

**FISCAL YEAR 1978 AUTHORIZATION FOR
MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT, AND ACTIVE
DUTY, SELECTED RESERVE, AND CIVIL-
IAN PERSONNEL STRENGTHS**

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 1210

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1978 FOR PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, NAVAL VESSELS, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, TORPEDOES, AND OTHER WEAPONS, AND RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND TO PRESCRIBE THE AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH FOR EACH ACTIVE DUTY COMPONENT AND OF THE SELECTED RESERVE OF EACH RESERVE COMPONENT OF THE ARMED FORCES AND OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, AND TO AUTHORIZE THE MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

PART 3

Manpower and Personnel

MARCH 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 1977



Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

86-996

WASHINGTON : 1977

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL
HEARINGS
ON
THE
MILITARY SERVICE OF WOMEN
IN THE
ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES
JANUARY 10, 1964

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi, *Chairman*

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington	JOHN TOWER, Texas
✓HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada	STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, New Hampshire	BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia	WILLIAM L. SCOTT, Virginia
SAM NUNN, Georgia	DEWEY F. BARTLETT, Oklahoma
✓JOHN C. CULVER, Iowa	JESSE HELMS, North Carolina
✓GARY HART, Colorado	JAKE GARN, Utah
DALE BUMPERS, Arkansas	
ROBERT MORGAN, North Carolina	
WENDELL R. ANDERSON, Minnesota	

FRANCIS J. SULLIVAN, *Staff Director*
JOHN T. TICE, *Chief Clerk*
SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

SAM NUNN, Georgia, *Chairman*
HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia
JOHN C. CULVER, Iowa
WENDELL R. ANDERSON, Minnesota
WILLIAM L. SCOTT, Virginia
DEWEY F. BARTLETT, Oklahoma
JESSE HELMS, North Carolina

(II)



QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN TOWER

[Questions submitted by Senator John Tower, answers supplied by Department of Defense.]

Senator TOWER. What are different types of flight training that the Navy now conducts and at what location are these phases conducted?

ANSWER.

NAVAL AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Command: Location: Squadron	Type training	A/C utilized
Training 1: NAS Meridian, Miss.: VT-9, 19..... VT-7.....	Intermediate strike..... Advanced strike.....	T-2C TA-4J
Training 2: NAS Kingsville, Tex.: VT-23..... VT-21, 22.....	Intermediate strike..... Advanced strike.....	T-2C TA-4J
Training 3: NAS Chase Field, Tex.: VT-26..... VT-24, 25.....	Intermediate strike..... Advanced strike.....	T-2C TA-4J
Training 4: NAS Corpus Christi, Tex.: VT-27..... VT-28, 31.....	Primary, int maritime and helo..... Advanced maritime.....	T-28 TS-2A
Training 5: NAS Whiting Field, Fla.: VT-2, 3, 6..... HT-8..... HT-18.....	Primary, int maritime and helo..... Basic helo..... Advanced helo.....	T-28 TH-57 TH-1
Training 6: NAS Pensacola, Fla.: VT-4..... VT-10..... VT-86.....	Intermediate strike, advanced strike..... NFO basic..... NFO advanced (jet nav, RIO).....	T-2C, TA-4J T-39, T-2C T-39, TA-4J
Navairtu: ¹ Mather AFB, Calif.....	NFO advanced navigation.....	T-43

¹ Training conducted under the interservice undergraduate navigator training conducted by Air Force augmented with Navy instructors.

Senator TOWER. At what air training bases has the Navy *ceased* flight training operations over the past 5 years?

ANSWER. The Navy ceased flight training operations at the following bases as indicated:

NAS Ellyson, Fla.—December 31, 1973.

NAS Glynco, Ga.—June 1, 1974.

NAS Saufley, Fla.—December 1, 1976.

Also the following outlying fields located in the Pensacola operating area have been closed as indicated:

Canal	1973	Magnolia	1975
Site 5	1973	Faircloth	1975
Site 4A	1975	Silverhill	1975
Kaiser	1975	Kings	1975
Summerdale	1975		

Senator TOWER. What has been the disposition of these bases?

ANSWER.

NAS Ellyson. Headquarters for Chief of Naval Education Training Support (CNET Support) and Naval Education Training Program Development Center (NETPDC).

NAS Glynco. Runways have been turned over to GLYNN County. Other facilities were turned over to the Department of the Treasury, which uses them for the consolidated Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

NAS Saufley. Presently used as an outlying field for NAS Whiting.

Senator TOWER. What plans are under consideration with respect to future activity at Ellyson and Saufley?

ANSWER. The Navy plans to move the Ellyson activities to Saufley and then excess Ellyson.

Senator TOWER. How many squadrons of what type would then remain at North and South Whiting?

ANSWER. If Congress approves the consolidation of helicopter training, three primary and intermediate maritime training squadrons, VT-2, VT-3 and VT-6, would remain at North Whiting Field. Separate from the helicopter consolidation issue, should the decision be made to reduce NAS Corpus Christi to a NAF then South Whiting Field could be utilized in support of maritime training using the T-44A aircraft, while already being used as an outlying field for the squadrons located at North Whiting Field.

Senator TOWER. Under the proposed realignment, would the number of required moves for student pilots receiving jet training be reduced?

ANSWER. This cannot be stated until there is a fully approved realignment plan.

Senator TOWER. Has the Navy considered moving the six jet training squadrons in Texas to Pensacola so as to reduce the number of required moves?

ANSWER. No. Sufficient runways of the required length and the dedicated airspace needed to conduct jet training by six training squadrons are not available in the Pensacola area.

Senator TOWER. If the Navy can't eliminate these costly moves for its jet pilots by taking the jets to where the basic training is, then has it ever proposed putting some basic training squadrons at or near where the jet squadrons are?

ANSWER. The permanent change of station (PCS) and travel funds associated with the one-time movement of the student jet pilot from the Pensacola area to either Naval Air Station (NAS) Kingsville, or NAS Chase in Texas, or NAS Meridian, Mississippi are considered to be economical when the entire concept of Navy undergraduate pilot training and the organization with the Naval Air Training Command (NATRACOM) is evaluated.

All students entering the NATRACOM are ordered to Naval Aviation Schools Command at NAS Pensacola where they undergo either a 4 week aviation indoctrination course if they are commissioned officers, or 12 weeks aviation indoctrination and officer candidate training if they are commissioned aviation officer candidates. NAS Pensacola is the only base equipped for this indoctrination and training which includes use of facilities and personnel of the Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory and Naval Aerospace Medical Institute for Aviation Physical and Physiological Screening and Flight Physiology. In addition, water and land survival training and physical conditioning are conducted in conjunction with aviation indoctrination.

Upon completion of pre-flight training, approximately 80 percent of the undergraduate pilot training students are assigned to NAS Whiting Field, Milton, Florida. The remaining students are assigned to Training Squadron Twenty-Seven at NAS Corpus Christi, Texas for primary training. This dual track is a temporary expedient only and will terminate upon delivery of sufficient T34C aircraft at NAS Whiting Field (North). This single basing of primary training should occur by the end of fiscal year 1978.

The assignment of the students to NAS Whiting is administrative in nature and no travel or dislocation obligations are incurred. The relocation of the students to NAS Corpus Christi on the other hand requires expenditure of travel or dislocation funds. The primary flight training conducted at NAS Whiting Field (North) and NAS Corpus Christi provide all student inputs for the intermediate and advanced training pipelines (strike, maritime and helicopter).

Since the basic phase of training experiences the highest attrition rate, this location, convenient to initial point of entry, provides the most cost effective organization for screening the unsuccessful student aviator. In a similar concept, the student naval flight officer receives the same aviation indoctrination at the Naval Aviation Schools Command and is then assigned to Forrest Sherman Field at NAS Pensacola without the expenditure of funds. Keeping these phases of training in the same local area is highly efficient.

Approximately 40 percent of the undergraduate pilot training students, upon successful completion of the basic flight training phase, are transferred to one of the jet training bases where they receive intermediate training in the T2C aircraft and advanced training in the TA4 aircraft.

Senator Tower. Has this alternative ever been analyzed in terms of the current Navy air training structure? (If so, provide a copy of such a study for the record.)

ANSWER. A specific alternative of relocating basic training at or near the intermediate and advanced training base to eliminate the cost of student permanent change of station (PCS) or travel has not been developed. However, the feasibility of this concept of operations has been considered and judged detrimental to flight safety because it involves mixing slower primary training aircraft with higher speed intermediate and advanced jet aircraft at a single site. The alternative of consolidating all the basic fixed wing training at NAS Corpus Christi is under evaluation at this time.

Senator Tower. Do all Navy pilots receiving jet training at Kingsville and Beeville, NAS Corpus Christi and at Meridian, Mississippi, currently have to receive primary and basic training at Pensacola?

ANSWER. Approximately 80 percent of Navy pilots receiving jet training at NAS Kingsville, NAS Chase Field, NAS Pensacola, and NAS Meridian received their primary training at NAS Whiting. The remaining 20 percent received their primary training at NAS Corpus Christi. No jet training is conducted at NAS Corpus Christi.

Senator Tower. Then they and their families are transferred from one base to another before they even receive their wings?

ANSWER. Yes. All jet flight training students are transferred from the base at which they receive primary training to the base at which they receive jet training (intermediate and advanced).

Senator Tower. How much does this cost each year? (Average over last 5 years) Provide exact data for record.

ANSWER.

	Cost	Cost per student
PENSACOLA TO KINGSVILLE AND BEEVILLE		
Fiscal year:		
1976.....	\$445,200	\$1,060
1975.....	333,450	975
1974.....	332,112	814
1973.....	400,302	706
1972.....	543,817	691
Total cost.....	2,054,881	NA
Average over last 5 years.....	410,976	814
PENSACOLA TO MERIDIAN		
Fiscal year:		
1976.....	116,369	781
1975.....	82,915	721
1974.....	86,565	597
1973.....	131,796	523
1972.....	237,104	511
Total cost.....	654,749	NA
Average over last 5 yrs.....	130,950	582

Senator TOWER. Under the current organization, is the same thing true for multi-engine student pilots who receive advanced training at Corpus Christi?

ANSWER. Approximately 20 percent of Navy pilots receiving multi-engine training at NAS Corpus Christi also received their primary training at Corpus Christi; the remainder received primary training at NAS Whiting.

Senator TOWER. How much have these moves cost each year? (Average over last 5 years.)

ANSWER.

PENSACOLA TO CORPUS CHRISTI

	Cost	Cost per student
Fiscal year:		
1976		
1975	\$688,636	\$1,066
1974	648,760	980
1973	567,692	818
1972	502,677	711
	454,530	695
Total cost	2,862,295	NA
Average over last 5 years	572,459	851

Senator TOWER. Now, can you outline the proposed realignments to the Navy Air training Command and indicate when you expect these actions to take place?

ANSWER. A series of realignment alternatives have been developed and are being analyzed. It is not possible to state, at this time, the full scope or timing of possible realignment actions. However, the following four actions are being considered as part of the total realignment actions:

- a. Redesignate NAS Corpus Christi as a Naval Air Facility, which will maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units at the Naval Air Training Command and other activities and units as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.
- b. Relocate Chief of Naval Air Training (CNATRA) to Saufley Field.
- c. Continue Training Squadron Twenty-Seven (VT-27) operations at NAF Corpus Christi for an indefinite period.
- d. Continue regional centralized support of Eighth Naval District activities.

Senator TOWER. The matter of outlying fields is one that I would like to explore further. Can you substantiate the alleged requirement for 7 outlying fields to support primary and basic flight training programs? The Air Force requires one auxiliary field for its undergraduate pilot training bases; the Navy has said it needs seven to support basic propeller training. I would like a fairly detailed explanation of that requirement for the record.

ANSWER. The Naval Air Training Command's stated requirements for seven outlying fields to support primary and basic flight training is based on the following criteria:

- a. There will be 172 of the T-34C aircraft at NAS Whiting Field in which eighty percent of all the Naval Air Training Command students will receive primary flight training.
- b. Eighty-five percent of these aircraft will be operationally ready on a daily basis (146 flyable aircraft).
- c. Under the Navy Integrated Flight Training Systems (NIFTS) mode of training, forty-five percent of the flyable aircraft (66) could be involved with familiarization training at any one time and at least fifty percent of these aircraft (33) would be in a touch and go landing pattern at an outlying field.
- d. The optimum number of aircraft in a single outlying field pattern varies with airspace restrictions, solo student proficiency, cross wind restrictions and type of landings which are being performed. Normally four aircraft is the maximum number of aircraft in which flight safety can be maximized and efficient training can be accomplished at a single outlying field. Increased density of operations, while feasible, lengthens the landing cycle time appreciably, increases the probability for traffic conflict, and increases the time to train each student. Having seven outlying fields allows the optimum of 4 aircraft in each field pattern and provides the essential flexibility to alter training areas when local weather patterns and cross winds make one or more of the outlying fields unsuitable for student landing practices.

Senator TOWER. Has the Navy analyzed the trade-offs in terms of costs between retaining the current training organization of moving pilots about from base to base and altering its training plan to permit single-site pilot training.

ANSWER. The Navy conducts specialized flight training, utilizing three pipelines, i.e., jet, multi-engine and helicopter. However, all students share the initial 13 week primary curriculum. After this initial primary training, students are selected for one of the three pipelines, based on their performance, aptitude and needs of the service. This specialized train-to-requirements method of flight training effectively optimizes training to meet the needs of the Navy operating forces. Efficiencies from this optimized training for Fleet requirements in the three pipelines are greater than would be realized in generalized single-site training even when balanced against the cost of student PCS moves. Further, due to the vastly different operating characteristics of primary prop aircraft and jet training planes, these two types of training need to be conducted at different bases in order to maximize safety of flight operations.

Senator TOWER. What is the status of the so-called NATO pilot training program, which I understand is now under consideration for possible location in several NATO countries, including the U.S.?

ANSWER. EURO-NATO pilot training is being studied by a ten nation working group. To date, the working group has agreed upon a syllabus and a methodology for determining the cost per graduate. Current tasking to the working group is to compare the cost of training in Europe (Italy or Turkey) vice that of the United States. This will be completed in May 1977 and forwarded to the NATO ministers for decision at their fall 1977 meeting.

Senator TOWER. How many pilots would this program involve in the course of a year?

ANSWER. The estimated annual output of EURO-NATO pilot training would be 320 pilots. Of these, approximately 210 would be non-U.S. students; about 110 would be U.S. students participating in the joint program. The United States is currently training some pilots for Germany, Denmark, and Norway. Consequently, less than 200 of the 320 would be additive to current output requirements.

The estimated annual output of 320 is based on the number of student pilots of the nations which have indicated, at least tentatively, an intent to participate in the joint program. It is conceivable that other NATO nations might join at some future date, but probably not before the 1990's.

Senator TOWER. Does the Air Forces believe that it could absorb these additional 200 student pilots into its training structure if the U.S. were chosen as the site for a NATO pilot training base?

ANSWER. The Air Force could accommodate an additional 200 non-U.S. student pilots, as well as programmed U.S. student pilots, within the proposed UPT basing structure.

Senator TOWER. Provide the Base Operating Support costs (including all overhaul expenditures) at each of the following bases for fiscal year 1976/77 and fiscal year 1977?

NAS Whiting Field (North and South)
 NAS Saufley Field
 NAS Ellyson Field
 NAS Pensacola
 NAS Corpus Christi

ANSWER. The following represents total operations and maintenance dollars for the Naval Air Station operations, and does not include military personnel pay and allowances or squadron operations.

[In thousands of dollars]

Naval Air Station	Fiscal year—		
	1976	1977	1977
Whiting Field.....	8,222	2,160	10,582
Saufley.....	3,358	856	500
Ellyson.....	(9)	(9)	(9)
Pensacola.....	28,840	7,803	28,732
Corpus Christi.....	15,668	3,702	12,678

¹ Includes \$1,804,000, T-34C maintenance contract.

² Continued operation of NAS Saufley in caretaker status, assumed by NAS Pensacola, Jan. 1, 1977.

³ Disestablished Dec. 31, 1973.

⁴ Includes \$739,000, T-44A maintenance contract.

[NOTE.—Total base O&MN costs as contrasted with base operations support budget definition which excludes aircraft maintenance, aircraft operations, and training departments.]

Senator TOWER. When was the Chief of Naval Air Training located in Corpus Christi?

ANSWER. The Chief of Naval Air Training (CNATRA) was located in Corpus Christi in July 1972.

Senator TOWER. Where was the Chief of Naval Air Training located before?

ANSWER. Prior to that date, CNATRA Headquarters was located at NAS Pensacola.

Senator TOWER. What base would the Chief of Naval Air Training move to under the proposed realignment and at what cost?

ANSWER. CNATRA Headquarters is being considered for movement to the proposed Naval Education and Training Program Development Center (NTPDC), Saufley Field, at a cost of \$1.17M, excluding military construction.

Senator TOWER. What is the justification for this move? When would it take place?

ANSWER. At Saufley, CNATRA Headquarters would be closer to the majority of the commands for which it is responsible, i.e., the Naval Aviation Schools Command, Multi-Engine Pilot Training, and Naval Flight Officer Training at Pensacola, and near primary training and helicopter training at NAS Whiting. The move, if it occurs, would take place after Corpus Christi was designated a Naval Air Facility.

Senator TOWER. Would there be any training squadrons assigned to the station where this staff would be based?

ANSWER. It is not expected that there would be any training squadrons based at Saufley. However, Saufley would be used as an outlying field for primary training.

Senator TOWER. What will be the military construction requirements at this station in order to accommodate the Chief of Naval Air Training staff?

ANSWER. One project costing approximately \$400,000 would be required to convert an existing permanent building (last used as BEQ, now vacant) at Saufley, Pensacola, Florida, to CNATRA Staff requirements.

Senator NUNN. Thank you very much. It was a good hearing. Thank you, sirs.

The subcommittee is recessed subject to call.

[Whereupon, at 1 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR TOWER

NAS Corpus Christi, TX

✓ Question #1: What base operating support funds have been requested in FY 78 for NAS Corpus Christi? What was the funding in FY 76, 77, and 78?

<u>Response:</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>FY 77</u>	<u>FY 78</u>
	\$15.668M	3.702M	12.678M
			0*

*No base operating support O&MN dollars are in the FY 78 budget for NAS Corpus Christi. However, there is a \$3.5M figure for one-time costs of realignment.

✓ Question #2: If a decision is made to reduce NAS Corpus Christi to a Naval Air Facility, what will be the annual base operating support requirements for the Navy in subsequent years.

Response: \$11.7M.

Question #3: Has the Navy discussed the impact of the reduction or closure of NAS Corpus Christi with the Army?

Response: Only informally, since there will be no marked impact on the Army.

Question #4: What support functions, services, and overhead costs would the Army be required to assume if the base were to be designated an NAF?

Response: If the Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi were designated a naval air facility, it would continue to provide to the Army the services that are now provided as a naval air station. There would be no support functions, services, or overhead costs passed to the Army because of this change that are not now paid by the Army. Primary difference between the base operating as an air station or as an air facility is in the support provided to naval aviation training rather than to other activities.

Question #5: What would be the impact on the Army if all Navy personnel and support were withdrawn?

Response: Preliminary discussions with the Army indicate that some support personnel, functions and funding would have to be transferred to the Army in order to continue the Army operation at Corpus Christi. Refinement will be required should Navy withdraw from NAS, Corpus Christi.

Question #6: Have the appropriate officials in OSD and D/A been advised of the impact of Navy reductions or withdrawal from NAS Corpus Christi as outlined above?

Response: No. Proposed realignment is still in review within Navy.

Question #7: If so, please provide a copy of any letters or memoranda which advises OSD and D/A of this impact?

Response: Not applicable.

Question #8: Has this impact been incorporated into the Navy's study of the proposed realignment action affecting NAS Corpus Christi?

Response: Impacts have been included in the Navy study.

Question #9: Has this consideration altered in any way the savings cited by the Navy in March 1976 when the realignment was first proposed? If so, how?

Response: The Navy announcement in March of 1976 only addressed proposed alternative actions for study and did not cite savings. These were to be developed in the study process.