

JAMES M. INHOFE
OKLAHOMA

WASHINGTON OFFICE
205 RUSSELL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3603
(202) 224-4721

TULSA OFFICE
1924 SOUTH UTICA, SUITE 530
TULSA, OK 74104
(918) 748-5111

OKLAHOMA CITY OFFICE
1900 N.W. EXPRESSWAY, SUITE 1210
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73118
(405) 608-4381

COMMITTEES:
ARMED SERVICES
ENVIRONMENT AND
PUBLIC WORKS
FOREIGN RELATIONS

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3603

August 2, 2012

The Honorable Ray Mabus
Secretary of the Navy
1000 Navy Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-1000

Dear Secretary Mabus,

Thank you for your response to my letter dated July 24, 2012, inquiring about various costs the Department of the Navy incurred during the "Great Green Fleet" demonstration on July, 18 2012. I appreciate you providing the information that was included in your response. With due respect, many questions were left unanswered which raises additional questions and I hope you would be able to provide me with the answers.

To be clear, I fully support the development and use of all sources of alternative fuels. For the sake of our energy security and independence, we must take an all-of-the-above approach in order to end our dependence on foreign oil. This includes making full use of Research and Development (R&D) funds to test, evaluate, and certify all types of alternative fuels. At the same time, I believe these pursuits within the military must be sensible and affordable solutions. Using scarce Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds impacts readiness and jeopardizes the lives of our service men and women.

I respectfully request a detailed report that provides the total cost of this "green" event. The report should include at a minimum: total fuel burned, type of fuel burned to ship the biofuel from Louisiana and Texas to Washington state by ground; total number of vehicles required to transport the 450,000 gallons of fuel from Louisiana and Texas to Washington; total fuel burned, type of fuel used and cost to transport the biofuel from the port to Hawaii; cost to the Navy to promote the event, and cost to repaint the aircraft and ships after the event concluded; number of days the 900,000 gallons of 50/50 blend supported operations; total number of gallons of fuel used, broken down by biofuel and traditional fuel, during the event for all aircraft and ships to include all supply ships; and number of aircraft and ships that operated solely on traditional fuel during event.

Additionally, please include in the report Navy's R&D and O&M expenditures on alternative energy over the past 10 years; types of fuels procured, supplier of those fuels, and a break-down of how funds were used in the respective budgets. Also, please include details on how the Navy planned, implemented, and certified ships, planes and all other equipment for use of the 50/50 fuel blend.

During Admiral Greenert's briefing to Senators and staff on July 12, 2012, he voiced concern about certifying alternative fuels at a 50/50 blend and requested certification of blends other than 50/50. What is the rationale behind this request and what type of blends would the Navy be certifying. A 2010 study conducted by the University of Oklahoma and the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory on the impact of biodiesel on metal voiced concern about biodegradation and its propensity to stimulate

corrosion. A 2010 study from Fuels, Engines, and Emissions Research Center at the Oakridge National Laboratory in Tennessee raised similar concerns about dissolved water in biofuels contributing to corrosion and stress corrosion cracking. What research and testing has the Navy done to determine if the long term use of biofuels increases corrosion and the potential impacts of using biofuels on aircraft, ships, storage facilities? One proposed solution to reducing corrosion and stress corrosion cracking risk is to make the fuel more petroleum-like, using more traditional fuels. Is this why the Navy is looking at additional blends than just the 50/50 blend?

Finally, what has been the involvement of the U.S. Navy in funding the design and construction of biorefineries? On August 9, 2011, the Department of Defense (DOD) asked to reprogram \$170 million in Fiscal Year 2011 funds, \$137.3 million from O&M accounts, to “design, construct, and operate/validate multiple domestic, commercial-scale, integrated biorefineries.” The request was not approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee. However, in Fiscal Year 2012 Omnibus, \$120 million was added to DPA activities and an unspecified amount went to build biofuel refineries. In the Fiscal Year 2013 President’s Budget Request, the President requested \$89 million in DPA activities with \$70 million for building a biofuel refinery. No authorization was requested in Fiscal Year 2013.

The budget cuts DOD and all the Services have already absorbed, in addition to those that could be realized under sequestration, are a stark reminder of how responsible the DOD must be with current acquisitions and planned purchases. It is imperative that DOD and all the Services effectively use the shrinking funds available to continue providing an adequate defense for the men and women of this country and our allies abroad.

Sincerely,



James M. Inhofe
United States Senator