Defense Reforms

More than a decade has passed since the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and the Special Operations reforms.

Do you support full implementation of these defense reforms?


What is your view of the extent to which these defense reforms have been implemented?

From what I have learned to date, these defense reforms have been implemented and have achieved the desired results. Having said that, I believe it is important, and consistent with the intent of the reform legislation, that the Army continues to assess and modify its operations and internal procedures to meet the challenges of a dynamic security environment.

What do you consider to be the most important aspects of these defense reforms?

The most important aspects of these reforms were strengthening civilian control; streamlining the operational chain of command, improving the efficiency in the use of defense resources, improving the military advice provided to the National Command Authorities, clarifying authority for combatant commanders, and enhancing the effectiveness of military operations.

The goals of the Congress in enacting these defense reforms, as reflected in section 3 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act, can be summarized as strengthening civilian control; improving military advice; placing clear responsibility on the combatant commanders for the accomplishment of their missions; ensuring the authority of the combatant commanders is commensurate with their responsibility; increasing attention to the formulation of strategy and to contingency planning; providing for more efficient use of defense resources; and enhancing the effectiveness of military operations and improving the management and administration of the Department of Defense.

Do you agree with these goals?

Yes, I fully support the Congressional goals reflected in the Department of Defense

Recently, there have been articles, which indicate an interest within the Department of Defense in modifying Goldwater-Nichols in light of the changing environment and possible revisions to the national strategy.

Do you anticipate that legislative proposals to amend Goldwater-Nichols may be appropriate? If so, what areas do you believe it might be appropriate to address in these proposals?

At this time, I have not had an opportunity to consider whether changes to Goldwater-Nichols may be warranted. If confirmed as the ASA (I&E), I will remain open to proposals within the Department that will increase the effectiveness of the organization and missions within my areas of responsibility.

Duties

What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment)?

Under current Army policy, the Assistant Secretary is responsible for policy development, program oversight, and coordination for a wide variety of Army activities, including installation management, safety and occupational health programs, and environmental cleanup, compliance, prevention and conservation. I understand that the ASA-I&E is responsible for the stewardship of 12 million acres and facility investment totaling more than $160 billion.

What background and experience do you possess that you believe qualifies you to perform these duties?

I have had a diverse background of engineering management, nuclear power discipline, major laboratory management, and most recently, manager of a major Department of Energy facility (Savannah River Site.) In many of these positions I was responsible for landlord functions, research and development, downsizing and economic development. For example, at Savannah River Site, I was responsible for this 320 sq mi area of forest, and industrial area. Downsizing of the industrial complex, combined with environmental controls of this large area, including major environmental research (conducted by the University of Georgia as a contractor to DOE), were all part of the DOE manager’s area of interest and responsibility. Such experiences, including those in the Naval Service earlier, prepare me very well for the challenges of the ASA (I&E) position.

Do you believe that there are actions you need to take to enhance your ability to
perform the duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment)?

It is never too late to find new and innovative ways to accomplish the very important tasks at hand. If confirmed, I plan to utilize the expertise of the Army's military and civilian workforce, supplemented by independent advice from standing groups such as the Army Science Board, the Institute for Defense Analyses, and from private sector organizations and individuals. For many of the issues that I will face I would utilize a multi-disciplinary project team drawing on expertise in I&E, other Army Secretariat organizations, DoD and outside organizations as appropriate. In my past experiences I always have sought the best talent available both in employees and in advisors to supplement and enhance my personal experience and expertise. I have learned that providing the people an opportunity to perform is key to the success of the organization. People must be challenged and be held accountable.

Assuming you are confirmed, what duties and functions do you expect that the Secretary of the Army would prescribe for you?

The duties of the Assistant Secretary are currently defined in a General Order. If confirmed, I will advise the Secretary on issues, initiatives and ideas that fall within my areas of responsibility and I will accept any other assignments he may deem necessary for the successful accomplishment of the Army mission. I look forward to working closely with the Secretary and making the Army team an example for others to emulate.

In carrying out your duties, how will you work with the Secretary of the Army, the Under Secretary of the Army, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment)?

The organizational relationship between the ASA (I&E) and the Under Secretary of the Army is defined by the Secretary of the Army. The Under Secretary is the Secretary of the Army's principal civilian assistant and senior advisor and I will be available to assist him at all times and always keep him informed of significant issues under the ASA (I&E) purview. If confirmed, I will establish a cooperative and open relationship with the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense and assist him in developing programs that are cost effective and would benefit the entire military structure.

Major Challenges and Problems

In your view, what are the major challenges that will confront the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment)?

I believe there are three major challenges in managing I&E. First, the Army faces a major
ongoing challenge in its effort to meet mission requirements and provide for the quality of life for soldiers and their families in this era of diminishing resources. Second, the Army needs to move forward aggressively in reducing and realigning its infrastructure to match its requirements into the Twenty-first Century. Third, the Army needs to strive to achieve more efficient and cost effective remediation of its properties. The identification and resource programming for the Army's requirements to cleanup munitions and Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) at its non-operational ranges and disposal areas are one of our major challenges.

Assuming you are confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing these challenges?

If confirmed, I will quickly evaluate the action plans in place, and with the assistance of staff and other experts, develop changes that have proven effective in other areas or have significant promise to effectively and economically address the challenges. There is a wealth of knowledge in the Army, other government agencies, and in the private sector. I would not reject any help that makes sense and assists the Army in properly marshalling its resources to address these challenges.

What do you consider to be the most serious problems in the performance of the functions of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment)?

With shrinking budgets, I believe that the Army must strive to achieve an effective balance between the quality of life for Army soldiers and their families, force sustainment, and the modernization necessary to build an effective Army for the future. Moreover, it will be a continuing challenge for the Army to achieve the optimum balance among the competing tools available to meet these needs, such as private sector performance of functions, use of emerging technologies, and the development of innovative programs.

The Army's ability to address requirements for munitions cleanups and dispose of real property is controlled by the absolute need to protect the health of the affected communities and meet the regulatory requirements for environmental cleanup.

If confirmed, what management actions and time lines would you establish to address these problems?

If confirmed, I will quickly assess the nature and scope of the problems and challenges that ASA (I&E) faces. I will retain those programs that appear to be working well, develop new programs where required, and modify those that have promise. I would work very closely with Congress, the regulators, other stakeholders, and other DOD and Executive Departments.

Priorities
If confirmed, what broad priorities will you establish in terms of issues, which must be addressed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment)?

Establishment of policy and programs to address the legacy of unexploded ordnance and munitions residues at closed, closing and formerly used military ranges and disposal areas will be one of my top priorities. The Army must ensure that our legacy of past military activities is addressed in a responsible and timely manner and also ensure that past mistakes are not repeated. Additionally, I will work to streamline the Army’s property disposal process and address environmental cleanup concerns so that excess properties are returned to reuse in the public or private sector as rapidly and efficiently as possible.

**Housing Privatization**

The Congress has repeatedly expressed its support for improving military family housing. In recent years the Department of Defense and the Congress have taken significant steps to improve family housing. However, it will take many more years and a significant amount of funding to meet the Department’s housing needs. An alternative option that was created to speed the improvement of military family housing and relieve base commanders of the burden of managing their family housing is the housing privatization program. If confirmed for the position of Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment) you will have a key role in any decisions regarding military family housing.

**What are your views regarding the privatization of family housing?**

The legislation enabling privatization initiatives within DoD and the military services provides an effective mechanism to leverage the Military Services' limited resources, thereby increasing the availability and quality of family housing for Service members and their families. It appears that privatization may prove to be the most effective and affordable method of revitalizing the Army's large and aging family housing stock and providing essential new housing. I understand that there is enormous interest among the nation's leading developers in partnering with the Army in this program. It is essential to approach housing issues with a broad-based program perspective that addresses long-term development and management of Army communities--not simply the construction of housing units. Army communities, like civilian communities, include all of the facilities and services that accommodate and support soldiers and their families. If confirmed, my primary goal in this area would be to develop appropriate program strategies to effectively use scarce Army resources and significantly improve the quality of life for our soldiers.

**What is your view of the structure, pace, and general goals of the Army’s current housing privatization program? Do you think the program should be continued, and if**
so do you believe the program should be modified in any way?

The privatization authorities that were provided by Congress in 1996 in the Military Housing Privatization Initiative provide a good structure and the appropriate tools to carry out family housing privatization. If confirmed, I will become fully engaged in the Army’s housing privatization program and will conduct periodic reviews and/or lessons learned sessions to identify modifications to improve the process.

The Army has contracted for a major housing privatization effort at Fort Hood, Texas using a request for qualifications (RFQ) process instead of the more traditional request for proposals (RFP) process.

What are your views on the relative merits of these contracting approaches?

I understand the Army is using a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) solicitation process in the housing privatization program because this allows the Army to partner with a highly qualified, world-class development partner to design the best residential community for a given installation.

The Department of Defense has established 2010 as a goal to improve all of its military family housing.

Do you believe the Department of the Army can achieve this goal?

Yes, I believe that the Army can achieve the DoD goal of eliminating inadequate family housing by FY 2010 using a combination of traditional MILCON, increases in the Basic Allowance for Housing, and housing privatization.

Competitive Sourcing

Over the past several years, DOD has increased its reliance on the private sector to perform activities that are commercial in nature, including many functions relating to running and maintaining our military installations.

What approach would you recommend to balance the need to maintain necessary decision-making functions and technical capabilities in the government’s civilian workforce, including the knowledge necessary to be a “smart buyer,” and skills such as civil engineering within the military, with the savings that may be available from outsourcing?

Although inherently governmental functions normally cannot be performed by contractors, I
understand that there is a credible process within the Army for identifying those core commercial capabilities required for maintaining a smart buyer capability, and I intend to support that process. In all cases, the military and civilian employees must be trained to be “smart customers.” I believe the smarter the customer, the better will be the performance of the supplier and frequently at less cost.

**Do you support the principle of public-private competition as the preferred means to make the “sourcing” decision for such functions?**

Generally, OMB Circular A-76 and federal law require public-private competition as the means to make the “sourcing” decision.

**Do you believe that public-private competition results in significant savings to the Department of Defense regardless of which side wins the competition?**

Yes, according to experts familiar with the process, public-private competition typically results in savings in excess of 30%, regardless of which side wins the competition. I feel that these savings are important and must be considered as we plan to manage in the future.

OMB Circular A-76, which establishes the guidelines for outsourcing most government functions, is slated for scrutiny by a congressionally mandated panel of government and private experts in this area. The panel, chaired by the Comptroller General, is scheduled to report to Congress with specific policy and legislative reforms and recommendations for changing the way the government conducts out-sourcing decisions and implements them.

**What is your view of the current A-76 process?**

If confirmed, I intend to thoroughly familiarize myself with the process and ensure the process is effective and will continue to provide substantial savings and efficiencies.

**Are there other effective alternatives to achieve the benefits of public-private competition?**

This is a complex issue, and I believe it is prudent to wait until the Commercial Activities Panel has provided its analysis of the question before I make a final judgment as to whether other effective alternatives exist.

**Base Closure**

The President’s February budget blueprint document states that “with 23 percent in estimated excess infrastructure, it is clear that new rounds of base closures will be necessary
to shape the military more efficiently”.

Do you believe that we need more base closures?

The Secretary of Defense initiated a broad review of the Department of Defense that is currently ongoing. I would expect recommendations about reshaping our infrastructure to emerge as a result of this review. The Secretary recently indicated that with a round of base closings and adjustments that reduced unneeded facilities we could focus the funds on facilities we actually need.

Do you believe the Army has excess infrastructure that uses resources that could be applied to higher priorities within the Department of the Army?

In an April 1998, DOD report to Congress the Army reported that it had excess infrastructure. A final determination on this point cannot be made until ongoing Defense reviews are completed and the impacts are assessed. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the Army retains the infrastructure that it needs to support current and future Army force structure, training, and readiness requirements.

Do you believe the process established by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is a fair and effective way to reduce excess military infrastructure and return the property to local authorities?

Improvement is always possible in a process as complex as the Act of 1990. In the future, the Army will need to reshape its infrastructure to support the Army of the future. Once there is a clear understanding of the direction the Army needs to take, it can be determined if the Act of 1990 is the right process or whether recommendations to modify the process should be made.

In your view, would changing the base closure process to exempt some bases from the independent commission’s review make the process more or less open, fair, and stressful to communities with military installations?

If confirmed, I will carefully consider any proposed changes to improve the process. I do believe that communities deserve to know the status of their base as quickly as possible. Above all, we need to ensure that the process is open and fair and achieves that objective.

Real Property Maintenance

The military departments have consistently struggled to maintain their base infrastructure. The backlog of real property maintenance has remained high whether budgets were increasing or decreasing, and the military is far behind industry standards for
Are there any new approaches to this issue that you believe could help the Army move toward a solution of this perennial problem?

I understand that the Army is taking several approaches to the problem of maintaining its base infrastructure in the face of inadequate funding, including utility privatization. In addition, the military services’ out leasing authority under Title 10 USC, Section 2667, is an important tool for addressing real property maintenance and revitalization. Also, the Army is involved in an effort to relocate from leased facilities to on-post facilities. All of these programs work together toward eliminating the funding delta for the maintenance of base infrastructure.

Environmental Issues

The Senior Readiness Oversight Committee is currently reviewing a group of readiness challenges it has characterized as “encroachment” issues. These include population growth near military installations, environmental constraints on military training ranges, airspace restrictions to accommodate civilian airlines, and the conflicts with civilian users over the use of radio frequency spectrum.

In your opinion, how serious are these problems for the Department of the Army?

I believe that the Army must provide our soldiers with tough, realistic, battle-focused training in preparation for a wide variety of mission essential war-fighting scenarios ranging from tropical to desert to cold region operations. Ensuring our soldiers have access to the most realistic training possible is a challenge for both our operations and environmental personnel.

Army environmental programs help support this core mission by conserving training lands, preventing pollution, complying with laws and regulations, partnering with local communities, and cleaning up contamination at Army installations.

If confirmed, what role do you expect to play in addressing these challenges and what actions would you propose to take to address them?

If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the Army has a holistic approach to land management. Doctrinal changes and advances in equipment capabilities require that we use more of our land resources than ever before. If confirmed, I seek ways to improve our stewardship so that this valuable resource continues to be available for training our soldiers.

The Department of Defense makes it a practice to request funding only for those environmental compliance areas that are already out of compliance and subject to an
enforcement action, and those that will be out of compliance before the next budget cycle.

Do you believe that continuing funding for this type of environmental cleanup is critical to maintaining a positive relationship with local regulatory authorities and the communities around our military bases?

Continued funding of the Army environmental compliance program is critical to all stakeholders, and I will, if confirmed, ensure that we approach our commitments to make sure our communities are protected from harm. I believe that the Army’s commitment to comply with federal, state, and local regulations and laws is sound and it is a key in maintaining good community relations. Americans want to feel safe living and working on or near our installations. This compliance strategy also supports the Army training and readiness goals for mission sustainment. Compliance with environmental requirements builds and maintains community trust and tolerance of our installations activities.

Do you believe that the Department of Defense should be exempt from the application of the environmental laws?

I feel that the military should comply with environmental laws and regulations, just as civilian entities must comply. I am mindful that some laws do provide a limited exemption for national security reasons where the activity is uniquely military and critical to the maintenance of national security.

Do you support the basic principle of the Federal Facility Compliance Act and other laws that federal facilities, including DOD facilities, should be subject to the same standards as comparably situated civilian facilities?

I believe that the military should be subject to the same environmental laws and regulations as comparably situated civilian facilities. Nonetheless, I believe it is important to acknowledge that the military has a unique mission that distinguishes it from the civilian sector. Every opportunity must be explored to identify the impacts of the rules/regulations on our mission before the federal, state, or local law or regulation goes into effect.

The Department of Defense faces a bill for the clean up of unexploded ordnance (UXO) that is at least in the tens of billions of dollars and could well be in the hundreds of billions of dollars. At current funding levels, it has been estimated that it would take the military services several thousand years to remediate UXO problems on a DOD-wide basis.

What do you believe would be an acceptable time period for cleaning up unexploded ordnance problems throughout the Department of Defense?
This is a complex issue with many factors. It would be difficult at this time to define an “acceptable” period. I do appreciate the importance of this matter, and if confirmed, will make it one of my top priorities.

**Do you believe that increased investment in UXO remediation technologies would be likely to produce more effective and efficient remediation processes and substantially reduce the Department’s long-term clean-up liability (and the time required to complete such clean-up)?**

Yes, the Army needs to continue to invest in UXO and munitions response technologies to improve its ability to discriminate ordnance from non-ordnance items. I further believe that the Army should develop procedures and techniques to characterize UXO properties to gain public and regulatory agency acceptance of proposed cleanup plans.

**Energy Efficiency**

Executive Order 13123 lays out a number of specific steps that agencies should take to promote energy conservation. These include the use of energy savings performance contracts, utility energy efficiency contracts, and other contracts designed to achieve energy conservation; conducting energy efficiency audits for approximately 10% of an agency’s facilities each year; and exploring opportunities for energy efficiency in industrial facilities for steam systems, boiler operation, air compressor systems, industrial processes, and fuel switching.

**Do you support the use of these energy conservation approaches?**

Yes.

**Are there other steps that you would take, if confirmed, to promote energy conservation by the Department of the Army?**

Yes. If confirmed, I would encourage the increased use of renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, photovoltaic and geothermal when cost effective. I would also support the development and use of new energy saving technologies and business-oriented management techniques.

**Do you believe that the energy conservation goals established in the Executive Order are achievable?**

Yes.
Integration of Installations with Local Communities

The Department of Defense is in the midst of an effort to increase the basic allowance for housing to eliminate out-of-pocket housing costs for military families who choose to live off base. This policy is intended to encourage more military families to live off base and reduce the demand for government housing. In recent years, outsourcing of base operations functions on military installations has increased substantially. Secretary Rumsfeld has proposed examination of additional contracting out in certain areas, including the operation of commissaries. All of these policies tend to increase the integration of the military into the local community and increase the non-military population on our bases.

At the same time, force protection concerns are leading the military services to take steps to close or restrict access to military installations and to build force protection measures into the construction of schools and other non-military facilities on those installations.

What do you believe is the appropriate level of integration, or separation, between military installations and the surrounding local communities?

I believe that the military services have expanded the integration between the military community and adjoining civilian communities. Where once posts were opened only on Armed Forces day, they now are more accessible and share facilities and areas – recreational areas such as parks and lakes and space in schools located on Army facilities. With respect to economic activity, the Army has have never been separated from communities surrounding our posts. The civilian community is a source of medical, health and welfare, and comfort for the military community. If confirmed, I would continue to look for ways to develop or improve partnerships while maintaining focus on force protection, readiness and mission accomplishment.

Davis-Bacon Act

40 U.S.C. Sec. 276a, commonly known as Davis-Bacon, requires that for every contract in excess of $2000 involving construction, alteration, and/or repair of public buildings or public works, the prevailing wage in that state shall be paid. When the contract cost-floor was set in the 1930’s, $2000 was a substantial sum of money, however, inflation during the intervening years has eroded the value of the dollar to the point were there is virtually no project that is not covered by Davis Bacon.

If confirmed, would you support raising the contract threshold to a more current standard before Davis-Bacon can be invoked?

Yes.
In your personal opinion, what would be an appropriate contract cost before Davis-Bacon should apply?

I have not examined the issue of raising the contract threshold, and would have to look at the impact of various contract cost levels before making a recommendation. I understand that this is a sensitive issue, which warrants thorough analysis and considered judgment.

Installation Management

One of the obvious handicaps to the implementation of the Family Housing Privatization initiative is the lack of specialists in real estate and financial management throughout the Department of Defense. A similar shortfall is said to exist in the area of business managers and installation managers.

If the Army is experiencing similar shortfalls, should these positions be filled with contract or civil service personnel? Please explain.

I understand that the Army generally has sufficient personnel resources to meet its mission requirements in the real estate and financial management areas. However, if confirmed, I will review the training of our personnel in this area to independently evaluate their expertise and take action as is necessary.

As the Army enters a new era of defense reform and business practices, does it have a program to ensure it has a cadre of real estate and business managers?

The Army has established a real estate career and other personnel programs to provide trained professionals to meet current and future staffing requirements. In addition, contingency real estate support teams provide trained professionals to support deployed forces to assist in national emergencies. I will examine these programs for opportunities to make improvements and to apply commercial practices and concepts to better meet the Army's real estate and business management needs.

Environmental Encroachment

Some of the Service Chiefs have asserted that they spend more money each year complying with environmental regulations than they spend on training. In visits to military installations, Committee members have observed first hand the barriers to training caused by compliance with environmental regulations.

If confirmed, what steps would you take to reduce the cost to the Department of
environmental compliance?

I believe that better management practices are the keys to cost effective environmental program funding and spending while the Army continues to fund all "must fund" requirements. The Army expects to be more effective in minimizing environmental program costs through the implementation of the Environmental Management System approach to identifying and solving environmental problems. I encourage continuation of the effort to promote environmental program tracking, environmental audits, contract management and savings, levering science and innovative technologies, and integration of environmental considerations in planning. These are sound and prudent environmental management practices that will continue to engender smart sound program efficiencies.

If confirmed, how would you propose to facilitate the development and implementation of a comprehensive strategy to address readiness concerns related to these encroachment issues?

I understand that the Army's Sustainable Range Program (SRP) maximizes the capability, availability, and accessibility of ranges and training land, and in a manner that provides sound environmental stewardship, all in order to support overall doctrinal training and testing requirements.

In order to sustain readiness in light of increasing encroachment, if confirmed, I will work to ensure that the Army improves its management of ranges and land.

**Overseas Installations**

The Army maintains a network of bases to support our forward deployed forces. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, both the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and the Commander, United States Forces, Korea, stated that the installations in their commands are in serious need of repair. The implication of these statements is that overseas installations are not faring well in the funding allocation process.

In your view, what share of resource allocation should go to our overseas bases?

If I am confirmed, I will study the concerns expressed by the commanders of the Army's overseas forces to ensure that the needs of their commands are adequately addressed.

**67-Year Facility Replacement Goal**

One of Secretary Rumsfeld’s more significant goals is to fund facility replacement on a
67-year standard, rather than the almost 200-year cycle on which the Department is currently operating. Although this standard is still short of the industry standard of 57 years, it will significantly increase the readiness of our military installations.

In your view, is it realistic to hold the Army to such a standard when there are fluctuating budget demands and priorities?

I believe that it is realistic to hold the Army to the 67-year facility replacement cycle. There will always be fluctuating budget demands and priorities, but the only way to plan for facilities that can maintain readiness and support the Army’s mission is to set a standard. I feel that facilities requirements should not be determined by the resources remaining after funding the other mission accounts.

Other than increased funding for military construction and repair and maintenance, what other tools would you suggest the Department employ to achieve the 67-year replacement goal?

Although increased modernization funding is necessary to achieve the 67-year replacement goal, I believe it must be tied to increased sustainment funding as is proposed in FY02 to continue to properly maintain the facilities.

**Modernization/New Mission Costs**

All components, including both active and reserve forces, face the challenge of providing facilities required for a new weapon system or the assignment of a new mission. This is especially challenging to the reserve components, which have been assigned new missions or weapons systems and then expected to fund the new facilities from their limited military construction funds.

Do you believe the funding for new equipment support facilities should be programmed as part of any given program’s acquisition cost?

Yes, I believe that the Army should include the RC infrastructure costs as part of the acquisition development program. Funding should be provided in sufficient lead-time for additional modification or construction of the facilities that will support the systems being fielded. These facilities improvements could include the upgrade and construction of new buildings, training ranges, training areas and communications backbone (i.e., digital backbone on installations to tie-in equipment with integrated testing/training components in the motor pools and on ranges). Providing funding for the infrastructure cost as part of the fielding of new equipment allows for better planning, because the full requirement is captured and allows the Program Manager to control the
phasing/sequencing of facilities as the new system(s) are acquired or new units activated.

What are your views on the assignment of new missions to the reserve components without specifically programming the funds in the military construction program to support those missions?

I feel that any new missions should be supported by the appropriate military construction projects.

**Congressional Oversight**

In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

Do you agree, if confirmed for this high position, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress?

Yes.

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment)?

Yes.

Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate Committees?

Yes.