

## UPTE-CWA FACT SHEET

# National Security is Enhanced if Competitive Bidding For Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) Is Delayed One Year to Enable Lessons Learned From Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) Bid



UNIVERSITY  
PROFESSIONAL  
AND TECHNICAL  
EMPLOYEES

CWA Local 9119  
AFL-CIO

■  
representing  
employees at the  
University of  
California

■  
P.O. Box 4443  
Berkeley, CA  
94704

phone (510) 704-8783  
fax (510) 704-8065  
info@upte-cwa.org

■  
www.upte-cwa.org

### Contacts:

Roger Logan/LLNL  
Rodney Orr/UPTE

Manny Trujillo/LANL  
Jelger Kalmijn/UPTE

### Background: Bids for LLNL and LANL

We are rushing through an unprecedented experiment of simultaneously changing both our nuclear weapon design agencies (LANL and LLNL) to private, for-profit, limited liability companies, with no product accountability, and simultaneously push a bold new plan to replace the tested nuclear stockpile with new designs lacking nuclear tests. The conscious effort to remove employee rights by the first part of this experiment (the LANS “At Will” Employee doctrine at LANL) risks turning this unprecedented experiment into a perfect disaster. We’ve suggested legislation to add employee rights, but the process is too rushed. We remain convinced the best suggestion is to slow the process down so that we don’t make the same mistakes twice.

### The long, growing list of reasons to delay the LLNL bid and revisit LANS:

1. We need more time to meet and converge with the bidders and NNSA on language for “openness in national security with accountability” i.e., employee rights for LANL and LLNL
2. We need more time to assess what we have wrought with LANS before we perform the same experiment again:
3. Security: Close on the “Memory Stick” security issues at LANL of Oct 06.
4. The follow-on to the Jan 2007 hearing was delayed – why not delay the LLNL bid accordingly?
5. Weapons: Look into the recent controversy surrounding LANS handling of a Stockpile Life Extension Program – does LANS have the judgment to do the right thing for the customer?
6. Weapons: Wait for the independent JASON review of both “new weapon” RRW designs. This was due March 2007 but is delayed to October 2007 – again, why not delay the LLNL bid accordingly?
7. Weapons: Delay the LLNL bid until completion of the National Academies study of the Methodology for Certification of the new RRW nuclear weapons without nuclear testing
  - i. Is RRW a good idea or not?
  - ii. CTBT and RRW: Do they complement or hurt each other?
  - iii. Without completion of this study in an open atmosphere, with employee rights, we won’t know either answer
8. Other: Early departure of LANS Key Personnel: Is this Breach of Contract? What is the explanation? There are signals that it will happen again. We should bring this LANS issue to closure before we restart the LLNL bid process.
9. Other: After nearly a year, LANS still does not have personnel policies (all are “Draft”, with an ominous “At Will” disclaimer on each front page). These policies should be finalized and given time to work (or fail) before the LLNL bid is awarded.
10. Other: UC has agreed to movement of pension funds to assist LANS’ “TCP1”. Will DOE approve these plans? Even if they do, what are the implications for LANL, LLNL, and even for UCRP?
11. Budget: Rumors of LANS layoffs abound – starting June 2007, conveniently after the LLNL bid award. LANS offered an enticing set of promises in their bid, but will they stand the test of time, or even last through 2 budget years? Waiting another year will tell us. Such layoffs might be the fault of LANS, or might be the fault of the bid process itself. Only waiting will let us avoid the same mistake for LLNL.

### Action:

Delay of the LLNL bid, while we revisit the LANS contract and conditions at LANL, is essential to national security during this unprecedented time of change for the nuclear weapons labs and stockpile. We request that language be added to the FY2007 Supplemental Appropriations Bills to delay the LLNL bid process by 1 year, resolve the issues mentioned above, re-issue a new RFP for LLNL with the employee rights package attached (when finalized to be implemented at LANL as well).