DCN: 7400

103-06A – RH13 – Statements and Testimony
Regional Hearing – July 11, 2005 – San Antonio, TX
BRAC COMMISSION – FY 2005
COFF:_____ DISPOSITION: Permanent

Statement of Congressman Mac Thornberry
13th District of Texas
before the
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

San Antonio, Texas

July 11, 2005

Chairman Principi and Commissioners,

My name is Mac Thornberry. In Congress, I represent the 13th District of Texas, which includes Sheppard Air Force Base. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee for more than ten years, I have always supported this BRAC process and am very grateful for the important role each of you plays in ensuring that it is credible and that it results in greater security for our nation.

You will hear from two of our community leaders with more specific comments related to Sheppard. I would like to offer a few observations based on the proposals for Sheppard, but which may also apply to your larger responsibilities. I should emphasize that I am speaking only for myself.

1. The recommendations affecting Sheppard deserve your scrutiny.

Sheppard is in many ways a unique base. It began training German pilots in 1966, and since 1981, it has been home to the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT). In responses to questions I submitted to the military, ENJJPT was called a "multi-national program unparalleled by any other program in the world."[1]

In 1941 training for aviation mechanics began at Sheppard. Today, medical and dental technicians, global aircraft maintenance and munitions technicians, and six other career field families including telecommunications, aircraft systems, avionics, civil engineer, fuels and vehicle operations are all trained at Sheppard.[2] Conducting this training are personnel from the Air Force, Navy, Army, and Marine Corps, as well as civilians. Our students are from all of the services. Jointness is not new at Sheppard.

What we do, we do as well as anyone, anywhere. Since 1992, Sheppard has received 46 outstanding unit awards, over half (25) were for excellence in training.[3] In the military values used in this BRAC, Sheppard was ranked third in Health Care Education & Training, behind only Brooks and Pensacola.

In Specialized Skill Training, DOD ranked Sheppard first in "Initial Skills Training" out of the 70 bases measured. In the other two subgroups, "Skills Progression" and "Functional Training," Sheppard ranked fifth and fourth respectively, which, when combined, made it the top-ranked base in the nation for Specialized Skill Training.[4]

Sheppard fared well in previous BRAC rounds. It has had approximately $475 million in new construction since the first BRAC round in 1989. And the new emphasis on jointness, not simply collocation, for this round is something we have been doing all along – among services and among nations. So you can appreciate that the military's proposals, which would cost Sheppard more than 4,000 jobs and would be the sixth biggest impact of all the bases affected by this year's BRAC, were a surprise.

These proposals, which have such a large impact on a base which has been doing the right things all along, deserve your careful scrutiny.

2. "Realignment" proposals are far reaching.

I think it fair to say that most of us in Congress think of BRAC as being primarily about base closings. We have set up a process for an objective evaluation of military installations which produces a set of recommendations to close certain facilities and move their missions to other existing bases. Deciding which bases to close is certainly where most of the publicity, and probably your attention, will be directed.

But I am struck by the extent of change proposed under "realignment." In fact, I am not sure that the word "realignment" accurately captures the scope of the recommendations here, some of which are quite broad and far-reaching. Sheppard is most affected by the proposal to consolidate all enlisted medical training for all services at one site and the proposal to bring all pilot and maintenance training for the Joint Strike Fighter to one site. In each case, the military proposal includes a significant decision about what to do in addition to the recommendation about where to do it.

A. Enlisted Medical Training

For most of us, it makes sense to train medical personnel from all services together. There are not enough differences among the services to warrant separate medical training programs. But that does not mean that our only choices are to combine training for all specialties at all levels or to leave it exactly as it is. We should consider carefully a range of alternatives. Unfortunately, that was not done in this instance.

The military decided to consolidate all enlisted medical training at one site. In order to understand the reasons for the decision, I submitted some basic questions

to the Medical Joint Cross-Service Group (MJCSG) related to differences in dental and other medical training, specifically whether it might make sense to train certain specialties in one location and other specialties in another. I asked, for example, whether dental students attend the same classes as other medical students. The answer I received was that "[t]his was a level of detail not examined during the FY05 BRAC data calls." The Medical Group further said that there is no joint curriculum; it will have to be developed later.[5]

In response to another question, the Group said that "[i]nitially, the MJCSG explored collocation of selected training programs. However, it was the military judgment of the MJCSG, that the collocation of all medical basic and specialty training would provide the best overall solution for the Department."[6] In other words, they only evaluated two options – all or nothing.

Sixty percent of the decision on where to consolidate all enlisted medical training was based on "health care services," i.e., hospitals and clinics which are used for Phase II training. Phase I medical training does not require or even include access to clinics and hospitals. But the Medical Group never seriously considered, much less costed-out, an option to conduct Phase I training where classrooms are available and Phase II training where clinics and hospitals are available.

We believe that such an alternative would save money and improve training, as will be explained in a few minutes. But, like other alternatives, it was not considered due to "military judgment" rather than any data or analysis.

B. Joint Strike Fighter

As another example, the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) decision is the first of its kind – to group all pilot and maintenance personnel associated with a particular airplane at one base. This proposal would actually cost, not save, money under the military's own calculations. One might ask whether a JSF mechanic has more in common with a JSF pilot or with an F-16 mechanic. Why is it preferable to consolidate around equipment rather than around function? It seems that question was not asked or answered in this process.

Some of the "realignment" proposals are not just about <u>where</u> things are done; they are really about <u>what</u> is done. And some of those decisions were made without data to support them and without much of an explanation.

3. <u>With the Joint Cross-Service Groups, the military's proposals may not make the best use of the space and facilities we have.</u>

A. Some information is outdated.

Some of the key information used to make decisions is outdated. For example, in assessing Sheppard's capacity to house students, DoD did not consider two student dormitories that provide berthing and messing for 600 students.[7] This information makes a difference in determining military value and capacity of Sheppard to house students.

B. Overall best use of bases was not the cross-service groups' goal.

The 1995 BRAC was criticized because suggestions of the five cross-service groups were filtered through the services before any final recommendations were made.[8] This year the cross-services groups made their recommendations independent of the services. Each approach has certain advantages and disadvantages. As GAO noted in reviewing the 1995 round:

> The cross-service groups' perspective on the activities they studied differed from that of the services. They looked at the functions performed at two or more sites, or by two or more services, and those with the potential for being consolidated. In most cases, these functions represented only a portion of what was done at a specific site. Furthermore, the activity was usually only part of a base or installation. The services had the broader perspective of the entire base and its future needs.[9]

The broader perspective of how to make the best and most efficient use of each base is missing for those facilities affected by the cross-service groups.

The Groups that affected Sheppard were the Medical Group and the Education & Training Group. The Medical Group's objective for medical training was to consolidate it. They were not particularly concerned about making the best, most efficient use of the medical training facilities left behind. In fact, when asked what they expected would happen to the 768,000 square feet of class rooms and laboratories that would be vacated at Sheppard under their proposal, they simply said it would be up to the Air Force to decide what to do with it.[10] The Air Force has no such proposals in its recommendations.

I am not criticizing the Medical Group. I am simply pointing out, as GAO observed in the last round, that there are advantages and disadvantages to each approach. This year someone needs to look at the end result of all of the recommendations with a view toward determining whether, taken together, the proposals make the best use of the bases we continue to operate.

That is one of the reasons we suggest that you should ask for a separate analysis of the cost of conducting Phase I medical training for all services at Sheppard and conducting all Phase II training, when hospitals and clinics are needed, at Fort Sam Houston. We believe that you will find that it will save money and actually enable each site to specialize in a phase of training for all services.

C. Some recommendations were bundled for quicker payback.

In discussions with GAO about its recent report on the military's proposals for this round, it became clear that some recommendations were bundled together in a way that improves the payback period. My understanding is that DoD's own Red Team analysis came to the same conclusion. Decisions in previous BRAC rounds had paybacks which usually occurred in five years or less.

In the case of medical consolidation, the payback for collocating training was 21 years.[11] However, because it was combined with consolidating health care services, the overall payback was reduced to 10 years. The Commission might consider whether the operational benefit of consolidating all enlisted medical training at one location is sufficient to warrant such a lengthy and costly payback, which is estimated to be over $1 billion.[12]

D. Some savings may not be achieved.

Additionally, GAO noted instances where DoD assumed savings in personnel and in vacant facilities which may not be achieved. They note that personnel may not be reduced or may be reassigned, facilities will still require upkeep, or more likely, will be converted to other uses.[13] The same points have been made to me informally about the claimed savings in personnel and facilities at Sheppard.

4. We all have to look ahead to the future.

These recommendations are not the last word. As I mentioned, if the military's proposals are implemented as is, there will be some rather large, gaping holes left at existing bases. I recognize that the Commission cannot fill all of those holes. But you can help point the way for future decisions.

Some of the suggestions the community has for Sheppard relate to future missions, based on its demonstrated track record of excellence in training. For example, the military proposal for JSF training would place "initial" pilot and maintenance training for the Joint Strike Fighter at the same location. Obviously, pilots and mechanics from the U.S. and from our partner nations will have to be trained after that "initial" period. We think Sheppard is a logical site for those future missions.

The Air Force notes that there is consideration to expanding the ENJJPT program at Sheppard beyond NATO nations.[14] Because of the growing importance of training and fighting with allies, our experience in multi-national training will be a key asset for the nation in any such expansion.

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles are growing in number and importance and assuming a variety of missions from surveillance to weapons delivery. It may be necessary soon to consider a center of excellence for UAV maintenance training. Sheppard is already providing support in this area.

Conclusion

You obviously have a big job and a big responsibility. Making the right decisions is not just about saving money; it is about America's security and the safety of our citizens. As each of you has served our nation in the past, we are grateful for your willingness to take on this vital new mission.

Enclosures: 1. Memorandum for OSD Clearinghouse, 26 May 2005
2. Inquiry Response re: CT-0365/BI-0062, 29 June 2005

END NOTES

[1] David L. Johansen, Lt Col, USAF, Chief Base Realignment and Closure Division, "Inquiry Response, Re: CT-0365/BI-0062, Requester: Rep. Thornberry's Office, Sheppard Air Force Base BRAC Questions," 29 June 2005.

[2] United States Air Force, Fact Sheet, 82d Training Wing Office of Public Affairs, [http://www.sheppard.af.mil/], August 2004.

[3] Carrie Loranger, Capt, USAF, 82 TRW/CCE, Sheppard Air Force Base, (e-mail), 7 July 2005.

[4] Department of Defense, Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group, Military Value Analysis Report, Infrastructure Steering Group, 20 April 2005, 8, 10, 12, 13.

[5] Johansen, 5-7.

[6] Ibid, 6-7.

[7] Department of Defense, Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group, Specialized Skill Training Subgroup Capacity Analysis, May 2005, 24. (Note: On June 21, 2005, the Sheppard Air Force Base Public Affairs Office reported that current berthing, including two recently completed dormitories, is 7,224. This is a 49.3% increase).

[8] Government Accountability Office, Military Bases: Analysis of DOD's 1995 Process and Recommendations for Closure and Realignment, April 14, 1995, (GAO/NSIAD-95-133), 40-50.

[9] Ibid, 43.

[10] Nancy E. Weaver, Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group Coordination Team, "BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker #0123: BRAC Questions Regarding Sheppard Air Force Base," 26 May 2005 , 3.

[11] Government Accountability Office, Military Bases: Analysis of DOD's Selection Process and Recommendations for Base Closures and Realignments, 1 July 2005, (GAO-05-785), 20 3.

[12] Ibid, 203.

[13] Ibid, 40, 56, 217.

[14] Johansen, 1,2.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-4000

PERSONNEL AND
READINESS

MAY 2 6 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR OSD CLEARINGHOUSE

Subj: OSD BRAC CLEARING HOUSE TASKER #0123: BRAC QUESTION REGARDING SHEPPARD AFB

Attached is the Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group response to the referenced query.

If you have any questions, please contact Mark Horn at the E&T JCSG Coordination Team, (703) 696-6435 ext. 287 or Mark.Horn@wso.whs.mil.

Nancy E. Weaver
E&T JCSG Coordination Team

Attachment:
1. Response to Tasker #0123.DOC

Enclosure (1)

Sheppard Air Force Base
Questions

Assumptions

1. Please explain the assumptions used to determine:
    a. Why the medical training mission was removed from Sheppard Air Force Base?
    b. Why the JSF training mission was removed from Sheppard Air Force Base, especially since Sheppard is the Air Force Center of Excellence for aircraft maintenance training? OSD (AT&L) directed that the BRAC 2005 process select the Initial Joint Training Site for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). The Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group developed scenarios that located maintenance training and pilot training together and scenarios that located them separately to determine the most cost effective alternative. The scenario that achieved the greatest return on investment placed the maintenance training and pilot training for Air Force, Navy and Marines in the same location at Eglin AFB. Eglin AFB was selected because it best achieved the Service endorsed criteria for a JSF training base and had the highest military value.
    c. Why only 51 military 2 civilians for pilot training billets from Moody Air Force Base were transferred to Sheppard? The only function that moves from Moody Air Force Base to Sheppard AFB is a small portion of the Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals (IFF) training program (A total of 25 pilot and weapons systems operator students). Because Sheppard AFB has contract maintenance, the military personnel who perform maintenance functions for these aircraft at Moody AFB will not move. Adjustments will be made to the maintenance contract at Sheppard AFB (COBRA analysis included a $898K recurring cost at Sheppard for additional contract maintenance). DoD does not move contractors in BRAC scenarios; civilians refer only to government employees.

    d. The Area's Economic Employment which is stated to be 93,033. The report says this number came from the 2002 Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA). During 2002 the estimated Civilian Work Force was projected to be about 60,000 what accounts for the difference in population and which number most accurately reflects the actual population?

Medical Training (Answers to be provided by Medical JCSG)

2. Please be more specific on the following billets:

Medical Training
Current number of billets at Sheppard AFB
Military/Civilian/Students
Current billets filled at Sheppard AFB
Military/Civilian/Students
Annual break out of lost billets for 06/07/08/09/10/11
Military/Civilian/Students

3. Must all enlisted medical training be together, what about disciplines such as dental training?

4. What alterations are needed, including dorms, of existing facilities at Ft. Sam Houston? How much will this cost? Are those changes reflected in the FYDP?

5. What is the expected use of medical training facilities at Sheppard?

6. What are the ages, conditions, and construction costs of the facilities that will no longer be needed?

7. What is the effect on future Sheppard dorm expansion plans?

8. What are the phase-out plans for transferring permanent party personnel from Sheppard to Ft. Sam Houston?

Joint Strike Fighter Training

9. Please be more specific on the following billets:

Joint Strike Fighter Maintenance Training
Current billets at Sheppard AFB
Military/ Civilian/Students

There are currently no billets at Sheppard AFB to support JSF maintenance training

Current billets filled at Sheppard AFB
Military/Civilian/Students
(see above)

Annual break out of lost billets for 06/07/08/09/10/11
Military/Civilian/Students

The recommended scenario relocates the following billets from Sheppard AFB to Eglin AFB:

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
Military	0	0	44	0	0	0	44
Students	0	0	18	40	116	73	247
Civilian	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
TOTAL	**0**	**0**	**66**	**40**	**116**	**73**	**295**

10. For permanent party personnel, how many are current jobs? How many were projected jobs?

All permanent party billets (i.e., non-students) that will move from Sheppard AFB to Eglin AFB will support the standup of the new JSF aviation maintenance training school. The reduction in personnel at Sheppard AFB will coincide with decreases in the aviation maintenance training loads for legacy aircraft as JSF aircraft come on line. **No projected positions are included. All positions identified for BRAC are based on the AF manpower program as of the 4th Quarter, 2003.**

11. When were JSF billets going to start being filled? How many were planned? How many JSF billets are for legacy systems?

The Department of Defense is scheduled to take delivery of the F-35 (JSF) beginning in 2008, at which time we will transfer the manpower required to implement the Joint Training Site concept. There will be a total of 811 positions required for the Joint Training Site. The positions will be realigned from Air Force and Navy bases, including Sheppard AFB, TX. These positions will not be used for legacy systems. All positions will be used to support JSF pilot and maintenance training.

12. Why group all JSF activities together at one location rather than group all aircraft maintenance training together at Sheppard Air Force Base?

OSD (AT&L) directed that the BRAC 2005 process select the Initial Joint Training Site for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). The Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group examined scenarios that located maintenance training and pilot training together and scenarios that located them separately. In the end, it was determined that an integrated training site that co-located JSF pilot and maintenance training for all services was the most cost effective solution. Eglin AFB was selected as the initial training site because it best achieved the Service endorsed criteria for a JSF training base and had the highest military value.

13. Was there a cross-services committee that reviewed aircraft maintenance and ground support training in the same manner as medical training? If we are creating a joint medical training center of excellence, would it be

possible to create a joint aircraft maintenance training center of excellence at Sheppard Air Force Base?

The Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group conducted analysis on the establishment of both a maintenance training center and a combined maintenance/pilot training center. As the result of their analysis, it was determined that an Initial Joint Training Site for USAF, USN, and USMC Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) training organizations to teach both aviators and maintenance technicians how to properly operate and maintain this new weapon system was the most efficient option. The Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group analyzed the implementation of this concept and found an ideal location based on the OSD-approved military value and capacity analysis models. Eglin AFB was found to be the most suitable installation to accommodate an initial training site for maintenance and JSF pilot training.

Fighter Pilot Training

14. What are the total numbers of pilot training billets at Moody Air Force Base?
2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010

a. Military
b. Civilian
c. Student

Pilot Training Positions to be Realigned from Moody

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
Officers	0	0	178	0	0	0	178
Enlisted	0	0	32	0	0	0	32
Students	0	0	180	0	0	0	180
Civilians	0	0	132	0	0	0	132
TOTAL	**0**	**0**	**522**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**522**

15. What are the plans to transfer this pilot training from Moody AFB to Sheppard AFB?

The recommended Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training Scenario relocates the Primary Phase of undergraduate pilot training out of Moody AFB to Columbus AFB, Laughlin AFB, and Vance AFB. It relocates the Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals training for Pilots out of Moody AFB to Columbus AFB, Laughlin AFB, Vance AFB, and Sheppard AFB. It relocates the Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals training for Weapons Systems Officers out of Moody AFB to Columbus AFB, Laughlin AFB, Vance AFB, and Sheppard AFB. It also relocates the Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals training for Instructor Pilots

out of Moody AFB to Randolph AFB. The scenario, which calls for moving 25 student billets (IFF training) from Moody AFB to Sheppard AFB, will require the relocation of 26 permanent party military billets and 2 permanent party civilian billets to Sheppard AFB. Air Education and Training Command will determine details for each of these moves through their site survey process.

Sheppard Air Force Base Capacity

16. Can Sheppard Air Force Base accommodate more pilot training missions?
    a. How many?
    b. From what locations?

Results of the Flight Training subgroup capacity analysis showed that excess capacity exists at Sheppard AFB, specifically 12 percent excess in runway capacity, 28 percent in special-use-airspace capacity, and 25 percent excess in ramp capacity. (Excess capacity accounts for a 20 percent increase in current requirements as a hedge against potential surge increases in production requirements). Although the ability to accommodate more pilot training missions depends on having available capacity, decisions to realign these missions also depends on other factors such **as** aircraft and training type, sortie requirements, airspace needs, air traffic system support of mission requirements, environmental analysis, ramp and maintenance requirements, unique aircraft needs, fire support availability, housing, support requirements, classroom and simulator space, ops facility needs, and officer/enlisted, active, reserve, guard, US, NATO, foreign mix.

Capacity data from data calls will be available at www.defenselink.mil/brac once OSD completes its security review of the database.

17. Are there any aircraft maintenance training jobs being performed at other locations?
    a. What locations?
    Besides Sheppard, locations include Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Aviano (Italy), Barksdale, Beale, Cannon, Charleston, Davis-Monthan, Dover, Dyess, Edwards, Eglin, Eielson, Elmendorf, Fairchild, Ft Eustis, Grand Forks, Hill, Holloman, Kadena (Japan), Hurlburt, Keesler, Kirtland, Lackland, Lakenheath (UK), Langley, Little Rock, Luke, McChord, McConnell, McGuire, Mildenhall (UK), Minot, Misawa, Moody, Mountain Home, Nellis, New River MCAS, Offutt, Pensacola, Pope, Ramstein (Germany), Robins, Seymour-Johnson, Shaw, Tinker, Travis, Tyndall, Whiteman, Yokota (Japan).

    b. How many billets?
    FY06 student throughput is programmed at 36,000. Note: one student may be included multiple times in the throughput total because they

attend multiple courses. Permanent party billets include 996 military and 63 civilian.

c. What is the rationale for not consolidating them at Sheppard Air Force Base?

DoD Base Closure and Realignment Report and the Air Force Analysis and Recommendations BRAC 2005 provide justification and impacts of all of the Secretary of Defense's recommendations. Also, the Field Training Detachments are located at user bases to provide maintenance training tailored to their specific aircraft needs. Consolidating FTDs at Sheppard would be impractical from both a training and operational perspective.

d. What is the rationale for consolidation at Sheppard Air Force Base?

See answer to 17c above.

18. What is being done to expand ENJPPT Training to new or non-NATO countries?

ENJJPT routinely invites new countries to attend semi-annual Steering Committee Meetings at which the countries learn (in detail) what ENJJPT has to offer. It is then up to the individual countries to pursue participation within their resource capability. Non-NATO participation is not normal but there is consideration for inclusion on a case-by-case basis.

19. What additional missions could Sheppard AFB assume in the future, based on its core competencies and future joint training needs of the services?

As with pilot training, consideration of Sheppard AFB for additional missions would depend on what type of training and would require specific mission requirements and detailed site surveys. Variables include but are not limited to training type, facility needs, environmental analysis, unique training needs, housing, dorms, support requirements, classroom space, special tech training requirements, ops facility needs, and mix of students.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, DC

May 26, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR OSD BRAC CLEARINGHOUSE

FROM: 1420 Air Force Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330-1420

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC CLEARING HOUSE Tasker #0123: BRAC Questions regarding Sheppard Air Force Base

Attached is the Medical Joint Cross Service Group response to the referenced query.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (703) 692-6990 or mark.hamilton@pentagon.af.mil.

Mark A. Hamilton

MARK A. HAMILTON, COL, USAF, BSC
Secretary
Medical Joint Cross Service Group

Attachments:
1. Response to Query

Query:

- Why the medical training mission was removed from Sheppard Air Force Base?

Answer: The consolidation of all medical/dental enlisted basic and advanced training at Ft Sam Houston was created to address current mission requirements and achieve scale efficiencies. Utilization and assignment of medical personnel in theatre has expanded beyond single service requirements, i.e.Army Medic may be attached to the Marines or an AF medic to an Army unit. At the same time, the amount of Service-unique knowledge is only a portion of the didactic training. This suggests that consolidation of basic enlisted training would allow an increase in interoperability and intraoperability through standardization. Fort Sam Houston was selected because they had sufficient excess capacity and buildable acreage, a nearby field training site (Camp Bullis), and a large clinical capacity at Brooke Medical Center and Wilford Hall. For most of the advanced training, the didactic portion will be accomplished at Ft. Sam Houston, while the Phase II training will continue at hospitals throughout the military healthcare system. As a part of this recommendation, the limited amount of medical officer training at Sheppard AFB was also moved to Ft Sam Houston as well.

Medical Training

- Current number of billets at Sheppard AFB Military/Civilian/Students.

Answer: Sheppard AFB has 553 military and 81 civilians supporting the 1,578 medical trainees.

- Current billets filled at Sheppard AFB Military/Civilian/Students - AF Answer

- Annual break out of lost billets for 06/07/08/09/10/11 Military/Civilian/Students

Answer: The final schedule for the realignment of personnel will be developed during the implementation of this recommendation, if approved. The Medical JCSG analysis suggests that 478 Military and 66 civilian billets would be realigned to Ft Sam Houston TX in 2009 along with all of the 1,578 medical students. Seventy-five military and 15 civilian positions that support the medical training mission would be eliminated due to consolidation efficiencies gained by moving to one location. The Air Force also identified 93 military and 73 civilian base operating support positions that would be eliminated with this action.

- Must all enlisted medical training be together, what about disciplines such as dental training?

Answer: Ultimately, separate training will not fully prepare our medical enlisted forces for the operational environment that they will face in a 21st Century military that emphasizes joint operations. Separating pieces of the whole will also negatively affect the synergistic effects of collocating medical and dental enlisted training. Additionally, separating pieces of the whole will reduce efficiency cost savings by incurring additional overhead and admin support to operate at different locations.

- What alterations are needed, including dorms, of existing facilities at Ft. Sam Houston? How much will this cost? Are those changes reflected in the FYDP?

Answer: The Medical recommendations, if approved, include $253 million for MILCON to construct academic instruction facilities, student barracks and dining facilities to accommodate the increased students and staffing from not only Sheppard AFB but also the Navy medical training sites at Great Lakes, Portsmouth, and San Diego that would realign to Ft Sam Houston.

- What is the expected use of medical training facilities at Sheppard? -

The Air Force would determine the future use of medical training facilities if the BRAC recommendations are approved

- What are the ages, conditions, and construction costs of the facilities that will no longer be needed?

Answer: The Air Force identified 768,000 SF of facilities at Sheppard that directly support the medical training mission. Medical JCSG has no visibility onto the capital costs, ages, etc of these buildings.

- What are the phase-out plans for transferring permanent party personnel from Sheppard to Ft. Sam Houston?

Answer: The actual plan for the relocation of the personnel would be finalized during the implementation of this recommendation, if approved. The Medical JCSG analysis suggests that the personnel will relocate to Ft Sam Houston in Fiscal Year 2009.

29 Jun 2005

Inquiry Response

Re: CT-0365/BI-0062

Requester: Rep. Thornberry's Office

Sheppard Air Force Base BRAC Questions

JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER:

On page 8 of the Capacity Analysis Report to the Infrastructure Steering Group, dated April 20, 2005, attached to the Base Closure and Realignment Report by the Education & Training Joint Cross-Service Group, it lists Sheppard AFB as "Treaty Limited." Page 9 then indicates that the Services requested that Sheppard be evaluated for the JSF Initial Training Sites.

Question: Please provide specifically what provisions of which treaty are referenced.
Answer: The term "Treaty Limited" refers to the Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT) program presently at Sheppard. ENJJPT is unique when compared to other pilot training programs studied by E&T JCSG (make-up of its syllabus, fleet of aircraft, and facilities are governed by a Multi-nation Steering Committee comprised of senior leaders from Nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)). Member Nations share the cost to train pilot candidates for duty in their Nation's jet/fighter aircraft. Nevertheless, to treat all undergraduate flight training programs at US-owned installations fairly/equally, E&T JCSG explored various options that would combine like assets to include dispersing/moving elements (primary and advanced stages of pilot training) of ENJJPT to join units at traditional flight training bases. If this option proved feasible (it didn't), the Services requested E&T JCSG to determine whether or not Sheppard AFB had facilities necessary for it to host the Joint Strike Fighter's first-ever training unit. E&T JCSG determined that splitting elements of Sheppard's ENJJPT program would most likely violate provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement between NATO Allies who participate in ENJJPT so the enabling stage to place JSF at Sheppard was determined infeasible.

Question: Explain fully how those provisions affect Sheppard's ability to be considered for this or some other mission.
Answer: The cost sharing provision and syllabus for undergraduate training at Sheppard have created a multi-national program unparalleled by any other program in the world. In fact, the USAF is exploring alternatives that would

permit other Nations to join the program now reserved for NATO allies. The well-established international training program at Sheppard, if opened to other nations, will advance the direct and indirect benefits of partnering with emerging democratic nations much as it benefited the partnership USA has enjoyed with NATO Allies.

Page 20 of Volume VI of the Base Closure and Realignment Report by the Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group states, "This recommendation establishes Eglin Air Force Base, FL as an Initial Joint Training Site that teaches entry-level aviators and maintenance technicians how to safely operate and maintain the new Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) (F-35) aircraft. The Department is scheduled to take delivery of the F-35 beginning in 2008."

Question: What is meant by the "Initial Joint Training Site?"
Answer: "Initial Joint Training Site" has two meanings. It refers to the first of as many as three separate sites that will host the Joint Strike Fighter Training mission. It also refers to the first mission-related training a new-hire receives after he/she enters the JSF career field. Maintenance technicians with many years of service but no experience on JSF aircraft shall receive "initial" training just as young technicians who just enter active duty will receive "initial" training when assigned to JSF duty.

Question: How long is "Initial?"
Answer: The training syllabus for the Joint Strike Fighter is still under development, but typical training of this type varies from a few weeks for refresher training for experienced operators to approximately one year for inexperienced students. Initial training will continue throughout the life of the JSF (as it does for any aircraft).

Question: Where will aviators and maintenance technicians be trained after the "Initial" period?
Answer: Once pilots or maintenance personnel receive initial training for the Joint Strike Fighter, they are typically assigned to operational squadrons where they will continue they're training to obtain advanced qualifications.

Question: Is delivery of the F-35 still expected to begin in 2008?
Answer: Systems Development and Demonstrate aircraft will be delivered by 2008.

Question: If delivery is delayed, as recent news reports indicate, how will this recommendation be affected?
Answer: If delivery of JSF is delayed beyond the BRAC implementation window, units at Eglin AFB may continue their present day missions. Because Eglin AFB has been identified as the base best suited to stand up the JSF training mission, no other BRAC recommendations were made to change the mission of the base.

Question: What is the cost or savings of consolidating all "Initial" maintenance training for JSF at one site?
Answer: The COBRA data (which shows the costs and savings) is posted on the Defenselink website for each of the various scenarios.
http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/

Question: According to page 66 of the minutes from the September 30, 2004 meeting of the Air Force Base Closure Executive Group, in August 2001, Chief of Staff of the Air Force approved Air Force basing and training concept for the JSF. But the long term Air Force vision is for three training wings (2 flying at separate locations) and one maintenance training wing at Sheppard AFB. Is this basing and training concept still valid?
Answer: Perhaps, the BRAC charter was to explore all basing options for the operations and maintenance functions necessary to accommodate the JSF flight training program. Eglin emerged as the installation best suited to accommodate the mission as the Services forecast that mission today. Significant changes to the aircraft or mission would most certainly earn a re-look to make sure Eglin is still the "best in show" for all bases that could support flight and maintenance training. Further, once the fleet of aircraft on board justifies adding additional training sites/bases (original forecast would "earn" as many as 3 training units ... changes to the number of aircraft services will purchase could increase or decrease this requirement), the services should examine the many factors involved to determine of coupling maintenance and flight training at the same location is in the best interest of the Nation.

In the minutes of the January 27, 2005, meeting of the Education & Training Joint Cross-Service Group, the Specialized Skill Training Subgroup "deactivated" the scenarios, which would have created JSF Maintenance Training Centers at Sheppard AFB or NAS Pensacola.

Question: Why were these scenarios "deactivated?"
Answer: When E&T JCSG tasked the Specialized Skill Training Subgroup to cost three competing scenarios (consolidated JSF Maintenance Training Center at Sheppard AFB, consolidated JSF Maintenance Training Center at NAS Pensacola, or initial Maintenance Training Center at Eglin AFB (first of three possible ITCs with an MTC at each location); E&T JCSG appeared to be under the understanding that it had the latitude to determine whether the JSF training organization would consist of Integrated Training Centers (three possible with a Flight Training Center and Maintenance Training Center at each location) or separate Integrated Flight Training Centers with one consolidated Maintenance Training Center at another location. However following higher-level OSD clarification (based upon Mr. Aldrich memo), the tasker was limited to selecting the initial site for the JSF. As a result, E&T JCSG directed the MTC scenarios for the JSF be deactivated.

Question: What is the cost savings or expense of those options?
Answer: The COBRA data is posted on the Defenselink website for each of the various scenarios. Please note the ITC scenario (maintenance portion) cannot be compared to the two MTC scenarios (Pensacola and Sheppard) because the underlying training concepts are dissimilar (contractor provided training at three possible ITC locations vice service provided training at one consolidated MTC).

Question: Please explain the minutes of the January 26, 2005, meeting which states, "The ITC v. MTC is a training organizational construct issue rather than a cost issue."
Answer: Comment proposed to E&T JCSG that the organizational structure (ITC versus MTC) was an institutional policy decision the Services should make before the E&T JCSG could proceed with analysis for a BRAC recommendation, and emphasized that cost data comparing dissimilar concepts was not recommended. As a result of further discussions, OSD clarified the original JSF tasking and the E&T JCSG directed that the JSF MTC scenarios (Pensacola and Sheppard) be deactivated.

Regarding the purchase of the JSF aircraft by other nations:

Question: What other nations are expected to purchase JSF aircraft?
Answer: Currently the United Kingdom has committed to purchasing 150 aircraft. Other nations participating in the development program that are expected to purchase JSF aircraft are Norway, Netherlands, Demark, Italy, Turkey, Canada and Australia

Question: How many planes are other countries expected to buy?
Answer: Like the F-16 program, other countries could purchase JSF aircraft but they are not participating in the on-going development program. These countries will mostly likely make their purchase through the Foreign Military Sales program. Lockheed has estimated that other nations could purchase an additional 2,000 aircraft. Suggest SAF/IA provided a more current picture of international participation.

Question: Where will maintenance training for those other nations take place?
Answer: The location for other nations' maintenance training is not finalized. Expectations are nations will request their initial instructor cadre be trained in the U.S. with long-term maintenance training in their country. At this time only the United Kingdom has committed to purchasing JSF aircraft and they plan to train in the U.S. until approximately 2014 when they will standup their own Training Center. Some nations have expressed the desire to have Training Centers closer to home to minimize travel costs associated with U.S. Training Centers. Australia and turkey are current evaluating having a training Center in country. Another possibility is a European Training Center.

Question: Where will pilot training for the other nations take place?

Answer: The location for other nations' pilot training is not finalized. At this time only the United Kingdom has committed to purchasing JSF aircraft and they plan to train in the U.S. until approximately 2014 when they will standup their own Training Center. Expectations are some nations will request their initial instructor cadre be trained in the U.S. with long-term pilot training in their country. Other nations indicate they may desire long-term pilot training in the U.S.

Question: Do those sites have experience in international training?
Answer: BRAC recommended Eglin AFB as the initial training site and currently there is not a school house training mission there. However, Air Education and Training Command has vast experience in both pilot and maintenance international training. Once the JSF training Center at Elgin is opened the schoolhouse will instructors and staff experienced in international training.

Question: Is there any provision of any contract with any company which stipulates that initial or subsequent training of entry-level aviators and maintenance technicians will be conducted at a single site?
Answer: Today only the System Development and Demonstration contract with Lockheed Martin exists. This contract addresses only the initial training center where both pilot and maintenance training will be conducted. When approved production and sustainment contracts will be award addressing follow-on training centers. Base on the current projections, a minimum of three U.S. training sites will be required to support training requirements. The concept for the additional sites is not finalized. The follow the concept of integrated training (pilot and maintainers at the same location) or they may be Pilot Training Centers and a Maintenance Training Center at separate locations.

MEDICAL/DENTAL TRAINING: This recommendation will result in reduced infrastructure and excess system capacity. In addition, the development of a joint training center will result in standardized training for medical enlisted specialties enhancing interoperability and joint deployability. Co-location of medical enlisted training with related military clinical activities of the San Antonio Regional Medical Center at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston TX, provides increased opportunities to bring clinical insight, both practical and faculty, into the real-time training environment. As a result, both the healthcare delivery and training experiences are enhanced.

The Medical JCSG used certified data through the capacity data call, military value data call, and the scenario development data call to obtain certified responses for each recommendation. The certification process was overseen by the DoD Inspector General and the Government Accounting Office.

Question: Do medical and dental students currently attend the same classes?

Answer: This was a level of detail not examined during the FY05 BRAC data calls. During implementation, if the recommendation is approved, the finalization of a joint curriculum will be accomplished.

Question: Are there any reasons that enlisted medical and dental training must be conducted at the same site?
Answer: Yes. The MJCSG's intent was to collocate of all medical enlisted training programs. Thus, laying the foundation for transition to a joint program and enhancing interoperability of all three Services and reducing long-term costs.

Question: What is the cost or savings of consolidating only the dental training mission at Ft. Sam Houston?
Answer: Initially, the MJCSG explored collocation of selected training programs. However, it was the military judgment of the MJCSG, that the collocation of all medical basic and specialty training would provide the best overall solution for the Department.

Question: Was Sheppard or any other site considered for conducting only dental training?
Answer: Same as above.

Question: As a result of consolidation, will the overall training concept for medical curricula change? Have all Services agreed to one medical curriculum so that efficiency savings can be achieved? If so, what is the plan to implement the new curricula?
Answer: Decisions regarding the curricula were not within the scope of the MJCSG BRAC 2005 process. The senior medical leadership of the Medical JCSG anticipates that a joint medical training program will be developed that will allow flexibility for the inclusion of Service specific training. The details will be developed during implementation.

Question: The Air Force currently breaks down their medical training into two phases. Does current phase I training require access to hospitals?
What percentage of current phase I training curriculum is enhanced by gaining access to a hospital.
Answer: As with any training program, exposure to the real-word environment significantly enhances the training experience and student performance.

Question: Will phase I training be modified to include additional training in hospitals? If so what percentage of the training will occur in hospitals?
Answer: These details will be determined in execution/implementation of the recommendation.

Question: What percentage of current phase II training is occurs in hospitals?
Answer: Currently 100% of Phase II training occurs in hospitals.

Question: What percentage of current phase II training curriculum is enhanced by gaining access to a hospital?
Answer: All Phase II training is accomplished in a hospital.

Question: Will phase II training continue to be performed at bases throughout the country, or will it all be conducted at Fort Sam Houston?
Answer: These details will be determined in execution/implementation of the recommendation.

Question: If additional training days will be incorporated into the new program at Fort Sam Houston, does the estimate of $253 million in MILCON expenditures take into consideration the increased number of berthing, dining, and classroom capacities that will be required above those allocated at the current installations to accommodate this elongation of the training process?
Answer: Yes. The MILCON estimate provides increased academic training space and support facilities, such as berthing and dining, to accommodate the additional students.

Question: How many Permanent Party Military, Civilians, and Students will be moved from other bases to Fort Sam Houston?
Answer:

	PP Mil	Civilian	Student
Sheppard	478	66	1,578
Great Lakes	145	10	1,700
Portsmouth	97	10	350
San Diego	223	25	1,337

Question: How many enlisted medical students from each of the services are being trained at Sheppard, Great Lakes, San Diego, Portsmouth, and Ft. Sam Houston?
Answer: The BRAC data calls did not specify students by Service. The total numbers are provided in Question 7.

Question: How many enlisted dental students from each of the services are being trained at Sheppard, Great Lakes, San Diego, Portsmouth, and Ft. Sam Houston?
Answer: The BRAC data calls did not specify students by Service. The total numbers are provided below. These numbers represent the student throughput for the bases listed and are not adjusted for the length of the courses.

	Students/Year
Sheppard	1235
San Diego	51

Ft Sam Houston	416

Question: What is the timing of relocating Medical Training to Fort Sam Houston by Installation?
Answer:

	Year Planned
Sheppard	2009
Great Lakes	2009
Portsmouth	2009
San Diego	2009

BILLETS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT: (Please ensure coordination between OSD and Air Force.)

In a memorandum for OSD BRAC Clearinghouse, From 1420 Air Force Pentagon, Re OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker #0123: BRAC Question Regarding Sheppard AFB, it states:

"Seventy-five military and 15 civilian positions that support the medical training mission would be eliminated due to consolidation efficiencies gained by moving to one location. The Air Force also identified 93 military and 73 civilian base operating support positions that would be eliminated with this action."

Question: Detail the 75 military and 15 civilian positions that support Sheppard's medical training mission and would be eliminated.
Answer: The 75 military positions would consist of 12 officers and 63 enlisted positions. This was based on a savings from consolidation of 10% of the instructor staff and 20% of the support staff. The instructor staff savings included 4 officers, 32 enlisted, and 1 civilian. The support staff savings included 8 officers, 31 enlisted, and 14 civilians. The savings for consolidation was consistent with similar savings developed by the Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group.

Question: When would those positions be eliminated?
Answer: The positions were scheduled for elimination in FY09 to coincide with the relocation to Ft Sam Houston. Final determinations will be developed in the implementation of this recommendation, if approved.

Question: Specifically identify each of the 93 military and 73 civilian base operating support positions that would be eliminated.
Answer: The BOS positions will be specifically identified at the MAJCOM level during the execution of the realignment action

Question: How were these positions identified?
Answer: Reference question 1.c., the positions have not yet been identified.

Question: When would each be eliminated?
Answer: The positions were scheduled for elimination in FY09 to coincide with the relocation to Ft Sam Houston. Final determinations will be developed in the implementation of this recommendation, if approved.

Question: In order to eliminate those base operating support positions, how many instructors, students, and other personnel, were assumed to be present throughout the entire base?
Answer: The number of BOS positions that are realigned is determined by the number of mission positions that are realigned, not by the number of mission positions that will remain.

Question: If no specific positions have been identified for elimination, who made this estimate and how were these numbers calculated?
Answer: The estimate for the BOS positions was made by AF/DPM. A standard 8% BOS factor (from AFI 38-201) was applied to the number of positions being realigned from Sheppard to determine the support tail that should be realigned as well.

Question: In calculating the estimated economic impact from reductions in positions at Sheppard AFB, what formula or other calculations were used in estimating the economic consequences from a loss of :
a. Permanent party military billets?
b. Civilian positions?
c. Student billets?
Answer: Economic impact for all BRAC actions, measured in terms of total potential job change, was estimated using the Economic Impact Tool (EIT) developed by Booz-Allen, Hamilton for the Secretary of Defense. The estimating methodology is detailed in the Economic Impact Joint Process Action Team Report available on the DoD BRAC webpage at:
http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/minutes/brac_action.html

FOR AIR FORCE:

Question: If the Medical Joint Cross-Service Group recommendation is implemented and the 768,000 square feet of space is vacated at Sheppard AFB, what does the Air Force intend to do with that space?
Answer: To determine the best future use of this space, the Air Force will evaluate space vacated by the Medical JCSG recommendation during the site survey process based on: (1) current and/or future mission requirements; (2) condition and location(s) of the space; and (3) economic feasibility to re-utilize the space for current and/or future mission requirements. Depending on these

factors, the Air Force will determine if the vacated space should be excessed, demolished, or remain within the Air Force real property portfolio.

Question: Please provide an unclassified disk with all available information pertaining to Sheppard AFB.
Answer: All available data for Sheppard AFB may be accessed through the following websites:

http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/

http://www.brac.gov/

Approved

LT Col, USAF

FOR
DAVID L. JOHANSEN, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Base Realignment and Closure Division