
Environmental Defense Institute

News on Environmental Health and Safety Issues

June 2007

Volume 18 Number 4

DOE Forced to Release Some Censored Documents

Litigation against DOE by Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free, Environmental Defense Institute and David McCoy (Plaintiffs) forced the Department of Energy (DOE) to release in full three of more than ten documents we have been seeking in our Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuit.¹ Prior to this release, the documents had been heavily redacted (censored). The DOE had claimed it was entitled to redact the documents under FOIA Exemption 5 – the “deliberative process” exemption, which permits agencies to withhold information that is part of the agency “give-and-take” of decision making.

The previously redacted portions of the first two documents are significant, and reveal problems in management and engineering at the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR). These reports offer significant insight into the ATR operations. Plaintiff attorney Mark Sullivan developed the following analysis of these recently un-redacted reports DOE has released.

1. The Causal Analysis Report

The DOE’s Office of Independent Oversight and Performance Assurance (the “OA”) performed an evaluation of the ‘essential system functionality’ of selected systems at the ATR. Their review was performed in August and September of 2003. According to the report, “the purpose of an essential system functionality review is to evaluate the functionality and operability of ATR’s systems and subsystems essential to safe operation.” For this review, the OA investigated ATR systems designed to mitigate loss of coolant accidents (“LOCAs”).

¹ The DOE documents released under FOIA are: (1) The “Causal Analysis Report Essential System Functionality” dated December 17, 2003; (2) the Advanced Test Reactor Planning Assessment Team report entitled “Assessment Team Conclusions and Recommendations” dated February 13, 2004; and (3) A memorandum from Elizabeth Sellers, Idaho Operations Office Manager, to William D. Magwood IV, Director of the DOE’s Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, March 19, 2004.

Configuration Control Issues: Design and Safety Basis Discrepancies

In general the Causal Analysis Report identified significant problems relating to staffing and resources and “configuration control” for the ATR’s LOCA mitigating systems. The “configuration control” problem is one that we have been aware of for some time. In sum, the ATR has been modified many times over the years, and those changes have not been documented, such that the “safety basis documents” which the DOE relies on to determine the risks of operating the reactor, simply do not reflect conditions on the ground at the ATR. This is the reason for the very costly and time-consuming “design basis reconstitution program” that the DOE has initiated as part of the Life Extension Program. The Causal Analysis Report lays the blame for this failure squarely at the feet of ATR management. The redacted portion of the documents states:

“The failure of the various contractor and DOE managers to adequately consider both design and safety basis information over the years when making modifications and changes to either is the most likely root cause of the engineering design failures, including the maintenance of the ATR design and safety basis documents.”²

Finding insufficient funding is an inadequate excuse, the document later states: **“the failure to provide sufficient resources to do a thorough engineering job is a management problem regardless of the reasons.”** Id.

2. Staffing Shortfalls

We have known for some time that the ATR suffers a massive engineering work backlog. This document sheds further light on the flat funding and staffing shortfalls that created this problem. It also reveals the dangers of this staffing shortfall – a reduced staff has time only to focus on immediate “production goals” and no time for “stewardship”. For

² Causal Analysis Report at page 2 and 15.

example, previously-redacted portions (in bold type below) of the document state as follows:

“Adherence to the 1993 Cost Evaluation Study has been used as the basis for a flat funding justification for the past eight years. **This study failed to address the reality of trading of short-term production goals against long-term reactor stewardship. Reactor availability and schedule efficiencies have been realized by the prioritization of the limited resources assigned to Reactor Programs and at the detriment of stewardship activities.**”³

The document then details the fact that the ATR’s staff of 22 engineers is overworked. Together they are responsible for 119 ATR systems, and 205 assignments. Thus, each engineer is responsible for approximately 9 assignments. According to the document, standard industry guidance limits engineers to responsibility for 2 to 4 complex systems. The redacted portion of the document then reads: “**The TRA system engineer assignments significantly exceed the INPO guidance. Obviously, the time available for attention to individual system problems will be impacted by the number of systems assigned to a system engineer and the number of problems encountered.**”⁴ The document then lays the blame for this extraordinary workload on ATR management. Id.

Judgment of Needs

The Causal Analysis Report concludes with a “Judgment of Needs” and lists seven items. Items 3-6 were previously redacted. It recommends that the DOE establish a “**configuration management program sufficient to maintain required and necessary documentation of the ATR configuration and basis.**” This recommendation does now appear to be underway, as the DOE has commenced its “Design Basis Reconstitution Program.” But it took at least 2 years. The report also recommends that DOE “**establish an ATR engineering staffing plan to provide sufficient resources...**” We do not know if this has been done, but we do know that the massive engineering work backlog remains a problem, according to the September 2006 Life Extension Program plan.

3. The Planning Assessment Team Report

This document also contains some illuminating points. The report’s main thrust is that a long-term plan for the continued operation of the ATR is required because “**current long term planning by DOE and BBWI for ATR is fragmented and incomplete.**” The report states that “**if not comprehensively addressed, the practical operating lifetime will be established by default (e.g., material condition failures; human performance issues).**”⁵ It further states that “**lack of a well-thought out plan may result in a de-facto decision for premature shutdown of the reactor.**”⁶

Another item found in the previously redacted material is an estimate of the likely costs of “upgrade projects (Line Item, GPP, Operations and Capital Equipment).” The report does not detail what these capital improvement projects might be, but nonetheless estimates that they will cost between \$150 and \$250 million over ten years.⁷ The Life Extension Program, itself a \$200 million initiative, does not include these items. Thus, to continue operating the ATR, the DOE will have to spend between \$350 million and \$400 million in the next ten years. At that price tag, a new test reactor should start to look more appealing – particularly if the DOE were to consider its options in an EIS.

Finally, the report recommends that the DOE develop a comprehensive program to track performance indicators and trends.⁸ Such indicators would include human error rates, backlogs in maintenance, frequency of minor events, overdue surveillances, radiation exposure trends, etc. The report states that tracking such data will be important “in order to avoid operational reliability and safety problems.” The report states: “...the circumstances faced by a reactor like ATR in its last years or even last decade of operation can lead to reduced reliability and reduced safety margins as plant investments are reduced.” This is a point KYNF raised in its comments on the Pu-238 proposal – as ATR ages, it requires more, not less, attention.

Plaintiff attorney Mark Sullivan developed the above analysis of these recently un-redacted reports DOE released in May.

³ Causal Analysis Report at page 13.

⁴ Causal Analysis Report at page 14.

⁵ Planning Assessment Team Report at page 3.

⁶ Planning Assessment Team Report at page 4.

⁷ Planning Assessment Team Report at page 4.

⁸ Planning Assessment Team Report at page 9.

DOE Confirms Advanced Test Reactor Fails Commercial Reactor Standards

A 2006 DOE Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) Life Extension Program report released under the Freedom of Information Act outlines significant reactor regulatory and programmatic deficiencies that commercial nuclear reactors are otherwise required to comply with under federal regulations.

In order to maintain an operating license, all commercial nuclear power reactors must meet current Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) safety standards. Reactors that fail to meet NRC standards have their operating license revoked and are legally forced to shutdown.

Despite numerous 1990s Congressional legislative attempts to bring DOE reactors under NRC licensing regulations, DOE remains in a “self-regulated” category. DOE gives lip-service to voluntary compliance with NRC “Guidance.”

The Congressionally mandated independent Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) that up until the late 1990s conducted regular safety inspections of the ATR is currently blocked from its oversight role.⁹ DNFSB claims it no longer has jurisdiction over the ATR because it no longer is a “defense nuclear facility.”¹⁰ This is a dubious argument because most of the ATR’s primary missions are both national security and civilian that include the following programs;

- 1.) Global Nuclear Energy Partnership;
- 2.) Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative;
- 3.) International Reactor Support;
- 4.) Radioisotope Power Systems for Military;
- 5.) Space Reactor Systems for Military Space;
- 6.) Advanced Nuclear Research with Universities;

⁹ 42 U.S.C. ss 2286(g) 1/7/03 states “As used in this subchapter, the term ‘Department of Energy defense nuclear facility’ means any of the following: A production facility or utilization facility that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary of Energy and that is operated for national security purposes...”

¹⁰ DNFSB Chairman A.J Eggenberger 3/28/06 letter to Mark Sullivan (KYNF attorney), that states; “At this time, the ATR is not operated for national security purposes, consequently, ATR is not a defense nuclear facility subject to the board’s oversight.” Also see Mark Sullivan 1/17/06 initiating petition letter to DNFSB Eggenberger.

7.) Research and Test Reactor Fuel Supply for Universities.¹¹

Therefore, since the ATR is a DOE reactor that also does national security and civilian work, the DFNSB still has jurisdiction.

It is additionally revealing when DOE admits in recently declassified reports that the ATR does not meet commercial reactor operating standards imposed by the NRC. The ATR will never meet the NRC requirement of commercial reactors of a sealed concrete containment dome designed to prevent radiation from escaping into the atmosphere in the event of an accident. The ATR is housed in a porous conventional industrial steel sided building that provides little or no containment of accident radiation releases.

A 2006 DOE report states: “[T]he ATR is not contemporary with modern commercial nuclear power plants many of which have completed similar modernization programs.”¹²

DOE further acknowledges “public safety” issues in case of a major ATR accident. “Investing in modernization safety upgrades will reduce the [accident emissions] exclusion zone boundary considerably... and also further reduce risk to the public and INL workforce.”¹³ “[A] design basis accident would have a measurable environmental impact to the intermediate area ... the area surrounding the exclusion area where there is a reasonable probability of protecting people by evacuating or shelter”¹⁴

These DOE statements sound reassuring on paper, however, there is no assurance if and when the proposed “modernization” will be implemented for this 40 year-old reactor that DOE intends to operate through 2050 and whether the ATR will ever meet current Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulations for commercial reactors.

The public justifiably demands that the ATR be shut-down until the DOE completes a comprehensive environmental impact statement.¹⁵ Moreover, the public reasonably demands that the ATR meet all current NRC regulations for commercial power

¹¹ LEP-2006, page 11 and 12.

¹² Mission Needed Document for the Advanced Test Reactor Life Extension Program Safety Posture Modernization, 6/30/06, page 1, PLN-2239, herein after referred to LEP-2006.

¹³ LEP-2006, page 2.

¹⁴ LEP-2006, page 3 and page 6.

¹⁵ See; KYNF et al. v. DOE, CIV. No.07-36-E-BLW.

reactors.

Other safety problems DOE's 2006 report acknowledges are ATR Emergency Core Cooling System, Control Room Habitability, ATR Basement and main-floor needed to seal Emergency Core Coolant System boundary and channel the coolant flow from potential "loss-of-coolant-accident" (LOCA), "penetrations through the sealed sump boundary [that] will need seismic seals and air/water exchange controls."¹⁶ In "plain-speak" major ATR reactor coolant systems will fail in a safety system failure and/or an earth-quake.

The failure of the ATR Emergency Firewater Injection System (EFIS) could lead to a total loss of coolant in the reactor, resulting in a reactor core meltdown and a massive radiation release into the atmosphere. DOE engineers have stated that the radioactive inventory of the ATR's reactor core is 175,000,000 curies.¹⁷ A release of that magnitude would be second in world history only to the radiation released during the Chernobyl accident of 1986.

As cited above, DOE's own estimates of ATR radiation releases during a "loss-of-coolant accident" would be 175 million curies which includes 6 million curies of radioactive iodine-131. *Id.* This is nearly half the 340 million curies of radiation released by Chernobyl which permanently contaminated thousands of square miles around Chernobyl.

By comparison, the Three-Mile Island commercial power reactor melt-down in Pennsylvania released between 13 and 26 curies of iodine-131 largely thanks to a sealed concrete containment dome that prevented most of the radiation from escaping into the atmosphere.

President Bush and Idaho's Governor Butch Otter are playing "Russian roulette" with Idahoans and all INL downwinders' lives just like Gorbachev did with the downwinders' of Chernobyl. There is not even an off-site evacuation plan on record for a major INL

radiation release.¹⁸ Even if there were an evacuation plan, we have all seen how totally inadequate the Federal Emergency Management Agency response to the 2005 gulf coast hurricane disasters was for those residents.

DOE is well aware of the fundamental safety systems deficiencies and implemented the ATR Life Extension Program (LEP) so as to extend the 40-year-old ATR operating life additional 40-years to 2050.¹⁹

"The LEP plan addresses such issues as the procurement and availability of critical spare parts, including one-of-a-kind components (e.g., safety rods, core internal components, beryllium reflector), staffing requirements, and identifies the funding, schedule, and prioritization for replacement of key components and systems."²⁰ The "safety control rods" are the only means to shutdown the ATR reactor in an emergency "scram" and/or during a scheduled shutdown.

Given these current crucial safety system deficiencies, it's unconscionable for DOE to continue operating the ATR and exposing the general public to this huge radiation hazard in the event of a major accident. Moreover, it's ludicrous to be spending hundreds of millions of taxpayer money on "modernization" of this antiquated and deprecate nuclear reactor that has no legitimate mission.

If the Federal District Court grants our January litigation Complaint demanding that DOE conduct a thorough Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the ATR, DOE will be forced under the National Environmental Policy Act to tell the public all of the environmental risks, hazards, costs, regulatory compliance and alternatives to continued ATR operations. Our Complaint also demands that the ATR be shutdown until DOE produces a final EIS.²¹

¹⁸ Idaho's present Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) plans posted on <http://www.bhs.idaho.gov/>

¹⁹ The ATR was designed in the 1950s and began operation in 1967. It has therefore been in operation for nearly 40 years, and is based on a design that is approximately 50 years old.

²⁰ LEP-2006, page 9.

²¹ Complaint filed by Plaintiffs, Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free, Environmental Defense Institute, Mary Woollen, John Peavey, Debra Stansell, U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho, Eastern Division, 1/22/07, Case No. 07-36.

¹⁶ LEP-2006, page 6

¹⁷ Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Accomplishing Extended Civilian Nuclear Energy Research and Development and Isotope Production Missions in the United States, Including the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility, December 2000, Section I.1.1.1.2. (2000 DOE/EIS-0310).

Group Petitions Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board

Mark Sullivan, attorney representing Keep Yellowstone Nuclear Free (KYNF) petition to the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board, stated the following:

For the reasons set forth below, based on a review of DOE documents obtained through the Freedom of Information Act, KYNF believes that the ATR poses an imminent and substantial threat to public health and safety, and the extraordinary national treasures of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. **Specifically, we request that this review include but not be limited to the ATR's compliance with all DOE Orders and the ATR's current status to sustain a "design basis earthquake."**

We therefore ask that the DNFSB exercise its authority and swiftly perform a full investigation of the ATR's safety, including public hearings.

I. The ATR Is Unsafe

Briefly stated, KYNF's concerns regarding the ATR are as follows. The ATR is nearly 50 years old (and is based on a design that is nearly 60 years old) and lies in the heart of a seismically active region. It lacks secondary containment typical of commercial nuclear reactors which would prevent a catastrophic release of radiation in the event of an accident.

Many of its essential safety systems are corroded from age and wear, and replacements parts are simply unavailable. The ATR's essential primary and secondary cooling systems, as well as its emergency firewater injection system are likely to fail in the event of a major earthquake, causing a loss-of-coolant accident with potentially horrendous ramifications. In sum, the facility poses an unacceptable threat to tens of thousands of people and one of our nation's most cherished regions.

KYNF became concerned about the safety of the ATR when it began to investigate a DOE proposal to consolidate nuclear operations related to the production of plutonium-238 and radioisotope power systems at INL, and to use the ATR to produce the deadly isotope (the "Proposed Action"). If the Proposed Action goes forward, and a new \$300 million facility is constructed at INL for the purposes of processing, purifying and encapsulating Pu-238 as proposed, the DOE will be committed to operating the ATR, already well beyond its life expectancy, for

another 40 years.

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, KYNF, in cooperation with the Environmental Defense Institute, has sought from DOE numerous documents relating to the safety of the ATR. Some documentation has been provided; other critical safety documents withheld or redacted. What has been released thus far has raised alarming concerns regarding the safety of the ATR.

Attached hereto is a letter dated December 21, 2005 addressed to Secretary Bodman. The letter details the seismic vulnerabilities and deteriorating conditions at the ATR revealed by the DOE's own documents. In short, the facility, in particular its cooling system is seismically vulnerable. Furthermore, many of the ATR's components are corroded and pitted from age, and have experienced frequent mechanical or electrical failures. Replacement parts are increasingly unavailable. The letter further details that a recommended Natural Phenomena Hazards Assessment has not been implemented, apparently due to funding shortfalls.

KYNF's December 21, 2005 letter is based on the limited number of documents provided by the DOE. Other documents, including critical portions of the Upgraded Final Safety Analysis Report, and the Interim Seismic Probabilistic Risk Assessment, have been withheld by the DOE. Therefore, it appears that other serious concerns regarding the safety of the ATR are being actively concealed by the DOE.

II. The DNFSB Should Exercise Its Jurisdiction and Review the Safety of the ATR

The DNFSB has jurisdiction to review the safety of the ATR. As you are no doubt well aware, the DNFSB was chartered by Congress to provide independent third-party oversight of the safety of DOE operations at "defense nuclear facilities," a term defined in the DNFSB enabling legislation. Defense nuclear facilities include a "production facility" as that term is defined by the Atomic Energy Act. The term "production facility" means any equipment or device capable of producing special nuclear material, including plutonium. See 42 U.S.C. § 2014. The ATR is just such a device.

The DNFSB enabling legislation contains exclusions from the definition of "defense nuclear facility," including an exclusion for activities covered by Executive Order No. 12344, dated February 1, 1982 (See 42 U.S.C. 2286g), which outlined cooperation between the Navy and the DOE for the

purposes of carrying out the naval nuclear propulsion program. While the ATR has at times aided the naval propulsion program, it is capable of and has served other purposes as well, including materials testing for commercial purposes, and more important, national security purposes. Therefore, the ATR is subject to DNFSB jurisdiction.

The DOE's draft environmental impact statement for the Proposed Action plainly states that consolidation at INL using the ATR will serve national security purposes. The DEIS states: "Along with NASA deep space satellite applications, plutonium-238, in radioisotope heater units and RTGs, is needed to support national security missions.... After the events of September 11, 2001, the national security requirements for plutonium-238 RPSs have increased."²²

Thus the safety of the ATR, despite its use in the naval propulsion program, falls squarely within the jurisdiction of the DNFSB.

Indeed, in its first annual report to Congress, dated February, 1991, the DNFSB explicitly set forth the scope of the DNFSB's jurisdiction, and stated that it has jurisdiction over the ATR, despite the exclusion for naval nuclear propulsion program activities. The report states: "although the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR), which is operated under the authority of Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy, does work for the Naval nuclear propulsion program, it has other defense production and utilization capabilities that subject the ATR to some level of Board oversight."

Thus, because the ATR has defense and national security capabilities and applications that go well beyond the naval program, it is a production facility subject to DNFSB oversight and jurisdiction. At a time when the DOE is proposing to extend the life of the ATR for another 40 years to meet purported "national security requirements," the DNFSB should exercise that jurisdiction, and conduct a full review of the ATR's safety.

III. Need For Immediate Action

The DOE has informed KYNF that it will be releasing a final environmental impact statement relating to Pu-238 production at the ATR, however, it is yet to be published. We fear that if the DOE commits the substantial resources necessary to carry out the proposed consolidation at INL, there will be no turning back, and the ATR, despite the identified

safety concerns, will continue to operate well into the middle part of this century. Therefore, the DNFSB's attention to this matter is urgently needed. We ask that you direct a full and complete investigation into the safety of the ATR now, before an unthinkable tragedy unfolds in southeastern Idaho.²³

U.S. SPACE FIRST STRIKE PROGRAM WELL UNDERWAY

Bruce K. Gagnon reports in Global Network 5/13/07, "In May, US House of Representatives, Democratic Party Congress members lead the way to approve money for Star Wars research and development programs in the fiscal year 2008 budget. Rejecting the recommendations of a sub-committee, Representatives Ellen Tauscher (D-CA) and John Larson (D-CT) restored \$150 million to Pentagon boost phase missile defense programs, \$48 million for future missile defense systems, including space sensors, \$12 million more for sea-based sensors and language to allow \$160 million for a highly controversial European missile defense site.

Disguised as "missile defense" the Pentagon's Star Wars program is all about offense and global control and domination. The planned deployments in Europe are just one more piece in the military space architecture that would give the U.S. "full spectrum dominance." Last October the Bush administration released its new National Space Policy that essentially gave the Pentagon a green light to move ahead with deployments of space war-fighting technologies.

The Air Force Space Command's *Strategic Master Plan: FY06 and Beyond* says, "Air Force Space Command will deploy a new generation of responsive space access, prompt global strike, and space superiority capabilities....Our vision calls for prompt global strike space systems with the capability to directly apply force from or through space against terrestrial targets." A new arms race is well underway with the U.S., once again, leading the pack. The aggressive first strike space domination program stands to benefit the weapons industry and global corporations who are now moving to extract diminishing supplies of oil and other precious resources around the world. The cost will be further expansion of a militarized society in the U.S.,

²² DEIS at 1-2.

²³ Mark Sullivan petition letter to Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board Chairman Eggenberger, 1/17/06.

cutbacks in social spending worldwide, and more instability for the people of the world.

One key way to prevent this new arms race is to call upon the U.S. Congress to convert the growing military industrial complex to peaceful and environmentally sustainable production. Republicans and Democrats now support the expansion of the U.S. military empire. Both parties must be challenged to give up dreams of American "exceptionalism" and global dominance. In order to make this happen the peace movement worldwide must challenge the growing corporate domination of our governments.

Bruce K. Gagnon is the Coordinator for Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space See: www.space4peace.org

Post Office to Implement Periodical Mailing Rate Increases that Discriminates Against Small Publications

Katrina vanden Heuvel reports 5/15/07 in *The Nation*: "On July 15 postal rates for magazines are slated to go up...dramatically. It's nothing new really...postal rates are always going up. But this is different. In the past, most postage hikes were applied more or less across all publications. This time, big magazine publishers will get a big discount, small fry won't. A coalition of small magazines from *The National Review* on the right to *The Nation* magazine on the left say that's not fair. The radical restructuring that small publications face could end up silencing the diverse voices our Founding Fathers tried to foster when they created the national postal system.

Sure, like everyone else, we'd like to avoid a massive increase in costs. And it's not that we're afraid of intellectual competition; we welcome it. But postal policy for the past 215 years has played a pivotal role in creating an extraordinarily free press. And we shouldn't let this magnificent tradition change.

In this latest postal rate hike, the US Postal Service itself had proposed a 12 percent increase that would have affected most magazines more or less equally. Surprisingly, the Postal Regulatory Commission rejected that proposal and adopted a complicated alternative devised by the giant publisher Time Warner.

That proposal would give huge discounts to big magazines. But smaller magazines would have to swallow hikes of between 15 and 30 percent. It looks

like the Postal Service will adopt these rates without research into how it affects small and medium sized magazines, and without any meaningful public input.

For some small publications such huge and unexpected increases may prove fatal. New periodicals will find it very tough to enter the market. That means magazine publishing will get much less competitive. Time Warner argues that this is simply sane pricing by the postal authorities to reward efficiency.

But wait a minute. The Postal Service is a monopoly. If magazines like ours that require the post office to distribute our wares dislike the onerous new rates, we have nowhere else to turn. For decades, the Postal Service has always used its pricing mechanism to encourage smaller publications and competition.

From Madison and the Founders in the 1790s on, the idea was that low rates for small publications made it possible to have the rich, open, and diverse media a self-governing people required.

No less than that is at stake today, for every American.

This discriminatory mail rate increase has significantly increased this EDI newsletter mailing costs.

Global Warming or Conversion of Military Industrial Complex

Bruce Gagnon reports in *Global Network* "Global warming is on the minds of people all over the planet. They are talking about how strange their weather is these days. Severe fluctuations are causing new weather patterns alien to communities worldwide. Obviously, the growth in greenhouse gases is a primary reason for global warming.

Our lifestyle, especially in the U.S. with less than 5% of the world's population, is a major contributor as we produce 25% of global carbon emissions. But few ever ask what role the U.S. military plays in contributing to global warming. And as people like Al Gore and other environmentalists look for solutions, rarely is the Pentagon mentioned as a polluter and a place that we can look to for change if life is to survive on our Earth.

The Pentagon has been studying, and testing, the idea of using weather modification as a battlefield weapon for many years. Can we begin to talk about what impact weather modification experimentation could be having on our planet already?

In a recent article called "What's Possible in the Military Sector? Greater than 100% Reduction in Greenhouse Gases," Green Party activist Don Fitz says "The military is the only sector of the economy where emissions of greenhouse gases can be reduced by greater than 100%....Regular economic activity of the military is not exactly small. According to the February 2007 *Energy Bulletin*, the Pentagon is the single largest consumer of oil in the world. Only 35 countries consume more oil."

Fitz continues, "This domination of industrial activity by the military is often referred to as the 'permanent war economy.' There is an even more insidious meaning to the phrase. That is the need of the military to have ever-shorter periods of time between wars. The only way to have a true test of a weapon is to use it against people....Military spending is like a cancer which has metastasized throughout the body politic, with every congressional district demanding its place at the trough."

Many environmental groups are working on solutions to global warming. One for example is the Apollo Alliance, which is calling for the creation of a new economy – a new industrial policy that moves toward building alternative sustainable technologies. Uniting labor and environmental groups, who usually are on opposite sides of the fence, the Apollo Alliance is showing that a new environmental policy can also create good jobs which are something the labor movement and low-income communities can get excited about.

But there is just one huge concern. Where will be funds come from to invest in this new industrial policy? When the military industrial complex is soaking up over 50% of every American tax dollar, where will the funds come from to create the investment for this new industrial infrastructure? Space technology development will only exacerbate this trend as the Pentagon brags that Star Wars will be the largest industrial project in the history of the planet Earth.

Major private corporate industrial investment is leaving the country like rats off a sinking ship. Corporate **disinvestment** in U.S. industry is the reality today. Most politicians understand this new reality very well. They know that weapons production is currently the number one industrial export product of the U.S. They know that major industrial job creation is largely coming from the Pentagon. Thus most politicians, from both parties, want to

continue to support the military industrial complex gravy train for their communities.

Across the nation colleges and universities are turning to the Pentagon for greater research funding as Congress and successive administrations have cut back on scientific research and development investment. As this trend worsens we find growing evidence that engineering, computer science, astronomy, mathematics, and other departments are becoming "militarized" in order to maintain funding levels. Student protests against campus weapons research have been growing in recent years at places like the University of Hawaii, University of New Mexico, University of Oregon, and UC Berkeley.

It is abundantly clear that no real alternative sustainable technology investment will be possible on the scale needed to avert catastrophic global warming without conversion of the military industrial complex. It is imperative that the peace movement, environmental movement, social justice movement, and labor movements create a unifying vision and political demand calling on Congress to use our hard-earned tax dollars for conversion of the military industrial complex.

We must do as the old saying goes – follow the money. And increasingly the money in the U.S. today is in weapons production. By converting the military we can make large strides to dealing with greenhouse gases, create new sustainable industries and stop our free fall into endless war."

Bruce K. Gagnon is the Coordinator for Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space.

Former Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1961 Message to the Nation

"In the councils of government we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought by the military industrial complex, the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic process. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Eisenhower added, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone; it is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, and the hopes of its children."

Congressman Matheson Testifies on Nuclear Warhead Restraint

Katte Oliveri reports in *The Spectrum* 5/17/07, that U.S. Rep. Jim Matheson addressed the House on Wednesday during the debate on the Defense Authorization Bill where he expressed concerns regarding the Reliable Replacement Warhead program.

Matheson said Wednesday afternoon that because it was in the front end of consideration in the bill, it was important to get out the signal that there are people in Congress who have concerns with "whether we should be doing RRW," he said. "This was my opportunity to do that," Matheson said.

He said RRW, a program that would create multiple new warheads, is a multibillion-dollar program. His concern is there is an existing nuclear weapon stockpile where a lot of money is being invested. Before committing taxpayer dollars for two tracks, he suggested taking a step back and not hurrying down the new nuclear weapon path.

According to the National Nuclear Security Administration, it was determined that RRW is feasible as a strategy for sustaining the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile for the long-term and RRW will decrease the likelihood that a nuclear test will be needed to confirm weapon performance.

The RRW also will, according to the NNSA, enhance the security of nuclear weapons and help to develop more responsive nuclear weapons infrastructure. But critics, according to a recent Congressional Quarterly report, argue the new warhead will eventually have to be tested, that it's militarily unneeded and that existing warheads will last for another 50 years.

Matheson said he thinks the RRW is simply a program to create new nuclear weapons. "My fear is it will result in new nuclear weapons testing," he said.

J. Truman, director of Downwinders, said the

debate of possible testing is not over and people in Utah need to pay attention. "It's just another clandestine way to eventually resume testing," he said of RRW. Truman said there's no guarantee there won't be any testing of the warheads, especially if the configuration of the device itself is changed. "You can't build them if you can't test them," Truman said.

In his floor statement Wednesday, Matheson cited the study that was conducted by the independent JASON panel, which he said, using data compiled by the nuclear weapons labs, showed "all the plutonium pits have life spans of at least 85 years, and most are good for 100 years or more."

"So, it seems, there isn't a threat to the reliability of our warheads," he said. Truman said he's against RRW, especially in view of the JASON report. He said it showed RRW wasn't needed because we could rely on the viability of the existing stockpile.

Matheson told the House on Wednesday the history of the Department of Energy includes a long list of canceled and over budget projects that were started before the objective was thoroughly thought through and understood.

"We cannot make that mistake with the nation's nuclear weapons complex or the decision to begin building new nuclear weapons," he said in the statement.

Matheson Introduces Legislation to Protect the Public from Nuclear Testing

Congressman Matheson introduced legislation in the House of Representatives (H.R. 2383) in May titled the "Safety for Americans from Nuclear Weapons Testing Act" that will protect public health and safety, should the testing of nuclear weapons by the United States be resumed. The bill also mandates that:

"Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the National Cancer Institute, shall-- (1) complete a study to estimate the dose of all radionuclides received by the United States population as a result of exposure to nuclear weapons tests conducted in the United States; (2) disaggregate the results of such study by organ, by radionuclide, and by demographic variables; (3) submit a report to Congress on the results of such study; and (4) make such results publicly available."