

NOMINATIONS OF ADM SAMUEL J. LOCKLEAR III, USN, FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND; AND LTG THOMAS P. BOSTICK, USA, FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL AND TO BE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS/COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2012

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:36 a.m. in room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Webb, McCaskill, Begich, Shaheen, Blumenthal, McCain, Inhofe, Chambliss, Ayotte, Graham, and Vitter.

Committee staff members present: Richard D. DeBobes, staff director; and Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk.

Majority staff members present: Gerald J. Leeling, counsel; Peter K. Levine, general counsel; Thomas K. McConnell, professional staff member; Jason W. Maroney, counsel; and Russell L. Shaffer, counsel.

Minority staff members present: David M. Morriss, minority staff director; Adam J. Barker, professional staff member; Christian D. Brose, professional staff member; Lucian L. Niemeyer, professional staff member; Michael J. Sistik, research assistant; and Richard F. Walsh, minority counsel.

Staff assistants present: Hannah I. Lloyd, Mariah K. McNamara, and Bradley S. Watson.

Committee members' assistants present: Jeff Greene, assistant to Senator Lieberman; Nick Ikeda, assistant to Senator Akaka; Ann Premer, assistant to Senator Nelson; Gordon Peterson, assistant to Senator Webb; Maria Mahler-Haug, assistant to Senator McCaskill; Lindsay Kavanaugh, assistant to Senator Begich; Chad Kreikemeier, assistant to Senator Shaheen; Kathryn Parker, assistant to Senator Gillibrand; Ethan Saxon, assistant to Senator Blumenthal; Anthony Lazarski, assistant to Senator Inhofe; Lenwood Landrum, assistant to Senator Sessions; Clyde Taylor IV,

assistant to Senator Chambliss; Joseph Lai, assistant to Senator Wicker; Brad Bowman, assistant to Senator Ayotte; Sergio Sarkany, assistant to Senator Graham; and Joshua Hodges, assistant to Senator Vitter.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN, CHAIRMAN

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody.

This morning the committee meets to consider military nominations for two critical and challenging command assignments.

We welcome Admiral Samuel Locklear, U.S. Navy, who is nominated to be Commander of the U.S. Pacific Command, and Lieutenant General Tom Bostick, U.S. Army, nominated to be the Army's Chief of Engineers and Commanding General of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Thank you both for your many years of service to our Nation, for your willingness to continue to serve in these positions of great responsibility.

I would also like to welcome and to thank your family members, some of whom are here this morning. The committee is keenly aware of the importance of our military families to the overall success and well-being of our Armed Forces, and we appreciate greatly their unwavering support and their many sacrifices, particularly during the course of long military careers. In this regard and as a tradition of this committee, I invite both of our witnesses during your opening remarks to introduce the family members or others who are here with you this morning.

One of the main components of the President's recently announced defense strategic guidance is to rebalance force structure and investments toward the Asia-Pacific. So the nomination of Admiral Locklear to be the senior-most U.S. military commander in the Asia-Pacific region is most timely. Stability and security in the Asia-Pacific is indeed in the United States' national interest, and we must maintain and support a strategy that recognizes and protects that interest and works with allies and partners to address regional challenges and these regional challenges include some of the following.

The abrupt leadership change in North Korea, occasioned by the recent death of long-time dictator Kim Jong Il opens new questions about possible future threats from a regime that has shown little interest in cooperating with the international community and little concern for the well-being of its people.

China's continued rise as a regional and global power, coupled with its pursuit of military technology and capability, and its increasing propensity for challenging the territorial and maritime claims of other countries, particularly in the South China Sea and the East China Sea, has had an unsettling effect in the region and increased the prospects for miscalculation.

And other parts of the region continue to struggle with transnational violent extremism, insurgent groups, illegal narcotics, and humanitarian crises.

These challenges and others underscore the need for the United States to remain engaged and active in this vital region. But as we renew our commitment to the Asia-Pacific, we must also look for creative and new ways of thinking about U.S. military presence overseas, particularly in a constrained budget environment.

For example, realignment plans for U.S. forces in Korea, Okinawa, and Guam rely on the old paradigm of large, elaborate overseas bases to accommodate permanent force structure for long periods of time. While these plans might have fulfilled some specific needs and purposes when originally designed, it now appears that regional strategic requirements may be better served by looking at these realignments in the context of the needs of the broader Asia-Pacific and by rebalancing the U.S. military presence throughout the region.

Senators McCain, Webb, and I have advocated for changes to these plans in ways that support the strategic goals of U.S. military posture and presence throughout the region while avoiding excessive and unsustainable costs associated with large and elaborate new bases. The current Okinawa-Guam realignment plan is unworkable, unrealistic, and unaffordable. Our alliance with Japan is important for many reasons, we need to get this right. The United States and Japan have recently announced that they are considering adjustments to the plan. It is important that there be adjustments and that there be changes that are jointly agreed upon and jointly announced and that a more viable and sustainable U.S. presence in Japan and on Guam results.

Admiral, we look forward to learning more about how you would approach these various challenges and how the U.S. military can best remain present and active in this important region during the upcoming period of budget constraints.

Before the committee today also is Lieutenant General Bostick, a career Army engineer, who has been nominated to be the Army's next Chief of Staff and Commanding General of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Flooding in Louisiana caused by Hurricane Katrina and the relentless flood waters that poured over the banks of the Mississippi River last year vividly dramatize the importance of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, but these high-profile events are by no means the only challenges that confront the Army Corps. The Army's Chief of Engineers and Commanding General is responsible for both military and civilian programs and the associated planning, engineering, construction, and maintenance of a wide range of infrastructure requirements.

The responsibilities also include projects dealing with navigable waterways, flood control, environmental restoration, and disaster response. Under its broad national charter, the Army Corps deals with difficult and important issues in virtually every State in the union, including my home State of Michigan, which is inextricably tied to the vast navigable water systems of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes shoreline is the Nation's largest. The system connects manufacturing facilities, agricultural markets of the Midwest with trading partners throughout the world and provides the most efficient means of transportation, which is vital to our economic competitiveness. Yet, our harbors need dredging. Some are threatened with closure to commercial shipping or require ships to lighten their loads in order to enter some of our Great Lakes ports.

The Army Corps of Engineers for far too long has paid inadequate attention to the Great Lakes. General, we are interested in hearing your views on the various challenges facing the Army

Corps and how you would, if confirmed, prioritize efforts to deal with those challenges. And as co-chair with Senator Kirk of the Great Lakes Task Force, I would be particularly interested in your thoughts on the Great Lakes navigation system.

And by the way, Senator Kirk is doing well. He had surgery yesterday, and we are all gratified to hear yesterday afternoon and this morning that he is in fact recovering very, very well.

So it is against the backdrop of these various challenges, both foreign and domestic, that we again welcome both of you here today. We look forward to your testimony.

Senator McCain I know is coming but he is going to be late, and I think we will wait for his opening remarks when he comes here.

And we are going to call on you, Admiral Locklear, for your opening statement.

STATEMENT OF ADM SAMUEL J. LOCKLEAR III, USN, FOR RE-APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, honorable committee members. Good morning. Thank you for scheduling this hearing.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank President Obama and Secretary Panetta for this nomination. I am deeply honored and humbled, and I do appreciate their confidence that they have in my ability to lead the outstanding men and women of the U.S. Pacific Command.

I would also like to thank this committee for your enduring support of our service members and their families. They see it. They appreciate it as well.

Now, I would not be here today without the love and support of my family. My wife of 33 years Pam, my two daughters, Jenny and Jillian, are here with me this morning. And it gives me great pride and pleasure to introduce them to you. Now, these special women—they embody the strength and the courage of our military community, and they have been my inspiration to serve with honor and integrity for almost 4 decades. Jenny and Jill, my daughters, have blessed Pam and I with three grandsons who are well on their way to becoming fine citizens of our great Nation and we hope one day they will carry on our family's tradition of service and leadership.

If confirmed, I look very much forward to working with the committee to solve our Nation's security challenges in the Asia-Pacific region.

Again, thank you for this opportunity and for your support of our uniformed service members and their families.

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to take your questions.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Locklear follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Admiral, very much.

General Bostick?

STATEMENT OF LTG THOMAS P. BOSTICK, USA, FOR RE-APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL AND TO BE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS/COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

General BOSTICK. Chairman Levin, Senator McCain, distinguished members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am honored to appear before you today in support of my nomination as the Chief of Engineers and Commanding General, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I thank President Obama, Secretary Panetta, Secretary McHugh, and General Odierno for the opportunity to continue serving this great Nation.

It has been my privilege to serve our country in uniform for over 33 years. My wife Renee, who is here today, is a principal of Randolph Elementary School, Arlington Public Schools. Renee and I have been married for over 30 years, and she has managed to support our Army, our communities, her many different schools, 26 in total, and our family. Our son Joshua, who has moved with us 14 of our 19 moves, is a student at Stanford University and could not be here today.

We often say that we enlist the soldier, commission an officer, but we retain a family. I am here today still serving because of Renee and Joshua, my extended family, friends, and our great soldiers and civilians. I deeply appreciate their love and support. My father was an Army master sergeant, and Renee's father was a Marine Corps sergeant major. So we have been in the military our entire lives, and we are very proud and honored to continue serving.

If confirmed, I look forward to working with Congress, the administration, the Department of Defense, as well as other national, State, local government and nongovernmental organizations to continue executing the Corps' important mission of providing vital engineering services in peace and war to strengthen our Nation's security, energize our economy, and reduce the risk of disasters. The significant role of the Corps of Engineers was highlighted again during last year's flooding throughout the Nation, the enormous work related to base realignment and closure and the global repositioning of our armed forces, and during the operational support in Iraq, Afghanistan, and locations around the world.

If confirmed, I will ensure the Corps works closely with national, State, and local leaders to address the many challenges ahead. I will focus on maintaining trust in the Corps of Engineers through consistent and clear communications with all stakeholders to achieve a common vision, will continue developing the professional teams that must collaborate within and outside the Corps.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is a key member of the Nation's team that must collectively address complex engineering and changing defense requirements with the precious resources provided by Congress and the American people.

I embrace the challenges ahead and, if confirmed, look forward to leading the Corps of Engineers.

And I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Bostick follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Chairman LEVIN. We thank you very much, General. Again, we are delighted that your and the Admiral's family are with us here

today, except those who could not be with us. We are very much honored to have them here just as you are honored to have their presence and how much their support has meant to you throughout your careers.

Senator McCain.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your courtesy. I was testifying at another committee meeting.

Let me join you in welcoming Admiral Locklear and General Bostick and congratulating them on their nominations and in thanking them for their many years of distinguished service to our Nation.

Before this week, the last time I saw Admiral Locklear was in Naples, Italy where he helped to lead the NATO mission in Libya. Despite the restrictions placed on him and despite lacking the ability to employ the full weight of U.S. air power to defend the Libyan people, I must say that Admiral Locklear excelled in managing that complex coalition operation which ultimately succeeded in helping the Libyan people to liberate their country. And we owe him our thanks for that achievement.

If confirmed to be Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, Admiral Locklear, you will oversee the rebalancing our defense strategy toward the Asia-Pacific region. This is the right mission, though talk of it as a pivot is misguided. For 7 decades, the United States has maintained a balance of power in the Asia-Pacific region that fosters political and economic liberty. We will continue to do so and that requires the sustainment of U.S. military power to secure our vital interests, from the defense of our treaty allies, to freedom of navigation through international waters, to the preservation of a regional order that enables sovereign countries to resolve their differences peacefully free from intimidation and coercion.

To maintain this commitment, we need a more effective and sustainable military posture in the region. Our current plans to realign bases in Japan, Guam, and Korea are all grossly over budget, and Congress will not pay that bill. So this committee led the Congress in putting a pause on the entire enterprise and included a provision of the recently enacted National Defense Authorization Act that requires an independent assessment and alternative recommendations on how to proceed. So I want to point out the administration is free to move forward with a revised force posture, but this committee and the Pentagon must wait for the findings of our congressionally mandated independent assessment before authorizing funding for any regional posture arrangements.

It is essential that the U.S. military maintain its active and stabilizing presence in the Asia-Pacific region, but we need to get these important decisions right. And frankly, the Pentagon does not have a good record on this issue as the costs have escalated from around \$6 billion to at least \$16 billion.

At the same time, for our prioritization of the Asia-Pacific region to be meaningful, we must avoid catastrophic cuts to our defense budget, especially sequestration.

It should, therefore, be of concern to us all that the Navy remains short of its goal of 313 ships. That goal will be impeded fur-

ther by the administration's recently announced plan to retire seven cruisers earlier than planned, to retire two major amphibious lift ships needed by the Marine Corps, and to delay buying one large deck amphibious ship, one *Virginia*-class attack submarine, two littoral combat ships, and eight high-speed transport vessels. It is well and good to maintain 11 aircraft carriers, but cuts to our naval capabilities such as these, without a plan to compensate for them, only put our goals in the Pacific region at greater risk.

General Bostick comes before this committee with a long record of distinguished, 33 years, and carries forward his family's proud legacy of military service to our country.

General Bostick, if confirmed, you will be responsible for the performance of 38,000 civilians and soldiers who provide engineering services to more than 90 countries worldwide. We look to the Corps of Engineers to provide vital engineering services in peace and war, to strengthen our security, energize our economy, and reduce the risks from disasters. In other words, this is a critical post.

At a time when our Government faces daunting fiscal challenges, we will have to make tough decisions about investments in our critical infrastructure. In a prior Congress, then-Senator Russ Feingold and I repeatedly attempted to put in place a procedure for the Army Corps to provide to Congress clear, objective analysis of national priorities for our water infrastructure projects.

Unfortunately, many Members of Congress would rather maintain the current system of selecting projects based on seniority and the individual Member's influence over the committee process. I believe this earmarking of Army Corps projects puts lives at risk. We must be informed by the capable expertise and objective analysis of the Corps of Engineers, and we will continue to work to ensure these priorities are provided to Congress in order to ensure that taxpayer funds are spent wisely, efficiently, and effectively.

I thank and congratulate both of our witnesses.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

Let us try a 7-minute round. We have a lot of Senators here, and we can have a second round.

Admiral, yesterday's announcement describing negotiations between the United States and Japan is welcome news because it demonstrates a willingness to address issues about the level of our troop presence on Okinawa without conditioning the movement of marines off of Okinawa to progress on the Futenma replacement facility. However, the new thinking is not yet going far enough. For instance, there appears to be no intention of reconsidering yet the plan to build the Futenma replacement facility at Camp Schwab on Okinawa, nor does there appear that the Air Force bases in the region are being considered as part of the solution.

Now, we want to make it clear that the requirements in the statute that are contained in the fiscal year 2012 defense authorization bill must still be met before any funds, including funds provided by the Government of Japan, may be obligated or expended to implement realignment.

Now, some of the requirements are the following. Submission by the Commandant of the Marine Corps, in consultation with the Pacific Command Commander of his preferred force laydown. We

await a master plan for the construction of the facilities and infrastructure necessary to implement the commandant's preferred force laydown. We await a plan coordinated by all pertinent Federal agencies detailing how the Federal Government will satisfy the off-post requirements associated with the buildup on Guam and until the Secretary of Defense submits an independent assessment of the United States force posture in East Asia and the Pacific region as detailed in our Defense Authorization Act.

Admiral, first, are you familiar with these requirements, and if so, will you make sure that those requirements are met before there is any obligation of funds for those purposes?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the concerns of the committee, the various communications that have been presented to the leadership of the Department of Defense. I am aware of the ongoing—or the release of the communique that discusses the ongoing discussions between the Government of Japan and the potential that may come out of those.

I am prepared to support the leadership of the Department of Defense, if I am appointed or if I am confirmed, to give them my best military advice as they go forward with this process.

Chairman LEVIN. All right. Well, to the extent that you are not yet familiar with our statute's requirements, including for that independent assessment before funds are obligated or expended to implement the realignment which we discussed, will you do so and will you abide by them?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I will abide by them.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

As I alluded to in my opening remarks, much of the interest in China's continued rise as a global power involves its pursuit of military technology and capability and what that means in terms of regional stability.

Admiral, give us your assessment, if you would, of the situation in the South China Sea, particularly with respect to the competing maritime and territorial claims of the countries bordering that area?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there are competing claims in the South China Sea between many competing interests in that area, in particular between the Chinese and a number of our allies and our partners in that region. My impression is that we need to ensure that we move forward with a security environment that allows those discussions—those determinations to be realized through proper rule of law, proper international law, and that they do that in a multilateral fashion following the norms of international law based on the territorial land masses that then relate into maritime claims.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Admiral.

Can you tell us whether you support the United States joining the United Nations Treaty on the Law of the Sea?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Mr. Chairman, I do support the United States joining the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

Chairman LEVIN. And why is that?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. It has been my observation as a naval officer for many years that as this subject has been debated that having

this tool, us be a member of this important United Nations initiative, will provide us a better framework globally for us as there are competing interests globally particularly as economic zones are discussed, as we start looking resources that are on the sea bed. It allows us a better mechanism to be able to have a legal discussion that prevents us from having miscalculated events. It overall provides us a framework for better future security.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

General, let me ask you now about some of the Corps of Engineers' expenditures and how they are determined.

One of the issues which strikes me as a Great Lakes Senator is that the maintenance of our Great Lakes navigational system is funded entirely through the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, which is financed through fees which are charged on the value of shipments that arrive at these federally maintained ports. In contrast, only portion of other waterway systems is maintained through user fees and other systems get general fund contributions.

Will you, first of all, explain to us why it is that we have fees supporting our harbors in the Great Lakes but other activities are supplemented by general funds for other harbors and other waterway systems? Why is that the case, if you know?

General BOSTICK. Mr. Chairman, I do not have the history on why the funds were set up in that fashion. I do know that the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund contains about \$6 billion and collects about \$1.5 billion each year, and the Corps of Engineers plans about \$750 million of construction and maintenance using those funds.

We have a lot of work to do, and if confirmed, I am committed to working with the Corps and the Congress and the administration to ensure we do the best with the monies that we are provided.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, just to follow up on that question. We feel that we have been short-changed in the Great Lakes for a long time even though we have the longest shoreline of any of the areas of our country.

Will you review, when you are confirmed, the benefits of various navigational systems, including the Great Lakes, compared to the budget which is allocated to those systems and tell us whether or not in your judgment, after you are confirmed, there is a fair relationship between the benefits that are received by those various systems or allocated to those various systems and how those benefits compare to the financial expenditures which the Corps makes? Will you make that assessment after you are confirmed?

General BOSTICK. Mr. Chairman, you have my commitment that I will make that assessment. I will visit the Great Lakes and I will make sure that I understand how the performance-based budgeting priorities are set by the Corps and how that takes into consideration both the large systems such as the Mississippi and the smaller systems. In the Great Lakes, as you know, it is not a complete system in terms of how it is considered. But I will take a look at that, if confirmed.

Chairman LEVIN. We thank you very much, General.

Senator McCain.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And again I thank the witnesses.

Admiral, as you know, the plans the administration has announced to retire seven cruisers earlier than planned, retire two major amphibious lift ships, delay buying one large-deck amphibious ship, one *Virginia*-class attack submarine, two littoral combat ships, and eight high-speed transport vessels—does this increase our risks in the Asia-Pacific region?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, Senator, I would say that any number of ships less than what we state is the requirement does require combatant commanders and, if confirmed, will require me to manage those risks. It is always difficult, particularly from a Navy perspective, for us to see those type of decisions that have been made and will ultimately be made in budget decisions. But we will have to manage with the resources that the American people give us, that you authorize us. If I am confirmed, I will have to be frank with you about the decisions that are made because of the resources available and the risk that that requires me to assume.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, we will look forward to that because I understand flexibility and I understand a lot of the arguments the administration is making, but as you well know, presence is something that can only be achieved by numbers. And obviously, the goal of 313 ships is obviously not going to be met.

I just want to repeat what the chairman said. We have looked at this issue of Okinawa and Guam and the basing issue. Senator Webb has been heavily involved in it. And we did come to the conclusion that we needed an outside look at it, and we did not come to that conclusion just because it was an idea we had. We came to that conclusion because we have seen the costs go up from \$6 billion to \$16 billion or more, and there was not a coherent plan. We continue to get visits from Japanese members of the diet saying what are we going to do. So we really believed that an outside look was important. It will not take a long period of time. But I would like for you to participate in helping conduct that study and provide the assessment team that they need. Can I have that commitment from you, Admiral?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. You have my commitment, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you.

General, the omnibus appropriations bill for fiscal year 2012 included a slush fund totaling \$507 million for the Corps to spend on various construction, maintenance, and other projects that were not included in the President's budget. The funds were financed by reducing money for projects included in the President's budget request and adding \$375 million to the Army Corps of Engineers' budget. The funds added by the appropriators were not a part of the text of the omnibus bill but were listed in a joint report that accompanies the spending bill, which is the new way for Congress to circumvent the earmark moratorium. As such, they should not have the force of law.

So despite a crushing budget deficit and significant reductions to Government spending, including over \$20 billion less for the Department of Defense, the appropriators actually added more to the Corps budget than the administration had requested.

I note in your written answers to questions posed by the committee that you recognize in a constrained Federal budget that,

quote, with an aging population, therefore more entitlement spending, we can expect less to be available for discretionary programs. The Corps will have to prioritize projects and programs with rigorous analysis to ensure the greatest value for taxpayer funds.

If confirmed, will you spend these excess funds that were not requested by the President, General?

General BOSTICK. Senator, the Corps executes projects that are authorized by the Congress and appropriated. And we do not make a decision in terms of whether we expend those funds or not, but if authorized by the Congress and appropriated, then we will execute the mission to our greatest degree possible.

Senator MCCAIN. So you believe that the joint report that accompanies a spending bill has the force of law?

General BOSTICK. Sir, I have not been privy to the joint report. If confirmed, I am willing to go back and take a look at that in detail. What I can say is we would execute what is authorized and appropriated by the Congress.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, General, I am going to need your assessment on that before I move that the committee move forward with your nomination. I think it is outrageous that the appropriators should put into a, quote, joint report earmarked projects that are not authorized or requested. And so I am going to have to know your view as to whether you are required to spend those funds or not. So I hope that you will provide us an answer to that question as soon as possible. Okay?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I will.

Senator MCCAIN. Admiral, how concerned are you about the fact that we may have a serious North Korean provocation or miscalculation this year?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Senator, I am very much concerned about the stability of the situation on the Korean Peninsula. It is in our best interests to ensure that we maintain a strong deterrent there. I have not had discussions with General Thurman yet, but if confirmed, I will to get his immediate assessment.

But we have had, as you know, a transition of leadership there. Day by day, so far, so good. But it is yet to be determined how this will play out in the mid to long term.

There has been a shift over the last couple of decades in my observation of the North Koreans' ability in the military area. We have seen them through some provocation activity over the last several years using more asymmetric tactics such as small submarines, and certainly their proliferation of delivery vehicles for short-, medium-, and eventually longer-range ballistic missiles is a great concern.

So I am very much concerned and we should certainly stay vigilant, and if confirmed, I will assure you it will be one of my highest priorities.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. General, relative to the question which Senator McCain has very properly asked you about whether you are required to spend certain funds, you may submit a legal opinion on that question, if you so desire. I just talked to Senator McCain as to whether that would be satisfactory and he indicated it would be.

So if that is a legal question, you may submit a legal opinion rather than your own personal opinion. We do need an answer to that question. Is that fair enough? Thank you.

General BOSTICK. Mr. Chairman, I will do that.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator Lieberman.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Locklear, General Bostick, thanks very much for your extraordinary service to our country. I think the President has acted wisely in nominating both of you and I look forward to supporting your nomination.

Admiral Locklear, we are naturally focused, as we have been for quite a while, on the alignment of forces in Okinawa. But I want to state my own opinion and ask you your reaction. Regardless of what developments occur regarding the alignment of our forces, it is essential that all parties in the region and particularly the people of Japan know that America's commitment to their security is strong and unbreakable. Do you agree with that?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Absolutely, sir. Our alliance with Japan is the cornerstone of our strategy in the Pacific, of our friendships, of our future in the Pacific, and if I am confirmed, it will remain a priority and remain the cornerstone.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Well, thanks for that answer. I agree with you. This is another classic case of how you sometimes run the risk of taking your best friends for granted when things are happening elsewhere or you are making new friends. But in fact, over the last decade, the United States and Japan have reached a number of very significant agreements to develop our bilateral security relationship and to share missions and capabilities within the alliance, including areas such as air and missile defense.

I wonder if you would take just a moment to give your opinion on the importance of those agreements as you assume command of the Pacific Command?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Yes, sir. Those agreements are very important. I am quite proud of the relationship we have with Japan particularly in relation to the exposure I have had to the area of ballistic missile defense developments and their participation, their partnership that will allow us to more rapidly move into the future with capabilities that are critical not only to this region but globally.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Let me move briefly to the South China Sea, which you have already been asked about and also the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. I wanted specifically to ask you, because you have said you support ratification of the convention, to relate the convention to—well, to the competing claims that are now being made for various rights on and under the South China Sea.

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Yes, sir. Well, in general, my understanding is that we as a Nation, we as a military, we conform to the basic premises that are inside the Law of the Sea today. However, because we have not ratified it, when we approach a region such as the South China Sea, which has the potential for miscalculation, if the responsible parties here do not go through the normal rule of law to solve these kind of frictions, that if we are not a signatory,

to some degree it lessens our credibility as we try to help them work through this. This is not only in the South China Sea but I think it will become increasingly important globally as people look for resources and competing claims in oceans around the world.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Okay. I appreciate that answer.

But I want to talk for a moment about the so-called 'pivot' to the Asia-Pacific, which is a term I do not like because it suggests we have not been in the Asia-Pacific and we are going to turn our back presumably on the Middle East where we have been. We cannot turn our back on either. And of course, we have been in the Asia-Pacific since the end of the Second World War, and the security that we have provided has, in my opinion, been the foundation or the underpinning of the extraordinary economic growth that has occurred there and, in some sense, the development of nations that we now focus on as we think about the security relationship or arrangements there.

Of course, this gets specifically to China. And I wanted to invite you to talk about your opinion about what is the current status of our relationship with China and where do you hope to bring it in your time at PACOM. In other words, is China a hostile power to us? Is it a competitor? Is it a partner? What is it and what do you hope it will be?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, yes, Senator. First, I fully agree that since World War II, our security posture in that part of the world has underpinned much of the progress that has been made not only in the military area but in all areas of progress with our allies, our partners, and in some ways China.

Today I would say that our partnership with China, which we should have a partnership—and we do in many, many areas, not just militarily, but our partnership I would categorize as cooperative but competitive. We are an Asian power. We are a Pacific power. We are a global power. We have interest in that part of the world. And I believe that the Chinese and other people in that part of the world need to recognize that we do have U.S. national interests there and we have the interests of strong allies there. So I would call it cooperative but competitive.

In the area of military-to-military, which I think is important that we continue to pursue productive military-to-military relationships between our military and the Chinese military. That is so we can gain greater clarity and greater transparency as the world evolves, as the region evolves. So if I am confirmed, it will be my plan to, in every way possible, improve our mil-to-mil relationships with a recognition that there are things we will not agree on. That greater transparency is for the good of all of us to avoid miscalculation. But in the end, the objective is a secure, stable environment that allows our allies, our partners, and China, which should be a partner, to have the best security environment to allow us to grow economically, socially together into a better world.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thanks again for that answer.

Incidentally, when I talk about the American security presence in the Asia-Pacific region underpinning the economic growth that has occurred there in the last several decades, it is important to state also that we have benefitted tremendously from that economic growth. Do not hold me to it, but I believe I saw a number

just recently that said that \$1.2 trillion of American commerce travels through the South China Sea every year. So you get some sense of the benefit here and the extraordinary impact it has on our economy and on jobs here as well.

My time is up. I thank you very much, and I look forward to working with both of you in the time ahead.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Lieberman.

Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, let me thank both of you for the personal time you gave me, and we had a chance to go over almost everything that I would ask you today except for one thing, which I will in just a moment.

General Bostick, the Army Corps has done a pretty good job on the 404 permits under the Clean Water Act. And I would ask you if you would continue to try to expedite those permits as well as you can.

General BOSTICK. Senator, if confirmed, I will certainly look at the permits that are associated with the Clean Water Act and ensure that the Corps works as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Senator INHOFE. That is good.

Also, Senator Levin talked about the Great Lakes and we have talked about all these waterways. Will you not forget the Nation's most inland waterway that goes into Oklahoma, the Kerr-McClellan waterway?

General BOSTICK. Senator, as we have discussed, once confirmed, I will make a trip out there and make sure that I understand the issues surrounding that particular project.

Senator INHOFE. Well, I would appreciate that. I am not asking for that commitment, but I would like to have you become familiar with that.

Right now we are considering the reauthorization of the highway bill. It comes from part of that. At least the highway title comes in my committee where I am the ranking member. But we also have jurisdiction over the WRDA bill, the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). Do you have any idea when we might get something from the administration on a WRDA bill?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I do not have any knowledge of when a WRDA bill might come out.

Senator INHOFE. We can talk about that later.

Now, Admiral Locklear, I enjoyed very much meeting your beautiful wife and two beautiful daughters, and if you guys are going to reach my number of 20, you are going to have to get very busy, as we discussed.

But let me, first of all—I understand the way this goes. You were nominated by the President. You are going to have to assume the President, who is the Commander in Chief—his line. This always happens. It has happened ever since I have been on here. I do not know where you really are personally and I do not want to know. I do not want you to answer.

But as far as the Law of the Sea Treaty is concerned, you know, there are a lot of us. I have been fighting that since the Reagan administration. It has not really changed any. To have the United Nations pay an international body, which sometimes they deny it,

but it is the United Nations, gets royalties from offshore drilling, a body that would have some—we would have one vote out of 160 and distribute funds as it sees fit to the Nations it chooses. And I often wonder whatever happened to sovereignty. And I can tell you right now the idea of handing over our offshore technology to other countries, any country who wants it, I think is unreasonable. And so there is going to be opposition to that.

Now, having said that, let me get to a friendlier issue here.

I remember so well back in 1998—that was during the Clinton administration. That was when they were talking about the capability, at that time, of North Korea in terms of when they would have something that would be a threat to the United States. And I remember at that time General Shelton was in charge, and I wrote a letter to President Clinton and to General Shelton. How long would it be until the North Koreans have the capability of a multiple stage rocket that they would be able to use against the United States? The answer at that time was—we had two letters. One said 3 years; the other said 5 years. 7 days later on the 31st of August 1998, they fired one. It was a three-stage rocket. Only two of them worked, but nonetheless, that happened.

I could take a long time and talk about how we have guessed it wrong with them over a long period of time.

How confident are you in the intelligence that we are getting right now, considering that all of a sudden there is a wake-up call and the American people realize there is a threat out there? How confident are you with our intel into North Korea in terms of their capabilities?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, Senator, again, I will consult, if I am confirmed, with General Thurman about this important issue. I believe I understand that he has and his predecessors have said for some time that there is a need for more intelligence and surveillance assets to be able to understand and to shape what may be the future on that critical part of the Asia-Pacific.

As far as the intelligence community, my sense is that we have a better understanding than we probably did in 1998 of their emerging capabilities. But it is a very closed society and it is one that we need to work very carefully with, and I will do that, if I am confirmed, with all of the intelligence agencies that can bring capabilities to bear to help me understand so that I can help you understand where the shortfalls are.

Senator INHOFE. Okay. Well, let us stay on top of that one.

In the last minute and a half of my time here, I would like to renew, as I always do at these confirmation hearings, my four favorite programs, and we would like to get your opinion. Actually five. And that would be the 1206, 1207, 1208 programs, train and equip the SPP. That is the State Partnership Program. And then, of course, more important than the rest of them or as important is the IMET program. Would you comment on each of those five programs relative to your support for those programs?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Yes, sir. The ones that were related, 1206, 1207, 1208, and IMET, I fully support. I know that from my introduction thus far into what is happening in the Pacific Command today, 1206 is a critical aspect of our ability to help train and pre-

pare our allies and partners for the counterterrorism operations which are critical to not only their security but our security.

I can tell you that from the job I am in now in Europe and Africa where I spend a lot of time visiting our U.S. ambassadors, the IMET program is essential from their perspective. It has been over my experience one of the most powerful tools where it allows us to bring officers and other leaders from these other countries into our training systems and to socialize with them and to bring them into our value system and have them understand how we operate. Critical to the future and I believe, for the amount of money, a great return on investment.

Senator INHOFE. Yes, I do too. In your last—your current, I should say, position where you have the naval operations over AFRICOM, certainly those countries down there—I am glad we got beyond the point where we thought we were doing a favor to these countries out there who are participating in this program. In fact, they are doing us a favor because I think we need to get into the record and understand—and I am sure you agree—that if we do not develop those relationships that are enduring through the IMET program, China will do it. Other countries will do it. And so I think it has been very successful not just in Africa. I am the ranking member on the Far Eastern Pacific side of the committee on Foreign Relations. So I am concerned about continuing that program in your new assignment.

And I look forward to supporting both of your nominations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Senator Akaka.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Aloha to the two outstanding leaders we have before us today and also to your families.

First, I would like to thank you each for your many years of dedicated service to our country and what you have done already with our country.

Admiral Locklear, it was nice meeting with you earlier this week, and I appreciated hearing your thoughts on the tremendous responsibilities you will assume, should you be confirmed as the next PACOM commander. You have shown outstanding leadership throughout your career, including significant time in the Pacific theater. And I would like to congratulate you and your wife and your family because your family does support you, and welcome also Pam and Jenny and Jillian to our hearing today.

I also want to welcome General Bostick. As a former member of the Corps, I appreciate the efforts of the men and women who serve in this very important organization. Of course, I want to welcome your wife Renee and aloha to your son Joshua as well.

Admiral Locklear, piracy is one of the problems out there. With the President's new strategy, the Navy will be deploying four ships to Singapore, I understand. The Strait of Malacca is one of the world's most important shipping lanes, accounting for a third of the world's trade and half of the petroleum imports of Japan, Taiwan, Korea, and China. The strait is also one of the world's most dangerous maritime chokepoints and a hot spot for transnational crime.

My question to you, Admiral, is how do you see our forces working to secure this critical region?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, thank you, Senator. I have transited the Straits of Malacca on Navy ships many times in my career, and your assessment is exactly right. It can be an exciting transit. It is a critical chokepoint and it can be highly vulnerable to such things as piracy.

We have seen, obviously, over the past number of years the impact that piracy can have in many areas of the world and that it is not just located off the Horn of Africa. It is actually spreading north and have seen it spread north into the Indian Ocean. We have seen some instances of it in the South China Sea.

So if you take a look at the rebalancing strategy, I believe that it starts to help us address this in a better way. First of all, it starts to recognize that we do have security interests that are not just in the north of Asia and that we have to be aware of. It allows us to partner with our allies and our partners in that region to be able to better coordinate together to give us better maritime domain awareness.

You alluded to the possibility of putting some U.S. ships in and out of Changyi and Singapore. Singapore is a tremendous partner with the United States and has worked very closely with—as has other of our countries and allies in that region to be able to provide us collectively the ability to have a better maritime lane awareness and a better response capability for anti-piracy activities. And I hope to see that continue and to grow as we move forward with a rebalancing strategy.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Admiral.

General Bostick, there is a critical need in Hawaii and the U.S. Pacific territories for public infrastructure to support the waterborne commerce these islands rely upon to protect vulnerable coastal communities and to preserve unique environmental resources. Therefore, I am concerned by the Honolulu district's challenges in competing for Army Corps construction funds. Under current Army Corps policy, projects are favored that support large population bases and are not subject to the high construction costs.

If confirmed, would you be willing to look into this issue and possibly identify a more equitable policy which addresses the needs of these insular areas?

General BOSTICK. Senator, if confirmed, you have my commitment to look at that. As I understand the Corps' process in setting priorities, it is performance-based, and performance is based on a number of things. They have got nine different business lines, including navigation, coastal restoration, risk management, and other areas. I will look into that with the Corps. I will discuss it with the Honolulu district and ensure that all that we do is fair and equitable and done in a cost efficient and effective manner.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you.

Admiral Locklear, the U.S. relationships with Japan and South Korea help to form the basis for regional stability in the Asia-Pacific region. I know that you have touched on it in response to Senator Lieberman, but should you be confirmed, what would you like to accomplish with respect to these key allies?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, first of all, if I am confirmed, I would like for them to, first of all, understand that I realize the importance of our alliance and the criticality of our partnerships in that alliance and the importance of it to the security of the Asia-Pacific region.

Second of all, I would like to make sure that as we look at this rebalancing strategy that I can properly articulate what we are doing, how we are doing it, and the benefits of it as it relates to our alliances with those two critical allies.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Akaka.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Admiral. Thank you, General, for your service and all that you do for us.

Admiral Locklear, I wanted to ask what is your assessment of the *Virginia*-class submarine program, how has this *Virginia*-class submarine performed, and also what sort of capability will the littoral combat ship provide you as the PACOM Commander, and how important are both capabilities to our National security interests in the Asia-Pacific and around the world.

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, thank you, Senator.

The *Virginia*-class submarine is the backbone of our attack submarine force today. It provides us worldwide coverage in covert ways. It is a critical element of any combatant commander's higher-end campaigns or campaign planning, whatever that might be. So I think it has performed well and we should all be very proud of the crews and the men and, at some point in time, the women who will serve in those submarines.

The littoral combat ship is just now coming on line, and that ship will bring to the combatant commander and, if confirmed, hopefully to the PACOM Commander a high-speed, very versatile ship that has minimum draft, which means we can get into more shallow areas, more littoral areas, with reconfigurable mission bays that allow us to more quickly address a variety of missions, mission sets, than perhaps other ships that we have built over the decades. So it is an important aspect, and I think that they are particularly well suited to the littoral areas particularly around the straits and in the South China area.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you so much for your assessment of the *Virginia*-class submarine and littoral combat ships.

So I wanted to ask you—and I share your assessment of those ships and appreciate your sharing that with us.

I wanted to ask you about the Department of Defense has repeatedly said that strategy is driving the budget guidance and not just a pure numbers exercise because we have seen in the past where we just do a pure numbers exercise and we are not driven by strategy. We really put our National security at stake when we do that. And I hope that is the case this time, but I am concerned about what I see as a mismatch between our stated national security objectives and a portion of the Pentagon budget proposal.

You talked about the importance of, for example, the *Virginia*-class submarine as a backbone and a critical element to our National security, but also if you look at—and also the importance of

the littoral combat ship. But in the future year—you also described the importance of this in the future year defense plan.

So I would ask you why would the Navy postpone the acquisition of one *Virginia*-class submarine given the importance of it, particularly our focus on the Asia-Pacific. And also why would the Navy reduce the purchase of two littoral combat ships? And what is the strategic rationale for these reductions?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, Senator, in my current position, I have not been part of the budget deliberations, and I cannot tell you that I know exactly what is in the President's budget as it will be delivered.

But in my previous roles, I have done programming for the Navy and strategy development for the Navy, and we always start with a strategy-based approach, which is the right thing to do to see what it is that we would all like to have. And then we recognize pragmatically that the American people will be able to afford so much. And then there are decisions made that force us to have to manage risk. So if I am confirmed, I will assure you that I will identify to you where I think when those decisions are made that I have identified where the risks are unacceptable for me.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, thank you, Admiral. I obviously hope that we are not taking on additional risk as a result of these decisions in terms of our National security, and I hope when you get in the position—and I do expect you to be confirmed and appreciate your wonderful credentials and serving—that you will consult back with us and provide me with a more detailed answer on how you think the reduction in the production of the *Virginia*-class submarine or postponement of it and the littoral combat ships affects our national security and what your assessment is of the risk of this portion of the Pentagon budget. So I hope you could circle back with me on that.

Admiral LOCKLEAR. If I am confirmed, I will, ma'am.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you very much, Admiral. I appreciate that.

I also wanted to ask, Admiral—I certainly was pleased to see in your responses in the advance policy questions your testimony about the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command. This is, obviously, a very important issue. I recently had the opportunity to meet with Major General Tom, the Commander of JPAC, in January. And as you know, the recovery operations in North Korea are set to resume later this year, and I applaud that development. Most Korean War veterans and their spouses are now in their 80s, and the Veterans Administration has said that close to 1,000 Korean War veterans who served during the conflict, unfortunately, leave us every day. So we cannot wait any longer to resume this critical work.

JPAC is identifying and recovering the remains of 80 to 90 Americans per year. As you know, in the 2010 NDAA, it requires the Secretary of Defense to ensure sufficient resources are allotted to increase the recovery rate to 200 a year. I appreciate that there are many factors that will go into determining how to reach the goal of 200 recoveries a year. Will you commit to fully supporting the work of the Joint POW/MIA Accountability Command and doing all

you can to ensure that we can meet that goal and, obviously, supporting General Tom in his efforts?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Senator, if I am confirmed, I fully commit to supporting that critical program.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you. Thank you very much. I see that your time is up.

I also wanted to just say to General Bostick—as you know, in Hanover, New Hampshire, we have the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Lab. And the New England district and the Cold Regions Research Engineering Lab have done great work. Please let me know, as you go forward, what I can do to support their excellent efforts and your efforts in that regard. Thank you, General.

General BOSTICK. If confirmed, I will. That is a positive movement for the Corps.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you very much.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

Senator McCaskill.

Senator MCCASKILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly do not want to diminish the U.S. Pacific Command in any way, but we have a lot of floods in Missouri. So I hope you will forgive me, Admiral, if I direct my questions during this time to General Bostick because his job is very, very important to thousands of Missouri families that live along our greatest rivers in this country.

Let me start, General Bostick, about the Missouri River Recovery Program currently in the budget—let me just start with this question. Do you agree that the number one priority for the Army Corps of Engineers is flood management?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I would say the number one priority is the protection of life and some of that will be in flood management. Some of it will be in other areas. But protection of life and safety and risk management.

Senator MCCASKILL. And I am not aware of where there is a significant risk to life in terms of the Army Corps' responsibilities aside from flooding, which is obviously very important to my State and all of the people who live along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Obviously, protection of property comes in behind protection of life.

So I guess I am—and maybe this is something you can explain, and if you cannot today, I will look forward to a follow-up. In the Missouri River Recovery Program right now in the budget, there is \$5 million for flood management and north of \$70 million for habitat. And that discrepancy, that disparity in terms of the priorities of the Army Corps is like fingernails on a blackboard to most Missouri families, particularly those who live and have land along our great rivers. And I would like you to comment on that and if you believe that is an appropriate disparity between flood management and habitat or whether you think that is out of whack because I guarantee you that is what most of the folks I work for think.

General BOSTICK. Senator, if confirmed, I would have to follow up with you on the details of the flood management and how that varies with the habitat.

What I will say is that the Corps has done extensive studies into what happened this last year with the floods, particularly along the

Missouri, made an assessment. There was a lot of damage that was done, and the Congress appropriated \$1.7 billion in the supplemental. I do not know how much of that will break down in terms of repairing the systems in the Missouri, but I know that the Corps is committed to repairing those as quickly as possible. And if confirmed, I will look into the specifics of the issue that you brought up here today.

Senator MCCASKILL. Well, I am confident that you will be confirmed, and I will look forward to some time with you to talk about that discrepancy. I can assure you that the members of the Missouri delegation that represent our State here, along with the other Senators along the Missouri River—and by the way, the interesting thing along the Missouri River—I do not know what it is about the water of the Missouri, but almost every State in the Missouri River basin has one Republican and one Democrat representing them in the

United States Senate. It is a very bipartisan group, this Missouri River Working Group, that Senator Blunt and I, along with Senator Conrad and Hoeven, have gotten started. And now, rather than working north versus south, which as you may know, the historic fight has been navigation and irrigation up north versus—excuse me—recreation and irrigation up north versus navigation down south. We are now singing Kumbaya. We have joined hands and are united for flood control. And I think you will hit a real brick wall if there continues to be that kind of discrepancy in terms of the priority of funding going forward.

Birds Point was blown, as you know. Now we have switched over to the Mississippi. It was very controversial. All of us opposed the blowing of Birds Point. It was at 62.5 feet before it was blown. So far, the Army Corps has only rebuilt it to 55. I need a commitment from you today, General, or as soon as you can give it to me, if you are not comfortable giving it today, that it will get rebuilt to 62.

General BOSTICK. Senator, if confirmed, you have my commitment that I will work with the Corps of Engineers and ensure that they work as quickly as possible using the funds appropriated by the Congress to do the repairs that are necessary.

Senator MCCASKILL. Well, that is a great answer except it was not the answer I was looking for. I need to know from you—and I need to know before my vote on you—whether or not you will make the commitment that what the Army Corps blew up they will put back to the way it was before they blew it up. And that will be one I will not be able to wait until your confirmation on. I need to know before your confirmation your feelings about that levee being built back up to the place it was before the Army Corps decided to blow it. That will be important to me, just so you know.

Finally, I want to briefly talk with you, General. There seems to be a sense that if we are not earmarking in the U.S. Senate, the Army Corps will be ill-equipped to address the priorities of flood control and management along all of our great waterways in this country. Let us assume for purposes of this discussion—let me give you a hypothetical.

If individual Members of Congress were not injecting their priorities within the priorities that the engineers had determined were the best cost-benefit analysis for all of the uses of the rivers and

the most important in terms of protection of property and protection of life, would the Army Corps be able to prioritize the funds given to them in a way that would address the most urgent needs of our waterways as opposed to who sits on the Water Appropriations Committee deciding that their State deserved more just because they were senior ranking member or the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water?

General BOSTICK. Senator, in my view, the Corps works for the American people who express their views through the Congress. The Corps works for the National Command Authority, the Secretary of Defense, and the President. And the Corps has to do that work for those two bodies under the laws that are written. While doing so, the Corps can prioritize projects through performance-based, but I think each one of those bodies and our law have responsibilities to ensure that when those priorities are set by the Corps of Engineers, they fit within the expressed desires of the people through Congress and the National Command Authority.

Senator MCCASKILL. Well, since you all do priorities based on performance-based measurement and on engineering studies and on safety and flood control and you have those priorities, would you not agree, General, that just because a Member happens to be the senior on a subcommittee of appropriations does not mean that their priority should substitute for a performance evaluation throughout the whole country?

General BOSTICK. Senator, as I had stated earlier, the Corps can only execute what is authorized and appropriated by Congress. Determining which Member and whether they are senior or not—that is really not what the Corps is responsible to make decisions on. At this point, I cannot make a personal decision one way or the other on your question. But I can say that the Corps will execute what the Congress authorizes and appropriates.

Senator MCCASKILL. I think, obviously, this is a delicate problem you face and I put you on the spot here and I apologize. I have done it more than once in these questions. I know that I have. I will continue to follow up with you.

Just when I examine the water budgets that have been done around this place—my State has a lot of water. We have the two mightiest rivers, the confluence of those rivers. The management of those rivers is very important. It is as important as rural airports are to my friend from Alaska. But if our State is not fortunate enough to have a member on the right appropriations committee, then frankly we get to the back of the bus, not based on merit, not based on need, but just based on who is on what committee and how long they have been here and what party they belong to. And it seems to me a very backwards way to prioritize the resources of managing our rivers in this country, and I wanted to make that point while I had the chance.

Thank you both very much for your service, and thank you for your patience, General Bostick, and my very pointed questions.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator McCaskill.

Senator Graham.

Senator GRAHAM. General Bostick, are you sure you want this job? [Laughter.]

General BOSTICK. Senator, I am sure.

Senator GRAHAM. Well, you know, what Senator McCaskill is saying has got a lot of truth to it, that we need to spend taxpayer dollars wisely with some kind of plan. But I have been here for about an hour and you have been asked about 35 specific things that people would like you to do before you get confirmed, which makes me believe that we seem to know our States better than maybe other people do because I do not know about this thing you blew up. She wants you to build it back. I assume she knows what she is talking about, and I would support it. Is that an earmark to rebuild something you blew up?

Senator MCCASKILL. No. To fix what was blown up by them is not an earmark especially when they made a commitment to do so when they blew it up.

Senator GRAHAM. All right. So the point is that we are trying to fix an old problem with a new way of doing business, and I just feel for you.

The Panama Canal is going to be widened in 2014. Is that correct, General Bostick?

General BOSTICK. Sir, I understand that it will be widened in 2014.

Senator GRAHAM. And the ships on the sea today are going to be replaced by ships almost three times their size. Is that correct?

General BOSTICK. I understand that to be true, Senator.

Senator GRAHAM. So if you widen the Panama Canal and these super cargo ships can come directly to the east coast, that means we have to look at our infrastructure on the east coast anew. Is that correct?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I would say we have to look at our infrastructure across the country.

Senator GRAHAM. Do we have a plan to deal with the widening of the Panama Canal and how it would affect infrastructure in the Nation to make sure we can export our products to the market? Is there a national vision to deal with the changes in shipping? Is there an administration plan or congressional plan that you know of?

General BOSTICK. Sir, I cannot answer whether there is or is not a plan.

Senator GRAHAM. Well, I can tell you there is not, and that reflects badly on us all.

So to my colleagues, shipping as we know it is about to change. Earmarking is a very parochial endeavor that does not allow you to look beyond your local interest. But if you just withdraw from the game and your port like Charleston gets no money in the budget and you think it should be considered based on a merit-based system, what do you do?

So I would just say you have been beat up a lot, but I am going to beat up myself and my colleagues. We have absolutely no vision as a Nation as to how to deal with the change in shipping. And that is just one infrastructure change.

So I would suggest that we all sit down with this administration and come up with a game plan and say what does it mean if the ships are going to be three times the size they are today coming through the Panama Canal. What does it mean to the Mississippi River? Do you have to widen the Mississippi River because you are

going to have more barge traffic? Can every port on the east coast go to 50 feet, which is the minimum requirement to service these ships 24/7? And if every port cannot, who says no? And if you are not lucky enough to get in the President's budget, what are you supposed to do? Go home to your people and say sorry, we just lost, cannot help you. I just do not think these are good responses to real problems.

The Great Lakes. If it is the largest shoreline in the Nation, somebody should come up—how do you deal with the largest shoreline in the Nation? How does it fit into the change in export opportunity? The President says he wants to double exports in the next 5 years. Count me in. How the hell do you get your products to the market? What do you do when shipping changes? Does it affect transportation? Does it mean you have got to have more roads for trucks?

So there is no vision in this country, and I pledge to you, General Bostick, not just to complain but to sit down and work with you to come up with a merit-based system that would allow the Congress and the administration in a collaborative fashion to get ahead of what is going to be a major change in our economy. Rather than just talking about how bad earmarks are and how dirty the Congress is, I want to do a little more than that. I want to actually bring a solution.

So if you do not like earmarking and you think it is corrupting—and there is a case to be made—what have you done to fix it? What have you done to solve the problem of a world changing and America being left behind?

Have you ever been to the Shanghai port, General Bostick?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I have not.

Senator GRAHAM. You need to go and go visit our ports and see the difference.

So I enjoyed talking to you. [Laughter.]

To be continued.

Now, the Charleston port—you are familiar with that. Right?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I am.

Senator GRAHAM. They tell me it is going to take till 2024 to get the harbor deepened to accept these new cargo ships if funding stays the same. Is that okay with you?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I have not seen the plan, but it seems like an awfully long time.

Senator GRAHAM. You know why I think it is an awfully long time to go from 45 to 50 feet? It is three times longer than it took to build the Panama Canal itself. We built the Panama Canal shorter than it would take us to go from 45 to 50 feet in the Port of Charleston.

So we have got a lot to talk about in the Port of Charleston. You have been great to help us get into the work plan. And it is just not the Port of Charleston. It is the Port of Savannah. We are going to sit down and talk about a merit-based system, and I need your input and I need my colleagues to do more than complain about the old system. If you want merit-based decisions, we need to come up with a system that gets us there. And I am willing to help anybody to get there, Republican, Democratic, Libertarian, vegetarian.

Now, Admiral, are you familiar with sequestration plans of the Congress?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I did not hear the question, Senator.

Senator GRAHAM. Are you familiar with the plan of the Congress regarding sequestration?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I am generally familiar with the law and what it would entail.

Senator GRAHAM. Well, how do you feel about it?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, I believe the Secretary of Defense has properly articulated it would be devastating.

Senator GRAHAM. Devastating, dumb. We would be shooting ourselves in the head. It would be a Navy without ships, without sailors, brigades without bullets, air wings without trained pilots. Do you agree with that assessment?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I agree with that assessment.

Senator GRAHAM. Do you have any idea why we continue to want to go down that road? I mean, I do not. I am just asking you.

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I do not have an opinion on that.

Senator GRAHAM. So you are going to be the head of the Pacific Command, and you are telling the members of this committee that if we execute sequestration on top of the \$487 billion that we are already trying to cut, we will be devastating the United States Navy's capability to defend this Nation?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I would say it is not just the Navy but across all the—

Senator GRAHAM. So we would be devastating our military. Thank you for your candid testimony because I could not agree with you more.

Now, China. That is your theater of operations. Right? Is China engaged in a sustained effort of cyber attacks against this country's defense infrastructure? Is the Peoples Liberation Army engaged in cyber attacks against this country?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Senator, I do not have direct knowledge that I would share in this forum about the—

Senator GRAHAM. It is widely believed they are.

Would you agree with this? And this will be my last question. If the Peoples Liberation Army of China is engaged in cyber attacks against this country to steal our defense infrastructure, our trade secrets, our national security information, would you consider such activity, if it did occur, a hostile act against the United States? And would it be legitimate for us under the law of war to respond in kind?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I would only be speculating whether I would—to give you a legal opinion at this point in time.

Senator GRAHAM. Forget about that. From a military commander's point of view, if our Nation is being attacked in a cyber fashion against our defense infrastructure, do you consider that a hostile act as a military commander?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Yes, sir, certainly an act against the best interests of our—

Senator GRAHAM. Can you get with me about whether or not you consider it a hostile act and whether or not we have the right to respond in kind and whether or not we should?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Senator, I would say certainly the activity is hostile. Whether it fits in the category—

Senator GRAHAM. You can get back with me.

Admiral LOCKLEAR.—of an exact hostile act, I need to give you a legal opinion on that because, as you know, there are legalities in warfare that we would have to categorize that. But certainly it tends in that direction.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Graham.

Senator Begich.

Senator BEGICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It has actually been somewhat enlightening, this process and testimony so far. I want to say to both the General and Admiral thank you very much for your willingness to participate in what I am learning here. I am making a list of every demand that members have of you or they will not give you your confirmation. The problem is if you are not confirmed, those demands cannot happen. Maybe there is a disconnect, but also that is the old way, in my view, of doing business around this place.

So I have questions. I want you to get in the service of the positions that you are being nominated for because we want to work with you to make things happen.

But I made this shopping list that everyone has requested of you or demanded of you, which I think is somewhat amazing.

I want to just make a comment and I hope maybe the chairman and we could consider something in the future on the Law of the Sea because there was a comment from my good friend from Oklahoma earlier. We do a lot of work on issues together. He comes from an oil and gas State like I do. But there is a lot of misinformation out there on the Law of the Sea. I mean, the fact is there are only three countries that have not signed on: North Korea, Libya, and Iran, and us. Now, maybe I am confused, but I do not think so. Those are people I do not want to hang out with. I think the Law of the Sea from where it affects the most, Alaska, is an important part of our long-term national security, national economic opportunities, and a huge undiscovered resource up there in a variety of ways.

And so I appreciate our conversation, Admiral, regarding your understanding of the importance of it from a national security perspective, and I hope maybe we could have a further discussion because it is a national security issue if we are not part of the equation. And to be frank with you, I am not real interested hanging out with North Korea and Iran and Libya in regards to our not signing on.

So it is more of a comment, but I think there is a lot of misinformation up there in regards to how the revenue streams would work, what our sovereignty is, and the rule of law that we would be able to operate under. So it is more of a comment. I again want to thank you for your comment in support of that.

Let me, if I can, Admiral. Obviously, from Alaska and now especially the pivot to the Asian-Pacific priority or at least an enhanced priority, I should say, for the area and for PACOM and the importance at least from my perspective, Alaska, Hawaii. These are strategic if we are upping our ante in the Asia-Pacific area. Can you give me your comments on the importance of these somewhat for-

ward basing but also some of the critical pieces of missile defense and other from Alaska's perspective?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Yes, sir, I can. I had the privilege in a previous command of serving as the 3rd Fleet Commander, which is in command of all the naval forces that are in the eastern Pacific. So I am quite familiar with the implications of Hawaii, of the west coast of the United States, the Pacific Northwest, as well as Alaska.

First of all, you know, as a mariner, you look at the globe and you look at it as a globe and you see the world in great circles not in straight lines. So if you take a look at the geography of where you are when you are in Alaska, you really are very close and very significantly positioned geographically on the northern periphery of the PACOM, Pacific-Asia AOR. And it is critical not only from a ballistic missile defense perspective but also for the strategic positioning of forces to be able to have forces that are well supported inside the United States but at the same time are close enough to be able to be relevant in a short-term, quick-reaction requirement that we could have if our security interests are threatened in the Asia-Pacific.

I had some time on the east coast, and if you look at the Atlantic, it takes you about the same time to go from Charleston, SC, on a ship to Portsmouth, England as it does to go from San Diego to Hawaii. So you start to see this strategic position of that island chain and our other island chains that we deal with as we move forward.

So all of these are critical to the overall rebalancing strategy, and I look forward, if I am confirmed, to making sure that is well articulated.

Senator BEGICH. Thank you very much.

The other one I would like to ask you—I know we talked a little bit about it. It is the Joint Pacific-Alaska Range Complex, JPARC, which is an important training facility. It has the largest air space and ground domain that anyone in the country can train in. Can you give me your thoughts of how that may play into PACOM and the work you are doing?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Yes, sir. That range, as do all of our ranges, are critical to our military's ability to be ready when we go forward. Protection of those ranges from encroachment, ensuring that we are allowed to access them for the type of training we need and training that we do in a responsible, environmentally respectful way—we can do that as a military, but that is very important for us as we send young men and women forward with these very well built, very sophisticated systems that we need to counter the type of threats we might have. We have to have places where they can rehearse. Some can be done synthetically but the range systems are very important to our overall national security strategy.

Senator BEGICH. Thank you very much.

General, thank you. My late father-in-law, who just passed away recently, was a colonel in the Corps. So I hear all the stories and heard all the stories. So I thank you for your service.

Alaska—you know, we love the Corps. You have got your own Alaska district up there because of the size. When my friend from Missouri talked about water, we understand water. We are not the State of 10,000 Lakes. We are the State of a million lakes. Three-

quarters of the coastline of this country is Alaska, and we have the Arctic which the Corps is now working on which is an amazing part of the equation.

So let me ask you a couple questions. One, this whole prioritization, which I understand how you have to dice the answer because if you do not have the money, you cannot do it, if you are not authorized. The big debate here is earmarks. That is why the water bill is where it is because some people think because we nominate projects in the water bill, it is an earmark. So we are in this quandary of how to move that bill forward. But that is your authorizing bill to do your projects. Other than that, it is then just the presidential list. So we are kind of in this stalemate.

I am very interested in what Senator Graham said in setting the metrics and trying to figure out, because you have multiple layers. You have flood control. You have habitat. In my State, flood control is important to a certain extent. Habitat I can tell you is very important when 60 percent of the fishing industry of this country in the sense of live catch is from Alaska, a huge business, also a huge employer. The Corps plays a role in that to ensure that we have a viable fishing industry in this country. So it is a very careful balance.

So I would be interested, because my time is limited here, to get your thoughts at a later time, kind of how you see us building some metrics that we can restrain ourselves but also do what is right for this country but also giving the input that we are hearing from our own constituents on needs in port development. For example, in my State, the Arctic—we are going to need a deep water port up there. There is no question about it. If we are not careful, we will be in dire straights not having that up there for a variety of reasons. But can you just give me a quick comment? I know my time has expired.

General BOSTICK. Well, I agree, Senator, with many of the points both you and Senator Graham raised on the National priorities and how do we get at a national set of priorities. And I think it is going to take governmental, nongovernmental, the administration, and State and local leaders working together to come to a consensus and a common vision on a way to move forward. And I look forward, if confirmed, to being part of that team and helping to serve as a catalyst to bring our team together with the other teams in order to address this issue.

Senator BEGICH. Thank you very much. I look forward to seeing you both, if possible, in Alaska. And General, I will follow up in a written one on—we have about 300 used defense sites. I am curious where they fit and the priorities. We can talk offline on that.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Begich. We may have a slightly different definition of coastline since we think we have either the longest or second longest coastline in the Great Lakes. But nonetheless—

Senator BEGICH. We will measure it.

Chairman LEVIN. You are either number one or number two.

Senator BEGICH. We like to consider ourselves number one. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. In any event, thank you, Senator Begich, for your contribution.

I agree with you, by the way, about the confirmation. These two gentlemen hopefully will be not only confirmed but promptly confirmed and the answers that they will be offering to questions for the record are, I hope, the only thing—in terms of their coming in, will be the only thing that will be between them and confirmation, not so much the substance of it, I hope, but just the speed with which you can get us the answers because I think your answers will be satisfactory and believe they will be.

Senator Chambliss.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I want to pick up where both Senator Graham and Senator Begich left off with respect to this issue, General Bostick, of trying to make sure that the President's Executive Order number 13534 issued back in 2010 does come to reality. And in that executive order, he said we need to have a national strategy for doubling U.S. exports by 2015. Well, if we do not get our act together at our ports, then not only are we not going to double our exports, we are going to have a hard time receiving imports with the ships that are going to be coming through the expanded Panama Canal at the end of 2014.

As you know, we have been working on the deepening project at Savannah Harbor for 10 years. 10 years we have been jumping through all of the hoops that we have to jump through, some dictated by the Corps, some by environmental requirements and what-not. And I am not saying whether all of that is necessary or not. But I know what is necessary, and what is necessary is getting to the end of the day and getting the port at Savannah—and I am very supportive of the port at Charleston and Jacksonville and all of our ports around the country—to have the capability of receiving those Panamax ships.

It is going to be extremely difficult under the process that have now, and the reason it is going to be difficult is because history dictates to us that every major Corps project is an earmark. That is the way it has always been. And we are having to change the process now in this post-earmark world. And I am not sure what the answer is either.

But Senator Graham and I have had this debate and conversation time and time again about how we do go forward and represent our respective parts of the country. And in fairness to the ports at Mobile and Jacksonville and L.A. and wherever, we have got to come up with a better solution than earmarks and, at the same time, we have got to recognize that priorities are going to have to be set.

At Savannah, we are now ready. You and I have talked a little bit earlier today. We have got a small tranche of Federal money that is going to be joined up with a commitment that has been made by our State, and a major commitment that has been made by our State, to hopefully begin the process at Savannah. We are the fastest growing container port in the Nation. Last year, 12.5 percent of all containers that came in the United States came through Savannah. And if we are not ready by 2014 for these Panamax ships, not only is the port at Savannah going to suffer,

but retailers throughout the whole east coast and manufacturers throughout the whole eastern part of the United States are going to suffer. So it is of critical importance that we address this issue, General Bostick, in the short term.

Now, you said in response to your advance questions the Nation must be prepared to take advantage of the opportunities with completion of the Panama Canal in 2014. Now, as Chief of Engineers, what will you do to ensure that projects of national significance such as the Savannah Harbor project are not subject to unnecessary delays and are completed in the timeliest manner as is possible?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I would agree with you and the other Senators that have talked about the urgency of the work that we have ahead of us. We do need a national strategy in a number of different areas, whether it is navigation, hydropower, economic, ecosystem revitalization, some of the aging infrastructure that we are dealing with. All of that requires priorities, and some of those priorities are going to be important at the National level and some will be very important at the local level. And I believe it is important for us to work as a team to sort out those priorities.

I think we have demonstrated throughout our history many times in the past that when we have a common vision, when we have all parties pulling together, when we have the funding, and when we change our business processes accordingly, and then work within the laws and regulations that bind us, that we can move things faster than we currently are. And I am committed to being part of the team that moves this forward.

Senator CHAMBLISS. We look forward to working with you on this. Obviously, I think all of us—we are concerned about it, but we do not have the answers. We need the Corps to be forward-thinking with respect to how we deal with this post-earmark world.

Admiral Locklear, the F-35 program was designed to replace the F-16, the A-10, the F/A-18 fighter planes as a new fifth generation, multi-role fighter, as you well know. The U.S. military's current top-of-the-line fighter is the F-22, the world's only fully operational fifth generation fighter. There have been less than 200 F-22's produced for the Air Force, and as you and I talked yesterday, 40 of those are in the PACOM AOR. According to recent defense strategic guidance, DOD is further slowing the acquisition and delivery of F-35's. And this issue of budget reduction and the potential for sequestration makes that very difficult.

Now, both China and Russia are developing fifth generation fighters: the J-20 and the Sukhoi PAK FA. Both these aircraft will be challengers and in some facets may be superior to U.S. fighters. There is also a strong possibility that these new fighters will not only be used by China and Russia but may be sold to other countries elsewhere in the Pacific theater. The J-20 and the Sukhoi PAK FA are likely to start entering service in significant numbers by the end of the decade, and both countries are capable of accelerating this acquisition timeframe by settling for alternative engines or a little lesser capability. The presence of these aircraft and our delay in modernizing our tactical aviation forces in the Pacific could possibly alter the balance of power in the PACOM region.

Now, Admiral, assuming you are confirmed, this will be your AOR and your airspace. And I know that the J-20 is a new airplane and we have little data on it at this point in time, but it does concern me personally that it flew its first flight test earlier than expected and that the U.S. intelligence community is predicting its IOC date may be at least 2 years earlier than originally predicted.

What I see happening at some point in the future is that options the United States currently has in terms of defending U.S. interests and providing deterrence to U.S. allies in the Pacific region may not be available. When those options are no longer available, it will fundamentally change the balance of power in your AOR.

I would appreciate your thoughts on this issue and your thoughts on what the U.S. needs to do to preserve its options and ability to defend U.S. interests in the region specifically in relation to maintaining air dominance.

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, Senator, a critical aspect of our ability to ensure our National interests and the interests of our allies and partners are well protected in this critical region is our ability to stay forward, just to be there. So as any other nation or nations pursue anti-access, area denial capabilities, which are some of the ones you are alluding to, it is critical that we do a couple things. One is that we understand what they are doing. Two is that we keep the systems that we have already invested in as well prepared to address those, and I think that we are doing that at this point in time. And then we have to look longer term are we pacing the threat not only in the air domain but in all other domains.

The F-22 you mentioned are critical to our ability at this point in time to stay forward. The F-35 will be a great addition to that. Certainly any slow-down of that forces the combatant commanders to have to take additional risk in their planning as we look forward. So it is important that if I am confirmed, that I help this committee and the leadership in the Department of Defense to stay focused on what we may be giving up if we do not proceed properly.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Well, thanks to both of you for your leadership, your service to our country. Thanks to your families for their commitment. And we look forward to your confirmation and look forward to working with both of you.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Chambliss.

Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Locklear, Lieutenant General Bostick, thank you both very much for being here and congratulations on your nominations. I share Senator Chambliss' hope that we will see very swift confirmations.

Admiral Locklear, I know that you are looking forward to your future command in the Pacific. And we had a chance to talk earlier this week a little bit about that.

But as subcommittee chair of the European Affairs Subcommittee on Foreign Relations, we have been looking with great interest towards what is going to happen at the NATO summit in Chicago. And as you and I discussed, one of the potential topics for discussion will be what happened in Libya and the lessons learned. And given your recent post at NATO, I wonder if you could talk

a little bit about what you think some of those lessons learned from the Libyan effort are.

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, first, even as we rebalance our strategy and we start to articulate the Asia-Pacific—our National interests there and our military priorities there, I think from my perspective it is important for us to recognize that our alliance in the NATO alliance is, first of all, a very strong alliance, a mature alliance. It is a large alliance and it has a lot of capability when you put it together and you put it together in a way where it comes together in a meaningful way.

In the case of the Libya operation, it was the first opportunity for NATO to be able to accomplish an alliance operation of that size in a very short period of time. It was a matter of days when they could take the operation from a U.S.-led coalition to a NATO-led coalition, and it is something that really has not been done in the history of NATO. So I think it started to show the flexibility of that alliance.

I think it has pointed out some areas where defense spending within the alliance needs to be expanded and some of the areas that they found that there were shortfalls where we had to rely maybe too heavily on one partner or one member of the alliance. But I think it was also an opportunity for those countries—because Libya was in the back yard of the NATO alliance, it was important for the leadership of key countries to step forward and to take responsibility, and they did that. And overall I think we gave the Libyan people a chance.

Senator SHAHEEN. As we are recognizing that every situation is different, every country is different, but do you think this provides one of the models that we ought to be looking at in the future as we face other threats to NATO?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, I am always hesitant to plan on the last event because it never proves right to do that. But I think it had elements of it that could help us forecast in the future. I think it does demonstrate the benefits of partners and building partner capacity which I think is critical to the long-term security of an increasingly globalized world. The more friends and allies and partners that we can have that we can understand, that we can interoperate with, that we have systems that have somewhat compatibility—but there were some amazing instances where we had countries in the NATO alliance that, you know, when I was born, would have never spoken to each other, that came together and were able to interoperate and to do some really, I think, quite significant things in the area of warfare in a very responsible and effective way. So from that regard, it can be a model I think.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

I know that the issue of the slowing of the building of *Virginia*-class subs has been raised already, but I wonder if you could talk about the unique capabilities that submarines provide in the Pacific region both in terms of traditional warfare and asymmetric warfare. As I think I probably mentioned, I represent the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard where they do a lot of work on *Virginia*-class subs. So we are following very closely what is going on with this issue.

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Well, globally our attack submarine force provide basically a critical element of our defense strategy both from their ability to operate forward for sustained periods, their ability to operate somewhat covertly for sustained periods, and their ability to bring significant combat power to bear, as well as their ability to bring significant intelligence and reconnaissance. So I think they are a key element of our joint force.

Certainly in the Asia-Pacific area because of the vastness of the area, the tyranny of distance, the size of the oceans, the size of the littorals—half the people in the world live in the Asia-Pacific. Most of the emerging economies are there, as we have already heard, most of the trade, the globalization of trade. In the Navy we are commonly heard to say 90 percent of everything that moves in the world moves in the oceans and through the littorals. What we do not say very often is in the last couple of decades that 90 percent has increased fourfold. So it is 90 percent of four times what it was a couple decades. So that is an indication and we are talking about the Panama Canal being expanded. So being able to have an effective understanding of what happens in that globalized environment I think is critical, and our submarines are a big part of that.

Senator SHAHEEN. And can you talk at all about the trajectory of our submarine capabilities versus Russia and China over the next 10 years? Do we have a sense of how we will compare?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. We build the best submarines in the world.

Senator SHAHEEN. I had no doubt about that.

Are they developing any technology that may rival ours?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I think that what has concerned me most over time is the proliferation of very quiet diesel or diesel-electric submarines and the proliferation of those around the world. I think today there are well over 300 of those types of submarines that are in the various parts of the world, some with friends and allies and partners, but some places where they are not. And the proliferation of those assets, even though they are locally distributed—I mean, they are not far-reaching and they don't leave generally the coastal areas of those country—they become area denial weapons, asymmetric area denial weapons, which as we have seen in North Korea where they used a mini-sub that was able to take out a—that was able to accomplish an attack there.

And so that does concern us and it concerns us not only as it relates to our own submarines' ability to counter that, but also the rest of our technology that has to be developed, whether it is our airborne sensors, whether it is our surface-borne sensors, whether it is our intelligence community to be able to keep track of what is happening inside these nations that are proliferating. So those are the things that concern me.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

I am out of time, but I wonder if I could ask Lieutenant General Bostick just one question. And I know my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator Ayotte, raised the importance of the Cold Regions Lab up in Hanover which does such great work. So I just want to echo that.

But one of the things that I have been very concerned about and I know that our military is also very concerned about is the number of engineers, science and technology professionals that we are

losing. By 2020, about 50 percent of them will be eligible for retirement. So can you talk a little bit about how you see being able to rebuild that STEM capacity within the Army? And as you think about the challenges facing the work that you will be taking on in our labs and other technical areas, how are we going to attract the engineers and the STEM professionals that we need for the future?

General BOSTICK. Senator, I think this is a very, very important point for the country. I sit on the advisory board up at West Point for the civil engineering department and for the systems engineering department. Even at the institution that was the first engineering school in the country, we have concerns about growing engineers.

But it really starts at a very young level. I mentioned that my wife is an elementary school teacher, and each time during the year I try to go to speak to the youngsters about the importance of engineering. I think that is where it starts. Our education in America must focus on science, technology, engineering, and math in a greater degree than we may be now, and to galvanize that interest in the young men and women so that we have a population to choose from to encourage them to study in this important area. We are going to need STEM specialists in every part of the country, and the Corps of Engineers will be part of the team that helps develop them.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you. I could not agree more with your comments, especially when it applies to early childhood education.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Shaheen.

Senator VITTER.

Senator VITTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to both of you for your dedication, for your lifetime of military and public service. We all appreciate that.

General Bostick, because of the enormous importance of the Corps to Louisiana, I will focus the conversation with you. And I also want to thank publicly the many, many fine men and women in the Corps, very talented, very dedicated, very bright.

But I also want to focus on a problem which is that the Corps, as a bureaucracy, as an organization, is really broken in fundamental ways, is really dysfunctional in fundamental ways. The average Corps project that gets done takes 20 years to get done. It is studied for 8-plus years, and that has grown over time. The Corps seems to be best at studying things, and over time, of course, costs go up. So limited resources never quite keep up. It is like a dog running after its tail. And those issues have only gotten worse in the last decade within the Corps in terms of that dysfunction and those problems.

What would be the top three specific reforms you would make if confirmed to fix that?

General BOSTICK. Senator, first, thanks for the compliments about the Corps employees. I think they are hard-working, dedicated professionals, and I have served with them in peace and combat. I deployed with the 1st Calvary Division and then help lead the Gulf Region Division, and I saw Corps military and civilian employees do things side by side with our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. So I am very, very proud of them.

As I look at the Corps—first, I talked about trust and building trust and understanding each of our issues and each of our concerns, whether it is national, local, State, government or non-governmental, is bringing the team together. I think the Corps' team has got to come together, and I think they have got a solid team. But making sure that the issues of all the teammates are understood.

I think we have to transform the Corps in terms of our programs, both military and civil. The Corps is working on that. I think they have to be aligned to the National priorities of this country. I believe we have a huge issue with aging infrastructure. Many of our hydropower plants are over 34 years old. The infrastructure along our levees and our dams, also very old and aging. Our navigation channels. We have over 900 that we are responsible for. 250 are maintained at any level, and of that 59 are top priorities that 90 percent of commercial traffic flow against. And of those 59, they are going to dredge to the depths and widths that they are authorized only 35 percent of the time. So the other issue is to focus on funding and how do we take the precious resources that we have and align them to the National priorities and achieve energy goals. And achieving the energy goals are very important.

And finally, I think our business processes. Sir, I think you saw in Louisiana that the Corps adjusted its business processes in addressing the issues after Katrina. And I think what happened there also is that the Nation had a common vision. It went after the post-Katrina with immediate funding, a common vision on what had to be done, and the Corps adjusted its business processes to make things happen. So it can be done, and I am convinced that it can be done, and I look forward to working with you on that.

Senator VITTER. General, right after Katrina, the Corps did adjust in part because of extraordinary authority and funding. I am here to tell you that the Corps has completely adjusted back. That phase, unfortunately, is done and the Corps has completely adjusted back to pre-Katrina organizational responses.

My question was about specific organizational reforms. What are your thoughts about your top three specific organizational reforms that you would implement to help fix this?

General BOSTICK. Well, first, I would look directly at the business processes and look at the business processes in military programs and civil works. I think with BRAC and what we have seen with base realignment and closure and what has happened on the military side to move BRAC 2005 along from design, bid, build processes to design, build has taken the contractor and brought them forward and moved things quickly. So I think those lessons learned and the lessons learned in Katrina that allowed for the rapid funding, allowed for some of the accommodations of NEPA, and allowed for the team to work together in a common vision—I think a business process from those two examples is what we need to do throughout the Corps with the agreement of Congress, the administration, and the American people.

I think energy goals remain important in this day and age. I am going to look at the energy security and energy sustainment and ensure that we are meeting the requirements of the American peo-

ple and the Nation, and looking at the aging infrastructure, as I talked about before, and prioritizing that to national priorities.

Senator VITTER. General, in the written questions that were submitted and answered before the hearing, one of the questions goes directly to this. In your view, does the Army Corps of Engineers need to make any changes in the way it operates, and if so, what changes would you recommend? And your answer was basically, if confirmed, you would consult with a lot of people and we could determine what, if any, changes are needed.

Are you really unsure that significant changes are needed as you answered in your written response?

General BOSTICK. I believe changes are needed, and I believe some of them are significant.

Senator VITTER. Okay. So you would amend this written response in that regard.

General BOSTICK. I have had time to think about this since I provided that response some time ago, and I believe that based on the things that we have seen and the time that I have been able to review this, that there are significant changes. Some changes require changes well outside the Corps, as you know. There are issues with funding. There are issues with the amount of risks we are willing to take, the amount of lawsuits that occur, the environmental requirements that are required by law. I think all of that has to be taken into consideration and changes in those areas, just as we were allowed to do post-Katrina, are the kind of changes I think that are necessary to move all of us along with a common vision.

Senator VITTER. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Vitter.

Just one additional question for you, Admiral, relating to our strong alliance with South Korea. There has been in the past a number of times when we said we were going to transfer the wartime situation that we were in to transfer the wartime operational control, or OPCON, from the United States to South Korea. That has been delayed again. It is scheduled now for December of 2015.

Would you agree that it is appropriate that the Republic of Korea assume operational control of its own forces during time of war?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. Mr. Chairman, I would agree and I would agree that the 2015 timeline appears to be moving in that direction from everything I have been told and that we seem to be on track for that. And I would support staying on track for that transition date.

Chairman LEVIN. I think it is important that we stick to that when we should have stuck to the earlier one, but that is now water over the dam. And so the 2015 date is now one that ought to be kept. And I am glad to hear your answer that it is your intention that we keep down that track—keep on that track.

Okay. We have come to the end of Senators' questions, and now let me ask you the standard questions which we ask of our nominees, which usually come before all of your other answers, but this time come afterward. These are the standard questions and you can answer together.

First, have you adhered to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I have.

General BOSTICK. I have.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you agree, when asked, to give your personal views, even if those views differ from the administration in power?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I do.

General BOSTICK. I will.

Chairman LEVIN. Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. No, sir.

General BOSTICK. No, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Will you ensure your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I will.

General BOSTICK. I will.

Chairman LEVIN. Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to congressional requests?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I will.

General BOSTICK. I will.

Chairman LEVIN. Will those witnesses be protected from reprisal for their testimony or briefings?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. They will.

General BOSTICK. They will.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this committee?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I do.

General BOSTICK. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. And 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 the committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Admiral LOCKLEAR. I will.

General BOSTICK. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. We thank you. We thank again your families. We are delighted to see them here and know how important they are in your lives and in the security of this country. And we look forward to a prompt confirmation and hope that you can get your answers for the record in promptly so we can proceed to vote on your confirmation here at a markup as soon as possible. Thank you both. Congratulations.

And we will stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the committee adjourned.]