

**ORR, ELKIND, SUH, AND BEAUDREAU
NOMINATIONS**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

TO

CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOMINATIONS: DR. FRANKLIN M. ORR, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY; MR. JONATHAN ELKIND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS), DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY; MS. RHEA S. SUH, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; AND MR. TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR (POLICY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET)

DECEMBER 12, 2013



Printed for the use of the
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

86-264 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2013

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

RON WYDEN, Oregon, *Chairman*

TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota	LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont	MIKE LEE, Utah
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan	DEAN HELLER, Nevada
MARK UDALL, Colorado	JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
AL FRANKEN, Minnesota	TIM SCOTT, South Carolina
JOE MANCHIN, III, West Virginia	LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii	ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico	JOHN HOEVEN, North Dakota
TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin	

JOSHUA SHEINKMAN, *Staff Director*

SAM E. FOWLER, *Chief Counsel*

KAREN K. BILLUPS, *Republican Staff Director*

PATRICK J. MCCORMICK III, *Republican Chief Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Beaudreau, Tommy P., Nominee to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Policy, Management and Budget)	15
Begich, Hon. Mark, U.S. Senator From Alaska	7
Elkind, Jonathan, Nominee to be Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs), Dept. of Energy	10
Feinstein, Hon. Dianne, U.S. Senator From California	4
Murkowski, Hon. Lisa, U.S. Senator From Alaska	2
Orr, Franklin M. Jr., Nominee to be Under Secretary For Science, Depart- ment of Energy	8
Suh, Rhea, Nominee to be Assistant Secretary of Fish and Wildlife, Depart- ment of the Interior	12
Wyden, Hon. Ron, U.S. Senator From Oregon	1

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional questions	37
-----------------------------------------	----

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record	69
----------------------------------------------------	----

ORR, ELKIND, SUH, AND BEAUDREAU NOMINATIONS

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2013

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:01 a.m. in room SD-366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Ron Wyden, chairman, presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. RON WYDEN, U.S. SENATOR FROM OREGON

The CHAIRMAN. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee will come to order.

Today we meet to consider 4 nominations.

Dr. Franklin M. Orr, to be the Under Secretary for Science.

Mr. Jonathan Elkind, to be the Assistant Secretary of Energy for International Affairs.

Ms. Rhea Suh, to be the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks.

Mr. Tommy Beaudreau, to be the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Management and Budget.

My view is these are 4 very well qualified nominees.

Briefly, Franklin Orr has been nominated to be the Under Secretary for Science at the Department of Energy. This is a position that was originally established to oversee the Department's research and development programs. Secretary Moniz has expanded the Office's role to encompass both science and energy programs.

I'm of the view that Dr. Orr is an individual with credentials as broad as the expanded scope of the office he has been nominated to. He is also a Stanford Fellow which I'm sort of predisposed starting with my history with my mom as a librarian there. I came there after starting at Cal after, particularly, start with a basketball career.

So we're glad you're here, Dr. Orr.

Jonathan Elkind, nominated to be the Assistant Secretary of Energy for International Affairs, had been the principle Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs since June 2009 and has served as the Acting Secretary since earlier this year. Before joining the Department of Energy in 2009, he was the Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution where he focused on energy security and foreign policy. He has also worked in the private sector.

We're very glad to have you as well.

Ms. Rhea Suh, been nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks. She has been the Assistant Secretary of the Interior of Policy and Management and Budget for the past 4 years. She previously worked for the Hewlett and Packard Foundation, served as a Senior Legislative Assistant to Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell.

We look forward to talking with you, Ms. Suh. You have one big challenge on your hands, as you know. Senator Murkowski and I have, in a bipartisan way, made it a priority to look at how we're going to fund the parks for the future. So we're looking forward to exploring that with you.

Mr. Beaudreau, you've been nominated to be the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Management and Budget. The job is being vacated by Ms. Suh if she's confirmed in the position she's being considered for. You've been the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management since 2001. Previously you were a partner in the law firm of Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson.

Like our other nominees this morning we think you're very well qualified, enjoyed visiting with you. As you know, we're going to really be interested in those kind of 3 parts of the job that you're going to be focused on, policy, management and budget. We're going to ask some questions about how we can look to that position to help us tackle some of the issues that I, Senator Murkowski and Senator Landrieu feel very strongly about and that's revenue sharing.

We think all of you are highly qualified for the positions you've been nominated for. We look forward to learning more about your thoughts on key issues this morning.

I'm going to recognize Senator Murkowski to make her statement at this point, then we have some other formalities.

We're very happy to be joined by our colleague, the Chair of the Intelligence Committee, Senator Feinstein, who has a long history of involvement in these issues.

So we're going to recognize now, Senator Murkowski, for her statement. Then we have some formalities to go through, an oath and on a hectic morning in the Senate. We will manage to get it all in.

So, Senator Murkowski, please proceed.

As all of you nominees know, Senator Murkowski and I feel very strongly about working on these issues in a bipartisan way. We're going to do that again.

**STATEMENT OF HON. LISA MURKOWSKI, U.S. SENATOR
FROM ALASKA**

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to those who are with us this morning. Welcome to Senator Feinstein.

It is important work this morning. Since our committee last convened we've seen some changes in the Senate rules with respect to nominations. Without seeking to revisit any of that this morning, I hope that all Senators would agree that our committee's process on nominations, which has always been very significant, perhaps has renewed significance.

I think it's worthy of note that through history more than 90 percent of nominees are confirmed and roll call votes, when they're

taken are ordinarily not close. Nominees often are confirmed with large majority. Some have contended that this process has been just a rubber stamp for the President.

But on the other hand, I think others would agree with me that the high pass rate is an indicator that the process is generally working properly.

Either way, the work of the committee generally and of this committee, specifically, is crucial in the confirmation process. Among other things through the committee process the President and certainly nominees themselves, should expect a thorough vetting process. Thus it's good to be in that vetting process this morning, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to welcome each of our distinguished nominees to the committee. Thank you all for your willingness to serve.

I'd like to first recognize a fellow Alaskan, Mr. Tommy Beaudreau.

Some may not recognize that Mr. Beaudreau grew up in Alaska. He graduated from Service High School in Anchorage. His family moved to the State when his Dad got a job working on the North Slope which is a story that's very familiar to a lot of us in Alaska. I'm always pleased to see Alaskans holding positions with decision-making authority over activities in the State because no one understands the importance more of the blend of resource development and the protection of our lands and our waters like someone who's lived there and experienced it firsthand.

Mr. Beaudreau, it was great to visit with you yesterday. As I mentioned in our conversation, I'm counting on you. I'm counting on you for a lot of different things, but to really complete the very important work, even as you conclude your service in the current position. I'm looking forward to continuing to work with you in your new role here.

I've been assured by you and by others that your new position represents a promotion for you and is evidence of the value that the Secretary and the Administration assigned to your counsel. With your experience on Arctic issues and other issues that are very important to the State, I'm optimistic that wise counsel will be heard at the top echelons at the Department of the Interior.

So I look forward to you in this new position.

Ms. Suh, it was good to visit with you prior to the recess. As I mentioned at that time, the Department's role as Alaska's landlord is always front and center. I think Mr. Beaudreau saw that firsthand.

I had kind of hoped that in your previous position you had become more familiar with the policy issues as they specifically related to Alaska which consume, will consume, so much of your time. I think you have a learning curve in front of you. I'm looking forward to, not only learning more about you today and through your answers to the questions on the record, but about your knowledge, your experience and your policy views on issues that are important to Alaska and to the nation.

Dr. Orr, Mr. Elkind, welcome. I've been impressed with the team that Secretary Moniz is assembling at the Department of Energy. I think he's doing a good job over there.

As I told Dr. Croley and Mr. Smith last month, I'm counting on DOE, specifically through its leaders to be a vigorous advocate for affordable and reliable energy, especially in the interagency process. I also want the Department to carry out its clear legal responsibilities according to settle law. So I'm going to be listening carefully this morning. I know it's going to be, kind of, up and down. I apologize to you all, but you know what the process is like around here.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murkowski.

We're going to call an audible here because we've got a vote coming on and Senator Feinstein is here on about, probably, 3 and a half hours sleep.

Dr. Orr, you are very lucky to have her in her corner—in your corner. I think we have just enough time for Senator Feinstein's statement and we can all still make the vote.

Welcome, Senator Feinstein.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DIANNE FEINSTEIN, U.S. SENATOR
FROM CALIFORNIA**

Senator FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm very impressed that both of you are bright eyed and bushy tailed this morning.

I'm really very honored to introduce to both you, Mr. Chairman and to your distinguished Ranking Member, Stanford University professor, Franklin M. Orr, who President Obama has nominated to serve as Under Secretary for Science in the Department of Energy.

Dr. Orr currently directs the Precourt Institute for Energy at Stanford. He's led this Institute since it was created in 2009. This is \$100 million Institute. It is drawn upon deep expertise from across the Stanford campus and around the world to develop sustainable energy solutions and search for ways to reduce atmospheric levels of carbon.

The research funded under Dr. Orr's leadership is ground breaking. Just this year the Institute has funded revolutionary new designs for fuel cells, studies focused on improving the performance of hybrid cars, natural ventilation systems in buildings and programs that financially motivate utility customers to use electricity more efficiently and experiments boosting the output of wind farms, testing a new kind of solar cell and using carbon dioxide as a way of storing electricity. Dr. Orr's work overseeing the Precourt Institute grant program prepares him to oversee DOE's programs including ARPA-E in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy. They award billions of dollars to promising energy technology research each year.

Now what I've gotten from the Precourt program is how practical it is to real solutions. I think that's important.

Prior to leading this Institute, Dr. Orr served as the Founding Director of the Global Climate and Energy Project at Stanford. He has been a professor in Stanford's Department of Energy Resources, Engineering since 1985, serving as Dean of the School of Earth Sciences from 1994 to 2002 and Chairman of his Department before that.

If confirmed, he will be taking on a very important task. Secretary Moniz has expanded the Under Secretary for Science role so that it now oversees both basic science research and applied energy programs such as nuclear energy, fossil energy and the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

The Under Secretary now will oversee offices that had a combined budget of \$7.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2013. These offices are the epicenter of our nation's effort to conduct basic physical science research in order to develop the cleaner technologies we need. They are charged with developing and demonstrating the emissions free power plants, affordable electric cars, fuel cells and low carbon transportation fuel that will allow our nation to slow global warming and grow our economy at the same time.

Secretary Moniz has handpicked Dr. Orr to lead a much more integrated approach where basic science, applied research, technology demonstration and deployment programs work together to push clean energy toward a coordinated strategy. In other words, Dr. Orr is being given the job of leading our nation's charge to tackle climate change. I really recommend him to you for that role. He has the brains, the experience and the manner to get the job done.

So thank you very much for giving me a few moments to say this and highly recommend him to your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Feinstein, thank you for a very important statement, both in terms of the work that's going on at Stanford, Dr. Orr's qualifications.

My sense is we've got about 90 seconds left to vote. So if our witnesses are agreed we'll let 3 Senators get out the door. I think it's very appropriate we break after Senator Feinstein's eloquent statement.

We will be back here fairly shortly and thank you again. We'll be breaking for the vote.

[RECESS]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank all the nominees and Senators for their patience. It's going to be something of a juggling act.

At this point let us have the oath. The rules of the committee which apply to all nominees require that they be sworn in connection with their testimony. So if you would, please rise and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[A chorus of, I do]

The CHAIRMAN. Please be seated.

Before you begin your statement I'll ask 3 questions addressed to each nominee before this committee.

Will you be available to appear before this committee and other Congressional Committees to represent Departmental positions and respond to issues of concern to the Congress?

[A chorus of, I will.]

The CHAIRMAN. Each of you have said, I will.

Are you aware of any personal holdings, investments or interests that could constitute a conflict of interest or create the appearance of such a conflict should you be confirmed and assume the office to which you've been nominated by the President?

[A chorus of no.]

The CHAIRMAN. Each of you have said no.

Are you involved or do you have any assets held in a blind trust? Alright. What we're going to do now we'd like each of you to introduce your family members. This has been a very good tradition. After we do that, we're going to welcome our colleague and friend, Senator Begich, to make an introductory statement. Then we'll recognize the nominees to make their opening statements.

So let us ask each of the nominees to introduce their family members.

Dr. Orr.

Mr. ORR. It's a great pleasure to introduce my wife, Susan. We're in our 44th year and counting. One of the products of that partnership, my son, David, is also here.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you all at least wave? If you're willing to stand up, we like that so everyone else can see you.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. We welcome you and glad that you're here.

Let's go with you, Mr. Elkind? Where is your family? There's some little characters floating around back there.

Mr. ELKIND. Thank you, Chairman.

I'm delighted to introduce my wife, Susan Mintz. We're short timers in comparison to Dr. Orr, 25 years and our eldest son, Benjamin and our youngest, Noah and maybe on the other end of the webcast are our son, who is overseas at present.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good.

Mr. ELKIND. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you all stand just real quickly so we can all see you? Great. Good. Glad the Elkind caucus is here. That's great.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Suh, welcome.

Ms. SUH. Mr. Chairman, my 3 year old daughter, Yeumi, woke up today with a little bit of a cold. So unfortunately my husband and my daughter are not able to join us.

The CHAIRMAN. Your 3 year old is excused, potential friend for Scarlett Willow Wyden, age one. So we like that.

Mr. Beaudreau, your family?

Mr. BEAUDREAU. Yes, I'm joined today by my wife, Carrie, my daughter, Nellie and my son, Auggie. They've missed some school this week because of the weather so I'd like to thank Grace Episcopal Day School for excusing them again this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. How old are you guys? How old are you kids?

Nellie Beaudreau, 10.

Auggie Beaudreau, 8.

The CHAIRMAN. Very good. Alright. Thank you. I see the family resemblance too.

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. We're glad you're here. Welcome.

Let's now have Senator Begich's statement. He's been juggling a lot today. We knew you were going to parachute in at some point. We are very glad to have you and know of your long standing expertise and interest in energy issues.

So, please proceed with your comments.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MARK BEGICH, U.S. SENATOR
FROM ALASKA**

Senator BEGICH. Thank you, Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Murkowski. I know you have a whole slate of nominees so I will keep my comments brief.

It is my pleasure today to introduce an Alaskan known to many members of the committee, Tommy Beaudreau. As you know Tommy served as the first Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management beginning in October 2011. Since January of this year he has also served as Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management.

Beyond this impressive experience already, he has incredible degrees from Yale University as an undergraduate and Georgetown Law School.

Tommy has experience and traits we Alaskans value highly.

First, he and his family have first hand and lived firsthand with the economic ups and downs found in natural resource extraction industries. His family came to Alaska when his father got a job in the oil business and he lived with that job going away.

As an Alaskan he can also understand how an economy and people depend on resource extraction at the same time treasure natural beauty and abundant wildlife. He knows how communities of subsistence dwellers rely on oil production for schools and healthcare facilities. While it makes me happy to have someone in power who knows how to pronounce Alaskan names, it's more important that he knows—is known as an honest broker.

I haven't always agreed with every decision Tommy or the Department has made during his tenure. But he listens. He listened to me. He listened to the industry and he listened to the conservation community.

In the end, by and large, we have a workable policy.

As we move toward another season of offshore exploration in the Arctic Ocean, I'm sad to see him leave his current position. However, I know that he won't be far from it. His experience getting up to speed on offshore oil and gas and the host of scientific environmental work it depends on is too valuable to let go, particularly 5 years into an 8 year Presidential Administration.

Tommy, congratulations and consider this truly fair warning, I'll continue to call you on many occasions. I know my colleagues, my colleague from Alaska will do the same on multiple times. We're anxious to see you move forward.

Again, congratulations. I just wanted to introduce another Alaskan in the bureaucracy of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Begich, thank you very much. As you know, you are always welcome in this committee.

Senator Murkowski, both of you, both of Alaska Senators, 100 percent of the Alaskan Senate delegation has, I think, eloquently made the case. There's some unique challenges that are faced in your part of the world that are different than the lower 48. Both of you are very involved, obviously, in national energy policy issues.

But you make some very important arguments with respect to the well being of your State that really does affect the whole country. So we thank you.

Mr. Beaudreau, you are lucky to have Senator Begich in your corner.

So we'll excuse you. I know you have a busy day, Senator Begich. Again, you're always welcome here at the committee.

Senator BEGICH. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Alright. We're going to make your prepared remarks a part of the hearing record in their entirety. I want to make a plea that each of you set aside your prepared remarks. They're going to be part of the hearing record and just take 5 minutes or so and speak to us.

I know that there is a compulsion to just put your head down and read every single word. If I can somehow persuade you to take the time, just kind of summarize your concerns. That'd be helpful.

It's going to be a hectic morning. We would like to get to questions.

Dr. Orr, welcome and you're nominated for a particularly important position. So, go ahead.

**TESTIMONY OF FRANKLIN M. ORR, JR., NOMINEE TO BE
UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

Mr. ORR. Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Murkowski and members of the committee, thanks for the opportunity to appear before you today. It's certainly an honor.

I'm grateful to the President for nominating me. I spent pretty much my whole career working on energy matters in one way or another. This is a chance for me to apply all of that to a position that I think is of critical importance to the future of energy in the Nation.

I'm a chemical engineer by training. My early career was spent on working on enhanced oil recovery to try to recover oil that would be left behind by typical, conventional methods. A lot of that involved using high pressure CO₂. So that led me into work on carbon capture and storage. That's been a big focus for my research group in the last 15 years.

Along the way I also got involved in leading research enterprises. I was Dean at one of the schools—the School of Earth Sciences at Stanford and then stepped down from that to lead a big energy research project that worked on ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from energy use by much more efficient conversions of some primary energy resource into energy services.

In recent years, as Senator Feinstein was kind enough to say, we formed an energy institute at Stanford. The idea was really to try to bring together people across the whole campus who were thinking about energy. They are distributed in 22 different departments across the University and are trying to build a fully enriched conversation that goes from the fundamental science through lots of technology to the economics and policy and finance and regulatory issues and all the behavioral issues that all of us who make decisions in our daily lives about energy work on.

So that experience has taught me the value of a portfolio, of looking at research that really has the potential to change the game, to make possible energy futures that are more efficient and emit fewer greenhouse gases. Those are things that I'm convinced that we can do.

I'll just close by saying that, I think there is a huge opportunity to work on the question of how we integrate science and technology research at DOE. That's a challenge I look forward to taking on if I'm confirmed.

So thank you for considering my nomination. I'm happy to answer questions when we get to that stage.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Orr follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FRANKLIN M. ORR, JR., NOMINEE TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Murkowski, and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today as you consider my nomination for the position of Under Secretary for Science at the Department of Energy (DOE). It is an honor to be here. I also very much appreciate the time Members of this Committee have taken to meet with me, and, if confirmed, I look forward to working with the Committee to address the challenges of maintaining the Department's critical efforts to ensure America's security and prosperity through vigorous and productive basic science and energy technology research programs.

I am deeply grateful to the President for nominating me for this position. I have worked on energy research for my entire career, and if confirmed, this post will allow me to apply what I have learned to the management of the DOE science and energy research enterprise.

I grew up in Texas: I was born in a small refinery town near Houston and then lived in Houston in high school. I studied chemical engineering as an undergraduate at Stanford and as a PhD student at the University of Minnesota. I interrupted my graduate studies to serve as a commissioned officer in the US Public Health Service, working initially at the National Air Pollution Control Administration and then at the Environmental Protection Agency when it was created. The experience in public service was extremely formative, and I returned to my graduate studies with helpful perspective. Those few years in Washington taught me that the government is full of talented people working hard on issues that matter, and I did a bit of growing up in the process.

In the midst of that period, my wife Susan joined me in a partnership that is now in its 44th year and counting. I will be forever grateful to our respective roommates at Stanford, who organized the blind date that introduced us when we were undergraduate students.

I worked briefly in Houston after my PhD for Shell Development Company, as a research engineer helping to develop enhanced oil recovery processes using high pressure carbon dioxide injection to produce oil that would otherwise be left behind in the subsurface. I then moved to the New Mexico Petroleum Recovery Research Center at New Mexico Tech to lead a research group working in the same area. After seven great years there, I moved to Stanford University, where I have benefited from a much broader range of energy experience. I have had the good fortune to teach and do research with very talented students on the fundamentals of how complicated fluids flow in the rocks of the Earth's crust. Those ideas turned out to apply directly to many aspects of geologic storage of carbon dioxide in porous rocks deep in the subsurface. That area has been an important area of focus for my research group for the last 15 years as we have worked to understand the subsurface portion of carbon capture and storage.

I've also had a chance to learn about leading a wide-ranging research enterprise, first as dean of the Stanford School of Earth Sciences, working with geologists, geophysicists, petroleum engineers, and Earth system scientists. In 2002, I stepped down from my dean position to start the Global Climate and Energy Project (GCEP), a ten-year, \$225 million industry-supported project of fundamental, pre-commercial research on technology options to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from energy use. That project has created a portfolio of breakthrough research on ways to convert primary energy resources (such as sun, wind, coal, oil, or natural gas) into energy services (such as electricity, light and heat, or transportation) with improved efficiency and lower emissions of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. In addition to research, that effort has supported the graduate study of about 750 graduate students and postdocs at Stanford and at 39 collaborating institutions around the world. Those students and many more at other universities will be needed to work on the energy transitions that lie ahead.

The process of building the GCEP research portfolio taught me the value of working across disciplines, of attacking tough energy problems from differing science and

engineering perspectives, of research teams working together to solve problems that go beyond those that could be attacked with the methods available within an individual research group.

Energy use is woven throughout the fabric of modern life. But it is also clear that the technology of energy conversions is only part of the challenge we face, and in recognition of that fact, we created the Stanford Precourt Institute for Energy in 2009. Its goal is to make sure that students and faculty at Stanford are working on the full range of important energy issues: from the fundamental science, to the engineering and technology, to economics, policy, finance and regulatory issues, to the behavioral side of the energy choices all of us make in our daily lives.

Our goal has been to harness the creativity and talent of 225 faculty members in 22 academic departments and create a vibrant, comprehensive conversation about all the important aspects of energy use among the community of energy students and faculty at Stanford. I note that the student Energy Club at Stanford is the largest student club on campus, an indication that our students are very engaged in these issues, as they should be. And I'm teaching a course for 60 Stanford freshmen this quarter on all the different ways of thinking about energy for the future. Interacting with those students gives me confidence that we can chart a productive energy path for the future.

And finally, I have had the good fortune to participate in a variety of studies conducted by the National Academies' National Research Council that have broadened my energy background as well. The most recent one was entitled America's Energy Future. I know I have learned more from my fellow committee members than they learned from me, and I am grateful for the experience that effort provided.

Let me close by saying that if I am confirmed, I very much look forward to working with all of you to continue to develop the wide-ranging portfolio of fundamental science, energy science and engineering, and technology that will provide the foundation for the energy future of the United States.

I thank you again for considering my nomination, and I will be happy to answer any questions you have.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Orr, thank you. You managed to summarize very well, so extra points for that. We're going to make your prepared statement part of the record.

Mr. Elkind.

TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN ELKIND, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS), DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Mr. ELKIND. Thank you very much, Chairman Wyden. Thank you, Senator Murkowski and members of the committee. I'm very pleased to be able to appear before you today.

This is a particular honor for me to potentially, if I am confirmed, have this new association with the Department of Energy. As a matter of coincidence my family ties to the Department of Energy go back quite a ways. For the fact that my father was a researcher, who for a portion of his career in the 1960s and 1970s, worked at Brookhaven National Laboratory and at Argonne National Laboratory in those days under the Atomic Energy Commission and ERDA.

But the fact that I'm in front of you today probably has more to do with my dad's attitudes about career choices than anything else. When I was an undergraduate at the age of my oldest son, the advice that I got from my dad was to find a niche that I was interested in and to look at that opportunity as a chance, a life opportunity to work on issues that made me excited to spend time on every day. So his advice really was love what you do and do what you love, which indeed, was the case with him as well.

For a little bit more than 25 years I have worked in relation to international energy issues, sometimes in government service. My first government role was in the Administration of President

George H.W. Bush, then in the Clinton Administration. I've also been in think tank positions and in private sector consulting.

From all these experiences I know how important it is that the United States has strong and constructive international energy partnerships. That sense of excitement about building those relationships and making them work for the benefit of the United States is the opportunity that I would be very, very pleased to focus on, if I am confirmed into this position.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Elkind follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JONATHAN ELKIND, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS), DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Murkowski, members of the Committee: I am grateful for the opportunity to appear today as you consider my candidacy to be the Assistant Secretary of Energy for International Affairs.

I am honored to have been nominated for this post by President Obama. I also deeply appreciate the confidence that Secretary Moniz has expressed by asking me to serve in this capacity.

I would like to introduce and thank my wife of twenty-five years, Suzanne Mintz, and two of our three sons who are here with me today, Benjamin and Noah. Our third son, Sam, is completing a college semester abroad.

In 2009, I was appointed as the Department of Energy's (DOE) Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs. This was my second professional association with the Department, but by coincidence my family's prior ties to DOE go back to my childhood. My father was a researcher who worked on cancer treatment and carcinogenesis. He spent portions of the 1960s and 1970s at the Brookhaven and Argonne National Laboratories that are now operated by DOE—in those days by the Atomic Energy Commission and later the Energy Research and Development Agency.

The fact that I am before you today, however, had more to do with my dad's attitudes about career choice than with the mere fact that I have known DOE and its precursors since childhood. When I was an undergraduate, my dad counseled me to find a professional niche that I felt passionate about, a place where I would want to make a contribution because of my own fascination with the issues at hand. Whether I made that contribution as a business person, an academic, or a government official wasn't central. His advice was essentially: Do what you love, and love what you do.

For a little more than twenty-five years, I have focused on international energy issues with that backdrop. I first worked on energy and environment issues in the federal government when I served at the Council on Environmental Quality under President George H.W. Bush. I served subsequently through the 1990s at positions in the Department of Energy, the Office of the Vice President, and the National Security Council staff. Later, I worked as a private energy consultant and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution.

From these experiences, I know how important it is for the United States to work effectively with international partners on energy issues. We need strong international partnerships that allow us to understand where markets are heading, where there are opportunities for U.S. businesses, and where breakthroughs and flash points can emerge.

I am proud of the progress we have made on many of these fronts during my current tenure at the Department, including establishing collaborations like the Clean Energy Ministerial and the International Partnership on Energy Efficiency Cooperation. These key partnerships have helped us to identify and share best practices in low-carbon energy technologies. Other bilateral engagements such as the U.S.-China Clean Energy Research Center and the U.S.-India Joint Clean Energy R&D Center are helping us forge new research partnerships and establish commercial ties on topics like carbon capture and sequestration, buildings energy efficiency, and next-generation biofuels.

If I am fortunate enough to be confirmed by the Senate, these are some of the areas that will be my focus. I also look forward to working with this Committee to identify additional opportunities to advance our energy economy. I hope to secure your support so that I might have that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Well said.
Ms. Suh.

TESTIMONY OF RHEA SUH, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Ms. SUH. Mr. Chairman, ranking member and members of this committee, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. Thank you also for the chance to meet with you in person.

I am a child of the West. I was born and raised in Colorado, raised by Korean immigrant parents who, like many, found their way to that great State with dreams of freedom and a better life for their family. While my parents could not be here today, I would like to acknowledge them as well. They came to America with nothing and in turn gave me and my sisters everything.

Like so many other Westerners I grew up reaping the benefits of the lands and waters managed by our Federal Government. My earliest memories are memories of being outside, fishing with my father, of exploring for fossils up in the foothills of the Rocky Mountains and going to camp in Rocky Mountain National Park. This tapestry of lands, the backdrop of my childhood, has influenced me and my values throughout my life.

For the past 4 years I have served as the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget at the Department of the Interior. I have had the privilege of working with each of the 9 bureaus on a wide array of issues. I have led the efforts to secure the resources to enable each of those bureaus to uphold their missions, but I have focused a concerted effort on ensuring that we manage those resources in a way that is both effective and efficient.

In these challenging fiscal times I have saved the Department over \$500 million and untold millions in cost avoidance including \$160 million in real estate consolidations and \$200 million in smarter purchasing agreements.

While my most recent experience at the Department has focused more on administrative and fiscal policy, I have nearly 2 decades of experience in natural resource issues. I started out as a Senate staffer working for Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell from Colorado where I worked on both energy and natural resource issues. I had the unusual opportunity during that time to work on both sides of the aisle spending 2 years on the Democratic side and a year on the Republican side. This unique circumstance profoundly shaped my views on policy and left me with the strong belief that collaboration, while not easy or straightforward, can result in the most creative and durable policy outcomes.

These beliefs helped me in my tenure at both the Hewlett and the Packard Foundations where I continued to work on natural resource issues. In particular I supported the efforts to expand their array of voices and perspectives on conservation including those of hunters and anglers, indigenous communities and faith based organizations.

I am now before you today as the President's nominee as the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, a position that would allow me to focus more concertedly on the critical work of conservation. I come to this opportunity with great humility. It

would afford me the chance to work with 2 of the most storied and venerated agencies at Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service.

Americans love the outdoors. We love to hunt and fish. We love our parks.

The National Refuge system is truly America's backyard. These are the places where millions of us go to hunt and fish and explore and are among our Nation's most popular pastimes. The Fish and Wildlife Service is uniquely positioned to welcome a new generation to be connected to this natural heritage that is our birthright as Americans.

When the National Park Service celebrates its 100th anniversary in 2016 we will have an even greater opportunity to renew the bond that Americans have with their parks. The National Park Service's second century is a defining moment offering us an opportunity to celebrate America's natural and cultural history and to lay a strong sensible foundation for the next century of stewardship.

From the time I hooked a rainbow trout with my dad I became the beneficiary of our Nation's rich natural heritage. If confirmed I hope to continue this bounty by strengthening the opportunities for Americans both to be connected to and to benefit from the outdoors and by pursuing pragmatic, balanced solutions that contribute to conservation of the Department's lands and waters for the benefit of all the great people of this country.

Thank you again for the opportunity to be here today.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Suh follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RHEA SUH, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. Thank you also for the opportunity to meet with many of you in person.

I would like to acknowledge and thank my husband, Michael Carroll who agreed to come with me on this journey four years ago and my daughter Yeumi, who was a blessing for us nearly three years ago now. And while my parents-Chung Ha and Young Ja Suh-cannot be here today, I want to acknowledge them as well. They were young immigrants from Korea who came to this country in the early 60's with nothing and in turn gave me and my sisters everything. From my love of the outdoors to my commitment to public service, I am instilled with their love of this country and I owe everything to their sacrifices and courage.

For the past four years, I have had the honor of serving as the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget at the Department of the Interior. It is chiefly a management position that is focused on the financial and administrative policy for the Department. I have had the privilege of working with each of the nine bureaus on a broad array of issues, but I have primarily been responsible for leading efforts to secure the resources to enable each of the bureaus to uphold their missions but also to ensure that we manage those resources in a manner that is both effective and efficient. In these challenging fiscal times, I have led the enterprise to achieve more than \$500 million in savings and untold millions in cost avoidance, including \$160 million associated with real estate consolidations and \$200 million in smarter purchasing agreements. I have also led the longer-term efforts around workforce and succession planning and the policy efforts on youth.

I am now before you today as the President's nominee for the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks-a position that would allow me to focus more concertedly on the critical work of conservation.

For the members of the Committee whom I have not had the chance to get to know, I'd like to tell you a little bit about myself. I was born on the edge of the Rocky Mountains in Boulder, Colorado, and raised by Korean immigrant parents who found their way to that great State like so many other pioneers with the

dreams of freedom and of a better life for their family. Like so many other westerners, I grew up reaping the benefits of the lands and waters managed by our Federal Government. My dad first taught me how to fish in waters managed by the Bureau of Reclamation. As a Girl Scout, I camped out under the starry skies in Rocky Mountain National Park, and in high school, I helped build a section of the Continental Divide Trail, which is in part managed by the Bureau of Land Management. This tapestry of lands, the backdrop of my childhood, has influenced me and my values throughout my life.

I come to this opportunity with great humility, as it would afford me the chance to work with two of the most storied and venerated agencies in the federal government: the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service. These agencies are the caretakers of some of our nation's most special places and most vulnerable species. And uniformly, I have never met a more passionate set of employees-dedicated in the missions of their organization and in their commitment to public service. At the top of the list are the directors of these agencies Dan Ashe and Jon Jarvis-public servants who have dedicated their careers to these special missions and to the critical work their organizations do on behalf of the American public.

Before I joined the government four and a half years ago, I spent my career focused on conservation issues. I started off as a senate staffer for Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell, from my home state of Colorado, where I worked on energy and natural resource policy. I also had the unusual opportunity to work on both sides of the aisle during this time, spending two years on the Democratic side and a year on the Republican side. This unique circumstance profoundly shaped my views on policy and left me with the strong belief that collaboration, while often not easy or straightforward, can result in the most creative and durable policy outcomes.

These beliefs helped me in my tenure as a program officer for both the Hewlett and the Packard foundations, where I continued to work on natural resource issues. Both institutions have a keen interest in building institutional capacity within the non-profit sector, and I focused much of my efforts on helping the variety of NGOs we worked with on strategic planning and on developing appropriate metrics to help evaluate progress towards their goals. I also supported a number of efforts designed to create opportunities that could not only balance economic development and conservation but also that saw those twin goals as inexorably linked. My foundation experience also uniquely equips me to be able to work on innovative public-private partnerships to advance successful models that leverage Federal resources with those provided by the philanthropic community, partners, and other interested entities.

The opportunity to balance our economic needs with conservation is illustrated in fact that both the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service are significant contributors to local economies. According to the Department's FY2012 Economic Report, recreation alone drove an estimated 417 million visits to DOI managed sites, generating \$45 billion to the American economy and supporting 372,000 jobs.

The national wildlife refuge system is truly America's backyard-the places where millions of us go to hunt, fish, hike and explore the outdoors. Hunting and fishing are among our nation's most popular pastimes; more than 41 percent of the US population 16 and older participated in wildlife-related outdoor recreation in 2011 and in some states, more people have hunting and fishing licenses than vote. However, as more and more children become attuned to technology and the internet rather than the natural chorus of the outdoors, the Fish and Wildlife Service can work to ensure that the next generation is also connected to the natural heritage that is our birthright as Americans.

The National Park Service manages Interior's most visited lands, and arguably the country's best known and loved sites. These destinations draw visitors from across the globe, and these visitors support over \$30 billion in economic activity. When the National Park Service celebrates its 100th anniversary in 2016, we will have an even greater opportunity to renew the bond that Americans have with their parks. The beginning of the National Park Service's second century is a defining moment, offering us an opportunity to celebrate America's historical, cultural and natural heritage and to lay a strong, sensible foundation for the next century of stewardship.

Although it is clear that there are many challenges facing the two agencies, and conservation as a whole, I believe we have enormous opportunities in the near term. My skills in constituency building can help guide the agencies to ensure that our work is meaningful to all Americans, regardless of where they live or what cultural background they represent. And my experience in the Department, working side by side with these bureaus and others toward effective financial management, equip

me to assist them in a constrained budget environment to effectively utilize their resources. During my tenure at DOI and in my previous work, I have developed relationships across government and with diverse stakeholders that will assist me in fostering a pragmatic, collaborative approach to conservation that builds coalitions across all of our constituencies in the interests of the American public we serve.

I am a child of the West. From the first time I hooked a rainbow trout with my Dad, I became the beneficiary of our nation's rich natural heritage. If confirmed, I hope to continue the legacy of this bounty by connecting the next generation of American's to their outdoors and of pursuing pragmatic, balanced conservation solutions that contribute to the sustainable use and management of the Department's lands and waters for the benefit of all the people of this great country.

Thank you again for the opportunity to be here today and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.
Mr. Beaudreau.

TESTIMONY OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR (POLICY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET)

Mr. BEAUDREAU. Good morning. Thank you, Chairman Wyden and Ranking Member Murkowski.

As Senator Murkowski and Senator Begich mentioned this morning, I am an Alaskan. We moved to Alaska in 1979 when my dad, a Vietnam veteran, was able to get a good job working in Prudhoe Bay on the North Slope and did the week on, week off routine up there. He also moved us to Alaska for the adventure of an outdoors life in the last frontier. He even considered moving us to Sitka at one point which the trajectory of my life probably would have been a lot different if he had done that.

so on the one hand I saw firsthand what resource development means to the State of Alaska and to families like mine. On the other hand, for the same reasons many people live in Alaska, we enjoyed the outdoors, hunting, fishing, hiking and skiing. Everybody in Alaska appreciates the benefits of those blessings as well. So those are the values I carried with me when I joined the Interior Department in June 2010 to help the Administration's response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

Our charge from the President and from Secretary Salazar was to strengthen industry standards with respect to offshore oil and gas exploration and development and also to restore public confidence in regulatory oversight of that activity. Those were difficult times as we all remember. But you look at the Gulf of Mexico today and there are more rigs operating in the Gulf today than there were 3 years ago, prior to the spill.

I talked to oil and gas executives about their plans for the Gulf of Mexico and they're extremely optimistic for the area and are looking to bring additional rigs in. They asked—I asked them, you know, what do you think about it? He said, 3 years ago if you'd asked me would we be where we are today I would have said it was a long shot. But the investment is strong and the public's confidence and our oversight is strong as well and the activity is being done more safely and more responsibly than ever before.

So it's that track record that I bring into the new position. It's based on hard work, listening intently to a broad spectrum of stakeholders, working collaboratively with States, tribes and local

communities and thinking creatively and positively about solutions to seemingly intractable problems.

Moving into Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, if concerned—or if confirmed, would place me as the Chief Financial Officer for the Department. Secretary Jewell, who is as you know an experienced businessperson and Chief Executive in her own right, has challenged us to take a hard look at the way DOI does business with an eye toward cutting red tape, finding efficiencies, working across organizations rather than in silos and saving resources in light of increasingly constrained budgets. I'll be on point to build on some of the successes that Assistant Secretary Suh has made. It's a challenge I look forward to with enthusiasm and energy.

If confirmed I'll carry all of those same core principles of hard work, active and genuine engagement, humility and creative problem solving with me into this new role.

So, I look forward to answering your questions. Thank you.
[The prepared statement of Mr. Beaudreau follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR (POLICY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET)

Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Murkowski, and members of the Committee, I am honored to appear before you today as the President's nominee to be the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Management and Budget. I am joined today by my wife, Carrie, and our children, Nellie and Auggie. I'd like to thank Grace Episcopal Day School for excusing their absences this morning. I have been with the Department of the Interior (DOI) for nearly three and a half years, and during this entire period of public service my family has been a constant source of support and inspiration, for which I am profoundly thankful.

While I have appeared before this Committee previously in my capacity as the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) and acting as the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management (ASLM), I will take a moment to reintroduce myself.

I was born in Colorado, where my mother is from, and was raised in Alaska. My father moved our family to Alaska for the outdoor adventure of a life in the Last Frontier and the opportunity for a Vietnam veteran to get a good job working in the Prudhoe Bay oil field on the North Slope. Because of my upbringing, I have a first-hand understanding of the importance of responsible resource development to the economic well-being of communities and families. Having grown up hunting, fishing, hiking and skiing in the vast Alaskan wilderness, I also have a deep appreciation for the special character of the American outdoors. We have a shared responsibility to conserve these wondrous spaces so that future generations have them to experience, enjoy and learn from.

These are the values I brought to the Interior Department when I left my law practice in 2010 to join the Administration's response to the Deepwater Horizon blowout and oil spill. The Macondo well was still flowing at the time, and the direction from the President and Secretary Salazar was to reform offshore drilling standards and oversight so that the American people can be confident that oil and gas development on our oceans, which is vital to our economy, is safe for workers and for the environment, and is overseen by strong, independent and effective regulators.

Three years later, offshore oil and gas in the Gulf has rebounded strongly. There are more rigs working there today than prior to the spill, and this growth is expected to continue. I am proud to say as well that the activity is being conducted more safely and more responsibly, and is subject to stronger oversight, than ever before.

We also have made substantial progress standing up new, renewable sources of energy both onshore and offshore. We are already more than halfway to the President's goal of approving 20,000 megawatts of renewable energy on public lands by 2020, and earlier this year successfully held the first two competitive offshore wind lease sales in federal waters.

I am proud of this track record, which has been premised on hard work, listening intently to a broad spectrum of stakeholders, working collaboratively with States, tribes and local communities, and thinking creatively and positively about developing solutions to seemingly intractable problems. I believe this track record, my values and my approach to the issues are my most important qualifications.

I now look forward, if confirmed, to following my friend Rhea Suh as DOI's Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget and to continuing this collaborative, pragmatic and creative approach to tackling many of the most significant challenges, as well as seizing the substantial opportunities, that are before the country and the Interior Department.

As the primary steward of our shared landscapes and resources, DOI has a special place and set of responsibilities on behalf of the American people. The activities we oversee are an enormous economic engine for the country. In 2012, DOI's programs contributed \$371 billion to the United States' economy and supported 2.3 million jobs across sectors including recreation and tourism, conventional and renewable energy development, grazing and timber harvests. Specifically, in 2012, there were 417 million visits to DOI-managed lands, and recreational visits alone contributed an estimated \$45 billion in economic activity, much of it benefitting local communities in rural areas. We also oversee the responsible development of approximately 23 percent of America's energy supplies, and DOI is the largest supplier and manager of water across 17 Western states. Interior is responsible for maintaining our special relationships with the 566 federally-recognized Tribes, and provides services to more than 1.7 million American Indian and Alaska Native people.

Secretary Jewell also has made it a major priority of the Department to strengthen connections between young people and the outdoors, so that new generations of Americans have the same formative experiences with the lands that are their shared birthright that I did growing up in Alaska. With tightening resources available for youth programs, it is imperative that we continue to aggressively leverage public investments as well as further develop partnerships with private institutions.

Secretary Jewell, as an experienced business person and chief executive officer, also has challenged us to take a hard look at the way DOI does business, with an eye toward cutting red-tape, finding efficiencies, working across organizations rather than in silos, and saving resources in light of increasingly constrained budgets.

As the Department's chief financial officer, I would be on point for building on DOI's successes in these areas, and it is a challenge that I look forward to with enthusiasm and energy. If confirmed, I will carry the same core principles of hard work, active and genuine engagement, humility and creative problem solving with me into this new role.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to discuss my nomination with you this morning, and for your consideration. I look forward to answering your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Beaudreau, well summarized and I appreciate it.

I do want to note that you have great experience, but I'm not yet clear whether you have taken the test that Senator Murkowski introduced me to when I went to Alaska. That is whether you have eaten a graham cracker treated with LNG. Because I have done that, lived to tell about it and Senator Murkowski and I kid that that is something of a special ritual, a bipartisan ritual, we have here.

But you have a long history and look forward to questions.

So let's begin quickly with that because of the hectic nature of the morning.

I want to begin with you, you know, Dr. Orr, because, you know, right at the heart of what we need to do in this country is ground breaking research in the energy area. Focusing on innovation is what your position is all about. This is particularly important given the urgency of climate change.

As you know, the NOAA report reflected 400 parts per million. If nothing serves as a wakeup call, that certainly, you know, ought to. So we see your position as the ideal spot to help us innovate and let me repeat that, innovate, out of our way of the climate

challenge. This is right at the heart of how we, you know, get out of this.

I'd like to just start by asking you in your view what are the biggest opportunities for transformational type innovation that's going to let us, you know, fight climate change?

Mr. ORR. Senator, thank you for that question.

I've really worked on this exact question for most of the last dozen years at Stanford. So I'll give you a couple of examples from that experience just to, sort of, frame the conversation.

The CHAIRMAN. Give us a couple of examples of the past, but I don't want this question to go by without your giving us some insight onto what you want to do for the future—

Mr. ORR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Or for the days ahead.

Mr. ORR. Yes.

So I'll give you 2 quick examples.

One is batteries.

The conventional lithium ion battery uses a carbon atom to hook up to a lithium ion. If you replace that with silicon you can put 4 lithium ions next to the silicon. But you have to be careful how you do this because if you do it in a bulk material it just expands and contracts and destroys itself. But if you use nano-structured materials, tiny little rods or tiny little particles, shielded in the right way, you can build a battery with higher energy density and nice long life.

So the reason—

The CHAIRMAN. Nano materials and batteries.

Mr. ORR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Would be an area.

Mr. ORR. So the idea of nano materials, catalysts and using those small structures to control properties gives us a whole set of design opportunities for the future. That could change transportation dramatically.

Another application of the same kinds of ideas is catalysts for taking electricity and converting it into a fuel by basically pulling off one of the oxygens off of CO₂ making CO, CO and then you can transform that chemically.

Now we have some very promising results from that so far. There is some ways yet to go. But it's an example of how taking the links between chemistry, material science and the ability to make small structures can give us a huge set of opportunities for the future.

Now in terms of applying that in the Department of Energy, if confirmed, then the way we've tried to do this in the past is really to build teams that lay out research agendas that could really go after big problems with breakthrough potential. We should do that going forward. If confirmed I will work very hard to try to make that happen.

The CHAIRMAN. You had me at hello when you mentioned nano materials because in, sort of, my previous Senate service, George Allen and I wrote the 21st Century Nano Technology legislation that still guides a big part of the research. So I'm very pleased that you're moving ahead on that.

Let's shift to energy storage.

Today the Department is releasing an R and D plan for energy storage which I first requested from one of your predecessors, Steve Koonin. I hope that the fact that it took so long to get this done doesn't indicate some sort of inability to think outside the box here because that's what it's really going to take.

We've got 4 different DOE offices, ARPA-E, Office of Energy Efficiency, the Office of Electricity and the Office of Science. Part of the reason that your office is being reorganized is Secretary Moniz, correctly in my view, wants better coordination between basic research programs and technology development programs. Energy storage is exactly the kind of program that is going to take this kind of department wide approach.

I want to make sure, as we talked about in the office, that this report that is being put out today does not just find its way to the gazillions of other kinds of reports stockpiled, you know, somewhere in the Forrestal, you know, Building. So I want to announce today that I am naming David Berick of the committee as the point person. He's going to be the person responsible in working with you to get this plan, you know, implemented.

So tell us your thoughts with respect to how you're going to proceed. You're going to see a lot of Mr. Berick because he is going to be all over this to get this actually implemented. Give us your thoughts on that.

Mr. ORR. Senator, thanks for that.

I'm going to suppress my professorial urge to launch into a discussion of why the energy storage problem is so interesting from the short time scale to take the millisecond variations out of wind to hydro to longer time scales. But it's a very interesting area. It has applications across many parts of the energy space and the reason that there are multiple groups at the Department of Energy that are thinking about it is exactly that.

Now I haven't seen the plan yet. But if I'm confirmed, you can bet that I'll be in there pitching it. It's a really interesting area. It gives us a vehicle for testing ideas about how to bring groups together, to lay out a research plan that really can lead to breakthroughs in a very important area.

We have some experience in trying to do this at Stanford and we've have some tricks that have worked well for us. If confirmed, I'll do my best to get those working at the Department of Energy.

The CHAIRMAN. Get up to speed quick because I've indicated and talked with the Secretary. I've talked to you. This is one of my top, top priorities. Energy storage is one of those transformational opportunities.

I mean if we're serious, for example, about grid reliability one of the best ways to attack the grid reliability issue is to have a comprehensive energy storage plan. It is sure we've got plenty of energy stored if you have a Hurricane Sandy or a tragedy like that.

So we're going to work very closely with you. Appreciate it.

I'm over my time.

Senator Murkowski.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think I'll use this first round to stick with our DOE nominees. Let me go to you, Mr. Elkind.

We're seeing a really encouraging situation on the ground in this country, certainly on private lands, with the dramatic oil and natural gas production that we're seeing taking place on, again, State and private lands primarily. But I would assume that what we're seeing with this increased production would influence your views as they relate to international responsibilities. We're going to be having here on the committee a hearing, probably in January now, on the geopolitics of oil, the geopolitics of natural gas and the fact that as a Nation we really move from a position of scarcity to one of greater abundance.

Just very generally and you've got about a minute to do it. Can you describe some of the geopolitical impacts of our oil and natural gas boom? Do you think that this has helped strengthen our Nation's position and would potential exports of either oil or natural gas or other types of energy, for that matter, further enhance or diminish this impact?

Just generally the geopolitical impact here of what we're seeing in our Nation now with increased production.

Mr. ELKIND. Senator, thank you very much for the question. It's a very, very important question. This has been such a dramatic development over the last several years to watch this very impressive and sustained growth in our domestic oil and natural gas production.

I will just note very briefly that of course the domestic implications in terms of job creation, in terms of other benefits inside of our borders are not to be glanced past.

With regard to the impacts in terms of the global scene they also have been very important. There are opportunities for countries that have had relationships with certain suppliers to now have competing supplies. That is a very positive development on the natural gas side.

In terms of oil it is, after all, a very liquid, global market—truly a global oil market. But having additional supplies in the marketplace makes it easier to move through times when one sees, for example, production going offline from some of the traditional suppliers like Libya.

So it's a very important issue. It is one that has my full attention in my current role. If I am confirmed, please rest assured that this is something that will be very, very, much a focus that I will be watching very closely.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you for that.

Let me ask you, Dr. Orr, when we talk about those transformational energy sources one of the things that I have been involved with over the years is trying to advance the research on methane hydrates. We reauthorized the Methane Hydrate Research Act of 2005. I've been pushing the Administration to make sure that we've got adequate funding out there for the program.

I think we're seeing far less than we need. We had a test back in January 2012 up in Prudhoe that seemed to show that methane can be made to flow from these hydrates by replacing it with carbon dioxide. You know, when you're talking about how we're going to be able to utilize sequestered gas.

I think these are some advances that are proving promising.

Clearly Japan is recognizing that. They've been working with Alaska on some of this research. Earlier this year they conducted their own follow up test. They reported some substantial progress.

Do you see methane hydrates as a priority area for the Department's research budget? Just, kind of, generally where are you on methane hydrates?

Mr. ORR. Senator, thanks for the question.

Methane hydrates are interesting structures. They're kind of cage-like structures which the gas molecules can be trapped.

It's pretty clear that there's a very large resource out there and certainly Alaska is one of the places—

Senator MURKOWSKI. Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. ORR. Yes.

Alaska is one of the places that these things form and they're actually widespread on the ocean floor. So there's no question there's a bigger source.

It's a tough one to get to economically because you need to work offshore or in places where sustaining production for the long time to pay out the costs can be a challenge.

So obviously I'm not in office so I'm not as knowledgeable about the details of the DOE program as I should be. But it's clear that there are good science questions to be answered and then to move to the question of engineering to be able to take advantage of these things.

It's an area that interests me personally. I'll look forward to working on it if I'm confirmed.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I appreciate that. Obviously it's always a question about budget and resources when we're looking toward additional research dollars. But I'd look forward to learning more about your views on this as you move into the job here.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll move to the DOI nominees next.

The CHAIRMAN. Excellent.

Senator Murkowski and I work very closely with Senator Barrasso on all the issues that come before the committee. We welcome you today, Senator Barrasso.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Suh, thank you very much for taking time to come and visit with me and my staff on some of the issues. I want to talk a bit about your views on natural gas.

A couple of years ago, actually 2007, you made a statement that natural gas development is and I'll quote, easily the single greatest threat to the ecological integrity of the West."

Now natural gas development is, as you said, "easily the single greatest threat to the ecological integrity of the West." Now I find this viewpoint goes, kind of, beyond what is in the minds of the members of this committee. It's out of the mainstream.

I mean, we've had issues of others who've come to talk to this committee about natural gas. Expanding responsible natural gas development is one of the biggest economic success stories in the country. Create thousands of jobs in places like Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, West Virginia, Louisiana and others.

So if confirmed there are pending issues that you'll be in charge of and you'll have influence that will allow you to essentially stop natural gas production.

You're going to be in charge of the Fish and Wildlife Service where you'll have influence and authority to set policy.

You'll be able to influence decisions as to where to designate critical habitat which can lock up millions of acres of land from natural gas production.

They'll be numerous decisions that will be made during your tenure as to whether to list or to designate either crucial, critical habitat for different species, whether it's sage grouse in 8 Western States, potential listings of the lesser prairie chicken in Oklahoma, the Gunnison sage grouse in Colorado, your home State and in Utah, to name only a few.

You know, you'll also have influence over future species, the sue and settle agreements and to issue new rules that can restrict and lock up more land and ocean from natural gas production offshore and onshore.

In addition the National Park Service, which you will also oversee in this position, has also begun commenting on BLM hydraulic fracturing rules.

So, given the views stated by you in 2007 I want to know how members of the Senate that support natural gas could support your nomination.

Ms. SUH. Senator Barrasso, thank you very much for the question and also for the time that you spent with me personally. I appreciate it.

As a member of this Administration and personally I believe strongly in the President's all of the above energy strategy of which natural gas is a hugely important component. My work at the Hewlett Foundation and at the Packard Foundation was really focused on trying to enable conservation solutions that were balanced, balanced with development as well as preservation. We worked hard to ensure that that all of those efforts were efforts that ultimately were respected, I think, the economic needs and aspirations of local communities.

So recognizing the importance of not only natural gas and the overall, kind of, energy needs of the country and opportunities of the country, but specifically natural gas' role in the economic development and livelihood of local communities throughout the country. I respect the role of it, understand the need for it and if confirmed in this new position, will work hard to ensure that the decisions that are made, specifically by the Fish and Wildlife Service, are made in such a way that recognize, again, that this larger question of balance.

Senator BARRASSO. You know, I support natural gas. I think saying natural gas is the single greatest threat to the ecology of the West really doesn't sound like the support is there fundamentally for natural gas. I've got concerns.

I'd also like to read from an October 31st of this year Op Ed by the Washington Examiner on your nomination by Ron Arnold. It was entitled, "Another Big Green Power Player moves up in Obama's Washington."

I'm sure you've seen the article. The article references your background being a program officer for the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, you just mentioned that, your work with the David and Lucille Packard Foundation and your leadership roles of the

Environmental Grant Makers Association. The article states that at Hewlett, Suh managed the multimillion dollar Western Grants portfolio doling out hundreds of thousands to green groups who sued the government to block productive ventures and usurp private property rights at the Federal, State and local levels from the Dakotas to Texas to the Pacific.

So after years of you serving 2 big foundations and the Environmental Grant Makers Association you then joined the Interior Department. But even after you joined the Interior Department you stated before the Environmental Grant Makers 25th anniversary that quote, "I look forward to working with you, my colleagues." You're not there anymore. You're at the Department of Interior, but you're still saying, "I look forward to working with you, my colleagues, mentors and friends to utilize the skills and talents of the EGA community to advance," you said, "a more resilient world and a resilient movement."

So my question is given your lifetime of funding activist groups, opposing natural gas production, how can the members of this committee suddenly expect you to change your views if you're confirmed?

Ms. SUH. Thank you again for that question.

Perhaps I can take the opportunity to clarify my views.

Once again, I think both as demonstrated in my personal experience working for this committee and a member of this committee as well as my experience in the Foundation world where I focused my grant making not on activities that were opposed to, again, the needs of local community and the participations of local communities and local stakeholders on conservation decisions. In fact, the vast majority of the work that I did both at the Hewlett Foundations and then the Packard Foundations were really designed about raising those voices.

As I said in my opening statement I worked considerably on a suite of grant making at both institutions to enable a broader suite of voices to be heard in the conservation movement, voices of hunters and anglers, voices of communities of color, voices of native people. I can give you concrete examples throughout the West where I focused my efforts on ensuring that those voices of local communities were heard and balanced against the voices that were just coming from Washington, DC.

So I believe that with each and every single grant that I recommended during my tenure at both the Hewlett and Packard Foundations, those grants were balanced in a way that, again, both enable the opportunity to think about conservation, think about the resilience, again, of our conservation opportunities with the needs, aspirations and desires of local communities.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your patience because my time has expired. I would just say this is a statement given just less than, about a year ago, the fall of 2012. I just think that this is not a position to which you've been nominated, in my opinion, to promote any movement. So, you know, I question whether this is really the right position for you given your deeply held views.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Barrasso.

Let me explain to our witnesses.

I have to also be in the Finance Committee because we're getting ready to make some transformational changes as it relates to physician reimbursement and health care. I'm going to give each of you an additional question just to highlight an additional issue with each of you. We have the good fortune that Senator Murkowski will wrap up and that will be a big plus.

I'm going to want to have in writing from you, Dr. Orr, and let's say a week from Friday, your views with respect to what to do about methane leakage. Senator Murkowski talked about, touched on the methane issue. But I feel very strongly that we ought to be pushing to get at less than 1 percent leakage from the well to the consumer.

We do that, it's going to make a big difference. This is an opportunity for a balanced approach as it relates to natural gas.

I talked about I've been a strong supporter of, you know, natural gas. I'd like to think I was for natural gas before it became cool, 50 percent cleaner than the other fossil fuels. We've got to get at some of these critical environmental issues. One of them is methane leakage.

The CHAIRMAN. For you, Mr. Elkind, I'm particularly interested in your response to the question that we'll give you in writing about our relationship with China.

China has become the world's largest importer of crude. It's a role the United States used to hold. There are a host of issues with respect to our relationship with China that we'll want your answers for.

The CHAIRMAN. For you, Ms. Suh, what we need is what we talked about in the office. That is your thoughts about fresh ideas for funding the maintenance, you know, backlog.

What I'll ask you in writing is particularly to give us your sense of some approaches that haven't been tried, you know, to date. Dr. Coburn has worked with Senator Murkowski and I. We want to make sure that we're looking at every opportunity, particularly to bring the private sector into the maintenance backlog.

So we'll need your thoughts on that.

The CHAIRMAN. For you, Mr. Beaudreau, as we indicated in the office because you're the policy management and budget person, what we're particularly interested in is having your thoughts, as Senator Murkowski, Senator Landrieu and I look to this whole question, you know, of revenue sharing, which is a jobs issue. It's an environmental issue. It's a taxpayer's, you know, issue.

What I'm particularly interested in here is trying to find a way to make common cause between all the communities where there's Federal land and Federal water. The meetings in these communities all, pretty much, look the same. They're sensible people trying to figure out a way to have jobs and to protect our treasures.

If we were starting over I don't think we'd come close to doing what we got today, this bizarre hodgepodge of different revenue structures and revenue sharing kinds of programs. But you never get to, sort of, start from scratch. So Senator Murkowski and Senator Landrieu, in my view, have been very constructive, you know, in terms of trying to think again on these kinds of issues. I'm com-

mitted to working with them. So we're going to ask you some questions about that in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. So that's what you'll be getting. We're going to need it a week from Friday.

With that, Senator Murkowski, I'm just so appreciative of all your help and happy to have you wrap up.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Alright. Thank our nominees. I intend to support each of you here in the very near future when we're able to have a vote.

Thank you.

Senator MURKOWSKI [presiding]. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To our nominees again apologize for the, kind of, disruptive process. But it's kind of a weird week.

Let me go to both you, Ms. Suh and Mr. Beaudreau. We're in, kind of an interesting situation. The hearing is a little bit interesting because you're basically kind of swapping places here, if you will.

Mr. Beaudreau, your nomination to Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget where Ms. Suh has been. I don't think I'm making any news by saying that I have appreciated your leadership, Mr. Beaudreau, in so many of these issues that impact us, particularly up North, the leadership that you have clearly demonstrated on some policy issues that required, kind of, paving some new ground there as we look to explore and produce in the Arctic. The fact that you are moving to, what I would consider to be more of a desk job, in the sense that the focus is on more of the administrative and the budget end of it.

I've expressed my concerns to you that I don't want this to be moving backward in any way. Not that I would suggest that focusing on the budget piece of it is not equally important. But I want that assurance that you still remain engaged in the policy level, the decisionmaking that goes on and recognizing that within the Department and under this new Secretary there are different management styles. You've indicated that you think that this is a more, kind of a kitchen cabinet type of an approach to management.

But it is important to me to know that you will continue to be involved in so many of these initiatives where you have really led. The interagency working group on Alaska energy is a very specific example of that where you bring together the high level officials to advance energy developments, streamline the permitting process. You—the leadership that you've demonstrated as the Acting Chair, I think, has been very important.

So I'd like the assurance that you will remain committed to not only being part of this group, but remaining the Chair of this group and continuing to lead on these policy initiatives that I think we all recognize are going to be very critical going forward.

Mr. BEAUDREAU. Yes, thank you for that, Senator Murkowski and for the vote of confidence.

As you know, and we've discussed, I'm heavily invested in all of these issues, resource issues, the interplay with resource development and responsible conservation at a landscape level. I believe from the Assistant Secretary of Policy, Management and Budget position I can actually take a broader perspective on all those

issues and help us move forward and build on the gains we've made so far as both a naturally situated coordinating role across all the bureaus in the Department, but also to provide the benefit of my experience and my counsel to the Secretary and to the Deputy Secretary and the other members of the Department in their leadership roles.

I wouldn't be interested in this position unless I was able to carry forward to all those issues. As you know, I'm pretty heavily invested in them, including the issues relating to Alaska. With respect to the interagency working group on permitting in Alaska, that is a tremendous innovation that we've made there. I actually think it has broader application elsewhere in the country as well, that type of approach, of bringing in the entire Federal family as well as other stakeholders, local communities, local tribes and other interests, bringing them to the table to try to work through the difficult issues that are involved in coming up with the right answers and right solutions on permitting major, major projects.

So again, I'd bring that perspective into this role and I'll carry it forward. I also expect to be and to remain very visible, very involved on a host of issues related to Alaska including continuing in a leadership role with the working group.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I appreciate that. I will acknowledge that that does give me some comfort to know that not only your involvement on the Alaska oil and gas issues will be a prominent part of your responsibilities as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, that you'll continue with the working group and continue to work as these regs are developed for oil and gas exploration in Alaska.

I think it's important to have your leadership there. I want it made very clear that I have that confidence in you. I think many do. I don't want us to be going backward at a time when we need to be making forward progress.

Ms. Suh, when we met in my office and I appreciate the time that you gave me, I will admit I was a little bit surprised that given your tenure as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, that you were clear with me that you had really not been engaged in that much from a policy perspective, particularly as those issues related to the State of Alaska whether it was ANWR or more parochial things like Izembek or legacy wells. I was concerned after our meeting. I'll be very frank with you in this forum because the issues that are front and foremost for us as Alaskans are really key to our everyday opportunity to either have an economy of any sort or be able to access, just be able to access healthcare which is what the Izembek road is all about.

So I think you've got a pretty steep learning curve here when it comes to those policy implications on a State like Alaska where the Federal landlord is so present there. So I'm curious to know in your current position as Policy, Management and Budget, how you describe the importance of what you have been doing verses what you will now be doing which is really taking over the reins of some very significant agencies whether it's Fish and Wildlife, whether it's BLM, whether it's Park Service? Moving from that more administrative focus, which is what I understand your focus was, to one now where it's really big picture policy initiatives.

Can you give me the level of comfort that I'm seeking as you're presenting your credentials for this nomination?

Ms. SUH. Ranking Member, thank you very much for that question and also for the opportunity to take so much time out of your schedule to meet with me. I found the meeting incredibly helpful. If I wasn't clear in articulating the role that I have at the Department, how it interacts with policy, let me take the opportunity now to talk a little bit more about that.

As the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, again, you know I'm primarily responsible for budget formulation and execution. As you know as an appropriator often times the budget process is the tail that wags the dog. So I have been involved in every single one of the major policy priorities from Secretary Salazar to now Secretary Jewell. Ensuring, again, we have the resources and the resources are deployed in such a way that we can stand up those priorities, energy priorities, conservation priorities, youth priorities.

So I have been engaged on policy at those levels, but I have certainly not played the kind of role that my colleague, Mr. Beaudreau, has played as kind of more the forward facing policy role as it relates to any of the segments of the Department.

Let me also take an opportunity to talk a little bit about my Alaska experience. Now, again, while I've been at the Department it has—I have taken more of an administrative view of the role that I seek. But that has afforded me some opportunity to interact with issues related to Alaska.

We've worked on local hire issues which I know has been a hugely important issue for you.

We've also worked on trying to improve aviation contracting.

So I am familiar with the kind of on the ground issues as they relate to, kind of, the appropriate management of our organizations.

But beyond that I have had quite a bit of experience in working on natural resource issues, policy issues, as they relate to your great State of Alaska. I mean, I think I've been to Alaska probably a dozen times. The first time I ever salmon fished was out in the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge.

Some of the grants I was referring to when I answered Senator Barrasso's question were grants that we made in Alaska. Let me point you to 2 in particular.

We worked for 4 years, providing 4 years of support when I was at the Hewlett Foundation, to the Cup'ik community out in Chevak to actually map out their subsistence rights so they could work more, to improve their relationship with the Fish and Wildlife Service to assert their subsistence rights.

We worked on a variety of different issues in Southeast Alaska as they related to the Tongass Roundtable, working with local timber owners as well as mayors to try to figure out a way to come together to preserve the opportunity of that industry while trying to create an opportunity for long term conservation.

Those types of balanced approaches, not only I think represent the kind of policy vision I have for the role that I will take, but they also represent, I think, perhaps a little bit more knowledge

about Alaska issues, about communities, about native people than I was able to convey during our meeting.

You know, there's a ton of stuff to learn in Alaska. I want to be quite humble about the fact, I mean, it's the largest State in the country. As you said in your 2011 speech, you know, if you superimpose it on the map of the United States, it would span from Florida all the way to California.

There's a ton I have left to learn about Alaska. I have left to learn about ANILCA and ANCSA. I'm eager to do so because I recognize the importance of Alaska, not only for Alaska, but for America.

I am deeply interested in working with you and building a good relationship with your staff so that I can get up to speed on the issues that you care about and that I can spend more time on the ground in Alaska. I'm not just interested in going up to Alaska to take scenic view tours on bright, sunny days. Whenever you want me there, whether it's the spring, summer, fall, winter, I will be there and I very much look forward, if confirmed, to having a good working relationship with you and your staff.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I appreciate your willingness to recognize that you have some things to learn. We'd certainly would be working with you on that.

What I was hoping to do with the questions of both of you, keep in mind we're kind of trading spaces here between the 2 of you. Mr. Beaudreau has assured me that even though that the title is Policy, Management and Budget, he's going to not only be focused on the budget/management part of it, but he's also going to have that policy role.

Yet, Ms. Suh, you have confirmed with me that in your years in this position your focus has not been on that policy, but it has been on the budget/management side.

I want to make sure that you, Mr. Beaudreau, are not going to be locked into the budget/management, as important as that is, I want to know that that policy piece continues. I think that you have the credibility and the support within the Administration to make sure that you do insert yourself that way. I just want to make it very clear, for the record, that that is my expectation here.

My colleague is here from West Virginia. I will defer to him. I thank you.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you so much, Madame Chairman.

To all of you, thank you for being here. I appreciate you all, your testimonies and your commitment to our great country.

Dr. Orr, you do know the State I come from and we try to do everything. We're really, we're all in. We're doing it all.

So, I guess my first question to you, sir, would be the EIA in the Department of Energy, Energy Information Agency, has stated the need for all of the above really. They're relying on coal and natural gas and so much nuclear mix and renewables coming on. Do you agree with their forecast in findings of how much and I will state coal, how much fossil will be needed for the next 2 to 3 decades for our energy mix?

Mr. ORR. Senator, thanks for the question.

I have to say I had not delved hugely, deeply into the process by which EIA constructs those estimates. I don't have reason to doubt them. But I'm not fully briefed on the details.

But I will say that—

Senator MANCHIN. I think it's 35 percent, you know, for the next 2, 3 decades.

Mr. ORR. Yes, the diversified energy system is exactly what we do want. We need to have a variety of primary energy resources and a variety of ways to transform those into the energy services that we all use, electricity and transportation and all those kinds of things.

So, I think that there's no question that there will be—

Senator MANCHIN. We need all of the above. I mean—

Mr. ORR. Yes, absolutely.

Senator MANCHIN. Any reasonable person.

But you understand we're running into some pretty strong headwinds as far as in the State that's produced most of the energy and exported a lot of energy and kept this country where it is today. But our people are very skeptical about having to work against our government rather than our government working for us.

What we're saying to the Department of Energy, you all have been the ones recommended to the EPA what new technologies were feasible and doable and had come to fruition on a commercial scale? I think that you've recognized we have not had one commercial carbon capture sequestration, commercial. We've been able to show through demonstrations but we don't have anything commercial on operational for, let's say, a year.

But yet everything we have is the new source performance standards, everything is moving to that direction before we can continue forward. The uncertainty is what I think, I'm concerned about, the uncertainty and the policies of the EPA. I don't know whether that you believe and you feel that you should have more oversight or more input to what direction they're going or tell them what's feasible.

But I've always said if it's unattainable, it's unreasonable to put those benchmarks when we haven't been proven to meet them and don't have technology.

I don't know what your feelings. I'm sorry, I don't mean to on the rest of you all, but this is so important to, I think, our Nation, the energy and definitely to the State of West Virginia.

Mr. ORR. So, Senator, thanks.

The role of the Department of Energy, as I understand it, has been to work on advanced coal technologies and clean coal technologies, in particular the idea of carbon capture and storage.

Senator MANCHIN. Sure.

Mr. ORR. Of course I'm not in office, but if confirmed, this is an area that of course I will have to pay a lot of attention to.

I do have some experience looking back in my own career both with enhanced oil recovery and some with trying to understand the subsurface part of the carbon capture and sequestration.

Senator MANCHIN. If I may, because I know we're going to be time constrained here. I want to make sure I can and I'm so sorry.

I'm not interrupting you, sir, but I want to give you a little bit different perspective of this.

The Department of Energy has had \$8 billion for research and development. It's been laying there for since 2, 9, I think. I don't understand. Not one penny or one award or one grant has been approved for new fossil research or technology or anything driven toward that direction to find the new technologies, if you will.

With 8 billion tons of coal being burnt in the world and everyone is identifying and trying to put the oneness and saying it's—and I'm looking at basically for answers. But if we burn less than one billion tons of coal and have some of the most reliable, affordable and dependable energy what are you going to do with the other 7 billion tons that's being burned in the world if we don't find the technology? How are you going to find the technology if you don't partner up with the private sector to spend some of that \$8 billion to try to move the ball forward?

Mr. ORR. Senator, that's clearly an important question. It's one that matters. I know only the broad outlines from the outside.

But I do understand that there is work in progress to invest those dollars. If I'm confirmed then this will be an area where I'll be happy to work with you and communicate with you about what's going on.

Senator MANCHIN. I sure look forward to that, too.

I don't mean to skip over the 3 of you all. But as you can—and I've heard your testimonies and your backgrounds and everything seems, I believe that you're sitting there for the right reasons. I appreciate that.

I think Doctor, you are too. We need help. We need help basically in getting it all in energy policy.

West Virginia has been a heavy lifter for many, many years. We do coal. We do natural gas. We've been very blessed with all the resources.

We have one of the largest wind farms east of the Mississippi, so we're all in. I've taken our Ranking Member here with me. She's seen West Virginia. We're willing to do everything and anything.

But we just want people to recognize we're just trying to continue to provide the energy this country needs. We're getting the living crap beat out of us by our own government. That doesn't seem to look at what's feasible.

When your EIA is saying you're going to be needing this resource and then I talk to all the utilities they're saying because of the EPA they're making us make decisions that's not good for our portfolio. It's definitely not good for the American public for us to get so lopsided in our portfolio that we can't get dependable, reliable and affordable energy. Coal is such a major mix of that.

That's all I'm asking for is a realistic, sympathetic look to what we can do and what we need to do for our country. So I do look forward to working with you, sir. I would hope that you would be very accessible for that.

Mr. ORR. I will look forward to it.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, sir.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Senator Flake.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you.

Ms. Suh, during the recent government shut down the State of Arizona provided about \$465 thousand to temporarily open the Grand Canyon, the National Park. Likewise, in 1995, the State of Arizona provided \$370 thousand to temporarily reopen the park during the shutdown that occurred that year. In both instances Congress retroactively appropriated funding for the Park Service that covered the shutdown period. In 1995 the Park Service subsequently refunded the amount that was spent by the State of Arizona.

This year the Park Service has retained this funding creating, kind of a shutdown windfall for the Department, if you will. Can you explain why? Why the Department has chosen to act differently this time?

Ms. SUH. Senator, thank you for that question.

It is my understanding that we require Congressional authorization in order to repay the States. If Congress so chooses to provide us that authorization, we would be happy to pay the States back.

Senator FLAKE. Was that authorization received in 1995?

Ms. SUH. I'm not aware of the specifics of the legislation that was passed when it reopened the government. But, yes, I believe we had the authority with that appropriations or with that continuing resolution to do so.

Senator FLAKE. My understanding was that Congressional reauthorization or the kind of legislation you're seeking was not provided in 1995. So if additional legislation or authorization was not provided in 1995 and the Department or the Park Service refunded the State, will you do the same this time?

Ms. SUH. I assure you it is not by a simple matter of choice that we are not refunding the funding that we received from the States during that period of time. We believe that we lack the authorization to actually transfer that money back to the States.

I'm happy to work with you and your staff to, as well as with our Solicitor's office to look into that matter in more detail to try to come to some clarity about the way we can resolve this.

Senator FLAKE. That—can you just assure me that you won't require anything this time that you didn't acquire last time?

Ms. SUH. Again, not having been here in 1995 and not being familiar with what was actually required at that time, I can only speak for what I believe is required now. I understand that we need Congressional authorization in order to pay the States back. If we receive that from Congress, we would be happy to pay them back.

Senator FLAKE. You mentioned that you're happy to work with us in that regard. We sent a letter or the Arizona delegation, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to the Department on November 13th. We've not heard anything back.

What are we to believe if you say you want to work with us, but we wrote more than a month ago and haven't heard anything back?

Ms. SUH. I apologize for the tardiness of that reply. Again, I'm happy to immediately go back and try to get clarification from the folks within Interior and reach out to your office and have a conversation about it.

Senator FLAKE. I would appreciate that certainly. When you do, please, if there is any justification for providing the funding in

1995 and not providing the funding now, we'd like to know what that is. Why you feel it's appropriate to keep the windfall this time, shutdown windfall, and not last time.

That's what we're concerned about.

So, anyway, look forward to hearing from you on that. Just want to say that, yeah, it's been over a month and we've not heard a thing back.

Ms. SUH. Yes, sir.

Senator FLAKE. So we do need to consult on this or if we need to find out what action has been taken.

Ms. SUH. Yes, sir. Thank you.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Senator Flake.

Ms. Suh, I have just probably a couple more quick questions for you and then I believe we've got yet another vote coming up at 11. This relates to a policy issue that for us in Alaska is pretty important, some would say all consuming and that's the issue of ANWR.

The Fish and Wildlife Service's draft conservation plan and EIS for ANWR did not include a development alternative for oil and gas in the coastal plain. The Department stated in testimony previously that the reason they did this was because that development requires an act of Congress. But the draft plan included alternatives for additional wilderness and wild and scenic rivers. Those require an act of Congress.

So on the one hand they're saying well, we can't do an alternate plan for development because that would require an act of Congress.

Yet they also turn around and say, well, wilderness, scenic rivers, which requires an act of Congress is OK. We're going to put this in the plan.

I think it's very inconsistent, highly inconsistent.

So the general, broader question to you is whether or not you believe the 1002 area of the coastal plain which was set aside for oil and gas development in ANWR, as part of this compromise reaching under ANILCA, whether or not you believe that it should be developed?

Ms. SUH. Senator Murkowski, the President has made it clear that he does not believe that development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is warranted at this time. The Secretary of Interior, Sally Jewell, agrees with the President. I agree with both the Secretary and the President.

That is not to say that the balance of energy needs and the energy opportunities in the North Slope of Alaska are unimportant to this Administration or to the Department of Interior. Again, in the all of the above energy strategy, I think we are working very concertedly and I know that you've been working very closely with my colleague, Mr. Beaudreau, on opportunities to expand the opportunity for responsible energy development in both onshore and offshore in Alaska.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I didn't really anticipate that you were going to tell me that you supported development in ANWR. It would have been a great surprise this morning. But that was not what I expected.

But you have mentioned in your response to me previously that you look forward to understanding and learning more about the Federal laws that have such impact on us in Alaska, ANCSA and ANILCA.

ANILCA specifically, specifically, provides that there will be no more wilderness designations within the State of Alaska. How do you reconcile this proposal then coming out of Fish and Wildlife for additional wilderness and wild and scenic rivers when ANILCA has specifically stated no more?

When those designations were made several decades ago it was recognized that the amount of wilderness that we have in Alaska, which is more than the entire wilderness in the rest of the country, that basically Alaska had contributed. Yet, this Administration is continuing to push on this in direct violation and contradiction to what ANILCA spells out.

How do you reconcile the terms of ANILCA with this latest effort coming out of Fish and Wildlife?

Ms. SUH. Thank you, Senator.

First, again thank you for forwarding this speech that you gave on Alaska Day in 2011 and the background that that provided of the kind of origins of intents of primarily ANILCA were quite helpful to me.

My understanding is that the Fish and Wildlife Service has a variety of different alternatives. There is not a preferred alternative. I recognize your concern associated with wilderness, but I also recognize that wilderness, wherever it's designated is an act of Congress and will require an act of Congress. To that we are ultimately and always deferential to this body.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Do you expect or do you know when the final plan is expected to be released?

Ms. SUH. I am not aware of the timeframe.

Senator MURKOWSKI. One of the real concerns from folks back home is that despite the statements coming from the Administration that local residents should be involved in the land management decisions. Secretary Jewell has articulated this as well. But it seems that that only happens to favor conservation, unfortunately, not production.

In Alaska there's a clear, clear majority of folks including every State wide elected official, both Republican and Democrat, that strongly support responsible oil and gas administration. The concern back home is that the Administration is going to unilaterally act on ANWR.

Would you support such unilateral action without, again, the involvement of the people that live and work and raise their families there?

Ms. SUH. Again, I believe every public process that we have around important policy decisions requires and demands the need for strong public engagement, particularly for engagement of the local communities and local stakeholders.

As I stated earlier I don't believe the Department has the authority to unilaterally decide anything on wilderness. That is an authority that, again, rests within this body that we will ultimately and always be deferential to.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Let me ask one last question and then I'll let you all go. You've been very patient this morning.

I raised this briefly, but this, again, is an important issue in the State of Alaska. Some might say it is so extraordinarily parochial we can't believe we spend so much time talking about the Izembek road, a ten mile, one lane, gravel road that would be used for non-commercial purposes to connect the small community of King Cove with the State's second longest runway there at Cold Bay.

I have taken the position that as significant as that refuge area is and I appreciate the bird populations that move through, but that we should be working every day to give equal protection to the residents, who live in this small, Alaska, Aleut village provide them access to life saving healthcare which is only available if you can get out of the village to an airport that can take you to Anchorage or to other medical facilities.

So I have been trying to work this initiative. Secretary Jewell has been out to King Cove. The Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Mr. Washburn, has been out.

What I would ask from you is that if you are confirmed, your commitment to work for a suitable solution that will ensure the protection of the residents of King Cove that, as important as wild-life is, that we not ignore the health and safety needs of the local residents who are out there.

Ms. SUH. Senator, as you know, Secretary Jewell had an opportunity to visit the community. Secretary Washburn is completing or has recently completed his report to her on the situation.

I recognize that this is Secretary Jewell's ultimate decision, but I absolutely commit to you that I will be looking at the critical issues, the issues of safety, health associated with whatever decisions we might make in the future, but certainly with the decision that the Secretary is going to be making associated with Izembek. So you do have my commitment. I am very interested in engaging with you further on this issue.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I appreciate that.

I think it should be noted that certainly within Alaska and many who are looking at this issue back here, there appears to be, again, an inconsistency with the position that the Fish and Wildlife Service has taken with regards to its ongoing opposition to the King Cove road.

Yet, just the recent decision to grant permits to that will allow for the taking of eagles at wind farms around the country. People are looking at that and saying well, wait a minute. It's going to be OK given that permits can be issued, that our national bird would be killed and yet, we've got a situation where human lives are at risk and we're saying we cannot provide for a road because we need to protect the migratory water fowl.

It seems to me you're talking about balance. I think we need to work to try to find that balance here. Your assistance in that would be appreciated.

I have many questions for the record that I will submit to all of you.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I know that I can speak, probably speak, hopefully speak for the chairman on this, that others on the committee will as well given that most were not able to attend and

based on the conversations I've had with others. I know that they were all very interested in your nominations and the perspectives that you hold. So I think you can expect additional questions.

Senator MURKOWSKI. But I appreciate the time that you have given us and again, your willingness to serve.

With that we'll stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:09 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to Additional Questions

RESPONSES OF JONATHAN ELKIND TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR WYDEN

Question 1a. China.—As many predicted, China has become the world's largest importer of crude, a role the U.S. used to hold. The U.S. has a long history of working with our partners internationally in times of crisis to ensure an adequate supply of energy for our allies.

I know China also maintains strategic petroleum reserves, but are we considering discussions or entering into cooperative efforts with them to ensure a stable energy market in the future?

Answer. Over the last few years, DOE has actively engaged the Chinese National Energy Administration, both bilaterally and multilaterally, on issues related to reserves. DOE is currently negotiating a cooperative agreement with China on issues related to the Chinese Strategic Petroleum Reserve in order to allow us to better understand the country's planning and policies related to reserve management. If confirmed, I will work to conclude these negotiations expeditiously, the outcome of which will support U.S. energy security goals through sharing best practices and encouraging China to increase transparency and improve the quality of its oil data.

Question 1b. Keeping this in mind, can you elaborate further on what efforts if any the Administration is pursuing in terms of addressing possible future international supply shortages?

Answer. DOE is engaged with a wide range of producer and consumer countries on planning and policies for supply disruption and shortages. Promoting international cooperation on data transparency, policy reform and technology innovation with countries such as China is critical to addressing potential future energy shortages. Better understanding supplies and reserves, and how they are managed allows for early warning of potential problems, better informed policies and more effective coordination to address disruptions and shortages as they arise.

Question 2. Strategic influence.—Domestic consumption is dropping and production is increasing. While this is a positive development—specifically the U.S. being less reliant on politically tumultuous states for energy—it could also result in a shift of the U.S.' strategic influence overseas. I believe the U.S. needs to begin contemplating what comes after energy independence, and how we can change roles internationally but maintain our influence abroad.

In your opinion how should U.S. energy policy evolve with the U.S. transition from highly dependent on imported oil to becoming a global energy player?

Answer. Even as U.S. energy imports decline, the U.S. market will remain integrated with international energy markets. I believe our energy policies should be designed to enhance U.S. energy security by advocating for transparent international energy markets and being prepared to respond to domestic and international energy supply disruptions with actions that mitigate the adverse effects of those disruptions on U.S. consumers. Our policies should also focus on maintaining U.S. technological leadership in energy, both domestically and internationally, and reducing global emissions of greenhouse gases.

RESPONSES OF JONATHAN ELKIND TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR MURKOWSKI

Question 1. As part of your Opportunity08 project for the Brookings Institution, you wrote that, "Without doubt, the United States needs higher energy prices."

a. Do you continue to hold that view?

b. In your opinion, how high should energy prices be? What should be the average national price for electricity and gasoline, as compared to where we are today?

Answer. The mission of the Department of Energy is to drive down the costs of energy technologies and to facilitate the smooth functioning of energy markets through effective policy. This has been my focus through my tenure at DOE, and it would continue to be my focus if I am confirmed as Assistant Secretary for International Affairs. We need to keep prices for energy services as low as possible while still maintaining a reliable, robust and clean energy system; to do otherwise would inflict serious impacts on families.

Question 2. As part of your Opportunity08 project for the Brookings Institution, you noted that “worldwide, 1.6 billion people still lack energy services in their homes.” That’s an astounding number and a reminder not only that energy is fundamentally good, but also that we are blessed to have it in relative abundance.

a. If you are confirmed as Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, how would you advise Secretary Moniz to seek to increase energy access around the world?

b. Would you advise the Secretary to seek to deny those living in energy poverty access to fossil fuels, whether through international financial institutions or greater energy exports from the U.S.?

c. Will you work with this Committee to identify sensible policies, such as greater energy exports, that would help improve energy access throughout the world?

Answer. If I am confirmed as Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, I will advise Secretary Moniz to work on energy access issues by seeking to work with key international partners on the policies, technologies, and business models that can help to alleviate this important challenge. If I am confirmed, I would certainly be prepared to work with the Committee to identify policies that improve energy access throughout the world.

We know that people will use whatever fuels and whatever technologies they feel to be most advantageous, and that those energy resources will be largely made up of what is geographically available. If I am confirmed, I will advise Secretary Moniz to work with our international partners to increase knowledge and encourage host countries to create the right policy environments, to focus on renewables-based systems, efficient fossil-fuel-based systems, fossil-renewables hybrid systems, or others.

The Administration does not support denying energy access to anyone—least of all the poor. Recognizing the very real and increasing threat of climate change, the Administration does not intend to use taxpayer funds to finance conventional coal plants that lack carbon capture, although exceptions may be made in some cases for the poorest countries. As an alternative, and in order to promote global access to energy services, we are supporting programs and projects using a variety of clean energy options.

Question 3. How do you believe the United States can better engage on energy policy with the rest of the world? What does that mean to you, with regard to specific policies that should be pursued? What would be your top priorities if you are confirmed to this position?

Answer. If confirmed as Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, I will focus efforts on several Secretarial and Administration priorities, such as multilateral forums like the Africa Energy Ministerial and the Clean Energy Ministerial, as well as critical bilateral efforts like those with China, which would include oil market transparency, promote jobs in the export of technologies and energy, dialogue on oil market disruptions, buildings efficiency, and clean coal to name a few areas.

Question 4. Please describe how you view the relationship between the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of State, in terms of international activities related to energy development. Do any official documents, such as memoranda of understanding, govern this relationship?

Answer. The Departments of Energy, Interior, and State all bring different capabilities to the table in connection with international energy issues. The Department’s obligation is to identify the most effective ways to collaborate, under the coordination of the National Security Council structure, in order to secure maximum benefit for the American taxpayer from our varied institutional strengths. DOE’s strengths lie in the areas of energy policies, energy technologies, and energy markets. DOI plays distinct, vital roles in connection with energy regulation, offshore development, and related issues. The State Department is, of course, the political representative of the U.S. Government, and it has permanent presence through its diplomatic missions all around the world. At present, there are no formal, overarching agreements that govern these relationships as far as I am aware. Instead, interagency coordination is managed through the National Security Council process.

Question 5. Can you commit to working with me and this Committee to improve interagency coordination between DOE, State, Commerce, and other relevant federal entities on the overseas energy-related work that American taxpayers support?

Answer. If I am confirmed, I would be happy to work closely with you and other members of the Committee to help ensure good interagency coordination.

Question 6. Other DOE programs outside the Office of International Affairs have internal sections, offices, or task forces that deal with international implications specific to their work and missions. Do you think there is some duplication of activities across the Department that needs to be addressed and better managed?

Answer. Certain DOE program elements do focus on international aspects of their work. This enables the Department to tailor its engagement with foreign partners by ensuring a high degree of knowledge about individual technology groups. Through internal coordination mechanisms, we work to ensure that this does not result in duplication.

Question 7. As part of your Opportunity08 project for the Brookings Institution, you advocated for the next President to set a “goal of an annual increase of 2.5 percent in energy efficiency.”

a. How does this compare to efficiency gains made in the years since 2008?

Answer. The Energy Information Administration’s Annual Energy Outlook 2014 (Early Release) shows that the energy intensity of the U.S. economy (energy use per dollar of GDP) has decreased by 1.5 percent per year between 2008 and 2013. The rate of decrease goes up to around 2 percent per year in projections for subsequent years as a result of new appliance and CAFE standards: “U.S. energy use per capita was fairly constant from 1990 to 2007 but began to fall after 2007. In the AEO2014 Reference case, energy use per capita continues to decline as a result of improvements in energy efficiency (e.g., new appliance and CAFE standards) and changes in the ways energy is used in the U.S. economy.” (http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo/er/early_intensity.cfm)

b. How do you believe our current federal energy efficiency policies could be improved?

Answer. The President has outlined his strategy for improving energy efficiency policies in the Climate Action Plan, with the goal of doubling energy productivity by 2030 relative to 2010 levels. In particular, the Department of Energy is focused on moving more quickly on appliance standards, as well as expanding our efforts on the Better Buildings Challenge, with the goal of helping residential and commercial buildings be 20 percent more efficient by 2020. These actions, coupled with the historic increase of fuel economy standards for light-duty vehicles, represent a dramatic improvement in Federal efficiency policies.

Question 8. To what extent, if any, has the Department of Energy’s International Affairs office been involved in the formulation of the President’s forthcoming National Security Strategy?

Answer. The Department of Energy’s Office of International Affairs has supported the participation of senior DOE leadership in the formulation of the forthcoming National Security Strategy.

RESPONSES OF JONATHAN ELKIND TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BARRASSO

Question 1. In Opportunity 08, you wrote that: “Without doubt, the United States needs higher energy prices” (emphasis in the original). Please explain why those of us who support lower energy prices should vote in favor of your nomination.

Answer. The mission of the Department of Energy is to drive down the costs of energy technologies and to facilitate the smooth functioning of energy markets through effective policy. This has been my focus through my tenure since 2009 at DOE, and it would continue to be my focus if I am confirmed as Assistant Secretary for International Affairs. It is clear that higher energy prices inflict serious impacts on families.

Question 2. In Opportunity 08, you listed a number of “[p]otential [t]hreats” to our nation’s energy security. Among these threats, you included “support for increased use of coal before carbon capture and storage are commercialized.”

A. Has carbon capture and storage been commercialized?

Answer. Carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology has been and continues to be deployed on a range of projects, and have demonstrated the viability of CCS technology. World-wide, twelve large-scale CCS projects are operating. In the US, one large-scale project is operating and seven more are on track to enter commercial operation by 2018. These include a mix of projects, including fully integrated power and industrial applications; pre, post, and oxy-combustion efforts, and both enhanced oil recovery (EOR) and deep saline formation storage. Some projects that use available carbon capture technology have been operational for years, and these have

direct applicability to the power sector. If confirmed, I plan to be involved in DOE's continuous work to advance CCS and other important technologies in this area.

Question 2B. If so, do you support the increased use of coal, including but not limited to coal-to-liquids technology?

Answer. Coal is a part of the President's domestic "All of the Above" strategy, and can be part of a future where its effects on the environment are minimal. For coal, CCS is a critical part of the achieving those environmental benefits in any application, in the U.S. or abroad. DOE's goal is to continue to enhance the technology so that coal continues to have a competitive role in a future domestic energy mix.

Question 3. In Opportunity 08, you listed coal-to-liquids technology with carbon capture as an energy option with "[n]egative climate characteristics." Please explain why you believe this to be the case.

Answer. I appreciate the opportunity to clarify my Opportunity 08 essay. I do believe that coal-to-liquids technologies with CCS can result in lower greenhouse gas emissions. According to life-cycle analyses and commercial operations conducted to date, coal-to-liquids with CCS can have positive climate characteristics if a zero-emission energy source powers the plant's entire operation. Under such circumstances, coal-to-liquids fuels could contribute to greenhouse gas emission reduction over gasoline or diesel in the transportation sector.

Question 4. You have written extensively on the dependency that eastern European countries, such as Ukraine, have on natural gas from Russia.

A. Do you believe exports of liquefied natural gas (LNG) from the United States would help eastern European countries reduce their dependency on natural gas from Russia? If so, how?

Answer. Eastern European countries can reduce their energy dependency through strategies that focus on both the diversification of energy supply as well as the reduction of energy demand. These countries can diversify supply by exploring domestic resources, renewable energy potential, and new import opportunities including liquefied natural gas (LNG). Infrastructure interconnections can also help them to manage crises and have diversification options. These countries can reduce energy demand by pursuing significant energy efficiency opportunities in buildings, the industrial sector, and the public sector.

Question 4B. If confirmed, what steps, if any, would you take to convey the importance of U.S. LNG exports to the energy security of our allies and our own national interests to Secretary Moniz, the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Fossil Energy, and other relevant policy makers within the Department of Energy and the Administration?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with the Secretary, the Office of Fossil Energy, and all other relevant decision makers in Department and elsewhere across the Administration to stress the importance of global energy security and our own national interests. The Department can work with our allies to develop strategies to diversify energy supply by exploring their domestic resources, renewable energy potential, and new import opportunities including liquefied natural gas (LNG). At the same time, the Department can work with these countries on strategies to reduce energy demand through increased energy efficiency.

Question 5. Do you support exporting coal from the United States?

Answer. For the past ten years, the United States has exported between 5 percent and 10 percent of its coal production; our 2013 levels are at their highest share since the mid-1990s. While we must be cognizant of the implications of substantial increases in our coal exports, in terms of global environmental consequences to climate change as well as to domestic coal prices and local environmental concerns, any changes would need to be taken as a result of careful consideration of all the costs and benefits, including to jobs, economic welfare, energy security and the environment.

Question 6. Do you support the Department of Treasury's Guidance for U.S. Positions on [Multilateral Development Banks] Engaging with Developing Countries on Coal-Fired Power Generation issued on October 29, 2013?

Answer. Yes. This guidance was developed in an interagency process and has concurrence throughout the Administration.

Question 7. Do you agree with the Export-Import Bank's new policy to significantly limit financing for coal-fired power plants?

Answer. Yes. While there are some exceptions (in particular for the least-developed countries with no other options), the Administration has taken a position that it does not make sense to provide financial support to build coal-fired power plants without carbon capture and storage given their impact on the global climate—and hence their impact in the U.S.

Question 8. Do you believe coal provides a low-cost and reliable energy source to countries looking for assistance in poverty alleviation and economic development?

Answer. The federal government is committed to working with the poorest countries to build a sustainable, robust and accessible energy system in support of economic growth and poverty alleviation. We do not, as a rule, believe that coal will necessarily provide that service at least cost—particularly when taking into account the climate damages that accrue from coal use without carbon capture and storage. We believe that in most cases, alternatives exist that can meet the same needs. However, the Administration has made an exception to its policy so that in cases of certain least-developed countries, we can deploy coal, and in these cases we propose to consider the most efficient technology available in coal fired power plants.

Question 9. How much funding did the Office of Policy and International Affairs receive in fiscal year 2013?

Answer. The Office of Policy & International Affairs received \$25,991,000 in funding for fiscal year 2013.

Question 10. What is the number of staff positions at the Office of Policy and International Affairs? Did the number of staff positions increase from fiscal year 2012 and 2013?

Answer. The number of staff positions from FY12 to FY13 decreased. In FY15, as a result of reorganization, the Office of Policy & International will be split into two entities: the Office of International Affairs and the Energy Policy & Systems Analysis Office. If confirmed, I will head the former with a current number of 74 staff positions.

Question 11. Are you committed to ending duplication and to preventing redundancies in the U.S. government?

Answer. Yes.

Question 12. What measures and practices are in place at the Office of Policy and International Affairs to avoid duplicating efforts of other parts of the government?

Answer. The Office of International Affairs coordinates with interagency partners through the National Security Council's policy process and directly with the State Department and other U.S. Government stakeholders on relevant issues and initiatives to avoid duplicating efforts.

Question 13. How is the Department of State's Bureau of Energy Resources different from the Department of Energy's Office of Policy and International Affairs? Please outline the different roles and lines of authority between the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Policy and International Affairs and the new Bureau of Energy Resources at the U.S. Department of State.

Answer. The Department of Energy's Assistant Secretary for International Affairs (IA) is the primary policy advisor to the Secretary of Energy on international policy analysis, development, evaluation, and implementation. IA represents the Department and the U.S. Government in interagency processes, intergovernmental forums, and bilateral and multilateral proceedings that address matters relating to the development and implementation of international energy policies, strategies and objectives.

IA has primary responsibility for coordinating the efforts of diverse elements in the Department to ensure a unified voice in DOE's international affairs. IA's chief strengths lie in the areas of energy policies, energy technologies, and energy markets. IA represents the Department and the Secretary in all international engagements. The State Department is the political representative of the U.S. Government overseas and it has a permanent presence through its diplomatic missions all around the world; the Bureau of Energy Resources is the State Department's main energy unit and consolidated any of the energy capabilities that long existed in different parts of that department before the Bureau's formation.

Question 14. As Assistant Secretary, what major international energy projects would be your primary focus?

Answer. If confirmed as Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, I will focus efforts on several Secretarial and Administration priorities, such as multilateral forums like the Africa Energy Ministerial and the Clean Energy Ministerial, as well as critical bilateral efforts like those with China, which would include oil market transparency, promote jobs in the export of technologies and energy, dialogue on oil market disruptions, buildings efficiency, and clean coal to name a few areas.

Question 15. What work is being done by the Office of Policy and International Affairs on Iran's energy sector and the implementation of sanctions on Iran?

Answer. The Office of International Affairs plays a key role in the Administration's interagency efforts to pursue a dual track policy with Iran to persuade the government of Iran to abide by its international obligations with respect to its nuclear program. The Office of International Affairs monitors and analyzes the effects of economic sanctions on Iran's energy sector, in particular, and international energy markets, in general.

RESPONSE OF FRANKLIN M. ORR TO QUESTION FROM SENATOR WYDEN

Question 1. Methane leakage. One of the key aspects of making sure natural gas development is a climate benefit is that there aren't methane leaks throughout the production, gathering, transport, and delivery of natural gas to consumers. The goal that I've been saying we should be pushing for is less than 1 percent leakage from the well to the consumer. The President mentioned methane leakage as an important concern when he announced his climate action plan, but I've seen no real activity out of the Administration on it since. What is your level of concern over methane leakage, and what do you view the role of DOE to be with regards to addressing methane leakage?

Answer. I agree that methane leakage is an important issue, one in which I am personally interested based on work done in my own research and that of colleagues at Stanford and elsewhere. While I am not intimately familiar with what the Department is doing in this area, I am aware that the Department is engaged in an interagency effort to comprehensively look at the research on hydraulic fracturing and I have been told DOE is working with other agencies to reduce methane leakage. If confirmed I will review DOE activities in this area, and I will work to support those efforts, including involving methane leakage.

RESPONSES OF FRANKLIN M. ORR TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR MURKOWSKI

At least two recent reports have called for the reform of the Department of Energy, or parts of it. One report was by the Clean Air Task Force, and the other is an effort from the Heritage Foundation, ITIF, and the Center for American Progress.

Question 1a. Do you believe any of the recommendations within those reports have merit?

Answer. I am aware of these reports. I understand that Secretary Moniz is committed to improving performance and management at the Department, and I know he is very supportive of the national laboratories. I share that support, and I believe the national laboratories are truly a national treasure.

I understand that the Department is in the process of constituting the National Laboratory Operations Board and the National Laboratory Policy Council to look at lab issues, including those raised in various reports. If confirmed, I plan to work with the Secretary and my counterparts across the Department on these important issues. I look forward to working with you and your fellow Committee Members, on this and other issues regarding the Department and our national labs.

Question 1b. Do you believe that the Department of Energy—and particularly its research functions—are in need of structural reform?

Answer. As a professor and a scientist, I believe it is important that we continue to look at new ways to innovate as well as continue with basic and applied programs. It is important to review ongoing programs, and it is also important to evaluate new efforts. And I know from my university experience that there are many benefits to linking research across disciplines in a way that produces creative solutions to challenging problems. Toward that end it is my understanding that Secretary Moniz recently charged his federal advisory committee, the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board, to study multiple new approaches to R&D that the Department has undertaken over the past several years. Secretary Moniz has created the National Laboratory Operations Board and the National Laboratory Policy Council to provide additional scrutiny on an ongoing basis.

Question 2. What have you learned at Stanford that you believe the federal government could or should do better to help spur innovation?

Answer. The most important elements of Stanford's success in innovation are hiring first-rate researchers, encouraging them to pursue a creative path that they determine, expecting them to compete successfully for funding based on their creativity, and rewarding them (with recognition, promotion, tenure, and a share of patent income, for example) when they are successful. One important element of promotion and tenure deliberations is whether a faculty member's research changes the way the world thinks about a certain problem. Creating innovations that make their way into the marketplace is one way to demonstrate that.

Stanford has an effective Office of Technology Licensing that handles the process for faculty to pursue patents and for entities outside Stanford to license Stanford patents. If a patent produces income it is shared among the university, the faculty member, and the department of the faculty member. Stanford has surely benefited from the Silicon Valley culture of investing in new ideas, so there is an audience for innovation that occurs on campus. Stanford is also experimenting now with a modest program of support to bridge at least part of the gap between demonstrating

a technology in the lab and passing it to a commercial entity to develop and market the technology.

If confirmed, I will look for opportunities to take what I have learned during my tenure at Stanford to determine what may fit within the Federal government framework. This will require careful analysis of incentives and barriers that exist now to develop pathways to encourage innovation going forward. If confirmed I look forward to exploring this area further.

Question 3. Some of the new responsibilities of the Undersecretary for Science now include oversight over all of the Department's energy offices, such as the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, the Office of Fossil Energy, and the Office of Nuclear Energy. a. If confirmed, you would also be overseeing 13 of DOE's national labs now that energy is part of the Undersecretary for Science's portfolio. Many have recently been calling for reforming and revitalizing our national labs to better align with the needs of the DOE and our nation. Given this expanded portfolio of the Undersecretary's office, how would you view the future of the national labs and their work in supporting DOE's basic and applied research missions?

Answer. I strongly support our national labs and believe that the underlying structure is a great benefit to our nation. The national labs are critical to the basic and applied work of the Department, but also to newer efforts such as innovation hubs and other targeted research efforts. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the National Laboratory Policy Council, the National Laboratory Operations Board, the National Lab Directors Council and my counterparts across the Department to engage on how the national labs and DOE can continue to improve outcomes that better our country.

Question 3b. Would you say that there are existing duplicative research and development efforts across the DOE science and energy offices? If so, what do you think needs to be done to minimize these?

Answer. I appreciate your comments on making sure we are spending our taxpayer dollars wisely, particularly in this era of fiscal constraint. It is my understanding that programs throughout the Department address the multiple stages of research, development and deployment across integrated topics. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that those efforts are coordinated.

Question 4. Do you believe that nuclear power should and could have a prominent role as baseload power generation that also supports future drastic reduction in Green House Gas emissions and overall clean energy production?

Answer. Yes, I believe in an all-of-the-above approach to energy, which includes nuclear power generation. Baseload power generation with low greenhouse gas emissions is an essential element of a diversified portfolio of energy supply to the nation.

Question 5. How do you view the role of government in the support of design, licensing and potential deployment (for domestic and international) of small modular nuclear reactors, and what future market opportunities do you see for this type of power plants?

Answer. I'm familiar with the SMR concept and understand that the Department has already awarded two grants under its SMR program. I agree with Secretary Moniz that this is a promising direction that we need to pursue, and if confirmed I look forward to learning more about this important program.

Question 6. In your opinion, is carbon capture and storage (CCS) currently commercially available for power plant applications? Please explain.

Answer. CCS technology has been and continues to be deployed on a range of projects. A number of full-scale, conventional coal-fired projects that will use CCS are moving forward today. IGCC projects using CCS are also moving forward, and projects that use available carbon capture technology have been operational for years, and these projects have direct applicability to the power sector. In my own research career over the last thirty-eight years, my students and I have developed a detailed understanding of how carbon dioxide flows in geologic settings associated with large-scale enhanced oil recovery projects. And there is considerable experience in the processes for separating carbon dioxide from other gases in refining, gas processing, and fertilizer manufacturing. If confirmed, I plan to be involved in DOE's continuing work to advance CCS and other important technologies in this area.

Question 7. At one of our recent nominations hearings, the President's nominee to head the Office of Fossil Energy, Mr. Chris Smith, noted that "there are 12 large-scale CCS projects in operation worldwide today." For each of the 12 projects, please identify the project location, project type/purpose (e.g., power plant or industrial), the project's initial operation date, and its estimated costs.

Answer. There are currently 12 large scale CCS projects in operation world-wide today, 7 of them are in the United States. Please note that due to the multiple factors included in determining estimated cost, it is difficult to provide meaningful cost

numbers across these projects. If confirmed, I look forward to discussing these projects with you or your staff.

Program	FE CCS Project Name	Stage of Development
	Name	
CCPI	Southern/Kemper County IGCC	Shutdown/Commissioning. Startup expected in 4 th Quarter of 2014
CCPI	Hydrogen Energy California (HECA)	Under Development. Permitting, NEPA, and Off-take agreements being negotiated.
CCPI	Summit/Texas Clean Energy	Awaiting Financial Close. Expected in early 2014.
CCPI	Petra Nova (formerly NRG)	Awaiting Financial Close. Expected in April 2014.
FutureGen	FutureGen	Under Development. Front End Engineering and Design (FEED) to be completed in Mid-Dec 2013. Class VI Injection permit (not yet secured) required for project success
ICCS	Archer Daniels Midland (ADM)	Under Construction. Construction is ~55% Complete. Class VI Injection permit (not yet secured) required for project success
ICCS	Leucadia	Awaiting Financial Close. Expected in Jan 2014. Record of Decision in Late 2013/Early 2014.
ICCS	Air Products	Operating. Project recently passed the 700,000 tons of CO2 sequestered milestone.

Question 8. At what stage of development (e.g., demonstration) are the CCS projects being financed by the Office of Fossil Energy?

Answer. There are currently eight major carbon capture and storage demonstrations being supported through the Office of Fossil Energy's (FE) Clean Coal Power Initiative (CCPI), Industrial Carbon Capture and Storage Initiative (ICCS) and FutureGen Programs. These projects represent an investment of over \$3 billion US dollars from the Federal side, leveraging roughly \$13 billion from industry, for a total investment of approximately \$16 billion dollars. Each of these projects is at a different stage of development listed below:

Project Name	Country	Operation Date	Capture Type	Storage Type
Val Verde Natural Gas Plants	US	1972	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	EOR
Enid Fertilizer CO ₂ -EOR Project	US	1982	Industrial Separation	EOR
Shute Creek Gas Processing Facility	US	1986	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	EOR
Sleipner CO ₂ Injection	Norway	1996	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	Deep saline formations
Great Plains Synfuel Plant and Weyburn-Midale Project	US / Canada	2000	Pre-Combustion (gasification)	EOR
In Salah CO ₂ storage	Algeria	2004	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	Deep saline formations
Snohvit CO ₂ Injection	Norway	2008	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	Deep saline formations
Century Plant	US	2010	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	EOR
Air Products Steam Methane Reformer EOR Project	US	2013	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	EOR
Petrobras Lula Oil Field CCS Project	Brazil	2013	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	EOR
Coffeyville Gasification Plant	US	2013	Industrial Separation	EOR
Last Cabin Gas Plant	US	2013	Pre-Combustion (natural gas processing)	EOR

Question 9. Do you believe CCS has been adequately proven at commercial scale or at a level required for baseload generating capacity?

Answer. From my own experience, I can tell you that all components of CCS, including large-scale CO₂ capture, transportation, and multi-million ton per year injection, have been demonstrated world-wide and in the U.S. for many years, and some are in the commercial phase. I also understand that there are twelve large-scale CCS projects currently in operation worldwide today. If confirmed at DOE, part of my mission will be to continue to pursue research to drive down the cost of CCS technology.

Question 10. What do you see as the major constraints preventing the commercial adoption of CCS (e.g. technological, financial, regulatory)? What do you believe is necessary to overcome those restraints?

Answer. The 2010 Interagency Task Force Report on Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) identified certain policy, legal, regulatory, and technical barriers to CCS deployment. Notably, however, while the Task Force Report stated that early projects face certain challenges, it also stated, "there are no insurmountable technological, legal, institutional, regulatory or other barriers that prevent CCS from playing a role in reducing GHG emissions." The report identifies specific constraints such as lack of a clear market signal, pore space ownership, long-term liabilities, and cost relative to other technology options as barriers to commercial deployment of CCS.

Since the release of the task force report, DOE is addressing the barriers by implementing its RD&D portfolio that is focused on a suite of first generation and sec-

and generation technologies to gain experience through early CCS demonstration projects and coupling this learning with advancements in R&D to further reduce costs and improve the technology. The large-scale demonstration projects are also helping to provide information and input on addressing the financial and regulatory barriers associated with commercial deployment. In general, existing Federal, State, and local regulatory programs will apply equally to CCS-equipped plants as they would to plants without CCS. However, there will be additional requirements because of the need to select an appropriate geological reservoir for CO₂ storage and the need to obtain proper permits for constructing the offsite CO₂ pipeline and CO₂ injection wells for the new CCS-equipped plant.

While challenges remain, and the legal and regulatory issues vary from site to site depending upon State and local law, the advancements being made in development and demonstration of CCS technologies are driving legal and regulatory measures that will ensure wider-scale deployment in future years.

RESPONSE OF FRANKLIN M. ORR TO QUESTION FROM SENATOR CANTWELL

Question 1. Dr. Orr, as director of the Precourt Institute at Stanford University, you have demonstrated an ability to draw together experts across a wide range of disciplines in an effort to craft integrated science and technology solutions to complex societal problems, among them climate change. I think you and I are in agreement with the President and Secretary Moniz, that climate change is one of the defining challenges of this century, and one that must be addressed urgently. I also know from my conversations with researchers at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in my home state of Washington that DOE's national laboratories have a lot of depth of expertise and capabilities across the science and engineering disciplines that could be very powerful in addressing climate change, particularly if they were brought to bear on the problem in an integrated, coordinated way. As Under Secretary for Science and Energy, how would you go about integrating the Department's basic climate science research programs with the resources of DOE's applied program offices to address climate change? What is your vision for climate science under DOE's new organization?

Answer. Secretary Moniz's reorganization brings the Department's basic research and applied energy programs under one Under Secretary, creating opportunities for improved coordination of the Department's efforts to address climate change and achieve the goals of the President's Climate Action Plan. If confirmed, I plan to look closely at this issue and ensure DOE is taking full advantage of the new organizational structure and resources, such as the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

RESPONSES OF FRANKLIN M. ORR TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BALDWIN

UW Madison is the proud home of one of the three Bioenergy Research Centers run by the DOE, the Great Lakes Bioenergy Research Center. I had the opportunity to tour the research labs earlier this year and saw firsthand how this innovative research model is accelerating the transition between basic research and technologies that can be transferred into the private sector.

Question 1a. What impacts do you see the Bioenergy Research Centers having in developing the next generation of advanced biofuels?

Answer. While I am not intimately familiar with the Bioenergy Research Centers, I understand that they have been very successful, as evidenced by their recent review and renewal for another 5 years, subject to appropriations. It is my understanding the Centers have carved out a complementary set of research areas in order to tackle the scientific challenges of producing advanced biofuels. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about the Centers and how we can continue to enable their success.

Question 1b. One of the exciting parts of playing host to the Great Lakes BRC is seeing research collaboration across many disciplines. Can you discuss the importance of the Bioenergy Research Center model, which helps break down research silos to accelerate innovation?

Answer. I agree that collaboration across disciplines is critical to accelerating innovation. These Centers seem in many ways to be precursors to the Energy Innovations Hubs. My understanding is that the goals of both are to assemble diverse and collaborative teams of scientists from many disciplines to tackle a single grand challenge. I believe scientists are drawn to these complex challenges and enjoy working together toward a common, well-understood, goal that is related to clean energy. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about the Great Lakes BRC.

Question 2. I've heard of foreign universities offering attractive research positions to US scientists, pulling them away from critical research projects we have invested in and poaching the talent we have developed. This fall I introduced the Next Gen-

eration Research Act to jumpstart investments in the next generation of biomedical researchers.

a) Are you concerned about our ability to attract and retain the next generation of researchers who will tackle one of the most pressing issues of our time-energy research?

Answer. Yes, I am concerned about the future of our scientific workforce. It is extremely important that we find ways to attract talented scientists and engineers into energy research. Workforce issues in science, energy and especially the biomedical field are challenging, and I understand how important it is that we find ways improve how we attract and train the next generation of scientists.

Question 2b. How will you work to ensure DOE addresses this potential innovation deficit so that we continue to host the best and the brightest researchers in US labs?

Answer. One way to bring talent to our labs is to expose students and young researchers to our labs early in their career, for example through opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to do research at the DOE national labs. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about the needs of the DOE workforce, existing workforce programs, and to working to find ways to attracting the best scientists into our mission.

RESPONSES OF RHEA SUH TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR WYDEN

Question 1. Maintenance backlog.—As you are aware, the National Park Service's deferred maintenance backlog is estimated to be over \$11 billion. The backlog issue has become a major issue raised in opposition to almost any new park-related legislation.

Do you have any fresh ideas for funding the maintenance backlog?

Answer. This is one of the more significant issues facing the National Park Service and it is a difficult and longstanding issue that several Administrations have faced. In my role as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, I am aware that the facilities and roads in the parks are an essential part of meeting the mission of the National Park Service. In our constrained fiscal environment, we must find a way to embrace new opportunities to address this need.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee has taken innovative steps to address the maintenance backlog, most recently by allocating additional funds to be leveraged with non-federal funds for this purpose. Taking a lesson from your work on the Helium legislation, we know that we cannot look solely to appropriations to address this challenge; we need to look to other funding models in the both the government and private sectors. Currently, the National Park Service is working on expanding public-private partnerships, and is developing a strategy to expand the potential universe of philanthropic interest and support, with maintenance as a key area for this effort.

I believe that we also have the opportunity to expand innovative solutions like Energy Savings Performance Contracts across the country to be as efficient as we can be with the resources that we have, and focus them on the most critical facilities. Currently, we are developing a contract to assess energy use at sites in the National Park Service's National Capital Region with potential for energy and water savings. I believe there is capacity to do more of these across the country.

I also believe that the National Park Service must focus on key assets that are mission essential and key to operations. Evaluating each and every building, utility, and other facility in the system, and actively managing the facilities footprint, will allow us to eliminate unneeded facilities and those that have outlived their useful life. This will also help to reduce the backlog.

Lastly, it is important to note that about one-half of the maintenance backlog is transportation related—about 49 percent of the infrastructure backlog needs in national parks are roads, bridges, and alternative transportation systems. These needs are broader than those currently funded by MAP-21, and a significant opportunity exists for addressing a portion of these needs with the Federal Lands Highways Administration. I look forward to working with you and other Members of the Committee to resolve this difficult issue, if confirmed.

Question 2. Recreation fees.—The Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act provides fee authority for the National Park Service and other Federal land management agencies. The law was recently extended for an additional year, but the committee still needs to consider comprehensive fee legislation, including a longer-term authorization.

In your opinion, has the fee law been successful, and what changes, if any, would you recommend be made when the law is reauthorized?

Answer. Yes, I believe the law has been successful. In 2012, there were almost 500 million visits to lands and waters managed by the Department generating billions of dollars in economic benefits to local communities and hundreds of thousands of jobs. These visitors come to our national parks, public lands, and refuges to hike, camp, hunt and fish, bike, and enjoy other recreational activities. The Department currently collects over \$200 million in recreation fees annually under this authority from sites that can charge fees and uses them to enhance the visitor experience through maintenance of recreation sites, educational experiences, interpretive programs, engaging youth, and leveraging other programs. Surveys have shown that most visitors to our lands believe that the fees they pay are reasonable for the services that are provided at these sites.

Regarding changes to the law, the Department supports permanent authorization of this law. Our land managing bureaus with on-the-ground experience have identified areas where changes to the program could result in more effective service to recreation visitors and the public at large. These areas include possible expansion of the program beyond the current agencies, reviewing interagency pass benefits, and utilization of existing and new technologies to improve visitor services and agency operations. The recent one-year extension granted in the fiscal year 2014 Continuing Resolution signed on October 16, 2013, has provided the additional time necessary to complete this task. If confirmed for this position, I look forward to continuing to work to assure the continued success of this program.

RESPONSES OF RHEA SUH TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR MURKOWSKI

Question 3. As I am sure you know, we have a nearly \$13 billion parks maintenance backlog. The Land and Water Conservation Fund budget request is for a funding level of \$600 million, which represents a nearly \$300 million increase above the current level for DOI agencies and the Forest Service, and the Department has indicated its intention to request full funding of \$900 million in the coming budget cycle. Most Americans wonder why the Federal Government is buying more land when it cannot afford to properly maintain and safeguard what it currently owns. This ongoing practice does not appear logical to me.

a. Do you agree that we should address the maintenance backlog before we acquire additional lands? If not, can you please explain why, with such an enormous maintenance backlog, DOI would focus such a large amount of money on acquiring more federal land?

b. More generally, how do you reconcile additional federal land acquisition, adding to the federal burden at this time of staggering national debt and maintenance backlogs?

Answer. I understand and have seen first-hand the difficult challenges facing agencies that must maintain facilities and infrastructure in these constrained fiscal times. However, like President Obama and Secretary Jewell, I support the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and do not believe that land acquisition is inconsistent with our maintenance responsibilities.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was envisioned as a program that would use a portion of the proceeds from the development of our public lands and waters for investments in conservation and recreation for the benefit of all Americans. The Administration's proposal would ensure continued funding for this program designed to balance investments in conservation and recreation with the development of oil and gas resources. Protecting this balance through mandatory LWCF funding would reduce landscape fragmentation, making it more efficient to protect wildlife habitat, respond to wildfires and other natural disasters, and increase recreational access on the lands and waters that belong to every American. This funding will also provide stability needed for agencies and states to make strategic, long-term investments in our natural infrastructure and outdoor economy to support jobs, preserve natural and cultural resources, bolster outdoor recreation opportunities, and protect wildlife.

It is also important to note that more than half of the Land and Water Conservation Fund is comprised of grant programs for states and local partners and does not entail federal acquisition. For example, the State and Local Assistance Program has provided tens of thousands of grants to local, state and tribal governments for planning, acquisition and development of outdoor recreation lands and facilities throughout the country. Seventy-five percent of the total funds obligated have gone to locally sponsored projects to provide close-to-home recreation opportunities that are readily accessible to America's youth, adults, senior citizens and the physically or mentally challenged.

The American Battlefield Protection Program provides grants to states and other partners to protect Civil War battlefields. These grants are often leveraged 3:1, and

the long term conservation of these sites drives significant tourism development. Similarly, the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund (section 6 of the ESA) provides grants to States and Territories to participate in a wide array of voluntary conservation projects for candidate, proposed, and listed species. These competitive grants enable states to work with private landowners, conservation groups and other government agencies to initiate conservation planning efforts and acquire and protect habitat that benefits threatened and endangered fish, wildlife and plants.

The Department takes seriously its responsibility to maintain facilities and infrastructure at the sites that it manages, and has proposed budget increases for this maintenance in the Administration's budget request. If confirmed, I am committed to working with the Committee to explore available opportunities for a long-term solution to these funding issues.

Question 4. Recently, the National Park Service has closed a number of preserves in Alaska to certain methods of bear and wolf hunting or shortened the hunting seasons as defined by the Alaska Board of Game. When instituting the closures, the NPS has cited "Park Values" in those closures.

a. Don't you believe that Alaskans should be able to conduct their traditional and customary hunting techniques in Alaska?

Answer. From my work with the Cup'ik community in Chevak, I know that Alaskan Natives have relied on traditional harvest of wild foods for centuries. I also know that subsistence practices have also become important to many non-Native Alaskans, particularly in rural Alaska. While I understand that the management of subsistence harvests of natural resources can be difficult, I believe we have an obligation to provide rural Alaskans on federal lands the opportunity for customary and traditional harvest and use of natural resources while maintaining healthy fish and wildlife populations.

Question 4b. Can you provide me with a definition of "Park Values"?

Answer. I understand the general definitions of park resources and values are found in Section 1.4.6. of the National Park Service's Management Policies. Specifically relating to this issue, the National Park Service has informed me that section 101 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act cites "values" among the purposes for establishing conservation areas. Section 1313 of the Act authorizes the NPS to designate where and when to close or restrict hunting in preserves for reasons of public safety, administration, floral and faunal protection, or public use and enjoyment.

Question 4c. Do you believe that the State of Alaska has the right to manage wildlife within the borders of the State? When is it proper for the federal government to reverse State Board of Game decisions?

Answer. The State of Alaska has the right to manage wildlife within the State. Non-conflicting State general hunting and trapping regulations are adopted on lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System and on National Parks and Preserves. However, if State regulations conflict with federal statutes and policy that govern management of federal lands, then it is appropriate for the federal government to act to ensure that State measures do not compromise wildlife conservation and management actions mandated by federal law.

Question 5. On September 19, 2013 the Energy Committee held the first subsistence oversight hearing since the creation of Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). One area where everyone can agree is that the dual management framework in Alaska is not working for our rural residents. There are two areas where we are focusing our initial reform efforts.

a. The first is the Federal Subsistence Board. We would like to add additional subsistence users to the Board, in order to have an equal split between Alaska users and the FSB which makes the decisions that impact their livelihood. Additionally, we would like to reform the Rural Determination Process, which currently reconsiders the rural status of Alaska's communities every decade, leaving many Alaskans constantly worrying about their rural preference or lack thereof. Will you commit to working on this pressing reform effort? If so, when could I expect to hear from DOI in response to my letter dated October 25, 2013?

Answer. Yes, I commit to working on this effort with you and your staff, if I am confirmed. In Alaska, the Department has a special responsibility is to ensure fish and wildlife resources are available now and in the future for rural Alaskans who rely on subsistence harvest. I understand that the management of subsistence harvests of natural resources is complicated. There are a number of laws that provide many mandates related to management; there are multiple management entities with subsistence management responsibilities; and there are many different subsistence users who are affected by management of harvest. Opportunities to streamline,

clarify and simplify these efforts should be pursued. If confirmed, I would look forward to learning more about the issues and working with you on ways to improve subsistence management for users that ensure natural resources are available for subsistence harvest in the long-term.

With respect to the October 25, 2013, letter you reference, I understand that the Department has been coordinating with the U.S. Department of Agriculture on a response, which you will receive shortly.

Question 5b. The second area of our subsistence reform focus is with Self-Governance Agreements. Current law allows each National Park Unit and National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska to enter into a self-governance agreement with a local tribe to allow the tribe to conduct a range of work and activities on those federal lands, including subsistence management work. If confirmed, would you commit to expanding the use of self-governance agreements in Alaska?

Answer. If confirmed, I commit to working with you to improve the opportunities for Native Alaskans to work more collaboratively and concertedly with both the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service.

Question 6. Recently, the USFWS put out their final guidance on the significantly altered definition relating to the Alaska Native harvest of sea otters. While I am thankful for the agency's efforts on this so far, I have been somewhat frustrated by the length of time it took to reach this positive outcome and very much hope that it will work in good faith to ensure that this new definition is understood by Alaska Natives in Southeast Alaska. Will the USFWS commit to me that it will hold briefings throughout the villages of Southeast Alaska to ensure that all interested residents truly understand the new definition?

Answer. If confirmed, I commit to working with the Service to ensure that the new definition is understood by affected Alaska Native communities and to finding the most effective and efficient means to conduct outreach to interested residents of Southeast Alaska to that end.

Question 7. For decades now the federal government has been engaged in a proposal to establish an international park spanning the Bering Straits in Alaska and Russia. On September 30, 2013 the National Park Service indicated that the latest draft Memorandum of Understanding between the U.S. and Russia for Beringia will be released shortly. Alaskans are increasingly concerned about the prospects that this agreement will be finalized in the near future and the impacts that this will have on the region and Alaskan stakeholder concerns remain largely unaddressed. It is very troubling that the federal government is looking to impose this without articulating any type of benefits for the local population. What are your views on the idea of an international park? Would you support the Beringia proposal even though local and state government entities continue to have unanswered concerns and many tribal groups have expressed their desire not to move forward?

Answer. I understand that international cooperation has been in place in the Bering Strait area for over 20 years, and that the Shared Beringian Heritage Program has enabled cultural and scientific exchanges between Alaskans and Russians and grants to Alaska Native corporations, tribal groups, the University of Alaska and many Alaska-based scientists. I also understand that the State Department has proposed a non-binding memorandum of understanding that would recognize the recent addition of a national park in Russia and add a degree of formality to the international cooperation. However, this MOU would not establish an international park nor would it change regulations, access, or subsistence uses. I also understand that there is currently no proposal before Congress to establish such a park.

I agree that local, state and tribal stakeholders should be engaged in the discussion of this MOU. If confirmed, I will work closely with the NPS to ensure that they fully engage the local, state and tribal stakeholders and work to address any concerns that they may have concerning the MOU.

Question 8. Please describe the extent to which USFWS has responded to the President's July 1, 2013 Executive Order on combating wildlife trafficking.

Answer. Illegal trafficking of wildlife and their derivative parts and products and the poaching of protected species is estimated to be a multibillion-dollar international enterprise. It is an underpinning of transnational organized crime that fosters instability and undermines national security. Across the United States Government, we are working to identify new approaches to crack down on poaching and wildlife trafficking. I know that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been working for decades with partners in countries across the globe to conserve imperiled wildlife.

The President's Executive Order is bringing together agencies from across the federal government to develop a comprehensive strategy to combat wildlife trafficking. The Service is providing key leadership and capacity in this effort, and has supported the Secretary in establishing the Advisory Council on Wildlife Trafficking which will make recommendations to the Presidential Task Force led by the Attor-

ney General and the Secretaries of State and Interior, as established by the E.O. The Service is also engaging the Council's expertise in law enforcement and criminal justice, wildlife biology and conservation, finance and trade, and international relations and diplomacy to develop and implement a national strategy. The Council recently held its first meeting here at the Department on December 16, 2013.

Question 9. The USFWS recently extended the duration of its programmatic permits for non-purposeful take of bald and golden eagles by wind facilities from 5 years to 30 years.

a. Please explain how the USFWS arrived at the 30 year figure. What is the rationale for 30 years instead of 10, 15, 20, or 25?

b. How do you reconcile the Service's ongoing opposition to the King Cove gravel road in Alaska with this recent decision to grant permits that allow for the taking of eagles at wind farms around the country? What is your personal opinion of the King Cove road?

c. The new rulemaking notes the Service's intention to incorporate mitigation measures into the permit. Please explain these mitigation requirements and provide specific examples.

d. Are there any other programmatic, non-purposeful taking activities relevant to golden eagles and bald eagles known to the Service besides wind energy projects, and have you discussed mitigation efforts with any applicant that is not a wind energy project?

Answer. My understanding is that the Fish and Wildlife Service, working with stakeholders in the course of developing the rulemaking to grant permits for industry for the incidental taking of eagles under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, sought to extend the maximum permit term from five years to 30 years to reflect the actual operational life of renewable energy and other long-term project operations. These permits are subject to a recurring five-year review process for the duration of the permit.

I also understand that the development of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Izembek National Wildlife Refuge and the Service's eagle permitting rulemaking were each prepared in accordance with all applicable statutes, and that the Service is working with industry to develop Advanced Conservation Practices and mitigation practices for energy projects as part of the programmatic take permit process. Examples of compensatory mitigation measures the Service and industry are working on as part of the current permit process include retrofitting power lines that currently pose a risk of electrocution to eagles, clearing roadways of animal carcasses which can threaten scavenging eagles, and increasing the availability of eagle prey.

There are also projects and operations of industries other than wind energy that can result in incidental take of bald eagles and golden eagles. An example is the electric power line industry. The Service has worked with this industry for many years to develop best management practices to avoid and minimize the taking of eagles. If confirmed, I will work to ensure this constructive working relationship with this industry and others continues as effective conservation and mitigation practices are developed.

Regarding the King Cove road proposal, I believe that we should do everything we can to accommodate the critical human health and safety needs of the people of King Cove while providing adequate protections for the refuge.

Question 10. On December 5, 2013, President Obama issued a directive calling for the executive branch's departments and agencies to acquire 20 percent of their electric energy from renewable resources by Fiscal Year 2020.

a. Please explain how the executive branch arrived at the 20 percent figure.

b. In his last two State of the Union addresses, the President called for an 80 percent Clean Energy Standard mandate by 2035 for the utility sector. Why isn't the federal government attempting to achieve the President's own 80 percent goal?

c. In the 2005 Energy Policy Act, Congress required that federal agencies purchase at least 7.5 percent of their electrical power from renewable resources by FY 2013. Has the federal government met this statutory requirement?

Answer. The 20 percent figure was first announced by the President in June in his Climate Action Plan. The figure was developed by the White House, in coordination with a number of agencies. Implementing sustainability actions like this are consistent with the Department's overarching mission.

My understanding of the President's proposal for a Clean Energy Standard of 80 percent by 2035 is that it is a long-term goal targeted at energy production, as opposed to the shorter-term goals focused on sustainable performance, similar to the provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 referenced in your question. Those provisions of the Energy Policy Act are tracked for the Administration through the Department of Energy's Federal Energy Management Program. The Department's per-

formance with regard to that statutory requirement is highlighted in the Department's Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan, which can be found at: http://www.doi.gov/greening/sustainability_plan/upload/2013_DOI_SSPP_website.pdf. Last year the Department exceeded the Energy Policy Act goal with 8.6 percent of its electrical use coming from renewable sources.

RESPONSES OF RHEA SUH TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR SCOTT

Wilderness

Question 11. In a June 2007 "Q&A" with "Foundations" you made a number of very concerning statements regarding land and resources management, particularly to those who understand the importance of energy production for job creation and economic growth. In reference to Wilderness protection you said, "It's the crown jewel of what environmentalists work for in public land." Please expand upon what you mean by that statement.

If confirmed, how much direct involvement will you have in advocating for or working on potential Wilderness designations?

Answer. Wilderness areas are great places to hunt and fish and include some of the best representation of our natural heritage in the country. It is but one of many designations, but one that only Congress can make. I have demonstrated in my current job that I support our obligations associated with multiple-use and if confirmed, will work with Congress to continue to pursue balanced approaches to conservation and development.

Question 12. Secretary Jewell has complained about the lack of activity in Congress in regards to Wilderness designations and has said that if Congress doesn't act, the administration will act by using the Antiquities Act to unilaterally designate areas as National Monuments.

In your current role, specifically what has your involvement been in developing any lists of potential areas to be designated as National Monuments under the Antiquities Act?

If confirmed, how much direct involvement will have in Antiquities Act designations?

Did you have any involvement in the Department's creation of the "Wild Lands" policy? If so, specifically what was your level of involvement and what work did you perform?

Answer. In my role as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, I was not and have not been involved in developing any lists of potential areas to be designated as National Monuments, nor am I aware that any such lists exist. I also was not involved in the creation of the Wild Lands Policy.

If confirmed as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, I would be involved in policy discussions regarding potential monument designations with respect to NPS and FWS lands. Any activities by the Department would be guided by the Secretary's belief that efforts should focus on areas where there is a groundswell of public support; that there will be a commitment to public engagement and the involvement of local communities; and that decisions will not be driven by lists made in Washington but by the input of citizens on the ground and Members of Congress.

Energy Production

Question 13. In the same "Foundations" Q&A, you called natural gas development, "Easily the single greatest threat to the ecological integrity of the West." Even President Obama has recognized the importance of natural gas production to America's economy, job creation and energy security. Do you still believe natural gas production is the single greatest threat to the ecological integrity of the West? If so, why? If not, what do you consider the single greatest threat to ecological integrity of the West?

Answer. As I stated at my confirmation hearing, I strongly support the President's all-of-the-above energy strategy, which focuses on development of our resources in a responsible fashion and in the right places, and specifically the role that natural gas plays in that strategy. The public lands managed by the Department account for about 20 percent of the natural gas production in the country. As Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, I promoted robust budgets for safe and responsible oil and gas development, and I believe that these budgets demonstrate that natural gas is a priority and that development of these resources can take place in a balanced, responsible way.

Question 14. Specifically, what are your critiques or concerns of how individual States have regulated hydraulic fracturing?

Answer. The Department of the Interior does not regulate hydraulic fracturing on state lands. The proposed regulations address hydraulic fracturing on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and on Indian lands. As I noted in my response to the previous question, natural gas has played and will continue to play a crucial role in America's economy.

Question 15. Have you had any involvement in the development of the largely duplicative hydraulic fracturing regulations proposed by BLM? If so, please explain to what degree and specifically what work you performed.

Answer. In my role as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget I am aware of the ongoing rulemaking; however I have not been involved in the substantive development of the proposed regulations.

Question 16. If confirmed, what will be your involvement in your new capacity in the implementation of the BLM fracking regulations?

Answer. The position for which I have been nominated does not oversee the Bureau of Land Management, the principal agency within the Department of the Interior that manages development of oil and gas resources on public lands. Consequently, if confirmed I would have little, if any involvement in implementation of the BLM's regulations.

Question 17. Do you believe the federal government should regulate hydraulic fracturing on state and private lands as well as federal lands?

Answer. The Department's jurisdiction for regulating hydraulic fracturing through the Bureau of Land Management applies only to the federal and Indian mineral estates. The position for which I have been nominated does not oversee the development of natural gas resources on public lands.

National Ocean Policy

Question 18. Recommendations adopted in the National Ocean Policy Executive Order state that Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning will require "significant initial investment of both human and financial resources," and in early 2012 the National Ocean Council noted that federal agencies had been asked to provide information about how "existing resources [can] be repurposed for greater efficiency and effectiveness" in furtherance of the National Ocean Policy. Furthermore, according to the Interior Department, U.S. Fish & Wildlife and National Park Services officials in the Alaska, Caribbean, Great Lakes, Gulf of Mexico, Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, Pacific Islands, South Atlantic, and West Coast regions have been involved in Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning activities.

If confirmed, your responsibilities would include oversight of entities including the U.S. Fish & Wildlife and National Park Services. In your capacity as Assistant Secretary of Policy, Management and Budget, please describe how many USFWS and NPS resources and personnel have been directed toward activities specifically in support of the National Ocean Policy to date, and how many resources and personnel are being requested to support such activities in the FY 2014 budget request.

Please describe the USFWS and NPS responses if any to the National Ocean Council inquiry about the repurposing of existing resources, and any actions that USFWS and NPS have taken or plan to take in this regard.

Answer. The Department tracks funding for programmatic activities related to ocean and coastal areas including the Great Lakes but not for work related to the National Ocean Policy. The Department's cross cut of mandatory and discretionary funding related to these ocean and coastal areas includes such activities as funding to support the offshore oil and gas development program. The cross cut indicates \$245.8 million in related ocean and coastal activities in FY 2014, including Sport Fish Restoration grant estimates and \$93.5 million for similar National Park Service activities, which include Everglades Restoration and Research. I am not aware of FWS or NPS funding or personnel information related to the National Ocean Policy or of any FWS or NPS responses regarding the inquiry to which you refer.

Question 19. According to the USFWS FY2014 Budget Justification, the Coastal Program is the Service's "lead for implementing the National Ocean Policy" and USFWS is "helping lead DOI's role in developing the National Ocean Policy." Under this request, USFWS notes that "[t]here is no separate budget line item for the National Ocean Policy or National Ocean Council in the President's Fiscal Year 2014 budget as the National Policy uses existing authorities and resources to strengthen ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes stewardship."

Of the \$14.948 million for the Service's Coastal Program in FY2014, how many resources would be allocated in support of the National Ocean Policy, and what specific activities would those resources support?

Answer. The Department maintains a crosscut of funding that supports oceans and coastal related resource management. The cross cut does not identify any resources that support the National Ocean Policy.

Question 20. Section 6(b) of Executive Order 135474 that established the National Ocean Policy in July 2010 requires “[e]ach executive department, agency, and office that is required to take actions under this order shall prepare and make publicly available an annual report including a concise description of actions taken by the agency in the previous calendar year to implement the order, a description of written comments by persons or organizations regarding the agency’s compliance with this order, and the agency’s response to such comments.”

Pursuant to this requirement, have USFWS or NPS been asked to prepare and/or actually prepared a summary of such activities for calendar years 2010, 2011, or 2012?

Answer. I have been advised that neither bureau prepared their own reports, as the requirement to take action under this Executive Order lies with the Department. Staff from both bureaus submitted material for the Department’s Ocean Policy accomplishment reports in 2010 and 2011. Due to the focus on completing the Ocean Policy Implementation Plan, no accomplishments report was requested by the National Ocean Council for 2012.

Question 21. The recommendations adopted by the National Ocean Policy Executive Order state that effective implementation will require “clear and easily understood requirements and regulations, where appropriate, that include enforcement as a critical component.” In addition, the Executive Order requires federal entities including the Interior Department to implement the policy to the fullest extent possible. At the same time, the National Ocean Council has stated that the National Policy “does not establish any new regulations or restrict any ocean uses or activities.”

If confirmed, what if any commitment can you make that USFWS and NPS will not issue any regulations or take any actions having a regulatory impact pursuant to the National Ocean Policy, including Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning?

Answer. I am advised that none of the National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan actions in which the Department is involved, including specifically those involving the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service, have any elements that require or contemplate new regulations. The implementation actions should, through increased interagency and federal-state cooperation, generate better and more timely information that can help inform our decisions. New regulations from the Department, or these two bureaus, are not part of the plan to implement the Policy.

RESPONSE OF RHEA SUH TO QUESTION FROM SENATOR RISCH

Question 22. Public Data—The Endangered Species Act requires the use of “the best scientific and commercial data available”. The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has yet to release this data from the 2010 “warranted but precluded” determination for sage grouse. I would respectfully request the data be release prior to the confirmation of Ms. Suh. Will you do so?

Answer. The Endangered Species Act directs the Fish and Wildlife Service to make its determinations under the Act using the best scientific and commercial data available. I fully support this critical aspect of the Act, as does this Administration. I understand that there are instances when the best available data is peer reviewed scientific studies published in scientific journals or monographs, where access to the underlying raw data is proprietary and therefore under the control of the author and/or the journal. I am not familiar with the specifics of the circumstance your question references, but if confirmed I would be happy to look into the matter and report back to you.

RESPONSES OF RHEA SUH TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR PORTMAN

Question 23. There is need for reform of the federal permitting process. The United States ranks 17th in the world in the time it takes to get a government green-light to actually build something—one of the ten International Monetary Fund metrics for the “ease of doing business.” Under the current system, businesses seeking approval for major capital projects often must run the bureaucratic gauntlet of a dozen separate agencies, and the threat of litigation looms as long as 6 years after securing all required approvals. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) permits are required for many domestic energy projects. Do you think there is room for the FWS to improve how efficiently those permits are processed? If so, are there specific measures you would take to improve the process?

Answer. Over the past two years, the Department and its agencies have worked closely with OMB and CEQ in responding to the President’s Executive Order on Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects, a government-wide initiative to improve Federal decision-making processes, while

producing measurably better outcomes for communities and the environment. To date, agencies have expedited the review and permitting of 51 selected major infrastructure projects and have identified a set of best practices for infrastructure permitting and review, including expanding the use of IT tools and improving early coordination across agencies. The Department is working closely with OMB and CEQ in developing a plan that institutionalizes these best practices and modernizes procedures for the review and permitting of major infrastructure projects.

FWS is also collaborating with the BLM and other bureaus and agencies, as well as state and local partners, to improve planning early and at the landscape scale. Collaborative efforts such as the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan and multi-stakeholder efforts to ensure the viability of sage grouse populations are setting a new standard for planning that will allow project proponents to avert conflict in advance, contribute to landscape-scale outcomes, and ultimately expedite permitting. Another important element is to integrate various environmental reviews into a unified process, with clear timelines and accountability.

If confirmed, I would continue to work on these critical issues, and I would welcome the opportunity to discuss with you the Service's role and track record in permitting and review of energy projects. Sen

Question 24. The FWS has proposed declaring the northern long-eared bat an endangered species and is expected to make a final decision on this in January. I understand that this species of bat is found in 39 states and Canada, including: Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, South Dakota, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Can you provide my office data on what FWS estimates the economic impact would be of listing the long-eared bat as an endangered species, both nationally and for Ohio?

Answer. I have been advised that the Fish and Wildlife Service proposed to list the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species on October 2, 2013, and recently extended the comment period for the listing proposal for an additional 30 days, until January 2, 2014. The Service anticipates making a final listing determination, after consideration of public comments and an independent scientific peer review, before October 2, 2014. The Service is precluded by the Endangered Species Act from considering economic impacts during the listing determination process. All other aspects of the ESA, however, including consultation among agencies on federal actions, incidental take permitting, designation of critical habitat, and designing and implementing recovery actions, consider economic impacts in decision-making.

Question 25. I have been told that the proposed listing involved only three species-specific investigations and that this is inconsistent with prior listings that involve dozens of studies prior to a decision, such as the listing of the Indiana Bat. If confirmed, will you agree to conduct a review of the FWS proposal for the long-eared bat to be federally listed as an endangered species and ensure that FWS did not relax its standards on scientific investigation and species-specific study for this proposal?

Answer. The Endangered Species Act requires the Fish and Wildlife Service to use the best available scientific information in making determinations under the Act. I have been informed that the Service solicits independent scientific peer review of its proposed listing determinations, and that one of the reasons for doing so is to validate that it identified and appropriately considered the best available scientific information in its proposal. The public comment period provided by the ESA and the independent scientific peer review of all listing proposals are designed to ensure meaningful opportunities for any additional relevant scientific information to be provided to the Service, or for deficiencies to be identified. If confirmed, I would be happy to discuss this issue with you and further understand your concerns.

Question 26. When I was OMB director, I worked with both parties in Congress to secure support for a partnership program that provided needed financial support for the parks. Finding a fiscally sustainable path forward for our national parks continues to be one of my top priorities. As you may know, the deferred maintenance backlog has grown to \$11.5 billion. Do you have ideas for reducing the backlog?

Answer. This is one of the more significant issues facing the National Park Service and it is a difficult and longstanding issue that several Administrations have faced. In my role as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, I am aware that the facilities and roads in the parks are an essential part of meeting the mission of the National Park Service. In our constrained fiscal environment, we must find a way to embrace new opportunities to address this need.

I know that you care deeply about this issue and took steps to address it while the Director of OMB. Likewise, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee has taken innovative steps to address the maintenance backlog, most recently by allocating additional funds to be leveraged with non-federal funds for this purpose. We know that we cannot look solely to appropriations to address this challenge, we need to look to other funding models in the both the government and commercial sectors.

Currently, the National Park Service is working on expanding public-private partnerships, and is developing a strategy to expand the potential universe of philanthropic interest and support, with maintenance as a key area for this effort.

In addition to these strategies, we also have the opportunity to expand innovative solutions like Energy Savings Performance Contracts across the country to be as efficient as we can be with the resources that we have, and focus them on the most critical facilities. Currently, we are developing a contract to assess energy use at sites in the National Park Service's National Capital Region with potential for energy and water savings. I believe there is capacity to do more of these across the country.

I also believe that the National Park Service must focus on key assets that are mission essential and key to operations. Evaluating each and every building, utility, and other facility in the system, and actively managing the facilities footprint, will allow us to eliminate unneeded facilities and those that have outlived their useful life. This will also help to reduce the backlog.

Lastly, it is important to note that about one-half of the maintenance backlog is transportation related—about 49 percent of the infrastructure backlog needs in national parks are roads, bridges, and alternative transportation systems. These needs are broader than those currently funded by MAP- 21, and a significant opportunity exists for addressing a portion of these needs with the Federal Lands Highways Administration. I look forward to working with you and other Members of the Committee to resolve this difficult issue, if confirmed.

Question 27. Do you consider historic leases in parks to be a viable way to help parks mitigate the operation and maintenance backlog?

Answer. Leasing authority is a valuable tool for NPS to use in managing its assets; however, it is limited by market forces. The NPS roughly estimates that only between 1 and 3 percent of the deferred maintenance could be resolved by leases. Leasing generally works well in urban areas where favorable market fundamentals and business opportunities exist, such as at Golden Gate National Recreation Area. However, any prospective lessee must be able to afford the upfront investment many structures require, including costs to address deferred maintenance. This initial cost often results in no private-sector interest in the building. The NPS is working to improve the use of leasing by developing a more active leasing program and leasing-specific training, and encouraging parks to assess buildings for leasing opportunities.

Question 28. Cuyahoga Valley National Park in Ohio has grown its volunteer program, co-managed by the park and the Conservancy, to 5,900 volunteers and over 200,000 hours annually. Their volunteers include youth, families, corporations and individuals from diverse backgrounds. Do you see volunteer programs as a key supporting our parks? Do you think the National Park Service policies adequately support philanthropy and the park mission?

Answer. Volunteer contributions are vital in supporting the park mission. NPS policies strongly support volunteer programs as well as other means of contributing to the NPS mission. Not only do volunteers provide cost-effective support for high-priority programs and projects, they engage members of the community in accomplishing the NPS mission while fostering an understanding and appreciation of park resources. In FY 2013, the NPS engaged 246,000 volunteers who contributed 6,700,000 hours valued at over \$148 million.

I know that one of Secretary Jewell's highest priorities is engaging a new generation in the mission of the Department, and one of the ways we plan on doing that is by expanding the number of volunteers on our lands to 1 million annually, which represents a nearly threefold expansion. This goal is further leveraged by the approach of the NPS Centennial in 2016, and I expect that there will be renewed interest in volunteering with the NPS and a heightened opportunity to expand volunteer engagement and management.

The National Park Foundation is the National Park Service's key partner in leveraging philanthropy for parks across the country and in preparation for the 100th anniversary, the Foundation is expanding its efforts to solicit contributions to support the Parks. In addition, there are more than one hundred friends groups associated with individual park units working to support the efforts of those parks. I believe there is an opportunity to strengthen and expand these groups to engage with local communities and private interests in support of the national parks.

RESPONSES OF RHEA SUH TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR FLAKE

Question 29. During the recent government shutdown, the State of Arizona provided \$465,000 to temporarily reopen the Grand Canyon National Park. Likewise, in 1995, the State of Arizona provided \$370,125 to temporarily reopen the Park dur-

ing the shutdown that occurred that year. In both instances, Congress retroactively appropriated funds to the Park Service that covered the shutdown period. In 1995, the Park Service subsequently refunded the full amount to the State of Arizona. This time, however, the Park Service has retained a “shutdown windfall” refusing to refund money to the State, even though it also received retroactive appropriations. Can you explain the difference in policy between 1995 and 2013?

Question 30. Would you support a full refund to the State of Arizona for the amount it provided in 2013 to temporarily reopen the Grand Canyon National Park, so as to avoid a shutdown windfall for the Park Service?

Question 31. If you believe congressional action is required to fully refund the State, why was congressional action not required in 1995?

Question 32. If you believe congressional authority was provided following the 1995 shutdown to refund the State of Arizona, please provide a citation to that congressional authority.

Question 33. Do you believe there is a distinction between “refunding” a state following a retroactive appropriation and “reimbursing” a state, when Congress does not provide a retroactive appropriation?

Question 34. On November 13, 2013, I joined eight members of the Arizona delegation (Republicans and Democrats), in sending a letter to National Park Service Director Jarvis urging him to follow past practice and provide a full refund to the State of Arizona for temporarily reopening the Grand Canyon during the government shutdown or to explain why the Park Service was choosing to retain a “shutdown windfall.” When can we expect a response to that letter?

Answer. Response to Questions 29-34: I understand that Director Jarvis signed a response to you on January 6, 2014.

As a result of the recent lapse of appropriations, the National Park Service was required to close all 401 national parks across the country and furlough more than 20,000 National Park Service employees who ensure the safety of visitors and the security of the resources. Responding to the economic impacts that these park closures were having on many communities and local businesses, Secretary Jewell announced that the National Park Service would consider agreements with Governors who indicated an interest and ability to fully fund National Park Service personnel to re-open national parks in their states.

The National Park Service entered into such a donation agreement with Governor Brewer. Under this agreement, the State of Arizona donated to the National Park Service a total of \$651,000, equivalent to funding for seven days of operations at Grand Canyon National Park (at the rate of \$93,000 per day). When Congress enacted appropriations to end the government shutdown, the Park had been open for five days. The National Park Service promptly returned the unobligated, unexpended balance of \$186,000 to the State. However, the National Park Service does not have the authority to return those funds that had already been obligated or expended.

During the lapse in appropriations in 1995, the National Park Service also entered into a donation agreement with the State of Arizona to provide for operations at Grand Canyon National Park. However, before any moneys were expended or obligated under that 1995 agreement, Congress enacted appropriations to end the government shutdown. Consequently, the National Park Service returned to the State the unobligated, unexpended balance, which was the full amount donated to the National Park Service.

As I noted in response to your question at the hearing, I understand that an act of Congress is needed to provide the National Park Service with the authority to reimburse the State for that portion of the donated funding that was expended or obligated to operate Grand Canyon National Park in 2013.

Question 35. You previously supported grants for water projects that analyzed “how much water can safely be taken from the Colorado River.” Do you believe water managers and policy makers in the Colorado River Basin are best suited to address projected Colorado River water imbalances?

Answer. Yes. The Colorado River Basin is one of the most critical sources of water in the West, and it is currently facing record drought. In December 2012, the Bureau of Reclamation released the Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study, which was conducted with participation and input from a broad range of stakeholders throughout the Colorado River Basin. The Study was to define future imbalances in water supply and demand in the Basin through the year 2060, and develop and analyze options and strategies to resolve those imbalances. Engaging with water managers and policy makers in the Colorado River Basin, through the next steps of the Study and otherwise, will be critical to addressing Colorado River water imbalances.

Question 36. Given that your role with regard to the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as the National Park Service will involve watershed issues generally and the Colorado River more specifically do you believe water augmentation, as well as water conservation should be used to address water imbalances, including those projected along the Colorado River?

Answer. Aside from the Colorado River and its tributaries providing water to nearly 40 million people for municipal use and for irrigation of nearly 5.5 million acres of land, it also represents the lifeblood for at least 22 federally recognized Indian tribes, seven National Wildlife Refuges, four National Recreation Areas, and 11 National Parks. In order to address ongoing concerns regarding the reliability of the Colorado River system, the Bureau of Reclamation completed the Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study in December 2012. This Study projects water supply and demand imbalances throughout the Colorado River Basin and adjacent areas over the next 50 years and identifies a wide range of potential options to resolve supply and demand imbalances in the Basin. A process has begun to move beyond the Study, which involves multi-stakeholder workgroups and representatives of the Department's National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Reclamation and U.S. Geological Survey. These work groups are actively exploring additional efforts that could reduce supply-demand imbalances, including agriculture and municipal water conservation programs as well as augmentation.

Question 37. Do you support the Colorado River Compact and subsequent Law of the River statutes, decisions, and agreements that have led to the equitable apportionment of the Colorado River among the Basin States and Mexico?

Answer. Yes. The Colorado River Compact, along with the Mexican Water Treaty, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, and the Arizona v. California litigation, form the foundation of the Law of the River, and I support upholding this framework in regard to the management of the Colorado River.

RESPONSES OF RHEA SUH TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BARRASSO

Question 38. Please provide a list of all policy positions, legal actions or threats of legal action, press releases, policy analysis, grants or public statements made by the Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, or Environmental Grantmakers Association or officials with those organizations during the time you served and were associated with those organizations, with which you disagreed or took an opposing view.

Question 39. Please provide a short explanation of what action you took, if any, to articulate your disagreement with the policy positions, legal actions, press releases, policy analysis, grants, or public statements by the Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, or Environmental Grantmakers Association or officials with those organizations.

Question 40. Please provide a list of all policy positions, legal actions or threats of legal action, press releases, policy analysis, grants or public statements made by the Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, or Environmental Grantmakers Association or officials with those organizations during the time you served or were associated with those organizations with which you now disagree or oppose.

Answer. Response to Questions 38-40. The mission of the Hewlett Foundation is to solve social and environmental problems in the US and around the world. The Foundation's programs have ambitious goals that include: helping to reduce global poverty, improving education for students in California and elsewhere, improving reproductive health and rights worldwide, supporting vibrant performing arts in the community, advancing the field of philanthropy, and supporting disadvantaged communities in the San Francisco Bay Area. Similarly, the Packard Foundation works on the issues its founders cared about most: improving the lives of children, enabling the creative pursuit of science, advancing reproductive health, and conserving and restoring the earth's natural systems. The Environmental Grantmakers Association is a professional association of over 200 philanthropic organizations, including institutions such as the Ford Foundation and the Kellogg Foundation. The association's mission was to foster knowledge sharing and collaboration among institutions.

Both the Hewlett Foundation and the Packard Foundation conducted grantmaking that was designed to build institutional capacity for their grantees, helping them identify goals and indicators of their progress, as well as evaluating their success. The guiding principles they followed included making positive contributions to society; a belief in collaboration with others; and support for independent, non-partisan approaches. These are important attributes and ones that I plan to carry forward to this new position, if I am confirmed. Neither institution,

to my knowledge, is involved directly in any policy debate or legal action associated with policy debates. The Environmental Grantmakers Association is not a grantmaking institution but rather a professional association. To my knowledge, it does not have policy or legal capacity, take positions on policy or legal debates or issue press releases.

Question 41. I am sure you are well aware of the agreement between the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), WildEarth Guardians and the Center for Biological Diversity regarding the potential listing of 750 new species across the country. One of these species of particular concern is the sage grouse.

If a majority of such designations were to occur, economic development for rural communities would be severely impacted and thousands of people would lose their jobs. If confirmed, how would you work to ensure that millions of acres of habitat are not designated over the next four years potentially hurting these communities?

Answer. I know that this is an issue of great importance to you and other members who represent states that could be impacted by potential designation of sage grouse habitat. Secretary Jewell in her remarks to the Western Governors Association has said that collaboration is the key to effectively addressing the threats to sage grouse populations, and I agree with her. If confirmed for this position, one of my highest priorities will be to ensure that FWS continues to work collaboratively and proactively with the Bureau of Land Management, as well as state and local governments and private landowners, to take measures aimed at avoiding the need to list the species.

Question 42. With regard to the sage grouse, if confirmed, how will you work to ensure that federal authority does not adversely impact those states that are already proactively working to conserve the sage grouse at a state level?

Answer. As I noted in my response to the previous question, Secretary Jewell is committed to the principle that collaboration is key to addressing complex issues such as this. I know that the Department has been engaging states and working to ensure a coordinated effort to address the issue. I am aware that much has been accomplished through these partnerships, and I commit to continuing this proactive approach, if I am confirmed.

Question 43. Do you believe sue and settle agreements are an open and transparent way to make public policy that significantly impacts Americans?

Question 44. Do you believe states and communities impacted by sue and settle agreements should have a say in court agreements that might severely impact them?

Question 45. If confirmed, would you agree not to enter into closed-door settlements where the public and affected states are not a party to these agreements?

Question 46. If confirmed, would you open up litigation to local stakeholders and give impacted states and communities a seat at the table before any final agreements are signed?

Answer. Response to Questions 43-46. While I was not a party to any of the discussions or decisions regarding the development of these settlements, I am aware that the FWS has recently finalized its plan to address the backlog of species that have been found to warrant protection under the ESA. Although it is not always possible to avoid litigation, if confirmed, I will ensure that the Department actively engages state and local governments and the public in the search for improved and innovative ways to conserve and recover imperiled species.

Question 47. Governor Mead of Wyoming sent a letter to FWS Director, Dan Ashe, dated November 27, 2013, requesting that the FWS delay its proposed listing on the wolverine for 6 months to allow an independent panel to review the science used to justify the FWS's assessment.

a. Do you know if the FWS will allow, or would you allow, for this time?

b. Do you think it is important that states impacted by these listings be allowed to submit their own independent evidence from biologists and scientists living and working in the state?

Answer. Yes, the FWS has agreed to extend the timeframe for its listing decision by six months. I know that the Fish and Wildlife Service welcomes and solicits the input from scientists in affected states prior to listing and during the public comment period. I believe this is an indispensable component of the rulemaking process.

RESPONSE OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU TO QUESTION FROM SENATOR WYDEN

Question 1. Virtually everywhere there are Federal lands and Federal waters there are practical community leaders working together to find ways for their citizens to have good paying jobs while they enjoy and preserve their scenic treasures. For example, in visiting Louisiana and Alaska to meet with the constituents of Sen-

ator Landrieu and Senator Murkowski, I came away convinced that but for the wonderful Cajun accents of Senator Landrieu's constituents, the meeting resembled those we have in Southern Oregon where timber industry leaders seek a sustainable harvest on Federal lands and environmentalists work to preserve old growth. Of course, it takes revenue to pay for the roads, parks and schools that spark private investment in their communities— and of course, additional revenue is needed for programs that conserve treasured land and waters.

What I have been exploring is how to make common cause among the communities that provide natural resources the rest of the county enjoys. I've been looking for ways to ensure that those communities are protected from the boom-bust cycle that can occur and that they can have the necessary funding to restore their natural landscape. The office of Policy Management and Budget would seem to be uniquely situated to help look for these solutions.

Can we work together to see if there's a way to bring all these communities together and end this hodgepodge of programs?

Answer. If confirmed, I look forward to the opportunity to work with you to identify ways that the federal government can fulfill its role of being a good neighbor to local communities and providing them the opportunity to have their voices heard. The Payment in Lieu of Taxes, Secure Rural Schools, and Land and Water Conservation Fund are examples of programs that provide tremendous benefits to communities throughout the country that help provide our nation with critical natural resources. If confirmed, I look forward to working with you to identify collaborative, pragmatic, and creative approaches to providing sustainable, efficient support to these local communities.

RESPONSES OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR MURKOWSKI

Question 2. I understand that the position you have been nominated for provides policy leadership on the Arctic. In your current role, your efforts have been critical to the Department's efforts to develop regulations for the exploration of oil and gas resources on Alaska's Outer Continental Shelf. As you know, the lack of regulatory certainty makes it difficult to do business in Alaska and provide the public with information on how exploration may move forward.

a. Would your involvement in Alaska oil and gas issues change as Assistant Secretary for PMB? If so, please describe how your role may change.

b. What is the status of the effort to develop regulations for oil and gas exploration in Alaska?

Answer. During my time at the Interior Department I have worked on a broad range of issues that are important to the State of Alaska, including permitting and oversight of safe and responsible offshore oil and gas exploration. As I discussed at the hearing, I am personally committed to these issues and, if confirmed as the Assistant Secretary for PMB, I will be in a position to continue to provide leadership and support on these matters. For example, I currently act as the chair of the Interagency Working Group on Coordination of Domestic Energy Development and Permitting in Alaska and have been involved in developing a more integrated approach to managing the dynamic Arctic landscape, which includes building on relationships not only among the relevant federal agencies but with the State, industry, North Slope communities, and other key partners. Although the position of Assistant Secretary for PMB brings with it an additional set of responsibilities, as a principal policy advisor to the Secretary I can assure you that if confirmed for this new position I will continue to provide my support and experience on the many issues affecting Alaska, including responsible energy development.

The development of regulations relating to oil and gas exploration offshore Alaska is a high priority for the Department, and as a result of a very intensive and focused effort over the past nine months substantial progress has been made in preparing the draft regulations. The draft regulations are being finalized and undergoing review, and we hope to publish the draft rulemaking for comment in early 2014.

Question 3. The federal government both directly and under contract drilled some 136 oil and gas and exploratory wells in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska in the 1940s and again in the early 1980s. Many of those wells have not been properly capped and were instead abandoned. The State of Alaska has been seeking for years for Interior to do a better job of cleaning up its messes, just as the government would fine private developers who had not properly abandoned exploratory wells. Earlier this year the Administration proposed to use Alaska's share of mineral leasing revenues to pay to remedy the federal messes—something I found totally unacceptable and unjust. While we approved \$50 million in the recent helium legislation that may fund 16 more well cleanups over the next five years, as budget director,

do you believe it is the federal government's responsibility to clean up all remaining wells at its own expense—not Alaska's—in the future?

Answer. I believe that the federal government has a responsibility to remediate and clean up the legacy NPR-A wells, and the Department and the Bureau of Land Management are committed to that effort. Earlier this year, BLM published its strategy to address these legacy wells, which includes establishing priorities with respect to the individual well sites to be remediated. I look forward to continuing to work with the Committee to ensure that BLM has the resources necessary to complete this important effort without diminishing our ability to address current and emerging issues, and appreciate very much the recent inclusion of funding in the Helium Reauthorization Act that will allow the BLM to accelerate progress on legacy well cleanup.

Question 4. As you know from your current work at the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, both exploration and production of oil and gas from federal lands requires federal agencies to process environmental and other regulatory permits in a timely manner. In Alaska, delays in the permit processing cost years of time, given the short seasons for exploration. A prime example is what's happening on our Kenai Peninsula, where several entities are having trouble gaining permits for seismic exploration and oil production from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other Interior agencies. As budget director, will you support allocating more money for permitting so that energy developers can have more comfort that needed permits will be issued on a timely basis?

Answer. The Administration and Interior Department are committed to having a well-coordinated and efficient permitting process for energy-related projects in Alaska, so that permitting decisions are made in a timely fashion based on sound scientific information and with appropriate safeguards and environmental protections. This is the purpose of the Interagency Working Group on Coordination of Domestic Energy Development and Permitting in Alaska, established by Executive Order, for which I act as the chair. If confirmed, I will continue to be focused on these issues and will work with our bureaus and partners to identify where the Department's budget and staff resources can be used effectively to ensure safe and responsible energy exploration and development.

Question 5. The U.S. Geological Survey has a host of important roles nationwide and especially in a state like Alaska. One of them is funding seismic research and data gathering to help detect both volcanic eruptions and earthquakes, both of which are major geophysical hazards for Americans and also real hazards to international aviation.

a. Do you believe Interior should fully fund hazards work?

b. Interior's FY 2014 budget calls for sharp cuts to the Alaska Volcano Observatory, which monitors a couple dozen Aleutian Chain volcanoes threatening international aviation. Without \$7 million of additional funding many of these seismic monitoring systems may fail by late next year or by 2015, threatening the reliability of the nation's entire seismic monitoring program. What priority will you give USGS hazards programs in building Department budgets for future years?

Answer. I agree that the U.S. Geological Survey's work in natural hazards has direct benefits to communities across the country, is vitally important, and must to continue. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Bureau Directors and Assistant Secretaries to develop balanced funding recommendations for the Secretary's consideration and presentation to the President. The USGS hazards programs serve a vital mission which will be fully considered along with all of Interior's programs, within the context of significant budget constraints.

Question 6. The federal government's conveyance program of land owed to Alaska and Alaska Natives is mandated under the over 42-year-old Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). The BLM has repeatedly proposed to cut the funding and personnel for the Alaska Conveyance Program and perhaps more egregiously, BLM proposes to take the State of Alaska's 50-percent share of revenue from oil and natural gas activity in the NPR-A to pay for the land conveyance program and the Legacy Well Cleanup. I believe the BLM should fund conveyance and surveying closer to the \$29 million that BLM provided in FY 12—without making Alaska pay for it. The Alaska Land Conveyance Program is very important both to the State of Alaska and Alaska Native Corporations who are eagerly awaiting their long promised lands to which they are entitled.

a. If confirmed, can you commit to me that you will ensure that the Alaska Land Conveyance Program receives the necessary funding to complete the conveyances as expeditiously as possible?

b. Do you believe that it is proper for the BLM to reduce the funding of a legislatively mandated program, and one which it is 40 years delinquent on fulfilling,

while spending funds on non-legislatively mandated programs, like climate change monitoring and adaptation?

Answer. In light of my role as Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, I am aware of the importance of completing the Alaska Conveyance work and of recent innovative efforts by the Bureau of Land Management to identify ways to reduce the costs of surveys and expedite the program while maintaining the quality of the information upon which we base our recommendations and decisions. Recognizing the current constrained budget environment, I fully support BLM's efforts to complete this work more quickly and less expensively. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Bureau Directors and Assistant Secretaries to develop balanced funding recommendations for the Secretary's consideration and presentation to the President. Factored into this balance are statutory and contractual requirements, mission directed requirements, investments needed to perform Departmental missions more effectively, and deficit reduction considerations.

Question 7. Please describe how you view the relationship between the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, and the Department of State, in terms of international activities related to energy development. Do any official documents, such as memoranda of understanding, govern this relationship?

Answer. The Department of the Interior, through its natural resource, wildlife, and science agencies, conducts a broad array of international activities to accomplish its mission and in support of U.S. foreign policy priorities. The Department collaborates on these types of activities with the Department of State and Department of Energy where appropriate. On energy issues, key technical expertise resides within several Departmental bureaus, including the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, the Bureau of Land Management, and the United States Geological Survey.

As Director of BOEM and Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, my interactions with these key partners have revolved primarily around the safe and responsible development of conventional and renewable energy resources. For example, I worked with personnel from BSEE and our key partner, the Department of State, during the negotiation of the U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement. Negotiation of this Agreement was based on a formal inter-agency document.

The Department also worked closely with the Departments of State and Energy on the Ministerial Forum on Offshore Drilling Containment in Washington, DC, in 2012. The Department and its bureaus also regularly provide critical support to the Department of State as it represents the U.S. in the Arctic Council on offshore oil and gas cooperation. Finally, the Departments of State and Energy often request and fund technical assistance provided by the Department and its bureaus, and the Department regularly makes technical experts available for meetings with visiting foreign officials, provides technical advice to the Departments of State and Energy, and coordinates with the relevant State and U.S. Embassy personnel when sending technical personnel to carry out activities in foreign countries.

Question 8. To what extent, if any, has the Department of the Interior been involved in the formulation of the President's forthcoming National Security Strategy?

Answer. I understand that the Department participates in several interagency committees and subcommittees of the National Security Staff, and that the work of these committees informs the National Security Strategy, but that the Department has not been asked to participate directly in preparation of a forthcoming National Security Strategy document.

RESPONSES OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR CANTWELL

Question 9. The Yakima River basin supports over a billion dollars of agricultural production and thousands of jobs. It has suffered two severe droughts since 2001 resulting in \$335 million of economic damage, as well as damage to fish and wildlife. To address future droughts, concerns over the Endangered Species Act, groundwater availability and treaty fishing rights, the Yakama Tribe, irrigators, Washington State, local governments and environmentalists have worked together to develop the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Integrated Plan. That Plan was endorsed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 2012 when they issued a Record of Decision on a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and former Secretary of Interior Salazar toured the project to hear about the plan in 2011. This year the State of Washington committed \$137 million to get the first elements of the Plan going and the Department of Interior has already invested over \$10 million in studying the options for improving the project.

Can you commit to me that as the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget you will continue the Department's Commitment to this the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project?

Answer. My understanding is that the President's FY14 budget includes a request of \$8 million for the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, of which \$1 million is targeted towards the Integrated Plan. To advance many of the Integrated Plan activities, my understanding is that legislation is needed to provide authority and/or additional cost ceiling. If confirmed, I will support the needs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science to continue the cooperative relationship with the State to further the goals of the Integrated Plan.

Question 10. I also hope that we can work with you, if confirmed, to translate that commitment into increased funding in the President's FY15 budget request. The State of Washington has shown its commitment with a \$137 million investment over the next two years, and it is my hope that the federal government can make a strong contribution as well. Will you commit to work with my office in support of funding for the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project?

Answer. The Department is currently working to develop funding recommendations for FY 2015. Recognizing the current Federal budget climate is very difficult, if confirmed, I would support the Department's commitment to work collaboratively and creatively to further the goals of the Integrated Plan, including working with the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation to identify funding for the project.

Question 11. I am sure you know that the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act authorizes tribes to enter into contracts with the Department of the Interior and Indian Health Service to operate federal programs at the tribal level. The Act also provides the tribe with contract support costs which are the essential for the proper administration of federal contracts. Federal budgets have rarely provided enough resources to fully compensate tribes for their contract support costs.

The Supreme Court ruled last year in *Salazar v. Ramah* that the Government must pay each tribe's contract support costs in full. However, in the Fiscal Year 2014 budget, the Department of the Interior did not request enough funding to cover all contract support costs. Further, Interior's budget request seeks to cap each tribe's contract support costs by statute to limit the Department's liability.

The Administration has stated that part of the reason it has not requested full funding for contract support costs is that doing so would necessarily force the Administration to cut into other program dollars.

But, by not providing sufficient funds for contract support costs, aren't the agencies forcing tribes that carry out federal programs to reduce the amounts that they would otherwise spend on carrying out their programs?

How will you as director of Interior's Budget Office ensure that the Agency accurately reports the need to Congress as required by current federal law?

Answer. Full funding for contract support costs has been among the Tribes' highest funding priorities and a key component of the success of Self-Determination programs. I also understand that contract support costs allow Tribes to manage the Federal programs for which they contract, and eliminate the need for Tribes to use program funds to fulfill administrative requirements. Funding for contract support costs remains a priority for Secretary Jewell and the Administration and, if confirmed, I will work with the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs and this Committee to pursue longer-term solutions in consultation with the Tribes to streamline and simplify the contract support cost process.

RESPONSES OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BARRASSO

Question 12. Under 43 CFR 2806.14 (a)(2)(ii), rural electric cooperatives are exempt from rental payments to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) when requesting or renewing rights-of-way (ROW) on public land managed by BLM.

It is my understanding that, prior to granting a rental exemption, BLM requires the Rural Utilities Service (RUS) within the Department of Agriculture to certify that a rural electric cooperative is an eligible RUS borrower. Historically, BLM required rural electric cooperatives to obtain a letter from RUS for each rental exemption.

However, in March of this year, RUS issued a letter to BLM certifying that all rural electric cooperatives in Wyoming are RUS eligible borrowers and therefore exempt from having to pay rent either on an existing ROW or a new ROW.

I understand that BLM, to date, has refused to rely on this letter for the purposes of granting rental exemptions.

Please explain in detail why BLM refuses to rely on the RUS letter certifying that all rural electric cooperatives in Wyoming are RUS eligible borrowers.

Answer. Although I have not yet been formally briefed on the details of this issue, I have been advised that the Rural Utilities Service submitted a list of its current borrowers to the BLM with no statement specific to Wyoming. My understanding is that the information contained in the list does not satisfy statutory requirements for rental exemptions under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. It is my understanding, however, that the BLM and RUS have been working together to resolve this issue, and that both agencies recently agreed on an interim process to ensure the proper certification of these facilities.

Question 13a. Grand Teton National Park recently began scoping an Environmental Impact Statement to study 10,000 acres for the 8 mile long Moose-Wilson Road. It appears the park is starting from scratch on the same road that was studied in 2007.

At a time with significant park maintenance backlogs and budget cuts, do you believe it is in the best interest of taxpayers and park visitors to spend millions of dollars to restudy this road?

Answer. My understanding from the National Park Service is that the 2007 transportation plan did not fully evaluate the Moose-Wilson Road corridor and that there are issues that have emerged since 2007, including increased presence and frequency of grizzly bears within the corridor. Filling in the gaps and ensuring the use of current, relevant, information is critical for developing an informed and useful plan that builds on the work done back in 2007. Regarding the costs associated with this evaluation, I have been assured that NPS is working hard to reduce the cost of the plan and the time required to complete it, including the costs of the associated visitor experience studies necessary to support the plan.

Question 13b. In this case, do you believe an environmental assessment is more appropriate to study the road corridor?

Answer. The National Environmental Policy Act provides that an EA may be prepared by an agency when it is not clear whether an EIS is required. It is my understanding that the NPS evaluated the level of NEPA compliance that would be necessary and determined that the likely outcome of an EA would be that it must prepare an EIS. Consequently, in the interest of expedience and cost, the NPS moved forward with an EIS. I know this issue is important to you and, if confirmed, I will work closely with the NPS to ensure that the plan is completed in a timely and cost effective manner.

RESPONSES OF TOMMY P. BEAUDREAU TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR SCOTT

Question 14. As Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Policy, Management and Budget, how much involvement will you have in the development of the next five year offshore leasing plan?

Answer. If confirmed as the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, I will continue to support the Secretary in the development of the five year offshore leasing plan for 2017-2022. As the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management since October 2011, I have substantial experience with offshore oil and gas leasing and, if confirmed, I will continue to provide the Secretary my support based on that experience. Moreover, the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget serves as one of the principal policy advisors to the Secretary, and discharges the authority of the Secretary for Departmental management, budget and coordination activities that also are relevant to the offshore planning process.

Question 15. Are you actively working on the five year plan right now?

Answer. The 2017-2022 Five Year Program planning process will begin in 2014. The development of the Five Year Program typically takes two and a half years.

Question 16. You have said previously that the delays in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Atlantic seismic will not hinder the ability for the Department to include the Atlantic in the next five year plan. Is that still the case and if so is the Atlantic being considered during the current work on the next five year plan?

Answer. Finalizing the PEIS is a high priority for the Department and BOEM. As discussed in the current Five Year Program for 2012-2017, responsible acquisition of modern seismic information about the size and location of potential oil and gas resources is key to informing future decisions about possible leasing in the Mid and South Atlantic. However, it is not necessary to have such data in hand at this stage in determining whether to include these areas for scoping as an initial step in the process for preparing the next Five Year Program, which will begin in 2014. We will use the scoping process to identify issues that should be analyzed as we prepare the program.

Question 17. As you know the PEIS has suffered from many delays. Can you commit that the Department will finalize the PEIS in January 2014 as scheduled?

Answer. BOEM was on track to complete the PEIS in early January, but the October government shutdown occurred during a critical period for reviewing and finalizing the PEIS and required the issuance of a stop work order to the contractor involved in assisting BOEM in completing the PEIS analysis. While this set the process back, BOEM is now working toward the goal of publishing the final PEIS by the end of February 2014.

National Ocean Policy

Question 18. In December 2010, the Interior Department announced that it was revising the Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program to preclude through at least 2017 the possibility of development in any areas that did not already have leases. In foreclosing even the possibility of leasing in the Mid and South Atlantic and vast majority of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, the announcement cited the National Ocean Policy Executive Order in part as justification.

What precise role did the Administration's new National Ocean Policy play in the decision to so significantly restrict the possibility of offshore development through 2017?

Answer. Although the current Five Year Program does not schedule any lease sales in the Mid or South Atlantic, it sets forth a clear strategy for consideration of potential future leasing in those areas based on (1) the responsible acquisition of modern seismic data concerning the size and location of potential oil and gas resources, and (2) work to resolve conflicts with existing important uses in these areas, including military operations and training. The intersection with the National Ocean Policy (NOP) is a recognition that the principles of the NOP complement the requirements set forth in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, including encouraging effective information dissemination and active engagement with other Federal agencies, such as the U.S. Navy, as well as state, tribal, industry, environmental, and other stakeholders, all within the scope of existing authorities.

Question 19. The National Ocean Policy Executive Order, by incorporating Final Recommendations of the Interagency Ocean Policy Task Force, requires the establishment of nine "Regional Planning Bodies" in every coastal region of the United States, tasking these new bodies with the development of "Coastal and Marine Spatial Plans" in each of these regions. An Interior Department document from 2012 states that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management is "DOF's lead" for Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning, and that Interior Department leads and Bureau members from BOEM, the Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Survey, and National Park Service have been assigned to engage in Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning activities in all nine regions.

What specific activities have BOEM officials been engaging in? How many individuals within BOEM are involved in implementation of the new National Ocean Policy, including Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning?

Answer. The Ocean-related activities in which BOEM engages are core functions in carrying out the mission of the OCS Lands Act and other statutes, including environmental studies; digital mapping of physical, ecological, and cultural information on the OCS; and coordination with other federal agencies, states, tribes, and other stakeholders. BOEM-sponsored research is needed for management of the OCS and also contributes to a balanced understanding of key issues across all major sectors, and also provides critical input to National Ocean Policy implementation.

As the Final Implementation Plan makes clear, the Plan specifies that regional stakeholders will determine the scope, scale and content of collaborative marine planning, that participation is voluntary, and that regional planning bodies will be established only in regions that want them.

BOEM also is the federal co-lead for the Mid-Atlantic Regional Planning Body (RPB) and co-chairs the Coordinate and Support implementation group. In addition, BOEM is supporting Regional Planning Bodies in regions where there is interest in marine planning.

Approximately six BOEM employees conduct mission-related work under existing authorities and their work contributes directly to NOP implementation, and other subject experts provide assistance as needed.

Question 20. The Interior Department has noted that Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning "has emerged as a new paradigm and planning strategy for coordinating all marine and coastal activities and facility constructions within the context of a national zoning plan."

The Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Program Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement stated that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management "has incorporated the requirements of the National Ocean Policy EO 13547

into its 5-year Program, which includes CMSP.” It also noted that “[i]t is anticipated that the [coastal and marine spatial] plans will serve as an overlay for decisions made under existing regulatory mandates,” with National Ocean Council-approved plans “assist[ing] the BOEM programmatic EIS process in making informed decisions.”

How will institution of a national zoning plan and a new Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning overlay impact permitting timelines and opportunities to develop offshore oil and gas resources?

Answer. The intent of the marine planning effort is to help guide resource conservation, security interests, navigation, and economic development by facilitating information sharing, fostering collaboration, and improving decision-making about accommodating a growing number of uses of ocean resources and space, including, among other things, energy development. The products and guidance produced through this process will be advisory in nature only, and will not supersede or modify the statutes, policies, and regulations used by BOEM in its programs. They will be a part of the information that BOEM considers in its decision-making related to offshore leasing and development.

Question 21. Please explain specifically how BOEM “has incorporated the requirements of the National Ocean Policy EO 13547 into its 5-year Program, which includes CMSP.”

Answer. As discussed above, the principles of the National Ocean Policy are consistent with BOEM’s planning processes under OCSLA. The Regional Planning Bodies (RPB) described in National Ocean Policy EO 13547 did not exist at the time that the current Five Year Program was developed. All four RPBs (Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Caribbean, and the Pacific Island) were established earlier this year, and these entities are building capacity to support marine planning. Initial discussions indicate that marine planning in each region will be informed by regional and local drivers and concerns. State, tribal, and federal representatives on the RPB are currently discussing the scope of the marine planning exercise, and are seeking stakeholder input to inform the future course. For future Five Year Programs, the RPBs will be given the opportunity to comment on the Program during the stakeholder review process.

Question 22. The recommendations adopted by the National Ocean Policy Executive Order state that effective implementation will require “clear and easily understood requirements and regulations, where appropriate, that include enforcement as a critical component.” In addition, the Executive Order requires federal entities including the Interior Department to implement the policy to the fullest extent possible. At the same time, repeating previous assurances that contradict language incorporated in the Executive Order, the Administration’s recently-released National Ocean Policy Final Implementation Plan states that it “does not create new regulations.”

If confirmed, what if any commitment can you make that the Interior Department and its affiliate agencies will not issue any regulations or take any actions having a regulatory impact pursuant to the National Ocean Policy, including Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning?

Answer. The Policy does not impose or require any new regulations now or in the future, or alter any existing Federal authorities. I am advised that none of the National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan actions in which the Department is involved have any elements that require or contemplate new regulations. While the implementation actions should, through increased interagency and federal-state cooperation, generate better and more timely information that can help inform our decisions, new regulations from the Department are not part of the plan to implement the Policy.

Question 23. Among other things, the National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan calls for National Ocean Council member agencies (of which Interior is a member) this year to adopt ecosystem-based management (EBM) “principles, goals, and performance measures” and a related policy statement. In addition, National Ocean Council agencies (of which Interior is a member) are to “[i]ncorporate EBM into Federal agency environmental planning and review processes” by 2016.

What if any work is the Interior Department conducting in furtherance of the new ecosystem-based management requirement under the National Ocean Policy? What if any such activities have already been completed? Please explain how incorporation of EBM into DOI environmental planning and review processes will impact proposed offshore and onshore energy projects.

Answer. I am advised that consistent with the National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan, NOC member agencies, including DOI, are working to establish “principles, goals, and performance measures” and a related policy statement. As these actions are not due until 2016, they have not yet been established. Onshore and off-

shore energy projects, however, will remain among the important uses that must be considered as part of any planning or review process.

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

APIAHF,
Washington, DC., December 10, 2013.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Chair, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, 221 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
Ranking Member, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, 709 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Re: Rhea Suh's nomination to be the next Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks

DEAR CHAIRMAN WYDEN AND RANKING MEMBER MURKOWSKI;

On behalf of the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum (APIAHF), I write this letter in support of Rhea Suh's nomination as Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks at the Department of Interior.

Incorporated in 1986, APIAHF is the oldest and largest health policy organization working with Asian American (AA), Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (NHPI) communities across the nation and across the Pacific. APIAHF influences policy, mobilizes communities, and strengthens programs and organizations to improve the health of AAs and NHPIs. With over 30 community-based organizational partners in 20 states and territories, APIAHF provides a voice in the nation's capital for underserved AA and NHPI communities and works towards health equity and health justice.

We applaud the nomination of Rhea Suh to be the next Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. As the first Asian-American woman to hold this position, we know Rhea will fulfill her duty to protect and preserve the abundance of natural beauty in our great country and its territories, while maintaining a narrative inclusive of all the cultures and histories that have contributed to the development of this land. APIAHF is confident that Rhea will continue to strive for a healthy natural environment for all people to enjoy, and for generations to come.

Ms. Suh has proven her passion for connecting underserved communities to our nation's parks. She has worked hard to strengthen the "Youth in the Great Outdoors" program, which provides thousands of disadvantaged youth the opportunity to work on natural and cultural resource conservation and learn about America's wildlife, public lands, culture and heritage. With a natural landscape as diverse as ours, it is comforting to know the Department of Interior has a nominee who values youth leadership development as highly as Rhea Suh.

In addition to her many professional accomplishments and qualifications, her confirmation would add much needed diversity in the senior levels of government, and to the Department of Interior in particular.

As such, we encourage the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to confirm Rhea Suh expeditiously and without delay.

STATEMENT OF JOBIE M. K. MASAGATANI, CHAIRMAN, HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION,
HONOLULU, HAWAII

Aloha Chairman Wyden, Ranking Member Murkowski, and distinguished members of the Senate Committee on Energy & Natural Resources. Thank you for this opportunity to provide this testimony in support of President Obama's nomination of Assistant Secretary Rhea S. Suh.

In her current position as Assistant Secretary of Policy, Management and Budget of the Department of the Interior, Ms. Suh is charged with exercising the respon-

sibilities of the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Hawaiian Home Lands Recovery Act (P.L. 104-42). These responsibilities include advancing the interests of the beneficiaries of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, and assisting the beneficiaries and the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands in obtaining assistance from Federal programs that promote homesteading opportunities, economic self-sufficiency, and social well-being of the beneficiaries. To this end, Assistant Secretary Suh's open and collaborative style has helped to bring clarity to longstanding issues between our two agencies. In short, Assistant Secretary Suh's work with us has improved and advanced our relationship and consequently has helped our program and the families our program serves.

In closing, we appreciate her leadership, support, and attention to our issues. Based on our experience and working relationship, we are confident she will continue to be an asset to the Department of the Interior as she oversees Fish and Wildlife and Parks. We support this nomination and we ask your committee's favorable consideration. Mahalo nui loa (thank you very much).

PT CAPITAL,
Anchorage, AK, December 11, 2013.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Senate Energy Committee, 221 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington DC.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
Ranking Member, Senate Energy Committee, 709 Hart Senate Bldg., Washington DC.

Re: Confirmation of Tommy P. Beaudreau

DEAR CHAIRMAN:

I write to support the confirmation of Tommy P. Beaudreau as Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget at the Department of the Interior. Since his arrival at the Department, Tommy has demonstrated his ability to understand and solve complex issues. Those who work with him appreciate his thoughtful approach.

Tommy's presence is felt across our nation. My testimony, however, is based upon his work in the American Arctic. In short, Tommy has used his talent and exerted his influence to improve the lives of Arctic residents.

Tommy was key to restructuring the Department's approach to leasing, permitting and regulating offshore oil and gas. The process of restructuring the former Mineral Management Services has had a profound and positive impact on how the federal government conducts business in the Arctic. Tommy was an important part of the team that changed the system and the culture. As a result DOI has restored the confidence of those living in the region. After dramatic failures, local residents are more optimistic that the federal government can protect their interests through a high quality permitting and regulatory system.

Tommy has been a strong advocate for improving Arctic standards. Fundamental to improving the chances of successful offshore oil and gas operations is the willingness of the government to reach out to stakeholders to identify best standards. The process is cumbersome and requires balancing competing visions of success, a process in which Tommy has excelled. By insisting on higher standards, Tommy has improved the chances of successful offshore operations in the Arctic Ocean.

As you know, Arctic coastal communities are at once excited and fearful of the changes occurring around them. Tommy has demonstrated a willingness to travel great distances to talk with indigenous residents. He has traveled to the Arctic on several occasions, including a multi community visit in the middle of our long Arctic winter. While in the communities, he has listened, learned and responded as a statesman. Over time Tommy has become a welcomed guest in the Arctic communities.

The Department should take great pride in Tommy's work in the Arctic. It would be difficult to replicate Tommy's work or his reputation as an Arctic problem solver. I give my highest recommendation to Tommy P. Beaudreau for Assistant Secretary and hope that he is confirmed quickly.

Sincerely,

EDWARD S. ITTA.

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY,
Arlington, VA, November 13, 2013.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WYDEN AND RANKING MEMBER MURKOWSKI:

On behalf of The Nature Conservancy, we are writing in support of the nomination of Ms. Rhea S. Suh for the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, U.S. Department of the Interior, with lead responsibility for overseeing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service.

Since 2009, Ms. Suh has been at the helm of the U.S. Department of the Interior's Policy, Management and Budget Office, where she has overseen Department-wide administrative policies and practices and implemented several major Departmental initiatives focusing on land conservation, sustainability, diversity and youth engagement and employment. Ms. Suh has spent much of her career identifying opportunities for improving the transparency and efficiency of on-the-ground conservation and ensuring that a broader constituency is engaged in impactful ways in conservation delivery mechanisms. In her current role, Ms. Suh has emphasized the need for federal funding sources such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund to be targeted toward collaborative, community-based initiatives, while also continuing to address existing needs. She has also focused on broadening the constituency for conservation to include both rural and urban communities, as well as approaching environmental issues in a bipartisan and non-controversial way. These transformative initiatives at the Department under her leadership, combined with her extensive experience working with Congress and holding roles within both the conservation and foundation fields during her professional career, position Ms. Suh as an ideal candidate for the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks position.

Additionally, Ms. Suh has been a driving force at the Department of the Interior for ensuring internal and external accountability. As the Chief Financial Officer and Chief Human Capital Officer for the Department, Ms. Suh has been responsible for implementing the Budget Control Act (BCA) and associated sequestration cuts for all of agencies of the Department of the Interior. She has closely coordinated these efforts with Capitol Hill, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Administration. The BCA budget implementation has been executed seamlessly at the Department, exemplifying the professionalism and leadership of Ms. Suh.

The Conservancy requests the Committee's consideration of Ms. Rhea S. Suh as a strong and qualified candidate for the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks position. Thank you.

Sincerely,

LYNN SCARLETT,
Managing Director for Public Policy.
KAMERAN L. ONLEY,
Acting Director, U.S. Government Relations.