## HEARING ON DEFICIENT ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS

AT U.S. FACILITIES IN IRAQ

Wednesday, July 30, 2008

House of Representatives,

Committee on Oversight and

Government Reform,

Washington, D.C.

"This is a preliminary transcript of a Committee Hearing. It has not yet been subject to a review process to ensure that the statements within are appropriately attributed to the witness or member of Congress who made them, to determine whether there are any inconsistencies between the statements within and what was actually said at the proceeding, or to make any other corrections to ensure the accuracy of the record."

## **Committee Hearings**

of the

## U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



**OFFICE OF THE CLERK Office of Official Reporters** 

1 Court Reporting Services, Inc.

- 2 HGO212000
- 3 HEARING ON DEFICIENT ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS
- 4 AT U.S. FACILITIES IN IRAQ
- 5 Wednesday, July 30, 2008
- 6 House of Representatives,
- 7 Committee on Oversight and
- 8 Government Reform,
- 9 Washington, D.C.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Henry
A. Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Waxman, Higgins, Altmire, McCollum, Tierney, Sarbanes, Lynch, Davis of Virginia, Brady, Marchant, Speier, Issa, and Bilbray.

Staff Present: Kristin Amerling, General Counsel; Caren Auchman, Press Assistant; Phil Barnett, Staff Director and Chief Counsel; Jen Berenholz, Deputy Clerk; Margaret Daum, Counsel; Christopher Davis, Professional Staff Member, Zhongrui 'JR'' Deng, Chief Information Officer, Miriam

21 Edelman, Special Assistant; Ali Golden, Investigator; Earley 22 Green, Chief Clerk; Ella Hoffman, Press Assistant; Karen Lightfoot, Communications Director and Senior Policy Advisor; 23 Jennifer Owens, Special Assistant; David Rapallo, Chief 24 25 Investigative Counsel; Leneal Scott, Information Systems 26 Manager; Mitch Smiley, Special Assistant; Lawrence Halloran, 27 Minority Staff Director; Jennifer Safavian, Minority Chief Counsel for Oversight and Investigations; Keith Ausbrook, 28 29 Minority General Counsel; John Brosnan, Minority Senior 30 Procurement Counsel; Steve Castor, Minority Counsel; Mark Lavin, Minority Army Fellow; Brian McNicoll, Minority 31 32 Communications Director; and John Ohly, Minority Professional Staff Member. 33

Chairman WAXMAN. The meeting of the Committee will please come to order.

Our soldiers and their families make enormous sacrifices for our Country. And they make these sacrifices understanding the deadly risks that they may face. Since the Iraq war began over five years ago, over 4,000 servicemen and women have been killed and over 30,000 injured. But no soldier should die while relaxing in a swimming pool, or washing a vehicle, or taking a shower. Yet that is exactly what happened in Iraq. As a result of widespread electrical deficiencies throughout U.S. military facilities, our soldiers have been shocked and killed needlessly.

The purpose of today's hearing is to examine why this happened and to determine whether the actions taken by the Defense Department and its largest contractor in Iraq, KBR, are sufficient to prevent these senseless deaths.

There was no shortage of warnings about the electrical dangers in Iraq, just a shortage of will to do the right thing by our troops.

In 2004, the U.S. Army Safety Center issued a report warning about widespread electrical hazards throughout Iraq. The report explained that five U.S. soldiers had been electrocuted in Iraq that year alone. According to the report, one of these soldiers ''was found dead, lying on a shower room floor with burn marks on his body.'' The report

attributed his death to ''electricity that traveled from the water heater through the metal pipes to the showerhead.''

The 2004 report warned commanders that they 'must require contractors to properly ground electrical systems.''
But despite these warnings, few actions were taken by
Pentagon leadership or KBR officials.

In February 2007, the Defense Contract Management Agency reported that there had been 283 fires at facilities maintained by KBR in a five-month period from August 2006 through January 2007. These fires burned down the largest dining facility in Iraq. And they killed at least two soldiers.

The Defense Contract Management Agency report described the widespread electrical deficiencies as a 'major challenge' and the 'primary safety threat, theater wide.' It also warned that 'some contractors connected to KBR were not following basic safety principles.'

But Defense Department officials again took no action. In a May 2008 e-mail, a DCMA official warned his superiors that the ''lack of action with regard to any corrective action, or increased surveillance, results in a direct liability for our Agency.''

In his testimony today, Jeffrey Parsons, the executive director of the Army Contracting Command, says that the Defense Department now recognizes that ''neither LOGCAP nor

DCMA have sufficient skill sets or expertise to perform adequate oversight of electrical work being performed by KBR.''

Well, that is a remarkable admission. We will ask why it took the Defense Department four years to realize that it lacks the skill and expertise to oversee KBR. In total, 19 U.S. military and contractor personnel may have been killed as a result of electrocution or faulty wiring in Iraq. These young heroes might still be alive today if the Department had done the proper oversight.

One of the individuals who died by electrocution is

Staff Sergeant Ryan Maseth, a decorated Army Ranger and Green

Beret who was electrocuted in his shower on January 2, 2008.

Army investigators concluded that he was killed when his

water pump overheated, 'thereby causing the failure of the

breaker switch, capacitor, and internal fuse.''

A preliminary report by the Defense Department Inspector General on Sergeant Maseth's death was provided to the Committee on Monday and leaked to the press yesterday. This IG report absolves the military and KBR of responsibility in the death and asserts that there was ''no credible evidence'' that they knew of electrical problems with Staff Sergeant Maseth's shower.

As part of the Oversight Committee's investigation, we obtained many new documents about Staff Sergeant Maseth's

109 When we described these documents to the Inspector 110 General's staff yesterday, they said they believed they did 111 not have this new information. 112 Now, we do not know whether the Inspector General failed 113 to ask for the right documents, which would be a stain on the Inspector General's work, or whether the documents were 114 115 withheld from the Inspector General, which would call into question the motives of the Department and KBR. 116 But we do 117 know that these documents appear to contradict the Inspector 118 General's findings. 119 My staff has prepared an analysis of the new information 120 about Staff Sergeant Maseth's death. And I ask that this staff analysis and the documents it cites be made part of 121 today's hearing record. 122 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. There is no objection, Mr. 123 124 Chairman. 125 Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection, that will be the 126 order. 127 [The referenced information follows:] 128 \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. The documents obtained by the Committee include work orders from the facility where Staff Sergeant Maseth was electrocuted. These work orders appear to show that Sergeant Justin Hummer, who occupied Staff Sergeant Maseth's quarters until October 2007, repeatedly warned KBR and the military about electrical shocks in the shower.

According to Sergeant Hummer, he was shocked ''four or five times in the shower,'' between June and October of 2007. On at least one occasion, he ''had to use a wooden handle to turn off the shower nozzle because the electrical current was so strong.''

If these work orders are accurate, they show that in July 2007, six months before Staff Sergeant Maseth was electrocuted, KBR may have installed the water pump that ultimately malfunctioned, resulting in his death.

The electrical problems that led to Staff Sergeant
Maseth's death were not new problems. In February 2007, KBR
conducted an assessment of the facility where he worked. The
KBR assessment found major electrical problems, including
with the building's main circuit panel.

These problems were confirmed in a second KBR assessment prepared after Staff Sergeant Maseth's death. The report found that the majority of electrical panels in the complex 'are in disrepair and require replacement' and that a majority of electrical systems are 'in complete disarray.''

154	The serious electrical hazards are finally getting some
155	attention. KBR recommended in March that troops immediately
156	evacuate at least six buildings at the compound where Staff
157	Sergeant Maseth was killed because the ''electrical
158	conditions in all buildings make them uninhabitable for
159	safety and health reasons.''
160	Today we will ask why it took so long for KBR and the
161	Defense Department to protect our troops from these dangerous
162	conditions. We are going to ask our witnesses tough
163	questions about the documents we have obtained, and we will
164	try to understand both the specific cases and the broad
165	systemic problems at issue.
166	I know that one of our witnesses recently retired and
L67	did not have to appear today. I know that others flew in
L68	from Iraq for this hearing. And I want to thank all of you
L69	for your cooperation with the Committee's investigation.
L70	Before we call on our witnesses, I want to recognize Mr.
L71	Davis.
.72	[Prepared statement of Chairman Waxman follows:]
İ	

\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

173

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to be brief, because I know we have Senator Casey. We are happy to have you here today.

Today's hearing will examine injuries and deaths of military personnel resulting from deficiencies in the electric system at facilities occupied by our forces in Iraq. There is no question everyone of these accidental deaths is a tragedy. There is also no doubt the electric infrastructure in Iraq is a mess and presents a constant danger to everyone there.

Further, there is little question the electric systems within many of the facilities occupied by our personnel are significantly below U.S. standards. In many cases, pursuant to command decisions, we are forced to use buildings built and wired during the regime of Saddam. Apparently, the regime had the same disdain for building codes it showed to UN resolutions.

The first step in preventing injuries and death from electrocution is to do a better job training our soldiers to appreciate the inherent dangers of living, working, and fighting in the middle of a Third World electrical infrastructure. These are considerations you don't often work about in the United States and other First World countries. Our soldiers are trained and equipped to deal with the inevitably dangerous environment of Iraq and other war

zones, but are they sufficiently prepared to understand the dangers of ungrounded high voltage electric current?

As you said, Mr. Chairman, on January 2, 2008, Army Staff Sergeant Ryan D. Maseth was electrocuted while showering in his Special Forces compound in Baghdad. Sergeant Maseth was electrocuted when the ungrounded water pump on the roof of his facilities failed and electrified the water distribution pipes. The safety shut-off also failed, apparently, because tar from recent roof repairs followed the circuit breaker.

Sergeant Maseth's death is one of 16 electrocutions identified by investigators from the Department of Defense's Office of Inspector General. The accidental deaths have occurred under myriad circumstances. IG investigators determined eight of the cases involved contact with power lines during military or construction operations. Four cases were caused by improperly grounded or faulty electric equipment. The three remaining cases involved individuals attempting to repair faulty electric equipment.

These deaths raised the question of whether our soldiers are properly trained to be aware and vigilant. For example, in May 2004, a soldier was electrocuted after trying to use a shower that was taken out of service for maintenance reasons. It was locked and the wiring disconnected, but a tired soldier looking for some clean water and comfort put the

shower back into service with tragic results. Another unfortunate incident involved a service member who died after being clipped by a low hanging power line while atop a seven-ton truck.

Better communication and safety awareness training may have prevented these deaths, and I think would have prevented these deaths. These accidents are troubling, occurring under a variety of circumstances in different locations throughout Iraq. They have occurred in facilities such as forward operating bases and camps, along power lines, atop towers, while traveling in vehicles, and outside tents. Fatalities have occurred in connection with servicing generators, communication equipment, radar equipment, lighting systems, and air conditioning units.

According to the IG, these unfortunate incidents had no correlation with each other in terms of causal factors other than the need for better safety standards and practices in an inherently unsafe environment. So based on what we know, it is premature to attribute electric incidents to just contractor performance. And the familiar contractor blame doesn't make soldiers safe by themselves, but we need to look at it and understand it further.

It is true that the death of Sergeant Maseth occurred in a facility maintained by KBR, the former Halliburton subsidiary that provides most of the logistical support for

our forces in Iraq. The contract calls only for repairs when requested by the military unit, and we will learn more about this as we move through the hearing today.

An internal report by the IG on the Maseth tragedy found no evidence, no credible evidence, that representatives from KBR, or DCMA, were aware of imminent life-threatening hazards prior to the electrocution, but other aspects of the incident are in litigation. And this Committee should tread carefully so that we don't interfere with prejudice into that.

This hearing should also help raise awareness of important safety issues affecting our soldiers, sailors, and Marines abroad. Any death of deployed personnel by electrocution in theaters should be promptly and thoroughly investigated. All factors contributing to unsafe conditions should be immediately remedied. At times, this involves making sure contractors do what DOD pays them to do. It will always mean doing everything possible to increase occupational safety, training, and awareness, for those we send to do the most unsafe thing imaginable, and that is fight a war. Thank you.

Chairman WAXMAN. Let me ask unanimous consent that Representative Brady and Altmire be permitted to sit with us in our hearing today. They are not members of the Committee, but we want to welcome them and their interest in this subject.

I am pleased to welcome Senator Bob Casey to give a statement to the Committee. Senator Casey, who represents the family of Staff Sergeant Ryan Maseth, has been actively involved in these issues in the Senate, and I thank him for being here and for his testimony today. Senator, this Committee is unusual in that every witness that testifies before us does so under oath. And we would like to ask you if you would rise and hold up your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony that you will give before this Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Senator CASEY. I do.

[Witness responds in the affirmative.]

Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that you answered in the affirmative. We are pleased to have you here and to recognize you for such statement as you wish to make.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senator CASEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege that I have to testify today before this Committee and for your leadership on this issue. I want to thank you and thank Ranking Member Davis for this opportunity, and especially for the commitment that you have made to find the truth, the truth as it relates to the death of Ryan Maseth, as well as the other soldiers and others who have lost their lives because of this problem we have had in Iraq. And I want to thank other members of the Committee who are here. I know that Jason Altmire, from Pennsylvania, who as well represents this family is here with us today.

And I am really here for a number of reasons, but I think the principal reason I am sitting here today, and maybe the principal reason that many of us are sitting here today, is because of the courage of a number of people, but in particular, the courage and the determination that Cheryl Harris has shown. To do two things really, one obviously, as a mother, as a member of a family who lost someone tragically in Iraq to get answers, to get the truth about what happened to her son. No one would expect anything less of her. But she has also been so committed to finding the truth about

this so that it doesn't happen to any other family. Over and over again, she has emphasized that.

And when you think about all of the ways that a soldier can die in battle, die on the battle field, no one would ever imagine, and I think one of the major questions that hangs over this hearing and this tragedy, and the series of tragedies, is why should a soldier be put at risk when he is taking a shower, or when he is washing a Humvee, or doing the things that soldiers do in their daily lives when they are not on the battlefield, when they are not under fire?

And as you said, Mr. Chairman, Ryan Maseth is a native of Shaler, Pennsylvania, in western Pennsylvania. A decorated Army Ranger and Green Beret. And when he was killed, he didn't die of enemy fire, but he was electrocuted simply by taking a shower. His mother, Cheryl Harris, was first told by Army officials that Ryan died because he took an electrical appliance into the shower. Only after further digging did she learn that he died because an improperly grounded water pump produced an electrical current in Ryan's shower.

And it is because of her passion and drive to find the truth that I, and others, are here today. What she deserves and what every family deserves is very simple, an honest explanation of what led to the death of her child, and accountability for those whose actions may have, may have,

contributed to an unnecessary death.

We are, I believe, at the beginning of what should be a comprehensive inquiry. We have many more questions at this time than answers. Multiple actors, including the Defense Department, private contractors, and others, may bear varying levels of responsibility and we should not leap to presume guilt by anyone. But it is important that we pursue this matter wherever it may lead. I wrote in my initial letter to Secretary Gates last month that we need to know 'what steps the Department of Defense has taken to ensure that no more American men or women serving in Iraq suffer needless deaths by electrocution due to faulty wiring or negligent maintenance.''

Mr. Chairman, just a quick summary of some of the history here, some of which you have already outlined. You cited testimony and evidence that indicates that in October of 2004, only 18 months after the United States entered Iraq, the Army published a safety bulletin describing electrocutions as a ''killer of soldiers.'' Frank Trent, a safety specialist with the Army Corps of Engineers, was quoted in the report as follows, in part, ''We've had several shocks in showers and near misses here in Baghdad, as well as other parts of the country. As we install temporary and permanent power on our projects, we must ensure we require our contracts to properly ground electrical systems.'' So

said a safety specialist with the Army Corps of Engineers in October of 2004.

And as you cited, Mr. Chairman, between June and October 2007, Sergeant 1st Class Justin Hummer residing at the same Palace Complex, where Ryan Maseth would later live, during this time period Mr. Hummer reports being shocked in the shower at least four times and submits a work order at that time, each time for an appropriate repair to be made.

And then finally, on January 2nd, 2008, Sergeant Maseth steps into the shower and was electrocuted. His body, burnt and smoldering, is discovered at that time by a fellow soldier who himself is then severely shocked due to a lingering current.

We were initially told that 12 Americans had died due to electrocution deaths in Iraq. On July 8th, General David Petraeus, in response to a question that I submitted to him, stated, in fact, that 13, not 12, 13 Americans, 11 soldiers and two contractor employees, died by electrocution. When I met with Mr. William Utt, the President and CEO of KBR last Friday, he told me that KBR believes that 15 Americans have died by electrocution. Finally, just in the last 24 to 48 hours, the Department of Defense Inspector General is reporting 16 non-combat electrocutions in Iraq since 2003. So, we have to get to the bottom of what that number is.

Mr. Chairman, when I met with the KBR CEO on Friday, he

told me that KBR does not bear responsibility for Ryan Maseth's death because KBR, allegedly, was operating at the complex in Baghdad under the so-called Level B contract engagement. Under this type of contract, Mr. Utt asserted that KBR technicians were responsible for servicing problems brought to their attention by the Army, and not given the broader task of preventive maintenance and proactively identifying problems, as a 'Level A'' contract responsibility would have required.

We don't know what the truth is there. Just because someone asserts what their responsibility was doesn't make it so. We need to know more about Level B and Level A, but especially what Level B meant.

I have sent letters to both Mr. Utt and the Pentagon to ascertain the facts. But it does not explain why, even after four separate work orders were filed in a matter of months on the same shower, why that shower was never fixed and why Ryan Maseth was electrocuted in that same shower. It is my hope today that this hearing will begin to shed further light on this question, and other questions as well. I look forward to reviewing what the Defense Department Inspector General has to say.

I was, however, yesterday, disappointed that the Pentagon's chief spokesman, at his daily briefing, made an unprompted statement questioning the rationale for this

hearing and implying that partisan politics are involved in this hearing. The United States Congress should not apologize for carrying out one of its core functions, as envisioned by the framers of our Constitution, oversight of the Executive Branch. While they died under different circumstances, we know that these Americans, and possibly more, died of electrocutions in Iraq. Sixteen deaths do not make for isolated incidents or random occurrences. They constitute a pattern and are of genuine danger to our men and women serving in Iraq.

As this danger continues to this very day, my office has heard from several active-duty soldiers, who report that, as recently as three weeks ago, soldiers in Iraq continue to receive electrical shocks on a regular basis as they carry out their daily activities, including taking showers.

Electric shocks are not the only danger produced by faulty wiring. There have been hundreds and hundreds of electrical fires at U.S. military facilities throughout Iraq since 2003.

The Defense Department itself acknowledged that almost 300 electrical fires in one five-month period between 2006 and 2007. On June 25th, a faulty light fixture sparked a blaze that destroyed ten buildings in the U.S. encampment outside Fallujah. Thank God, there were no casualties, but members of the Lima Company 3rd Battalion 6th Marine Regiment lost their entire possessions. They have been forced to

write home and ask for donations to replace personal items.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude with this. I am not here, nor is anyone here, to point fingers, but simply to demand the truth. We are not here to prejudge the culpability of KBR, the Defense Contract Management Agency, the U.S. Army, or any other entity. The Congress must proceed with an open and transparent investigation. But Cheryl Harris, and the loved ones of at least 15, maybe more, other Americans, deserve answers. They need to know why faulty wiring in Iraq has been highlighted, time and time again, as a major safety hazard going back to as early as 2004, but little or no action has been taken.

The American people and these families have a right to know the truth. We arrive in America at the truth by asking tough questions and demanding honest and complete answers.

Our system of justice is by its very nature adversarial. We know that the truth doesn't fall like raindrops, clear raindrops from the sky. It must be elicited from individuals or unearthed in documents or other evidence. The only way to bring about justice is to get the truth.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the privilege of appearing before this hearing.

[Prepared statement of Senator Casey follows:]

\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Casey.

I agree with you. It is our responsibility to get to the truth. And I am amazed that someone would consider this in any way partisan. It is ironic to hear that people that should have been doing the oversight within the military, who are saying that they did the best they could, and the contractor saying he did the best he could, and then as Congress looks at it, they say, well, if you look at it, it must be partisan. One of the best ways to keep people honest is to make sure that we get to the truth and the people know the truth is going to come out, not so much because we want to blame people but because we want these problems corrected.

I, too, met with Cheryl Harris and I know of her commitment to make sure that what she suffered with the loss of her son doesn't happen to anyone else. And I congratulate you as her Senator, and Congressman Altmire as her Representative in the House, for insisting on this investigation, and insisting on this hearing, and insisting on knowing the facts, not with any other purpose but to get the facts so that this sort of thing will never happen again. I thank you for being here.

Mr. Davis, do you have comments?

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Well, Senator Casey, we very much appreciate your being here and your leadership on there, and I just want to reiterate what the Chairman said. This is not

partisan politics. We support this hearing, and I think we would be remiss and even negligent if we didn't follow through and investigate. This is something that the Executive Branch has really not seen fit to follow through on. If the Executive Branch doesn't want to get to the bottom of this, this Committee certainly will, and we appreciate your efforts on this and will continue to work with you. Thank you for being here.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman WAXMAN. With the indulgence of the other members, we would like to move to the second panel. Thank you very much, Senator, for being here.

I want to now call forward the following witnesses: For the DCMA, Charlie E. Williams, Jr., the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency; Keith Ernst, the former Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency; he retired from that position in May 2008. From the Army, Jeffrey P. Parsons, the Executive Director of the U.S. Army Contracting Command. From the Defense Department, Inspector General Gordon Heddell, Acting Inspector General at the Department of Defense, and he is accompanied by Don Horstman, the Deputy Inspector General for Policy and Oversight; and from KBR, Thomas Bruni, who is KBR's Theater Engineer and Construction Manager for Iraq.

We are pleased to have all of you here. Even before you

sit down, you might as well keep standing, because it is our practice to put all witnesses under oath. So, if you would raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give before the Committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

[Witnesses respond in the affirmative.]

Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that each of the witnesses answered in the affirmative. For those of you who have given us a prepared statement in advance, that statement will be in the record in its entirety. What we would like to ask each of you is to give us an oral presentation of around five minutes. We are going to have a clock that will indicate that green for four minutes, yellow for the last minute, and then when the five minutes is up, it will turn red. And when you see a red light, we would very much appreciate it if you would conclude your testimony.

We are delighted that you are all here and I thank you for being here.

Mr. Williams, why don't we start with you.

532 STATEMENTS OF CHARLES E. WILLIAMS, JR., DIRECTOR, DEFENSE 533 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY, ACCOMPANIED BY DAVE GRAFF, 534 DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL DIVISION; KEITH ERNST, FORMER 535 DIRECTOR, DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY; JEFFREY P. PARSONS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ARMY CONTRACTING COMMAND, U.S. 536 537 ARMY; GORDON S. HEDDELL, ACTING INSPECTOR GENERAL, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE; ACCOMPANIED BY DON HORSTMAN, DEPUTY 538 539 INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR POLICY AND OVERSIGHT, U.S. DEPARTMENT 540 OF DEFENSE; AND THOMAS BRUNI, THEATER ENGINEERING AND 541 CONSTRUCTION MANAGER, KBR, INC.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. WILLIAMS, JR.

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Chairman Waxman, Congressmen Davis, and distinguished members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and discuss your concerns about the Defense Contract Management Agency's contract management and oversight in Iraq. With me today is Captain Dave Graff, Director of our International Division.

First, I would like to recognize the families of our fallen patriots for their courage and strength. We honor their children, spouses, and siblings for the great

sacrifices they have made in support of their Country and each of us. The loss of life is always tragic. Please know that the entire DCMA team is committed to the care and safety of our warfighters, civilians, and contractor personnel.

I became the Director of DCMA in May of this year, and my comments today reflect my observations over the last three months. I am extremely proud to lead the DCMA team of approximately 9,900 professional civilians and military located in over 700 locations around the world. DCMA is responsible for the administration of about 324,000 contracts with unliquidated obligations of over \$180 billion awarded to over 17,000 contractors. DCMA accepts approximately 750,000 shipments of supplies and some 1,200 aircraft each year. We also manage over \$100 billion of government property and administer about \$32 billion of contract financial payments each year. I am greatly impressed with the dedication and commitment of our employees to support our warfighters and I am honored to serve as the DCMA Director.

Since the standup of the Defense Contract Management Command in March of 1990, except for aircraft maintenance, closeout, and vehicle heavy repair, the Agency's contract administration services have been primarily focused on weapons systems. We have, however, applied our support to battlefield service contracts awarded by the military services, largely under the Army's Logistics Civil

Augmentation Program, LOGCAP, and to a lesser extent the Air Force's Contract Augmentation Program, AFCAP.

DCMA does not develop or retain employees with deep technical skills in overseeing construction and facilities contracts. To perform contract management responsibilities for service contracts in Iraq, DCMA relies on obtaining technical expertise from the military services in the form of contracting officer representatives or support provided by other Department of Defense entities.

Since initiation of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, DCMA has taken on an increasing role in providing contract management services in support of operations in the theater. In late 2007 and early 2008, DCMA deployed an additional 100 personnel to support the expanded need for additional contractor oversight of personnel security contracts and various other theater-wide contract activities. We anticipate that the total DCMA managed capability in theater will be approximately 225 personnel by the end of this year.

Today DCMA manages contracts in excess of \$12 billion, supporting 124 forward operating bases and approximately 350,000 coalition forces and civilian/contractor personnel in Iraq, Kuwait, Qatar and Afghanistan. DCMA is currently working with the Army on the transition planning for LOGCAP IV, ensuring that there is no disruption in logistical

support to our forces or loss of accountability for the government property that we oversee.

Additionally, DCMA has been working very closely with the Joint Contracting Command Iraq/Afghanistan to develop better controls of contractor movement in theater via the use of Synchronized Pre-deployment and Operational Tracker system and on various other contract management needs.

From a comprehensive agency perspective I think it is important to recognize that just as our contingency contracting theater mission has grown, our traditional CONUS mission has also grown and become more complex. In fiscal year 2001, we managed contracts with \$100 billion of unliquidated obligations, and today that number is \$180 billion.

Balancing these two missions has further stressed the already downsized DCMA workforce and represents risks on both missions. Since fiscal year 1990, DCMA's civilian workforce has declined by 59 percent to under 10,000 personnel. To address our resource requirements, the Agency is working closely with the Office of the Secretary of Defense to ensure we have the required resources to support the needs of the Department.

I would like to also thank the Congress for passage last year of The Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, commonly known as Section 852. That Fund certainly helped

get us started down the road.

Let me close by stating that my assessment during the past two and a half months is that we are moving in the right direction, collectively in the Department and in DCMA. We have learned from the early days of LOGCAP and we continue to learn every day. This allows us to identify gaps in our administration oversight and continuously revise the processes needed to effectively manage the O&M contract requirements.

In closing, we appreciate the Congressional support of our efforts as the Department's primary contract management agency in providing our nation's warfighters and allies with quality products and services. Again, thank you for the opportunity to appear before this Committee today to address DCMA's role in this matter. I look forward to answering any questions the Committee may have.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Williams follows:]

645 \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.
Mr. Ernst.

## STATEMENT OF KEITH ERNST

Mr. ERNST. Chairman Waxman, Congressman Davis, and distinguished members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to discuss your concerns about contract management and oversight in Iraq.

Before I begin, I would like to recognize the men and women who serve our Country and especially the families of our fallen heroes for their courage and heart. Our servicemen and women and their civilian counterparts lay their lives on the line every day and the death of any soldier, sailor, airman, marine, or civilian is a tragedy.

It was my privilege for close to 25 years to work in helping to ensure that the military men and women who serve this Country are provided with the best equipment and services possible. From January 2006 until my retirement at the end of April, this year, I had the opportunity to serve as both the Acting Director and then Director of DCMA. Every member of the Defense Contract Management Agency team that I had personal contact with during my career take their

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

responsibility to support the warfighter very seriously.

Those men and women that perform this mission in theater in support of our deployed members are some of the most motivated people I have ever worked with.

The Defense Contract Management Agency's mission is worldwide and complex. DCMA excels at the oversight and management of contracts performed in plant environments across the globe for a full range of products serviced by the To be successful in this mission requires that DCMA's personnel be proficient not only in the business and financial management aspects of the contract but to also have a detailed understanding of the technical requirements of the product or service being acquired. This technical understanding for in-plant work is gained through professional classroom training, extensive on the job This training and experience training, and experience. package allows the quality assurance rep to ensure conformance to technical requirements.

One of the main hurdles to accomplishing the oversight mission in Iraq and Afghanistan is that DCMA does not perform the technical function this mission requires outside of theater. As a result, DCMA does not have a corps of personnel with extensive knowledge in the areas of potable water, waste treatment, dining facilities, security contracts, or facility construction and maintenance.

The Gansler Commission clearly recognized this issue when they recommended that DCMA be provided additional resources and be assigned this mission in the continent U.S. The Commission realized this was necessary in order to gain both the training and experience required to excel in the performance of this mission. Clearly, either DCMA needs to be assigned this mission CONUS with appropriate resource increases or those organizations responsible for this mission outside of theater needs to accept the responsibility for performance of this mission in theater.

From 2001 to 2008, DCMA's personnel decreased by close to 25 percent while its mission, as measured by unliquidated obligations, increased by nearly 80 percent. Due to the Agency's decreasing number of personnel, increasing requirements both in-plant and in-theater, and a lack of experience in the technical areas required by theater mission, DCMA implemented an oversight process in Iraq and Afghanistan utilizing an extensive network of contracting officer representatives. These individuals are typically members of the operational units receiving the services of the contractor and are the technical experts that DCMA relies on to help ensure conformance to contractual technical requirements.

The input of these individuals is critical in identifying technical performance issues and providing timely

feedback to the DCMA quality assurance representative for appropriate action with the contractor. At the end of April, 2008, DCMA had over 600 of these CORs providing technical oversight of the mission and reporting the results to the QAR responsible for overseeing the contractor.

In closing, I appreciate the support of both the Department and the Congress of DCMA's effort as the primary contract management agency in providing our nation's warfighters and allies with quality products and services. The in-theater contract oversight mission is a formidable one. Aspects of such a mission, including personnel security and safety, workload shifts and dispersion, and personnel placement, are a continual challenge.

During my time as Director of DCMA, I worked to effectively balance resource requirements between our core, in-plant mission and our contingency contracting mission to ensure that the high risk missions in both environments received the type of coverage required. Again, thank you for the opportunity to appear before this Committee today to address DCMA's role in this matter and answer any questions the Committee may have.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Ernst follows:]

740 | \*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

741 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Ernst.

742 Mr. Parsons.

STATEMENT OF JEFFREY P. PARSONS

Mr. PARSONS. Chairman Waxman, Congressman Davis, and distinguished members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and discuss your concerns related to injuries and deaths associated with electrical issues in Iraq and the Department's management and oversight of these contractors performing Operation and Maintenance, commonly referred to as O&M, of the facilities where our military and civilian personnel work and live each and every day. Just as the Committee is concerned with the injuries and deaths that have taken place in Iraq, so is the Army.

Each injury and loss of life is a tragedy and we must do all we can to minimize the threats to our personnel. Our management and oversight of contractor performance must ensure that our contractors are meeting the standards and requirements specified in their contracts. To this end, the Army continues to pursue and implement many of the recommendations identified by the Commission on Army Acquisition and Program Management in Expeditionary

Operations, which released its final report, ''Urgent Reform Required: Army Expeditionary Contracting,'' on October 31, 2007.

Why I am here today as the Army witness, I do work for the U.S. Army Materiel Command. Our responsibility in the CENTCOMM theater of operations primarily consists of management and execution of a Logistics Civil Augmentation Program, known as LOGCAP. This program is managed by the Army Sustainment Command located at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, a subordinate command of the Army Materiel Command.

Based upon our review of available information, it appears that there are a total of 16 deaths resulting from electrocutions or other electrical related incidents since the inception of our operations in Iraq. The majority of these deaths are the result of accidents associated with the conduct of military or construction operations, although three and possibly a fourth appear to be related to electrical issues associated with facilities over a five-year time frame.

The only fatality that we can connect to a facility maintained under the LOGCAP III contract is the tragic January 2, 2008 incident, where Staff Sergeant Maseth was electrocuted while taking a shower. Those quarters that he lived in are commonly referred to as the RPC. This is a pre-existing Iraqi facility occupied by U.S. personnel. The

circumstances surrounding his death are currently under investigation by the Department of Defense Inspector General.

I can assure the Committee that the Army is cooperating with the Inspector General and will quickly respond to the Inspector General's final report. In addition to corrective actions already taken, we will take whatever additional corrective actions are required to protect the life, safety and health of our personnel.

At the time of Staff Sergeant Maseth's death in January 2008, the LOGCAP contract included O&M requirements for the facility where the accident occurred. The task order covering the O&M of the facilities in the RPC was issued in February 2007. The specific O&M requirements were jointly developed with the customer for the facility in question and commonly referred to as Level B. This means the contractor, in this case Kellogg, Brown and Root, was only required to provide limited maintenance. Limited maintenance does not include routine inspections, preventative maintenance and upgrades. Any repairs that need to be conducted on the facility are initiated with a service request by the customer.

We are also aware that there were previous contracts for the O&M of this facility prior to the task order issued under LOGCAP III. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers awarded three previous contracts starting in November 2003 that required

the O&M of these facilities. Knowing that they were 813 814 additional contracts requiring O&M of facilities in Iraq, we are in the process of identifying the scope of their 815 816 contractual requirements. This review should provide us with a holistic picture. The electrical issues in Iraq involve 817 more than just the LOGCAP III contract. 818 819 As a result of our investigations, we have taken a number of corrective actions. We are working with the U.S. 820 821 Army Corps of Engineers to obtain additional expertise in the oversight of electrical work by our contractors. 822 823 Furthermore, we are working with the Corps of Engineers, 824 DCMA, and the customer to develop a plan to conduct 825 inspection verifications of those buildings recently 826 inspected by KBR for life, health, and safety issues. 827 will utilize a third party to validate those inspections. The LOGCAP Program Director also met with KBR officials 828 829 to discuss their hiring practices and requirements for 830 electricians to include certification requirements. 831 Following this meeting, the contracting officer issued a 832 contract modification to the LOGCAP III contract on July 21, 2008 to more clearly specify personnel and certification 833 834 requirements. 835 KBR was also directed to submit a Trades Certificate and 836 Validation Plan to the Government describing the process they 837 will use to recruit, train, and retain qualified personnel.

The plan must address the criteria through which personnel, including non-U.S. citizens, will be qualified and/or certified as a master journeyman or apprentice, and the proposed schedule for implementing the plan. This requirement is also applicable to all subcontractors.

Expeditionary military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have placed extraordinary demands on our contracting system and the people who make it work. The vast majority of our military and civilian contracting personnel perform well in tough, austere conditions. We know that the success of our warfighters and those who lead them is linked directly to the success of our contracting workforce. We are working hard to ensure that contracting is a core competency with the Army. We appreciate the concerns expressed by the Committee and we are aggressively moving out to make improvements. I look forward to answering your questions.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Parsons follows:]

\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Parsons.

Mr. Heddell.

STATEMENT OF GORDON S. HEDDELL

Mr. HEDDELL. Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of this Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning. My name is Gordon Heddell and I am the Acting Inspector General for the Department of Defense. The magnitude and complexity of the Department of Defense requires nothing less than a full time effort. We are in a time of war and our work not only saves taxpayer dollars, but also, and much more importantly, the lives of U.S. service members.

To that end, I assure you that we take issues regarding safety very seriously. The men and women engaged in Operation Iraqi Freedom, whether service members, federal employees, or contractor personnel, deserve an environment that is free from preventable dangers. In response to recent concerns regarding electrocution deaths of service members in Iraq, my office has initiated two complementary reviews.

The first review, which is still ongoing, is looking into the relevant management, contracting, and maintenance actions prior to and subsequent to the death of Staff

Sergeant Ryan D. Maseth, U.S. Army. This review is being conducted at the request of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology in response to inquiries made by Representative Altmire, and observations were provided earlier this week.

I want to emphasize and strongly caution that the information I provide here this morning is preliminary in nature and subject to change. This is an interim response, a status report, if you will, not a final report. Just last night we received significant information from this Committee. This was not unexpected, as we work to obtain additional information and documentation from various sources leading to our ultimate findings and conclusions, which will be contained in our final report.

The second review evaluated the sufficiency of criminal investigations involving electrocution deaths of U.S. military or Department of Defense related personnel in Iraq. This review also sought to glean from the investigative case files information concerning the nature of the electrocutions that might be helpful in responding to the Deputy Under Secretary and to members of Congress.

Since March 2003, there were 16 electrocution fatalities in Iraq. Fifteen of those were military members and one Defense Department foreign national civilian employee. We determined that investigations conducted by the U.S. Army

Criminal Investigation Command and the Naval Criminal Investigative Service accurately determined the nature and cause of death in each instance. We also found that these 16 electrocutions can be attributed to a variety of causes. This includes electrocution deaths caused by contact with power lines, ungrounded and/or faulty electrical equipment, and working with electrical equipment or attempting to make an electrical repair.

Based on the investigations reviewed, we are concerned that Iraq's infrastructure continues to pose a significant hazard to U.S. personnel in-country. This is due to poor design, inferior construction standards, a failure to upgrade electrical systems, and systems that are not properly grounded.

Let me once again assure you, my office takes the safety of our men and women serving in Iraq, and elsewhere, very seriously. We have additional work to perform, and we will keep you aware of the progress of our efforts regarding the death of Sergeant Maseth. We extend our sympathies to the family of Sergeant Maseth, and to his friends, and to other individuals and families of others that have been involved in these very, very unfortunate and tragic incidents. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today, and I am ready to answer any questions you might have.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Heddell follows:]

928

\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Heddell.

930 Mr. Horstman.

931 Mr. HORSTMAN. I have no opening statement, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Bruni.

## STATEMENT OF THOMAS BRUNI

Mr. BRUNI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Thomas
Bruni. I am the Theater Engineering and Construction Manager
for KBR in Baghdad in support of U.S. and Coalition troops.
I am here today to assist the Committee in its inquiry
regarding the maintenance of electrical systems in facilities
occupied by U.S. military and contractor personnel in Iraq.

I would like to begin my remarks by expressing on behalf of KBR our deepest sympathy to all of the families and friends who have lost loved ones. It is important to honor these soldiers by examining the circumstances surrounding their untimely deaths, and KBR is completely committed to assisting in this process. From everything we presently know, KBR's actions were not the cause of any of these terrible accidents, however, I hope that my testimony today will help the Committee answer its questions about this important issue.

I am a civil engineer and a former member of the United

States Marine Corps and the Army National Guard. I have also served as the Director of Engineering for Northeastern
University and as the Director of Capital Projects Management for Boston College.

I first joined KBR in 2005 as a Deputy Project Manager in Al Anbar Province. I am now the Theater Engineering and Construction Manager.

KBR is one of many contractors providing support to U.S. and Coalition personnel in Iraq. The current environment in Iraq presents unique maintenance challenges. Many U.S. military personnel and contractors currently occupy facilities that were built during Saddam Hussein's reign and contain inferior electrical and other systems compared to U.S. standards. KBR is, therefore, even more acutely aware of electrical safety concerns.

A number of electrical shock incidents have recently gained attention in the media and in Congress. There are media reports that as many as 15 soldiers have been killed by electrical shocks in Iraq. These reports have contained a number of factual errors and inaccuracies. The reality is that KBR's actions were not the cause of any of these terrible accidents. In fact, only one of the 15 incidents even occurred at a facility where KBR had maintenance responsibility. And I would like to describe KBR's current understanding of that incident.

KBR had, as directed, maintenance responsibilities at the Radwaniyah Palace Complex, or RPC, where a soldier died from an electrical shock in January 2008. RPC, which consists of roughly 200 buildings, was built and controlled by Saddam Hussein's regime until occupied by the U.S. military. The military had assigned Staff Sergeant Ryan Maseth to live in a small, one-level building at RPC, now known as LSF-1, with another Army staff sergeant and an Iraqi interpreter.

At the time that KBR was first tasked with any maintenance for this building in 2006, all of the electrical systems and equipment had already been installed, though KBR does not know when or by whom. KBR's maintenance responsibility at that time was limited to repairs only at the direction of the Army.

It is important to understand how the Army categorizes maintenance responsibilities. Under LOGCAP, the Army directs KBR to perform different levels of maintenance service. In some facilities, KBR provides Level A maintenance service, in which KBR is authorized to perform maintenance and repairs without specific instructions from the Army. In other facilities, KBR provides Level B maintenance service performing repairs only when specifically directed to do so by the Army. The decision to classify any building at a specific level is a decision made by the Army, at its own

1001 discretion.

In February 2007, KBR conducted a technical inspection of LSF-1. Under LOGCAP, KBR conducts such inspections to assess the conditions of a building, and the Army determines the level of service required for that building. For LSF-1, the Army directed KBR to provide Level B service. Therefore, KBR was not authorized to perform repairs without specific direction from the Army.

This February 2007 technical inspection identified a number of electrical deficiencies. However, the Army did not authorize KBR to repair the identified electrical deficiencies. In November 2007, at the Army's request, KBR again produced the same February 2007 technical inspection. Once again, the Army did not authorize KBR to make the repairs.

It is my understanding that the Army now believes that Staff Sergeant Maseth's death was the result of a malfunctioning water pump on the roof of his building. Though we cannot be certain who installed the water pump, we do know that KBR did not do so, and that it was most likely Iraqi-installed. We have been told that the water pump contained camel-hair string in place of Teflon tape, which is a practice frequently used by local Iraqi workers.

Finally, at the direction of the Army, KBR has subsequently performed additional inspections in the LSF-1

building, as well as other buildings throughout RPC. KBR has also conducted at the Army's direction, inspections of all occupied hard-stand structures in Iraq.

As I have described, KBR views safety as a top priority and will continue to pursue the highest level of safety throughout Iraq. I hope that my testimony has aided the Committee in understanding these issues, and I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Bruni follows:]

1035 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Bruni.

We will now have questions from members of the Committee. I will start off.

I want to ask about the death of Staff Sergeant Ryan Maseth. He was a highly decorated Army Ranger, a former Green Beret, killed in January of this year while taking a shower. Army investigators determined that he was electrocuted. Both the Defense Department and KBR have said they had no knowledge of any electrical problems that resulted in his death, and that they didn't know of any in that building.

Mr. Heddell, you are the Acting Defense Department Inspector General, and your office issued an interim memo on Monday stating that you had ''no credible evidence'' that either KBR or Defense Contract Management Agency knew of these problems. And I would like to ask you about some documents the Committee obtained that you did not or may not have.

First, the Committee obtained a work order. This is a work order from July 8, 2007 that was submitted by Sergeant 1st Class Justin Hummer.

Sergeant Hummer lived in the exact room before Staff
Sergeant Maseth moved into it, and Sergeant Maseth replaced
Sergeant Hummer in October 2007. So they both used the exact
same shower. This work order seems to indicate that Sergeant

1061 Hummer warned of exactly the electrical problem that killed Sergeant Maseth, and I think we furnished you with a copy of 1062 1063 It says LSF. That is the building they lived in, ''pipes have voltage, get shocked in shower,'' and on the 1064 bottom, you can see it says, ''Kellogg Brown & Root 1065 1066 Proprietary Data.'' 1067 Mr. Heddell, on its face, this document seems to be credible evidence that KBR was aware of this hazard last 1068 1069 July; do you agree? 1070 Mr. HEDDELL. I do agree with you, Mr. Chairman. 1071 Chairman WAXMAN. Were you aware of this document before you issued your interim memo on Monday? 1072 1073 Mr. HEDDELL. No, sir. I was not. If I could, Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a 1074 correction for the record. 1075 1076 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, let me ask you about some of the 1077 questions that I have and then we will give you an 1078 opportunity to do that. I want to show you another document. This is a spreadsheet of task orders that the Defense 1079 1080 Department provided to the Committee. And this spreadsheet 1081 lists the same work order from July 8, 2007 warning that Sergeant Hummer gets shocked in the shower. Mr. Heddell, 1082 this document seems to be credible evidence that the Defense 1083 Department was aware of this problem as well. Do you agree? 1084 1085 Mr. HEDDELL. It would appear so, sir.

Chairman WAXMAN. And finally, Mr. Heddell, let me show you a sworn statement signed by Sergeant Hummer.

On June 6, 2008, in this statement, Sergeant Hummer says this wasn't the only work order he submitted. He says, he was 'shocked four or five times in the shower,' between June 2007, when he first moved into the building, and October 2007, when he moved out, and Staff Sergeant Maseth replaced him.

Mr. Heddell, I know your memo was not a final product, the memo you issued yesterday. You said it was interim. It was a snapshot of what you learned to date, but someone leaked the document last night, and the press reported you absolved KBR and the Defense Department of any knowledge of this problem or any responsibility for fixing it. Given these new documents, do you stand by the statement in your memo, or would you like to go back and review them in light of this new information?

Mr. HEDDELL. Well, there is nothing really to change,
Mr. Chairman. My position has never been to absolve anyone
of responsibility or culpability. What we provided to your
office on Monday of this week, sir, and to this Committee,
and also to the Secretary of Defense, was a status, meaning
our preliminary observations of what we have found up to that
point. It is not a report and it was simply a status. A
final report will be forthcoming.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I am concerned, Mr. Heddell, because it seems like you have less information than the Committee. It raises the question of whether you were doing your job, or whether the Defense Department or KBR officials were withholding information from you. And as our investigation continues, we are going to need answers to these questions. And I presume you are going to need answers to these questions, as well.

Mr. HEDDELL. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I can't presume to tell you whether information was withheld. I can only tell you what we knew up until Monday when we provided the Committee with an idea of what we were going to be testifying to today.

I will tell you, you don't have to be an Inspector General to be very concerned about these tragic deaths, and you don't have to be an Inspector General to expect candor and forthcoming from entities who might have knowledge or information regarding this. I am not saying that anyone withheld, but what I am saying at this point, these documents that you brought to my attention this morning, I had not seen these, was not aware of them, until this Committee brought them to our attention last night, I believe it was. They are certainly very dramatic, and they certainly are documents that we will have to spend a lot of time looking at. We anticipate, as we have even before this Committee was

announced for this hearing, that we would find a lot of additional information, Mr. Chairman, and we think that we will.

Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I appreciate that. And these new documents do undermine the tentative conclusion you submitted to us earlier this week.

Mr. HEDDELL. Well, we have absolved no one, let the record be clear on that, never have and have not at this moment.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Issa.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Heddell, I would like to continue, we are the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and I always try to remember that we look at the reform part of this.

When we look at this contract, or any contract that essentially says, take somebody else's work and maintain it, and that work is not essentially up to U.S. standards, or even comfortable at U.S. standards in voltage, in plugs, and so on, are we inherently producing a contract that puts us, and I ask Mr. Bruni too, aren't we, and I am leading a little bit, but aren't we inherently, if we limit a contract to that and we don't have a separate oversight who does a clean bill of health on the structure and the equipment, aren't we inherently handing something off that has a gap in its safety

and reliability?

Mr. HEDDELL. Well, with all due respect, Congressman, I understand what you are saying, and in principle I agree with that, but when you look at the system, for instance, the contract that was in play in this particular instance, and the process that was set up, the relationship process, let's say, between the contractor, KBR, and the contract administrator, DCMA, there are hoops that have to be jumped through, that have to be looked at and acknowledged, and the customer, as Mr. Parsons referred to it, being the Army in this case, they have to bring items to the attention of appropriate people and then things begin to happen, changes are made, and therefore. I think everyone that is in Iraq, soldier, contractor, civilian, deserves the feeling that they are being protected.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Well, Mr. Parsons, maybe I will go to you next because somebody died who, based on the contracts this Committee has, should not have died because there were warnings based on this document that should have caused a look for, why are there shocks to somebody in a shower. When you are dealing with high voltage there is no question that that is not a small what-if.

So when we look at the contract and the command structure because, of course, these people worked for commissioned officers, NCOs and commissioned officers, where

was the gap that allowed this to happen in your opinion?

Granted I am asking you to Monday morning quarterback, but
this Committee needs to make sure that procurement going
forward doesn't have these loopholes in it.

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I would say, from my personal opinion, that it goes back to what is the requirement? And in this case, through the requirements determination process, it is clear that the customer, in this case it would have been Multinational Corps Iraq, and the mayor, the local mayor that is responsible for that RPC Complex, had done some prioritization on what buildings were going to get what level of maintenance. In this case they elected to Level B, which does not require routine inspections and preventative maintenance. I can't tell you why that decision was made.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Well, let's go back through the command structure for a moment. The Chairman is taking one line, but I am not going to take a different line in this case because people died, a person died who shouldn't have died. I am a former Army officer. Somebody had to look out for the well-being of every soldier, every soldier's weapon, every soldier's equipment. Who was that somebody, and what did that person do to ensure that that living condition was safe?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, in my opinion, the mayor of that RBC Complex is ultimately the one that has to make the calls on those types of things, or what repairs are going to be

affected and executed, and I can't tell you, I think the DOD 1211 1212 IG is taking a look at that entire process. I think you are 1213 right, there probably are some gaps that need to be examined. 1214 Mr. ISSA. Okay. I am a little disappointed, but let me 1215 go back to Mr. Heddell for just a second. Can you come back 1216 to this Committee, because I don't believe you are prepared 1217 to answer today and tell us within the command structure that 1218 says no uniformed soldier shall ever not have a chain of 1219 command that includes uniformed superiors, can you tell us 1220 today, or by written backup, who that was? Who was 1221 responsible? 1222 And with all due respect, Mr. Parsons, I am not here to 1223 blame KBR, because it appears as though their contract was 1224 fairly limited, and it doesn't appear as though they were 1225 tasked properly. Mr. Heddell, I need to know what soldier 1226 was responsible for that soldier, and if it was a mayor, and 1227 I assume this is an Iraqi mayor--it was a U.S. mayor? Mr. PARSONS. Let me correct you. The military units 1228 appoint, make their mayors, it is a term that is used for 1229 1230 their--it is equivalent to--1231 Mr. ISSA. Okay. It was a commissioned officer? 1232 Mr. PARSONS. I am not sure. I can't answer whether it 1233 was a commissioned officer or not. Mr. ISSA. For the record, because I am out of time and I 1234 1235 want to be respectful of the Committee's time, I would like

to know the chain of command, because as a former Army officer, and I appreciate the Chairman's indulgence for just a second, we need to know that the chain of command met its responsibility for the health and safety of its personnel. And that includes obviously the procurement irregularities that may or may not have occurred, but we have to understand who was responsible for that person's welfare.

Today, that is not really what we are talking about. I don't want to look at an electrician who did or didn't get a task order. I want to look at the chain of command and did it do its job, and if there are changes that we need to make, or the House Armed Services Committee needs to make, we need to provide that guidance. So I hope you will respond for the record, and I hope other members will perhaps pick up if you have answers. I thank the Chairman for his indulgence.

[The information to be supplied follows:]

1252 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa.

1254 Mr. Higgins.

1255 Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bruni, I would like to ask you about Staff Sergeant Maseth, who was electrocuted on January 2nd, 2008. In your written testimony today, you state that KBR wasn't allowed under contract to make repairs to Staff Sergeant Maseth's building without specific direction from the Army. You also say that the Army did not authorize KBR to make these repairs. And then, you address the water pump that electrocuted Staff Sergeant Maseth. You said, 'Though we cannot be certain who installed the water pump, we do know that KBR did not do so.'' That is your testimony; correct?

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir. It is.

Mr. HIGGINS. The Committee has obtained documents that seem to suggest that KBR may have installed the faulty water pump. Let me go through these documents and ask you about them. First, we have already talked about the work order submitted by Sergeant Justin Hummer, who lived in the same quarters before Staff Sergeant Maseth moved in. Let's put that up there. If you recall, this work order warned that the pipes have voltage and that he was getting shocked in the shower. This was the same shower that Staff Sergeant Maseth was subsequently electrocuted. Have you ever seen this work order before?

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir. I have.

Mr. HIGGINS. Okay. Let me show you another work order. This one is from the next morning on July 9th, 2007. You can see that it is the same building. It is the same person, Justin Hummer. He signed it at the bottom. And when you look at the task box, it says, ''Replace pressure switch and water pump.'' And when you look at the labor box, it says, ''3 x 3,'' meaning three people worked for three hours, and you can see the total of nine hours. And then, when you look at the material box, there are various items, and over on the right, you can see one says, ''One water pump.'' This work order is stamped finished at the top. Does this mean that KBR installed the water pump that malfunctioned that caused Staff Sergeant Maseth's death?

Mr. BRUNI. No, sir. It does not. We believe that this particular installation occurred not at LSF-1, but at another building. There is another document that says that the pump and switch were located on the eastern side of the building. The pump unit for LSF-1 is on the roof. We believe that this work was accomplished in another building. Sergeant Hummer placed a service order request for more buildings than just LSF-1.

Mr. HIGGINS. Why would Sergeant Hummer request a replacement of the water pump for other buildings other than the one he was staying at?

1303 Mr. BRUNI. Because he wrote work orders, Mr. 1304 Congressman, for other buildings, not just LSF-1. 1305 Mr. HIGGINS. I see. Well, this work order says, time started, was July 9th, 2007, 0800 hours, and it says, time 1306 1307 completed was the same day at 1100 hours. Does that indicate 1308 that they actually did the work on the day of those three 1309 hours? 1310 Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir. It would appear that it was 1311 accomplished on that day. Mr. HIGGINS. This is Sergeant Hummer's declaration 1312 1313 stating that, ''During the months that I was living at the 1314 LSF Advisor Building, I was shocked four or five times in the 1315 shower, the same shower where Staff Sergeant Ryan Maseth was 1316 electrocuted.'' That is Sergeant First Class Justin Hummer. 1317 Mr. Chairman, KBR's spokeswoman, Heather Brown, has 1318 stated publicly that there is no evidence of a link between 1319 KBR's work and these electrocutions. Her statements appeared in various press accounts on July 18th. To me, this document 1320 1321 raises serious questions about KBR's work, and it appears to contradict not only Mr. Bruni's testimony but the public 1322 statements KBR's officials have made for weeks on this issue. 1323 1324 I yield back. 1325 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you very much.

1326

1327

Mr. Davis.

1328 start with the Army. Mr. Parsons, an initial cost estimate 1329 was requested to refurbish the Palace Complex, as I 1330 understand it, where the Maseth tragedy occurred, and it 1331 would have brought the facilities up to LOGCAP standards, 1332 which was \$10 million. A second estimate was done for Level 1333 B maintenance, but under Level B, facilities were taken and 1334 it would reduce the price to \$3 million. Is that right? 1335 Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I have heard about the first estimate 1336 I have not seen anything to verify that that 1337 estimate was actually produced. 1338 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay. But they went with Level 1339 B, is that right? 1340 Mr. PARSONS. It was for the entire RPC area, for the 1341| maintenance of the RPC area? 1342 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Yes, they went with the Level B instead of a whole refurbishing. Is that fair to say, LOGCAP 1343 1344 standards? 1345 Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I am not sure that I follow you, but the actual estimate again was negotiated between the LOGCAP 1346 1347 program office and the contractor, including the customer, to 1348 determine what level maintenance was going to be required. 1349 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. So, the customer in this 1350 case--was KBR involved in that? Would they have been 1351 negotiating that? 1352 Mr. PARSONS. KBR was involved from the standpoint that

1353 they were preparing the price estimate in response to what 1354 the requirement was. 1355 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Would the requirement have 1356 included making this basically shock-proof, the showers 1357 there? 1358 Mr. PARSONS. Not for this particular facility, because 1359 this particular facility was designated, as I said before, as 1360 a Level B, which did not require any upgrades or repairs. 1361 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Right. Now, but there had been 1362 previous reports of people being shocked there, hadn't there? 1363 Mr. PARSONS. Based on, previously? Before the LOGCAP 1364 contract? 1365 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Yes. 1366 Mr. PARSONS. Yes, were under the impression that there 1367 were some electrical issues identified with that building. 1368 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. So why would you go with the 1369 Level B? 1370 Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I can't answer that question. 1371 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Who would have made that decision? 1372 1373 Mr. PARSONS. It would have been again the mayor cell, 1374 which again, is not an Iraqi mayor. It is the unit that 1375 occupied that RPC Complex? 1376 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. And what unit? Who is the person, do you know? 1377

1378	Mr. PARSONS. What?
1379	Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Who is that?
1380	Mr. PARSONS. I am not sure who that is, sir.
1381	Unidentified SPEAKER. Colonel in the command structure.
1382	Mr. PARSONS. It would have been someone from the
1383	Multi-National
1384	Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. It is Colonel, we don't know his
1385	name in the command structure.
1386	Mr. PARSONS. Do not.
1387	Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Can you get that to us, and get
1388	that to the Committee?
1389	Mr. PARSONS. Yes, we will take that further.
1390	[The information to be supplied follows:]
1391	****** COMMITTEE INSERT ******

1392 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Is risk mitigation a factor when 1393 you decide how much to spend and what level maintenance to 1394 provide? 1395 Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I think the risk mitigation is always a factor when they decide what the requirement is going to 1396 1397 be, and I can only assume in this case that there was some of 1398 that going on when they determined what level of maintenance was going to be required for the different facilities. 1399 1400 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Are the operational commanders 1401 who are using the services of contractors fully informed about the levels of risks they are taking on by opting for 1402 1403 less than full Level A maintenance? Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I can't answer that question. 1404 1405 know how far down that information flows. So I would say 1406 that the mayor, who is responsible for that RPC, certainly 1407 knows the risks associated with the different level of 1408 maintenance. How that is flowed down from there, I cannot 1409 tell you. 1410 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Let me ask, Mr. Bruni, who is to 1411 blame for this? Is KBR to blame? 1412 Mr. BRUNI. Sir, I do not believe so. No, sir. 1413 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Is the Army to blame? Mr. BRUNI. Sir, I don't know if it is that simple, a 1414 1415 black and white case. 1416 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Well, if it is not the Army, and

417 it is not KBR, then who could it be?

Mr. BRUNI. Sir, all I can tell you is that from the KBR

- 1419 perspective, we don't understand what tactical or force
- 1420 protection issues may have been required to be factored into
- 1421 the Army's decision in this decision-making process. We
- 1422 don't know.
- Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Well, whatever decision was made,
- 1424 you would agree that someone shouldn't turn on the shower and
- 1425 get electrocuted, wouldn't you?
- 1426 Mr. BRUNI. I would agree that that is not something that
- 1427 should have happened. Yes, sir.
- 1428 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Yes. And particularly, if there
- 1429 were previous reports of people being shocked in the shower?
- 1430 It is not like this was without warning?
- 1431 Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir.
- Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. So, under that scenario, if KBR,
- 1433 as you maintain, is not to be blamed, who else could you
- 1434 possibly blame for this? Wouldn't it be the Army? I am not
- 1435 trying to focus on any individual in the Army. We don't even
- 1436 know the Colonel's name who was making these decisions. But
- 1437 | wouldn't it be fair under that to say that the Army would be
- 1438 responsible?
- 1439 Mr. BRUNI. Sir, even if the Army had--
- 1440 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I am just asking you a question.
- 1441 Wouldn't the Army be responsible? Or do you think the

soldier should be responsible for taking a shower? 1443 Mr. BRUNI. No, sir. It shouldn't be the soldier. 1444 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Okay. Should it be the Army? 1445 Mr. BRUNI. I think that the Army could have turned the 1446 situation differently. 1447 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Well, it surely could have. 1448 retrospect, they should have. So aren't they responsible? 1449 know they are a client and you are looking for more 1450 contracts, but you are saying you are not responsible. understand that. Wouldn't the Army then be responsible for 1451 1452 this in one way, shape or form? 1453 Mr. BRUNI. I think that the Army has some responsibility 1454 in this. Yes, sir. 1455 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Well, if they have some, who 1456 would have the rest of it? Just conceivably, who else could have it, if the Army just has some responsibility? Would KBR 1457 1458 have some then? 1459 Mr. BRUNI. The responsibility lies with the Army. 1460 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. That is all I am asking to just try and figure it out. Nobody is dodging. This is a tragic 1461 1462 case. Let me ask, Mr. Parsons, of the 16 electrocutions, how 1463 many occurred on KBR-managed facilities? 1464 Mr. PARSONS. Sir, our understanding, and based on 1465 records that we looked at, only one was connected to a KBR-maintained facility. 1466

1467 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Now, that was the Maseth death, 1468 okav. 1469 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis. Ms. McCollum, you are recognized for five minutes. 1470 1471 Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Parsons, you made a comment in your testimony on 1472 1473 page six that I find absolutely remarkable. You say that 1474 ''neither LOGCAP nor DCMA have sufficient skill set or 1475 expertise to perform adequate oversight of electrical work being performed by KBR.'' Then you say, we are trying to 1476 1477 acquire the expertise. My question to you is, who has been 1478 overseeing KBR's electrical work for the past five years? Mr. PARSONS. Ma'am, as Mr. Ernst testified earlier in 1479 his opening statement, for those LOGCAP contracts, DCMA has 1480 1481 been providing quality assurance oversight, which really 1482 focuses on the contractors' processes. They focus on whether 1483 the contractor has got the right QA processes in place. 1484 aren't doing actual inspections. 1485 Ms. MCCOLLUM. I am hearing processes. I want to know 1486 who was going in, and looking, and inspecting KBR's 1487 electrical work for the past five years? 1488 Mr. PARSONS. Again, for the technical inspections, they 1489 rely on what we call contracting officer representatives, 1490 which are appointed in each of the Units. Those are the individuals that have the subject matter expertise to provide 1491

that type of level of oversight.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Parsons, I am going to move on, but you have already said that there was no one available with that type of expertise. The DCMA and the Army have responsibility for, the ultimate responsibility is what you are saying, through all of these subcontracting, and whatever that they did, to oversee KBR's work. Your statement that you don't have the expertise to oversee the job adequately basically said that no one in our Government was taking on the responsibility of making sure that the safety of our troops was being looked at and handled quickly.

In my opinion, that is just strictly deplorable. And it is astounding how dependent our military has become on private companies, that they just don't have the can-do, I can do it myself, as past military had had where they could call on people directly to take care of things.

Now, in Staff Sergeant Maseth's building, there were work orders to fix the electrical problems for his shower. And here is a sworn statement on June 6, 2008, by the individual who lived in the building who used this shower before Staff Sergeant Maseth. His name is Sergeant Justin Hummer. And he stated, 'During the months I was living in the LSF building, I was shocked four or five times in the shower, the same shower where Staff Sergeant Maseth was electrocuted.''

He said on one occasion he had to use a wooden spoon.

If you are bringing wooden spoons to the shower, it is telling something that our servicemen knew that there was a big problem here, because the electrical current was so strong. He stated that in response to each work order, personnel from KBR showed up, but the problems persisted. He said his roommate even submitted a work order for these problems. According to Sergeant Hummer, he made these requests over and over and over.

Mr. Parsons, KBR never adequately addressed these problems, did they? And, the fact that maybe they had work orders for another Unit that was faulty doesn't mean that there aren't work orders that exist that were generated by Sergeant Justin Hummer. Can you work to provide the Committee with these work orders, because obviously we are missing some?

Mr. PARSONS. Ma'am, with this new information that we have received, we will work with the Department of Defense IG to look and gather more of the work orders.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Well, the fact that we don't have the work orders for something that was pretty specific in what this Committee was going to be dealing with, with the death of one of our servicemen, is a little astonishing. So obviously, we are not going to find work orders stamped fixed after four or five times Sergeant Justin Hummer requested the shower be

1542 | fixed.

My question is, basically, where was the Government in all of this? I heard you folks refer to customers. A customer is someone who has a choice of where to go shopping for their cell phone. A customer is not a soldier who is going in to take a shower. That soldier does not have a choice. But we have a responsibility. So, did anyone ever go out and check and see if KBR did what it was supposed to do? Your quality assurance officials, where were they?

Mr. ERNST. Congresswoman, let me try to answer that again, what Mr. Parsons had said. As I stated in my opening statement, we do not have the requisite skills to see facilities and maintenance oversight. We are assigned that mission in theater by the Department. In order to bring the kind of skills that we lack, we work with the service units themselves to bring the technical experts that have the kind of skills required to oversee it. I don't have the specifics in this instance. We would have to go back and take a look at the report from the COR, to see if there were reports from the COR on the ground to the--

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman Waxman for having these hearings. And we have had hearings on the U.S. Embassy and all of the shoddy work that is going on there, as well. We don't want State Department and other people being

electrocuted. And I am glad that you are going to produce
the work orders that Sergeant Justin Hummer had put in four
or five times.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. McCollum. Mr. Bilbray,

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. McCollum. Mr. Bilbray, you are recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield to Mr.

1574 Issa for a moment.

1586

1587

1588

1589

1590

1591

1575 Mr. ISSA. I thank you. I will be very brief.

1576 Mr. Horstman, are you a military veteran?

1577 Mr. HORSTMAN. Yes, sir. I am.

1578 Mr. ISSA. What were you in, what branch?

1579 Mr. HORSTMAN. I was in the Navy for 26 years.

1580 Mr. ISSA. Okay. Commissioned officer?

1581 Mr. HORSTMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Well, that means that I have six people here who are all military veterans, Air Force, Army, Navy. I am sorry, I had you listed as Air Force Reserve. Okay, well then, I will leave you out of this.

I put my hat on for a minute while I was waiting for the young lady's comments to end, which were good. As Lieutenant Daralisa, or Captain Daralisa, I had to ask the question, how dare any of us think that the first mistake wasn't a Sergeant reporting a near electrocution four times, and the command structure didn't close down that shower, including maybe that

whole facility until it was clarified.

1592

1598

1599

1601

1602

1603

1604

1605

1606

1607

1608

1609

1610

1611

1612

1613

1614

1615

1616

1593 Now, for those who served, please answer just a quick 1594 question, do any of you know a good reason that the immediate 1595 chain of command didn't take that action until it was 1596 corrected for the safety of that Sergeant, forgetting about 1597 the work order? KBR, don't answer as a contractor, answer as a former military person, isn't the first responsibility of the immediate commander who has the authority to say, I can't 1600 have that guy in that shower? I have to have him showering down the hall, or be in a different barracks. Do any of you disagree with that at all here?

Mr. HORSTMAN. No, I don't.

Mr. ISSA. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bilbray, thank you. I yield back.

Mr. BILBRAY. Thank you.

Let me first clarify that the gentlelady was concerned about the issue of contracting out a lot of these services. Well, let me say this as somebody who represents one of the largest concentrations of military service individuals in the entire world. There are going to be these contracts and they are essential. You can't ask and nor do they want to participate in having sworn service members issuing towels at a gym or doing a lot of these maintenance work that we have been contracting out since we sent contracts out to build the forts in the West.

But that aside, we have over 100,000 service personnel in Iraq today. As somebody who comes from being a mayor, and a council member, and a county chairman, it is not brain surgery to know how to set up a building inspection system where the unified building code is enforced. The most successful Government regulation ever comprised in the world is a unified building code.

Are we saying, Mr. Parsons, we don't have somebody on staff, or on contract, and probably contract, that has a background as a building inspector would be required in a city, which has practical, not book learning, doesn't come out of college, but has experience in the field that they are inspecting? Do we have on staff, or on contract, preferably contract, former electricians who now function as the building inspector for electrical work?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, we are in the process of working with the theater, with Multi-National Corps-Iraq, to do exactly that. They have brought in some Seabees. They have brought in some Air Force Red Horse teams with those types of engineers. Army Corps of Engineers is also going to be sending some of those types of experts to help do that type of thing that you were talking about with the inspections of the buildings to really understand what the safety issues are with them.

Mr. BILBRAY. Well, Mr. Bruni, work in the United States,

when you go in and put in a pump, put in an electrical 1642 1643 system, isn't it traditional that before the job is done, you 1644 get a sign-off from a Building Inspector? Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir. You pull a permit. 1645 1646 Mr. BILBRAY. And who does the sign-off when you are in 1647 Iraq, and you finish putting in an electrical system? 1648 signs it off? 1649 Mr. BRUNI. If there is a QAR available and assigned to 1650 that task, he will do that. 1651 Mr. BILBRAY. And that QAR has the background as a 1652 trained electrician who has experience in the field that they are inspecting? 1653 1654 Mr. BRUNI. I can't vouch to that. No, sir. I do not 1655 know. 1656 Mr. BILBRAY. Okay. Mr. Bruni, just let me tell you flat 1657 out, if you are going to look for the Seabees, if you are 1658 going to look for the engineers, you are going to look for 1659 in-house operations. It doesn't take brain surgery to contract former Building Inspectors and bring them out on 1660 1661 short-term contracts to be able to get this job done. We are 1662 doing contractors, and that is why I disagree with the gentlelady that, this ought to be all in-house. 1663 The ability to grab somebody who has experience doing 1664 1665 this all over America, has been doing it for 20, 30 years, 1666 and be able to spot the fact that a ground was not properly

1669|

grounded, is not brain surgery to these guys who have the experience. I know those of us that haven't worked in this field, it is magic. But what I am concerned about is, there is not a city in this Country, at 10,000, 15,000, that doesn't have the ability to have a building inspector check out an electric system before the switch is allowed to be thrown. Why can't we do the same operation in a facility, or an operation in Iraq, that has over a 100,000 personnel out there that we need to protect?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I don't think there is anything to prevent us from doing that. That is one of the things I believe Major General McHale has been tagged by General Petraeus in the Multi-National Corps to get his arms around. He is looking at the different options that he has to bring those type of companies and personnel into theater to do those types of inspections. And we are working closely with Defense Contract Management Agency.

Mr. BILBRAY. Is it a policy today that the unified building code will apply unless it is waivered? Is that a policy for our--

Mr. PARSONS. Can you repeat that sir?

Mr. BILBRAY. Does the unified building code apply to all projects, all construction in Iraq, unless those codes are waived, or are those not even considered?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, my understanding is that there are

various codes that are being used. Again, one of the charges to General McHale is to come up with a unified standard that will be used by troops, and by all contractors.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time, it is just that you know and I know that the entire United States, almost every municipality and every Government Agency, and every contractor uses the unified building code as the universal consensus. I don't see why we have to reinvent the wheel.

And I yield back.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Bilbray.

Mr. Tierney.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, in fact, we had somebody inspecting those things. In 2008, after the death of Staff Sergeant Maseth, KBR conducted a complete electrical inspection of all the buildings in the Radwaniyah Palace Complex where the Sergeant lived. The inspection found that a majority of the electrical systems are in complete disarray, that a majority of the electrical panels are in disrepair and require replacement, and that 45 water pumps needed to be replaced because of electrical shortage or age.

These problems were so severe that KBR's own site
manager recommended that service members immediately evacuate
six buildings. We have a copy of this recommendation from

1717 KBR to the Army, and let me read it to you.

'The electrical conditions in all buildings make them uninhabitable for safety and health reasons. The recommended course of action, if the buildings will continue to be used, is to disconnect the power to the buildings immediately and completely replace the electrical systems.'' Now, Mr. Bruni, why didn't KBR recommend evacuating the troops from these buildings when they were inspected in 2007?

1725 Mr. BRUNI. I am sorry, sir. I couldn't hear you. Could 1726 you repeat that please?

Mr. TIERNEY. Sure. Why didn't KBR recommend evacuating the troops from these same buildings when you inspected them in 2007?

Mr. BRUNI. Sir, when we inspected them in 2007 and produced the technical inspections that identified the deficiencies, we had submitted them directly to the mayor, and it was then his responsibility to take that and make decisions about what we should be turned on to perform.

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, you didn't recommend that people evacuate the building in 2007, did you?

Mr. BRUNI. No, sir. We did not.

1738 Mr. TIERNEY. And everyone keeps referring to the mayor.

1739 The mayor is a military individual; is he not?

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir.

1727

1728

1729

1730

1731

1732

1733

1734

1735

1736

1737

1740

1741 Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. Now, Mr. Ernst, in February of 2008,

you received the memo from the head of the DCMA in Iraq. The memo said that the problems KBR identified in 2008 were 1743 virtually the same identical to those that were identified in 1744 2007. Let me read that memo, if I could. 'The overwhelming 1745 1746 majority of these findings in the Legion Security Force area were identical to those findings or problems as either 1747 1748 alleged or identified in the 10 February 2007 limited inspection.'' Is that right? 1749 Mr. ERNST. Could you clarify which report that was, sir? 1750 1751 Mr. TIERNEY. This was the report that you received in February of 2007, relating to the inspections in 2007, the 10 1752 1753 February 2007 limited inspection. Mr. ERNST. What was that the safety inspection report in 1754 1755 2007? Mr. TIERNEY. It was a memo that you received from the 1756 head of the DCMA. 1757 Mr. ERNST. Okay. I understand, sir. I received that in 1758 2008, but the reference, just for refresher purposes, was 1759 that the safety inspection? 1760 Mr. TIERNEY. I believe it was, but we can check if that 1761 1762 makes a difference. You either remember getting it, or you 1763 don't. Mr. ERNST. I don't remember getting the safety 1764 inspection, but I do remember getting this one. 1765 1766 Mr. TIERNEY. You remember getting the one that I just

1767 read?

1768 Mr. ERNST. Yes, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. Now, Mr. Bruni, KBR, at that time, said that these defects were serviceable. This year, you look at the same buildings, and the same problems, and you find that they are not inhabitable, and they are the same problem. So, what has changed in the intervening 12 months?

Mr. BRUNI. Essentially, nothing, sir. The classification as serviceable, but requiring, with qualifications. The qualifications are that the deficiencies were to be repaired. To further answer your previous question, after those technical inspections were delivered to the military at the RPC, there were meetings held between the site management and the mayor to discuss the next steps and onward progression of what should be done.

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, what concerns me here, is it looks to be, and maybe you are clarifying that now, it looks to be in 2007, as serious as these were, nobody recommends that the buildings be evacuated. In 2008, the same problems, all of a sudden, it being recommended that people evacuate, or just don't use the facilities, or whatever. All that seems to have happened in the interim is that the Staff Sergeant died, and this Committee started investigating. But are you telling me that you had verbal conversations back after the 2007 reports and made a recommendation to evacuate?

Mr. BRUNI. No, sir. We did not make that 1792 1793 recommendation. That is not our recommendation to make in a normal situation. 1794 Mr. TIERNEY. Well, it was your recommendation to make in 1795 2008, why wouldn't you possibly see something that serious in 1796 1797 2007, something that could result in something this harmful 1798 to somebody and not make a recommendation that they evacuate. Mr. BRUNI. Sir, we made the recommendation that the 1799 1800 deficiencies that had been identified be fixed, that they be repaired. When it finally got to the point in February that 1801 1802 nothing was happening, the General Program Manager for KBR in Iraq met directly and personally with the Commander of DCMA 1803 and said, something has to be done. 1804 Mr. TIERNEY. Why didn't he feel that way in 2007? 1805 1806 mean, it was just as serious then? Mr. BRUNI. Sir, I can't answer that question. 1807 know why he didn't. 1808 Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. I yield back, Mr. Chairman. 1809 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Tierney. 1810 Mr. Sarbanes. 1811 Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to go 1812 back to the Level I, Level II maintenance distinction. 1813 that the right terminology? Or Level A and Level B? Is that 1814 what it is? So Level A is a higher degree of responsibility 1815 for upgrade and maintenance than Level B is? And you said 1816

that you are not sure how the determination was made as to why this particular location was under a Level B designation?

Is that right?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, do you mind repeating that question?

Mr. SARBANES. I think you said that you are not sure who made the decision that this would be a Level B designation in terms of the particular location that we have been focusing on today?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, from our review of the information that we have seen for the circumstances surrounding that, it was a team effort between the customer, which in this case is the Multi-National Corps-Iraq. The actual units that are occupying that RPC are LOGCAP Program Office was involved with those negotiations. DCMA was part of that negotiation, as well.

It is a team effort on determining, based on the customer's resources and their prioritization and risk assessments on what those trade-offs are going to be. I can't tell you for sure what the thought processes are for that specific building and why they decided that one was Level B, and others Level A, but those are resource trade-offs associated with risks that the units are making as they occupy those buildings.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Bruni, does KBR, I mean, what kind of perspective does KBR bring to the discussion of whether

something is going to be designated as a Level A, or a Level B, maintenance responsibility for you all.

Mr. BRUNI. Sir, that is basically a decision made by the military, by the mayor, based on his tactical or planning process for the use of that base.

Mr. SARBANES. Okay. So a KBR maintenance person will come across a situation and they might determine that a certain amount of upgrade needs to be performed, and then they will consult with their status of being either in a Level A, or a Level B, before they decide whether to do that upgrade. In other words, does the KBR person sit there and say, my goodness, we have a bad situation here, but this is a Level B situation or facility and, therefore, my hands are tied in terms of what I can do; is that how it works?

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir. Basically, we produce a technical inspection that quantifies those deficiencies, and in a Level B maintenance or service status, that technical inspection is turned over to the mayor of the military entity at that camp to make a decision of whether we should be told to make those repairs.

Mr. SARBANES. And, if you are not told to make those repairs, and you come back and you see the situation hasn't changed, you just do another report?

Mr. BRUNI. No, sir. There would be most probably, and I don't know specifically in this case, but there would

follow-on discussions with the mayor about his process and priorities for moving forward to make these changes, the deficiency remediations.

Mr. SARBANES. So, presumably, that happened but you still weren't getting the orders to fix and upgrade this particular situation that we have been focusing on.

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir.

Mr. SARBANES. Does the KBR contract with the Government have provisions in it that indemnify you against claims that are brought in situations where you make the Government aware of a situation in a Level B status, and they don't react and take action on one basis or on a repeated basis, do you know?

Mr. BRUNI. I am not aware of that, sir. I don't know the answer to that question.

Mr. SARBANES. I guess the evidence was, or the testimony we have, is that there has been 283 fires at facilities that are maintained, or were maintained, by KBR that are traceable to electrical problems and dysfunction, is that correct?

Mr. BRUNI. We have just come into possession of that report from DCMA, and we are looking at it right now, sir.

Mr. SARBANES. I mean, I just find it implausible that a contractor of your size and experience wouldn't have pretty specific guidelines in place in terms of who would be liable under these circumstances. I mean, I guess, you are making the case that your arriving in a situation where there has

already been equipment installed, and then you are just supposed to maintain it, but I would think you would get some kind of liability protection. You said you don't know who installed these things?

Mr. Chairman, before my time runs out, I would just like to ask, does anybody know who did the original fitting out of this electrical work? All right. So, how is it possible that nobody knows that? I mean because it was done before we were on the scene; is that the idea?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, we became aware that there were previous contracts for these facilities that were issued by the Corps of Engineers dating back to 2003. I have asked the Corps of Engineers to research and go through those contracts to understand what the scope of work is. We will share that information with the DoD IG. They have an interest in that as well, because I had the same question that you did. All right.

What was the original assessment made on these buildings when we first started occupying them? And I can't give you that answer right now, but we will definitely get to the bottom at taking a look back at what happened in 2003, 2004, when these buildings were being occupied by our forces.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sarbanes.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you

for holding this hearing, and I appreciate the panel coming forward to try to help us make sense of this. I just had an opportunity over the weekend to visit Iraq again, specifically, with the focus on this hearing. I had an opportunity to sit with General Tim McHale, who is conducting the investigation here. And the bottom line here, this is a terrible tragedy.

Sixteen fine young Americans put on the uniform for this Country, and they were not protected in a very basic way.

And we did not provide an environment for them within their own bases and within their own housing facilities that protected them in a meaningful way. Now, as sad as that tragedy is, it would be a greater tragedy to point the finger of blame at other individuals who may not deserve it.

But I do want to, with all due respect, and I think it is our duty to those families, and also to the 142,000 folks that are still over there, that we correct this, that we get to the bottom of this, and that we do justice to their memory. It is completely mind-boggling that a family in America today would send their sons and daughters off to war in defense of this Country, knowing full well what the dangers were with respect to combat and the situation over there, and then to have something like this. Something like this electrocution happened. It is just extremely, extremely sad.

Let me start with Mr. Bruni. Mr. Bruni, I understand.

I am also a construction manager, which is why they sent me
over there. That was in my former life. You seem to be
positing two choices here on inspection, and one is you are
authorized to inspect, but then you need a further
authorization to make those corrections; is that what you are
testifying to today, sir?

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir. That is correct.

Mr. LYNCH. But sir, and believe me I do not fault you in any way, but sir, in my experience, there is a third option. And once you discover a deficiency in a system, especially in an electrical system, there is a latent danger in that system. And I know from my own experience as a construction manager that you can tie that off, that you can flag that, and that you can require that that system not be used until it is corrected. It doesn't mean you have to correct it. It doesn't mean you have to be authorized to make the repairs, but you are protecting someone from using a system that is inherently dangerous.

Can I ask you why that option was not used here? I understand it was in the first instance when the gentleman was electrocuted in 2004, there was actually a lock put on, which was the proper way to handle this thing. And then someone got a key and unlocked that, and then the tragedy occurred. So I cannot fault the action taken by the

authority in that instance. However, in a lot of these other 1968 cases, I think there may have been an opportunity to tie this 1969 thing off, to shut it down, and to flag it, so that someone 1970 else didn't come along and continue to use it. 1971 We have testimony here of one fine young soldier who was shocked four or five times. Now, that in my mind is not 1972 1973 acceptable and should not have happened. Can you help the 1974 Committee understand why this third option was not used? 1975 Mr. BRUNI. Well, sir, the decision to keep those 1976 soldiers in those facilities is made by the military. 1977 not made by KBR. And we finally reached the point in 1978 February where action was taken by the leadership at KBR with 1979 DCMA to actually sever power and water connections to a 1980 number of buildings at the RPC, and also, working with the 1981 military to establish--1982 Mr. LYNCH. Sir, when was that? I just want to make sure 1983 I understand. When was that decision finally made? 1984 Mr. BRUNI. I believe it was February of 2008. 1985 Mr. LYNCH. February of 2008? 1986 Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir. 1987 Mr. LYNCH. Okay. I'm sorry. Did you want to say 1988 anything more on that? 1989 Mr. BRUNI. No, sir. I'm finished. Thank you. 1990 Mr. LYNCH. Okay. The other thing that troubles me 1991 greatly is, I had a chance again to sit with Major General

Tim McHale, and there seems to be a fairly coherent action plan this morning after the deaths of 16 of our best and bravest. One, there was an assessment made that, yes, we went into a country that had terribly deficient electrical standards, it had an assortment of Codes in place, none of which in my mind really reached to the standard that we require in this Country.

Notwithstanding that fact, we moved our folks into these buildings, and there was no really coherent effort to bring those buildings up to standards in any meaningful way, not in a comprehensive way, maybe, in a patchwork sort of fashion.

And it seems in hindsight, I realize in hindsight, it seems pretty basic that we should have done that.

The second thing was there is no database. There was no database for these different Units to understand the dangers that were being faced, and the injuries and the fatalities that were being encountered by some units elsewhere. And those are just two basic things that we are going to do now, thanks to General Tim McHale, and some others. But why did it take 16 deaths to get to that point? Can anybody on the panel help me with that?

Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I would just comment that I think this Committee's interest in this, and the issues that have been highlighted to me have pointed out that we do have a gap from a doctrinal standpoint that when we do go to an operation and

occupy buildings built by other countries that don't meet our standards, what is our process. I mean, who is making those decisions on what buildings we will utilize and which ones will be upgraded. And I am confident that the Department is going to go and tackle that.

Again, to me, it is a gap. This has been a long, protracted war. We have been occupying facilities that weren't built to U.S. standards, and I think we need to come up doctrinally with solutions on how do we do that in the future. Obviously, General Petraeus is taking this very seriously, and so is Major General McHale, and they are tackling it now.

Mr. LYNCH. Sir, if I can just say in closing before I yield back, we have got a lot of situations over there right now. Some number of troops are going to be there for a while. And I have been to Afghanistan as well, and we got a similar situation there. You guys have to get this right. You have to get this straightened out. And it shouldn't take a work authorization to remove a dangerous situation. It should just be assumed that if the contractor sees a dangerous situation, you flag it, and you remove it, take it out of service, and then, it would force the contracting authority to authorize the changes.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your questions.

2042 Mr. Altmire.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Bruni, I recently met, as you know, with KBR CEO William Utt. During our conversation, he informed me, and it has been reiterated today by both you and Mr. Parsons in your testimony, that KBR was not involved in any electrocutions, as far as maintenance, except for Staff Sergeant Maseth's incident, and I assume you would still agree with that?

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALTMIRE. So I want to turn to another incident that you referred to in your written testimony today. It involves the incident with Sergeant Christopher Everett, who was electrocuted in September 2005, when he was power washing a Humvee in a motor pool at Camp Al Taqqadum. Now, on page five, in your written statement, you say, ''Though KBR did have a presence ... at Camp A Taqqadum ... KBR had no responsibility for maintenance of the power washer, the motor pool, or the generator that supplied power to the motor pool.''

So we put in front of you a document, which I have here. It is too small to put up on the board, but it has two pieces to it. The first page here is a letter of technical direction dated January 5, 2005, fully nine months before Sergeant Everett was electrocuted. And in this letter, DCMA is tasking KBR with inspecting and maintaining all generators

2067 at Camp Al Taggadum that are shown on the attached 2068 spreadsheet, which is the second and third lists. And if you 2069 go to the end of this list, five up from the bottom, you will 2070 see the motor pool on there. 2071 So you can see that the generator at the motor pool is, 2072 in fact, included on this document. It looks like KBR was, 2073 in fact, responsible for maintaining the generator that 2074 supplied power to the motor pool that contributed to the 2075 death of Sergeant Christopher Everett. And so, to give you a 2076 moment to review that document, would you agree with that? 2077 Mr. BRUNI. Excuse me, sir, it does list the generator, yes, sir. But it is our understanding that this particular 2078 2079 generator did not power the motor pool. Rather, it was 2080 approximately 100 or 200 meters away from the motor pool. 2081 did not power the motor pool. 2082 Mr. ALTMIRE. Do you, given that, and we will reference 2083 that at the Committee, do you want to revise your statement

Mr. ALTMIRE. Do you, given that, and we will reference that at the Committee, do you want to revise your statement earlier, when you said KBR had no responsibility for the maintenance of the power wash in the motor pool, or the generator that supplied power to the motor pool?

Mr. BRUNI. No, sir. I do not.

Mr. ALTMIRE. You stand by that?

Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir.

2084

2085

2086

2087

2088

2089

2090

2091

Mr. ALTMIRE. Well, we would hope that you would review these documents a little bit more closely, and we will return

2092 to this subject.

2093 Mr. BRUNI. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALTMIRE. The next question, following the death of my constituent, Staff Sergeant Ryan Maseth, the Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force, which from my understanding has authority over U.S. Special Forces soldiers and Iraqi Special Forces soldiers in Iraq, sent teams of electricians out to inspect and repair all facilities under its command. Additionally, on January 21st, 2008, the report states that following the death of Staff Sergeant Maseth, DCMA funded KBR to fix hazards throughout Sergeant Maseth's compound.

While I commend the Special Forces and DCMA for taking these steps to protect our Nation's Special Forces troops, I wonder if similar steps have been taken to protect Americans not serving under this command. So, I would say to Mr. Heddell, have you determined in your review if similar steps have been taken by other military commands throughout Iraq?

Mr. HEDDELL. Sir, we know that there have been actions taken since January 2nd, after Sergeant Maseth's death, and

taken since January 2nd, after Sergeant Maseth's death, and some of those actions were undertaken by the Multi-National Corps-Iraq, and others followed approximately a month later, by the Multi-National Forces Iraq. I can be more specific if you would like. Would that be helpful in terms of exactly what has been done?

2117 Mr. ALTMIRE. Well, I wanted to in my brief time also follow up with Mr. Williams very quickly, if I could, on the 2118 2119 same subject. 2120 Mr. HEDDELL. Okay. 2121 Mr. ALTMIRE. Has the DCMA provided additional funding to KBR so that they may at the very least perform repairs on all 2122 2123 facilities known to have deficiencies? 2124 Mr. WILLIAMS. Congressman, I would say that DCMA 2125 obviously orders the contractor, or directs the contractor, 2126 based on funding that comes from the Army, or the Multi-National Corps, based on their prioritization efforts. 2127 To the extent the DCMA has been given that funding to apply 2128 to the contract, I am sure that that has occurred. 2129 2130 I would also observe that I think one of the reasons 2131 that General Petraeus is looking at this very seriously is 2132 because it is a theater-wide issue, and in many cases, they 2133 are facilities that do not follow-up under the particular 2134 contract that DCMA may have authority over. So, there are those facilities that still are outside of the range of the 2135 2136 contract, and I think that is why General McHale is taking a 2137 closer look theater-wide. 2138 Mr. ALTMIRE. Thank you, and I thank the Chairman for 2139 allowing me to participate today. 2140 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Altmire. 2141 Mr. Brady.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for allowing me to participate in this hearing today. You are right. This is not a Republican or Democrat issue. I appreciate the leadership of yourself, Congressman Altmire, Senator Casey, and Senator Cornyn of Texas on this issue. Losing one American life and one soldier's life to faulty grounding is unacceptable. Continuing to lose more is unforgivable.

In our case, my constituent, Ms. Larraine McGee of Huntsville, Texas lost her son, Staff Sergeant Christopher Everett. He was killed in Iraq on September 7th, 2005 when he was electrocuted by an improperly grounded power washer as he washed down the Humvee. And in Chris' death, we lost a promising 23-year old National Guardsman, who had a bright future and came from a very loving family, who wants answers to that death. His mom was led to believe this was the first death by electrocution. It turns out it was by then at least the fourth, and it has continued to happen. And we know war is dangerous and death occurs in those struggles, but you don't suspect death to come from a swimming pool, or a shower, or a car wash.

And to date, we have 16 deaths, a number of them due to contact with power lines, which raises other questions, but to date, we have seven known deaths attributed to improperly grounded electrical devices, and if KBR is responsible for

2167	that then the company should have the book thrown at it. But
2168	my frustration is I cannot seem to determine who is
2169	responsible for installing that equipment and maintaining it,
2170	and I so I want to ask those who ought to know, our Army
2171	representatives, and we have talked about Staff Sergeant
2172	Maseth, but earlier than that Sergeant Michael Montpetit, who
2173	was killed in Baghdad, electrocuted while working on a
2174	generator at his camp. To our Army representatives, Mr.
2175	Williams, Mr. Parsons, and Mr. Heddell, in that case, who
2176	installed that equipment, that generator, and who was
2177	responsible for maintaining it, do you know?
2178	Mr. HEDDELL. Are you asking me, sir?
2179	Mr. BRADY. All three of you.
2180	Mr. HEDDELL. From an Inspector General's point of view,
2181	we are attempting to find out, but we do not know the answer
2182	to that.
2183	Mr. BRADY. Don't know?
2184	Mr. HEDDELL. Don't know.
2185	Mr. BRADY. Don't know?
2186	Mr. PARSONS. Don't know
2187	Mr. BRADY. Don't know?
2188	Mr. ERNST. Sir, I do not know the answer either.
2189	Mr. BRADY. Don't know?
2190	Mr. WILLIAMS. No, Sir, I do not know.
2191	Mr. BRADY. Thank you. And in 2005, Staff Sergeant

2192 Christopher Everett was killed, electrocuted by a power 2193 washer, who installed that motor pool, that power washer? Who was responsible for maintaining it, do you know? 2194 2195 Mr. HEDDELL. I do not know, sir. Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I do not know either. 2196 2197 Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir. 2198 Mr. BRADY. In 2004, Corporal Marcos Nolasco was electrocuted while showering in his base in Baji. Do you 2199 2200 know who installed that shower, and who was responsible for 2201 maintaining it? 2202 Mr. HEDDELL. Again, Mr. Brady, this is a question that 2203 we are attempting to pursue, and will continue, but we do not 2204 know the answer. 2205 Mr. BRADY. Private First Class Brian Cutter, killed in 2206 Al Asad, electrocuted while working on trying to fix the AC 2207 unit outside his tent. Do we know who installed that AC 2208 unit, and who was responsible for maintaining it? 2209 Mr. HEDDELL. The Inspector General's Office does not 2210 know, sir. 2211 Mr. BRADY. Specialist Chase Whitman, killed in Mosul, 2212 electrocuted while just swimming in a pool. Do we know who 2213 installed that pool, and who is responsible for maintaining 2214 it? 2215 Mr. HEDDELL. No, sir. 2216 Mr. BRADY. Same answer.

Mr. HEDDELL. We are pursuing that.

Mr. BRADY. Finally, Specialist Marvin Camposiles, killed as early as April 2004, four and a half years ago, Coalition Base near Samarra, electrocuted while working on a generator as well. Does the Army know who installed the generator, and who was responsible for maintaining it?

Mr. HEDDELL. Mr. Brady, on all of those that you cited, the investigations conducted by Army CID and NCIS, we have reviewed those, and I believe that I can say accurately that based on our review of those investigations, we do not know the answers to your questions.

Mr. BRADY. And I guess my frustration is, it has been four and a half years, since the first death, why don't we know? Why does not the Army know who installed that equipment in those deaths, and who was responsible for maintaining it? Why don't we know now? I know we have sent letters and I have spoken personally to Secretary Gates, and I know Congressman Altmire, and I know the Chairman has as well. This is not a new issue. Why don't we know now who put those facilities in and who was responsible for maintaining them?

Mr. HEDDELL. If you are asking me, sir, I do not know why we do not know, but I do know that almost every question that we are addressing here today comes down to an issue of leadership, but those questions should have answers, but they

2242 don't at this time.

2243

2255

2256

2257

2258

2259

2260

2261

2262

2263

2264

2265

2266

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Parsons.

2244 Mr. PARSONS. Sir, I can't explain why there are no 2245 answers to those questions. And I have asked the same ones 2246 that you have. Again, that is why I am working with the Army 2247 Corps of Engineers to try to understand the scope of the contracts that they had in place, and what their contractors 2248 2249 were maintaining. No excuse, but it is a complex issue. We 2250 are talking 80 some thousand facilities just under LOGCAP alone, but I don't have a good answer on why those types of 2251 2252 strings weren't pulled at the time of the accident. 2253 can assure you that the Department will continue to work with the DOD IG to ferret that out. 2254

Mr. BRADY. And I understand how complex Iraq is, and Afghanistan, I understand that, but I would think the red flag occurred four and a half years ago. It should be a focus for our Country to find out why that occurred. So, my follow-up question is, when will we know? When will you get back to this Committee with answers of who installed, and who maintained in those deaths specifically?

Mr. SARBANES. Sir, I will have to get back to you on a time line on when we think we will actually have all of that information.

Mr. BRADY. Inspector General.

Mr. HEDDELL. Sir, we anticipate completing our review of

this by October of this year. 2268 Mr. BRADY. In October. And will it include specifically who was responsible for installing and maintaining? 2269 2270 Mr. HEDDELL. We are going to try. We are attempting to 2271 answer every question that you have asked, sir, and I hope 2272 that our report contains that. 2273 Mr. BRADY. Mr. Chair, it needs to. It needs to. 2274 again, one, we need to fix the problem that is occurring 2275 today. And two, we need to find out and hold accountable who did it, and my frustration is we cannot seem to get the 2276 2277 answers that I think our soldiers, and their moms deserve. 2278 Mr. Chairman, I have two questions of Mrs. McGee, Chris 2279 Everett's Mom asked me to ask. Would you like me to submit

Chairman WAXMAN. If you wouldn't mind, we would like you to submit it, in writing, and again a response for the record.

2284 Mr. BRADY. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate 2285 it.

2286 [The information to be supplied follows:]

2287 \*\*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*\*\*

that, in writing, to KBR?

2280

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Brady. I want to thank Mr. Brady for the questions he asked, and all the other members of this panel, because from what I have heard from the witnesses before us, there is a lot we don't know that we should know.

Yet last night, there is a fellow named Geoff Morrell, who is the Pentagon Press Secretary, and he called a press conference to say about our hearing for today, 'There seems to be a misperception out there that our facilities in that theater are replete with electrical hazards that have caused hundreds of fires and multiple fatalities.''

And, Mr. Morrell went on to say, it is ''flat out wrong'' to suggest that there has been a lack of oversight by the Pentagon. I find that incredible, that he would say, he knows that it is an overblown issue.

Well, it is not an overblown issue to Cheryl Harris, when she is trying to find out the truth for her son and what happened to him. It is not an overblown issue for the family of Corporal Marcos Nolasco, in their son's death, who was also electrocuted while taking a shower, and they are trying to find out the answers about that. It is certainly not overblown for the family of Petty Officer David Cedergren who was electrocuted in the shower. Specialist Chase Whitman was electrocuted in a swimming pool. Their families don't think these risks are overblown.

And I have to say that while there are a lot of things we don't know, as soon as Staff Sergeant Ryan Maseth was killed, the Army said they knew how he died. They told his mother he must have brought in some electrical appliance into the shower with him. Well, I just hope that all of you when you go back to the Pentagon that you tell the people there after this hearing that the Press Secretary ought to stop trying to spin these facts away and start looking out for the health and safety of our troops.

We expect people to know what has happened, to hold people accountable for what they did, and the most important thing is to make sure it doesn't happen again. But I can't say after this hearing that I feel assured that the Pentagon, KBR, the Inspector General, or any of you, are on top of this situation. It is all an interim report still be worked on. Let's find out the answers. This panel didn't supply them. I am disappointed, but we still insist on getting those answers. And we are going to continue to press from the Congressional side, and we hope that the Pentagon will continue to press as well from the military side.

I thank all of you for your participation, and particularly, the two guests for our Committee, our two colleagues that joined us. We very much appreciate your being here. That completes the business of the hearing, and we stand adjourned.

2338

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]