

# NEC Minutes

---

**National Executive Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
29-30 October 2010**

---



**Maxwell AFB, AL**

National Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
29–30 October 2010  
Maxwell AFB, AL

Contents

**OPEN SESSION**

**Action Agenda Items**

1.	Advisor / Committee Reports.....	Col Chazell.....	5
2.	Approval of May 2010 NEC Minutes.....	Col Chazell.....	12
3.	Safety		
	a. Amending Annual Safety Day Dates .....	Col Cortum.....	14
	b. Amending the Face – to – Face Safety Education.....	Col Rushing.....	16
4.	Support		
	a. Cadet Staff Duty Analysis Program & Achievement .....	Col Kuddes.....	22
	b. CAP Health Services Support for USAF .....	Col Vazquez.....	25
	c. FY11 New Aircraft Distribution.....	Col Jensen.....	29
5.	Operations		
	a. ARCHER Mission Status .....	Col Jensen.....	32
	b. Aircrew Emergency Training Course .....	Col Vazquez.....	35
	c. CAP G1000 Training Course .....	Col Vazquez.....	38
	d. High Performance Aircraft Checkout Requirements .....	Col Vazquez.....	40
	e. VHF Antennas .....	Col Jensen.....	43
6.	IG		
	a. SUI Tracking and Compliance .....	Col Hayden.....	45
	b. Program Presentation During CIs.....	Col Ward.....	47
7.	Revisions to CAPR 900-5.....	Col Herrin.....	49

**Other Items**

8.	Old Business		
	a. Membership Eligibility .....		51
	b. Quality Cadet Unit .....		54
	c. Conduct of Members Using Social Media .....		59
	d. Active Personnel Files .....		64
9.	New Business		
	a. Parts for ARCHER Systems .....		67
	b. Introductory Safety Education Requirements .....		67
	c. Location of May 2011 NEC Meeting .....		67

d. Delay in Reduction of Glider Fleet ..... 68  
e. Change to MARB..... 68  
f. Confirmation of General Officer Grade ..... 69  
g. Procedures for Off-Cycle Minutes & Approval of 15 January 2010 Fax Vote .... 70

Special NEC Minutes – 6 December 2010 ..... 72

Administrative Announcements ..... 75



ATTEST:

Barry S. Herrin  
Colonel, CAP  
National Legal Officer



OFFICIAL:

Amy S. Courter  
Major General, CAP  
National Commander

Civil Air Patrol  
National Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
29–30 October 2010  
Maxwell AFB, AL

**OPEN SESSION**

CALL TO ORDER .....	Maj Gen Amy S. Courter, CAP
INVOCATION.....	Ch, Col Whitson B. Woodard, CAP
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE .....	Col Russell E. Chazell, CAP
ROLL CALL.....	Mr. Don R. Rowland, HQ CAP/EX
SAFETY BRIEFING .....	Col Bob Diduch, CAP
NATIONAL COMMANDER REMARKS.....	Maj Gen Amy S. Courter, CAP
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REMARKS.....	Mr. Don R. Rowland, HQ CAP/EX
CAP-USAF COMMANDER REMARKS.....	Col William R. Ward, USAF

**NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Maj Gen Amy S. Courter, CAP .....	National Commander
Brig Gen Charles L. Carr, Jr., CAP .....	National Vice Commander
Col Russell E. Chazell, CAP .....	National Chief of Staff
Col C. Warren Vest, CAP .....	National Finance Officer
Col Barry S. Herrin, CAP .....	National Legal Officer
Col William S. Charles, II, CAP .....	National Controller
Col Christopher J. Hayden, CAP .....	Northeast Region Commander
Col Joseph R. Vazquez, CAP .....	Middle East Region Commander
Col Robert M. Karton, CAP .....	Great Lakes Region Commander
Col James M. Rushing, CAP .....	Southeast Region Commander
Col Steven W. Kuddes, CAP .....	North Central Region Commander
Col Joseph C. Jensen, CAP .....	Southwest Region Commander
Col Donald G. Cortum, CAP .....	Rocky Mountain Region Commander
Col Larry F. Myrick, CAP .....	Pacific Region Commander

**Non-voting members:**

Col William R. Ward, USAF .....	CAP-USAF Commander
Col Merle V. Starr, CAP.....	CAP Inspector General
Ch, Col Whitson B. Woodard, CAP .....	Chief of Chaplain Corps

**CORPORATE TEAM**

Mr. Don Rowland	Executive Director
Mr. John Salvador	Sr Director & Director, Public Awareness & Membership Dev.
Mr. Johnny Dean	Director, Plans & Requirements
Mr. John Desmarais	Interim Director, Missions
Ms. Susan Easter	Chief Financial Officer
Mr. Larry Kauffman	Assistant to Executive Director for Fleet Management
Mr. James Mallett	Director, Educational Programs
Mr. Rafael Robles	General Counsel
Mr. Gary Schneider	Director, Logistics & Mission Resources

---

**AGENDA ITEM - 1**

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Advisor / Committee Reports  
CAP/CS – Col Chazell**

---

**1. (Staff) CAP National Safety Officer – Col Diduch**

COL DIDUCH presented a slide briefing which included a recommendation for a Safety Staff College every other year. He expressed appreciation to the NEC and National Board for supporting the safety team, without which they could not have accomplished the great strides they have made in just a little over a year.

**2. (Executive) Finance Committee – Col Vest**

COL VEST/NFO presented the National Finance Committee Report, with information items and committee recommended action items:

- a. FY10 Appropriated and Corporate Budget Execution: Information.
  
- b. FY11 Appropriated Restored Financial Plan:

**THE NEC FINANCE COMMITTEE moved that the NEC endorse the FY11 Restored Appropriated Financial Plan for the amount as presented in the Senate Appropriations Committee and forward to the Board of Governors for approval. If the appropriated amount should either increase or decrease during conference committee, the budget will be amended proportionately.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Include in the Dec 2010 BoG agenda.

- c. FY12 Appropriated Financial Plan:

**THE NEC FINANCE COMMITTEE moved that the NEC endorse the FY12 Appropriated Financial Plan and forward to the Board of Governors for approval.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Include in the Dec 2010 BoG agenda.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### d. AR Wing ACMX Balance:

There was no committee recommendation for NEC action. The NEC informally discussed the issue of repayment of aircraft tail number accounting balances. Maj Gen Courter requested written information on the status of the reimbursement of ACMX balances and further requested that this item be brought back to the NEC via conference call if it isn't resolved today.

Later in the meeting, the requested information on ACMX balances was reviewed. There was discussion on how the pay-back plans were handled in other wings. Col Vest, on behalf of the Finance Committee recommended that Col Jensen go back to the Arkansas Wing and ask for a better offer of a repayment plan. Maj Gen Courter stated that guidance needed to be provided to Col Jensen in terms of what would be acceptable to help him in dealing with the issue in Arkansas. She suggested that NEC and Finance Committee members give their thoughts on this matter to Col Jensen.

### e. Equipment Assignment in ORMS:

**THE NEC FINANCE COMMITTEE moved that the NEC approve amending CAPR 174-1 to require aircraft, vehicles, and communications equipment be assigned to the unit level where equipment is located in accordance with the table of allowances.**

**COL CORTUM/RMR MOVED TO AMEND and COL JENSEN/SWR seconded the amendment to add the word "permanently" between the words "be" and "assigned"**

COL CORTUM/RMR, with concurrence of COL JENSEN/SWR, withdrew his amendment.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy, notification to the field, and change to CAPR 174-1, Property Management and Accountability. Guidance to staff in writing the policy: "what we mean by this is not every time the equipment is located somewhere; we are talking about the equipment assignment where the person is managing it. (Does not apply to borrowing a van for a week). It is the thought of semi-permanence and the unit that is overseeing it—not a geographical location.

### f. Wing Audit Requirement:

**THE NEC FINANCE COMMITTEE moved that the NEC eliminate paragraph 32(a) from CAPR 173-1, which states: "If an incident of fraud is confirmed, the wing will be required to have a separate external audit for a period of 2 years following the disclosure of the fraud. The external auditor fees will not be reimbursed by National Headquarters."**

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy, notification to the field, and change to CAPR 173-1, Financial Procedures and Accounting.

g. Donations from CAP:

**THE NEC FINANCE COMMITTEE moved that the National Commander refer the issue of CAP donations to individuals or other non-profit organizations to the appropriate body (with technical expertise), as she sees fit, for further study and recommendation.**

**COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO AMEND and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded the amendment to add a statement that an Interim Change Letter be sent to every unit to prohibit payments of CAP money to any outside organizations or individuals in the interim until a policy is developed.**

### **MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED**

### **THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTIONS:

(1) ICL to CAPR 173-4, Fund Raising/Donations sent to all units prohibiting payments of CAP money to outside organizations or individuals.

(2) National Commander refer to an appropriate entity with technical expertise to further study and make recommendations on appropriate use of CAP funds for charitable purposes and CAP's charitable tax-exempt status to benefit third parties outside the organization.

h. Mission Budgeting in WMIRS:

The NEC Finance Committee did not request NEC action. With concurrence, Mr. Salvador/PM briefed a DRAFT letter (distributed to NEC) outlining a procedure to bring the budgeting process for A9 missions into WMIRS, which should help reduce costs. He requested feedback from NEC members on the draft letter in order for Gen Courter to finalize a policy letter by Monday, 1 Nov 2010.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Finalization of National Commander Policy letter by 1 Nov 2010.

i. Insufficient ACMX Balances/ACMX Balances at RI Wing:

COL VEST/NFO briefed this information, noting that of the four remaining wings that have balances, two wings have brought forward repayment proposals. He also briefed that the Rhode Island proposal for repaying \$3,771.00 was approved by the Finance Committee at its meeting. Col Vest stated that the Arkansas repayment proposal is being considered separately.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

j. Vanguard Funds:

COL VEST/NFO briefed this information item on the status of these funds.

k. National Board Travel Allocation:

COL VEST/NFO briefed this information item noting the number of wings eligible for reimbursement under this allocation.

l. Wing Financial Analyst Unit Visits:

COL VEST/NFO briefed this information item on the audits since 1 June 2010. There was a suggestion that when significant financial issues, such as no finance officer or finance committee, are identified in these visits, FM needs to immediately notify the National Commander and appropriate region and wing commanders. The National Commander's general guidance was that the data needs to be turned into information that can be acted upon. There will be a whole report that goes out that will be data. What is needed are very specific things when there are failures--the exception reports, what the exceptions are that would flag it above the normal report, and would go to wing, region, and national.

m. FY09-FY10 Comparison Additional Funding for MIPR Missions:

COL VEST/NFO briefed this information item depicting in pie-chart format the comparison of additional mission funding by mission type for the last 2 years.

n. National Staff College Funds:

COL VEST/NFO briefed that the Finance Committee did not agree with a request from the National Staff College that the use of residual funds from staff colleges be restricted for future NSC requirements. The normal procedure for all corporate-funded activities (including NSC) is that the funds collected are deposited in the general fund and used as needed; if there is a residual balance, it stays in the account, and if more funds are needed, within reason, they are paid from the general fund account.

o. Risk Matrix, 25 October 2010:

COL VEST/NFO briefed a chart that reflects financial trends only--the result of the wing financial analysts visits compiled and displayed as a history for 3 years of the risk rating categories.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Maj Gen Courter requested that approximately a week before the NEC meetings, that the Finance Committee meet telephonically and go through all the financial items—not to take action, but to review and provide the information to the NEC in order to be better able to address the issues at the NEC. Ms. Easter/CFO stated that this could easily happen when the meetings are in May and Nov, but not Oct because of close-out of fiscal year.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

Gen Courter expressed appreciation to Mrs. Easter/CFO, and the financial staff and committee for excellent work and emphasized that she did not have concerns in the financial area. She added that she is thrilled with the progress that has been made but pointed out the need to go through all the issues that surface because of fiduciary responsibility.

### **3. (Executive) Chaplain – Ch, Col Woodard**

CH, COL WOODARD stated that there was no update to the statistical data reported at the National Board. However, he reported there are some continuing objectives that are being worked through the system: (1) Revised on-line version of the Form 34 is nearing the beta test; (2) Publication of the revised and expanded 221 Chaplain's Training Track is nearing completion. He also reported that the application process begun in December 2009 is proving to be effective. He added that some the ecclesiastical endorsements, external to CAP, are taking many months for final approval.

### **4. (Executive) Inspector General – Col Starr**

COL STARR reported that one of the IG objectives has been training of the membership, particularly for members doing IG work in the field. He added that the basic IG course was put on-line during the past year, which included an expansion of three different modules: (1) Introduction to IG, (2) Investigating Officer, and (3) One for members conducting inspections and SUIs. He stated that over 400 members have taken the course, which in some cases is being presented in residence within weekend seminars.

The senior course has been reworked and revised and the goal for that is one per region per fiscal year, which is on track. He also reported the following:

- a. There were 59 graduates this year from the IG College at Kirtland AFB, NM.
- b. Seventeen CAP members were able to attend the basic inspection course conducted by AFIA at Kirtland AFB.
- c. The IG is working on a 45-day goal of getting the CI reports back to the wings, and the responses are up to date.
- d. The CAPR 123-1, 123-2, and 123-3 are being updated. A new regulation on commander directed investigations —will probably be named CAPR 123-4—has been drafted. Also, a new Investigating Officer's Guide and a new CDI Guide are being developed.

### **5. (Executive) National Controller – Col Charles**

COL CHARLES/NCON presented a slide briefing.

**6. (Advisor) Senior Advisor, Support – Col Guimond**

COL GUIMOND presented a slide briefing.

**7. (Advisor) Senior Advisor, Operations – Col Murrell**

COL MURRELL presented a slide briefing updating the operational missions.

**8. (Advisor) National Advisory Council – Brig Gen DuPont**

MAJ GEN COURTER noted that this item is kept on the agenda in the event that group wants to provide information to the meetings.

**9. (Advisor) National Cadet Advisory Council – c/Col Coogan**

MAJ GEN COURTER noted that a briefing was given at the National Board outlining the items they are working on.

**10. (Staff) Historian – Col Blascovich**

MR. ROWLAND thanked Col Blascovich and his team who did an outstanding job of inventorying and boxing up historical documents before the renovation of the headquarters building. They also set up and organized the displays after the move back into the building, which will be an ongoing project. Mr. Rowland clarified that there has been discussion as to updating and displaying plaques of former region and wing commanders that hung in the old conference room prior to the renovation. When time permits, these plaques will be updated and displayed. He stated that also under discussion are different ways to display the plaques of former National Commanders and all the historical heritage of this organization in this building.

**11. (Staff) National Medical Officer – Col McLaughlin**

MAJ GEN COURTER stated there is some work being done on policies that have been approved.

**12. (Committee) Hall of Honor – Maj Gen Wheless**

MAJ GEN COURTER stated this committee is working on a couple of things. There was note that Maj Gen Wheless may have a report at the winter 2011 National Board meeting.

**13. (Committee) Constitution and Bylaws Committee – Col Herrin**

COL HERRIN stated that these issues would be addressed under Old Business.

**14. (Committee) Public Trust**

MAJ GEN COURTER reminded that the NEC has already seen the committee's work on diversity to get approval to start that, including going to the BoG for ratification and support. There is work to bring that committee up and a lot of good work is happening. The committee is also available to assist in other areas, such as public relations and the output from the recent PR summit. The committee has also asked for Gen Courter's view on a few of the long-term objectives or areas CAP will focus on. Gen Courter asked that the NEC work on that on Saturday.

**15. (Committee) Governance – Col Verrett**

No report.

**16. Social Media – Maj Pabon**

Maj Gen Courter stated that Social Media will be handled under Old Business.

---

**AGENDA ITEM - 2**

**PM**  
Minutes

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Approval of May 2010 NEC Minutes**  
**CAP/CS – Col Chazell**

Author: None

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

The minutes of the May 2010 National Executive Committee meeting were distributed in draft form. This allowed the National Executive Committee members a chance to review the minutes for any discrepancies.

The May 2010 NEC Minutes are included in your material.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve the May 2010 NEC minutes.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

None.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

None.

**CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

None.

**DCS / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

None.

**REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

None.

**NEC ACTION:**

**COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and COL RUSHING/SER seconded the PROPOSED NEC ACTION, with the following corrections:**

1. Page 17; correct spelling of Col Jensen's name.
2. Page 43, Item 13.c. following the motion, add the following words to the clarifying statement: "and would replace all other types of recognition for such service."

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

3. Page 44, Item 13.d, add the word "CARRIED" after the words "THE AMENDED MOTION."

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Make the above corrections and remove the word 'DRAFT" from the May 2010 Minutes.

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 3a**

**SE**  
Safety

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Amending Annual Safety Day Dates**

**Author: National Safety Team**

**RMR/CC – Col Cortum**

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

The Annual Safety Day has been a requirement in October of each fiscal year. However, with the reduced flying operations for each year's end of year financial close outs, it seems more practical to adjust the annual safety days to align to this period of time where CAP operations are reduced to missions only.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve the change of the annual safety day to be a period of 31 days starting on September 15 of each calendar year and ending 16 October of each calendar year.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Minimal.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur.

**CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

It's true that training and orientation flights terminate 14 Sep, but operational missions continue. Using this logic, it may be more appropriate to hold the Safety Day in January because the flying historically decreases during the period of Thanksgiving to New Years.

Recommend making January of each year the period for the annual Safety Day.

A stand-down may not be the best solution to focus on safety. As an example, a flying safety event might prove more beneficial to some units. The end result, regardless of stand-down or event, September or January, is to re-focus member's attention on safety and commanders know best the health and needs of their Wing's safety culture.

**ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Senior Advisor - Support: Concur.

Senior Advisor - Operations: Concur.

October 2010 NEC Minutes

**REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 62-1, *CAP Safety Responsibilities and Procedures*

**NEC ACTION:**

**COL CORTUM/RMR MOVED and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded** the PROPOSED NEC ACTION.

**COL KUDDER/NCR MOVED TO AMEND and COL JENSEN/SWR seconded** the amendment to change the annual safety day from October to 1 January – 31 March.

**THE AMENDMENT CARRIED**

**THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy, notification to the field, and change to CAPR 62-1, *CAP Safety Responsibilities and Procedures*. The change would allow time to analyze the data from the previous year's flying and also provide a better time-frame in which to solve problems.

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 3b**

**SE**  
Safety

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Amending the Face – to – Face Safety Education/Briefing Requirements**  
Author: National Safety Team                      **SER/CC – Col Rushing**

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

The requirement for members to have a face-to-face safety meeting has been put into and removed from CAP regulations on numerous occasions over the past couple of years; however, the requirement to have members have a face-to-face safety education briefing within the organization of CAP is too difficult to manage.

CAP has been active in promoting the requirement to perform Operational Risk Management (ORM) practices, but has not put into the policy a clearly defined process in which the results of ORM are briefed to activity participants.

This is a revision to define a process of safety awareness that is more accommodating to the personal activities and geographic separation of CAP members that will ultimately improve compliance.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve the following definitions and policy:

1) Approve the following definitions:

- a. **Safety Education:** an act whereby a topic is presented and there is interaction or an assessment to measure comprehension and content retention.
- b. **Operational Risk Safety Briefing:** a briefing that discusses the risks associate with a particular activity and/or sub-activity and must be conducted in-person with the member(s) that is/are about to engage in such activity.
- c. **In-Person:** a session where a participant can interact, ask questions, and contribute to the session. The participant does not have to be physically at the same location and the communications platform must be interactive between the participant and the educator/briefer. This may also be a meeting or session where multiple participants are physically located in the same room and provided the ability to interact in real time, ask questions, and can contribute to the meeting. Conference calls with a briefer and more than one participant (receiver of the brief) does not satisfy the intent of in-person.

Note: The difference between **safety education** and an **operational risk safety briefing** is that a risk briefing would create awareness, whereas **safety education** would provide lessons to promote a strong safety mindset and culture; namely, risk recognition, risk mitigation, risk avoidance and enduring safe habit patterns. No member will participate in

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

a particular activity until they have received this **operational risk safety briefing** as defined. See Item 4 below.

An example of an **operational risk safety briefing** would be a briefing by a Flight Release Officer that advises an aircrew that windshear is present and the steps to mitigate the risk, such as what should be done at the controls of the aircraft to recover from or avoid it, whereas **safety education** would discuss what the physics of a microburst resulting in windshear and the impacts on flight and what occurs when the steps to mitigate the risk are implemented.

A sub-activity example would be having an **operational risk safety briefing** before an obstacle course at an encampment, a risk brief of working in an encampment kitchen, or discussion of terrain hazards before entering a new land navigation lane at a search and rescue exercise. At the start of each new day, **operational safety risk briefings** must be refreshed to ensure new participants are included and members that were present are refreshed on the hazards of the day. Additionally, new participants that arrive throughout an activity or sub-activity must receive the same mandatory **operational risk safety briefing** before participating.

- 2) The removal of the current quarterly Face-to-Face **safety education** requirements for all CAP members and replace with mandatory **operational risk safety briefings** as defined above.
- 3) Maintain that **safety education** is important to all CAP members and require that active members (senior members, cadets, cadet sponsors, 50 year, and life members) complete **safety education** monthly and have it documented in the national online **safety education** database. There are no restrictions to the method in which **safety education** is received, as long as it maintains relevance to CAP's mission scope. **Safety education** documentation is also required for participation in activities for active members. CAP Safety Officers will still be required to provide monthly **safety education** as it is currently described in CAP regulations.
- 4) This policy revision will direct the National Safety Team to work with Region and Wing leadership, safety officers, and NHQ directorates to establish a list of approved activities and sub-activities that require **operational risk safety briefings**, to include who is authorized to give those briefings. The activities on this list will require mandatory **operational risk safety briefings**; however this list is not all encompassing and a commander or activity director could require **operational risk safety briefings** for any activity that is not listed if deemed necessary. If an activity is not on the list and is deemed necessary for an **operational risk safety briefing**, a copy of the approved risk management worksheet must be provided to the National Safety Team for consideration to be added to the national approved activities list.

### ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

No funding impact.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

NHQ Safety strongly supports this methodology and believes that CAP has defined a clear requirement to perform ORM; however this reinforces the need for pre-activity briefings to share the results of ORM. This forward movement of CAP's safety programs will be more appropriate for the volunteer environment of Civil Air Patrol and will keep the risk awareness at a heightened level at the start of all activities and sub-activities.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur. CAP-USAF fully understands the challenges presented by volunteers' busy schedules and distance from their home unit. This proposal is a step in the right direction to promoting CAP's progressing safety culture while offering the greatest chance of success for full compliance. Removing the need for face-to-face dialogue in no way relieves any CAP member from their responsibility to be safety vigilant in every activity. This new approach will, of course, require the active involvement of commanders, as well as, software tools and resources to provide content and track compliance.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Senior Advisor - Support: Concur.

Senior Advisor - Operations: Concur. Pre-activity Safety and ORM briefings will add emphasis to CAP's desire for accident-free activities and will be an effective supplement to on-going safety training without over burdening the membership.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 62-1, *CAP Safety Responsibilities and Procedures*

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL RUSHING/SER MOVED and COL VAZQUEZ/MER seconded the PROPOSED NEC ACTION.**

**COL KARTON/GLR MOVED TO AMEND and COL HERRIN/NLO seconded the amendment to delete the last full sentence of paragraph 1) c., as reads: "Conference calls with a briefer and more than one participant (receiver of the brief) does not satisfy the intent of the in-person."**

### **THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED**

**COL JENSEN/SWR MOVED TO AMEND and COL KARTON/GLR seconded to add a substitute last sentence to paragraph 1) c. to read: "The use of technology whereby all participants may simultaneously hear and speak with each other constitutes an 'in-person' participation."**

### **THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED**

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

**COL WARD/CAP-USAF/CC MOVED TO AMEND and COL KUDDES/NCR seconded** that a sentence be added at the end of paragraph 2), to read as follows: “Operational risk safety briefings will not be tracked for compliance”.

**COL JENSEN/SWR MOVED TO SUBSTITUTE and COL MYRICK/PCR seconded** the substitute motion to add “but it is expected that operational risk safety briefings would be conducted before each activity although they will not be evaluated as part of any SUI or CI.”

COL JENSEN/SWR, with concurrence of the COL MYRICK/PCR, withdrew the substitute motion.

### **THE AMENDMENT DID NOT PASS**

**COL JENSEN/SWR MOVED TO POSTPONE and COL KARTON/GLR seconded** the postponement of this item until Saturday.

### **THE MOTION TO POSTPONE CARRIED**

On Saturday morning, Revision 2 to this proposal was presented and discussed.

**COL RUSHING/SER MOVED TO SUBSTITUTE and COL MYRICK/PCR seconded** the PROPOSED NEC ACTION as outlined in Revision 2 dated 10/10/2010.

### **THE MOTION TO SUBSTITUTE CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy, notification to the field (IC Ltr making changes effective immediately), and change to CAPR 62-1, CAP Safety.

Responsibilities and Procedures. Also, the Revision 2 proposal will be e-mailed to region commanders for their transmission to wing commanders, and THE PROPOSED NEC ACTION reads as follows:

#### **PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve the following definitions and policy:

- 1) Approve the following definitions:
  - a. ***Safety Education:*** an act whereby a topic is presented and there is “in-person” interaction or an assessment to measure comprehension and content retention.
  - b. ***Operational Risk Safety Briefing:*** a briefing that discusses the risks associate with a particular activity and/or sub-activity and must be conducted “in-person” with the member(s) that is/are about to engage in such activity.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

- c. ***In-Person***: a session where a participant can interact, ask questions, and contribute to the session. The participant does not have to be physically at the same location and the communications platform must be interactive between the participant and the educator/briefer. This may also be a meeting or session where multiple participants are physically located in the same room and provided the ability to interact in real time, ask questions, and can contribute to the meeting. Participation in a meeting held using telephonic or other technology that permits each participant to simultaneously hear and speak with each other participant constitutes “in-person” attendance.

Note: The difference between ***safety education*** and an ***operational risk safety briefing*** is that a risk briefing would create awareness, whereas ***safety education*** would provide lessons to promote a strong safety mindset and culture; namely, risk recognition, risk mitigation, risk avoidance and enduring safe habit patterns. No member will participate in a particular activity until they have received this ***operational risk safety briefing*** as defined. See Item 4 below.

An example of an ***operational risk safety briefing*** would be a briefing by a Flight Release Officer that advises an aircrew that windshear is present and the steps to mitigate the risk, such as what should be done at the controls of the aircraft to recover from or avoid it, whereas ***safety education*** would discuss what the physics of a microburst resulting in windshear and the impacts on flight and what occurs when the steps to mitigate the risk are implemented.

A sub-activity example would be having an ***operational risk safety briefing*** before an obstacle course at an encampment, a risk brief of working in an encampment kitchen, or discussion of terrain hazards before entering a new land navigation lane at a search and rescue exercise. At the start of each new day, ***operational risk safety briefings*** must be refreshed to ensure new participants are included and members that were present are refreshed on the hazards of the day. Additionally, new participants that arrive throughout an activity or sub-activity must receive the same mandatory ***operational risk safety briefing*** before participating.

- 2) The removal of the current quarterly Face-to-Face ***safety education*** requirements for all CAP members.
- 3) Require mandatory ***operational risk safety briefings*** as defined above. Physical documentation is not required.
- 4) Maintain that ***safety education*** is important to all CAP members and require that active members (senior members, cadets, cadet sponsors, 50 year, and life members) complete ***safety education*** monthly and have it documented in the national online ***safety education*** database. There are no restrictions to the method in which ***safety education*** is received, as long as it maintains relevance to CAP’s mission scope. ***Safety education*** documentation is also required for participation in activities for active members. CAP Safety Officers will still be required to provide monthly ***safety education*** as it is currently described in CAP regulations.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

- 5) This policy revision will direct the National Safety Team to work with Region and Wing leadership, safety officers, and NHQ directorates to establish a list of approved activities and sub-activities that require **operational risk safety briefings**, to include who is authorized to give those briefings. The activities on this list will require mandatory **operational risk safety briefings**; however this list is not all encompassing and a commander or activity director could require **operational risk safety briefings** for any activity that is not listed if deemed necessary. If an activity is not on the list and is deemed necessary for an **operational risk safety briefing**, a copy of the approved risk management worksheet must be provided to the National Safety Team for consideration to be added to the national approved activities list.”

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 4a**

**ED**  
Cadets

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Cadet Staff Duty Analysis Program & Achievement Names**

**Author:** Col Kuddes

**NCR/CC – Col Kuddes**

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

Cadet Officers are currently required to complete a Staff Duty Analysis (SDA) report and SDA staff service during Phases III and IV. Feedback from Cadet Officer School students over the past two years has shown that the SDA program is terribly unpopular. Common complaints include (1) the learning is not meaningful; (2) the program is difficult to execute; and (3) the subject matter is “adminish-trivia,” not timeless knowledge.

The SDA program claims to further critical thinking and communication skills. Those are worthy goals, but the curriculum needs to be reformed so as to better achieve those goals. Moreover, the revised subject matter must be relevant to cadets, and the program must be easy for cadets and local commanders to implement.

The Phase III and IV achievement names are currently connected to the SDA requirements. Those achievement names (e.g. Achievement 16 is Cadet Commander) would remain as is for now, but in 2011, the NCAC will propose to the NEC new names in honor of aerospace pioneers for the Phase III and IV achievements.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve establishing the policy that the SDA program be eliminated in its entirety by 31 December 2011. Further, the NHQ staff will develop a new “Professional Communications Program” in the cadet officer leadership curriculum, as described below, by 31 December 2011, concurrent with the release of *Learn to Lead*, Volumes 3 and 4:

**Writing Assignment:** To complete each achievement in Phases III and IV, cadets must complete a writing assignment using one of the formats shown below. Each format may be used no more than twice during the cadet’s advancement from Mitchell to Spaatz. Cadet performance will be graded pass / fail, with a senior member providing feedback and mentoring. Each of the documents below would be approximately 2 pages in length.

- position paper
- activity proposal
- operations plan
- staff study report
- after action report
- personal leadership plan

**Speaking Assignment:** To complete each achievement in Phases III and IV, cadets must complete a speaking assignment using one of the formats shown below. Each format may be used no more than twice during the cadet’s advancement from Mitchell to Spaatz. Cadet performance will be graded pass / fail, with a senior member providing feedback and mentoring.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

- program briefing *approximately 10 minutes*
- classroom lecture *approximately 30 minutes*
- leadership philosophy *approximately 10 minutes*
- year in review *approximately 10 minutes*
- guided discussion *approximately 30 minutes*
- extemporaneous talk to a non-CAP audience *approximately 10 minutes*

The NHQ staff will develop a guidebook to aid cadets and local commanders in implementing these new requirements.

As mentioned above, the NCAC will propose to the NEC new names for the Phase III and IV achievements in 2011.

### **ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

The cost of printing a 10-page guidebook for all 1,200 cadet units and approximately 400 new cadet officers annually should be less than \$1000.

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

National Chief of Staff: I think this agenda item is well-taken. However, I believe it misses the fundamental purpose of the SDA – to teach cadet officers the roles and responsibilities of service as a staff officer. By going through the process of researching and reporting on a squadron staff position, the cadet reviews CAP directives and presumably become more familiar with the critical importance of an effective staff section. No commander, however talented he or she may be, can be effective without a functional staff section. Inasmuch as the cadet program is preparing our youth to serve in the military, business, or as CAP senior members, the cadet program needs to prepare our youth to work in support roles. The SDA should serve that function. I agree that all of the suggestions in this agenda item are necessary skills that cadets must master – but the roles and responsibility of service as staff officer is being lost in the proposal. I would encourage amending the agenda item to include the development of that skill set as well. Perhaps one of the achievements could require that a cadet officer shadow a unit staff officer for some period of time and complete a list of tasks, not unlike those found in the professional development program specialty track. Perhaps, the SDA could be replaced with the requirement of achieving a technical rating in two specialty tracks before the award of the Eaker. As a former cadet officer, I didn't like SDAs either; but as a senior member, I'm glad that I was required to familiarize myself with CAP directives and learn the ropes of some unit staff positions. SDAs better

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

prepared me to serve as a senior member staff officer. We should not lose sight of the important role of the staff officer in the training of cadet officers.

Senior Advisor – Support and CP Advisor: Concur.

National Cadet Advisory Council: Strongly concur. In the course of their leadership roles, cadet officers communicate regularly through the written and spoken word. Mentoring, as provided in this proposal, will help cadets learn from these “real world” communication opportunities. Guided communication benefits the entire cadet unit.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 52-16, *Cadet Program Management*  
CAPP 52-14, *Cadet Staff Duty Analysis*  
CAPVA 52-100, *Cadet Super Chart*

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL KUDDES/NCR withdrew this item. He will propose a revised agenda item at a later date.**

**SUBJECT: CAP Health Services Support for USAF**

**Author:** Col Knowles

**MER/CC - Col Vazquez**

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

Over the years various programs within Civil Air Patrol have reinvented themselves when times have changed. The most obvious current one is our homeland security mission whose origins can be traced back to the coastal patrol mission. Another example is the metamorphous CAP's Chaplains Service has undergone in recent years to support a major shortage of active duty and reserve chaplains at military bases across the country.

We currently recruit and provide advanced grade to members who join CAP as part of our Health Services program. Except for providing first aid instruction, advice on health issues and occasionally helping out at an encampment, there is little for our Health Service officers to do. In essence we recruit these members for their professional skills but have no real method to utilize them.

Current DoD operations tempo across the world and major budget and personnel short falls in all branches of the service presents an opportunity for CAP to mirror the program used by our Chaplains to support the active duty in the health care arena. There are major hurdles to overcome but after having some discussions with health care professionals and with a very basic understanding of the military health care system I believe there is a great deal of potential to expand CAP Health Services to augment bases in the US.

The biggest obstacle, with regards to supporting this effort according to the health care professionals I spoke to, is liability. In private practice just about all health care professionals have to carry malpractice insurance. This includes physicians, dentists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, physician assistants and some nursing specialties. A unique aspect of the military healthcare service is that the Feres Doctrine upheld by the Supreme Court in 1987 bars military personnel from suing for malpractice. When CAP officers serve on AF authorized missions that are covered for liability and tort claims and protected against claims due to unique relationship we have with the Air Force, this same principle has the potential be used for health care professionals.

Since most health care professionals require advanced degrees, continuing education, and state licensure in order to practice medicine, there already exists an objective system in place for qualifying potential volunteers. Per the CAP Chief of Health Services, what is needed to proceed with assistance to the USAF Health service is a database developed by CAP National IT to register and track Health Service Officers in a way that chaplains currently are. This way, accurate information (based on AF personnel codes) of who is qualified to assist the Air Force in Health Services can be developed toward securing an agreement with the USAF Surgeon General.

## **October 2010 NEC Minutes**

### **PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee direct CAP IT to develop, in conjunction with the Chief of CAP Health Services, a database system to register and track Health Service Officers and other health specialties that could be useful in providing volunteer assistance to military hospitals. Such a system should be on line and ready to go prior to the 2011 Summer National Board meeting.

### **ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Possible developmental cost necessary for IT time to develop a database accessible within e-Services.

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Though there may be opportunities for health officers to support the Air Force, there are also many issues that also need to be seriously considered. The leadership should proceed cautiously if they even want to explore the possibilities outlined, and needs to establish clear boundaries in order to avoid significant liability exposure. Technically, bases could request this type of support now as an Air Force Assigned Mission (AFAM), but to date no AFAMs for this type of support have been requested that we are aware of. That may be due in part to not advertising medical capabilities, but also because of the liability and exposure the Air Force would potentially take on when our volunteers act in a higher level medical capacity. Our corporate insurance is very limited in this regard, and before supporting such an initiative it needs to be clear that the Air Force must provide the coverage necessary for these members when acting in this capacity. We'd also have to be careful to avoid mission creep; support in a hospital setting is one thing, but field operations and emergency response which military hospitals also support is much different. Support as a CAP Corporate Mission rather than an AFAM really should not be considered either in that we lack insurance coverage for this type and level of exposure; though firm numbers have not been requested from our broker, we believe our insurance premiums would skyrocket if medical malpractice coverage in any significant level was required. Also, it may present an issue with civilian doctors who could potentially challenge CAP volunteers adversely affecting their job opportunities

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Non-concur with the proposal to develop the Health Service Officer database at this time. While a noble proposal, much effort and time will be required to bring this program online and uncertainty remains regarding actual volunteer participation. At a period where the IT staff is heavily tasked, it may not be prudent to add this task to the load. If the data structure must be designed/coded, it should be done as part of the new association management software. That system is still in the process of being implemented in its initial form. Recommend as a starting point that CAP survey all Health Service Officers to determine which HSOs would actually be willing to volunteer in this effort. Additionally, reestablishing contacts with current AF/SG representatives should precede the database development to ensure there will be an avenue for the described service. If both of those efforts indicate promise for the eventual service, then this proposal could be revisited.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Chief, Health Services - Health Services Officers in the field have indicated a desire to explore the possibility of assisting the Air Force with medical needs using CAP health professionals. Gen Wheless, I and others met with the AF Surgeon General at the time, Maj Gen George Peach Taylor (a former CAP cadet!). He was interested in the proposal and assigned a staff member to liaison with CAP, Col Arnyce Pock. Lt Col Rick McLaughlin and I met with Col Pock who was also interested in the project and felt CAP could address some of her personnel needs. Col Pock suggested that we look into using one Air Force medical facility as a test site to develop a process to credential and use CAP health personnel at the facility. The next step was to identify the types and numbers of

CAP health professionals and their locations in relation to AF medical facilities to choose a test center to start this project.

Unfortunately CAP does not have a current way to access information on what types of health personnel we have and where they are located. Col Pock also needed information on credentials, as the members participating would all need to be board certified and state licensed. The Health Services Personnel Classification Matrix based on AF personnel codes has been developed to designate the specialty of each Health Service Officer. The Health Services Specialty Track was developed (now in review) which includes a requirement to register as a Health Service Officer. This registration process would allow us to collect up to date credentials, board certification and licensing information and assign AF personnel codes to each CAP health professional.

The next need is to develop the IT infrastructure to handle the collection of this information. CAP's IT structure has been undergoing updates, and IT staff felt that this project should be done on the new systems. Those systems are now near implementation. However, HS does not have a mandate from the board to task CAP IT resources to include HS information in the mission qualification programs. In addition to basic information like personnel codes, board certification status, and licensure status and expirations, additional storage and accessibility is needed for a Curriculum Vitae-type document containing training and background information, as well as limited access secure storage for scanned copies of credentials.

This AF Medical Assistance project cannot precede any farther without the IT infrastructure in place to collect information the AF needs. In addition, Maj Gen Peach Taylor and Col Pock have retired in the interim, so new contacts will need to be made. This IT project will not only benefit any future joint AF projects, but will serve as a way for commanders to locate medical resources and expertise when needed and to improve communications in the Health Services Program as it continues to develop. As an example of what CAP Health Services Officers can do for CAP, its missions, and furthering safety, I have attached an informational document on HSO duties and roles.

In order to develop the HS IT infrastructure, a mandate from the board to expend CAP IT resources for this project is needed. Once we know what CAP health professional resources are available, we can better discuss this project with our Air Force colleagues.

October 2010 NEC Minutes

**REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 161-1, *The CAP Health Service Program*

**NEC ACTION:**

**COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED the PROPOSED NEC ACTION**

**THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND**

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 4c**

**LG**  
Aircraft Purchases

**Action**

**SUBJECT: FY11 New Aircraft Distribution**  
**SWR/CC - Col Jensen**

Author: Col Varljen

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

The Civil Air Patrol (CAP), utilizing an all volunteer force, provides surrogate MQ-1 Predator capabilities as a realistic alternative during joint pre-deployment training for GREEN FLAG (GF). The CAP operates 2 C-182Q aircraft equipped with the MX-15 Sensor to supported ground commanders and Joint Terminal Attack Controllers (JTACs). CAP aircrews are trained to replicate the latest theater MQ-1 Predator Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (TTPs) and are trained to simulate Close Air Support (CAS) procedures IAW JP 3-09.3 and JFIRE directives. The modified C-182Q aircraft cannot perform the mission as effectively in the GF West (Las Vegas) environment due to limited high density altitude performance and weight carrying capabilities. The TC-206H aircraft can meet all performance requirements to perform the GF West mission. USAF Air Combat Command (ACC) originally requested CAP provide one additional aircraft for FY11 and an additional aircraft for FY12. They would now like CAP to commit to 2 new aircraft for FY11 instead of spreading the purchase over 2 years since there will be a cost savings if 2 aircraft are modified at once. USAF ACC has stated they will pay the difference in the cost between 2 C-182Ts and 2 Turbo C-206Hs if CAP is willing to contribute toward the purchase what it normally would pay to purchase the C-182Ts.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve committing FY11 aircraft procurement funds equal to the purchase of 2 new C-182T Nav III aircraft that will be used toward the purchase of 2 TC-206H aircraft for the Surrogate Predator Program. USAF ACC will fund the cost difference between the C-182Ts and the TC-206Hs and pay all of the additional MX-15 procurement and modification costs.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

There could be funding impacts and or realignments depending on the resolution of this item.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

CAP is only expecting to receive enough funding in FY11 to purchase 5 C-182T aircraft. Our preference would be that the Air Force provides enough additional aircraft procurement funds to allow CAP to purchase 2 TC-206H aircraft in addition to the 5 C-182T aircraft.

**CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

CAP-USAF understands CAP's desire for the AF to purchase TC-206H aircraft for the express support of GREEN FLAG WEST and other joint exercises. We've worked aggressively with HQ AF to acquire funding, but as of this response, no funding exists.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

The alternative is to continue working with ACC to fund the difference between C-182T aircraft and TC-206H models. Once appropriations are authorized, we'll know better how to proceed and will work with NHQ on the way ahead. Without additional aircraft funds provided by ACC or the Air Staff, we would not recommend purchasing TC-206H aircraft.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Senior Advisor – Operations: Concur. There is little doubt that neither the C182T G1000 nor the Turbo C182T G1000 can effectively or safely perform in some of the environmental conditions that exist in some of these operational areas. The C206, especially the Turbo C206, presents a much more desirable platform, with greater performance, not only for the environment considerations, but system accommodation and placement, as well.

That being said, if we upgrade two C182Ts to TC206Hs with the limited number of acquisitions scheduled for FY11, what impact can we expect on fleet size and utilization, and which regions would be willing to defer to FY12 or beyond? As an alternative, can these surrogate predator aircraft be in addition to the currently established fleet of 550? Will USAF be willing to provide all of the required funding for the two additional aircraft?

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

None.

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL JENSEN/SWR MOVED and COL KUDDER/NCR seconded the PROPOSED NEC ACTION, EXCEPT that the first line is changed to read: "That the National Executive Committee refer to the National Headquarters staff, and CAP-USAF for consideration to commit future aircraft procurement" and EXCEPT that in the last sentence delete the word "will" and substitute with the word "may."**

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

There was a lengthy discussion on this item as to how CAP should consider going forward with this issue, as well as Col Ward's explanation of how procurement works in the Air Force considering current financial struggles. There was agreement that this would be a good mission for CAP, even if CAP had to buy the aircraft. There was agreement to go ahead with approving the two Turbo 206Hs, with consideration that the Air Force may pay the difference in the cost of a C-182T and a Turbo 206H. The possibility of purchasing demonstrator models of the Turbo 206H was also mentioned. The decision of purchase to be determined by National Headquarters.

**COL JENSEN/SWR MOVED TO RECONSIDER and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded the motion.**

### **THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER CARRIED**

**COL CHARLES/NCON MOVED TO SUBSTITUTE and COL JENSEN/SWR seconded** the substitute motion to replace the motion under Agenda Item 4c;, as follows: “That the National Executive Committee supports purchase with FY11 procurement funds two C-T 206H aircraft to support the Green Flag Program.”

**COL CHARLES/NCON MOVED TO AMEND and COL JENSEN/SWR seconded** the amendment to add a second sentence: “The NEC also requests that CAP-USAF seek additional funds for aircraft through USAF/ACC.”

### **THE AMENDMENT CARRIED**

### **THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: CAP-USAF and National Headquarters staff action

**BRIG GEN CARR/CV MOVED and COL KARTON/GLR seconded** that the National Executive Committee request National Headquarters to develop a case to be made to the Program Manager and Grants Officer to increase the current fleet size from 550 aircraft to 552 aircraft based on the dedication of four aircraft to the Surrogate Predator mission.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters staff action requesting and justifying increase in aircraft fleet size to 552.

**AGENDA ITEM – 5a**

**MD**  
Operations

**Action**

**SUBJECT: ARCHER Mission Status**  
**SWR/CC – Col Jensen**

**Author:** Lt Col Russell

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

The operational status of ARCHER across CAP is nearing emergency status. There are at least 6 systems out of the original 17 procured systems that are not fully functional or are unreliable as an asset.

- There are no replacement parts/components
- There is no dedicated funding for maintenance and repair
- ARCHER is not a sustainable system given its current unfunded status.
- Texas Wing has been unable to support customer missions for over one year
  - Operation Seventh Flag (JTFN/CBP) (2008 & 2009)
  - Huntsville TCEQ foliage survey (2010)
- Cables (Octopus cable) cannot be repaired or reverse engineered due to design. SATA cables are too light duty and need to be replaced with heavier duty cables with locking connectors.
- Vibration and moisture incurred over the past 5 years these systems have been deployed is taking its toll on every electronic connection and component in the system.
- Original manufacturer of Octopus cable cannot/will not provide a schematic or pin-out drawing to enable new manufacture of the cable.
- In prior years, Texas Wing has had GA8s and ARCHER systems from 4 different wings trying to get one working system in one GA8. (CO, MO, NM, UT). Utah Wing's ARCHER is still NTC inoperative. NM has a bad drive slot but is otherwise functional. CO and MO Wing's systems are operational to the best of my knowledge. TX Wing's system is up and down like a yo-yo. It stops archiving after about 30 minutes of flight.
- We didn't buy 17 production systems. We bought 17 prototypes which are not sustainable under current conditions.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee appoints a committee primarily composed of individuals with actual ARCHER experience to study, evaluate, and report to the National Board with recommendations on this critical mission shortfall. In addition, that, pending resolution of these issues, ARCHER operations be designated as “optional, if personnel and equipment are available” on operations evaluation missions.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Unknown.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

We believe it would be better to have a small committee of senior leaders review this issue. CAP, with the full support and assistance of the Air Force Research Lab, the Naval Research Lab and the US Coast Guard R&D Center, completed testing and accepted the first production ARCHER system in July 2005. The systems are getting older and required maintenance is increasing. This project was funded by a special earmark from Congress and did not include any subsequent funding for sustainment of the program, thus CAP has been required to fund the maintenance of the systems primarily out of our regular, but limited Federal budget.

CAP has performed well on 39 operational missions in FY09-FY10. Twelve of those were monthly missions flown for the US Geological Survey (USGS) in the Northeast and there were 6 other USGS missions that were flown during this period thus making USGS CAP's largest ARCHER customer. The senior level committee should consider how many ARCHER systems are required nationwide to support this level of mission activity. Reducing the total number of ARCHER systems to a level that still supports the mission would allow CAP to better maintain the systems that are needed.

The computers, hard drives and monitors are all beyond the normal useful life that you would expect from this type of equipment especially given the temperature extremes plus the constant aircraft vibration that the ARCHER systems operate in. It is likely that these and other components of the ARCHER systems will continue to fail in the years ahead. Some of the ARCHER system components are no longer being produced so it will be impossible to replace them unless we cannibalize from other systems. CAP doesn't have the funding to replace everything and it won't be cost effective to reengineer a six year old system to incorporate some of the new components that will more than likely be required in the months and years ahead.

The biggest ARCHER problem CAP has faced so far has been a failure of the "Octopus" cable. CAP had an extremely difficult time finding a vendor that could manufacture the cable. We finally found a vendor and the cables will be delivered in October.

It's important to note that CAP should not face the same challenges with the Surrogate Predator program. The primary reason is the SP equipment is government furnished and the Air Force provides separate funding (in addition to CAP's Federal budget) to maintain the system. If the Air Force needs CAP to operate an updated SP system in the future, then they will fund the R&D, procurement, installation and maintenance of the new system. This is the best way for CAP to obtain and maintain expensive operational systems both now and in the future.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Non-concur with proposal as written. The ARCHER platform is indeed aging; however, some of the problems (i.e. Octopus cable) are being resolved. Given the growing challenges with maintaining the system, it's prudent to consolidate resources into a more sustainable fleet, much like the Senior Advisor describes. We further agree with NHQ that the committee should be comprised of senior leaders and not specifically those with ARCHER experience to allow for more variety and objectiveness in defining the way

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

ahead. The decisions to be made here fall less in the technical arena (how to configure/maintain/operate the equipment) and more in the mission management arena (how many platforms are truly necessary to accomplish a limited number of missions). Senior leaders are better suited to make these choices for the corporation.

Finally, CAP should employ all available resources to meet the requirements of Operations Evaluations. Making the ARCHER's use optional neither makes good use of appropriated resources nor affords the opportunity to evaluate ARCHER crew performance. Legitimate circumstances that drive an inability to perform a required mission should be handled as exceptions through a properly coordinated waiver approval process.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Senior Advisor – Operations: Do not concur. The Advanced Technology Group is already developing a working group to explore future ARCHER mission opportunities.

The ARCHER program has and continues to have its challenges and there are a number of issues ranging from funding and support to parts availability and repairs, and from training to system quality of care. There have been more than a few disappointments, but also a number of accolades. Not exactly what was initially envisioned, it is a system in transition, as seen in the North Central/ North East flood missions.

There appear to be two givens. One, although, the octopus cable replacement seems to have been resolved, the ARCHER system is getting older and availability of parts and technical support is becoming more and more of a challenge. Two, there is insufficient funding available for overall ARCHER support.

With limited parts availability and the prospect of more systems going down, it will become increasing more difficult to maintain the numbers we have today. In an effort to conserve parts, perhaps the ARCHER fleet should be reduced to no more than six nor less than four units, strategically placed throughout the United States and available for mission repositioning. By reducing the numbers, parts availability from other unused units will provide a better opportunity for maintenance, repair, and more importantly, reliability.

Initially, sufficient funding was provided to get the program going, but there were little or no follow-up funds for program maintenance. If ARCHER is to continue, at any level, it will require some kind of funding. I would encourage a dedicated budget for ARCHER maintenance and upgrade support of the remaining units.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

None.

### **NEC ACTION:**

COL JENSEN/SWR withdrew this item due to COMMENTS which revealed work already in progress.

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 5b**

**MD**  
Operations

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Aircrew Emergency Training Course**

**Author:** Lt Col Vazquez

**MER/CC - Col Vazquez**

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

Some of the duties of the mission observer are to assist the pilot with tasks that can reduce the workload within the cockpit, providing a better environment for cockpit resource management (CRM) and operational risk management (ORM). If the observer is also a trained pilot, the additional knowledge and skill-sets further enhances effective CRM and ORM in normal flight, as well as in emergency conditions.

The very nature of many of our SAR/DR/CD/HLS missions makes them inherently more hazardous than our other flying tasks, in that; they are usually prolonged flights, sometimes over challenging geography, at lower altitudes, with more pilots ‘heads-down’ concentration on instruments while accomplishing accurate tracking tasks. Having another pilot on board would, undoubtedly, provide a safer environment, especially in an emergency; however, only about 50% of our observers are pilots.

A recent event has raised a question. What would happen if a pilot was suddenly incapacitated by an unknown medical condition, a bird strike, or some other event? Who would land the airplane? It raises another question. Should we give our non-pilot observers the opportunity to get training on what to do if confronted by pilot incapacitation?

The Aircrew Emergency Training Course (Fly, Land, and Live) will be a new course for CAP to offer some of its membership. The training will offer non-pilot Mission Observers hands-on time on the aircraft controls, with the goal of making a survivable landing, if the pilot becomes incapacitated during flight. We believe that this course is not appropriate for cadets, except for those cadets 18 years of age or older with a current Mission Observer rating, due to the physical and emotional rigors associated with the tasks included in the training.

The number of members qualified to take the course will be limited to Non-Pilot Mission Observers on a one time basis only. No recurrence is required and participation is voluntary. This will be an optional course offered for review on the CAP NHQ website and available for downloading by the course certified instructors.

The course will be conducted over two days with a total of 8 hours of classroom instruction and 3 flight hours allowing the student hands on manipulation of aircraft controls. Similar courses exist in professional aviation (e.g. AOPA “Pinch Hitter” Course) but they only offer ground school training. This course will not only integrate the aeronautical information necessary to familiarize the student with the procedures and equipment, but increase the student’s understanding and retention of that information by including actual aircraft handling experience.

Since this course is mission related, flight hours will be scheduled under mission symbol B12. Instruction will be conducted by course trained CAP Instructor Pilots only. Initially, the course will be voluntary with funding at the discretion of the wing commander.

## **October 2010 NEC Minutes**

As designed, the addition of this training will not only enhance aircrew proficiency, CRM, ORM, and mission capability; in addition, we believe these additional skills may provide increased survivability for the aircrew in the case of unexpected pilot incapacity.

### **PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve the development of the Aircrew Emergency Training Course.

### **ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Classes have to be limited to the number of course trained CAP Certified Flight Instructors (CFI's) available to assist when the course is given. The most an instructor should handle in one afternoon is 2 students each. An aggressive program for most wings would be 20 students per year.

The anticipated fuel costs are estimated to be \$110 - \$150 (C-172 and C-182 respectively) per student (based on \$5.00/gal average). The course is designed to be unfunded and a one-time only expense per student; however, if approved by the wing commander, may be paid for with SAR/DR training funds.

In an effort to identify the number of members who would qualify for this course, NHQ statistics show 15 Wings have 20 or less Non-Pilot Observers, 20 Wings have 21-40 Non-Pilot Observers, and 17 Wings have 41-162 Non-Pilot Observers. In response to a Wing Stan/Eval Officers' survey conducted across the country, 50% were identified as active non-pilot observers.

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

NHQ concurs with the need for the course but we have two concerns dealing with the flight portion. First, the syllabus requires the non-pilot observers to perform landings during the three hours of flight instruction. CAP has experienced a large number of incidents and accidents in the past with instructor pilots and check pilots onboard the aircraft. In most of these cases, if the instructor pilot or check pilot had taken control of the aircraft from the other individual, they would have prevented damage to the aircraft. Given this fact, how will the course instructors be screened and trained so CAP minimizes the potential for a landing incident/accident with non-pilots conducting the landings?

The second concern deals with funding. The agenda item states these will be unfunded B-12 missions but could be Air Force funded if the wing commander approves. The feedback we receive every year from the field is that the wings need all of their current training funds to keep their personnel proficient. Therefore, allowing the use of Air Force funds for this program could have a detrimental impact on the proficiency of the wing's aircrews, ground teams and mission base staff.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur with the proposal for "the development of the Aircrew Emergency Training Course," however; some of the implementation details are still subject to additional

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

discussion. There shouldn't be any reason not to make the ground instruction portion of the curriculum available. This could proceed immediately. Prior to adding a flight portion (B-mission), NHQ's stated concerns must be addressed, particularly the screening and admonition of flight instructors to mitigate any added safety risk. Additionally, HQ CAP-USAF operations staff should be included in the coordination process for approval of the courseware.

For the sake of equity and appropriate stewardship of appropriated funds, there must be a national level decision as to whether designated training funds (A-mission) could be used to administer this training. Clearly pilot proficiency is of utmost importance in ensuring safe operations. Utilizing training funds for non-pilots would need to be well justified. While a recent high-profile incapacitation event looms large in imagining the possibilities, we don't make policy based on anecdotes. Prior to any discussion of using AF training funds, there should be a statistical analysis of incapacitation events and the likelihood that this type of training would have made a difference in the outcome.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Senior Advisor – Operations: Concur. Giving the other front seat crew member, a non-pilot Mission Observer, the opportunity to learn the basics of manipulating controls in an effort to maneuver an aircraft to a survivable landing in the event of pilot incapacitation, regardless of cause, makes sense from both a Safety and ORM prospective.

Senior Advisor – Support: Agree with the NHQ comments, however, due to the safety implications every effort should be made to resolve the issues addressed by NHQ and find the necessary funding. Non-pilot members often express a concern with the fact that only a single pilot is on board. The classroom training could be developed at minimum cost, and made available to all members desiring to take the training (priority to active mission personnel). The flight portion of the training is geared to allow the occupants to "walk away" from the aircraft—not ensure a damage free landing. Many members will be willing to pay for this safety training, and it will certainly enhance CAP CRM.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 60-1, *CAP Flight Management*

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED and COL RUSHING/SER seconded** that the National Executive Committee approve the development of the Aircrew Emergency Training Course along with an appropriate "train-the-trainer" course for instructors.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters staff action. In the implementation phase of this safety related training, there was recommended guidance that the OPR work with CAP-USAF to gain B mission status, with the members paying for this but gaining the insurance coverage during this safety training. Change to CAPR 60-1, CAP Flight Management.

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 5c**

**MD**  
Operations

**Action**

**SUBJECT: CAP G1000 Training Course**

**Author:** Lt Col Vazquez

**MER/CC - Col Vazquez**

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

When the Cessna G1000 aircraft were first introduced to CAP, there was a need to “jump start” the training process for technologically advanced aircraft and to ensure an initial level of standardization. Initially, therefore, the only means for becoming a CAP instructor, check pilot, or check pilot examiner for G1000 was to complete the Cessna factory training in Kansas.

The factory training follows Cessna’s FITS (FAA Industry Training Standards)-accepted G1000 Training Course. The Cessna course is designed to transition an IFR proficient pilot already familiar with C-182 flying directly into C-182 G1000 cross country IFR operations. It consists of ground training, followed by three flights – VFR cross country, IFR cross country and partial panel VFR/IFR flight. The course encourages pilots to use the autopilot from shortly after takeoff to landing approach, including vertical navigation and flight plan tracking. Consistent with the FITS concept of scenario-based training, the Cessna training is primarily directed at cross country navigation using the G1000 and the autopilot, which is how the typical Cessna customer uses the aircraft.

Although CAP (through changes to CAPR 60-1) has substantially relaxed the factory-training requirement as the number of G1000 aircraft and qualified G1000 pilots in the nationwide CAP fleet has grown, there is still a substantial cost to CAP for the factory training it does procure. In addition, it has become clear that Cessna’s FITS syllabus does not fully address the mission-oriented local flying key to CAP operations.

There is no liability advantage to using the Cessna FITS-accepted syllabus. (*Note: The syllabi developed through the FITS program are voluntary industry consensus standards. FAA acceptance (not “approval”) of FITS training programs was intended to be an initial quality control mechanism to help ensure that programs so labeled include scenario-based training and the other tenets of the FITS approach.*) A FITS-accepted course from a manufacturer such as Cessna is not deemed to be superior to any other course of instruction. Indeed, CAP potentially faces greater risk from a course that does not adequately reflect the equipment (e.g., dual audio panels, SAR software) or operations (e.g., local mission-oriented flying) CAP performs.

To provide better CAP-specific training and free funds for aircraft purchase or refurbishment, CAP should introduce its own course of instruction for G1000 aircraft.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve the development of a Civil Air Patrol G1000 training course by the National Operations staff.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

No funding impact to develop and implement the new course. CAP will additionally save money now dedicated to transportation, per diem, and the Cessna course fee needed to train G1000 instructors.

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur with the development of a CAP mission-based G1000 syllabus instead of using the Cessna syllabus. However, recommend CAP continue using the Cessna factory training course if the region and wing commanders determine that intensive professional training is needed by CFIs in their region/wing. The feedback NHQ has received from our CFIs who have attended the Cessna factory training has always been outstanding. Our CFIs learn a tremendous amount of information about how best to operate the G1000 system in the 6 days of intensive training they receive in Independence KS.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur with developing a CAP G1000 training course, but not limit access to the FITS course for CAP pilots. In addition, CAP should develop a similar course for ASPEN-modified aircraft.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Senior Advisor – Operations: Concur. The Cessna Factory FITS course is an excellent program for those who wish to participate; however, there are those who cannot or may not wish to travel to the Cessna factory. In addition to reducing CAP's training cost, development of a CAP-based G1000 course that meets and exceeds the Cessna Factory course will not only provide the same training, it will also enhance training by incorporating CAP's unique mission requirements.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 60-1, *CAP Flight Management*

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED and COL CHARLES/NCON seconded the PROPOSED NEC ACTION**

There was clarification that a similar training course for ASPEN-modified aircraft is being developed.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters staff action. Change to CAPR 60-1, Flight Management.

**SUBJECT: High Performance Aircraft Checkout Requirements**

Author: Col Vazquez

**MER/CC - Col Vazquez**

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

At the August 2006 National Board, a New Business item was approved that tasked the National Operations Committee to develop language removing the prohibition against cadet primary flight instruction in Cessna 182s. A related agenda item was submitted to the November 2006 NEC permitting cadet primary flight instruction in C-182s, which resulted in the current rules in CAPR 60-1 exempting student pilots from the minimum time requirements for that model aircraft.

The student pilot exemption was based on the policy at that time of purchasing only C-182 aircraft to replace CAP's fleet, impacting the availability of C-172s in the future. It was felt that low time pilots could be trained to fly C-182s as easily as any other aircraft, especially if this was the only aircraft type a student pilot would be flying.

In light of industry standards, recent changes in CAP fleet replacement, flight instructor feedback and the characteristics of the C-182, CAP should reverse its decision to permit primary student pilot flight instruction in high performance (C-182) aircraft. The list of reasons includes the following:

1. Industry standards. A review of 7 flight schools selected at random nationwide revealed that checkout standards ranged from a low of 100 hours total time with 5 hours make and model to a high of 200 hours total time with 5 hours make and model to fly fixed gear non-turbo charged C-182s. At no point was student pilot primary flight instruction found to be permitted in C-182s.
2. CAP recently started to refurbish older C-172 aircraft in lieu of purchasing new C-182s. This should result in better availability of C-172s for future student pilot training, without the need to commit to using C-182s for the task.
3. National Operations recently formed a committee of Region and Wing Stan/Eval officers to provide feedback on whether or not student pilots should be trained in C-182 aircraft. Out of 7 committee members, only one indicated approval for continuing C-182 primary flight instruction.
4. Aircraft damage potential is high with C-182s, particularly due to bad landings. As stated in the October 2010 issue of AOPA Pilot Magazine (page 82), regarding C-182 aircraft:

“The Skylane is, in fact, a nose-heavy airplane, and the careless can be timid in the landing flare. The results show up in logbooks as bent engine mounts, buckled firewalls, and cryptic log entries for propeller, engine, and nose gear replacements.”

## **October 2010 NEC Minutes**

Primary student pilots spend a predominate amount of training learning to land. Training aircraft have to be forgiving of bad landing attempts, an attribute that is not true of the C-182.

Lastly, it was reported that in 2010, all five National Flight Academies used C-172 aircraft only for cadet flight instruction. Elimination of the student pilot exemption for C-182s in CAP will not impact this important cadet activity. It will improve the safety of flight by providing a minimum standard all pilots operating this complicated aircraft model should possess.

### **PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve that the National Operations staff revise CAPR 60-1 to eliminate the existing student pilot exemption and present that revision to the Winter National Board for final approval.

### **ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

No funding impact is anticipated.

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Non-concur with the proposal as written. Procedurally, the NEC and NB are charged to make policy. The national staff then codes that policy into appropriate regulatory form. It's unnecessary to draft regulatory language in order to have it approved by a policy making body.

On the substance of the amendment we agree with the concerns of both Senior Advisors. Rather than prohibit (or allow) the use of C-182 aircraft in all circumstances, the policy could acknowledge the added risk and state a general prohibition with a described waiver procedure (approved at the wing commander level or higher) to account for special circumstances.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

National Chief of Staff: While I appreciate the opinions of the author and the sponsor, I do not see the need to change this regulation. There already exists a mechanism for wing and region commanders to use their judgment regarding these issues. As the RMR Commander, I co-sponsored the initial change to 60-1 which this proposal seeks to reverse. The Senior Advisor for Operations and the current NEC at that time approved the changes. Since the promulgation of the original change, the circumstances have not changed for those regions – like RMR – that do not use C-172s for operational missions. The need to train new pilots has not changed. FAA pilot requirements for flying high-performance aircraft have not changed. Commanders should be allowed to exercise that discretion. I believe now, as I believed then, that the commander in the field, the check

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

pilot, and the flight instructor in the cockpit are the best judges of whether or not to approve flight training and Forms 5. We need to keep the onus on those best able to make reasoned decisions in light of local conditions. Again, I do not think this regulation requires a change. The flexibility to utilize the fleet to best advantage should be retained.

Senior Advisor – Operations: I concur that C172s will provide for a better flight training platform than the C182 for a number of reasons; including the fact the C182 was not built to be a primary trainer. That being said, although I encourage the use of C172s whenever possible, even with the planned retention of C172s in the fleet there may be some regions of the country where a C172 may not be available. In an effort to retain a cadet flight training opportunity, if a C172 cannot be available, I suggest consideration of a waiver process that would give the Region Commanders the opportunity to approve flight training and subsequent checkout in a C182 aircraft on an individual basis, as final authority based on information presented up the chain-of-command.

Senior Advisor - Support: Concur with the concept of this proposal; however, we have concerns that the complete elimination of the exemption will prevent some qualified and deserving cadets from being able to participate in flight training. Suggest that a provision be included in any new policy which would allow a Wing Commander to request approval, through channels, to use a C-182 for cadet training based upon documentation that a C-172 is not practically available for the mission.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 60-1, *CAP Flight Management*

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED and COL KARTON/GLR seconded** that the NEC direct the National Operations Staff to investigate hazards related to student pilot instruction in High Performance Aircraft and develop a program to mitigate those hazards. Staff to present the program to the winter 2011 National Board Meeting for final approval.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Operations staff action. Include in the winter 2011 National Board agenda.

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 5e**

**MD**  
Communications

**Action**

**SUBJECT: VHF Antennas**  
**SWR/CC – Col Jensen**

**Author:** Lt Col Howe

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

There is a growing concern for the potential loss of mission effectiveness due to the lack of broadband VHF radio antennas for our base station VHF radios. The new narrow band frequencies encompass a wide frequency spread that is beyond the capabilities of many of the existing “ham” antennas that have been used in the past. While these antennas may continue to be effective (low VSWR on the transmit frequency) on the fixed repeater frequencies they tend to have a high VSWR on the CC, Air, and Guard frequencies. The results could range from reduced range to damage to the radio transmitter from the high impedance mismatch at the antenna. The same impact may be felt on the liaison frequencies as we start to work with other state and federal agencies.

A high priority for providing funding for broadband antennas for our fixed VHF installations is recommended. While this issue is recognized within the communications circle, support within the command and ES community is needed to maintain a fully mission capable VHF communications structure.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve the formation of a committee to study the impact, report the consequences to the National Board, and advise on what level of funding is required to fix this serious operational problem.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Unknown, but we have nearly 6,000 VHF mobile radios with a book value of over \$10 million.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS’ COMMENTS:**

A committee to study the issue is not needed. Beginning in 2005, CAP provided a suitable antenna with each base and mobile VHF-FM and HF radio distributed to the wings. Therefore, the antenna shortfall should primarily be limited to base and mobile radios purchased prior to 2005.

CAP always has more requirements than funding can accommodate. If wings haven’t been able to purchase their own antennas for the pre 2005 radios, NHQ maintains an unfunded requirements list throughout the year and items are funded from this list when funds become available. This is partially how CAP funded more than \$300,000 in requirements for narrowband repeater installations in FY10. This is different from major unfunded requirements that CAP submits to the AF each year (like the recent end-of-year vehicle purchase). Antennas are usually not the kind of high-value items that CAP requests be put on the AF unfunded requirements list.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

There is one other funding option. If the NEC feels the antennas are a mission critical requirement, the NEC could decide to reduce another FY11 budget item in order to provide some level of funding for the antennas.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur with NHQ comments.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Senior Adviser – Operations: Do not concur. I do not believe creating a committee is warranted. Since 2005, CAP has provided an antenna with each base and mobile VHF-FM and HF radio distributed to the wings. It appears the proper antennas in question would either be for units purchased prior to 2005 or would be replacements for those that are damaged or inoperative. Wing funding should be considered primary; however, if that is not an option, there are NHQ funding sources that may be available for justified antenna funding requests, if there are funds available. These are not items, however, that would be considered part of the year-end major unfunded requirements list that is submitted to USAF, which is intended for major expense items.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

None.

### **NEC ACTION:**

COL JENSEN/SWR withdrew this item due to discussions and staff work already completed by the National Headquarters staff and other appropriate people.

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 6a**

**IG/IT**

**Action**

Subordinate Unit Inspection

**SUBJECT: SUI Tracking and Compliance**

**Author:** Lt Col Knightly

**NER/CC - Col Hayden**

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

Given the nation-wide problem with Wing Subordinate Unit Inspection (SUI) compliance, and the inability to easily track that compliance in any system thus far developed, many Group and Unit members have participated in activities in violation of CAPR 123-3, Para 12b having exceeded the maximum months between SUI's. The implementation of an electronic system similar to that is used to track Pilot or Emergency Services qualifications would provide a tool to better track compliance as well as prohibiting any members of non-compliant units from participation. This tool should include the ability to track required unit Self Assessments (SA) for those units on the 36 month cycle, and the ability to toggle that off if using a 24 month cycle.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approves the implementation of an e-services application where SUI dates are tracked and uploaded into an Inspector General (IG) only section, to include required SA's. This system would automatically prohibit members of any unit in non-compliance from flight release, activity participation etc, as well as send notification e-mails to the Wing and Unit CC's and the Wing IG.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Aside from un-determined implementation funds, no long term funding required.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

While it is possible to create an application in eServices that will accommodate SUI and Survey Audit scheduling and notifications, it will be very difficult to create an automated system that prohibits overdue units' members from activity participation. All activities do not require information from eServices and creating a system that will accommodate the significant number of participation exceptions is not possible at this time. We are concerned that continuing to add non-pilot rating criteria like this to the flight release process has the potential to add confusion to both the pilot and the flight release officer.

**CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

While we share the concern regarding compliance with the SUI program provisions, electronic tracking/enforcement may be a challenging undertaking for limited IT resources. Additionally, the failure in the SUI area didn't appear to rest with the lack of automation tools. The shortfalls more commonly resulted from complete negligence in the IG and CC programs. Given the demand for IT solutions in all mission areas, this may be an application that can be satisfactorily solved with greater attention to the basics of the program. Concur with NHQ comments.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

CAP IG: The IG concurs with the proposal. The IG staff has been working with the IT department for over two years to develop an inspection finding tracking program. However the program is designed to track findings and responses to closure for each and every finding on every inspection. It is a very complex design and much more detailed than what is necessary for this proposal. The greatest concern we have is the wings and/or regions that use this proposal must input and constantly update the data.

Senior Advisor - Support: Concur with NHQ comments, and recommend approval only of the scheduling and notification portions of this proposal.

Senior Advisor – Operations: Concur, when a unit presents an environment that creates an overdue SUI; however, there have been situations when the unit in question was not the primary cause of the failure to comply. Under that circumstance, if indeed this process can be automated, should there be an opportunity of review and waiver before participation is automatically suspended?

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 123-3, *Civil Air Patrol Compliance Assessment Program*

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL HAYDEN/NER MOVED and COL CORTUM/RMR seconded the PROPOSED NEC ACTION.**

**COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO AMEND and COL VAZQUEZ/MER seconded the amendment to strike the second sentence of the proposed action.**

### **THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED**

**COL CHARLES/NCON MOVED TO AMEND and COL KARTON/GLR seconded the amendment to delete the word “only” after the words “Inspector General (IG)” and add the words “and Commanders.”**

### **THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED**

NOTE: The amended motion reads: “That the National Executive Committee approves the implementation of an e –services application where SUI dates are tracked and uploaded into an Inspector General (IG) and Commanders section, to include required SAs.”

### **THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters staff action, as agreed by the summer 2011 National Board.

---

**AGENDA ITEM – 6b**

**IG**  
Inspections

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Program Representation during Compliance Inspections**

Author: Col Ward

**CAP-USAF/CC - Col Ward**

---

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

CAPR 123-3 states in para. 7. b.2., “All wing program directors should be present for wing inspections. Should a director be unavailable, someone knowledgeable in his/her functional area must represent the absent director.” Many wings inspected during the Cycle 3 round of compliance inspections do not have program directors showing up for interviews or the designated representative is not able to showcase the entire program to the inspectors. Recently, one wing did not have program directors available for 10 of the 18 inspected programs.

Significant capital is invested by the CAP and the Air Force in terms of man-hours and finances to comply with this Statement of Work inspection requirement. In addition, assessments are vital to the CAP National Commander and CAP-USAF Commander in providing an independent evaluation of organizational readiness, efficiency and effectiveness. It is vital that Wing Commanders ensure knowledgeable program representation is present for all compliance inspections.

**PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee form a committee to study the impact of wing program directors’ failure to attend the compliance inspection or prepare a knowledgeable substitute to present the program in his/her absence. This study should include guidance on how to assess programs which do not provide either functional representation or the representative is not able to address all aspects of the program. It should also recommend sanctions for wings that fail to adequately engage the quadrennial requirement for inspection. This committee should include both CAP and CAP-USAF members and will report back to the National Board no later than Feb 2011.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Administrative costs for the committee to provide the study.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS’ COMMENTS:**

Out of the 396 interviews thus far in cycle 3, 16 (4%) did not have the primary director present. Nine of those interviews resulted in ratings of Successful, three resulted in Marginals, and four resulted in Unsatisfactory.

**CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS’ COMMENTS:**

Concur. If this shortfall is not adequately addressed it may lead to Unsatisfactory compliance inspection ratings.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

CAP-IG: Do not concur with the proposal as written. We do not view this as an inspection problem, rather a manning/staffing problem. While we experience a continuing problem both in inspecting unmanned positions and/or substitutes with no or limited knowledge of the subject, we inspect programs rather than people. If the program can show adequate supporting documentation and some semblance of management, it is graded accordingly. The IG sees this whole problem as an organization mired in a 1950s organizational structure with commander's who are not able to man some programs with experienced, capable people. I thank CAP-USAF for bringing this issue forward for everyone to see a problem throughout the organization.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 123-3, *Civil Air Patrol Compliance Assessment Program*

### **NATIONAL BOARD ACTION**

**COL WARD/CAP-USAF/CC MOVED and COL MYRICK/PCR seconded the PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION.**

**BRIG GEN CARR/CV MOVED TO AMEND and COL CHAZELL/CS seconded the amendment to add the words: "request the National Commander" between the words "Committee" and "form" on the first line.**

### **THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED**

### **THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: The National Commander name a committee including CAP-USAF personnel, the IG, a member of the NEC, at least one wing commander, a member of Col Guimond's team, and a representation of National Headquarters. There was guidance to the committee to also consider the issue of leadership and in the context of manning, organizational structure, and personnel as well as electronic continuity books. Include in the winter 2011 National Board agenda.

**SUBJECT: Revisions to CAPR 900-5  
NLO - Col Herrin**

Author: Col Herrin

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

CAPR 900-5 governs CAP's Insurance/Benefits program, including medical benefits. CAP, through a program of self-insurance, offers medical benefits secondary to and in excess of members' existing medical insurance coverage. Cadets and senior members are entitled to up to \$8,000.00 of medical benefits in cases where (a) the member has no health insurance and (b) to the extent no coverage is afforded to members by the member's primary medical insurer. Therefore, a member who has health insurance will not be entitled to benefits from CAP until the deductible under his or her primary insurance has been paid. Members who have high deductibles health plans or "catastrophic" health care coverage could be forced to incur up to \$5,000.00 of medical expenses for an illness or injury occurring on a CAP activity before becoming eligible to receive benefits from CAP. Members have been told in the past that CAP's insurance will cover them if they are injured on CAP activities, but the technical application of the regulation may leave members with significant medical bills. In the past, this insurance issue has not been as critical because many CAP encampments took place on active duty or reserve military installations at which free medical care was available. In today's environment, however, the need for commercial hospital treatment is much more prevalent, and the expense should not be borne by CAP members when injured during a CAP activity. In particular, parents of CAP cadets who have been placed in CAP's care should not have to pay out of pocket for any medical costs associated with a cadet's participation that are not covered by the parents' health insurance. Such a policy is consistent with the policies of other youth service organizations, which pay the entire portion of a youth member's health care claim that is not covered by other insurance.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approve a change to CAPR 900-5 Section E Paragraph 20 as follows: (b) for senior members: that portion of the other policy coverage not paid such as coinsurance deductible (not including standard deductibles), etc., up to \$8,000 per occurrence; (c) for cadets: that portion of the other policy coverage not paid for any reason up to \$8,000 per occurrence. All medical expense benefit payments to senior members are subject to the \$50 per claim deductible.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Funding impact is estimated to be small because coverage is being extended to a small group of members: cadets who have primary medical insurance but with very high deductibles. Funding would only be an issue in the event that a cadet has this type of medical insurance and is injured on a CAP activity for which no other coverage is available.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS**

More information is required before we may provide a complete commentary. In summary, the CAP medical expense benefits will pay (a) if there is no other applicable insurance and (b) up to \$8,000 per occurrence. In addition, it should be noted that even though some CAP encampments do take place on military installations historically (past 16 years) only approximately 5% of claims for injured members received free medical care at those facilities.

In order to properly assess this agenda item, specific, detailed and empirical data is required regarding the definition of "high deductibles" and to further substantiate the policies of other youth organizations who pay the entire portion of a youth member's health care claim. Coverage and premiums may be affected by the proposed amendments.

One option to address this "hardship" issue may be to file an application for funds from the CAPCares program which was designed to provide relief for this type of situation and there would be no need to alter the regulation.

Finally, under the circumstances, referral to a committee seems proper for analysis, discussion and report.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS**

Non-concur as written. Prior to implementation of such a policy, the underwriter would need to be consulted to check for any unintended consequences and the completed proposal should undergo a thorough review.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

None.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 900-5, *Civil Air Patrol Insurance/Benefits Program*.

### **NEC ACTION:**

COL HERRIN/NLO withdrew this item in order to further study the insurance issue.

---

**AGENDA ITEM - 8**

**Action**

**SUBJECT: Old Business**

---

**A. February 2010 National Board Meeting**

**Agenda Item 5c.**

**Membership Eligibility**

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

At the present time, CAP members complete the screening process upon their initial membership and are generally only required to be rescreened if they have a break in service, participate in the counterdrug program, or apply for a Corporate Officer position. The Senior Member Oath of Membership that is agreed to upon joining and reconfirmed on an annually basis states that members are obligated to notify CAP if there are any changes to their background/screening information. It has recently been discovered that this requirement is not being following by members at all times. A formal procedure for submitting this information needs to be established.

**PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION:**

That the National Board approves a policy that states all senior members must notify the National Headquarters Screening Division (NHQ/PMM) of any changes to the background/screening information originally submitted on their CAP Form 12 within 30 days of the offense/arrest and/or conviction. Upon receipt of the updated information, National Headquarters will follow the established procedures for reviewing background information to determine continued membership eligibility. Failure to properly notify National Headquarters of any change in information may result in automatic loss of membership.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

The current budget should be able to accommodate the small increase in fingerprint screening that is anticipated as a result of this proposal.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur.

**CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

To be presented.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

**NLO** – Concur.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 39-2, *CAP Membership*  
CAPR 35-3, *Membership Termination*

### **NATIONAL BOARD ACTION**

**COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and COL RUSHING/SER seconded** the PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION.

**COL SAILE/MI MOVED TO REFER and COL BROWN/AK seconded** the amendment to refer this to the Membership Action Review Board and staff for appropriate language to make the intent of this proposed action more clear and to include a review of Form 12.

### **THE MOTION TO REFER CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Referral to committee and staff with guidance from the National Board to include review of Forms 12 and 2b in deliberations as well as the appropriate language to apply all CAP members. Include in 2010 summer NB Agenda.

---

## **October 2010 - Action**

COL HERRIN provided the report and recommendation from the Membership Action Review Board and made the following motion:

**COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED and COL CHARLES/NCON seconded** that the National Executive Committee approve that the following paragraph be included in CAPR 39-2, CAP Membership:

“All senior members must notify the National Headquarters Screening Division (NHQ/PMM) of changes in the information originally submitted on their CAP Form 12 within 30 days of any change that might make the individual ineligible for membership, (i.e. changes in residency status, military status, arrests, etc.). Upon receipt of the updated information, National Headquarters will follow the established procedures for reviewing background information to determine continued membership eligibility.

## **October 2010 NEC Minutes**

National Headquarters will notify the Wing Commander concerned of the pending membership eligibility review. A new fingerprint card may be requested by National Headquarters if necessary to complete the review process. Failure to properly notify National Headquarters of any change in information shall be grounds for termination of membership.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy, notification to the field, and change to CAPR 39-2, CAP Membership.

### **ITEM CLOSED**

**B. February 2010 National Board Meeting**

**Agenda Item 6a**

**Quality Cadet Unit Award**

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

The most successful cadet units all seem to display the same characteristics: their cadets are flying, earning promotions, attending encampment, renewing their membership, recruiting their friends, etc. The hallmarks of a great cadet unit are no secret.

To help put more squadrons on the road toward success, we need to motivate them to focus on the fundamentals.

This proposal calls for creating a Quality Cadet Unit Award. Every unit that meets certain criteria would earn the award. A big wing like California, for example, might set a goal of having 30 squadrons earn the Quality Cadet Unit Award, and every unit would know it could meet that goal if it works hard enough. In contrast, one shortcoming of the Squadron of Merit Award / Squadron of Distinction Award programs is that every year one, *but only one*, unit will win it, regardless of how many squadrons are performing well. It's also worth noting that SOM/SOD is entirely subjective, while the Quality Cadet Unit Award would be based on objective criteria.

The Quality Cadet Unit Award would give all cadet units something to strive for. Such a *criteria-based* award could help grassroots units focus on the Cadet Program's fundamentals. In turn, we would make a positive impact on how individual cadets experience CAP.

**PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION:**

That the National Board authorizes National Headquarters to establish a Quality Cadet Unit Award program, as outlined below. This award would replace the Squadron of Merit and Squadron of Distinction Award programs.

**Goal:** Motivate squadrons to excel in Cadet Programs by focusing units on the fundamentals

**Eligibility:** All cadet and composite squadrons are eligible

**Criteria:** The award criteria are entirely objective. Any squadron that meets at least 5 of the 8 criteria listed below, as of 31 December of a given year qualifies for the award:

- a. Cadet Achievement: 33% of cadets on roster have attained the Wright Brothers Award

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

- b. Orientation Flights: 40% of cadets on roster have participated in at least 1 flight
- c. Encampment: 40% of cadets on roster have completed encampment
- d. Growth: Unit's cadet roster increased by at least 10%, or 10 cadets during previous year
- e. Retention: Unit retained at least 40% of first year cadets during previous year
- f. Enrollment: Unit has at least 25 cadets listed on its roster
- g. Aerospace: Unit earned the Aerospace Excellence Award (AEX) during previous year
- h. Adult Leadership: Unit has at least 2 Training Leaders of Cadets graduates on its roster

**Award Elements:** All units that qualify for the Quality Cadet Unit Award would receive the benefits listed below.

- a. Permission to place a Quality Cadet Unit Award emblem on the unit website and letterhead
- b. An award certificate
- c. Permission to attach to the unit flag a blue and gold streamer, to be available through Vanguard (style will be similar to the Squadron of Merit streamer).

**Award Process:** Each January, NHQ will examine data from the preceding calendar year to determine winning squadrons. All squadrons are automatically considered for the award and all winners will automatically be notified by NHQ – this is to be a “push system” with no application process.

**Amending the Program:** NHQ is authorized to adjust the award criteria from year to year, with permission of the National Commander.

**Wing-Level Award:** Further, in each region, the wing that has the highest percentage of cadet units earning the squadron-level award will win the Wing-Level Quality Cadet Unit Award. The award elements will be similar to those used for the squadron-level award.

### **ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

Approximately \$100 per year for award certificates.

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur. Members have responded very enthusiastically to this idea and criteria based award would be an important new metric for the Cadet Program.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Concur.

### ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

**NLO** - Concur, and suggests that the current National Commander's Unit Citation Ribbon be converted to a Quality Unit ribbon to recognize members of such units, such ribbon to rank in precedence immediately below the Unit Citation ribbon.

#### Awards and Promotions Team and Sr Advisor Support:

We are in agreement with the basic idea of this agenda item, but do not believe that it has been sufficiently staffed to refer to the NB. This lack of detailed evaluation resulted in the failure of the old "CAP-MAP" award system. In addition, the cost and manpower necessary for the award needs further consideration. A total cost of \$100 per year is not realistic, and we do not believe it is proper to have the receiving units purchase their own streamer (current cost \$35 per unit). We also believe that the Wing Commander must have the final review on concurrence on all awards to his or her units.

Finally, we do not recommend the elimination of the Squadron of Merit/Distinction Award. Winning these prestigious awards have been the goals of many squadrons across the nation, and we believe the Quality Unit Award should supplement, not replace, the SOM/SOD.

In order for these items to be addressed, we recommend this AI be referred to a joint Cadet Programs/Awards Committee for return to the summer 2010 NB for final action.

### REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

CAPR 39-3, *Award of CAP Medals, Ribbons, & Certificates*  
CAPR 52-16, *Cadet Program Management*

### NATIONAL BOARD ACTION

**COL HAYDEN/NER MOVED and COL COOPER/NH (PROXY) seconded** the PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION, amended as follows: (1) Withdraw the second sentence of the motion; (2) Change the first sentence to read: That the National Board authorizes National Headquarters to establish a Quality Cadet Unit Award program, as outlined below including a banner on the squadron flag, as an incentive for working toward and achieving the Squadron of Distinction Award.

**COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO AMEND and COL ROBINSON/AL seconded** the amendment to provide direction to the Uniform Committee to develop an appropriate ribbon or devise for members of a quality unit to wear on their uniform.

### THE MOTION TO AMEND DID NOT PASS

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

**COL PHELKA/CO MOVED TO REFER and COL WINTERS/OH seconded** that the board approve this motion, in concept, and refer to committee with guidance to study the criteria and award elements, if any, and the study results brought forward to the next NEC meeting.

### **THE MOTION TO REFER CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Referral to committee with a report to the May 2010 NEC Meeting. Include in the May 2010 NEC Agenda.

---

### **May 2010 NEC - Action**

COL GUIMOND reported that the Cadet Programs Team and Awards Team have worked this item to some extent but have not reached a conclusion for a recommendation to the National Executive Committee. It is a reasonably extensive undertaking and there are a number of possible issues involved. He further reported that Cadet Programs and the committee members are strongly against moving the existing Squadron of Distinction and Squadron of Merit before the concept is proposed; the devil is in the details of achieving where that concept needs to go.

**COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and COL MYRICK/PCR seconded** that the National Executive Committee send this item back to committee until it is further vetted as to costs and what needs to be done.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Referred back to committee for continued work. Col Guimond accepted responsibility and stated a report would be given at the 2010 November NEC. Include in the 2010 Nov NEC agenda.

---

### **October 2010 - Action**

COL GUIMOND submitted a written report regarding the Quality Cadet Unit Award. He noted that the National Board referred to committee primarily the criteria for the award and asked the committee to develop criteria with supporting numbers. He also noted the following: That five of the eight criteria would have to be met in order to receive that award.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

The goal is essentially 15 percent of the units' eligible receiving the award. At the present time, 4 percent of the units in the time frame measured are meeting the current criteria, and by achieving five of the eight, and an additional 12 percent are meeting four of the five. The aim is to be pro-active and push success in order to achieve the 15 percent goal. The committee also recommends that the National Headquarters staff, with approval of the National Commander, be given the ability to amend and adjust the criteria on an annual review basis to continue to meet the goals (15 %) originally established by the National Board. Also, the program will continue to change over the years and this would allow the program to be modified without having to come back to the board or the NEC. Paragraph 5 establishes what the actual award is. The initiative was to maintain it on an annual basis to provide a certificate, a logo that the winners may use in the Volunteer Magazine. The committee did not recommend a streamer or other relatively expensive awards to the unit. He emphasized that the National Board was quite clear in their charge that the Quality Cadet Unit Award would not impact the existing Squadron of Merit or the Squadrons of Distinction, which is affirmed in paragraph 6. The final cost at the national level is approximately \$1500.00 as noted in paragraph 7. Col Guimond expressed an opinion that this is an award that Cadet Programs team both at National Headquarters and the volunteer staff have been developing and pushing for 3 or 4 years and he recommended it strongly to the NEC.

**COL JENSEN/SWR MOVED and COL VAZQUEZ/MER seconded** that the National Executive Committee approve the recommendation of the committee.

**COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO AMEND and COL MYRICK/PCR seconded** the amendment to require Quality Unit status before being eligible for Squadron of Merit or Squadron of Distinction.

### **THE MOTION TO AMEND DID NOT PASS**

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy, notification to the field, and change to CAPR 39-3, Award of CAP Medals, Ribbons, and Certificates; and CAPR 52-16, Cadet Program Management

### **ITEM CLOSED**

## C. November 2009 National Executive Committee Meeting:

### Agenda Item 2

#### Conduct of Members Using Social Media

##### INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

Social media is a broad term that describes increasingly popular software tools and techniques, primarily Internet based, that allows groups and individuals to engage in peer-to-peer conversations and to exchange content. Current examples of social media are YouTube™, flickr®, Facebook, MySpace™, Twitter™, and many others.

The primary demographic of social media is young adults, ages 18-34. However, use by other age groups is rapidly growing, including a reported 193% growth in users over the age of 55.

Statistics on social media use vary wildly, including projections that there are currently over 100 million active Facebook users daily, and that since its inception close to 5-billion “tweets” have been sent over Twitter™.

Social media outlets have had an enormous impact on global communications, most of it positive. Groups and sites have formed for every imaginable interest, not the least of which is the Civil Air Patrol. CAP has its own Facebook page with 4,753 fans. (capmembers.com/fb), as well as a presence on Twitter™ (capmembers.com/twitter) with 883 followers. Twitter™ was even used for emergency response (Southern California Wildfires) when other methods of communications were unavailable or had failed.

Unfortunately, there is a dark side to social media use, just as there is with other Internet technologies.

**Inappropriate content** – As with any form of personal expression, the topics discussed and methods used are limited only by the user’s imagination. What may be innocent communication to one person may offend the next. This is certainly true of the Internet. People regularly post photographs displaying near or total nudity, public drunkenness and antics of questionable safety and legality. Most such posters would be profoundly embarrassed to disclose the same material to their parents, children, spiritual leader, or CAP commander.

Other, less obvious, offenses include public disagreements, which deteriorate into “flame wars” and become the textual equivalent of hazing. Another easily envisioned scenario is posting of text or photographs from Civil Air Patrol missions that are classified as FOUO or otherwise not for public dissemination.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

**Malicious content** – The popularity of social media sites has not been lost on those who would use them for gain or crime. Virus, worms and other malicious program delivery via social media sites has been on the rise since its inception. It is estimated that up to 80% of all web sites are infected with some type of malware. Facebook has had 8 documented vulnerabilities in less than one year. The reason that malicious content works so well on social media sites is simple: There is an implicit trust of those on one's network or social circle, a willingness to share information, little or no identity and the ability to run arbitrary code (in case of user-created apps) with minimal review. This all adds up to users becoming an easy target for the bad guys and then unknowingly distributing the content to their contact lists.

**Illegal uses** – Notwithstanding the distribution of malicious software, social media can also be used for other illegal activities, the foremost of which is, predictably, the solicitation of minors. Pages and posts can be, and too often are, configured to deceive children and attract them to in-person meetings. Many social media outlets claim to have controls in place, but unfortunately, the techniques of those who abuse social media are always several steps ahead of such controls.

### **Recommendation**

It should not be CAP's intent to stunt use of social media. Rather, with the issues discussed in the preface to this proposed action in mind, CAP needs to tell its members what are CAP's expectations for social media use.

Civil Air Patrol members are expected to behave professionally at all times, not just while in uniform. This includes not only our appearance and speech, but in all ways we comport ourselves in public. Our use of social media should be no exception to these expectations.

Any CAP policy must distinguish guiding moral and ethical behavior from legal requirements. This is challenging. On the one hand are the behaviors guided by, for example, CAP Core Values, Ethics Policy and the bases for termination under CAPR 35-3. These standards provide the most concrete statements of CAP's commitments to member personal accountability insofar as they express CAP values, member fiduciary obligations, avoidance of conflict of interest, respect, fairness and openness, good faith, due care, and confidentiality. On the other hand, however, expressing these attributes, controlling actions that conflict with them and the legal constraints imposed by the United States Constitution and the Amendments to the Constitution (not to mention State constitutions) are in natural tension. Simply forbidding any speech that interferes with CAP Core Values, Ethics Policy, etc., is plainly unworkable.

A functional policy must be one that can be understood and followed by all members and that does not constrain a member's speech. This policy proposal attempts to meet those conflicting needs.

### **PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approves the following wording being added to CAPR 35-3, *Membership Termination*:

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

*Social Media.* CAP, its commanders, officers, and staff shall not constrain any communication by a member, whether senior or cadet, including without limitation use of the Internet. Provided, however:

- (1) CAP member generated material constituting "speech" shall not use either sexually explicit or suggestive language, profanity, photograph or graphic material of sexually explicit or suggestive or depictions of violence or mayhem;
- (2) CAP member generated material constituting "speech" shall not violate any CAP regulation or policy directive;
- (3) CAP member generated material constituting "speech" shall not link or redirect any person who may receive such material to any such proscribed material.

*Violation.* Violation of subparagraphs (1) through (3) may be deemed misconduct and may be subject to adverse membership action including membership termination. Before any adverse membership action is commenced for violation of this subpart of the regulation, it shall be reviewed by the Wing Commander, Wing Legal Officer, and CAP General Counsel. Any final adverse decision shall be reviewed by the National Commander or his or her designee.

### **ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

None.

### **CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

**Non-concur:** Due to considerations of First Amendment rights (Freedom of Speech), enforcement is very unlikely beyond making it clear that members participating in Social Networking Media in their individual capacity have no authority to speak for Civil Air Patrol.

In addition, Civil Air Patrol may properly enforce protection of non-authorized use of its logos, brands, and symbols in a Social Networking environment.

### **CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur with National Staff comments.

### **ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

**Senior Advisor - Support:** The entire Support Section agrees that social media has become a major factor in our lives with both a positive and negative side. The USAF and DOD have been struggling with this issue for some time; however, members of the armed services are subject to the UCMJ which is not the case in CAP.

A review of the proposed Agenda Item indicates that there are several areas which may have substantial legal issues involved. For that reason we recommend that the NEC refer this to a committee comprised of both NHQ and volunteer staff (including the CAP General

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

Council) to develop recommendations on this important issue and report back to the NEC at the spring 2010 Meeting.

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 35-3, *Membership Termination*.

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL CARR/GLR MOVED and COL MYRICK/PCR seconded** that the National Executive Committee approve sending this item to an appropriate committee for consideration and return to the appropriate body (no guidance provided by the maker of the motion).

### **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Referral to a committee to be created by the National Commander, with the following guidance: (1) Legal officer people who are aware of social media to review the internet policy; (2) Committee will be requested to send status interim reports at each of the next upcoming meetings until the final report. Include in the winter 2010 National Board agenda.

---

### **ACTION: February 2010 National Board**

**Committee Report:** The Social Media Committee is being formed with representation from all appropriated areas. The National Commander has approved the National Public Affairs Team Leader, Maj Al Pabon as Chairman. A formal report will be submitted to the 2010 summer National Board meeting.

---

### **ACTION: September 2010 National Board Meeting**

Maj Pabon, Chairman of the Social Media Committee gave his report. This agenda item will be considered at the October 2010 NEC meeting.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **October 2010 - Action**

MAJ PABON/COMMITTEE CHAIR provided a written Interim Report and Recommendations, dated 27 Oct 2010. He noted that the committee's key tasking was to create a policy recommendation, and he provided an overview of actions taken to date. He stated that the committee is respectfully requesting that the NEC approve the Interim Report that contains a broad-based CAP social media policy that will be used to develop the deliverables, including CAPP 190-1 (CAP Guide to Social Media) as the chief component of CAP's social media resources and the timeline for the work the committee anticipates doing within a year. He clarified that structured media is the social media used by CAP as an organization—National Headquarters, regions, wings, and squadrons; something that CAP can use to tell its story. Unstructured social media is an individual's Face Book, Twitter, or Blog.

During discussion on the undesirable aspects of unstructured social media, Col Herrin/NLO requested that the committee to specifically develop some recommendations about how to deal with Cyber bullying and hostile statement that are made by cadets about other cadets. There was agreement that the committee would also look at this issue and report back.

During discussion, Col Guimond clarified that one of the charges given to the committee was to define what would be acceptable or appropriate or not, but not to establish punitive action, which would be the prerogative of the commanders.

**COL CHARLES/NCON MOVED and COL CHAZELL/CS seconded that the National Executive adopt the committee's Proposed Social Media Committee Timeline (Atch 3 to the Social Media Committee Report).**

### **THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Continue including in Old Business with progress reports according to prescribed timeline. Include in winter 2011 National Board agenda.

**D. May 2010 National Executive Committee Meeting:**

**Agenda Item 9**

**Active Personnel Files**

**INFORMATION BACKGROUND:**

IAW CAPR 39-2 Section B Active Records 1.7 *The member's unit of assignment will maintain these records. The unit personnel officer normally maintains personnel records.*

This gives any unit commander access to their personal files whereby items such as a letter of admonishment or reprimand could easily be removed. By these records being moved to and maintained by the next highest echelon such interference would not be possible and the integrity of these records would be assured.

**PROPOSED NEC ACTION:**

That the National Executive Committee approves that all CAP members' personnel files would be held by their immediate unit except the unit commanders themselves where their personnel file would be held by the next level unit commander that they report to. Unit Commanders: Squadron to Group, Group to Wing, Wing to Region, and Region to National.

Effective date of \_\_\_\_\_.

**ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:**

None.

**CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur.

**CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:**

Concur.

**ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**

Sr Advisor Support – We have no objection to this agenda item, however, we suggest that Wing and Region Commanders maintain their own personal records in the same manner that National Staff Officers do. There will be a substantial cost involved for the NHQ to maintain all records, and the present system for senior staff and national officers has worked well for many years.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:**

CAPR 39-2, *Civil Air Patrol Membership*

### **NEC ACTION:**

**COL HAYDEN/NER MOVED and COL KUDDER/NCR seconded that the National Executive Committee refer this item to committee with a report to the November 2010 NEC Meeting.**

During discussion there were concerns especially about procedures for handling personnel files containing reprimands and how long they should be kept.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: The National Commander will work with Ms. Parker/DP and committee chairs to determine if the scope of the Adverse Action Committee should be enlarged to manage this item or if better served elsewhere send to another committee. Proposed options will be coordinated with region commanders prior to committee assignment.

Include in the November 2010 NEC Agenda.

---

### **October 2010 - Action**

#### **Committee Report – 23 Oct 10**

The Adverse Action Committee did discuss this issue at our last conference call. The committee is not in favor of the agenda item as proposed. They feel that a better approach to handling issues of letters of admonishment or reprimand, items which might be removed if a person had access to their own personnel files, would be for each commander to maintain a continuity book to be passed on to his or her successor with notes regarding admonishment or reprimand. Continuity book items do not have to be reviewed with the individual to the extent items entered into a personnel file have to be reviewed. Furthermore, if items are entered into personnel files, they should contain a date at which the item will be removed, based on the severity of the issue, if the action served to modify the individual's behavior as it was intended.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

**COL KUDDES/NCR MOVED and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded** that the National Executive Committee request the Adverse Action Committee to continue working this issue to include a recommendation as to how commanders access the database when evaluating people for promotion or placement in particular offices and report back to the May 2011 NEC Meeting.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Continued work by the Adverse Action Committee and report back to the May 2011 NEC. Include in the May 2011 NEC agenda.

---

**AGENDA ITEM - 9**

**Action**

**SUBJECT: New Business**

---

a. Parts for ARCHER Systems

With limited parts availability for existing ARCHER Systems, it is extremely important to COL CHAZELL/CS briefed that with limited parts availability for existing ARCHER Systems, it is extremely important to create more available parts by reducing the number of ARCHER units and, on behalf of the ATC (Advanced Technologies Group), made the following motion:

**COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and COL JENSEN/SWR second that the National Executive Committee approve reducing the number of ARCHER Systems to no more than six and using the remaining systems for spare parts due to their limited availability.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy (ATG work with NHQ to determine which six systems will be retained, in coordination with region commanders).

b. Introductory Safety Education Requirement:

**COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded that the National Executive Committee approve changing the date in the Interim Change Letter—Introductory Safety Education Requirements, paragraph 1.a., from 31 December 2010 to 31 March 2011.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Finalize ICL after changing the date to 31 March 2011 for current members to complete the current introductory safety education module.

c. Location of May 2011 NEC Meeting:

**COL RUSHING/SER MOVED and COL VAZQUEZ/MER seconded that the National Executive Committee consider holding the May 2011 NEC Meeting in Puerto Rico.**

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: EX will provide cost estimates before a final decision is made. SER/CC authorized to tell PR that location is being considered and anything PR can do to

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

help minimize costs may help. Other locations for the May 2011 NEC Meeting will be considered.

### d. Delay Reduction of Glider Fleet

COL RUSHING/SER stated that the Gliders Centers of Excellence have very recently been set up and in operation; the movement of the gliders to their proper locations has not been completed, and he expressed an opinion that the centers need a year of operation to show what they can do before making a 15 percent reduction in the current fleet. Col Rushing made the following motion:

**COL RUSHING/SER and COL VAZQUEZ/MER seconded that the National Executive Committee authorize moving the date of reduction of the glider fleet from 42 to 36 from 31 December 2010 to 31 December 2011.**

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Change date of reduction of the glider fleet from 31 December 2010 to 31 December 2011.

### e. Change to MARB

COL STARR/IG stated that the proposal will replace paragraph 3 of the Article pertaining to the MARB. The proposal sets a determined term for members of the MARB and gives consideration for membership from each region. It also establishes that there is a quorum for the meeting and allows for a member to recuse in case of conflict of interest.

**COL STARR/IG MOVED and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded that the National Executive Committee accept the proposed change to paragraph 3, ARTICLE XVI, CAP Constitution and Bylaws and forward to the BoG for action. The proposal reads:**

“3. The Membership Action Review Board (MARB) shall consist of nine members, one from each region and the NLO, or his designee, who shall be a non-voting ex-officio member of the MARB. Membership is limited to those members serving in the grade of Colonel or higher and not currently serving as a commander or vice commander at any level. Each region commander will nominate a slate of candidates for the MARB and the National Commander will select one from each region for appointment. The members of the MARB must be confirmed by the Board of Governors and will serve a term of 4 years. The term shall be staggered and a member shall not be eligible for reappointment. Two new members shall be appointed per year. The chair of the MARB will be the National Legal Officer or designee. A MARB member shall not consider a review from an applicant from the region he/she represents. Five members shall constitute a quorum.”

**THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Include in December 2010 BoG Agenda

f. Confirmation of General Officer Grade:

MAJ GEN COURTER distributed a DRAFT Standard Operating Procedure, "Confirmation of General Officer Grade at the completion of assignment." She stated that a year or two ago, CAP created a requirement for the Brig Gen and Maj Gen grades to be permanently confirmed within 18 months following leaving those positions or for those grades to disappear and to revert back. However, all the policy was not put in at that time and it seems similar to other significant events in CAP in selecting, etc. that CAP should have some type of open procedure so there is a way to get information from people, so this proposal has been put together for this. She expressed hope that something of this nature could be approved in order to have something in place before the May 2011 NEC to provide an opportunity for a discussion of upgrades as needs to be done. She read the proposal and made the following motion:

**MAJ GEN COURTER MOVED and COL CHAZELL/CS seconded** that the National Executive Committee approve the proposed Standard Operating Procedure on Confirmation of General Officer Grade at the completion of assignment, effective immediately.

**COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO AMEND and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded** the amendment to change paragraph 3 to delete the words "Chair shall solicit a motion to postpone the question" and substitute the words: "action shall be automatically postponed."

**THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED**

**THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED**

The amended Standard Operating Procedure, Confirmation of General Officer Grade at the completion of assignment, reads as follows:

1. In order for CAP general officer grades to become permanent, the National Executive Committee (NEC) must affirmatively vote in favor of converting the temporary grade to a permanent one within 18 months following the satisfactory completion of the assignment for which the temporary grade was bestowed.
2. A motion to consider the question of converting the temporary CAP general officer grade to a permanent grade must be made by an NEC member and seconded by another NEC member.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

3. Once a properly offered motion is accepted by the Chair, the action shall be automatically postponed until the next regularly scheduled NEC meeting in order to allow the individual to present evidence to the NEC showing cause why said temporary grade should be made permanent.
4. The individual shall be informed by the Chair by certified mail (return receipt required) to provide documentary evidence to the NEC. This documentary evidence shall enumerate the leadership initiatives and accomplishments of the individual during his/her tenure as National Commander or National Vice Commander. This evidence may be presented in written form by mail, or email. The individual may also choose to address the NEC by teleconference or to appear, at his/her own expense, to present the evidence verbally.
5. After presentation of the documentary evidence, the NEC may take from the table the original question and proceed to debate said question. This action will be conducted in closed session because it is a personnel matter. At such time as the question is called for a vote, the NEC will vote by secret ballot to convert the individual's temporary CAP general officer grade to a permanent grade. If the vote fails, the individual will immediately revert to his/her previously held permanent grade.
6. Should the NEC not advance this question within 18 months of the completion of the assignment, the individual automatically reverts to his/her previous permanent grade.
7. The individual shall be informed that an NEC vote has either passed or failed or that the 18-month window for grade conversion has expired. In any case, orders shall be issued informing the individual of his/her permanent grade.
8. The action or inaction of the NEC is final and not appealable as the failure to convert a temporary grade to a permanent one is not a demotion as contemplated by the CAP Constitution and Bylaws."

### g. Procedure for Off-cycle Minutes / Approval of 15 January 2010 Fax Vote:

MAJ GEN COURTER stated that the NEC hasn't always followed the procedure that anything that is done in a closed session gets captured, i.e. Susie Parker will capture the Personnel actions. Those should come back to be attested by the Legal Officer, the Secretary, and the Commander. Anything that is going to be considered in an open session between meetings would come back and literally be in the minute's section. You would show two sets of minutes, if there was one between, and we would approve both. She asked if the NEC would be comfortable for Mr. Rowland/EX to read the DSM motion (15 January 2010) for the minutes and then vote.

MR. ROWLAND/EX stated that the fax ballot that went out involved CAPR 39-3, Awards, Ribbons, and Certificates, which stated that: "the approving authority for the DCM is the National Executive Committee". Traditionally, the NEC has delegated the approving authority to outgoing wing and region commanders to the National Commander.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

There has also been delegated to the National Commander for recognition of national staff or those serving in those national-level projects, at the annual conference each year. In reviewing this practice it seems appropriate to change the policy outlined in CAPR 39-3 to make the approving authority for all Distinguished Service Medals to the National Commander. This policy change would also follow the currently established authority for other service awards, i.e. region commanders are the approving authority for Exceptional and Meritorious Service Awards; the wing commanders are the approving authority for Commander's Commendation; awards and group commanders approving authority for the new CAP Achievement Awards. Updated version of CAPR 39-3 has recently been completed and the comment period is currently awaiting the National Commander's final approval before publishing. This is an appropriate time to make an additional policy change. If the proposal is approved, the National Commander will be the approving authority for any Distinguished Service Medals. There has been some recent confusion concerning the name of the award. If approved the new regulation will refer to the award as a Distinguished Service Award instead of Distinguished Service Medal. This will eliminate any confusion with military service awards and remain consistent with other CAP service awards." This was sent out 15 January 2010. By 20 January, an e-mail was sent back to all members of the NEC at the time that it was approved by a vote 12 to 2.

**COL RUSHING/SER MOVED and COL KUDDER/NCR seconded that the National Executive Committee accept the minutes of the 15 January 2010 meeting, as read.**

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: In the future, off-cycle telephonic or fax meetings or votes will be included in future agendas for approval like the scheduled meeting minutes.

**COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED and COL CORTUM/RMR seconded that the National Executive Committee adjourn.**

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING ADJOURNED SATURDAY, 30 OCTOBER 2010, AT 4:00 pm.

## Special NEC Actions

### NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING, 6 DECEMBER 2010

ROLL CALL: Present: Gen Courter, Col Chazell, Col Vest, Col Charles, Col Hayden, Col Vazquez, Col Rushing, Col Cortum, Col Myrick, Col Woodard. Also on the call were Mr. Rowland and Susan Easter.

Absent: Gen Carr, Col Herrin, Col Karton (already submitted a vote), Col Kuddes, Col Jensen, Col Starr, Col Ward

The purpose of the meeting was selection of an Investment Manager. The BoG wanted to review in more detail this selection and more investigative work was done by committee.

GEN COURTER stated that the motion was before the NEC (Motion was sent in writing to all members of the NEC on 4 December 2010)

**“That the NEC recommend to the Board of Governors the selection of Summit Equities, Inc. to be CAP’s Investment Manager, based upon the work of the committee as documented in the ‘Investment Manager Decision Paper.pdf’ transmitted to the NEC on 4 December 2010.”**

COL VEST/NFO reviewed questions posed by Col Chazell/CS and provided his answers:

Q: What are the qualifications of the committee members?

A. Lyn McCauley is a regular member of the Investment Committee – 1 ½ years. The other committee members and status are as follows: Raj Kothari was recused from this round because of conflict of interest. Leo Wall resigned a few weeks ago because of increased demand on his time from his own business. Don Angel never participated. Another appointee was a no-show from the beginning. So there was only one other participant; however, Col Vest and Ms. Easter have been advisors to the committee, were involved in all processes of the committee and joined in the proposal evaluation. Ms. Easter asked one of her staff, Scott Watson, to analyze the investments and asked him to participate in this round as well. Lyn McCauley is an experienced investor, is very knowledgeable, and has been an asset to the group. Scott Watson previously worked at a firm that did evaluations of investment performance on some very large portfolios, including the Harvard Endowment—one of the largest in the world.

Q: What is the correlation between the scores and the information provided by the candidates?

A. The scoring system was specified before the proposals were received. All four of the group reviewed all seven proposals. They were scored individually to the extent needed to identify the short list of five proposals. Those five were invited for interviews just last Thursday. After the interviews, the proposals were thoroughly

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

discussed in detail and the final scores were assigned. Of the five finalists, two of the proposals were scored to be out of the competitive range. The final three were discussed and debated and all three were very close together. The group reached agreement and Col Vest stated in the material forwarded that the NEC would do well with any of the three.

Q: Why is there such a wide dispersion of fees between the candidates?

- A. There is really not a wide dispersion. Four of the finalists are in the .65% to 1% range. These percentages are what they call “assets under management” or the “total value of the funds.” These are annual fees, even though they are collected quarterly. The one “outlier” from that range is .21%—much lower. That “outlier” is the incumbent and what he is offering is a brokerage account with some advice. That is what we have had for some years. Col Vest added in response to Col Chazell that “you get what you pay for.”

GEN COURTER clarified that the meaning of the percentage spread. When you say that it is basically an account that we get some advice around, what that means is any trades that are done—purchases, buys, sells—are going to incur additional potential fees. However, the committee looked at what is the best approach for CAP to have someone to manage in terms of the total cost. That was a significant factor.

Q: Why was investment strategy only given a 25 percent weighting. What would be more important than their strategy to meet CAP goals? Things like reporting, customer service and management would be a given for candidates on the short list.

- A. The three finalists all had similar strategies based on CAP’s Statement of Investment Policy which requires somewhat of a conservative approach and excludes most of the really aggressive investments, so it limited what they could propose. The other factors—customer service and management—are very important because of what we have not been getting in the past from the incumbent. Also, because they are important discriminators when you have three contestants as close as three were, we had to find some ways to find the differences between them, which are very small. CAP would be well served by any of the three. If we just looked at investment strategy, we would have a 3-way tie.

Q: How will the candidates meet our investment objectives? What is the historical performance of the candidates?

- A. The historical performance has been good for investment portfolios with the same sort of investment policy that CAP has. They are quick to point out and the FCC requires them to say that history doesn’t forecast the future, but it certainly gives us an important perspective. CAP’s Investment Policy is characterized as low to moderate risk and puts our expected investment performance in the range of good returns in an up market but not necessarily the best returns, and less losses in the down market. Over the long haul, that is a good place to be.

The floor was opened for further discussion. There was further discussion.

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

COL VEST, with reference to Gen Courter's comments on additional trading fees beyond the annual fees, stated that he relooked at Summit's proposal and clarified that the .75% annual fee includes brokerage fees—there are no additional charges involved with them, unless we get into certain categories of investment that right now are not the kind of thing we want to be into, but Summit pointed out something we will need to think about. If we get into some of these investments they suggest, there will be a small number of additional brokerage fees incurred, but they estimate these fees won't be more than \$200 per year. Other than that, their fees are all-inclusive.

Hearing no further questions, Gen Courter asked if anyone needed to voice vote. She asked Mr. Rowland to say which voters have not yet voted, and for those who haven't, they need to send it electronically.

Mr. Rowland added that an electronic vote would be preferred which could be printed and added to the file, and that Col Chazell and Col Myrick are the two votes that he doesn't have.

Col Myrick voted Yes, but will send it electronically.

Mr. Rowland stated that Col Chazell was waiting for answers to his questions before voting.

Col Chazell stated that based on the answers received, he also voted yes.

Mr. Rowland stated that everyone that has a vote has voted. Gen Courter usually doesn't vote, but everyone has voted in the affirmative.

### **THE MOTION CARRIED**

Gen Courter stated that she appreciated the quick and deep response of each member to look at all of this. She added that this is just an informational meeting—not a Special Meeting. She added that it is an electronic vote, but she added that she would prefer to always have a call so that people can ask questions and learn from anybody else's questions and answers. That makes the NEC stronger as a team. She asked if there was anything else to bring up.

Col Vest stated that he had just found the Investment Policy on the web site and it is the old version, so he asked Ms. Easter to distribute the latest version and separately get it posted on the web site.

GEN COURTER: "I will leave you with a reminder that there will be a call on Sunday night because you will miss us. So, we have calls then, as stated, a Business and NEC Special Meeting. Then we have the litany of conference calls so that we can work our way across the nation and update everyone. So, I appreciate all your time and the great communication of all of this and look forward to any of those of you I will see at Wreaths Across America on Saturday and those I will see at the BoG Meeting tomorrow. Hearing nothing else, I appreciate your time and we will be talking soon. Take care and be safe."

## October 2010 NEC Minutes

### **ADMINISTRATIVE ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Maj Gen Courter welcomed everyone and expressed appreciation to those members watching the meeting over the video stream and for their service.

Maj Gen Courter complimented the new facilities at National Headquarters and praised the outstanding support of the Air Force in providing the renovated facility including incredible technology in the conference room. She noted the ribbon-cutting ceremony which was held on Thursday, 28 October 2010, and was presided over by Lt Gen Alan G. Peck, USAF, Commander, Air University.

Remarks updating current activities were made by Maj Gen Amy Courter, National Commander; Mr. Don Rowland, Executive Director; and Col William Ward, USAF, Commander, CAP-USAF.

Brig Gen Carr announced a first-time member on the NEC and Maj Gen Courter presented a NEC badge to:

Col Robert M. Karton, Interim Great Lakes Region Commander

Brig Gen Carr also announced a departing member of the NEC, Col Steven W. Kuddes, Commander, North Central Region, and thanked him for an outstanding job.

Maj Gen Courter expressed appreciation for the diligence and hard work of all the staff and committees, which greatly expedited the meeting and the ability of the NEC to get through all the agenda items.