

PERSONAL APPEARANCE		X RECORD REVIEW																		
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>YES</td> <td>NO</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>X</td> </tr> </table>		YES	NO		X	NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION		ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL												
YES	NO																			
	X																			
MEMBERS SITTING				VOTE OF THE BOARD																
				HON	GEN	UOTHC	OTHER	DENY												
[REDACTED]							-		X											
[REDACTED]							-		X											
[REDACTED]									X											
[REDACTED]									X											
[REDACTED]									X											
ISSUES AO100, A95.00		INDEX NUMBER A49.00		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>LETTER OF NOTIFICATION</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>BRIEF OF PERSONNEL FILE</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING</td> </tr> </table>			1	ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD	2	APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE	3	LETTER OF NOTIFICATION	4	BRIEF OF PERSONNEL FILE		COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD		ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE		TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING
1	ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD																			
2	APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE																			
3	LETTER OF NOTIFICATION																			
4	BRIEF OF PERSONNEL FILE																			
	COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD																			
	ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE																			
	TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING																			
HEARING DATE 22FEB01		CASE NUMBER 01-00029																		
REMARKS																				
Case heard at Andrews AFB, MD																				
Advise applicant of the decision of the Board, the right to appear before the Board with or without counsel, and the right to submit an application to the AFBCMR																				
SIGNATURE OF [REDACTED]			SIGNATURE OF BOARD PRESIDENT [REDACTED]																	
[REDACTED]			[REDACTED]																	
TO: SAF/MIBR 550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40 RANDOLPH AFB. TX 78150-4742			FROM: SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PERSONNEL COUNCIL AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD 1535 COMMAND DR, EE WING, 3 <sup>RD</sup> FLOOR ANDREWS AFB, MD 20762-7002																	

**AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE**

CASE NUMBER

**FD01-00029**

**GENERAL:** The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to Honorable.

The applicant was offered a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (Board) but declined to exercise this right.

**FINDINGS:** Upgrade of discharge is denied.

The Board finds that neither evidence of record nor that provided by the applicant substantiates an inequity or impropriety that would **justify** a change of discharge.

The Board finds that the applicant submitted no issues contesting the equity or propriety of the discharge, and, after a thorough review of the records, the Board was able to identify none. The applicant served 2 years and 9 months on active duty during which he received 1 Memorandum for Record, 5 Reports of Individual Counseling, and 5 Letters of Reprimand for various acts of misconduct and unsatisfactory performance. The Board opined that through these administrative actions the applicant had ample opportunities to change his negative/repetitive behavior. The many offenses of the applicant, although minor in nature when analyzed individually, amounted to an overall serious problem that could not be tolerated. The Board concluded the misconduct was a significant departure from the conduct expected of all military members.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The Discharge Review Board concludes that the discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the discretion of the discharge authority and that the applicant was provided full administrative due process.

In view of the foregoing findings the Board further concludes that there exists no legal or equitable basis for upgrade of discharge, thus the applicant's discharge should not be changed.

Attachment  
Examiner's Brief

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD  
ANDREWS AFB, MD

(Former A1C)

1. **MATTER UNDER REVIEW:** Appl rec'd a GEN Disch fr USAF 00/04/25 UP AFI 36-3208, para 5.26.1 & 5.26.3 (Unsatisfactory Performance). Appeals for Honorable Disch.

2. **BACKGROUND:**

a. DOB: 78/09/19. Enlmt Age: 18 8/12. Disch Age: 21 7/12. Educ:HS DIPL. AFQT: N/A. A-83, E-78, G-76, M-64. PAFSC: 2A631C - Aerospace Propulsion Apprentice. DAS: 97/11/25.

b. Prior Sv: AFRes 97/05/28 - 97/07/15 (1 month 18 days) (Inactive).

3. **SERVICE UNDER REVIEW:**

a. Enld as AB 97/07/16 for 4 yrs. Svd: 2 Yrs 9 Mo 10 Das, all AMS.

b. Grade Status: A1C - 98/11/16  
AMN-(EPR Indicates): 97/07/16-99/03/15

c. Time Lost: none.

d. Art 15's: none.

e. Additional: RIC, 05 AUG 98 - Adapting to military standards.  
RIC, 17 AUG 98 - Unsatisfactory Performance.  
MFR, 03 SEP 98 - Late for work.  
RIC, 18 MAR 99 - Failure to meet military standards.  
RIC, 22 APR 99 - Failure to follow instructions.  
RIC, 19 JUL 99 - Irresponsible/Poor control of government property.  
LOR, 09 AUG 99 - Failure to maintain military bearing and irresponsible/poor control of government property.  
LOR, 05 NOV 99 - Missed appointment.  
LOR, 10 MAR 00 - Failure to obey orders.  
LOR, 31 JAN 00 - Failure to obey orders & disrespect to a noncommissioned officer.

f. CM: none.

g. Record of SV: 97/07/16 99/03/15 Travis AFB 4 (Initial)  
99/03/16 00/03/01 Travis AFB 2 (Cmdr Dir)  
(Discharged from Travis AFB)

h. Awards & Decs: AFTR, AFOUA W/1 DEV.

i. Stmt of Sv: TMS: (2) Yrs (10) Mos (28) Das  
TAMS: (2) Yrs (9) Mos (10) Das

4. **BASIS ADVANCED FOR-REVIEW:** Appln (DD Fm 293) dtd 00/12/17.  
(Change Discharge to Honorable)

NO ISSUES SUBMITTED.

ATCH  
none.

01/01/25/ia

FD01-00029



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
HEADQUARTERS 60TH AIR MOBILITY WING (AMC)

MEMORANDUM FOR 60 AMW/CC

19 APR 2000

FROM: 60 AMW/JA  
510 Mulheron Street  
Travis AFB CA 94535-2406

SUBJECT: Legal Review of Administrative Discharge Under AFI 36-3208,  
[REDACTED]

1. **Initiation of Action:** I have reviewed the above-referenced action pertaining to [REDACTED] (Respondent) and I find it legally sufficient to support the recommended discharge action. On 4 Apr 00, 660 AGS/CC initiated separation action against Respondent pursuant to AFI 36-3208, paragraphs 5.26.1 and 5.26.3, for Unsatisfactory Duty Performance: Failure to Perform Assigned Duties Properly, and Failure to Progress in On-the-Job Training (OJT). The 660 AGS/CC recommended a general discharge characterization without probation and rehabilitation, and 60 LG/CC concurred. This 21-year-old respondent has 32 months of active service and 2 EPRs with overall ratings of 2 (referral) and 4. He has been awarded the Air Force Training Ribbon and Air Force Outstanding Unit Award (one device). A detailed summary of his personal data is contained in paragraph 2 of the Commander's Recommendation for Discharge letter, dated 17 Apr 00. After conferring with counsel, Respondent submitted a statement, including 4 character-reference letters, 7 letters of appreciation, a performance feedback worksheet, and a quality assessment worksheet. In his statement of 6 Apr 00, Respondent seeks retention in the Air Force or in the alternative, an honorable service characterization in order to preserve his Montgomery G.I. Bill (MGIB) educational entitlements (Tab3).

2. **Basis for Discharge:** Airmen are subject to discharge under AFI 36-3208, paragraphs 5.26.1 and 5.26.3 based on a documented failure to meet Air Force standards. The specific incidents are as follows:

a. Unsatisfactory Duty Performance, Failure to Perform Assigned Duties Properly, Paragraph 5.26.1 :

(1) On or about 4 Aug 98, [REDACTED] permitted Respondent to take a Mend to the airport during 2330 to 0730 mid-shift, provided that Respondent's work was completed and that he understood he was to report to the flight chiefs promptly in the morning. Respondent failed to return to work immediately following his trip to the airport, as instructed. Respondent never mentioned [REDACTED] that he was going to San Jose until later that evening. Although Respondent was given the permission, [REDACTED] never intended for him to be away for over 6 hours. Respondent never informed the unit that he would be late. Later, Respondent told [REDACTED] "I told [REDACTED] that I probably won't be coming back," which was untrue. For failing to return to duty, as instructed, Respondent received a record of individual counseling (RIC) on 5 Aug 98.

(2) On or about 11 Mar 99, Respondent failed to return/clear a Swiss files tool with Tool Crib. He was verbally counseled previously for not turning in/clearing all outstanding tools under his employee account number.

(3) On or about 11 Mar 99, Respondent lost a technical order (T.O.), but insisted it was not at COMBS, where he was working. A lost tool report was accomplished and his shift supervisor, SSgt [REDACTED] was left responsible to recover, resolve, and/or to locate the lost item. When asked if he had the T.O. with him while he was working at COMB's on the spare engine, he stated, "No, I did not have the T.O. there when I was pulling blades, I swear it was on the bobtail." When told to go back and look for it again, Respondent questioned his supervisor by saying, "what for, I've already checked there, it's not there." When told to go back and to check anyway, he muttered, "whatever." Respondent just admitted to his supervisors that he failed to use required T.O.'s while working maintenance. The lost item was eventually recovered from a spare engine, two spots from where Respondent was working.

(4) On or about 16 Mar 99, Respondent was tasked by [REDACTED] to install cotter pins on 6AE thrust reverse blocker doors on Aircraft 83-0080. Immediately after he left the aircraft, he started calling the specialist expediter, Phoenix 7, over the radio to pick him up. [REDACTED] told Respondent to remain at the aircraft and to continue working the blocker door installation. After he was told again to remain at the aircraft, Respondent began arguing with [REDACTED] over the radio, saying "I don't want to talk to you, I want to talk to Phoenix 7." This was one of the instances where Respondent used the radio to exhibit disrespect and lack of discipline to his superiors and trainers.

(5) On or about 16 Mar 99, after Respondent was told by [REDACTED] to install cotter pins on 6EA thrust reverse blocker doors, he was reluctant to do it. Respondent insisted the pins given to him would not go into the bolts. According to [REDACTED], they were correct according to T.O. 2-78. After [REDACTED] inspected and sampled one of the pins, he was able to fit them into the bolts. Respondent was again reluctant to complete the work, as instructed. He was again told to install the pins. After [REDACTED] re-inspected Respondent's work, he found the pins were not completely installed and secured. The excess was not snipped and bent down according to standard general practice procedures. Moreover, he found blocker door nuts only hand tight, and one each connection link bolt not installed. Respondent knowingly rendered an aircraft unsafe and passed it off as job completed in a hasty effort to go home for the day, which was conscious negligence and unsafe maintenance on his part.

(6) On 17 Mar 99, Respondent deliberately and knowingly interrupted [REDACTED] transmission over the radio several times, after he was clearly and distinctly ordered not to.

(7) On or about 17 Mar 99, Respondent was told to prep and begin assisting [REDACTED] with fan blade removal from the #3 engine of Aircraft 84-0187. Instead, he was found standing away from the aircraft visiting with crew chiefs and taking a smoke break, while [REDACTED] completed the task. For failing to perform assigned duties properly in paragraphs 2a(2) through 2a(7), Respondent received a letter of counseling on 17 Mar 99.

(8) On or about 20 Apr 99, ██████████ informed Respondent personally that he would be working 12-hour shift during the engine change of #1 Engine on Aircraft #79-1951. He repeated this instruction back to him to confirm it. On 21 Apr 99, Respondent was informed that the engine change that was put on hold was back in progress again and he would be working 12-hour shift. ██████████ reminded him as well. Then Respondent told them he was not instructed about it and he left for the day. For ignoring orders, Respondent received a RIC on 22 Apr 99.

(9) On or about 9 Jul 99, Respondent was specifically instructed to collect, inventory, and account for all borescope equipment items he and his shift used prior to going home. Respondent ensured ██████████ had done everything as instructed and the borescope set was completed. ██████████ checked the engine he was inspecting and found the eye/viewing attachment sitting inside the fan case, on the oil cooler. For his irresponsibility in accounting for government tools, Respondent was verbally counseled, as evidenced by a RIC on 19 Jul 99.

(10) On or about 15 Jul 99, Respondent neglected to accomplish a broken toolbox report. He had tools and other miscellaneous items turned over to your employee account number. Later, it was discovered that ██████████ had completed a broken tool report that Respondent should have accomplished because he broke the lock to the toolbox. The toolbox was turned over until Respondent received it again on his shift. It was located at Hangar 810, on top of the tailstand during the entire shift. Since he was not working at that location, it was left unattended and unsecured. Respondent told ██████████ that he told ██████████ about the broken toolbox, but ██████████ had not told Respondent to fill out a broken tool report. For not properly securing a government property, Respondent received a RIC on 19 Jul 99.

(11) On or about 23 Jul 99, while performing a main engine control change on Aircraft #83-0080, Respondent failed to maintain proper military bearing and improperly handled military property by throwing tools in frustration. Specifically, he became frustrated with the maintenance task being performed and began "swearing and yelling" as a result. Further, he admitted he may have "put down hard" tools used to perform the task. For his inappropriate conduct, Respondent received a letter of reprimand (LOR) on 9 Aug 99.

(12) On or about 28 Oct 99, Respondent missed a scheduled doctor's appointment. He told his supervisor about his 0900 doctor's appointment the previous day. As a consideration, Respondent was released at 1700 to ensure his availability for his morning appointment. For missing his doctor's appointment, Respondent received a LOR on 5 Nov 99.

(13) On or about 27 Jan 00, Respondent failed to comply with ██████████ orders on three different occasions. First, she twice asked Respondent to get on the launch truck but he ignored her orders. Respondent had to be told by another individual to comply with her directions. Second, ██████████ noticed Respondent was speeding through the parking lot in a government-owned vehicle, obviously exceeding the 5-mph speed limit. Third, ██████████ briefed the entire shift the next day to reduce their speed in the parking lots. Approximately 10 minutes later, ██████████ witnessed Respondent was again exceeding the 5-mph speed limits. When she stopped and questioned him about it, he replied, "I was just going 15 mph." The speed limit in the area was

5 mph. For failing to obey orders and unacceptable conduct, Respondent received a LOR on 10 Mar 00, with establishment of an unfavorable information file (UIF) on 22 Mar 00.

b. Failure to Progress in On-the-Job Training (OJT), paragraph 5.26.3.

(1) In a memo for record of 17 Aug 98, it was noted that on 17 Aug 98, Respondent was tasked to complete the fan lube on #1 engine of Aircraft 83-000078. After he completed the task, it was noticed that the blades and hardware were still wet with lubricant and lubricant spilled in the area. On 18 Aug 98, [REDACTED] took Respondent out to the aircraft to clean all the hardware for the fan blades and to re-lubricate them. On 19 Aug 98, Respondent was decertified on fan lubes pending further training, as evidenced by AF Form 623a (OJT Training Record Continuation Sheet).

(2) On 27 Jul 99, following a review of Respondent's training record and progress, it was determined he required further training due to these reasons: (a) leaving tools/equipment inside of engine; (b) exhibiting a great degree of difficulty assisting with task, and displaying frustration, episodes of rage to his supervisor, by slamming and throwing tools. The trainer was dissatisfied with Respondent's poor performance, lack of confidence, and motivation. It was determined that training would resume until both Respondent and his supervisors were satisfied and comfortable with Respondent's general maintenance practice abilities and competency with performing the task, and they should focus closely on his upgrade to 5-skill level.

(3) Upon arriving on station on 25 Nov 97, Respondent was placed on training status code (TSC) B (airman receiving 3-skill level experience or in upgrade training (UGT) for the initial award of a 5-skill level AFSC). The training section records show the maximum time for anyone in Respondent's AFSC to be awarded the 5-skill level has been 15 months. Respondent is currently at the 30-month point. Respondent was decertified in various tasks approximately 18 times, which translated into 64 out of 79 core task certified and 62 of 174 workcenter task certified. His vocabulary score of 11.8 and reading comprehension score of 11.1 during an Air Force Reading Abilities Test indicated these were not problem areas. As 4 Jan 00, Respondent made no progress in his UGT. On 23 Mar 00, it was suggested that Respondent needed to make more efforts towards his UGT. Although Respondent was made aware of his deficiencies, he showed no improvement. With these factors in mind, 660 AGS/CC determined Respondent was afforded ample opportunity to meet upgrade 5-skill level status. Despite these efforts, Respondent has not accepted responsibility for his 5-skill level training. Because he was decertified on several tasks, 660 AGS/CC opted to withdraw Respondent from the 5-skill level upgrade training and placed him in TSC "T" for failure to progress in OJT according to AFI 36-2201, Attachment 4.

3. Discussion:

a. In his statement of 6 Apr 00, Respondent admitted it had been difficult for him to adjust to the techniques of different supervisors, and that frustration had been a problem for him in many situations, causing his anger to take over his actions. He felt many of his difficulties were associated with personal problems, the death of his grandfather in 1999 and ex-girlfriend in 1998. Respondent cited the reasons why it took him longer to accomplish his 5-skill level status. He contended he changed supervisors several times and each supervisor trained in a different way. Further, there was no time for training because none of his co-workers would spend some time on-the-job longer that



they need to. Moreover, Respondent was never given the self-confidence to learn the job and to prove he could do it. Finally, Respondent felt like an outcast of the shop. Respondent also believed the biggest reason for taking so long to meet his upgrade training was he had no mechanical background like everyone else in the shop. He thought that once he told his co-workers he had no mechanical background, they would work harder to help him learn the job (Tab 3).

b. In his statement of 17 Apr 00, [REDACTED], acting 660 AGS/CC, does not believe Respondent accurately represented his circumstances or that his personal misfortunes are the underlying causes of Respondent's poor judgment and performance. Respondent was provided several opportunities to accept help of to overcome the situation, including attending an Anger Management Class to learn techniques to manage his temper. He completed a reading comprehension test and was referred for commander-directed mental health evaluation. According to [REDACTED], Respondent's lack of initiative and focus was brought to his attention on several occasions and annotated throughout his training record. Each time he acknowledged his deficiencies, but he continually refused to adjust. Respondent was assigned to various trainers in order to overcome "personality conflicts," conflicts actually generated as a result of his poor attitude. The unit's efforts had a short-term benefit, but eventually Respondent's focus and initiative tapered off and his training suffered. According to [REDACTED], although Respondent presented favorable information with his submissions, he lacked this focus on his primary duties (Tab 3).

c. Airmen are subject to discharge for unsatisfactory performance based on documented failure to meet Air Force standards. Further, airmen should be discharged when their unsatisfactory performance or conduct shows they are not qualified for service with the Air Force. Performance in the Air Force includes, but is not limited to, work done as assigned duties, military training, bearing, and behavior. It necessarily includes the member's continuing responsibility for maintaining the high standards of personal behavior and conduct required of military members at all times. Continued service in the Air Force is judged on the basis of conduct and ability. Members must meet required standards of duty, performance, and discipline. *Pursuant to AFI 36-2201, paragraph 4.14, the trainee (a) accepts all opportunities for qualification and skill-level UGT and actively participate in the learning process; (b) gets and maintains knowledge, qualifications, and the appropriate skill level within the assigned specialty; (c) becomes a productive member of the unit team, (d) budgets on-and off duty time to complete assigned training tasks, particularly CDC and self-training requirements; and, (e) maintains progress within the training program.* Respondent's failure to perform assigned duties properly and to meet upgrade training requirements support discharge.

d. Once convinced that there is a basis for Respondent's discharge, his entire military record is evaluated when deciding whether it is appropriate to discharge him. Despite the unit's rehabilitative efforts to aid Respondent in improving his conduct and behavior, including extensive involvement in UGT, he failed to make the necessary improvements to remain an Air Force member. Accordingly, discharge is appropriate.

#### **4. Characterization of Discharge**

a. The service of airmen discharged under paragraphs 5.26.1 and 5.26.3 will be characterized as honorable or general pursuant to AFI 36-3208, paragraph 5.28.2. Respondent requested an

honorable service characterization to be eligible for the MGIB. Pursuant to AFI 36-3208, paragraph 1.22, MGIB requires personnel entering active duty after 30 Jun 85 to receive an honorable discharge in order to qualify for educational benefits. An honorable characterization is warranted if Respondent's service generally meets Air Force standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty or whose service has been so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate. Such characterization is reserved to those airmen who served honorably and Respondent's record arguably does not meet this standard. The 660 AGS/CC recommended a general discharge and I agree. A general discharge, under honorable conditions, is appropriate if an airman's service has been honest and faithful but significant negative aspects of the airman's conduct or performance of duty outweigh positive aspects of the airman's military record. Respondent's unsatisfactory duty performance over a 17-month period resulted in 3 RICs, a verbal counseling, 3 LORs (one placed in UIF), and a LOC. The other derogatory information in Respondent's case file consists of memorandums for tardiness, recurring disagreeable temperament, and loss of his restricted area badge. As reflected by his referral EPR, the rater noted Respondent's serious problems with discipline, integrity, military bearing, and following orders. The indorser commented Respondent consistently displays negative attitude and refuses all encouragement, counsel, and help. Given Respondent's military record of inappropriate conduct and unsatisfactory performance a general discharge is appropriate. In my opinion, significant negative aspects of Respondent's failure to perform assigned duties properly and failure to progress in OJT outweigh the positive aspects of his service record. Accordingly, I concur with both commanders' recommendation for a general discharge.

b. AFI 36-3208, paragraph 6.45 provides that if the separation authority directs discharge for more than one reason, the instrument directing discharge must cite the primary reason. Although Respondent's failure to perform assigned duties properly was sufficient to warrant his discharge, 660 AGS/CC's recommendation for discharge was a direct result of Respondent's decertification, lack of motivation, and discipline in meeting his 5-skill level status. For that reason, the primary basis for discharge is paragraph 5.26.3, Failure to Progress in OJT.

## **5. Probation and Rehabilitation(P&R):**

a. P&R is not appropriate. AFI 36-3208, paragraph 5.2 provides that airmen should have an opportunity to overcome their deficiencies before discharge action starts. A commander's efforts to rehabilitate an airman may include formal or informal counseling, control roster action, punishment under Article 15, UCMJ, a change in duty assignment, demotion, additional training or duty, retraining, or other administrative action. P&R is based on the principle of conditional suspension of administrative discharge for cause in deserving cases. P&R should be offered, when it is reasonably possible to do so for those airmen: (a) who have demonstrated a potential to serve satisfactorily; (b) who have the capacity to be rehabilitated for continued military service or for completion of the current enlistment; and, (c) whose retention on active duty in a probationary status is consistent with the maintenance of good order and discipline in the Air Force.

b. AFI 36-3208, paragraph 7.4 provides that if the reason for discharge is unsatisfactory performance or misconduct, the case file must show that P&R was considered by the initiating commander, the board members if a hearing is involved, and the separation authority. If the initiating commander does not recommend P&R, the reason must be given. After reviewing

Respondent's record, 660 AGS/CC determined Respondent is not a viable candidate for P&R. Despite the unit's rehabilitation efforts stated above, Respondent's behavior showed no improvement. As stated above, Respondent was referred to the Behavioral Health Clinic for his questionable behavior and inability to adapt to military standards. He also attended an Anger Management Class. The unit's implementation of an extensive OJT campaign to increase Respondent's chances of meeting his 5-skill level training requirement has failed. Respondent has not displayed the requisite desire to improve himself, either through job performance or OJT. All rehabilitative efforts to assist Respondent in his 5-skill level training have failed to produce any positive change in his behavior. Respondent's actions indicate he has no capacity to be rehabilitated for completion of his current enlistment.

6. **Options:** As the Special Court-Martial Convening Authority, you personally approve or disapprove discharges under AFI 36-3208, paragraphs 5.26.1 and 5.26.3, and your options are to:

a. Withdraw this action and retain Respondent, or,

b. Discharge Respondent with an honorable or general discharge with or without P&R, with either paragraph 5.26.1 or 5.26.3 as the primary reason for discharge.

7. **Recommendation:** Discharge Respondent with a general discharge without P&R, by signing the appropriate letter at Attachment 1, utilizing paragraph 5.26.3 as the primary reason for discharge. Should you decide to discharge Respondent with an honorable discharge without P&R, an alternate letter is also included at Attachment 1.



Staff Judge Advocate

Attachments :

1. Proposed Letter

2. Case File (  )

FD01-00029



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
660TH AIRCRAFT GENERATION SQUADRON (AMC)

✓ OR/NDU FOR [REDACTED]

FROM: 660 AGS/CC  
585 Hickam Avenue  
Travis AFB CA 94535-2726

4 APR 2000

SUBJECT: Notification Memorandum

1. I am recommending your discharge from the United States Air Force for Unsatisfactory Duty Performance: Failure to Perform Assigned Duties Properly and Failure to Progress in On-the-Job Training (OJT). The authority for this action is AFI 36-3208, paragraphs 5.26.1 and 5.26.3, respectively. If my recommendation is approved, your service will be characterized as honorable or general. I am recommending that your service be characterized as general.

2. My reasons for this action are:

a. Unsatisfactory Duty Performance, Failure to Perform Assigned Duties Properly, Paragraph 5.26.1 :

(1) On or about 4 Aug 98, your supervisor [REDACTED] gave you permission to take a friend to the airport during your duty hours, mid-shift (2330 – 0730), provided your work was completed with the understanding that you were to report to the flight chiefs promptly in the morning. Further, you were instructed to return to work immediately following your trip to the airport, which you failed to do. You never mentioned to [REDACTED] that you were going to San Jose until later that evening. Although he gave you permission, he never intended for you to be away for over 6 hours. You never informed the unit that you would be late. Later, you told [REDACTED] "I told [REDACTED] that I probably won't be coming back," which was untrue. SSgt [REDACTED] discussed with you the military standards according to AFPAM 36-2241. For failing to return to duty, as instructed, you received a record of individual counseling (RIC) on 5 Aug 98 (Atch 1, Tab 1).

(2) On or about 11 Mar 99, you failed to return/clear a Swiss files tool with Tool Crib. You were verbally counseled previously for not turning in/clearing all outstanding tools under your employee account number (Atch 2, Tab 1).

(3) On or about 11 Mar 99, you lost a technical order (T.O.), but insisted it was not at COMBS, where you were working. A lost tool report was accomplished and your shift supervisor [REDACTED] was left responsible to recover, resolve, and/or to locate the lost item. When asked if you had the T.O. with you while you were working at COMB's on the spare engine, you stated, "No, I did not have the T.O. there when I was pulling blades, I swear it was on the bobtail." When told by your supervisor to go back and look for it again, you questioned

him by saying, "what for, I've already checked there, it's not there." When told to go back and to check anyway, you muttered, "whatever." You just admitted to your supervisors that you failed to use required T.O.'s while working maintenance. Eventually, the lost item was recovered from a spare engine, two spots from where you were working (Atch 2, Tab 1).

(4) On or about 16 Mar 99, [REDACTED] tasked you to install cotter pins on 6AE thrust reverse blocker doors on Aircraft 83-0080. Immediately after he left the aircraft, you started calling the specialist expediter, Phoenix 7, over the radio to pick you up. [REDACTED] told you to remain at the aircraft and to continue working the blocker door installation. After you were told again to remain at the aircraft, you began arguing with [REDACTED] over the radio, saying "I don't want to talk to you, I want to talk to Phoenix 7." This was one of the instances where you used the radio to exhibit disrespect and lack of discipline to your superiors and trainers (Atch 2, Tab 1).

(5) On or about 16 Mar 99, after [REDACTED] told you to install cotter pins on 6EA thrust reverse blocker doors, you were reluctant to do the tasks. You insisted the pins would not fit and would not go into the bolts. According to [REDACTED], they were correct according to T.O. 2-78. After he inspected and sampled one of the pins, [REDACTED] was able to fit them into the bolts. You were again reluctant to complete the work, as instructed. He told you once more to install the pins. When he re-inspected your work, he found the pins were not completely installed and secured, and the excess was not snipped and bent down according to standard general practice procedures. Moreover, he found blocker door nuts only hand tight, and one each connection link bolt not installed. You knowingly rendered an aircraft unsafe and passed it off as job completed in a hasty effort to go home for the day, which was conscious negligence and unsafe maintenance on your part (Atch 2, Tab 1).

(6) On 17 Mar 99, you deliberately and knowingly interrupted [REDACTED]'s transmission over the radio several times. After he clearly and distinctly ordered you not to do it. This incident was witnessed by [REDACTED] (Atch 2, Tab 1)

(7) On or about 17 Mar 99, you were told to prep and to assist [REDACTED] with fan blade removal from the #3 engine of Aircraft 84-0187. Instead, you were found standing away from the aircraft visiting with crew chiefs and taking a smoke break, while [REDACTED] completed the task. For failing to perform assigned duties properly in paragraphs 2a(2) through 2a(7), you received a letter of counseling on 17 Mar 99 (Atch 2, Tab 1).

(8) On or about 20 Apr 99, [REDACTED] informed you personally that you would be working 12-hour shift during the engine change of #1 Engine on Aircraft #79-1951. You repeated this instruction back to him to confirm it. On 21 Apr 99, you were informed that the engine change that was put on hold was back in progress again and you would be working 12-hour shift. [REDACTED] reminded you also. Then you told them you were not instructed about it and you left for the day. You seemed to have either forgotten [REDACTED] instructions or have chosen to ignore them. For your actions, you received a RIC on 22 Apr 99 (Atch 3, Tab 1).

(9) On or about 9 Jul 99, you were specifically instructed to collect, inventory, and account for all borescope equipment items you and your shift used prior to going home. You ensured

further training, as evidenced by AF Form 623a (OJT Training Record Continuation Sheet) (Atch 8, Tab 1).

(2) On 27 Jul 99, following a review of your training record and progress, it was determined you required further training due to these reasons: (a) leaving tools/equipment inside of engine; (b) exhibiting a great degree of difficulty assisting with task, and displaying frustration, episodes of rage to your supervisor, by slamming and throwing tools, that you are personally challenged in regards to general maintenance practices and procedures, such as, installation of "B" nuts and engine plumbing. It was then determined that training would resume until both you and your supervisors were satisfied and comfortable with your general maintenance practice abilities and competency with performing the task. At that time, your trainer was dissatisfied with your performance, lack of confidence, and motivation. It was recommended that they should focus closely on your upgrade to 5-skill level.

(3) Upon arriving on station on 25 Nov 97, you were placed on training status code (TSC) B (airman receiving 3-skill level experience or in UGT for the initial award of a 5-skill level AFSC). You successfully completed MQTP without problem. The training section records show the maximum time for anyone in your AFSC to be awarded the 5-skill level has been 15 months. You are now at the 30-month point. You have been decertified in various tasks approximately 18 times, which translated into 64 out of 79-core task certified and 62 of 174-workcenter task certified. Your vocabulary score of 11.8 and reading comprehension score of 11.1 during an Air Force Reading Abilities Test indicated these were not problem areas. As 4 Jan 00, you made no progress in your upgrade training. The training monitor suggested on 23 Mar 00 you needed to make more efforts towards your training. Although you were made aware of your deficiencies, you showed no improvement. With these factors in mind, I determined that you were afforded ample opportunity in an attempt to upgrade you to 5-skill level status. Despite these efforts, you have not accepted responsibility for your 5-skill level training. Because you were decertified on several tasks, I opted to withdraw you from the 5-skill level upgrade training and placed you in TSC "T" for failure to progress in OJT according to AFI 36-2201, Attachment 4 (Atch 8, Tab 1).

3. Copies of the documents to be forwarded to the separation authority in support of this recommendation are attached. The commander exercising SPCM jurisdiction or a higher authority will decide whether you will be discharged or retained in the Air Force. If you are discharged, you will be ineligible for reenlistment in the Air Force and any special pay, bonus, or educational assistance funds may be subject to recoupment.

4. You have the right to consult counsel. Military legal counsel has been obtained to assist you I have made an appointment for you to consult **Counsel, Travis Air Force Base, California, 540 Airlift Drive,** on 5 Apr 00 at 0830. You may consult civiliar counsel at your own expense.

5. You have the right to submit statements on your behalf. Any statements you want the separation authority to consider must reach me by (three workdays from service of this letter) 7 APR 2000, no later than 0900 hours unless you request and receive an extension for good cause. I will send any documents you submit to the separation authority.

6. If you fail to consult counsel or to submit statements on your behalf, your failure will constitute a waiver of your right to do so.
7. Any personal information you furnish in rebuttal is covered by the Privacy Act Statement of 1974. A copy of AFI 36-3208 is available for your use in the orderly room.
8. Execute the attached acknowledgment and return it to me immediately.



Commander

#### Attachments

1. RIC, 5 Aug 98
2. LOC, 17 Mar 99
3. RIC, 22 Apr 99
4. RIC, 19 Jul 99
5. LOR, 9 Aug 99
6. LOR, 5 Nov 99
7. LOR, 10 Mar 00; AF Form 1058, 22 Mar 00
8. Memorandum of 660 AGS/CC, 27 Mar 00
- ██████████ PAFSC Information, 28 Mar 00
- ██████████ Report to CCF, 16 Mar 00
- AF Forms 623a from 19 Aug 98 to 23 Mar 00
- MFR, 17 Aug 98
- AFRAT Test Results, 6 Apr 99
9. Other Derogatory Data:
  - MFR, 3 Sep 98
  - MFR, 3 Sep 99
  - 60 MDOS/SGOHH Memorandum, 18 Nov 99
  - 660 AGS/CCQA Memorandum, 22 Nov 99
  - MFR of ██████████, undated