

RELEASE IN PART
B6

From: Verma, Richard R <VermaRR@state.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 24, 2010 9:39 PM
To: H
Subject: Re: [START and CTBT Lobbying] ACA comment on Kyl "modernization" memoon START to Rs

Yes. We got the kyl memo earlier today; it runs thru his concerns on modernization and nuclear force posture. We have answered these issues before, and will do so again.

----- Original Message -----

From: H <HDR22@clintonemail.com>
To: Verma, Richard R
Sent: Wed Nov 24 20:51:00 2010
Subject: Fw: [START and CTBT Lobbying] ACA comment on Kyl "modernization" memoon START to Rs

Rich--Does the team know about this?

----- Original Message -----

From: Burns Strider <[redacted]>
To: H
Sent: Wed Nov 24 20:12:21 2010
Subject: Fw: [START and CTBT Lobbying] ACA comment on Kyl "modernization" memoon START to Rs

B6

Nov. 24

TO: NGO colleagues on New START

RE: ACA comment and analysis of Sen. Jon Kyl's November 24 "Memo on Modernization for Republican Colleagues"

Senators Kyl and Corder have sent a memo to fellow Republican Senators outlining his remaining (minor) concerns about details in the Obama administration's update of the so-called "Section 1251 Plan" on maintaining and upgrading the National Nuclear Security Administration's programs to maintain the shrinking number of U.S. nuclear weapons.

There is an early NYTimes story on the memo here <<http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/11/24/kyl-lays-out-objections-to-arms-treaty/?scp=1&sq=Kyl%20nuclear&st=cse>>

Kyl's memo is attached. ACA observations and my comments for the record (sent to reporters this evening) are pasted below.

For further background on this subject, see ACA's earlier Issue Brief on "Modernization Myths and Realities"

<http://www.armscontrol.org/issuebriefs/modernizationmyths>

ACA will post a blog commentary about this over the weekend.

I can be contacted over the Thanksgiving weekend at 202-277-3478 if you get or have questions about this that I might be able to answer.

NOTE: My sources also tell me that there will be a Kyl oped in the NYTimes this weekend, probably on this and missile defense-related issues. Be on the alert.

Thanks and have a safe holiday.

- Daryl Kimball, Executive Director, Arms Control Association

Daryl Kimball's background observations about the Kyl memo:

- Senator Kyl is acting in bad faith and is trying to burn time off the clock. His objections are not with the amount of money the administration is proposing for funding the nuclear weapons complex over the next decade (\$85b, nearly 20% higher than funding during the GW Bush years), but the with minute details regarding the pace.
- Senator Kyl has still not offered any substantive objection to the New START treaty itself.
- Senator Kyl is still leaving the door open to a vote on the treaty this year, though his stalling tactics are clearly intended to delay consideration well into 2011 or later.
- his quote of Sec Gates is two years old. He ignores Gates comment this year about the Obama administration's original 1251 plan and the comments of the lab directors:

Secretary of Defense Robert Gates wrote in his preface to the April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), "These investments, and the NPR's strategy for warhead life extension, represent a credible modernization plan necessary to sustain the nuclear infrastructure and support our nation's deterrent."

In a joint statement on the NPR from the directors of the three nuclear weapons laboratories issued April 9, Sandia's Tom Hunter, Los Alamos' Michael Anastasio, and Lawrence Livermore's George Miller said: "We are reassured that a key component of the NPR is the recognition of the importance of supporting 'a modern physical infrastructure--comprised of the national security laboratories and a complex of supporting facilities--and a highly capable workforce with the specialized skills needed to sustain the nuclear deterrent.'"

- his remaining concerns relate to certain imponderables that hardly merit holding up New START now: he argues that UPF and CMRR construction might be delayed by a couple of years unless there is even more money spent early on for those projects. He is also suggesting the Congress apply a new system of three-year appropriations to the program, which would tie the hands of future Congresses and give contractors free reign. And for very little benefit. If future Congresses believe that such funding increases are warranted, they should appropriate more money at the appropriate time, not now.

- Kyl wants an "update" of the possible additional needs for increased funding for stockpile surveillance. The stockpile surveillance numbers are already higher than under the George W. Bush administration years. At that time Kyl did not have any quibble with the adequacy of the administration's budget proposals for the NNSA weapons activities budget.

- he is objecting to the fact that the United States will not be able to be able to completely replace the entire existing stockpile by manufacturing new weapons, which the military and the lab directors do not believe is necessary because we are refurbishing existing warheads are reducing our overall stockpile along with Russia, and he is ignoring the fact that the United States will maintain a large number of active warheads in a non-deployed reserve.

- DK

Comments for the Record from Daryl Kimball on Senator Kyl's memo to Republican colleagues:

Further attempts by Senator Kyl to delay New START in order to 'earmark' still more funding for the well-funded weapons labs is fiscally irresponsible and damaging to U.S. security.

The administration's earlier, \$85 billion, 10 year proposal to maintain the arsenal through the life-extension programs and without renewed nuclear testing already provided the weapons labs with more than enough to get the job done.

Sen. Kyl is acting in bad faith. He refuses to take "yes" for an answer. His fellow Republican and the nation are poorly served by his refusal to heed the advice of American military leadership and national security experts from both parties who believe that the Obama administration's nuclear weapons complex funding strategy is 'more than enough' to get the job done and who believe prompt ratification of New START is critical to U.S. national security.

Delaying the vote on New START would damage U.S. national security, undermine cooperative efforts with Russia to contain Iran's nuclear ambitions, and shatter the fragile political consensus for higher funding to maintain the U.S. nuclear stockpile in the years ahead.