

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BLOGGERS ROUNDTABLE WITH MINDY MONTGOMERY, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR INVESTMENT IN DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING VIA TELECONFERENCE TIME: 11:03 A.M. EDT DATE: MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2008

Copyright (c) 2008 by Federal News Service, Inc., Ste. 500 1000 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA. Federal News Service is a private firm not affiliated with the federal government. No portion of this transcript may be copied, sold or retransmitted without the written authority of Federal News Service, Inc. Copyright is not claimed as to any part of the original work prepared by a United States government officer or employee as a part of that person's official duties. For information on subscribing to the FNS Internet Service, please visit <http://www.fednews.com> or call(202)347-1400

(Note: Please refer to www.dod.mil for more information.)

SEAMAN WILLIAM SELBY (Office of the Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs): Okay. Hello, I'd like to welcome you all to the Department of Defense Bloggers Roundtable for Monday, October 20th, 2008. My name is Seaman William Selby with the Office of the Secretary of Defense Public Affairs and I'll be moderating the call today.

A note to our bloggers on the line: Please remember to clearly state your name and blog or organization in advance of your question. Respect our guest's time, keeping questions succinct.

Today, our guest is Mindy Montgomery with the SecDef's Office of Defense Research and Evaluation to discuss DOD energy priorities, challenges and successes.

And ma'am, with that, if you'd like to go ahead with your opening statement. MS. MONTGOMERY: Okay. Actually, thank you all for joining us today. This is a really good chance for DOD. This is one of the areas that we've been proactive with, so to me this is a great good- news story. And we're really, I'd say, leading the nation in looking at energy and considering energy.

(Inaudible) -- started about two years ago. We formed the Defense Energy Security Task Force to look at energy challenges. That's when, if you remember back post-Katrina, when the -- when the oil prices shot up to \$70 a barrel. And it really increased -- (inaudible) -- and was very eye-opening for us because basically for every \$10 a barrel oil goes up, it increases DOD's costs by \$1.3 billion a year in the year of execution.

So suddenly, as we already have the budgets locked, we now have to find 1.3 billion (dollars) or, in the last couple years, closer to \$3 (billion) to \$4 (billion) to \$5 billion in the year of execution to pay our bills.

So for us, it started out as a cost, but then we also realized there's a very large operational capability component. As we free up our warfighters from worrying about the (tail ?) of energy -- do we -- worrying about energy to the warfight, to the battlefield, where can -- making sure that the fuel guys are right behind them, then they actually have more flexibility. They can go further, faster, and they don't have to worry about getting the oil.

Seventy percent of the convoys in Iraq and Afghanistan are for fuel and water. So if we can reduce those, we can reduce all the security assets that go along with those, the -- there -- all these convoys are at risk from roadside bombs, snipers. We have close air support. Basically, it's an operation to move fuel. So if we can reduce that, then we can actually give our operating forces a lot more freedom, and they can use these security assets elsewhere. So we realized that this is really the right thing to do, both from a cost perspective but also operationally.

And we've -- I think we've made a lot of progress. We still have a ways to go, but we're really headed in the right direction.

Since 2005 we've reduced our total energy consumption by 6 percent. On the installation side, since 2003, we've reduced our demand by 10 percent. In fact, the installations community has done an incredible job. They've had goals for many years now, and so they've done a great job of reducing installations energy consumption. And so on the platform side, what we call our weapons systems, we're kind of playing catch-up and trying to figure out how to do it for the weapons system side.

But this is actually -- this has interest from the highest levels of the Department of Defense. The deputy secretary actually approved our goals for the strategic plan a couple weeks ago. So he is personally involved and is really interested in what we're doing to increase operational capability for the warfighter.

SEAMAN SELBY: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

Still there, ma'am? MS. MONTGOMERY: Yes.

SEAMAN SELBY: Okay. Sorry. Went silent there for a second.

And we're going to take some questions now. And Christian, you were first on the line.

Q Yes, hi. Good morning, Mindy. This is Christian Lowe calling from military.com. I actually have several questions. It's good that -- I think there's about three of us on here, so we should have plenty of time.

But my first question is -- you mentioned some statistics here; 6 percent -- let me make sure I got them down correctly -- reduced total energy on installations by 6 percent since 2005.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Total energy consumption.

Q Consumption.

MS. MONTGOMERY: That's all consumption by DOD. That's fuel, electricity. The installations piece of that was 10 percent since 2003.

Q Does that include installations that are, like, deployed overseas installations, like installations in Iraq and Afghanistan?

MS. MONTGOMERY: The total energy demands number, the 6 percent, yes.

Q Okay.

MS. MONTGOMERY: The installations I should -- actually, that's a good point. The installations is for fixed installations only.

Q Okay.

MS. MONTGOMERY: We're -- we have not separated out the tactical installations in terms of their energy consumption, but we're starting to do that as part of the weapon systems and the platform look.

Q Okay. And the installations one is 10 percent since '03, you said?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Yes.

Q Okay. Now, my question is, do you have a dollar figure attached to that -- you know, how much the DOD has saved with this reduction in energy consumption?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Well, I'd like to say we've saved, but unfortunately, energy costs have gone way up. So actually the way I could say it is we've avoided a higher cost increase. It would have cost us a lot more than it did. So even though we've reduced consumption, it still costs us more in the long run.

Between 2005 and 2006, our energy costs went up by about (\$)2.7 billion, and between '06 and '07, they were roughly the same. So we paid about (\$)13 billion in total energy costs.

Q Okay.

MS. MONTGOMERY: So they haven't gone -- they're not going down yet. My understanding is, on the installation side, some of the electricity costs have stabilized to some extent because that was one of our -- the energy costs on the installation side just kept shooting up. So even though we were conserving, it was still costing us more. And you know what's going on with the fuel bills.

Q Okay.

And if I could just shoehorn in one more question on that, what are you guys actually doing to reduce this energy? Give us some examples of the initiatives that you've done to cut this down.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Let me talk about some of the things that we're doing for the tactical installations. This in my mind is one of our true success stories.

As we looked at the fuel convoys and how we could -- how we could reduce energy consumption, we developed the Power Surety Task Force to focus on combatant commanders' energy needs and to look at how we could reduce energy on the installations.

One of the things we found immediately was what we're calling foam, spray foam. Basically it's foam insulation that they put around tents. They've been using it in Canada as part of the housing code. They put it in attics. Well, what our guys decided to do was try it out, putting it on the outside of tents.

Tents that have been in Iraq and Afghanistan, for three years or so, aren't quite -- they were never energy efficient to begin with. But now they have holes. They're worn out. And basically this put an outer shell on them. And we found out that reduced energy consumption by about 30 percent.

Then we looked at also some other efficiencies. And basically the -- we just a couple months back awarded a \$95 million contract, to spray foam about 60 percent of the tents in Iraq and Afghanistan, which we expect to reduce energy consumption probably by about, I want to say, somewhere between 30 and 60 percent. Because we don't -- basically most of the energy was going to air conditioning the tents. Or in some cases, we called it the Horn of Africa.

And now we're keeping the air inside. And oh, by the way, the tents are actually about 20 degrees cooler than they ever got with the air conditioning. We estimate we're going to save about \$400,000 a day and take about 13 fuel trucks off the road a day. So what we're trying to do is test out different things and see what's working.

On aircraft, we're looking at more efficient turbine engines. How can we use technology to make the turbine engines more efficient? So we have some ongoing programs in that.

Looking at the next generation humvee, you may have heard of the Joint Lightweight Tactical Vehicle. We have a program called the fuel efficient demonstrator that's testing out a bunch of energy technologies to determine what would be useful, what has the best bang for the buck. And we're going to integrate that into the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle.

That program is run by TARDEC, the Army tank and automotive command. And they're looking at -- basically they have, they have a very innovative approach. They're -- a lot of it's kind of a monster garage approach, taking a lot of different companies and innovative people and smart guys, putting them in a room and saying, hey, what can we do? They're looking at different drivetrains, different kinds of engines, different power systems on the vehicle. Does a hybrid electric work in an environment that we operate in, like in Iraq or Afghanistan?

Is that efficient? Or what -- kind of putting in anything you could do, light-weighting, looking at different materials -- how about we use titanium or a carbon composite? And they're going to build about four to six model vehicles and just test it out, try it out and see what works.

So we're doing a lot of different things. I'd say right now on the platform side we're doing a lot of testing --

Q Okay.

MS. MONTGOMERY: -- and seeing what works. We're very focused on looking at the return on investment, kind of what's going to get -- what's the bang for our buck, whether in terms of dollars or capability. And then those projects that have the highest return are the ones we're trying to test out first and see if they work.

Q Okay. Great. Thanks a lot.

SEAMAN SELBY: Thank you. And Paul, you were second on the line.

Q Yes. Paul McLeary with DTI. Thanks for talking to us.

I'm wondering what you're doing as far as wind energy, solar energy, things like that, especially at the tactical level, out in the field in Iraq and Afghanistan. Are there any initiatives to get technology like that out in the field?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Actually, I'm glad you brought it up, because you reminded me.

I -- the -- one of the things that our power surety folks have been working on is what we call the tactical hybrid electric generator, which looked at -- which put together a generator but also used solar and wind power and -- to basically offset some of the fuel usage. And they got about a -- between a 60-90 percent reduction in energy consumption. It depended on what level load they were using -- (inaudible) -- the higher loads, you got -- we were less efficient. But for small loads, it was actually very efficient.

We took these -- they actually have tested some out in the field in -- they -- we have a training -- a testing and training center at the National Training Center in Fort Irwin, California. So they tried it out there. What we found was -- there were some pieces that weren't -- it wasn't really hard enough for a real battlefield operation. So we have -- we had a -- have another ongoing program where we're basically taking these technologies and modifying and looking for new ways of doing power generation for the generators.

Again, since most of the generators are used for air conditioning and that's what the big fuel sinks over in Iraq and Afghanistan, we're looking at ways to make those more efficient. So that's one of the pieces on a tactical level.

On an installations level, we are trying to use renewables where we can. It really depends on the installation. One of the key pieces they -- since we use the electrical grid -- is really making sure that we can get a good financial -- that it's cost-effective for DOD.

And I will tell you right now, renewables are more expensive. So we're -- the renewable energy credits that companies get to focus -- to be able to develop these technologies or even implement them, they need some help. So it becomes a cost issue.

We're trying to do more. We have mandates to do more. We actually just opened a solar farm -- over 14 megawatts in Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. That's actually a really -- we got a good deal on that one. I think they're paying about 2 cents a kilowatt hour. If that's not exactly the right number, it's pretty close, which is actually very comparable to other power generation. Basically, those guys got a really good deal. So there's some areas where, when you take into account all the credits, it's very cost-effective.

And in some cases, we're also trying to use underutilized land. With the Nellis, basically, it was on a trash dump that we couldn't use for anything else. So what we did was took that underutilized land, let a company come in and put a solar farm on our land, and basically that's part of the benefit back is we get really good rates.

We're -- we've also, for the last 20 years, had a geothermal plant at China Lake. But that's -- I want to say it produces somewhere between 180 to 200 megawatts. And the Navy actually gets -- thanks to some very effective legislation, Navy has made about \$200 million. We actually get money back. It was an enhanced use lease, but the way the legislation reads is the Department of Defense actually gets to get money back. So that was a good deal.

We're looking at expanding geothermal in several other areas, Hawthorne Army Base, I think, Fallon Navy Station, and a couple other areas. And in fact, that, for the geothermal plant, they actually pump power back to the California grid, which is one of the things California needs. They have to go -- be green. All new energy has to be green, and they have some serious energy concerns. So we're actually using some of our underutilized land or some of the resources on our military facilities and getting a benefit both for DOD and for the local economy.

Q Okay, thanks.

SEAMAN SELBY: And Andrew, you were next on the line.

Q Okay, thanks. Thanks, Steven (sic). Hello, Ms. Montgomery. And also, hi Christian and Paul.

My name's Andy Bochman from the DOD Energy Blog. I'm calling in from Boston and I have two basic types of questions. One is on the fully burdened cost of fuel, and then I'm going to come back to inflations again, if you don't mind.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Okay.

Q The fully burdened cost of fuel -- FBCF -- I did a post on it on my blog this morning, referencing NDAA '09 and seeing some things in there that looked like they grew straight of work and presentations from Chris DiPetto and one that I -- that I saw your name on as well. So that seemed like great stuff.

All I said in the blog after I referenced some of its key points was that I was going to endeavor to do follow-up. So the NDAA says this is what's going to happen or start happening. Can you tell -- can you tell me or could you tell us what will be the best ways to see it in action? Will we be able to start seeing new contract language that calls out the key performance parameters based on energy? Can you recommend how we can do that?

MS. MONTGOMERY: This one is one of the -- beginning work in progress, because, realize, the acquisition process, it takes a long time to change.

Q Right.

MS. MONTGOMERY: And the people that we've trained in the acquisition process need to understand these new rules as they come out.

The -- directing the use of fully burdened cost of fuel actually was done in a memo back, I believe, in 2007, by the undersecretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, where he said you will consider the fully burdened cost of fuel and energy costs in your cost estimates. And basically, Chris DiPetto's shop has been working ever since to try to figure out -- to try to help the acquisition community understand what that means, how do we cost it out.

Back a couple months ago, they held a workshop where they basically pulled all the insights together from their pilot programs. They used the next-generation cruiser propulsion system, the next-generation bomber and the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle, all programs that are in different places, different points of time in the acquisition cycle.

Q Okay.

MS. MONTGOMERY: What we're trying to figure out is how to do this. We need to give the program manager some kind of a cookbook of how you do this, what is an appropriate cost for energy. How do I -- particularly, as you've seen, energy costs recently fluctuating -- what number do I use? What makes sense? And getting back to the return on investment, is it worth spending an extra \$5 on the more efficient engine, if it's going to be in the system only 10 years?

Q Right.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Or if it's going to be in the -- in the process for 30 years -- if it's going to be used for 30 years, maybe it makes more sense.

Q And how the heck do you deal with not just the fact that energy has become much more expensive than it used to be, but the enormous volatility, especially looking down the road further than, like, one week. (Laughs.) How do you know what the price of a barrel of oil's going to be in one year, five years, 10 or 20?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Well, and that's what -- that's some of what they're trying to figure out what -- you know, how do we use -- what do we use to cost that? Do we parameterize, you know, use a parametric -- here's kind of a low, here's kind of a high.

And plus, as I talked about, some of the return on investment is in capability. It's not just monetary. If you have a more -- if you do have that more efficient Joint Light Tactical Vehicle engine, that means the Army can go further. That means they don't have to worry about the fuel guys behind them. They can go a little further before having to refuel. So there's other implications -- and trying to pull all that together.

I think it's going to take some time before you really start to see this as part of the process. I can tell you Mr. Young is very -- the acquisition community (comes ?) -- from the leadership are very interested in making this a reality. This is -- it's a smart business decision. We need to be -- we need to make good business decisions for the department.

So it's now just a matter of kind of helping the acquisition community understand -- helping them -- helping the new -- basically retrain our acquisition people to think in these terms of life cycle cost that include energy, but also helping them understand that the leadership may be willing -- I should say -- (or the ?) caveat -- the acquisition community's used to trying to cut their proposals -- their cost proposals to bare bones because they want to get funded. It might be more expensive if you have to buy the more expensive engine. Basically, if you -- if that's the right thing to do -- they're now going to be concerned that their program is going to be at risk, and they may not be approved. We need to get them past that. We need to help demonstrate to

them that the leadership isn't going to cut their program to make that happen. We will support them if they are doing it based on energy.

So it's a learning process for everybody. So it's going to take a while. A recent thing that came out was developing life science -- life cycle sustainment metrics for the major Defense acquisition programs. There was a memo released, I believe, the end of July of this year that said you now need to do life -- you now need to develop sustainment metrics, and energy needs to be a part of that.

So we're seeing more guidance come out, and hopefully over the next couple of months, (Chris's station should ?) wrap up, and they'll have a better -- basically the next iteration of DOD 5000 is going to have some of this energy guidance in there, and as -- I think you'll see more of it as we get some programs that are far enough along to make these kind of decisions.

Q Okay. I -- and I just wanted to get a feel for the maturity level. It seems like --

MS. MONTGOMERY: Sorry. That was kind of a long answer to --

Q (Chuckles.) It's -- no, it was all -- it was good stuff --

MS. MONTGOMERY: (Inaudible) -- progress, and it wasn't --

Q -- but it's early days. It's going to be -- we can say sometime or we could say several quarters or years, even, before it's normal for a new procurement officer who's going through training to have this be a full part of their indoctrination.

MS. MONTGOMERY: I think that's an accurate statement. I think the acquisition headquarters would like to see it happen sooner. But the reality is, we don't have that many acquisition programs anymore. We've really cut procurement back.

Q True.

MS. MONTGOMERY: And so the few programs we have that would be at a stage where you could make some of these trade-offs -- you know, there's only a few coming through, and we need to train people. And all I can say is, if I was a PM, I would want to see that the leadership didn't cut my program for having a high -- a more expensive cost estimate before I'm actually going to put my neck on the line.

Q Okay.

MS. MONTGOMERY: So I think there's some -- it's going to take some time. This one is a -- more of a culture change.

Q It will be nice if there was a way for there to be a website or some type of common meeting point for people, certainly on the inside but maybe people on the outside too, to be able to get a feel for both what's go on so far -- the right documents to refer to -- and then what upcoming classes or conferences might be in the future that are trying to narrow the focus on FBCF.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Okay. That's a good comment. I'm going to write that down. I'll send that to Chris and his folks. And I think as you -- I think

you're going to see more requests from Congress on what are we doing with energy. And as this gets more mature, we'll have -- we'll -- basically some of these reports will show some of this -- some of the progress we've made.

We have actually something you guys all may be interested in. On Friday we posted the report on energy initiatives. Basically it's a lot of examples of what we've done in the last couple years on energy and on our successes. We posted that on the DDR&E website, which is www.dod.mil/ddre, and it's under the documents tab. And that gives you a good example of some of the things we've recently completed or are ongoing. It talks a little bit about the fully burdened cost of fuel and the energy as a key performance parameter.

Q All right. Great.

MS. MONTGOMERY: But I think you're right. It's -- it would be very helpful for everybody to have a better understanding of what's going on with the fully burdened cost of fuel as we start to make this cookbook and help the community out.

Q This is the type of information, I assume, that isn't -- that DOD wouldn't mind sharing. I don't think it puts you at a competitive disadvantage or is necessarily even at threat for allies or even adversaries to see.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Well, actually, one of the things we've tried to do -- I've given my kind of energy pitch at a lot of different forums because one of the things we want to do is have industry come to us with more energy efficient things.

Q Sure.

MS. MONTGOMERY: We want -- this is a case of DOD doesn't know how to do it all, and we want to drive industry to come up with innovative ideas, and we want to let industry know yes, we may be willing -- may -- be willing to pay more for energy efficiency. And instead of just coming to us with the same types of engines or aircraft that you've given us before, you may actually have an edge if you come in with energy efficiency. So we're trying to put the word out there. So I think the more places we can say that, the better. And I think it's better again for DOD, but also for the taxpayer.

Q If you don't mind, my second question -- that first question was more (finite ?). I don't know if this one's going to be less of one or not. But it's a follow up on installations again -- and I don't mean tactical, I do mean -- the onus is primarily bases and the oft-cited gains that have been made there in terms of energy conservation. This -- that overachieved what the 2 (percent) or 3 percent goals per year that were set in 2005, I think it was.

I've had a chance to talk with civil engineers at some of the bases in the northeast as well as a couple of mission support group commanders. I'm former Air Force, so some of these people are just my friends and former colleagues. And other than the showcase examples, Nellis on solar and China Lake on geo and a couple of others maybe that bubble up sometimes, when I ask these guys, how are you guys doing? What are you -- what are the low-hanging fruit that you're doing on your bases, and what about renewable?

And I heard you address the renewable as expensive, and that's consistent from their point of view. How are you doing this? You can see in

the press -- I think, in some places, that some of those gains are reputed to be from BRAC; bases are closed down so they're not using energy. So bingo, we just saved -- we just saved a bunch. If someone asks you, you know, what are the one, two or three things that installations generally meaning not the, not the leading- edge ones that are doing something exciting, with solar or geothermal or wind, but what are bases in general doing, to conserve energy, that's not costing them?

They can't do anything that costs them very much money because none of them seem to have money. And I'll stop but I -- that went longer than I meant it to also.

MS. MONTGOMERY: No. Believe me, we are struggling with that too.

I will tell you, the installations community was rather concerned when the 3 percent number was locked in, in the executive order. We were okay with 2 percent. 3 percent got a lot harder because, as you said, we've taken the low-hanging fruit.

With the -- with BRAC, we have -- BRAC in some sense made it easy for us because some of the, some of the facilities we got rid of were some of the older buildings. And the newer ones are somewhat more efficient.

So now it becomes, oh, okay, what can we do what can we really do differently? And it's not just produce more power. It's how can we, how can we build our buildings more efficiently?

We're really focusing on sustainable design as we design our military construction projects, which is a culmination of using materials that last longer but also using more energy efficiency, efficient technologies. Using -- I know one of the mandates in the latest -- on some of the latest guides that came out was solar; basically all water heaters need to be solar, need to be powered by solar, so looking at technologies like that.

An interesting one: If you look at the report, you'll be able to find a little more information. In the Wedge 5 part of the Pentagon, we're going to install LED lights. And over the life cycle of the fixtures, it's going to save about \$4 million. And I think if people see the results of that, you may see some of those technologies expanded; using daylighting, a lot of the technologies that Wal-Mart uses.

Wal-Mart is actually a leader in energy efficiency. And using their -- during the day, you don't -- you can just put skylights in and you don't necessarily need to turn the lights on particularly in aircraft hangars.

Doing --

Q Wal-Mart is cited, Wal-Mart is cited in -- (inaudible) -- energy task force as being sort of an exemplar of pushing on all of these capabilities.

Is there somebody in your organization you know that is trying to pull as many things out of the Wal-Mart best practices as they can?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Well, I know Wayne Army, the deputy undersecretary for Installations and Environment is really looking at some of these technologies. And part of it, as you kind of alluded to, is trying to get the word out. The guy -- the poor guy -- the facilities commander on the base is just trying to

keep his roof from leaking and stop the roof leaks. He doesn't even have time to think about, okay, well, what else could I possibly do?

So I see part of our task force and through the installations community is trying to get the word out on lessons learned and populate those throughout the force. Each base commander shouldn't be having to come up with these things themselves. We should -- we at headquarters should be helping them out. So we're trying to do more of that.

One of the new technologies -- I know we're running low on time, but I'd like to talk about this one, because this is close to home. One of the tests that our (power ?) surety folks are running is a housing demonstration at Fort Belvoir. We have four houses that went up in July that were under construction and we're testing various energy technologies. It's basically -- we have the control house; the first house we did nothing to. The second house, we sprayed -- we sprayed foam, the foam installation I alluded to for the tactical installations. We put that in the attic. On the third house, we put the foam in the attic and the basement -- around the walls of the basement. And in the fourth house we had all that plus -- this was the Cadillac house. So it had some silver water heaters, other energy efficiency technologies. This whole demonstration cost \$115,000.

Q Nice.

MS. MONTGOMERY: And so four houses. We've now -- and we've needed them. So over the use of these houses over the next couple years, we're going to watch the energy use of the -- just the attic house we expect about a 30 percent reduction in energy consumption. In the attic and basement foam house, we think we're going to get between a 50 and 60 percent energy reduction. And then the Cadillac is kind of -- we think maybe 90 percent, but then, it's got a lot of power generation technologies inherent.

And what we want to do is after the test, the things that we think are successful with the best return on investment -- you know, kind of what can we afford to put up front versus what we'd look at from -- for the savings in the long run, and take those insights and populate them across the installations community. So we're anxiously awaiting to hear what happens there.

And I think the National Training Center's also trying some of these technologies, trying to go off the grid and, you know, using a combination of some of these hybrid electric generators, some of the foam technologies and expand that pilot.

Q (Inaudible) -- thanks. And one last positive comment, not a question, was, from the discussions I've had with the civil engineers and the mission support group commanders, you can tell that new buildings -- when new buildings are being considered, they're always thinking lead now, and I think lead the lower levels is at least a minimum standard on the new structures. But it's more a question of maybe like per your Belvoir example, what can they do to economically enhance the efficiency of the existing buildings they have? And they have tons of them, obviously.

MS. MONTGOMERY: That one gets harder. But that's the nice thing about the -- this foam insulation. You can use that on existing -- and that's kind of why I like that technology. It's not -- well, I shouldn't even call it technology. It's something that exists -- it's been used in Canada for years,

and it's something we can do today for not a lot of money, assuming that it really does have the energy savings that we anticipate.

Q Sure.

SEAMAN SELBY: Thank you, ma'am. And yeah, we are getting a little short on time now, so I'd like to thank everybody for their questions and comments.

Ma'am, did you have any closing statement?

MS. MONTGOMERY: I think I've gotten a lot of the key points out. I encourage you to go to our -- the DDR&E website and look at the report. It has a lot of good information in there. And if you have other questions, I'm happy to take them later, and I can answer them back to you over the next couple weeks.

SEAMAN SELBY: Okay. Thank you very much, ma'am.

Q Thanks.

Q Thank you.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Thank you, guys, for this opportunity.

SEAMAN SELBY: And today's program will be available online at the bloggers link on dod.mil, where you'll be able to access a story based on today's call, along with source documents such as the audio file and print transcripts. Again, thank you, ma'am, and our blogger participants. This concludes today's event, and feel free to disconnect at any time.

Q Okay. Thanks a lot.

Q Bye-bye.

Q Thank you.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Thank you.

END.