

Reference: General Dempsey's responses to Advance Policy Questions

Army Role in the Joint Force

The U.S. military fights as a joint force and strives to achieve realistic training in preparation for military operations. The Army provides trained and equipped forces for joint military operations.

How do you believe the Army can best contribute to improved joint military capabilities while preserving its service unique capabilities and culture?

The Army works our relationships with Sister Services diligently while maintaining our unique values, culture and traditions. The Army provides forces for prompt and sustained combat operations on land as a component of the Joint force. Through sustained operations on land and among populations, we make permanent the advantages gained by joint forces.

Acquisition Issues

Major defense acquisition programs in the Department of the Army and the other military departments continue to be subject to funding and requirements instability.

Do you believe that instability in funding and requirements drives up program costs and leads to delays in the fielding of major weapon systems?

A variety of factors contribute to increased risks of cost increase and delay, depending on the program, the technologies involved, and the acquisition strategy employed. However, I agree that the foundation for any successful large acquisition program rests on carefully refined requirements, a sound program strategy, and funding stability.

What steps, if any, do you believe the Army should take to address funding and requirements instability?

What is your view of the Configuration Steering Boards required by statute and regulation to control requirements growth?

I support efforts by the Congress to control costs, refine requirements and reduce program risk in our major acquisition programs. The Configuration Steering Boards play

a significant role in oversight of acquisition programs and compliment Army efforts to validate requirements and eliminate redundancies through Capability Portfolio Reviews. In tandem, these oversight processes help the Army avoid cost increases and delays in our programs.

What role would you expect to play in these issues, if confirmed as Army Chief of Staff?

If confirmed as Chief of Staff, I will work diligently with the Secretary of the Army and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics & Technology to ensure that all oversight mechanisms for acquisition programs are used effectively to reduce cost and schedule risk. In the area of requirements, I will work with TRADOC to refine requirements to meet affordable and achievable acquisition strategies.

The Comptroller General has found that DOD programs often move forward with unrealistic program cost and schedule estimates, lack clearly defined and stable requirements, include immature technologies that unnecessarily raise program costs and delay development and production, and fail to solidify design and manufacturing processes at appropriate junctures in the development process.

Do you agree with the Comptroller General's assessment?

I agree that this assessment is valid with respect to some of the Army's past programs. However, the Army has already adopted different approaches in the development of more recent programs. I understand that prior to the release of the Ground Combat Vehicle Request for Proposals (RFP) in November 2010, the program's requirements were carefully reviewed, prioritized and weighted in the RFP to avoid reliance on immature technologies, mitigate cost and schedule risk, and provide an achievable and affordable framework for a new vehicle. The GCV program involved close coordination between acquisition, requirements and resourcing experts to provide a solid program foundation. The Army is vigorously working to avoid the characterizations in the Comptroller General's assessment in future programs.

If so, what steps do you believe the Department of the Army should take to address these problems?

The Department of the Army has already begun taking significant steps to address these concerns. There is a renewed emphasis on collaboration between the requirements and acquisition communities in the development of new programs. Last year, Secretary McHugh commissioned a thorough review of the Army's acquisition process led by The Hon. Gil Decker and Gen (Ret.) Lou Wagner that provides a blueprint for improvements to the acquisition process. I understand the Army is now studying these recommendations and developing a plan to implement those that help our process. As a

whole, the Department must continue to build on these efforts to avoid unnecessary cost and delay in our programs.

What role would you expect to play in these issues, if confirmed as Army Chief of Staff?

If confirmed as Chief of Staff, I will continue to work with Department of the Army leadership to implement any necessary changes to ensure that the Army's acquisition programs succeed in providing needed capabilities to our Soldiers.

Beginning in 2010, the Army began a series of capabilities portfolio reviews that have contributed to the rationalization of the Army's modernization plans and resulted in significant programmatic decisions, including the termination of major weapons programs.

What is your understanding and assessment of the Army's capabilities portfolio reviews and process?

The Capabilities Portfolio Reviews have been successful in identifying redundancy and finding efficiencies across system portfolios. The Army is now studying how to best institutionalize the Capabilities Portfolio Reviews Process to identify additional efficiencies, and then work to achieve them.

If confirmed, what actions would you take, if any, to institutionalize the portfolio review process within the Army?

If confirmed, I look forward to reviewing the studies to institutionalize Portfolio Review Process to identify and achieve further Army efficiencies.

Army Modernization

In general, major Army modernization efforts have not been successful over the past decade. Since the mid-1990's, Army modernization strategies, plans, and investment priorities have evolved under a variety of names from Digitization, to Force XXI, to Army After Next, to Interim Force, to Objective Force, to Future Combat System and Modularity. According to press reports, a recent modernization study done for the Secretary of the Army by former Assistant Secretary of the Army Gilbert Decker and retired Army General Louis Wagner found that the Army has spent \$3.3 billion to \$3.8 billion annually since 2004 on weapons programs that have been cancelled.

What is your assessment, if any, of the Army's modernization record?

Over the last ten years, our Army has achieved a remarkable degree of modernization in areas such as improving Soldier protection, increasing battlefield intelligence, and

bringing the network to individual soldiers. At the same time, we have nearly completed the modular conversion of over 300 brigade level organizations and to complete the conversion of our division and higher level headquarters to enable mission command in the operational environments we anticipate in the first half of the 21st Century. If confirmed, I look forward to studying the Decker-Wagner recommendations to identify areas where we can improve.

If confirmed, what actions, if any, would you propose to take to achieve a genuinely stable modernization strategy and program for the Army?

I recognize that a stable modernization strategy and program is an important component to both a balanced Army and to exercise good stewardship of resources entrusted to the Services. If confirmed, I will work closely with Secretary McHugh on how to achieve this.

What is your understanding and assessment of the Army's current modernization investment strategy?

While it is true that several of our major modernization efforts over the past decade have been unsuccessful, I would submit that the American Soldier today is the best equipped and enabled Soldier this country has ever fielded. Successes such as the Stryker vehicle, world class body armor, Soldier night vision equipment, Soldier weapons, Precision fire systems such as Excalibur and HIMARS, and vehicles such as the Family of Medium Trucks all suggest to me that the Army has had some tremendous success in modernization.

I believe the Army has learned some valuable lessons and now has both the processes and the mindset to more carefully and rigorously review programs both before we initiate them and while they are in progress. This will be an area I will assess more deeply if I am confirmed as Chief of Staff and will periodically give this Committee my frank assessments.

Do you believe that this strategy is affordable and sustainable?

If confirmed, I plan to closely examine this strategy to ensure it is affordable and sustainable.

In your view does the Army's current modernization investment strategy appropriately or adequately address current and future capabilities that meet requirements for unconventional or irregular conflict?

From my current position, I believe the current modernization investment strategy strikes an appropriate balance between current and future capabilities. If confirmed, I look forward to studying this further with the Army Staff.

Does the investment strategy appropriately or adequately address requirements for conventional, high-end conflict with a peer or near-peer enemy?

From my current position, I believe the current modernization investment strategy appropriately and adequately addresses requirements for conventional, high-end conflict with the peer or near-peer enemy we can reasonably foresee in the FY12-16 FYDP time horizon.

If confirmed, what other investment initiatives, if any, would you pursue with respect to unconventional or conventional capabilities?

I have not yet formulated investment initiatives particular to either conventional or unconventional capabilities that are different from those the Army is currently pursuing, but I look forward to doing so, if confirmed.

If confirmed, what actions, if any, would you propose to ensure that all these initiatives are affordable within the current and projected Army budgets?

To be good stewards of the resources provided, the Army must continue to internalize a “cost culture” that considers “affordability” as an essential element of all (not just modernization) initiatives. If confirmed, I intend to work closely with the Secretary to ensure future initiatives are affordable within current and projected budgets.

In your view, what trade-offs, if any, would most likely have to be taken should budgets fall below or costs grow above what is planned to fund the Army’s modernization efforts?

While I do not have that information at this time, I believe trade-offs must occur after all areas of risk are carefully considered and coordinated with the Secretary of Defense and Congress.

Army Weapon System Programs

What is your understanding and assessment of the following research, development, and acquisition programs?

Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV).

In the development of the Ground Combat vehicle - the replacement for the Bradley Infantry Fighting vehicle - the Army is fully committed to the “Big Four” imperatives: Soldier protection; Soldier capacity (squad plus crew); the capability to operate across the Full Spectrum of operations; and Timing (seven years to the first production vehicle from contract award). The Ground Combat Vehicle will be the first vehicle that will be

designed from the ground up to operate in an Improvised Explosive Device (IED) environment. Modular armor will allow commanders the option to add or remove armor based on the current threat environment. The Ground Combat Vehicle will be designed with the capacity for Space, Weight, and Power growth to incorporate future technologies as they mature. The Army is using an incremental strategy for the Ground Combat Vehicle with the first increment being an Infantry Fighting Vehicle. The Army is currently reviewing proposals from vendors for Technology Development contracts.

Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T).

I believe that the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical is one of the Army's most important programs. It provides the broadband backbone communications for the tactical Army. Warfighter Information Network-Tactical Increment 1 (formerly Joint Network Node) began fielding in 2004 to provide a satellite based Internet Protocol network down to battalion level. Warfighter Information Network-Tactical Increment 2 begins fielding in Fiscal Year 12 to provide an initial On the Move capability, extending down to company level. Warfighter Information Network-Tactical Increment 3 will provide improved capabilities, including higher throughput, three to four times more bandwidth efficiency, and an aerial transmission layer, to all 126 brigades/division headquarters with an on-the-move requirement.

EIBCT Network Integration Kit (NIK).

The E-IBCT investment provides the infrastructure that will allow the Army to grow the tactical network capability, and an opportunity for both large and small companies to support the Army's tactical network strategy.

The NIK is a necessary bridge solution that allows the Army to continue evaluation and development of incorporated network technologies.

Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) including the Ground Mobile Radio (GMR) and Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form Fit (HMS) radios.

Joint Tactical Radio System is the Services' future deployable, mobile communications family of radios. They provide Army forces dynamic, scalable, on-the-move network architecture, connecting the Soldier to the network. FY12 procurement funding supports fielding of Joint Tactical Radio System capability to 8 Infantry Brigade Combat Teams to meet Fiscal Years 13/14 network requirements.

The Ground Mobile Radio is the primary vehicular radio capability using the Wideband Networking Waveform and Soldier Radio Waveform to meet tactical networking requirements.

The Man Pack and Rifleman Radio are the primary Joint Tactical Radio System capability for battalion and below tactical operations. The man pack supports the Soldier Radio Waveform and interoperates with legacy waveforms (Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems, Ultra High Frequency Satellite Communications). Rifleman Radio primarily serves the dismounted formation and utilizes the Soldier Radio Waveform to provide voice and individual location information from the dismounted soldier to the leader. The combination of the three radios helps the Army to push the network to the individual Soldier.

Stryker combat vehicle, including the Double-V Hull initiative, procurement of more flat-bottom vehicles, and the Stryker mobile gun variant.

The current Stryker vehicle has exceeded its Space, Weight and Power and Cooling (SWaP-C) limits due to add-on appliqué (armor and devices) required for ongoing combat operations. In the near term, it is imperative to increase crew protection with the Double-V-Hull (DVH) Stryker. In the midterm, Stryker modernization will improve protection and mobility by recouping SWaP-C, enabling future growth and allowing integration of the emerging network for all Stryker variants. Fleet-wide modernization for all variants upgrades protection, counter-IED, drive train, suspension, electrical power generation and management, and digital communications and network integration.

Double-V Hull: Stryker Double-V Hull (DVH) is on track for June 2011 fielding. The initial DVH test results are positive, indicating the vehicle will be ready for fielding as scheduled.

Non-Double V Hull and NBCRV: The Army will procure 168 Stryker NBCRVs in FY12 and 13 for a total quantity of 284 (an ARFORGEN rotation quantity). These vehicles are in normal Hull configuration. The Stryker NBCRV provides a unique capability to the Joint Force including a critical mission of Homeland Defense, for which DVH protection is a lesser consideration.

Stryker Mobile Gun System (MGS): The Army has procured and fielded 142 of 335 MGS. In August 2009, the Army decided to not pursue additional MGS procurement at this time with forthcoming fleet-wide modernization.

Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV).

The Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) is a joint program with the USMC, Navy and the Army; the Australian Army is also currently a partner in the Technology Development phase. I believe that the JLTV is a vital program to fill the force protection and payload gaps not currently satisfied by HMMWV. It will also fill the mobility, transportability

and communication architecture gaps not satisfied by the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles being used in Light Tactical Vehicle (LTV) roles. The Army Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Strategy plans for the JLTV to replace about a third of the LTV fleet, which is roughly 46,000 vehicles. The Army is currently examining the attributes of the JLTV program to ensure it meets our needs for the future Army light tactical fleet, especially in terms of protection.

Armed Aerial Scout (AAS).

I agree the Army has an enduring requirement for an armed aerial scout as was reaffirmed after the termination of the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter (ARH) program.

This requirement will be validated by the ongoing Armed Aerial Scout Analysis of Alternatives whose findings are scheduled for release in 3rd quarter FY11.

M1 Abrams tank modernization.

In my view, the Abrams modernization is necessary and will initially enable integration of the emerging network and provide ability to fire the next generation of 120mm ammunition. Future modernization will provide capability improvements in lethality, protection, mission command, mobility, and reliability intended to maintain the Fleet's combat overmatch and restore Space, Weight and Power margins to keep the Tank relevant through 2050. The Abrams modernization program is funded in the FY12 Budget Request. If confirmed, I will be able to offer an assessment as the program matures.

M2 Bradley infantry fighting vehicle modernization.

The Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle (IFV) will be replaced by the Ground Combat Vehicle beginning in 2018. Bradley Non-Infantry Fighting Vehicle (Cavalry, Engineer and Fire Support variants) modernization will address recoupment of Space, Weight and Power to provide platform growth and enable improvements in protection, mobility and ability to integrate the emerging network.

Logistics Modernization Program (LMP).

I understand the Logistics Modernization Program (LMP) is an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system in the Operation and Support phase of its life-cycle.

Based on commercial-off-the-shelf SAP software technology, LMP provides the Army with an integrated end-to-end supply chain solution at the National level that improves overall synchronization of information.

I concur with the Army's vision to achieve a seamless, end-to-end modernized logistics enterprise and to develop and implement logistics enterprise architecture with joint interoperability. To support that vision, the LMP will integrate with other Army ERPs, including General Funds Enterprise Business System (GFEBS), and Global Combat Support System-Army (GCSS-A), to provide a seamless enterprise-wide logistics environment spanning the factory to the foxhole in accordance with the approved Army ERP Strategy.

Paladin Integrated Management Vehicle program.

I understand that the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program is an effort to address an existing capability gap in the self-propelled artillery portfolio brought about by an aging fleet and the termination of prior howitzer modernization efforts [Crusader and Non-Line of Sight-Cannon (NLOS-C)]. The PIM program provides upgrades that allow the Army to meet existing and future needs, and leverages the commonality with the Bradley Fighting Vehicle chassis and automotive components. PIM should provide growth potential in Space, Weight and Power and capacity for network expansion to accommodate future howitzer related needs, to include the addition of such Force Protection packages as add-on armor.

M4 Carbine Upgrades/Individual Carbine Competition.

The Army continues to make improvements and upgrades based on operational lessons learned through the M4 Product Improvement Program. The Army's effort is designed to integrate full automatic firing, an ambidextrous selector switch and a more durable "heavy" barrel. Simultaneously, the Army has initiated a full and open competition to confirm the best possible Individual Carbine solution. Results of the competition are expected in FY13.

Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) Vehicles

If confirmed, what would you propose should be the Army's long term strategy for the utilization and sustainment of its large MRAP and MRAP-All Terrain Vehicle fleets?

The Army needs to continue to provide the best level of protection for our deploying Soldiers. Given what we have learned during the last ten years, I believe we should attempt to provide MRAP levels of protection to deploying forces worldwide commensurate with the mission assigned. The Army will integrate MRAPs into the force.

Quadrennial Defense Review

The 2010 report of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) provides guidance that military forces shall be sized to prevail in ongoing conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq, and the war against Al Qaeda as well as for conducting foundational activities that prevent and deter attacks or the emergence of other threats.

What is your assessment of the Army's current size and structure to meet the QDR report's guidance?

The Army's size and structure have proven adequate to meet the demands of our defense strategy as we know them today, although a very heavy demand has been placed upon Soldiers and their Families for nearly ten years. If confirmed, I would work closely with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and our combatant commanders to match endstrength, structure, and tempo in our ARFORGEN rotational model to meet demands as they change.

If confirmed, what size or structure changes would you pursue, if any, to improve or enhance the Army's capability to meet these requirements?

The nature of the strategic environment requires the Army to continuously assess its capabilities and force requirements. It's taken 10 years to achieve a size, structure, and capability that we can reasonably describe as balanced. We are accustomed to change, and we will undoubtedly need to continue to change. As we do we must seek to maintain a balance of capabilities that are available to meet the nation's needs at a sustainable tempo.

The QDR report particularly emphasizes the requirement for improved capabilities in the following six key mission areas. For each, what is your assessment of the Army's current ability to provide capabilities to support these mission requirements?

If confirmed, what changes, if any, would you pursue to improve the Army's capabilities to support:

Defense of the United States.

The Army is fully capable of fulfilling its responsibility to defend the homeland through detection, deterrence, prevention, and if necessary, the defeat of external threats or aggression from both state and non-state actors. A specific program recently undertaken to enhance this ability include the fielding of the enhanced STRYKER Nuclear Biological and Chemical Reconnaissance Vehicle. This

provides us with a much improved technical assessment and decontamination capability.

Support of civil authorities at home.

The Army is well postured to provide support to civil authorities. We are organized and trained to provide responsive and flexible support to mitigate domestic disasters, CBRNE consequence management, support to civilian law enforcement agencies, counter WMD operations and to counter narcotics trafficking activities. We continue to address the challenges associated with this mission set including unity of command, integration with civilian authorities, and the integration of Title 10 and Title 32 forces.

Succeed in counterinsurgency, stability, and counterterrorism operations.

We are highly proficient in counter insurgency, stability and counter-terrorism operations. This has been the focus for the Army for much of the last 10 years and we have institutionalized lessons learned across the operating and generating force.

Build the security capacity of partner states (including your views, if any, on the use of general purpose forces in the security force assistance role).

General Purpose Forces have a clear role in building sustainable capability and capacity of partner nation security forces and their supporting institutions. Peace time engagement is our best opportunity to shape the future operating environment. General Purpose Forces are well suited to support these activities through Security Force Assistance.

Deter and defeat aggression in anti-access environments.

The Army's ability to deter and defeat aggression in anti-access environments as part of the joint force is adequate to meet the demands of the current security environment. That said, there are some tasks and skills to which we have not trained due to the demands of our on-going conflicts. We must restore our proficiency in those tasks. We work with our sister Services to assess our capabilities to conduct entry operations as part of the joint force and watch closely the improved anti-access/area denial capabilities being developed by potential adversaries.

Prevent proliferation and counter weapons of mass destruction.

The Army provides highly trained and ready forces with capabilities to support Combatant Commander requirements to counter the proliferation of weapons of

mass destruction. Current capabilities include operating effectively within a chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear environment, specialized teams to locate and neutralize weapons of mass destruction (WMD), and an operational headquarters with expertise in eliminating WMD.

Operate effectively in cyberspace.

We are on the right glide path to support US Cyber Command and our geographic combatant commanders to operate effectively in cyberspace. On 1 October 2010, the Army stood up a new three star command (U.S. Army Cyber Command/2nd Army), to direct the operations and defense of all Army networks, and when directed, provide full-spectrum cyberspace operations. The Army is bringing the forces of network operations, defense, exploitation, and attack under one operational level command to integrate and synchronize global operations for the first time.

Missile Defense

The Department of Defense recently decided to terminate the Army's Surface-Launched Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile (SLAMRAAM), and not to proceed with procurement and fielding of the tri-national Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), two Army air and missile defense systems.

Do you consider missile defense to be one of the Army's core missions?

Yes. The Army has confirmed on many occasions that Air and Missile Defense is a core competency. Protection of our deployed forces is the priority. The Army provides this protection in coordination with our sister services and coalition partners.

How do you believe the Army should manage the risks that result from these decisions?

I believe the Army needs to continue to monitor the threat and prioritize required future capabilities to ensure we provide effective affordable solutions in a timely manner to our forces.

The Army has recently proposed transferring a number of its air and missile development programs to the Missile Defense Agency.

In your view, what is of the proper relationship between the Army and the Missile Defense Agency?

It is my understanding that the Army relies on the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to develop and produce the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS). The Army works with MDA to provide those BMDS capabilities to the Combatant Commanders. The Army maintains a relationship with MDA through the Army/MDA Board of Directors and its four standing committees.

The Army has recently completed a review of its air and missile defense portfolio.

In your view, what are or should be the Army's responsibilities, if any, with respect to development, procurement, and operation of missile defense systems?

The Army's responsibilities depend on the type of missile defense system being developed and guidance from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Protection of U.S. Forces Against Internal Threats

One year ago, 13 people were slain and scores wounded during a shooting rampage allegedly carried out by a U.S. Army Medical Corps officer. A Department of Defense review of the attack concluded that the Department was poorly prepared to defend against internal threats, including radicalization of military personnel.

What is your assessment of the lessons learned from the tragedy at Fort Hood?

The lessons learned are invaluable to the Army as we strive to improve the Army Protection Program for individuals and units against emerging threats. Through a holistic Protection approach, the Army is aggressively fielding material and non – material solutions to address internal and external threats.

If confirmed, what strategies would you advocate to prevent and mitigate such threats in the future?

If confirmed, I will ensure that we continue to integrate and synchronize the many Army Protection Programs that protect our Soldiers, Family members and Department of the Army Civilians by ensuring that Commanders and leaders have the information and tools needed to address the ever changing threat environment.

Religious Guidelines

The DOD Independent Review Related to Fort Hood observed that “DoD policy regarding religious accommodation lacks the clarity necessary to help commanders

distinguish appropriate religious practices from those that might indicate a potential for violence or self-radicalization” and recommended that the policy be updated.

What is your view of the need to clarify the policy regarding religious accommodation in the Army?

The policies for religious accommodation in the Army are published in AR 600-20, *Army Command Policy*. The policy must be clear and provide appropriate guidance to both Soldiers and Commanders regarding how the Army accommodates for religious beliefs and practices. To this end, if confirmed, I will assess the current policy and determine if further changes are necessary.

Are you concerned that the attack at Fort Hood could lead to harassment or even violence against Muslims in the Army?

Your question raises a valid concern. However, the Army is a diverse force. As Soldiers in the profession of arms, we understand the key role that good order, discipline, morale, and safety have in ensuring units are at all times ready to defend this nation. The Army has long been a place where people from all walks of life can serve proudly and where the many become one – a United States Army Soldier.

If confirmed, what strategies would you advocate to address the potential for harassment or violence against Muslims in the Army?

The Army has a long standing commitment to treat all Soldiers with dignity and respect. Treating Soldiers with dignity and respect requires continuous leader emphasis and vigilance.

Do Army policies regarding religious practices in the military accommodate, where appropriate, religious practices that require adherents to wear particular forms of dress or other articles with religious significance?

Regulations regarding wear of religious clothing or items are found in two regulations (AR 600-20, *Army Command Policy* and AR 670-1, *Wear and Appearance of Army Uniforms and Insignia*). The policy provides the authority to wear religious jewelry, apparel or articles if they are neat, conservative, and discreet and compliant with these regulations.

In your view, do these policies accommodate the free exercise of religion and other beliefs without impinging on those who have different beliefs, including no religious belief?

In my opinion, current Army policies provide commanders with adequate flexibility to balance accommodation for religious beliefs and maintain good order and discipline.

In your opinion, do existing policies and practices regarding public prayers offered

by military chaplains in a variety of formal and informal settings strike the proper balance between a chaplain's ability to pray in accordance with his or her religious beliefs and the rights of other service members with different beliefs, including no religious beliefs?

The Army does not have a policy regarding public prayer by military chaplains. As a matter of practice, however, chaplains are encouraged to be considerate of the audience.

Family Support

The Army Family Action Plan has been successful in identifying and promoting quality of life issues for Army families.

What do you consider to be the most important family readiness issues in the Army, and, if confirmed, what role would you play to ensure that family readiness needs are addressed and adequately resourced?

In my view the most pressing family readiness issues include sustaining the Army Family Covenant and improving communication and awareness of the extensive range of available support programs and services the Army has to improve Soldier and Family quality of life.

In 2007, the Army Family Covenant was unveiled to improve quality of life by providing programs and services that enhance Soldier and Family strength, readiness, and resilience. Since then, the Army has made great progress and continues to fulfill its commitment to provide Soldiers and Families a quality of life commensurate with the quality of their service.

The Army Family Action Plan, Survey of Army Families, and other studies revealed that Soldiers and Families may not be aware of the myriad of available support services.

To address this concern, the Army is transforming Army Community Service (ACS) to help connect Soldiers and Families to the right service at the right time. This transformation will create a more streamlined and modular support structure that better supports our modular Army at every installation. The Army has begun piloting ACS transformation and anticipates completion by October 2011.

The Army has made great progress in building a wide range of support capabilities over the last few years, but the strain on the force continues. If confirmed, I will continue to strengthen our support services and ensure our programs efficiently meet the needs of the Soldiers and Families who use them.

How would you address these family readiness needs in light of global rebasing, BRAC, and lengthy deployments?

If confirmed, I will endeavor to ensure that Army Family programs reach out to all Soldiers and their Families, regardless of geographic location or deployment status. I will also work to ensure that Family Program platforms and delivery systems keep pace with a mobile Army and utilize technological advances and social networking so services are available to the Soldiers and Families who need them.

If confirmed, how would you ensure support of reserve component families related to mobilization, deployment and family readiness, as well as active-duty families who do not reside near a military installation?

I am committed to ensuring Soldiers and Families remain connected to Army Family services and programs, whether by internet, telephone, or in person regardless of geographic location or Component. Army One Source (www.MyArmyOneSource.com) is the website of choice for information on Army Family programs and services. Army OneSource highlights Active and Reserve Component Family Programs, is publicly accessible, and thus available to all Components and immediate and extended Family members.

The State Joint Force Headquarters is the platform for support of geographically dispersed Service Members and Families. This platform projects the Joint Family Support Assistance Program resources, ARNG Family Assistance Centers (FACs), ARNG Family Readiness Support Assistants, and the ARNG Child and Youth program in support of Reserve Component Families and Active Component Families that do not reside near the installation. Additionally, Army sponsored programs including Operation Military Kids and Community Based Child Care and Respite Care programs build community capacity for the geographically dispersed Army population. These programs offer similar services and assistance to geo-dispersed Reserve Component Families as would be available on installations and are connected to local resources that Soldier and Families are eligible to use.

Space

The Army Space support to Strategic Command works closely with Air Force Space Command in getting space based communications to the warfighter. Recently the Army has begun to look at the possibility of expanding the scope of data that could be provided to the last tactical mile from space.

In your view, what are the needs that the Army could address from space, and, if confirmed, how would you ensure that this is coordinated with OSD?

While I am not yet in a position to provide an informed assessment, I understand that the importance of space programs continues to increase across DoD, and the Army needs to keep pace to fully leverage capabilities and ensure that space systems are appropriately prioritized within both DoD and the Department of the Army.

If confirmed, what would be your vision for the Army space forces in the future?

While I am not yet in a position to provide an informed assessment, one of my priorities, if I am confirmed, is to position the Army to keep pace to fully leverage capabilities and ensure that space systems are appropriately prioritized and resourced.

The Army, as do all the services, tends to lag behind in the acquisition of ground and other terminals to work with new satellite systems. Acquisition of GPS M-code capable equipment is just one example of where there is needed capability on orbit but terminals will not be available in a timely fashion to utilize the capability.

What is your view on this lag and, if confirmed, what actions would you propose taking to resolve the lag?

If confirmed, I would need to examine this issue more closely. While I understand that all of the services have specific requirements to meet specific needs for their forces and that the Army depends heavily on these systems, I am not yet in a position to provide an informed assessment.

Low Density/High Demand Forces

If confirmed, how would you address the Army's management of low density units such as special operations forces, military police, civil affairs, and others which are in extremely high demand in this new strategic environment?

If confirmed, I would use the Total Army Analysis (TAA) to identify the capabilities necessary, within resource constraints, to achieve the full spectrum of missions expected of the Army. When requirements for additional low density/high demand capabilities are identified through this process, they are resourced within acceptable risk. This process will help determine where these capabilities should reside: the active component, the reserve component, or a mix of both. The Army balances the inventory of these low density units to ensure availability of an affordable mix of flexible forces capable of accomplishing the missions required within the most likely security environment.

Are there functional changes among the active and reserve components that you believe should be made?

I am not yet aware at this time of any changes that may be necessary.

Mobilization and Demobilization of National Guard and Reserves

In the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the National Guard and Reserves have experienced their largest and most sustained employment since World War II. Numerous problems arose in the planning and procedures for mobilization and demobilization, e.g., inadequate health screening and medical readiness monitoring, errors caused by antiquated pay systems, limited transition assistance programs upon demobilization, and lack of access to members of the Individual Ready Reserve. Reserve force management policies and systems have been characterized in the past as “inefficient and rigid” and readiness levels have been adversely affected by equipment stay-behind, cross-leveling, and reset policies.

What is your assessment of advances made in improving Army reserve component mobilization and demobilization procedures, and in what areas do problems still exist?

I understand the Army is currently reviewing all of its mobilization policies to ensure that the systems in place are effective and responsive for Reserve Component Soldiers. I believe Reserve Components are a critical part of the Total Force, and if confirmed, I will continue the effort to ensure that Reserve Component Soldiers are mobilized and demobilized in the most effective and efficient way possible and that their needs and the needs of their families and employers are met.

What is your understanding and assessment of the sufficiency of current Reserve force management policies?

As I understand current Reserve force management policies, the goal is to manage the force to produce a supply of units to the Combatant Commanders with a short-term goal of one year of mobilization every five years with a long-term goal of one year of mobilization every six years. The challenge the Army has faced has been that demand has been greater than the supply and has caused the need for more frequent mobilizations. As operations in Iraq and Afghanistan start to draw-down, the Army should be better able to attain the mobilization to dwell goals.

What do you consider to be the most significant enduring changes to the administration of the reserve components aimed at ensuring their readiness for future mobilization requirements?

The Army Force Generation Model fundamentally changes the way the Army builds unit readiness for mobilization requirements. The ARFORGEN model presents a structured progression of readiness through a multi-year long cycle.

Do you see a need to modify current statutory authorities for the mobilization of members of the National Guard and Reserves?

At present, I am not aware of a need to modify current statutory authorities to facilitate mobilization of the National Guard and Reserves. If confirmed, I will work with Secretary McHugh to review the statutory authorities to determine if they are sufficient.

Individual Ready Reserve

The Commission on the National Guard and Reserves has found that accessing the IRR as a viable source of manpower for the war was problematic, and that using the IRR as a solution for unit manning is a failed concept.

What is your assessment of the value of the IRR to the All Volunteer Force?

I believe the IRR has proven an invaluable asset to all Army components to support contingency operations around the world.

What are your views on the proper role of the IRR in Army force management planning?

The IRR can serve as a source of experienced and highly skilled Soldiers to help the Army meet critical skill and grade requirements.

If confirmed, what changes, if any, do you foresee making to the Army's IRR recall policy?

At this time, I do not have sufficient information to recommend changes to this policy. If confirmed, I will consider input from all components to determine the best IRR recall policy.

What is your assessment of the adequacy of the system in place for members in the IRR receiving orders to active duty to request a delay or exemption for that activation, including the procedures in place for appealing the Army's decision on that request?

While this is an important part of the IRR mobilization, I do not have sufficient familiarity with this policy to recommend changes.

Recent studies of Army suicides show higher rates among the IRR.

What should the Army and DOD do to address this concern?

Suicides in the IRR are often more difficult to address because those Soldiers are not affiliated with a unit. If confirmed, I will consider all methods to integrate IRR Soldiers into the Army's Health Promotion/Risk Reduction efforts.

Personnel and Entitlement Costs

In addition to health care costs, personnel and related entitlement spending continues its steep upward growth and is becoming an ever increasing portion of the DOD budget.

If confirmed, what actions would you take to control the rise in the Army's personnel costs and entitlement spending?

We need to strike a balance between preserving the all volunteer force, accomplishing operational missions and retraining an Army that is affordable to the nation. If confirmed, I will work with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense on how best to achieve it.

If confirmed, what actions would you take to avoid a requirement for massive end-of-year reprogramming to cover personnel costs?

My understanding is the President's budget is adequate to meet current personnel costs.

What would be the impact of a year-long continuing resolution on Army personnel funding?

If the Army is given the flexibility to manage total resources (both Base and Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funds) to pay its force, then FY11 continuing resolution will have minimal impact on Military Pay and Allowances.

Medical and Dental Readiness of Army National Guard and Army Reserve Personnel

Medical and dental readiness of reserve component personnel has been an issue of significant concern to the Committee, and shortfalls that have been identified have indicated a need for improved policy oversight and accountability.

If confirmed, how would you seek to clarify and coordinate reporting on the medical and dental readiness of the reserves?

I believe the Army should develop and resource mechanisms to routinely identify screen and assess Reserve Component medical readiness. If confirmed, I will work with Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Army Reserves, the Director of the Army National Guard, and the Surgeon General to develop policies for more effectively identifying personnel that are non-deployable for medical reasons.

How would you improve upon the Army's ability to produce a healthy and fit reserve component?

This is a very important issue, and I will work with the Army's active and reserve component leadership to assess whether there are challenges in this area. The Army is moving forward with a Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program. If confirmed, I would determine how this program applies to Reserve Component and National Guard Soldiers.

Army Science and Technology (S&T)

What do you see as the role that Army science and technology programs will play in continuing to develop capabilities for current and future Army systems?

It is my understanding that the Army's science and technology investment strategy is shaped to foster invention, innovation, and demonstration of technologies for the current and future Warfighter. The science and technology program should retain the flexibility to be responsive to unforeseen needs identified through current operations.

What in your view have been the greatest contributions, if any, of Army science and technology programs to current operations?

I believe the most significant contribution the Army science and technology community has offered to current operations is the ability to use technology to significantly improve warfighter capabilities. Technological innovations have resulted in the rapid development and deployment of lightweight and adaptable Armor solutions that have been critical to addressing emerging threats, enhancing intelligence capabilities, and better protecting our deployed forces.

What metrics would you use, if confirmed, to judge the value and the investment level in Army science and technology programs?

To judge the value and investment level in Army science and technology programs, I would use metrics that demonstrate improved warfighter capabilities; improve acquisition programs; and align technology development to warfighter requirements.

What new S&T areas do you envision the Army pursuing, for instance to lighten soldier load, and to improve the survivability and combat effectiveness of dismounted soldiers and ground vehicles?

If confirmed, I will engage the Army's science and technology program and its stakeholders, including the acquisition community, Training and Doctrine Command and the combatant commanders to discuss the needs of the warfighter and the "art of the possible" for future technology-enabled capabilities to ensure the Army remains the best equipped force in the world.

Army Laboratories and Research, Development and Engineering Centers (RDEC)

How will you balance the role of Army laboratories between long-term fundamental research, support to current operations and the development of new capabilities to support current and future Army missions?

The Army laboratories are science and technology performing organizations and as such have and will continue to play a major role in supporting current operations with best capabilities available. Through their broad range of investments in key strategic science and technology areas, they also provide critical new capabilities for Soldiers.

If confirmed, how will you ensure that the Army laboratories and R&D centers have the highest quality workforce, laboratory infrastructure, resources, and management, so that they can continue to support deployed warfighters and develop next generation capabilities?

Army laboratories and Research and Development Centers need to maintain the resources required to continue initiatives and advancements that support the warfighter. If confirmed, I will learn more about their operations and support efforts to improve best practices and workforce quality necessary for mission accomplishments.

Army Test and Evaluation (T&E) Efforts

In the past, the DOD Test Resource Management Center did not certify the Army's test and evaluation (T&E) budget due to identified shortfalls in T&E range sustainment, operations, and modernization.

If confirmed, how will you ensure that the Army's T&E infrastructure is robust enough to test new systems and technologies and reliably verify their combat effectiveness and suitability?

Testing is a crucial capability for maintaining the Army's combat edge and modernizing the force. I fully recognize the value of testing to ensure new technologies and equipment address the capabilities our warfighters need. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Army T&E community and the Office of the Secretary of Defense T&E leadership to ensure the Army's T&E infrastructure is adequately resourced to address testing requirements and maintain robust test capabilities.

Army Information Technology (IT) Programs

What major improvements, if any, would you like to see made in the Army's development and deployment of major information technology systems?

I believe the Army needs to implement and enforce technical standards, make acquisition of commercial off the shelf (COTS) or near-COTS technology easier, and field new technology to operational forces more quickly. This is in line with the congressional mandate you gave us in section 804 of the 2010 NDAA.

As Commanding General for Training and Doctrine Command, I helped establish a center for network integration at Fort Bliss, TX- the Army Evaluation Task Force (AETF). It will serve as the Network's primary test unit with a two-fold intent, to remove the integration burden from the operational units and to provide an operational venue to evaluate new technologies and network capabilities prior to fielding to operational units. The new capabilities they develop should ultimately provide the impetus for future acquisition and equipping decisions.

How will the consolidation of IT systems announced under Secretary Gates efficiency initiative reduce the IT support cost per user to the Army?

I understand the two primary Army initiatives that fulfill Secretary Gates' mandate are Enterprise Email and consolidation of Army data centers. Implementation of these initiatives should help reduce the cost of information technology support to the Army.

Human Terrain Systems

What is your understanding of the Army's plans to institutionalize the Human Terrain System (HTS) program? Given the proliferation of such capabilities across the Services, what are your views, if any, on developing a joint HTS capability?

The Army has institutionalized the Human Terrain System as an enduring capability assigned to Training and Doctrine Command and funded capability starting in the fiscal year 2011. I believe there is merit to developing a joint capability. In September of 2010, I directed a Training and Doctrine Command capability based assessment of all Socio-cultural capabilities throughout the combatant commands and Services. The intent is to identify other on-going socio-cultural initiatives, to determine potential synergies and best practices in order to develop and evolve an enduring joint capability. The results of this assessment are due in the spring of 2011.

Operational Energy

Prior to and since the creation of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Program, a number of the Services have made progress addressing concerns associated with operational energy. The Army has announced its operational energy aspirations for the future but, unlike the other Services, the Army's five strategic energy security goals appear vague and lack quantitative metrics against which to measure progress.

If confirmed, how would you propose that the Army address its operational energy challenges, requirements, and opportunities in the immediate short-term?

The most important issue with operational energy is the amount of fuel used to meet our operational needs. Most of our fuel is used in generation of electricity. The Army has implemented, and accelerated deployment, of generators that use less fuel as well as microgrid systems that tie generators together to operate more efficiently. We are developing more efficient motors for helicopters and vehicles to reduce our operational energy footprint and, ultimately, wars are won or lost by dismounted soldiers, so the Army is addressing excessive soldier loads, driven in large part by energy and power constraints. As the Commanding General of the Army Training and Doctrine Command, I'm a charter member of the Army's Senior Energy and Sustainability Council, which is responsible for addressing energy challenges across the Army. If confirmed I will continue efforts currently underway to increase our energy efficient capabilities in theater and emphasize energy awareness through the military chain of command, and across the Army, to foster a more energy-aware culture.

What is your understanding of the Army's progress with respect to testing and deploying operational energy technologies?

The Army is taking advantage of every avenue, to include industry, to help us develop technologies that can reduce our operational energy footprint. Renewable energy systems and insulated tentage are some of the systems being piloted and tested. We are also evaluating technologies that will help lighten soldier loads and reduce the amount of batteries and fuel we must procure and deliver to theater. We will continue to pursue more efficient devices and employ energy management capabilities that are essential to retain energy as an operational advantage.

What is your understanding of how the Army is taking advantage of its labs and research, engineering and development centers to further its operational energy and security goals?

The Army has integrated the national laboratories with Department of Energy and Army laboratories to develop solutions to a range of operational energy, power and security

needs. Some of the initiatives include research to reduce the size and weight of components, broadening alternative energy sources, leveraging various emergent energy efficient technologies. These new technologies will increase energy efficiency and improve power supplies for contingency bases, forward operating bases and equipment carried by individual soldiers. If confirmed I will work to ensure that the research conducted at Army facilities continues to focus on meeting the operational energy needs of the current and future Army.

Investment in Infrastructure

Witnesses appearing before the Committee in recent years have testified that the military services under-invest in their facilities compared to private industry standards. Decades of under-investment in our installations have led to increasing backlogs of facility maintenance needs, created substandard living and working conditions, and made it harder to take advantage of new technologies that could increase productivity.

What is your assessment of Army infrastructure investment?

Since FY07, with BRAC, Transformation, and Grow the Army initiatives, the Army has made significant MILCON investments in its infrastructure. If confirmed, I will work with the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Installation, Energy and Environment, and the Commanding General at Installation Management Command to assess our infrastructure investments.

If confirmed, what actions, if any, would you propose to increase resources to reduce the backlog and improve Army facilities?

Proper stewardship of our facilities portfolio requires the Army to fully sustain the current facilities, dispose of our excess facilities, improve the quality of our worst facilities and build-out our largest and most critical shortages, all at a level adequate to support the mission.

If confirmed, I will evaluate the proper balance of funding, to include evaluating whether the Army should increase operation and maintenance (O&M) funding for restoration and modernization (R&M) and Demolition.

Army Policies Regarding Drug and Alcohol Abuse

What is your understanding of the Army's policy with respect to disciplinary action and administrative separation of soldiers who have been determined to have used illegal drugs? Do you agree with this policy?

Army policy directs commanders to initiate administrative separation for all Soldiers involved in trafficking, distribution, possession, use, or sale of illegal drugs. While the policy requires initiation of separation, commanders have the authority to retain or separate a Soldier.

I concur with this policy.

What is your understanding of the Army's policy with respect to rehabilitation and retention on active duty of soldiers who have been determined to have used illegal drugs or abused alcohol or prescription drugs? Do you agree with this policy?

Army policy requires that the separation authority consider a Soldier drug offender's potential for rehabilitation and further military service. For this reason, Soldiers who commit drug and alcohol offenses are required to be evaluated by a certified substance abuse counselor through the Army Substance Abuse Program (ASAP). Commanders consider the recommendation of ASAP counselors when determining a Soldier's potential for rehabilitation and retention.

I concur with this policy.

Do you believe that the Army has devoted sufficient resources to implementation of its rehabilitation policies and objectives since 2001? If not, in what ways?

My personal experience at various command levels since 2001 has been that the Army devotes sufficient resources to implement these objectives. If confirmed, I will assess and closely monitor the level of resourcing for this important area.

What measures are being taken to improve the Army's performance in responding to problems of drug and alcohol abuse?

Army policy requires a comprehensive approach by commanders, law enforcement and the medical community for drug and alcohol abuse. The Army is working diligently to improve its surveillance, detection, and intervention systems for drug and alcohol abuse.

The Army investigates all reported drug and alcohol incidents to assist commanders in properly adjudicating the offense. The Army is also enhancing detection capabilities through the Drug Suppression Teams.

The Army is also working to improve intervention systems. In addition to increasing the number of ASAP counselors to accommodate the increasing demand, the Army continues to expand the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program to build resiliency in the force. The Army is also conducting the Confidential Alcohol Treatment and Education Pilot program at six installations to promote help seeking behavior by allowing Soldiers to confidentially seek help for alcohol problems.

Medical Personnel Recruiting and Retention

The Army continues to face significant shortages in critically needed medical personnel in both active and reserve components.

What is your understanding of the most significant personnel challenges in recruiting and retaining health professionals in the Army?

There continues to be a national shortage of medical professionals that challenges the Army's efforts to recruit and retain healthcare professionals. The Army competes with governmental and non-governmental agencies, as well as private healthcare organizations to attract and retain the most skilled and talented healthcare providers, in a uniformed or civilian capacity. The Army continues to evaluate initiatives to provide more flexibility to allow the Army to adequately compete in these areas.

If confirmed, would you undertake a comprehensive review of the medical support requirements for the Army, incorporating all new requirements for 2011 and beyond?

I believe it is important to review medical support requirements on a regular, recurring basis. With that in mind, if confirmed I will assess whether the Army should undertake a comprehensive review of the medical support requirements for the Army.

If confirmed, what policies or legislative initiatives, if any, are necessary in order to ensure that the Army can continue to fulfill ongoing medical support requirements?

Given the policy initiatives currently underway and the changes implemented by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 at this time, I do not believe additional legislative authorities are needed to ensure that the Army fulfills medical support requirements. If confirmed, I will closely monitor this area and will work closely with the Administration and Congress to seek any additional authorities identified as necessarily to maintain this goal.

Foreign Language Proficiency

A Foreign Language Transformation Roadmap announced by the Department of Defense in March, 2005, directed a series of actions aimed at transforming the Department's foreign language capabilities to include revision of policy and doctrine, building a capabilities based requirements process, and enhancing foreign language capability for both military and civilian personnel.

What is your assessment of the progress the Army has made in increasing its foreign language capabilities in operations in Iraq and Afghanistan?

As Commanding General for the Training and Doctrine Command, I witnessed a tremendous increase in foreign language capabilities in support of OIF/OEF. The Army revolutionized its recruiting processes to enlist native and heritage speakers into vital interpreter/translator positions. Pre-deployment training for the General Purpose Force Soldiers and Civilians has transformed to include Afghanistan/Pakistan Hands Program, Language Enabled Soldiers training, the Rapport Program, and other Soldiers and Civilians with Culturally Based Language Training. The Reserve Officer Training Corps has introduced a very successful Culture and Language Program, which provides incentives and immersion opportunities for cadets who take foreign language and related cultural studies. Overall, these initiatives have provided enhanced capabilities for counterinsurgency operations and building partner capacity overseas.

In your view, what should be the priorities of the Department of Defense, and the Army in particular, in responding to the need for improved foreign language proficiency and improving coordination of foreign language programs and activities among Federal agencies?

In my opinion, one of the highest priorities for the Department of Defense should be the continued support of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, which provides Culturally Based Language Training to all Services and Department of Defense Components. With the increasing demand for Pashto and Dari instructors, and foreign language professionals in general, the Department of Defense must coordinate with Federal agencies to ensure best practices are shared to recruit and retain personnel with these critical skills.

Mental Health Advisory Teams

The Army's Mental Health Advisory Team (MHAT) studies in Iraq and Afghanistan have been valuable in identifying the extent of mental health conditions and resource and training challenges being experienced in combat theaters. The most recent report, MHAT VI, stated that multiple deployments were related to higher rates of acute stress and psychological problems, that service members on their third and fourth deployment "reported using medications for psychological or combat stress problems at a significantly higher rate," and that "soldiers with short dwell –time report high mental health problems, high intent to leave the military and low morale."

Based on the findings of MHAT VI that soldiers experience increased stress due to multiple deployments and short dwell time, what actions would you take, if confirmed, to ensure that appropriate mental health resources are available to soldiers in theater, as well as upon their return?

The MHAT studies play a key role in proactively identifying how changes in the operational environment impact the ability to provide behavioral health care. Since OEF MHAT VI, the number of behavioral health personnel in theater was significantly increased to improve the ratio of behavioral health specialists to Soldiers. Specifically, the MHAT team recommended one behavioral health personnel should be deployed for every 700 soldiers, and this ratio was met. Second, the MHAT team recommended a redistribution of behavioral health personnel to ensure that each BCT had one additional dedicated provider to augment their organic provider. This “dual provider” model was designed to ensure that a provider would be available to travel to remote outposts to see soldiers who had limited access to the larger Forward Operating Bases. If confirmed, I will ensure that the Army continues to develop and synchronize the expeditionary components of health promotion, risk reduction, and suicide prevention programs and services.

What do you think have been the most valuable findings of the Army’s Mental Health Advisory Teams, and what are the lessons which can be applied to future deployments?

One of the most valuable findings from the MHATs has been to document that soldiers on multiple deployments report higher mental health problems. This finding was first observed in 2005 (MHAT III), and has been replicated in every subsequent MHAT. Another valuable finding noted in the question was the observation that mental health problems are related to dwell-times. Specifically, short dwell-times are associated with a heightened increase in reports of mental health problems. Other key findings include the observation that deployment length is strongly associated with reports of mental health problems and deployments have put a strain on marital relationships. Overall, the willingness to take a systematic look at the behavioral health care system and the behavioral health status of Soldiers through programs such as the MHATs has ensured that the Army is being responsive to the needs of deployed Soldiers to include refining behavioral healthcare delivery models.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

Numerous cases of sexual misconduct involving soldiers in Iraq, Kuwait, and Afghanistan have been reported over the last several years. Many victims and their advocates contend that they were victimized twice: first by attackers in their own ranks and then by unresponsive or inadequate military treatment. They asserted that the Army failed to respond appropriately by providing basic services, including medical attention and criminal investigation of their charges and, ultimately, appropriate disciplinary action.

What is your understanding of the resources and programs the Army has in place in

deployed locations to offer victims of sexual assaults the medical, psychological, and legal help that they need?

I am very concerned about reports of sexual assault anywhere in our Army but especially in deployed locations. We cannot tolerate this behavior wherever it occurs. While the deployed theatres pose special challenges, the Army is committed to providing victims in deployed units with appropriate medical care, resources and support. The Army has taken a number of significant steps to improve the assistance to victims of sexual assault, including enhanced recognition of the special circumstances posed by deployed soldiers. The Army's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SHARP) Program includes medical, advocacy, chaplain, investigative and legal services. This program requires every brigade sized unit to appoint and train a deployable sexual assault response coordinator and every battalion to appoint and train unit victim advocates.

What is your view of the steps the Army has taken to prevent additional sexual assaults at deployed locations as well as home stations?

In 2008, the Army implemented its I. A.M. (Intervene, Act, Motivate) Strong Sexual Assault Prevention Campaign. The campaign includes strategic, operational and tactical level execution of the I. A.M. Strong Campaign, with heavy emphasis on Soldiers' commitment to intervene and protect their fellow Soldiers from the risk of sexual assault and from the risk of sexual harassment. The campaign places additional emphasis on establishing a command climate that deters sexual harassment and assault.

What is your view of the adequacy of the training and resources the Army has in place to investigate and respond to allegations of sexual assault?

While increasing emphasis to prevent sexual assaults before they occur, the Army continues to emphasize victim services and response capabilities, to include enhancements to investigation and prosecution resources.

The SHARP program is a great start to managing strategies, policies and resources necessary to adequately prevent and respond to incidents of sexual assault. This is a challenging problem that will require leadership and constant vigilance at all levels.

Do you consider the Army's current sexual assault policies and procedures, particularly those on confidential reporting, to be effective?

Prior to implementation of the I. A.M. Strong Prevention Campaign, the focus of the Army program was primarily on victim response. Part of that response focus was the implementation of confidential reporting, or restricted reporting, which is an effective way to allow a victim to come forward and have their personal needs met without fear that may be associated with a criminal investigation. If confirmed, I will continue to look closely at the Army's sexual assault program.

What problems, if any, are you aware of in the manner in which the confidential

reporting procedures have been put into effect?

Getting victims to trust the system and come forward can be challenging; however, I am not aware of any specific problems with the current reporting procedure. Confidential reporting, or restricted reporting, allows a victim to come forward and have their personal needs met without fear that may be associated with a criminal investigation.

What is your view of the appropriate role for senior military and civilian leaders in the Secretariat and the Army staff in overseeing the effectiveness of implementation of new policies relating to sexual assault?

Perhaps the most important role of any Senior Army Leader is to ensure there is an adequate assessment of an organizational climate, where such behavior is not tolerated and where victims feel free to report incidents without fear of reprisal.

If confirmed, what actions would you take to ensure senior management level direction and oversight of Departmental efforts on sexual assault prevention and response?

If confirmed, I will have an active role in the oversight and implementation of the Army's Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Program. I will work with the Secretary and the Army leadership to ensure the Army's SHARP program continues to receive the appropriate level of supervision, guidance, and support needed to drastically reduce incidents of this unacceptable crime.

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) programs are critical to enhancement of military life for members and their families, especially in light of frequent and lengthy deployments. These programs must be relevant and attractive to all eligible users, including active duty and reserve personnel, and their eligible family members.

What challenges do you foresee in sustaining and enhancing Army MWR programs and, if confirmed, what improvements would you seek to achieve?

The Army has taken steps to ensure we care for and retain Families through a broad range of meaningful initiatives, to include many Family and MWR programs and services. In October 2007, the Army leadership unveiled the Army Family Covenant, which institutionalized the Army's promise to provide Soldiers and their Families with a quality of life that is commensurate with their service to the Nation. The Soldier Family Action Plan provided the original roadmap to implement the Army Family Covenant, and includes such important programs as Soldier Family Assistance Centers, Survivor Outreach Services, improved services to the geographically dispersed, Exceptional

Family Member respite care, Army OneSource, Child, Youth and School Services (CYSS), Child Development Center and Youth Center construction, and more.

A challenge will be to sustain a consistent level of funding for these programs. If confirmed, I will consult with commanders, soldiers and families to ensure that these programs are adequate and meet their needs.