

# From The Point To The Point



4th Quarter 2015 Volume 19

**M**ARINE  
**E**XCELLENCE  
**C**ENTER for  
**C**ONTROLLING  
**A**IRCRAFT

**The Best ATC Training Facility in the Marine Corps**

## Table of Contents

<b>From The Point</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Training</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>To the Point</b>	<b>6</b>

ATC Facility Officer – Maj Jose R. Hernandez  
SNCOIC – MSgt Matthew C. Danque  
Training Chief – GySgt Louie S. Cruz  
Tower Chief – GySgt Joseph M. Derringer  
Radar Chief – SSgt Matthew H. Hartka  
Writer/Editor – Joseph G. Hendrickson

### On the Cover

ATNAVICS antenna sits on a pad next to Runway 32L in preparation for a certification test in Feb 2008.

This quarterly newsletter is published solely by the Editor and does not imply any consent, approval or endorsement by the ATCFO or the commander of MCAS Cherry Point.

[WWW.CHERRYPOINTATC.COM](http://WWW.CHERRYPOINTATC.COM)

Jan 2016

# From The Point

## GySgt Pugh Selected for Promotion, Reenlists and Gets Orders

GySgt Lee A. Pugh has been selected for promotion to Master Sergeant and on December 16<sup>th</sup> he reenlisted for another tour.



GySgt Pugh started his ATC career here at Cherry Point as a lat-mover back in June of 2005, receiving qualifications on Radar Flight Data, Radar Final Control Approach East and Arrival Control. He transferred on 29 Jan 2007. When GySgt Pugh returned on 12 Jan 2015, he assumed the responsibilities of our TERPS Chief.

GySgt Pugh's next assignment will be with the Weapons and Tactics Training Program (WTTP) at Marine Air Control Squadron 2 (MACS-2) right here at Cherry Point.

## Radar Chief Found

After many months of grueling competition and numerous interviews, SSgt Matthew H. Hartka became our latest fully qualified Radar Chief on 6 Oct 2015. He arrived at the facility on 27 May 2014 and received his last qualification on 4 Sep 2015. Once he met the requirements as an instructor on all radar positions, he was promptly knighted.

## Trainer of the Year 2015

Ms. Jill L. Adair has been selected as the MCAS Cherry Point Trainer of the Year. Jill returned to the facility as a civilian tower controller in August 2014 and during her first full year, outperformed all other civilians as an instructor. She provided 528 hours of OJT and 55 hours of simulation training to 30 Marines during the year.

Jill assisted in the training of Tower Supervisors and helped her crew qualify 7 Marines on Tower Flight Data, 6 on Ground Control and 4 on Local Control.

## Controller of the Quarter

LCpl Matthew J. Stoll has been awarded the Controller of the Quarter for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2015.

During the quarter, LCpl Stoll was both an instructor and trainee, combining for a total of 143 hours of training. He was designated as an OJT Instructor on Tower Flight Data and Ground Control while training and then qualifying on Radar Flight Data. He is currently training for his 4<sup>th</sup> position on Radar Final Control.

Congratulations to LCpl Stoll!

## Civilians Awarded

On November 30<sup>th</sup> 2015, four of our civilians received civilian service awards for their efforts during the airspace expansion. Awarded medals were Jeffrey S. Knipple, Jason D. Woodin, Timothy L. Henry and Joseph G. Hendrickson. The medals were presented by Col Pappas, Commanding Officer of MCAS Cherry Point at a ceremony in the Airfield Operations lobby.

Although these awards indicated a time frame of only one year, all of these individuals were involved in this concept as active duty Marines when it was originally presented in December 1996.

# From The Point

## Top Five Civilian OJT Instructors

Jill L. Adair	527.62
John M. Holbrook	434.40
Michael T. Seabrook	423.18
William H. Ness	388.00
Judson W. Woodard	367.75

## Top Five Marine OJT Instructors

Cpl Andrew J. Davis	368.02
SSgt Chance J. Newsome	297.25
Cpl Edward J. Ayala	241.83
Cpl James E. Entzi	225.48
Cpl Stewart L. Bohannon	208.73

## Top Five Simulator Instructors

Cpl Benjamin Bonilla	120.17
Cpl Edward J. Ayala	82.17
Cpl Zachary N. Heber	74.43
Cpl Richard J. Hession	70.25
Daniel J. McIlhenny	61.75

## Top Five Trainees (OJT+Simulation Hours)

LCpl Daron D. Prescod	390.10
LCpl Samuel R. Klaiber	378.98
Sgt Shinae A. Vedder	359.50
Cpl Kevin J. Harte	336.33
Cpl Justin D. McDaniel	335.25

## TRACON and Facility Ratings

Cpl Benjamin Bonilla	29 Sep 15	TRACON
SSgt Matthew H. Hartka	4 Sep 15	TRACON
Cpl Zachary N. Heber	24 Jun 15	TRACON
Cpl Derek C. Boti	30 Nov 15	Facility
Sgt Jonte N. Allen	11 Dec 15	Facility
Cpl Edward J. Ayala	22 Dec 15	TRACON

## Rookie of the Year

LCpl John-Paul Pineiro 331.62 Total Hours

## Civilian Instructor Milestones

John M. Holbrook	6,000 OJT Instructor Hours
William H. Ness	5,000 OJT Instructor Hours
Timothy R. Klinger	4,000 OJT Instructor Hours

## Cherry Point Records Broken in 2015

### OJT Instructor Hours – Career

John M. Holbrook – 6,247.25

### Training Chief – Career (GySgt Cruz)

Most simulation hours – 3,531 Hours  
 Most Approach North Qualifications - 13  
 Most Arrival Control Qualifications - 19

## Crew of the Year

The competition this year was extremely close between the crews with all three crews excelling in different categories. Last year the scores had a gap of 25 points but this year only 4 points separated the crews and after the dust cleared, the returning champions Crew 3 retained the honor as Crew of the Year.

Crew 3 beat out the other two crews in Total OJT Hours (4,785), OJT Hours per Trainee (150) and RFC Simulation per Trainee (109).

Crew 1 had the most qualifications with 62 and Crew 2 documented the most simulation with 728 hours.

# Training

## Training Program Statistics

	<u>Oct-Dec</u>
OJT Hours	2,863.25
OJF Hours	309.67
Tower Simulation (Training)	127.45
Radar Simulation (Training)	246.27
Simulated GCAs	1,440
MOSs Issued	15
Position Qualifications	44

## From The Schoolhouse

PFC Thomas Nguyen	6 Oct 15
PFC Pedro A. Zamora	21 Oct 15
LCpl Anthony J. Koch	17 Nov 15
PFC Andrew A. Plata	17 Nov 15
LCpl Maxwell T. Lundgren	30 Nov 15
PFC Thomas L. Godfrey	2 Dec 15
PFC Troy D. Farrington	2 Dec 15

## Qualifications

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>MOS</u>
GySgt L. S. Cruz	6 Oct 15	APW	
GySgt J. M. Derringer	7 Oct 15	APW	7253/54
LCpl B. T. Twiner	7 Oct 15	RD	
Cpl D. C. Boti	8 Oct 15	AR	
LCpl J. E. Tarver	15 Oct 15	RD	
Sgt J. J. Hall	16 Oct 15	GC	7257T
Sgt C. T. Debevec	19 Oct 15	RD	
Cpl C. E. Clark	23 Oct 15	APE	
Cpl A. J. Davis	27 Oct 15	LC	7252
LCpl A. R. Allen	28 Oct 15	RD	7257R
Cpl Z. N. Heber	28 Oct 15	FD	
Cpl J. L. Wurtsmith	2 Nov 15	RD	
Sgt T. E. Price	4 Nov 15	LC	7252
Sgt S. A. Vedder	17 Nov 15	APW	7253/54
LCpl M. J. Stoll	17 Nov 15	RD	
LCpl M. E. English	17 Nov 15	RD	
Cpl M. A. Hollingsworth	17 Nov 15	GC	7257T

## Qualifications

<u>Name</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>MOS</u>
Cpl J. E. Entzi	18 Nov 15	LC	7252
Cpl C. E. Clark	21 Nov 15	APN	
Cpl J. D. McDaniel	21 Nov 15	APN	
Cpl D. C. Boti	30 Nov 15	APN	
LCpl J. Pineiro	2 Dec 15	FC	7257R
LCpl B. P. Doherty	4 Dec 15	GC	
PFC M. A. Beacham	7 Dec 15	FD	
Cpl A. L. Tsang	8 Dec 15	RD	
LCpl D. D. Prescod	8 Dec 15	RD	
Cpl E. J. Ayala	9 Dec 15	APE	
LCpl B. P. Doherty	10 Dec 15	FD	7257T
LCpl D. T. CurryCavalier	11 Dec 15	FD	
Sgt Jonte N. Allen	11 Dec 15	LC	7252
Cpl S. M. Browning	17 Dec 15	FD	
Cpl A. L. Tsang	21 Dec 15	FC	7257R
Cpl E. J. Ayala	22 Dec 15	APN	
Cpl C. A. Browning	23 Dec 15	GC	7257T



# To The Point

with  
Joe Hendrickson

## MANNING FORMULAS

One of the more entertaining aspects of facility management is the occasional determination of required manning levels. We've all done the drill of pulling out and dusting off the Table of Organization (T/O) only to be both amused and frustrated at how it doesn't look anything like your facility.

Most of us don't know how these tables originated and how they have been whittled away over the decades, but we often use them if they favor our argument or hide them if they don't. Manning formulas are used the same way; if they indicate more bodies are needed we like it, if they say less we judge them to be faulty.

In 1994 we were heading toward a disastrous manning situation and needed an acceptable formula to support our shortfall and bolster our courses of action. Maj Muhlenberg prepared a brief for the 1995 ATC conference based on the FAA model. This formula analyzed the 37<sup>th</sup> busiest day of the year by counting the operating positions that were required. A multiplier of 1.6 was factored in to account for leave and training. One problem with this is if a facility is already undermanned and a 90% traffic day is analyzed, was a position vacant due to redundancy or non-availability? If non-availability, the formula that would have justified filling the position is now working to keep it vacant.

At the time it worked to justify hiring additional civilians since the positions could not be filled by Marines. One must conclude that the number counts only qualified controllers since position manning is the purpose. Ultimately, they would all be qualified on all positions unless some are hired for specific branches.

Around 2005 another formula was introduced as the Velez formula which also used the 37<sup>th</sup> busiest day. It attempted to account for training progression and attrition but again only computed the requirements to man a facility.

The formula required numerous calculations for time to train on each operating position. The attrition rate of 37.5 months was based on a Navy facility and was not adjustable. This formula also didn't tackle the ever present question of how many civilians are needed.

These formulas also do not suggest a crew rotation. They usually lead one to fill individual slots. The more popular three crew system appears to be incompatible with the formulas.

On 20 May 2014, a manning formula was added to OPNAV 3722.35A based on data that was collected 10 years earlier. This formula explained the multiplier by stating that 33 percent of the time training is conducted and 4 percent of the time controllers are in a grounded status, therefore, position requirements were simply multiplied by 1.37.

So now we have three formulas. How many are required to be Full Performance Level (FPL) vs trainees is unknown but we obviously don't fill operating positions with trainees. Each of these formulas have two main ingredients, (1) determine the number of positions required on a 90% day, (2) multiply that number by a logical amount needed to provide replacements due to attrition, leave or medical issues. It all comes down to the multiplier. The FAA formula appears to be consistent with the way FAA facilities are managed. The Velez formula appears to be compatible with the standard training and attrition of Navy facilities. The newest OPNAV formula simplifies Velez but accounts for only 33% training, medical grounding and no annual leave.

Staffing should be based on a goal. What is the goal expected at this facility? All of these formulas emphasize training but only to the level of attrition or replacement. My goal is to train to the level of capacity. Perhaps a category could be added to the multiplier for those facilities that can provide calculated capacities so that a maximum manning level can be established.

Even though our careers are continuously evaluated, mentored, counseled and reported on based on our performance, there is nothing in our system that evaluates the performance of our facilities. What can be expected, what can be considered accomplished, what is exceptional? I now have almost 20 years of training data and, by studying graphs and trends, I can estimate how many qualifications we should be able to attain given certain factors of student flow and attrition, neither of which I can anticipate. I am satisfied that the results of each year's accomplishments can be evaluated after the fact to determine how well we did based on our resources. I cannot accurately forecast the coming year because the resources are unknown.

What comes out of that data is a Maximum Training Capacity for each position. The number of hours available to train is finite and the maximum performance is calculable. Coincidentally, the average amount of time used for training with a healthy student flow is about the same as the OPNAV formula, around 33%. But I calculate our best performance level at 44%. Unfortunately, I believe these formulas picture a crew of 20 qualified controllers and 8 trainees when our typical scenario is just the opposite. There are about 8 controllers that are not training and the other 20 are constantly balancing time they are needed as a qualified controller with time needed to train. If we didn't always need trainees to work other positions, we would probably have trainees on 60-70% of the time.

Based on 2014 number, MCAS Cherry Point's average training capacity is 173 qualifications per year; however, based on best performance factors our maximum capacity is 252 qualifications per year. Our maximum student flow is based on our capacity to qualify at the senior positions of Local Control, Approach Control and Arrival Control which is currently 40. These numbers have been proven to be attainable when in April 2012 we reached a student flow of 36 and by the end of that year had 252 position qualifications. I have always considered Cherry Point to be a training facility since 50 out of the 70 Marines are always training and nearly all of them continue to train until they leave or become fully qualified.

I think each of these formulas give a manager a place to start and realistically establish an absolute minimum. The reality is that on paper anything over the minimum is considered extra. The multiplier determines the ability of the facility to merely survive or to excel.