93	Safeguards and Security	20.4 2001
59				Weapons Component and Testing & Development Lab	(same); RD&T D 98	WRD&T	50 2001
60				Technology Transfer Conference Center	(not shown)	WRD&T	30 2002
61				CAD/CAM Robotics Lab	(not shown)	WRD&T	12 2003
62				Electrical Power Systems Upgrade	Interior Electric Upgrades?; Infra.; D 98	WRD&T	26 2003
63				Liquid and Compressed Gas Facility	(not shown)	WRD&T	15 2004

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
64				SM-40 Refurbishment	(same); Infra.; D 98	WRD&T	30 2004
65				Transportation System Upgrades	(not shown)	WRD&T	33 2004
66				Central Computing Facility Refurbishment	(not shown)	WRD&T	50 2004
67				Special Experiment Assembly Facility	(not shown)	WRD&T	10 2005
68				Wellness and Child Development Center	(not shown)	WRD&T	10 2005
69				SM-43 Infrastructure Refurbishment	(same); Infra.; D 98	WRD&T	50 2005
70				Explosive Pulsed Power Facility	(same); RD&T D 98	WRD&T	70 2005
71				SM-123 Refurbishment	(not shown)	WRD&T	20 2006
72				Safeguards and Security, Phase III	Safeguards and Security Upgrades; Inf.; <u>complete C</u> in 93	WRD&T	33 2006
73				Administrative Support complex	(not shown)	WRD&T	50 2006
74				Field Test Support Complex	(not shown)	WRD&T	75 2006
75				Equipment Services Building	(not shown)	WRD&T	15 2007
76				Support Services Complex	(not shown)	WRD&T	75 2007
77				Robotics Lab Development Facility	(not shown)	WRD&T	100 2007
78				Sigma Building Renovation	(not shown)	SS	45 2002

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
79				Enriched Uranium Facility	(not shown)	SS	160 2002
80				LIH/LiD Component R&D Facility	(not shown)	SS	10 2004
81				PF-4 Rehabilitation	(not shown)	SS	80 2007
82				Condensate Systems Upgrades	(not shown)	EM	4 2002
83				Effluent Revitalization Plant	(not shown)	EM	5 2005
84				SCIF Refurbishment/Expansion	(not shown)	IS	20 2005
85					Materials Science Laboratory; RD&T; complete C in 93		
86					Test Transition/Safeguards Facilities; RD&T; D 95-96		
87					Weapons Explosives Safety Test Facility; RD&T; D 98		
88					Materials Science Initiatives Lab; RD&T; D 98		
89					Integration and Consolidation of LLNL Pu R&D; NM; D 95		
90					SNM Storage and Processing Facilities; NM; D 98		
91					Complex 21 Modelling Lab; NW/Reconfig.; D 97		
92					Special Electronics Shop; Defense; D 95		

No.	Advance Notice of Intent (ANOI) Project Name	Diana Webb List of LAO NEPA Reviews, 5/3/94	4/94 DOE HQ NEPA List	Capital Assets Management Plan 96 (CAMP 96) and its Site Development Plan 94	1993 LANL Strategic Plan (Project Title, Strategic Sector, and project date, from pp. 111-113; queried if uncertain match to other lists)	DOE Sponsor (as shown in ANOI) or Program (as in CAMP); NEPA Determination Date	Total Estimated Cost (TEC) in \$M and estimated initiation date from CAMP 96
93					Energetic Materials Pilot Plant; Defense; D 98		
94					Line D Shielding; Civ.; D 97		
95					Hot Dry Rock II; Civ.; D 97		
96					Environmental Sciences Bldg; Civ.; D 99		
97					Seven other infrastructure projects		
98					ES&H improvements; EM; C 93		
99					Accelerator Produced Tritium (APT)/ATW R&D Facility; EM; D 97		
100				18 other projects under WRD&T shown for 2008-2015			
101				Pu R&D Facility		SS	75; 2011