



No new bombs

Congress should not fund novel warhead designs or weapons with new military capabilities.



The country's current stockpile of more than 5,000 nuclear weapons has been extensively tested and certified reliable and will be for decades to come. The escalating cost of maintaining the stockpile is not due to the difficulty of the task or the effects of aging warheads. It is caused by increasingly elective changes introduced into the stockpile as part of the Life Extension Program (LEP).

The desire to modify warheads or develop new warheads is a primary factor in the push to upgrade other parts of the nuclear enterprise. The cost of modernizing the stockpile, including infrastructure and delivery systems, is estimated to be \$1.7 trillion over 30 years with a modest rate of inflation.

The 2018 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) added two new warheads and stopped the planned retirement of the B83 while expanding the role of nuclear weapons and the circumstances under which they could be launched. We are now confronted with new dangers and a runaway program that may reach \$2 trillion.

BUDGET REQUEST

The FY20 budget request for NNSA is \$16.5 billion, more than the \$15.2 billion requested for all other parts

continued on back, column 1

No new bomb plants

Congress should not fund new or expanded bomb production capacity without mission need justification and required environmental reviews.

A modern nuclear weapon requires a plutonium pit (trigger), thermonuclear secondary, and non-nuclear components (electronics package, etc.), along with high explosives, in order to function as a weapon of mass destruction.

PLUTONIUM PITS

The United States lost industrial-scale pit production in 1989 when the FBI shut down the Rocky Flats Plant near Denver, Colorado. In 1996, pit production was relocated to the Los Alamos National Laboratory, but capacity was capped at 20 pits per year. In May 2018 NNSA announced it will produce at least 30 pits per year at LANL and at least 50 more at the Savannah River Site. In its FY20 budget request, NNSA more than doubled "Plutonium Sustainment" to \$691 million, which includes \$410 million to repurpose the failed MOX Facility at SRS for pit production.

There is no need to expand plutonium pit production. Twenty thousand existing pits are stored at the Pantex Plant near Amarillo, Texas. Pits last at least a century, with most pits now around 40 years old. Congress required expanded production in 2015 as a hedge against a vague "future risk." Since then, plans for an Interoperable Warhead, which would have required new pit production, have been cancelled. Nevertheless, NNSA intends to spend at least \$30 billion dollars over the next 30 years to expand pit production capacity.

Expanded production is for new nuclear weapons designs. Changes in pit design could push the US back into testing with serious proliferation consequences.

Any change in pit production capacity, whether at Los Alamos or Savannah River, requires nationwide public review under the National Environmental Policy Act. Congress should not fund expanded

continued on back, column 2

Safer, smarter policies

Congress should restrain the president's authority to launch a nuclear first strike, move to a No First Use policy, and lead on efforts to prevent nuclear war.

The President of the United States has sole authority to order the launch of a US first strike nuclear weapons attack. The President is not required to consult with anyone in the government or military before issuing such an order.

Congressman Ted Lieu and Senator Ed Markey have introduced the Restricting First Use of Nuclear Weapons Act of 2019 (HR 669 in the House; SB 200 in the Senate). This legislation would require a declaration of war from Congress in order to launch a nuclear first strike, affirming Congress' constitutional authority as the only body that can declare war and exert a basic check on executive authority in line with our governmental system of checks and balances. The requirement would not apply in the event of a nuclear attack on the United States or its allies.

NO FIRST USE POLICY

Current US policy retains the option of using nuclear weapons in a preemptive attack, or in response to a non-nuclear attack. This option is unnecessary; the US has unparalleled conventional military capability more than adequate to respond to any conceivable situation. In addition, there is no scenario in which a nuclear first-strike would be morally justifiable.

Congressman Adam Smith has introduced legislation to establish US policy to not use nuclear weapons first (HR 921), and Senator Elizabeth Warren has introduced a parallel bill in the Senate (SB 272). This sensible legislation will establish a safer US policy consistent with American values.

continued on back, column 3

of the Energy Department combined. NNSA weapons activities get \$12.4 billion. Examples of wasteful spending on unneeded weapons systems include:

- \$112 million to develop the W87-1. This is a new weapon, intended to replace the W78, and will sit atop a new land-based missile called the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) system. The W87-1's annual costs will rise to more than \$500 million. Its novel design may complicate certification and add to pressures to resume nuclear explosive testing. The W87-1 will feature a new plutonium core, which is a key driver behind the push to spend billions to expand pit production. Eliminating the warhead would save \$15 billion; eliminating GBSD would save another \$17 billion.

- \$10 million to complete the more "usable" low-yield, submarine-launched warhead, called the W76-2, proposed in the 2018 NPR. A low-yield warhead reduces the threshold for starting a nuclear conflict. The low-yield W76-2's deployment should be canceled.

An alternative to runaway spending on elective weapons systems would be a strict curatorship approach to managing the stockpile. This approach could save billions of dollars while bringing the country into better conformity with its nonproliferation goals.

Additional places to save taxpayer dollars can be found in the box below.

CURRENT LEGISLATION

- Rep. Ted Lieu introduced HR 1086, the Hold the LYNE (low yield nuclear explosive) Act of 2019 to prohibit funding for the more "usable," W76-2 low-yield submarine-launched warhead. There are 30 cosponsors at this writing.

- Senator Ed Markey introduced a companion bill, SB 401 with 7 original co-sponsors.

pit production until a clear justification is presented and all required environmental review is completed.

HEU SECONDARIES: THE UPF

NNSA's problem-plagued Uranium Processing Facility's sole mission is to manufacture highly enriched uranium components for refurbished and new-design nuclear weapons at the Y-12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, at a rate of 80 thermo-nuclear "secondaries" per year. Secondaries put the "H" in H-bomb.

Skyrocketing cost estimates—from \$1.5 billion to \$19 billion—drove NNSA in 2014 to abandon plans to fully modernize enriched uranium operations. NNSA opted instead to build a smaller UPF for \$6.5 billion, and to continue to use two older, high-risk facilities for 30 more years.

The UPF's FY 2020 budget request of \$745 million continues a trajectory of ever-increasing annual costs. Citizens have challenged NNSA's refusal to complete a full supplemental environmental review of its radically changed UPF design, and Congress awaits a report, requested several years ago, on the actual need for new HEU secondaries.

MORE, MORE, MORE

The Government Accountability Office reported in April that NNSA will dramatically expand the workforce and production space at the Kansas City Plant, where more than 80% of the non-nuclear parts required for a nuclear weapon are manufactured.

The Kansas City Plant was built in 2012. Less than ten years later, NNSA plans to double the workforce by 2020 and to lease an additional 250,000 square feet of production space. This dramatic upscaling of operations reflects the pace of so-called modernization that seeks to indefinitely preserve nuclear weapons while giving them new military capabilities.

Investment in new and expanded capacity to produce nuclear weapons components throughout the rest of this century contradicts US claims of leadership in global nonproliferation and wastes billions of taxpayer dollars.

There have been multiple times in which misinformation or miscommunication led either the United States or Russia to come within minutes of launching a first strike nuclear attack. These bills to constrain the President's authority to use nuclear weapons first and establish a No First Use policy will greatly reduce this risk. They also reduce the risk of the use of nuclear weapons under unstable or rash leadership. Further, by sending a strong global signal, particularly to non-nuclear weapons states, that the US is deemphasizing the role of nuclear weapons, these measures would strengthen the global efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

We urge all members of Congress to co-sponsor HR 669 and SB 200 and HR 921 and SB 272.

NUCLEAR POLICIES THAT FIT

A resolution introduced by Congressman Jim McGovern and Congressman Earl Blumenauer, Embracing the Goals and Provisions of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, H.Res.302, calls on the President to align US policy with the goals of the United Nations' *Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons* and make nuclear disarmament the centerpiece of national security policy.

US leadership on global efforts to prevent nuclear war would include renouncing first use, ending the President's sole authority to launch a nuclear attack, pursuing a mutually verifiable agreement among nuclear armed states to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, and cancelling plans to replace, modernize and enhance US nuclear weapons arsenal.

We urge all US Representatives to co-sponsor H.Res.302.

GOOD MONEY AFTER BAD BOMBS

WEAPON	FY20 BUDGET REQUEST	RECOMMENDED ACTION	SAVINGS OVER TIME
W80-4	\$ 899 MILLION	Cancel system	\$ 30 BILLION
B61-12	\$ 794 MILLION	Forgo NATO deployment	\$ 17 BILLION
B83	\$ 15.5 MILLION	Retire	\$ 4 BILLION