A coalition of nuclear watchdog groups including two Santa Fe organizations wants a federal judge to prevent $300 million worth of planned upgrades at Los Alamos National Laboratory weapons facilities from going forward pending a legal action against the Department of Energy.

Among the projects that could be affected are planned upgrades to Technical Area 55, the lab's top secret plutonium research plant; to the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research building; and to the Nuclear Materials Storage Facility.

"We will seek an injunction of all activities related to the production of plutonium pits," Greg Mello, of the Santa Fe-based Los Alamos Study group, said Monday.

The hazardous work of building plutonium pits grapefruit-size metal spheres found at the heart of most nuclear bombs was recently transferred from the Rocky Flats plant near Denver to Los Alamos. The lab is expected to build from 20 to 80 pits per year far fewer than the more than 1,000 pits a year that were built at Rocky Flats during the Cold War.

In a March 14 letter to the Energy Department, the coalition of more than two dozen groups informed DOE attorneys that they are seeking to reopen a seven-year lawsuit between the agency and citizen organizations.

The groups say the agency has failed to live up to the terms of a 1990 settlement that required the DOE to conduct environmental studies of its plans to rebuild and clean up the U.S. nuclear weapons complex.

Energy Department officials were not reached for comment.

A laboratory spokesman declined comment.

The coalition is led by the National Resources Defense Council, a Washington D.C. organization, and includes groups from California, Nevada, Washington state, Tennessee, Utah and Texas. The other Santa Fe organization is Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping, an Albuquerque group, is also part of the coalition.

The coalition's major claim is that the agency has failed to properly evaluate alternatives to its plan to spend $40 billion over the next 10 years on revamping its nuclear weapons facilities.

The plan is controversial not just because of its cost. It is widely viewed as a political payoff to the nuclear weapons establishment, which was forced earlier in the decade to accept the termination of underground nuclear testing.

The coalition also says the DOE has fallen short in analyzing its plans to handle nuclear and chemical waste generated by future weapons work.

Christopher Paine, senior research associate with the National Resources Defense Council, said the agency has strayed so far from the 1990 settlement that its future plans "no longer add up to a coherent whole."

"They've confused themselves and the public," Paine said.

The stockpile stewardship and management program is designed to maintain the nation's existing nuclear arsenal in a state of readiness. This is to be accomplished in two ways: by replacing aging weapons components and by testing weapons without blowing them up in an array of new facilities.

The Los Alamos arm of the program is set to receive $416 million in 1997, about a 10 percent increase from the previous year. The lab is also set to install new supercomputers as a way to simulate nuclear testing.
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Lawsuit To Be Renewed Over DOE Studies

Group Targets Impact Statements

Journal Staff Report

Anti-nuclear activists plan to reopen a 1989 suit alleging the U.S. Department of Energy again has failed to perform adequate environmental studies on its largest nuclear weapons and waste-cleanup programs.

The renewed case will attack much of DOE's blueprints for post-Cold War work in weapons research and the cleanup and management of weapons-related radioactive wastes.

More than two dozen environmental groups nationwide — three in New Mexico — told the DOE on Monday that they view three key environmental-impact statements in those areas as deficient or nonexistent.

DOE officials could not be reached Monday night for comment.

One EIS on stewardship or caretaking of the nation's nuclear stockpile gives the green light to Los Alamos National Laboratory for an $800 million program to begin building plutonium pits — the fission triggers for thermonuclear weapons — by 2003.

"We just think all of this is rushing forward all too fast," said Greg Mello, president of the Santa Fe-based Los Alamos Study Group, which opposes nuclear proliferation.

The groups settled the 1989 case with the DOE on the agency's promise to perform the elaborate environmental studies. The renewed suit will allege the result falls short of a comprehensive review.

For example, Mello said, the EIS on stockpile stewardship fails to study potential environmental impacts from the $422 million Advanced Hydrotest Facility, planned for Los Alamos. Yet initial spending on the experimental machine already has begun.

The groups hope the suit will prompt the DOE and Congress to rethink the trend toward increased spending on weapons and reduced spending on waste cleanup, said Jay Coghlan, program director with another Santa Fe anti-nuclear group, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety.

"Given the choice, would the taxpaying public choose to fund pork-barrel nuclear weapons programs producing more nuclear waste or would it choose cleanup programs?" Coghlan said.

"We think taxpayers are due the peace dividend they paid for long ago."

The groups say they will file to reopen the case after the 10-day notice period expires.

The motion will be reviewed by the original judge, Stanley Sporkin of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, which handles appeals of actions by federal agencies.
Watchdog groups sue to stop LANL weapons upgrade work

By KEITH EASTHOUSE
The New Mexican

A coalition of nuclear watchdog groups — including two Santa Fe organizations — wants a federal judge to prevent $300 million worth of planned upgrades at Los Alamos National Laboratory weapons facilities from going forward pending a legal action against the Department of Energy.

Among the projects that could be affected are planned upgrades to Technical Area 55, the lab's top secret plutonium research plant; to the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research building; and to the Nuclear Materials Storage Facility.

"We will seek an injunction of all activities related to the production of plutonium pits," Greg Mello, of the Santa Fe-based Los Alamos Study group, said Monday.

The hazardous work of building plutonium pits — grapefruit-size metal spheres found at the heart of most nuclear bombs — was recently transferred from the Rocky Flats plant near Denver to Los Alamos. The lab is expected to build from 20 to 80 pits per year — far fewer than the more than 1,000 pits a year that were built at Rocky Flats during the Cold War.
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In a March 14 letter to the Department of Energy, the coalition of more than two dozen groups told DOE attorneys that they are seeking to reopen a seven-year lawsuit between the agency and several citizen organizations.

The groups say the agency has failed to live up to the terms of a 1990 settlement that required the DOE to conduct environmental studies of its plans to rebuild and clean up the U.S. nuclear weapons complex.

Energy Department officials were not reached for comment.

A laboratory spokesman declined comment.

The coalition is led by the National Resources Defense Council, a Washington, D.C. organization, and includes groups from California, Nevada, Washington state, Tennessee, Utah and Texas.

The other Santa Fe organization is Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping, an Albuquerque group, is also part of the coalition.

The coalition's major claim is that the agency has failed to properly evaluate alternatives to its plan to spend $40 billion over the next 10 years on revamping its nuclear weapons facilities.

The plan is controversial not just because of its cost.

It is widely viewed as a political payoff to the nuclear weapons establishment, which was forced earlier in the decade to accept the termination of underground nuclear testing.

The coalition also says the DOE has fallen short in analyz-
Anti-nuke groups reopen lawsuit

By STEPHEN T. SHANKLAND
Monitor Managing Editor

Several environmental and anti-nuclear groups planned to reopen a 1989 lawsuit today against the Department of Energy.

Jay Coghlan of Santa Fe-based Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety said today that the groups planned to file a complaint and a motion requesting a preliminary injunction.

Coghlan said the complaint argues that DOE failed to live up to a 1990 stipulation that required two programmatic environmental impact statements (PEISs) dealing with the future of the nuclear weapons complex.

The complaint also argues that the Stockpile Stewardship and Management PEIS — one of the PEISs that resulted from the agreement — is inadequate.

Greg Mello of the Santa Fe-based Los Alamos Study Group, another group involved in the lawsuit, said the motion for preliminary injunction seeks to stop Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programs.

With regard to Los Alamos National Laboratory projects, the motion asks the court to enjoin preparation for nuclear weapon plutonium pit production and the Atlas project, Mello said.

The lawsuit, in addition to the complaint and motion for preliminary injunction, is filed in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Judge Stanley Sporkin heard the case in 1989 and 1990, and will continue to hear this phase.
WASHINGTON -- A coalition of 40 environmental groups prepared today to sue the federal government, charging the U.S. Department of Energy broke its promise to study alternatives to expanding its nuclear-weapons program at Los Alamos, Sandia and other national labs.

The lawsuit, expected to be filed today in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, also contends that DOE has refused to set national standards for its nuclear-waste cleanup program.

The environmental groups are to ask the court to take two steps:

* Ban DOE from the construction of any new facilities in its nuclear-weapons program until it analyzes "reasonable" alternatives. The ban would affect several hundred million dollars' worth of construction projects at Los Alamos and about $100 million worth at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque.

* Force DOE to determine the environmental impact of its nuclear-waste cleanup program.

Among the groups filing the lawsuit are two New Mexico environmental organizations: the Los Alamos Study Group and Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety.

The lawsuit is a sequel to one filed in 1990 by the environmental groups. At that time, DOE signed a legal agreement requiring it to analyze plans for new nuclear-weapons research facilities, as well as do an environmental-impact statement for its nuclear-waste cleanup program.

"Through this lawsuit, we are seeking to have DOE honor the agreement they made in 1990," said Jay Coghlan of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, based in Santa Fe.

"We also want to bring the whole matter before the public gaze, and reverse the situation where money for weapons takes precedence over money for cleanup."

DOE officials couldn't be reached today for comment on the lawsuit.

But the heads of the Sandia and Los Alamos labs recently have urged Congress to beef up funding for the nuclear-weapons program.

The lab directors contend their dollars are stretched too thin to keep up with current nuclear-weapons research as well as build the new research facilities they say they need to ensure the safety of the current stockpile.

Among the facilities to be built at Los Alamos is one that would make the lab the nation's only manufacturer of plutonium triggers needed to detonate nuclear weapons.
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Fund Crunch Halts Lab Renovations

from PAGE 1

Atting for 20 to 30 years more.
Lab officials call the first phase of
the renovations urgent mainte-
nance, consisting mostly of electric-
cal work, coupled with repair of its
fire-suppression system and new
air-quality monitors for glove-box
exhausts, among other things.
The building plays a key role in
testing and refurbishing the aging
parts of nuclear weapons.
Workers found they had to
perform more work than anticipated in
areas believed contaminated with
radioactive materials, Trapp said.
And they found more outdated elec-
trical components that required
replacement than anticipated.
"Many of those systems, you can’t
tell their condition until you take
the power down and open them
up to look at them," Trapp said.

One anti-nuclear activist ques-
tions the $122.5 million budget for
the second phase of the building
renovations, which include shoring
up the building against earth-
quake and finding out why costs
are rising. A $3.5 million job, for
example, now costs $3.8 million.
Trapp said he was unsure why.

"What we’re finding is it’s costing
us more to fix things in some of our
nuclear facilities than we originally
anticipated," Trapp said.
The lab will need several
months to determine the cost of
remaining work, which project
officials estimate ranges from
$3 million to $11 million, Trapp
said. The lab faces internal scruti-
ny to find out why costs were
unanticipated, why they mounted
so quickly and why project man-
gagers kept spending as they closed
in on the budget limit.

Asking whether any project man-
gagers would be disciplined, Trapp
said, "We’re still looking at issues
associated with that."

Phases is $8 Million Over

By lan Hoffman
Journal Staff Writer

Budget overruns estimated at $8 million have forced
Los Alamos National Laboratory to shut down reno-

vations at the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Build-

ing. The renovations were intended to keep the building open.

The renovations are intended to keep the building open.

The renovations are intended to keep the building open.

The renovations are intended to keep the building open.

The renovations are intended to keep the building open.

The renovations are intended to keep the building open.
WASHINGTON — In an apparent blow, a federal judge discouraged anti-nuclear activists Tuesday from seeking a court injunction on the Energy Department’s $40 billion program to manage the nation’s nuclear weapons arsenal.

Instead, Judge Stanley Sporkin told environmentalists to work out their gripes with the Energy Department before the court reconvenes next week.

“It’s clear that we have to do something,” Sporkin said. “What I’m suggesting is that you talk to each other.”

The suit, filed by 39 anti-nuclear organizations, charges that the Energy Department failed to conduct environmental impact studies and to consider “reasonable alternatives” when developing its massive 10-year plan.

Slated plutonium projects at Los Alamos National Laboratory were the subject of repeated attacks by group attorneys. In court proceedings Tuesday, attorney Barbara Finamore said that LANL would face “extreme environmental dangers” under the DOE’s plan.

Finamore said the same plutonium projects slated for LANL caused a test site in Colorado to shut down, after more than 700 plutonium-induced fires and several radiation leaks.

“One of the first defects (in the DOE plan) is that it doesn’t take
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into account that the same accidents could happen at Los Alamos,” Finamore said.

But Sporkin said delaying the nuclear weapons management plan could threaten national security. He also questioned whether Finamore would, if granted the court injunction, object to later DOE proposals.

“Is it the motive to really get them to do what you want,” Sporkin asked. “Or is it to get them to give up (on the project) entirely.”

Justice Department officials said the DOE would consider recommendations made by the coalition over the next week. But environmental attorney Lisa Dowden said that only a court injunction would alter the course of the nuclear weapons management plan.

“Without a preliminary injunction, (a settlement) is meaningless,” Dowden said.

Sporkin scheduled a further hearing June 24 to allow the Justice Department to continue its argument. It is not known when a decision will be made.

Besides Washington-based NRDC, a leading environmental group, plaintiffs include 38 other organizations, many of them grassroots groups that have been active near federal nuclear weapons production and storage facilities around the country.

Groups participating in the lawsuit include two from New Mexico — the Los Alamos Study Group and Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety.

Among other things, the lawsuit would halt new DOE facilities, affecting several hundred million dollars’ worth of construction projects at Los Alamos National Laboratory and about $100 million worth at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque.
Judge reluctant to stop weapons work because of suit

By H. JOSEF HEBERT
Associated Press Writer
WASHINGTON (AP) — Lawyers for an environmentalist group contend the Energy Department failed to consider adequately the environmental impact of a program to revamp the way it manages nuclear weapons.

A lawsuit by the Natural Resources Defense Council asks the court to block parts of the weapons management plan including the construction of a $1 billion laser laboratory in California that is key to simulating nuclear weapons tests.

But U.S. District Judge Stanley Sporkin, hearing arguments on the suit Tuesday, made clear he is hesitant to block the program. He asked lawyers on both sides whether they would agree to a “dual track” in which the program would continue, but additional environmental assessment would be required.

“A judge can’t shut down a country from defending itself,” Sporkin said, alluding to suggestions by the government that the laser program might have national security implications.

But Sporkin also expressed some sympathy for arguments by NRDC lawyers that the Energy Department had not conducted adequate environmental impact assessments.

Lisa Dowden, attorney for the NRDC, said the Energy Department, in developing the nuclear weapons stockpile management plan, did not consider “reasonable alternatives” and in many cases did not adequately examine potential environmental harm at various proposed facilities.

She also maintained that only a small fraction of the program even had an environmental analysis.

Martin LaLonde, a Justice Department lawyer, replied that alternatives were considered but did not meet national security needs.

He said the management plan, including the laser facility in California, are designed to assure that nuclear weapons in the post-Cold War years are in proper condition.

The injunction requested by the NRDC also would halt planned tests later this summer at the Nevada Test Site in which small amounts of nuclear material would be used in a chemical explosion. The “subcritical” explosion is designed to gather information that would be used in analyzing weapons and warheads in the laboratory.

Sporkin scheduled a further hearing June 24 to allow the Justice Department to continue its argument. It is not known when a decision will be made.

Besides Washington-based NRDC, a leading environmental group, plaintiffs include 38 other organizations, many of them grass-roots groups that have been active near federal nuclear weapons production and storage facilities around the country.

Groups participating in the lawsuit include two from New Mexico — the Los Alamos Study Group and Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety.

Among other things, the lawsuit would halt new DOE facilities, affecting several hundred million dollars’ worth of construction projects at Los Alamos National Laboratory and about $100 million worth at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque.
LANL, testing

We are writing to clear up any misunderstanding that may have been created by The New Mexican article of June 25, 1997, LANL Nuke Test Gets Go Ahead. The coalition of 39 peace and environmental organizations (which includes our groups) that is suing the Department of Energy on environmental grounds opposes the two subcritical underground nuclear experiments planned this summer at the Nevada Test Site. The coalition of plaintiffs has not dropped subcritical tests from the lawsuit, only from the request for preliminary injunction blocking expansion of the nuclear weapons complex until adequate public review has been completed. Our challenge to the underground subcritical nuclear tests slated as part of the DOE’s Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program is very much alive.

The coalition charges that DOE failed to produce a legally adequate programmatic review of its proposed stewardship program for the nations nuclear arsenal, including the subcritical tests. Regarding the subcritical experiments, these alternatives should certainly include conducting them above-ground, not conducting them at all, and closure or conversion of the test site itself. The coalition may still request the judge to issue, as part of his final ruling, an injunction permanently enjoining subcritical tests and other parts of the weapons complex until adequate analysis is completed.

At a hearing on the motion for preliminary injunction on June 17, Judge Sporkin appeared unwilling to undertake a detailed analysis of DOE’s national security claims regarding the imminent subcritical test in his courtroom. While not persuaded there are any true national security concerns, in view of the judges attitude, on June 24 the coalition limited its request for preliminary injunction to certain key facilities in DOE plans the $1.3 billion National Ignition Facility at Livermore Lab in California and upgrades to the Chemical and Metallurgical Research (CMR) Building and the Nuclear Materials Storage Facility (NMSF) at Los Alamos. Because of Congress own doubts about NIF and the CMR upgrade, the House of Representatives has recently proposed to fence appropriations for those two facilities. We believe that Congress will look skeptically at the NMSF as well. That facility, an underground storage vault for plutonium pits, was built in the mid 1980s for $25 million, but never used because of fundamental design deficiencies and shoddy construction. LANL is now preparing to rebuild it for $56 million, with possible storage capacity for 5,000 plutonium pits. Approval for the rebuild is exempted from public review on the basis of an environmental assessment over a decade old.

Scores of major public interest groups, including the plaintiffs in this case, also staunchly oppose the subcritical nuclear experiments as unnecessary, provocative to other nations, and contrary to U.S. nonproliferation and disarmament policies. These groups, including many of the plaintiffs, organized a national call-in day June 26 to DOE headquarters to call for cancellation of the subcritical tests, the National Ignition Facility, and other new weapons facilities and upgrades. This opposition is gaining momentum, and has spread to the Congress where 44 representatives recently sent a letter to the president urging that the tests be canceled. According to these representatives, The U.S. is unwisely creating a testing norm under which other nations could justify conducting similar underground nuclear weapons experiments at their test sites.

We co-plaintiffs believe that the United States is setting a terrible international example, so soon after the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban treaty. Our opposition to these tests remains strong, and the future conduct of such tests as part of DOE’s overall stockpile program remains a vital element in the environmental lawsuit.

Jay Coghan
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety

Barbara Finamore
Natural Resources Defense Council

Greg Mello
Los Alamos Study Group
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Say a firm and joyful no to terrible weapons of mass destruction

The bomb first was our weapon. Then it became our diplomacy. Next it became our economy. Now it's become our culture. We've become the people of the bomb. — E.L. Doctorow

Nowhere is this more true than here in New Mexico, where the University of California (Los Alamos) and the Lockheed-Martin Company (Sandia) are fast becoming world leaders in the production — no longer just the design — of nuclear weapons. These products are "weapons of mass destruction," a term that also includes chemical and biological weapons. Making weapons like this is not quite an ordinary job. Let's face it: making weapons of mass destruction is not a great deal different than making ovens in case a Holocaust is needed someday.

Even within the class of weapons of mass destruction nuclear weapons are uniquely destructive. Dr. Siegfried S. Hecker, LANL's director, told Congress in March that nuclear weapons "are unique in their ability to inflict massive damage to a target — swiftly and surely... nuclear weapons are the 'big stick' that defends our homeland. . . ." And let no one doubt, Dr. Hecker said, that "we" would be "unwilling or unable to use the nuclear weapons in our stockpile."

This kind of bellicose rhetoric is new. It projects what the "warheads" hope will be a new consensus of legitimacy for nuclear weapons, a watershed shift in perception and hence funding. Already the nuclear weapons budget is considerably higher, in constant dollars, than it was on average during the Cold War. And it is growing. Hecker promotes weapons of mass destruction to keep the money flowing to his lab — by the truckload if possible.

Hecker is not alone. He is more than matched by Sandia director Paul Robinson, who told the Los Angeles Times that any further reductions in the U.S. arsenal would require, in his view, increased targeting of the Russian people. These men are assumed to speak for all their employees. In the language of political pork, the lingua franca of Congress, they are assumed to speak for the rest of the state as well — we, the people of the bomb.

The labs' nuclear promotion begins, but does not end, with weapons of mass destruction. One of Los Alamos' tactical goals is now to create what it calls "Our Plutonium Future," in part through its "Global Nuclear Vision Project," a series of meetings between the nuclear elite of many nations that is designed to work out an agenda to shape public policy and perceptions regarding "all things nuclear."

Walking its talk, Los Alamos is now poised to begin manufacturing "pits," the plutonium cores of nuclear weapons. But this too is just the beginning. Lab managers hope to please their "customers" (their term) in other ways as well, including establishing the capability to make complete thermonuclear explosives. These barbaric missions are painted with an Orwellian rouge that disguises self-serving manipulation; flashy euphemisms cover repulsive realities. Service, so to speak, with a sadistic smile.

The fact that a university would stump for such work is an education in itself.

The labs' future thus looks a lot like the past, only more so. But what about the rest of us — downwind, downstream and down dollar? What does our future hold?

I think you can see it, approaching from the next century like a highway sign: "Welcome to New Mexico! World Capital of Weapons of Mass Destruction."

Whether visible or invisible, that would be our sign, our identity, our legacy to our children and to our land.

Not long ago a Hispanic farmer was asked: "What does the Rio Grande mean to you?"

"It is the river of righteousness," was the reply. In these vivid, memorable words, we hear a heart and mind not separate from the world — a world which is flowing, intrinsically ethical and fundamentally Good.

That river will flow forever, but the path of nuclear weapons, the path we are choosing, does not lead by these waters. Where does it go? Through the Jordan, del Muerto. I am afraid there will be nothing for us to drink there. And I am not sure tourists will continue to find it so very attractive either.

It is simply no good to try to build a culture on weapons of mass destruction. These weapons do not deter threats to our "national security;" they are threats to our security. They do not deter "rogue states," they define rogue states. Those who make them do not protect us from terrorists; they are terrorists, witting or unwitting. These weapons deter nothing but the military budget cuts we so plainly need to finance our schools, care for our families and protect our communities.

More than this, these weapons corrode our conscience, undermine the authority of the state they supposedly protect, and attack the democratic freedoms they purport to guard. They and the fraudulent paradigm of "security" they embody distract us from the urgent cries of a world — our only world — being relentlessly crushed beneath the bulldozers of greed.

In a world of inverted values, where our local masters of war patriotically promote weapons of mass destruction, a firm and joyful "no!" from the barricades is a liberating "yes!" to human life and the generations yet to come.

Greg Mello of Santa Fe is a member of the Los Alamos Study Group.
Environmentalists have lost a major battle to curb the Department of Energy's Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program.

A federal judge on Friday ruled against a consortium of anti-nuclear groups seeking to prevent increased plutonium pit production at Los Alamos National Laboratory and the creation of the National Ignitions Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in Livermore, Calif.

But environmentalists say the ruling isn't a total loss.

The opinion issued Friday by U.S. District Judge Stanley Sporkin in Washington D.C. said national security concerns warranted the continuation of stockpile stewardship, a DOE program to maintain the nation's aging nuclear weapons arsenal. In the same ruling, however, he ordered the DOE "to perform a fuller disclosure of the environmental, health and safety risks associated with the plutonium pit fabrication program at Los Alamos National Laboratory and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory."

"First of all, we're disappointed the judge didn't see the wisdom of stopping the construction or upgrading of DOE's facilities," said Jay Coghlin of the Santa Fe-based Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. "At the same time, it's pleasing that he recognized that many of our concerns are real."

Concerned Citizens and the Los Alamos Study Group were among 39 groups nationwide to file the suit.

Coghlin referred to a passage in the judge's 24-page opinion that stated: "The court recognizes fully that there have been enough accidents involving nuclear programs to make Plaintiffs' concerns over the environmental, health and safety issues in this case real."

Sporkin cited the closure of the Rocky Flats pit production plant in 1989 after more than 700 plutonium-induced fires and several radiation leaks.

Plutonium pits are the grapefruit-sized triggers at the heart of nuclear warheads. Pit production involves the processing of substantial quantities of plutonium, a highly toxic nuclear explosive material. The DOE's proposal to transfer Rocky Flats' production capability to LANL would increase both the number and types of pits LANL produces. The lab is currently able to produce about 20 pits a year.

A spokesman at Los Alamos National Laboratory referred questions to the Department of Energy in Washington. Officials there could not be reached late Monday.
By STEPHEN T. SHANKLAND
Monitor Managing Editor

The Los Alamos Study Group sued the Department of Energy Thursday in an effort to obtain information about Los Alamos National Laboratory listed in six requests.

The study group complaint asks U.S. District Judge Martha Vasquez to order the DOE "to produce immediately the documents sought by the Los Alamos Study Group" and to commence an investigation to determine whether disciplinary action is warranted against any federal employee for DOE's unlawful pattern and practice of withholding information...."

Greg Mello of the study group said today, "These six are ones that are, to our view, quite clear-cut instances of foot-dragging. They represent a constructive denial of our rights to get information."

The complaint said the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) "requires federal agencies to respond to public requests for information within 10 days. In some cases, DOE's responses to the Los Alamos Study Group's 14 pending FOIA requests are more than five months late."

A news release said the study group is requesting information on "the purpose, general description, and status of nuclear weapons projects at LANL; documents regarding LANL's program to develop a replacement warhead for the Navy's submarine-launched missiles; budget codes and general descriptions of current nuclear weapons projects; background documents relating to LANL's plans to upgrade its defunct Nuclear Materials Storage Facility...; travel records regarding thousands of trips LANL employees took to the Washington, D.C., area and to foreign countries in 1996; and budgets and personnel involved in DOE and LANL public relations and 'corporate citizenship' activities in New Mexico."

However, LANL spokesman John Gustafson said today the delays in getting information to the study group are simply because of the amount of work needed to fulfill the complex requests, the limited number of people who fulfill the requests, and the fact that people at the lab have plenty to do as it is.

"The office that handles these information requests has two people working on them. Currently there are 50 open cases (requests), of which the study group represents 12," Gustafson said.

And the lab is working on the requests, Gustafson added.

"Given the amount of staffing we have to direct to these requests, and given the complexity of Greg's requests, it's not surprising it takes a little bit of time to fulfill it," Gustafson said.

In the case of the travel information, the request produced a 1,100-page document that somebody has to go through to screen out confidential information such as employee addresses or credit card numbers, Gustafson said. This work must be done by Travel Office employees who have their regular jobs to worry about. "When are they supposed to do it? They have to find time amidst their normal job activities," Gustafson said.

FOIA requests submitted to DOE are referred to LANL, said Gustafson and DOE spokesman Al Stotts.

Mello said that DOE-Albuquerque FOIA personnel "have told us that LANL is uniquely unresponsive" to FOIA requests.

Stotts said LANL accounts for 30 to 40 percent of the FOIA requests sent to DOE-Albuquerque — more FOIA
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