

**Advance Policy Questions for Lucian Niemeyer**  
**Nominee for Assistant Secretary of Defense for**  
**Energy, Installations, and Environment**

**Department of Defense Reforms**

**The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 included the most sweeping reforms since the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.**

**Do you support these reforms?**

Yes, I support these reforms. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment is appropriately integrated into the new office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment consistent with the FY 17 NDAA.

**What other areas for defense reform do you believe might be appropriate for this Committee to address?**

I have no additional recommendations for other reform areas to address at this time. If confirmed, I will work to review areas within the Energy, Installations, and Environment portfolio for reform opportunities.

**Duties and Qualifications**

**What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment (ASD(EI&E))?**

My understanding and knowledge from my previous positions is that the Assistant Secretary has oversight of a broad array of areas which includes DoD's real property portfolio, base realignment and closure, basing issues, military construction, facility recapitalization and sustainment, privatized housing, installation and operational energy, environmental contamination and cleanup, safety and occupational health, outside the fence mitigation (such as incompatible development or encroachment), and economic adjustment for military communities.

**What background and experience do you possess that qualify you to perform these duties?**

I have a deep understanding of the EI&E mission and requirements based on my years as a Senate professional staff member and as a military officer. I am a retired Air Force engineer with 20 years of service. Amongst other items, my portfolio included installations, environmental programs, base realignment and closure, local community support programs, global basing issues, and privatized housing.

**Do you believe that there are actions you need to take to enhance your ability to perform the duties of the ASD(EI&E)?**

I feel well prepared to assume the duties of the ASD(EI&E), but will certainly remain open to interaction with the Congress and other organizations internal and external within this area of responsibility.

**If confirmed, what duties and functions do you expect that the Secretary of Defense would prescribe for you?**

I anticipate the Secretary of Defense will ask that I assume oversight of the full scope of EI&E's portfolio and ensure its efforts support the Department's mission and objectives.

**Major Challenges and Problems**

**In your view, what are the major challenges that confront the next ASD(EI&E)?**

In general, the next ASD(EI&E) will be challenged by an evolving security environment and budgetary priorities. Facilities and basing decisions will need to support global efforts to counter threats. Additionally, the Department must manage its real estate portfolio effectively by reversing the declining condition of DoD's infrastructure in order to support the readiness of our troops, while ensuring taxpayer funds are not wasted on unneeded facilities.

Energy resilience matters must also be addressed. The risks of disruption to the distribution of energy to our installations and combat forces at home and abroad are growing, and will only be addressed through comprehensive and integrated decision-making.

Finally, the Department must continue to be a premier steward of the environment, balancing the needs of the warfighter with the preservation of our Nation's resources. This includes managing emerging contaminants, clean-up efforts, and incompatible development around military installations and ranges.

**If confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing these challenges?**

If confirmed, I will work diligently with the staffs of OSD, the Military Departments, and other federal agencies to oversee, plan, and execute efforts that support the Department's mission.

**What do you consider to be the most significant problems in the performance of the functions of the ASD(EI&E)?**

While not specifically a problem, key focus area will be implementation of the reorganization of AT&L to ensure the EI&E organization can effectively support the priorities of the Department.

**If confirmed, what management actions and timelines would you establish to address these problems?**

If confirmed, I will evaluate all EI&E efforts and establish appropriate timelines and actions.

**Do you see the need for any changes in the structure, organization, or reporting relationships of the Office of the ASD(EI&E)?**

I understand Section 901 of the FY 2017 National Defense Authorization Act has already required a reorganization of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. If confirmed, I will review the Department's recommended organizational changes before offering additional changes of my own.

### **Priorities**

**If confirmed, what broad priorities would you establish in terms of issues that must be addressed by the ASD(EI&E)?**

If confirmed, I will evaluate all EI&E lines of effort and prioritize actions to ensure our military bases and infrastructure effectively and efficiently supports the priorities of the Secretary to restore military readiness, adequately size our forces to meet global threats, and improve our lethality. Examples of items that are important include domestic infrastructure reviews and actions to eliminate wasted funds, facility restoration and demolition programs, overseas basing, smart facility contract management, mission assurance through utility resiliency opportunities for additional third party partnerships, environmental stewardship of our installations providing for the safety and welfare of our people, and continued collaboration with the hundreds of dedicated defense communities around the Nation committed to effectively supporting our bases and ranges, as well as the quality of life for our troops, and families.

### **Relations with Congress**

**What are your views on the state of the relationship between the Office of the ASD(EI&E) and the Senate Armed Services Committee in particular, and with Congress in general?**

I believe the Office of the ASD(EI&E) has a positive working relationship and communication flow with the SASC as well as other congressional defense committees. If confirmed, I will continue a strong and collaborative relationship with the defense committees to ensure transparency and accountability regarding our programs and goals.

**If confirmed, what actions would you take to sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between Congress and the Office of the ASD(EI&E)?**

If confirmed, I will ensure there is continual exchange of information and ideas to assist Congress in its oversight role of the Department's programs.

### **Military Construction**

**If confirmed, what would be your highest priorities for allocating military construction (MILCON) funding for the Department of Defense over the next several years?**

Secretary Mattis has articulated increasing readiness as a near-term priority. If confirmed, I will work with the Military Departments, Defense Agencies, and Combatant Commanders to focus infrastructure and facility investments needed to achieve the Secretary's priority. Second, I will ensure future MILCON funding supports military force structure growth and weapon system placement determined by the Department to be priorities in a national military strategy. I will also ensure that the taxpayer funds entrusted to the Department by Congress for MILCON are used effectively and efficiently. I will review other mission areas, such as the replacement of deteriorated mission and family support facilities to ensure the Military Departments are providing facility investments necessary to protect the welfare of our people and their families.

**What improvements, if any, do you believe should be made to the MILCON budget justification materials submitted to Congress, to include any revisions or changes in format to the DD Form 1391s?**

The current DD Form 1391, mostly unchanged since the 1970's, could use a thorough review. If confirmed, I would work with the OSD Comptroller and Military Departments to ensure the requirement, scope, and cost of a MILCON project provided to Congress is carried out as originally proposed, while still allowing necessary flexibility for a dynamic contracting climate. If confirmed, I would also review the DD Form 1391 section that identifies the design development and construction schedule without acknowledging the variations of different construction acquisition strategies.

### **Construction Cost Premiums**

**Are you familiar with "A Report on Construction Unit Costs Characterizing the MILCON Cost Premium" provided for the Army Corps of Engineers, which states, "The premium has been determined to be as high as 35% for some MILCON facility types"?**

**Do you agree with the report's findings?**

I am familiar with the April 2013 Cost Premium study and yes, I do agree with many of its findings. The Federal government, whether by law or policy, does place unique requirements on DoD MILCON projects that do not apply to the private sector (e.g.,

security enhancements, detailed specifications, laborious contracting review processes). These additional requirements add a financial burden to DoD when executing a MILCON project.

**If confirmed, will you look at the various factors and come back to this Committee with recommendations for actions that should be taken to reduce that premium?**

Yes. I look forward to reviewing the current DoD response to the findings in the study and I will work with the DoD design and constructions agencies and Congress to determine additional opportunities to reduce that cost premium.

### **Remote Locations**

**The cost of construction in remote locations is particularly expensive. When these locations are designated as accompanied tours this cost is magnified with the requirements for support facilities such as schools, larger hospitals, and family housing units. For example, the Department of Defense is looking to build a 5-bed hospital at Guantanamo Bay for \$250 million—or \$50 million per bed. The Army is proposing to build 52 single family homes for 18 military personnel on Kwajalein for \$1.3 million per home. Meanwhile, we do not have the resources necessary to maintain force structure, keep F-18s operational, or replace critical munitions.**

**If confirmed, what will you do to reduce the cost of construction at remote locations?**

In partnership with the Military Departments and construction agents, I will review the factors that drive requirements and costs at remote locations. My goal for this review will be to seek opportunities to leverage emerging technologies and construction techniques to create efficiencies and ensure the Department is incorporating the best lifecycle cost decisions for construction of facilities in remote locations.

### **Budget Pressures**

**In difficult budget times, funding for MILCON and facilities sustainment is often deferred in favor of other near-term priorities. However, over the long term, underfunding of these accounts increases the number of failed and failing facilities, escalates the risk that facilities will fail prematurely, and results in higher restoration and replacement costs.**

**Do you believe that current funding levels dedicated to MILCON and facilities sustainment are adequate to support the operational, housing, and quality of life requirements of the Department of Defense?**

No. Investments in DoD infrastructure has steadily declined since the enactment of the Budget Control Act of 2011. As a result, DoD has deferred maintenance and the

recapitalization of our facilities. While we have compensated with the outstanding efforts of people who are charged with the maintenance of our facilities, reduced facility investments ultimately jeopardize mission readiness and increase long-term costs. If confirmed, I will work with the DoD Components and the Administration to articulate the risks associated with reduced facility funding levels and recommend facility budgets to reduce the risk.

### **Base Closures and Realignments**

**The Department of Defense has requested another Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.**

**Do you believe another BRAC round is necessary? If so, why?**

I do believe BRAC is necessary to review current infrastructure, assess future needs, and station forces efficiently and effectively based on the military value provided by unique locations in the country. In the 12 year period since the last BRAC, emerging technologies and methods of warfare leading to new military capabilities have placed demands on military bases and infrastructure established during and immediately after World War II. The Department needs the ability to optimize bases, re-align forces and add new capabilities within a process that prioritizes military value defined by a national military strategy. A BRAC authorization from Congress with statutory improvements is an objective way to improve our force across all components, while freeing up resources over the long term for higher military priorities. A BRAC authorization offers opportunities for ideal base utilization, greater military effectiveness, and economic growth for defense communities around the country suffering from years of uncertainty. Finally, the Department needs to spend money on higher priorities rather than empty or underutilized facilities and infrastructure that serves no purpose. If I am confirmed, I will use my BRAC experience on the Senate Armed Services Committee and continued collaboration with Congress to ensure that future efforts to close or realign military bases provide substantial savings to the Department while enhancing military capabilities.

**It has been noted repeatedly that the 2005 BRAC round resulted in major and unanticipated implementation costs and saved far less money than originally estimated.**

**What is your understanding of why such cost growth and lower realized savings have occurred?**

I certainly questioned the significant cost growth associated with BRAC 2005 when I was working on this committee. I understood then that the Department of Defense used the BRAC round to implement a series of military transformational initiatives that prioritized an enhancement of military effectiveness over cost savings. I also understood that the dynamics of the BRAC law effectively limited the ability of Congress to oversee BRAC implementation costs and that the Department made deliberate decisions to use BRAC implementation as a recapitalization tool, expanding facility requirements and associated costs.

**How do you believe such issues could be addressed in a future BRAC round?**

If confirmed, I would review and implement planning and cost estimating processes to ensure that Secretary Mattis's intent for BRAC to be an essential enabler of his reform agenda, is focused on operational efficiency so that the resulting savings can be used for other warfighting needs.

**Do you agree with the "joint basing" concept that emerged from the 2005 BRAC and do you think it has worked at the locations where these joint bases were created?**

In principle I believe that eliminating duplicative activities at adjacent military installations leads to operational efficiencies. I also am aware that the military services to this day prioritize facility requirements differently based on competing needs. If confirmed, I will be able to look into their efficacy in more detail.

**Phasing of MILCON Projects**

**In some cases, the Department of Defense has proposed phasing, as opposed to incrementing, large MILCON projects over multiple fiscal years even when each distinct phase does not satisfy the overall requirement of the Department. It has been shown that phasing large MILCON projects, rather than requesting a single authorization for the complete facility and then seeking incremental authorization of appropriations over multiple fiscal years, can result in cost growth of 10% or more if all phases are executed independently.**

**Do you believe phasing, as opposed to incrementing, large MILCON projects is appropriate? If so, when?**

I believe a decision to phase a large MILCON requirement must be based on a compelling operational need as opposed to a way to avoid a large single year authorization and appropriation of funds. In general, I believe that a decision maker in the Department of Defense must be aware and budget for the total cost of a military construction requirement before obligating funds on a first phase in order to avoid a situation where only a part of the requirement is carried out, thus rendering it ultimately ineffective.

**Do you believe phasing of large MILCON projects can be justified even when it results in cost growth for the complete facility? If so, how?**

I believe the decision to phase a military construction requirement into multiple distinct facility projects must consider whether the operational need or mission impact is worth the contracting complexity or potentially increased cost of phased projects.

## **In-Kind MILCON**

**This Committee released a report on April 15, 2013, titled, “Inquiry into U.S. Costs and Allied Contributions to Support the U.S. Military Presence Overseas.” Among other things, the Committee’s inquiry found that in-kind payments from Germany, South Korea, and Japan have been used to fund questionable military construction projects. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 requires that future MILCON projects funded using in-kind payments or in-kind contributions pursuant to bilateral agreements with partner nations be submitted for congressional authorization in the Military Construction Authorization Act.**

**If confirmed, how would you ensure that in-kind payments are utilized only for identified U.S. priorities to offset costs that the Department of Defense would otherwise pay with appropriated funds?**

If confirmed, I would review the Department’s policies and procedures implementing the FY 2014 National Defense Authorization Act and subsequent statutory changes, to ensure payments in-kind and in-kind contributions for construction projects are carried out in compliance with the governing legal requirements. Additionally, I would ensure appropriate oversight mechanisms are in place within the Military Departments to validate that proposed host nation funded construction projects support U.S. priorities.

## **Investment in Infrastructure**

**Witnesses appearing before the Committee in the past have testified that the military services under-invest in both the maintenance and recapitalization of facilities and infrastructure compared to private industry standards. Decades of under-investment in Defense Department installations have led to substantial backlogs of facility maintenance activities, created substandard living and working conditions, and made it harder to take advantage of new technologies that could increase productivity.**

**If confirmed, what recommendations would you have for restoring and preserving the quality of our infrastructure?**

I would review the substantial efforts already underway within the Department to identify and track facility conditions in order to direct resources to projects with the greatest impact to life, safety, and health of our people as the readiness of forces. I am aware that the military services recently testified to Congress about billions of dollars in deferred maintenance and unfunded critical facility and infrastructure repairs. If confirmed, I will work with the DoD Components to assist them in advocating for the funds within their respective Service and Agency through Departmental policies that place a higher priority on investing in infrastructure to support resiliency and mission readiness.



**What is your understanding of the base operating support (BOS) and facilities sustainment restoration and modernization (FSRM) requirements of the Department?**

From my previous experience working on the Senate Armed Services Committee staff, I am aware that BOS and FSRM accounts are traditionally sources to fund other operational priorities. I understand that underfunding these accounts has a detrimental long-term effect on facility conditions thereby decreasing overall readiness and quality of life. If confirmed, I will work with appropriate entities in the Department to determine appropriate BOS and FSRM funding levels – and then budget to those levels.

**In your view, is the Department receiving adequate funding for BOS and FSRM?**

Based on previous experience working on the Senate Armed Services Committee staff, I have heard testimony about how BOS and FSRM accounts competed with other mission priorities within DoD. If confirmed, I will review the Military Departments and Defense Agencies processes for setting BOS and FSRM funding levels and look for opportunities to provide an objective assessment of the impact to military readiness and operations as a result of funding levels.

**How might the Department better distribute BOS and FSRM funds to best ensure sound investment of constrained resources?**

If confirmed, I will work with the Military Departments and Defense Agencies to review how they distribute funds from BOS and FSRM accounts to military installations to determine if there are opportunities to improve the effective use of constrained resources to meet the most urgent mission needs.

**Diego Garcia**

**On June 22, 2017, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution at the instigation of Mauritius seeking an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the sovereignty of the Chagos Archipelago, which the United Kingdom (UK) administers as the British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT). The resolution passed sending the issue to the International Court of Justice seeking an advisory opinion on the matter and whether the UK should surrender the Chagos Archipelago to Mauritius. The Archipelago includes Diego Garcia, which is home to U.S. military assets in the Indian Ocean.**

**Are you familiar with U.S. assets on Diego Garcia?**

During Air Force Service, I was responsible for the development of facility and infrastructure requirements for Air Mobility Command at Diego Garcia and spent time on the atoll. I understand that Diego Garcia hosts a U.S. Navy Support Facility that provides logistical support to operational forces in the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf and is also an important strategic base for the Air Force.

**Do you believe there exists a suitable replacement site for these assets?**

Without an understanding of the Department's revisions to our Nation's Defense Strategy, I cannot provide an opinion on the availability of a suitable replacement. I do know that the United States military has invested heavily in the infrastructure at Diego Garcia for decades to preserve certain capabilities that are provided by the unique placement and conditions at the Atoll. If confirmed, I will work with other DoD organizations to ensure the Department's infrastructure efficiently and effectively supports global operational requirements.

**What would be the cost and strategic impacts of relocating U.S. assets from Diego Garcia?**

I don't have access to information that would allow me to answer that question at this time. If confirmed I will work to ensure that cost implications are considered as part of the Department's basing decision processes.

**Spangdahlem**

**As part of the European Infrastructure Consolidation (EIC) plan, considerable assets will be moved from other bases to Spangdahlem in Germany. However, recent decisions by the Government of Germany may place a considerable liability on the U.S. military, and establish a significant precedent with respect to responsibility for abatement of noise impacts.**

**Do you expect this German decision to lead to changes in the proposed EIC including maintaining units at existing locations rather than moving to Spangdahlem?**

I do not have any specifics on this issue at this time. That said, if confirmed I will look carefully at the EIC implementation status and work to ensure the Department realizes the anticipated savings from that effort.

**Okinawa**

**The U.S. military together with the Government of Japan are pursuing a major realignment of Marine Corps units currently on Okinawa. Some will be moved to Guam, some to more remote areas of Okinawa, and some to Hawaii. However, opposition remains to any U.S. forces on Okinawa from some individuals including the Governor of Okinawa.**

**Do you believe the current laydown of U.S. forces on Okinawa is viable in the long term?**

I am aware that Secretary Mattis has stated his commitment to the Department's realignment efforts in Japan. If confirmed, I will work with others in the Department to ensure the laydown plan is sustainable.

**Are you committed to moving forward expeditiously with the plan to move forces?**

I am aware that Congress had concerns about the overall costs and strategic implications of the original 2007 plan of moving Marines and their families from Okinawa to Guam. That plan was subsequently revised in 2012 to add other locations in the Pacific theater and to change the types of forces to be relocated. I understand the committee continues to monitor its execution. If confirmed I will examine progress and cost to ensure both will result in an effective Marine Corps force relocation that meets strategic objectives without wasting U.S. taxpayer funds or the funds provided by other governments.

**Are you concerned that deviations or delays in the current plan will give opponents justification to demand more reductions, or cause concern with the Government of Japan that is funding a substantial part of the realignment?**

I understand that the Department is committed to its long-standing agreement with Japan to realign forces and will do so cost effectively. If confirmed I will ensure the requirements in the laydown plan are credibly justified in the context of support to operations.

**Enhanced Use Leases**

**Congress has provided the authority for each of the Service Secretaries to lease underutilized non-excess property and to use revenues generated by those leases to enhance infrastructure and operating costs on those installations. This "enhanced use lease" (EUL) authority is being used in different ways and for different purposes by each of the military departments.**

**What is your understanding of the EUL authority?**

As I understand it, Congress provided the Department the authority to lease underutilized property as a way to generate revenue in the form of cash or in-kind consideration to satisfy military requirements on the base.

**What do you see as the future of the Department's EUL program?**

I'm not familiar with the current scope of the Department's EUL program, but in principle leveraging underutilized assets to off-set operating costs makes good business sense. If confirmed, I will review the Department's current policy and oversight efforts, looking for opportunities to optimize use of EUL authorities.

## **Real Estate Transactions**

**Currently, section 1511 of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 411) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to acquire, dispose of, or lease real property for the benefit of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH). The AFRH has proposed legislation to authorize the Chief Operating Officer of the AFRH to exercise this authority. Currently, the Secretary of Defense exercises this authority through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The justification for AFRH's proposal states that the USACE has run into several policy and authority questions in managing and signing leases on behalf of AFRH, delaying the execution of leases on AFRH's behalf and resulting in the loss of significant revenue and missed opportunities to lease additional properties.**

**In your view, should authority to acquire, dispose of, and lease real property on behalf of the AFRH be changed from the Secretary of Defense to the Chief Operating Officer of the AFRH?**

I am not familiar with any issues faced by USACE in its efforts to lease property on behalf of AFRH, but I am aware from my time on the committee staff that the organizational status of AFRH and the authority over the real property that comprises the homes is not consistent. As an entity, AFRH is an independent establishment in the executive branch, while the authority over all of its real property is vested in the Secretary of Defense.

**In your view, does the Chief Operating Officer of the AFRH have the experience and expertise in real property matters to exercise this authority, especially when the USACE has found it to be challenging?**

I am not familiar with the experience or expertise of the AFRH Chief Operating Officer.

**In your view, does the Chief Operating Officer of the AFRH have greater expertise than the USACE in addressing the policy and authority questions related to real property matters involving the AFRH?**

I am not familiar with the experience or expertise of the AFRH Chief Operating Officer, nor how that would compare to USACE. If confirmed, I would look into this matter further to provide my views to the committee.

## **Family Housing and Privatization**

**In recent years, the Department of Defense and Congress have taken significant steps to improve family housing. The housing privatization program was created as an alternative approach to speed the improvement of military family housing and relieve base commanders of the burden of managing family housing. If confirmed, you will have a key role in decisions regarding military family housing.**

**What are your impressions of the overall quality and sufficiency of family housing both in the United States and abroad?**

I believe that the quality of family housing for military members (both DoD owned and that which has been privatized) is better now than before the Department privatized the majority of its U.S. housing inventory. Additionally, I understand the quality and customer satisfaction rates for the privatized housing located on installations are at all-time highs. I am also aware of the impact of quality housing on the morale, and retention rates for our military families. If confirmed, I will review the housing policies and processes to ensure DoD continues to make high quality family housing available to its members in the U.S. and abroad.

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

I believe that DoD addressed a compelling need in the late 1990s to upgrade military family housing without having to sacrifice other military mission requirements competing for scarce military construction funds. The Military Housing Privatization Initiative allowed the military departments to leverage third party financing and expertise through partnerships with private developers for ownership and management of the housing on installations. This effort drastically improved the availability of quality family housing in the United States far faster than could have been completed through traditional military construction budgets. If confirmed, I would work with the Military Departments and the private developers to ensure the long-term viability of the privatized housing program.

**What is your view of the structure and general goals of the Department of Defense's current housing privatization program?**

I think the Department's general goal of working with the private sector to manage and maintain housing privatized under the Military Housing Privatization Initiative is appropriate. I am aware of concerns with the long-term viability of certain projects that may require efforts to restructure financing. If confirmed, I would conduct a thorough review of the program's structure to assess whether the current program's vision, policies, and deal structures are sufficient.

**Do you believe the housing program should be modified in any way? If so, how?**

I don't have sufficient information at this time to determine if the housing program should be modified. If confirmed, I will review DoD's housing programs to evaluate if changes are required.

**In your view, can and should the privatization program be expanded to include military barracks?**

The Military Housing Privatization Initiative already authorizes the Military Departments to pursue privatizing unaccompanied housing in the United States. I am aware the Navy and Army have done so already in locations such as San Diego, CA; Hampton Roads,

VA; and Fort Meade, MD. If confirmed, I will work with the Military Departments to determine if privatizing additional barracks on military installations is viable.

### **Third-Party Financed Projects**

**The Department of Defense and the military services have upgraded its infrastructure and taken advantage of third-party financing mechanisms and authorities to pursue distributed energy projects that improve installation resilience, increase readiness and mission assurance, and offer long-term cost savings.**

**Do you support the Department and military services continuing these efforts?**

Yes, I support the continued use of third-party financing to improve the energy performance and resilience of DoD installations, to increase readiness and mission assurance, and the long-term cost savings it provides.

**Do you believe that the Department should pursue ways to expand the scope of third-party financing, to include additional investments that could improve energy resilience and mission assurance?**

Yes, I believe that the Department should leverage existing authorities to include Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC) and Utility Energy Services Contracts (UESC) and the enhanced use lease (EUL) authority among others. If confirmed, I will look into other authorities that may exist to allow the Department to expand the scope of third-party financing.

**In your view, how can the Department pursue and prioritize resilience in its third-party financed distributed energy projects and leverage payment in-kind options for capabilities like black-start ability in the event of grid outages, cyber-secure microgrids, additional feeder lines, islanded operations, and other assets?**

In my view, the Department has both the ability and the compelling need to participate in third-party financed projects to enhance mission assurance in the event of a full range of disruption scenarios. If confirmed, I would ensure that necessary policies are in place to best leverage third-party financing to provide the Department with the maximum flexibility to provide the capabilities.

### **Energy Resilience**

**The threat of severe weather and events such as the 2013 sniper attack on PG&E's Metcalf Substation, successful cyberattacks on Ukraine's electrical grid in 2015 and 2016, and the loss of power at Incirlik Air Base during the July 2016 coup attempt have put a**

**focus on our need to improve installation energy resiliency in the event of a commercial grid outage.**

**Are you committed to investing in energy efficiency, distributed generation, and microgrids to improve energy resilience and mission assurance?**

Yes, I support investments that will improve the energy security/resilience and mission assurance of the Department's military installations.

**What is your definition of energy resilience?**

The Department of Defense defines energy resilience as: "The ability to prepare for and recover from energy disruptions that impact mission assurance on military installations."

**Section 2805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 gave the Defense Department new authority to plan and fund military construction projects directly related to energy resiliency and mission assurance, and to help address and mitigate against incidents like Incirlik, not to mention secure microgrids to help prevent cyberattacks.**

**If confirmed, will you commit to using section 2805 to support mission critical functions, address known energy vulnerabilities with projects that are resilient and renewable, and commit to at least \$150 million per year through the FYDP?**

Yes, if confirmed, I will commit to using the authority under section 2805 to support mission critical functions through pursuing cost effective solutions where the suitability and design of the solution is determined to be the most appropriate technical vehicle for assuring continued installation mission performance. I will also carefully review the Energy Resilience and Conservation Investment Program to ensure the funds are optimally used to support the Department's highest mission priorities.

## **Environment**

**If confirmed, will you comply with environmental regulations, laws, and guidance from the Environmental Protection Agency?**

If confirmed, I will work with the appropriate DoD attorneys to ensure the Department of Defense will continue to comply with all applicable environmental regulations and laws.

**If confirmed, will you make the same level of investment for the Defense Department's Environmental Research Programs?**

The Department of Defense's research and development programs must aim to support mission capabilities while improving environmental performance and reducing costs. If

confirmed, I will review the R&D program to ensure it is meeting these goals while supporting Department priorities.

**If confirmed, will you work with the Department of Interior and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to find cooperative ways to ensure military readiness and protect the environment on and around U.S. military installations?**

I am aware that the Department of Defense has an exemplary track record as stewards of our nation's natural and cultural heritage. If confirmed, I will work with the Department of Interior, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and other agencies and organizations to find cooperative ways to ensure military readiness and environmental protection at our military installations and in the surrounding areas that impact military operations..

### **Emerging Contaminants**

**In your view, what are the main challenges the Department of Defense faces with the identification, remediation, and cleanup of emerging contaminants?**

The Department's main challenge is objectively determining unacceptable risks in the cleanup program and making subsequent resource allocations. There is a need for sound science to understand the potential human and environmental impacts, to accurately communicate the risk to the public, and to develop the technology necessary to characterize and remediate their presence in the environment.

**What challenges are you aware of specifically related to the environmental cleanup and restoration activities of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) contamination in drinking water, ground water, and other sources at National Guard and Reserve locations and nearby communities?**

I am aware of this national issue and the various policy and legal aspects affecting numerous industries and functions which used materials containing PFAS. If confirmed, I will work with the OSD staff, other federal agencies, and Congress to address the complex challenges of the issue and the impacts.

**The Committee-passed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 authorizes the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry in consultation with the Department of Defense, to commence a study on the human health implications of PFAS contamination in drinking water, ground water, and other sources.**

**What is your view of the PFAS issue and do you commit your support to conducting the human health study?**

The PFAS issue is very complicated since the science is still evolving regarding potential health impacts. I understand that DoD supports CDC conducting a national human health



study for PFAS that considers all sources and includes representative communities across the nation, not only DoD installations. I am aware that is not a DoD unique issue and Congress assigned the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) this role under the Federal cleanup law.

**Earlier this year, GAO found that the Defense Department has improved its reporting on the cost of environmental cleanup for installations closed under the BRAC process, but recommended that the Department include estimates of cleaning emerging contaminants in future reports to Congress and develop a process for collecting and sharing lessons learned on environmental cleanup. In the report accompanying the Committee-passed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the Committee directs the Department to implement GAO's recommendation to share lessons learned from environmental remediation among the military services to promote the redevelopment of closed military bases.**

**Do you agree with GAO's findings and commit to implementing its recommendations as directed by the Committee?**

Yes.

### **Water Strategy and Technology Roadmap**

**While there has been much attention placed on the cyber vulnerabilities of energy use and the fragility of the electric grid, a secure and reliable supply of water is essential to the Department of Defense's ability to perform its critical missions on its installations and in support of operational deployments. The report accompanying the Committee-passed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 directs the Department, in coordination with the military departments and combatant commands, to submit a technology roadmap to address capability gaps for water production, treatment, and purification and a comprehensive water strategy addressing research, acquisition, training, and organizational issues.**

**Do you share the view that the Department will continue to face long-term challenges related to its water requirements, coupled with the increased potential for security risks and destabilization impacts requiring the Department's response around the globe?**

Yes.

**Do you commit to delivering in a timely manner to the Committee the required comprehensive water strategy and technology roadmap related to water?**

Yes. If confirmed, I will ensure the Department completes the water strategy and technology roadmap by May 1, 2018.

## Climate Change

Secretary Mattis stated to the Committee, “where climate change contributes to regional instability, the Department of Defense must be aware of any potential adverse impacts,” “climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating today,” and “the Department should be prepared to mitigate any consequences of a changing climate, including ensuring that our shipyards and installations will continue to function as required.” The report accompanying the Committee-passed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 directs the Department to conduct a comprehensive threat assessment and implementation master plan on the risks and vulnerabilities to Department missions and infrastructure associated with climate-related events.

**Do you share Secretary Mattis’s views on climate change?**

Yes. , the climate plays a pivotal role in DoD's ability to execute our missions. The Department has always considered risks from climate related effects such as high winds, precipitation, extreme temperatures and drought to mission readiness and execution. As Secretary Mattis has stated “the Department should be prepared to mitigate any consequences of a changing climate, including ensuring that our shipyards and installations will continue to function as required.”

**Do you agree that the Department should be prepared to mitigate any consequences of a changing climate?**

I agree that the Department must be prepared for extreme weather, but in the long run DoD must plan now to ensure it can meet future mission requirements to remain a ready and resilient fighting force. If confirmed, I will work with the Military Departments to ensure our facilities and installation plans appropriately consider the impact of a changing climate.

**Do you commit to delivering in a timely manner to the congressional defense committees the required comprehensive threat assessment and implementation master plan on the risks and vulnerabilities to Department missions and infrastructure associated with climate-related events?**

Yes. If confirmed, I will ensure that the comprehensive threat assessment and implementation master plan is submitted to Congress in a timely manner.

## Encroachment on Military Installations

**Encroachment by commercial and residential development on military installations can negatively impact Defense Department operations at military airfields and training ranges, and the development of new facilities.**

**What do you see as the potential main constraints encroaching on the Department's ability to use its facilities, including training ranges?**

I understand that the Department's military mission can be adversely affected by nearby incompatible development and regulatory restrictions from a variety of development sources limiting types of training, physical access, airspace, frequency/spectrum availability and security. The sources can vary from the decisions by other federal agencies to list species, establish habitats, expand commercial flying corridors, or sell spectrum to projects by local entities for energy generation or incompatible development.

**If confirmed, what policies or steps would you take to ensure private development avoids negatively impacting Department missions and, where possible, enhances operations and training?**

If confirmed, I commit to seeking mutually-beneficial solutions to compatibility challenges. I will advocate to preserve the operating space needed to conduct our vital military operations, and will work to consistently and collaboratively engage with other federal agencies, States, local communities, and private entities to mitigate the negative impacts of these development initiatives.

**How can the Department address the issues of encroachment around its bases in the United States, particularly with respect to encroachment caused by residential development?**

I believe the Department must take a multi-faceted approach to address encroachment around its installations and ranges starting with proactive engagements with non-DoD partners on a regional scale to address concerns before they become major issues. The Department must collaborate with local communities to raise awareness and develop compatible land use solutions. The Department also has programs to directly engage in partnerships and projects to safeguard military activities from incompatible land uses such as residential development.

**What is your understanding of the Department's ability to receive information and plans from potential developers in a timely and effective manner?**

I understand that the Department's ability depends on the type of development. For energy generation and transmission the Department has coordinated with developers to receive, early in the project development process, the information needed to make an initial determination of the potential impact of energy development projects on DoD missions. I'm also aware that the Department coordinates with state and local municipalities to encourage informed land-use planning and promote compatible development.

**Since 2013, the Defense Department has cooperated with the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior in the Sentinel Landscapes partnership in states such as**

**Arizona and North Carolina, in order to preserve key rural landscapes, farms, ranches, and forests that also protect vital test and training missions conducted on military installations that anchor such landscapes across the United States.**

**What is your understanding of the Sentinel Landscapes program and do you commit to supporting the program's continuation and partnership, if confirmed?**

I understand the Sentinel Landscapes Partnership was established to strengthen interagency coordination and better align federal programs. This type of interagency collaboration is necessary to address the complex challenge of preserving test and training missions on DoD installations. If confirmed, I commit to reviewing the current initiatives to ensure the participation by each agency continues to support the Partnership's goals and objectives.

### **Energy Policy**

**The Department of Defense is the largest consumer of energy in the federal government and spends billions of dollars to power military installations and to fuel combat platforms. As threats to energy resources increase, the Department's energy planning is critical to ensuring successful missions in the future.**

**The threat of commercial grid disruption is growing. What steps would you take to ensure critical military infrastructure has assured access to energy?**

If confirmed, I would ensure the Department is taking a holistic approach to enhancing energy security and resilience on its installations in each and every project carried out by the services. This includes comprehensive installation energy planning, policy guidance, studies to recommend alternative solutions to achieve mission assurance, projects to improve installation energy infrastructure, and cybersecurity.

**How can the Department better integrate energy security and resilience within MILCON and the development of combat platforms?**

It is my understanding that the Department has an existing military construction authority under the Energy Resilience and Conservation Investment Program (ERCIP) that permits investments for projects that enhance installation energy security and resilience. If confirmed, I intend to continue to leverage this authority to ensure energy security and resilience projects are prioritized. In addition, I intend to review the MILCON program and design criteria to determine if more opportunities exist.

Regarding combat platforms, I will work with OSD, Joint Staff, Services, and Combatant Commanders to integrate the risks of energy-related vulnerabilities across requirements, acquisition, planning, and operational decision-making.

**If confirmed, what changes, if any, would you make to the Department's current energy policy?**

If confirmed, I will review current policy and guidance with OSD, Joint Staff, Services, and the Combatant Commands to determine the need for any changes or revisions with the goal to meet mission assurance requirements.

**What is your definition of energy security and mission assurance?**

I support the definition contained in 10 U.S. Code § 2924, where energy security is defined as having assured access to reliable supplies of energy and the ability to protect and deliver sufficient energy to meet mission essential requirements.

I support the definition of mission assurance in DoD Directive 3020.40, e as a process to protect or ensure the continued function and resilience of capabilities and assets, including personnel, equipment, facilities, networks, information and information systems, infrastructure, and supply chains, critical to the execution of DoD mission-essential functions in any operating environment or condition.

## **Research and Development**

**What do you see as the role or need for research and development to meet the Department of Defense's energy, installations, and environmental needs?**

I see the role of the Department of Defense research and development programs to improve the military's energy and environmental performance while reducing costs and, at the same time, enhance and sustain mission capabilities. If confirmed, I will review the energy and environment R&D programs to ensure it is meeting these goals.

**What is your current understanding of the way that the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments coordinate budgets for energy and environmental research and development?**

As I understand it, the Department uses a range of mechanisms, including Communities of Interest, reviews of Program Objective Memoranda, and annual certification of the budget, to review these research and development activities. Specifically, ASD (EI&E) currently has oversight of these RDT&E Programs at the Defense-Wide level and reviews and provides input for Service unique E&E RDT&E Programs.

**If confirmed, what steps would you take to coordinate the research and development efforts of the military departments for energy and the environment?**

If confirmed, I will work to ensure our Environmental Technology programs, both Defense-wide and Service-specific, focus on the most pressing Departmental needs.

Through the Operational Energy Capability Improvement Funds, I would seek Service views on the focus and purpose of these research funds and work with the Services to improve the transition of OECIF-funded R&D projects to Service-funded programs of record.

**What role do you believe DARPA should play in research and development to meet energy and environmental needs?**

There are several areas in which DARPA-sponsored research can jump-start advanced technologies that will then feed into the Department's environmental research, development, and demonstration programs. If confirmed, I will explore opportunities for cooperation between DARPA and the Department's energy and environmental programs.

**In your view, should the Department accelerate demonstration programs with respect to renewable energy platforms to better aid deployed forces in combat zones where energy and resources are derived solely from power generators and convoy/airlift support? If so, what steps would you take, if confirmed, to accelerate such programs?**

As Secretary Mattis noted, the Department should seek renewable energy sources that are reliable, cost effective, and capable of relieving the dependence of deployed forces on vulnerable fuel supplies. As I understand it, the Department operates a range of instrumented testbeds for evaluating and improving the use of energy at contingency bases. If confirmed, I will ask for an update on these activities.

**If confirmed, what specific metrics would you use to assess funding targets and priorities for the Department's long-term research efforts and determine whether the Department is making adequate investments in its basic research programs?**

If confirmed, I will coordinate with ASD(R&E) on appropriate priorities for basic research for energy and environment.

**The Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund (OECIF), Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP), and Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP) demonstrate and validate the most promising innovative technologies that can meet the Department's most urgent warfighter requirements.**

**Do you support the OECIF, SERDP, and ESTCP programs and commit to their continued funding across the FYDP?**

Yes, these programs have had success in helping to demonstrate and transition Environmental and Energy technology solutions to the field. If confirmed, to the extent that the programs continue to propose real innovation for the warfighter, I will work to prioritize funding for programs within the fiscal restraints of the Department.

## **Department of Defense Laboratory and Test Center Recapitalization**

**There has been concern over the adequacy of recapitalization rates of the Department of Defense’s laboratory facilities and test centers. Historically, technical centers, laboratories, and test centers do not appear to have fared well in the internal competition for limited military construction and facility sustainment funds.**

**What metrics would you use to assess the amount of investment in the recapitalization of technical centers, laboratories, and test centers to determine its adequacy?**

If confirmed, I would consider three primary metrics to assess investments in laboratories and test facilities. The first is a well-defined, long-term facility requirements plan from the laboratory and test communities that defines their adequacy, including functional consolidations, efficiencies, and flexibility for growth. The second metric is measuring the capacity of construction that can occur at one time without impacting ongoing missions. The third is consideration and timing of the ideal funding sources based on the type of project proposed. If confirmed, I would work with the laboratory and test communities within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Military Departments to assess if their facility programs address these metrics.

**If confirmed, how would you work to properly recapitalize the technical centers, laboratories, and test centers?**

If confirmed, I would work with the laboratory and test communities to ensure their unique requirements are being properly defined and articulated to their host Military Department. I would also work with them to ensure they justify their needs based on how their research supports military missions and how they leverage industry best practices.

## **Department of Energy**

**If confirmed, how would you work with the Department of Energy (DOE), including the Advanced Research Projects Agency – Energy, on the development of new or advanced approaches for energy requirements?**

If confirmed, I will assess opportunities for partnerships with DOE on essential military energy requirements, based on requirements from OSD components and the Services.

**Are there any specific areas where you think the Department of Defense or services are best suited to partner with the DOE?**

As I understand it, the Department is already coordinating with DOE on a range of topics, including energy storage, tactical vehicle improvements, and microgrid standards. If confirmed, I will seek an update on these activities.

## **Logistics**

**If confirmed, what would be your priorities with respect to logistical and materiel support, supply chain management, and sustainment efforts as they pertain to energy, installations, and the environment?**

If confirmed, I will work closely with senior logistics, installation, and energy leaders in OSD, Joint Staff, and the Services to ensure that military facilities and infrastructure meet logistics requirements around the world. I will work closely with the Departments to identify opportunities to strengthen the effectiveness of our organic industrial base with programs to enhance facilities, better utilize spaces and access additional resources.

**If confirmed, what is your view of the role you would play in addressing logistical support challenges associated with the delivery of energy to deployed units, particularly in harsh environments like Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and Africa?**

If confirmed, I believe my role is to work with other offices in the Department to enable the timely deployment of equipment and expertise that reduce the vulnerability of deployed forces to energy disruptions.

**The proliferation of multiple, often proprietary, battery storage systems across weapons platforms threatens to drive costs and logistics to unsustainable levels.**

**Do you agree that our goal should be to provide a family of common energy storage solutions that can expedite design and certification and lower acquisition life cycle operations and support costs?**

I agree that a common energy storage solution can provide the warfighter certain advantages. If confirmed, I will ask for an update from the Services, Defense Logistics Agency, and other standardization organizations to review options for expediting design and certification and lowering the costs of energy storage systems.

## **Section 2808 Authority**

**Section 2808 of title 10, United States Code, allows the Secretary of Defense, in the event of a declaration of war or national emergency, to undertake military construction projects supporting the use of armed forces with otherwise unobligated military construction funds.**

**What is your assessment of this authority?**



I believe Congress provided the Secretary of Defense the emergency authorities in Section 2808 as a vital tool for the Department to quickly undertake military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law using available appropriations in support of a declared national emergency.

**From a policy standpoint, what restrictions do you believe are appropriate for the use of this authority?**

I believe a policy restriction for the use of Section 2808 authority should be for the Secretary of Defense, or his designated representative, to maintain project approval in order to preserve the infrequent use of the authority under extreme conditions. Congress intended for the Secretary of Defense to be the final decision authority on the use of this provision.

**Do you believe it is appropriate to use this authority outside theaters of armed conflict? If so, in what instances?**

It is my view that this authority is, and should be, available for use outside of theaters of armed conflict subject to the President's declaration of war or national emergency that invokes this authority. Because many weapon platforms can operate from significant distances outside of the operating theaters, it may occasionally become necessary to construct facilities to support those launch capabilities, such as runways, aprons, or hangars. The requirement, its correlation to the declaration of war or national emergency, and when that requirement is needed are more important criteria than whether the authority constructs facilities within a theater of armed conflict.

### **Operational Energy**

**In his responses to the advance policy questions from this Committee, Secretary Mattis talked about his time in Iraq, and how he called upon the Department to “unleash us from the tether of fuel.” He stated that “units would be faced with unacceptable limitations because of their dependence on fuel” and resupply efforts “made us vulnerable in ways that were exploited by the enemy.”**

**Do you believe this issue remains a challenge for the Defense Department?**

Yes. Fuel has been a critical enabler of our military capability since the dawn of mechanization, and the availability of fuel is still a consideration in our ability to project and sustain power around the globe. Anti-access and area-denial capabilities, cyber threats, distance, geography, and our own requirements for fuel can slow or challenge the delivery of fuel to the warfighter.

**If confirmed, what will you do to unleash the military from the tether of fuel?**

If confirmed, I believe the Department should reduce the dependence of our forces on vulnerable fuel supply chains by increasing the reach of our warfighting platforms and ensuring the availability of sufficient and survivable logistics and infrastructure. To do so, I will work to integrate the risks of dependence on fuel across the full range of Department decision-making regarding the development, fielding, sustainment, and employment of military capabilities.

**If confirmed, what priorities would you establish for Defense investments in and deployment of operational energy technologies to increase the combat capabilities of warfighters, reduce logistical burdens, and enhance mission assurance on our installations?**

If confirmed, I will use the Secretary's focus on readiness and combat effectiveness to guide priorities in the Department's operational energy investments. I will coordinate with the Combatant Commands and the Services to better identify operational risks due to energy and focus our requirements, acquisition, and planning decision-making to quickly and effectively meet warfighter needs.

**What is your view of the current staffing of operational energy plans and programs of the military departments and defense agencies?**

I am not currently able to confidently assess current staffing. If confirmed, I will request an update from the Services and Defense Agencies to better assess the sufficiency and capability of staffing for operational energy activities.

**If confirmed, what role, if any, do you expect to play in ensuring that the operational energy planning and program functions of the military departments and defense agencies have sufficient staff of appropriately qualified and trained personnel to carry out their duties and responsibilities?**

If confirmed, I will seek close working relationships with my counterparts in the Services, and Defense Agencies to ensure a full understanding of requirements and resources. I also will use existing authorities to assess, influence, review, and certify annual resourcing decisions that affect the operational energy mission.

**Do you think that the Department is currently doing an adequate job of coordinating operational energy planning and programming across the services?**

I believe that coordinating operational energy planning in both the development of weapon systems and the gaming of war plans continues to be work in progress. However, if confirmed, I will review how the Department coordinates with the Services regarding operational energy to determine the need for any changes or improvements.

**Battlefield energy command and control systems can provide commanders the information they need to extend operational reach.**

**Do you believe that it should be a priority for the Department to leverage advancements in data analytics and associated technologies to improve commanders' visibility of fuel consumption by the force?**

Improving the commander's visibility in a range of limiting factors, including fuel consumption should be a priority. I will work with the Joint Staff, Combatant Commands, Services, and Defense Agencies to better understand and remediate any gaps in the ability to provide commanders with operationally relevant information on energy.

### **Energy and Acquisition**

**Secretary Mattis told the Committee that the Department of Defense's acquisition process should explore alternate and renewable energy sources that can relieve the dependence of deployed forces on vulnerable fuel supply chains and increase the readiness and reach of the force.**

**Do you agree with Secretary Mattis?**

Yes.

**In confirmed, what steps would you take to reduce energy-related vulnerabilities and increase the reach of the deployed force?**

If confirmed, I will work with OSD, the Joint Staff, the Services, and Combatant Commands to integrate the risks of energy-related vulnerabilities across requirements, acquisition, planning, and operational decision-making.

**How can our acquisition systems better incorporate the use of energy in military platforms?**

Along with the use of the energy key performance parameter in the requirements for new systems, I understand DoD includes the fully burdened cost of energy in analyses of alternatives, where the fully burdened cost is a significant discriminator among alternatives. If confirmed, I will seek outside sources of innovation in academia and the private sector, and work with the Joint Staff and the acquisition community to ensure energy is addressed in military platforms.

**Sustainment costs for the F-35 are an issue of interest for the Committee. Will you commit to assessing potential engine improvements like the Navy's Fuel Burn Reduction program to improve fuel efficiency in the F-35?**

As I understand it, there are an array of new engine designs and modifications to the current F-35 engine that could yield improvements in fuel use and performance. If

confirmed, I will review the operational benefits of possible improvements to the F-35 and other combat systems, and work within established planning, programming, and budgeting processes to determine a way ahead.

**Years ago, the guided-missile destroyer (DDG) *USS Cole* was bombed while refueling. Today, the Navy continues to focus on operational energy improvements to increase platform range, endurance, and ordnance payload. Given the high rate of deployments and constant stress on readiness, the Navy has used operational energy investments like hybrid-electric drive (HED) systems that can allow a DDG to remain on-station for an extra 11 days per year.**

**Do you support the Navy's commitment to conducting at least one DDG HED installation per year over the FYDP?**

I support modifications like the HED that can offer significant, operationally relevant improvements to current platforms. If confirmed, I will request an update from the Navy on the HED program to determine the appropriate levels of investment.

### **Energy Resilience in the Fight Against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS)**

**Back in July 2016 after a coup attempt, the Turkish government cut off power to Incirlik Air Base, which is the primary platform for launching coalition airstrikes in the fight against ISIS. For roughly a week, deployed units had to operate off backup generators, which is expensive and not the preferred method of operation given the demanding tempo of sorties against ISIS.**

**If confirmed, specifically how will you address and make energy resilience and mission assurance a priority for the U.S. military, to include acquiring and deploying sustainable and renewable energy assets to improve combat capability for deployed units on our military installations and forward operating bases?**

If confirmed, I would seek to target effective solutions towards the specific challenges to the energy resiliency of our military installations and forward operating bases. I believe we have an opportunity to assess new models for the procurement of electricity that will enhance reliability while providing capital for improvements to on base distribution. The Department should continue to explore new concepts, technologies, and renewable energy sources that are reliable, cost effective, and capable of mitigating the risks of dependence on vulnerable energy supplies. Where appropriate to the mission, the Department also should continue to effort to take advantage of third party financing to enhance energy resilience at our permanent installations.

**To what extent, if any, are title 10 training exercises and war games dealing with energy outages? If not, why?**

As I understand the issue, the Services have identified energy as a significant constraint and the operational energy team provides subject matter expertise through multiple wargames. If confirmed, I will ask for a complete update on the role of energy disruptions and outages in exercises and wargames.

**Do you believe that war games conducted by the Department of Defense and the services should model the impact of fuel and other energy-related constraints and threats such as cyberattacks on the commercial electric grid?**

Yes.

**Do you support the J-4's enforcement of the energy supportability key performance parameter in the requirements process?**

Yes.

**Do you believe the energy key performance parameter is important?**

Yes. As an indicator of energy supportability under combat conditions, the “energy key performance parameter” provides an important tool for improving the capability of the future force.

**Will you commit to strengthening the process for assessing the energy performance of future weapons system acquisitions?**

If confirmed, I will work with the Joint Staff, OSD, and the Services to strengthen the process for assessing the energy performance of future weapons systems acquisitions.

### **Non-Tactical Vehicle Transportation Options**

**Significant cost savings could be achieved through the more efficient use of non-tactical government-owned mobility and transportation on military installations. Notably, the Defense Department spends roughly \$435 million each year for non-tactical passenger vehicles and light trucks, with a use rate of just 7%. New technologies and approaches could be used to meet Department needs while also improving overall efficiency. The recent Department of Transportation Smart Cities Challenge provides useful insight to innovative approaches that might be beneficial to the Defense Department.**

**In your view, how can the Department better incentivize military installations to partner with industry and local communities to explore mutually beneficial transportation opportunities like the Smart Cities Challenge?**

It's my understanding that non-tactical fleet use is outside the purview of the OASD(EI&E) and the responsibility falls under the OASD(LM&R) Transportation

Policy Office. More efficient use of the Department's non-tactical fleet makes good business sense. If confirmed, I'd defer to the ASD(LM&R) to consider looking into this matter.

### **Congressional Oversight**

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

**Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of 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 ASD(EI&E)?**

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 in a timely manner?**

Yes

**Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted committee, or to consult with this Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?**

Yes

**Do you agree to answer letters and requests for information from individual Senators who are members of this Committee?**

Yes

**If confirmed, do you agree to provide to this Committee relevant information within the jurisdictional oversight of the Committee when requested by the Committee, even in the absence of the formality of a letter from the Chairman?**

Yes