

program. The same month, the Department forwarded to the White House a draft report intended for Congress on the retirement and modernization of the facilities in the weapons production complex. This study, known as the *2010 Report*, estimated that operation and maintenance of the weapons complex would cost \$244 billion over the next twenty years. These costs included new production plants, waste facilities, and environmental and safety corrective action and compliance. The *2010 Report* recommended ending all materials production at Hanford and closing down the Rocky Flats and Fernald facilities as well as the Mound nuclear material plant near Miamisburg, Ohio. The report reiterated the Department's commitment to constructing two new production reactors and a \$500 million special isotope separation plant in Idaho that would convert fuel-grade to weapon-grade plutonium.¹⁴⁸

In one of his last addresses as Secretary, Herrington noted that no departmental reactor was producing tritium for nuclear weapons. Under current planning, he stated, "we are not going to be in a serious problem." The Department's biggest challenge, nonetheless, was to make certain equipment modifications and improvements in training so that the production reactors could be restarted. "Nuclear deterrence remains at the heart of our national security policy," Herrington observed. "This means that a healthy, viable nuclear weapons complex is not an option for this country, it is a necessity." He also warned that the Department's contractors must share in the commitment to safety: "Any private contractor that does business with the Department of Energy had better realize that with us as a customer comes the obligation of fair and responsible dealing."¹⁴⁹

1988 ELECTION

On November 8, 1988, George Bush was elected president of the United States. Energy issues again played a minimal role in the presidential campaign. The energy spokesperson for Democratic candidate Michael Dukakis noted that there really was not much difference between the two candidates on the

issue of solving the Nation's energy problems. Both viewed oil imports as a serious threat to American security; both saw clean coal technologies as part of the solution to acid rain; and both agreed that alternative transportation fuels could affect the causes of global warming. A Bush spokesperson agreed that "there's not a huge difference in philosophy" between the two candidates, although he did suggest that "there is so in details." Bush advisers admitted that Dukakis was no "Jimmy Carter" on energy policy, but they contended that he would not adopt the "hands off" approach of the Reagan administration.¹⁵⁰

Perhaps surprisingly, the growing controversy surrounding the Department's weapons complex never became an election issue. A White House official noted that "the Department of Energy is managing the situation very well." Another administration source confided to the *New York Times*: "If the news is going to be really bad, don't you want to make it an Energy Department disaster rather than a White House disaster?"¹⁵¹

THE DEPARTMENT UNDER PRESIDENT REAGAN

Secretary Herrington, having served longer than any secretary in the history of the Department, resigned in January 1989. In an exit interview, he observed that some accomplishments of the Department during his tenure included securing presidential authorization and congressional funding for the superconducting super collider, continuing to fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and "putting in place a strong environment, health and safety plan" at the weapons complex. He noted that the failure to win decontrol of natural gas prices was a disappointment. Herrington acknowledged that President Reagan had been unable to obtain the elimination of the Department, but he asserted that the Department of Energy was now more to the President's liking. "I think the President is proud of how things ended up," Herrington stated. "The President was campaigning against [the Economic Regulatory Administration], federal regulation of refining capacity and petroleum production—those things that