

DRAFT

Civil Air Patrol National Board Minutes

(As of 6 April 2012)



**2-3 March 2012
Washington DC**

2-3 March 2012

Contents

OPEN SESSION

Reports

1. Advisor, Executive, Staff and Committee Reports..... Col Chazell..... 5

Action Agenda Items

Governance

2. Approval of the August 2011 National Board Minutes Col Chazell..... 6

Operations

3. Aircrew Emergency Training Course..... Col Chazell..... 7
4. CAP G-1000 Training Course Col Chazell..... 10

IG Program

5. Creation of a National Inspection Tracking System..... Col Karton..... 15
6. IG Investigation Clarification..... Col Karton..... 18

Old Business

7. A. Uniform Change Approval Process Col Chazell..... 23
B. Safety Compliance Intervals..... Brig Gen Vazquez..... 30
C. Commander's Guide for Performance Improvement..... Col Rushing..... 35

New Business

8. A. Executive Session Matters Col Herrin..... 36
B. Request to Change "Religious Endorser" to
"Character Reference" for CDI Appointment Col Ellis..... 36

Administrative Remarks 38

ATTEST:

OFFICIAL:

Barry S. Herrin
Colonel, CAP
National Legal Officer

Charles L. Carr, Jr.
Major General, CAP
National Commander

**CIVIL AIR PATROL
NATIONAL BOARD MEETING MINUTES
2-3 March 2012
Washington DC**

OPEN SESSION

CALL TO ORDER	Maj Gen Charles L. Carr, Jr., CAP
INVOCATION.....	Ch, Col, J. Delano Ellis II, CAP
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	CMSgt Lou Walpus, CAP
WELCOME.....	Maj Gen Charles L. Carr, Jr., CAP
ROLL CALL.....	Mr. Don R. Rowland, HQ CAP/EX
INTRODUCTIONS	Maj Gen Charles L. Carr, Jr., CAP
SAFETY BRIEFING	Col Robert Diduch, CAP
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REMARKS.....	Mr. Don R. Rowland, HQ CAP/EX
CAP-USAF COMMANDER REMARKS.....	Col Paul D. Gloyd II, USAF
NATIONAL COMMANDER REMARKS.....	Maj Gen Charles L. Carr, Jr., CAP
SPECIAL GUEST REMARKS	Maj Gen Charles L. Carr, Jr., CAP

NATIONAL BOARD

(As of 1 February 2012)

The National Board is comprised of the National Commander, National Vice Commander, National Chief of Staff, National Finance Officer, National Legal Officer, National Controller, National Inspector General, National Chief of Chaplain Corps, Commander, CAP-USAF, the 8 region commanders, and 52 wing commanders.

NATIONAL OFFICERS

*Maj Gen Charles L. Carr, Jr., CAP	Nat'l Commander
*Brig Gen Joseph R. Vazquez, CAP	Nat'l Vice Commander
**Col Paul D. Gloyd II, USAF	CAP-USAF Commander
*Col Russell E. Chazell, CAP	Nat'l Chief of Staff
*Col C. Warren Vest, CAP	Nat'l Finance Officer
*Col Barry S. Herrin, CAP	Nat'l Legal Officer
*Col Edward D. Phelka, CAP	Nat'l Controller
**Col Kenneth W. Parris, CAP	Nat'l Inspector General
**Ch, Col J. Delano Ellis II, CAP	Chief Chap. Corps

MIDDLE EAST REGION

*Col Larry J. Ragland, CAP	Region Commander
Col William S. Bernfeld, CAP	Delaware
Col John M. Knowles, CAP	Maryland
Col Richard J. Cooper Jr., CAP	National Capital
Col Roy W. Douglass, CAP	North Carolina
Col Hubbard J. Lindler Jr., CAP	South Carolina
Col David A. Carter, CAP	Virginia
Col Dennis D. Barron, CAP	West Virginia

NORTHEAST REGION

*Col, Christopher J. Hayden CAP	Region Commander
Col Cassandra B. Hutchko, CAP	Connecticut
Col Daniel M. Leclair, CAP	Maine
Col William H. Meskill, CAP	Massachusetts
Col William J. Moran, CAP	New Hampshire
Col David L. Mull, CAP	New Jersey
Col Jack J. Ozer, CAP	New York
Col Sandra E. Brandon, CAP	Pennsylvania
Col Benjamin F. Emerick, CAP	Rhode Island
Col Michael G. Davidson, CAP	Vermont

GREAT LAKES REGION

*Col Robert M. Karton, CAP	Region Commander
Col Rickey L. Oeth, CAP	Illinois
Col Richard L. Griffith, CAP	Indiana
Col Robert J. Koob, CAP	Kentucky
Col Leo J. Burke, CAP	Michigan
Col Gregory L. Mathews, CAP	Ohio
Col Clarence A. Peters, CAP	Wisconsin

ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION

SOUTHEAST REGION

*Col Alvin J. Bedgood, CAP	Region Commander
Lt Col Jack B. Lynn, CAP (Interim)	Alabama
Col Michael N. Cook, CAP	Florida
Col Tonya R. Boylan, CAP	Georgia
Col Carlton R. Sumner, Jr., CAP	Mississippi
Lt Col Luis A. Cubano, CAP (Interim)	Puerto Rico
Col Bill G. Lane, CAP	Tennessee

*Col Donald G. Cortum, CAP	Region Commander
Col Earl Sherwin, CAP	Colorado
Col Frederick H. Thompson, CAP	Idaho
Col Herbert C. Cahalen, CAP	Montana
Col Jerry E. Wellman, CAP	Utah
Col John E. Mitchell, CAP	Wyoming

NORTH CENTRAL REGION

*Col Sean P. Fagan, CAP	Region Commander
Col Ronald J. Scheitzach, CAP	Iowa
Col Regena M. Aye, CAP	Kansas
Col Gerald P. Rosendahl, CAP	Minnesota
Col Erica R. Williams, CAP	Missouri
Col David E. Plum, CAP	Nebraska
Col William E. Kay, CAP	North Dakota
Col Teresa L. Schimelfening, CAP	South Dakota

*Col Larry F. Myrick, CAP	Region Commander
Col Charles R. Palmer, CAP	Alaska
Col Jon L. Stokes, CAP	California
Col Roger M. Caires, CAP	Hawaii
Col Timothy F. Hahn, CAP	Nevada
Col Brian L. Bishop, CAP	Oregon
Col David G. Lehman, CAP	Washington

SOUTHWEST REGION

*Col Frank A. Buethe, CAP	Region Commander
Col Brian N. Ready, CAP	Arizona
Col Lewis D. Alexander, CAP	Arkansas
Col Cecil A. Scarbrough, CAP	Louisiana
Col Mark E. Smith, CAP	New Mexico
Col Joe H. Cavett, CAP	Oklahoma
Col Brooks A. Cima, CAP	Texas

*Voting Members of National Executive Committee - 14

** Nonvoting members of NEC and National Board - 3

CORPORATE TEAM

Mr. Don R. Rowland	Executive Director
Mr. John A. Salvador	Assistant Executive Director
Mr. Johnny Dean	Director, Operations
Ms. Susan Easter	Chief Financial Officer
Mr. Larry Kauffman	Assistant to Executive Director for Fleet Management
Mr. Jim Mallett	Director, Educational Programs
Mr. Rafael Robles	General Counsel
Mr. Gary Schneider	Director, Logistics & Mission Resources

AGENDA ITEM 1**CS****REPORTS****SUBJECT: Advisor, Executive, Staff and Committee Reports****CAP/CS – Col Chazell****Perfunctory Reports:**

Detailed reports, if available, will be provided to National Board members in advance of the meeting.

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. (Staff) CAP National Safety Officer | Col Diduch |
| 2. (Executive) Finance Committee Report | Col Vest |
| 3. (Executive) Chaplain Corps Report | Ch, Col Ellis |
| 4. (Executive) National Legal Officer's Report | Col Herrin |
| 5. (Executive) Inspector General | Col Parris |
| 6. (Executive) National Controller | Col Phelka |
| 7. (Advisor) Deputy Chief of Staff, Support | Col Guimond |
| 8. (Advisor) Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations | Col Murrell |
| 9. (NHQ) Regulations Update Report | Mr. Rowland |

Additional Reports, time permitting:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 10. (Advisor) National Advisory Council | Brig Gen du Pont |
| 11. (Advisor) National Cadet Advisory Council | C/Col Brennan |
| 12. (Staff) Historian Report | Col Blascovich |
| 13. (Staff) National Health Services Officer | Col Seoane |
| 14. (Committee) Hall of Honor | Maj Gen Wheless |
| 15. (Committee) Constitution and Bylaws | Col Herrin |
| 16. (Committee) Public Trust | Col Kavich |
| 17. (Committee) Governance Committee | Col Verrett |
| 18. (Other) Overseas Units Report | Lt Col Timm |

AGENDA ITEM 2

CS

Action

SUBJECT: Approval of the August 2011 National Board Minutes

Author: Col Chazell

CAP/CS – Col Chazell

OPR: EXA

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

The minutes of the August 2011 National Board meeting were distributed in draft form. This allowed the National Board members a chance to review the minutes for any discrepancies.

PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION:

That the National Board approve the August 2011 National Board Meeting minutes.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

None.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

None.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

None.

NATIONAL BOARD ACTION

COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and COL KARTON/GLR seconded that the National Board approve the August 2011 National Board minutes amended to change rank of Col to Lt Col and correct the spelling of Lt Col Cubano's name on page 30.

THE MOTION CARRIED with abstentions by commanders who were not present at the August 2011 meeting.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Change grade from Col to Lt Col, correct the spelling of the name of LT COL CUBANO on page 30, and remove the word "DRAFT" from the August 2011 National Board Minutes.

AGENDA ITEM 3	DO	Action
SUBJECT: Aircrew Emergency Training Course - A Hands-on Mission Observer Training Course		
Author: Lt Col Vazquez	CAP/CS – Col Chazell	OPR: DO

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 pilot “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.

The CAP pilot incapacitation incident in 2010 has raised questions. 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 Air Crew Emergency Training Course (ACET) 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. Due to the physical and emotional rigors associated with the tasks included in the training, 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.

The number of members qualified to take the course will be limited to Non-pilot Mission Observers on a one time basis only. No re-currency 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.

Although Certified Flight Instructors (CFIs) are trained to teach primary flight students, training for survival requires specialized focus. Therefore, an online Train-the-Trainer course has been developed to provide guidance in this area and will be required before participation in the program. In order to maintain instructor integrity, Wings will be required to place "extremely qualified" and "authorized" Course Certified Instructors on Orders with the concurrence of the Wing DOV/DO and CC. Two criterion to be considered during this selection process are a) recent experience instructing primary flight students and b) total flight experience. Although, the students will receive hands-on experience manipulating the controls of an aircraft, the Course Certified Instructor will always maintain control of the aircraft during take-offs and landings.

Although this course is mission related, flight hours will be scheduled as "C" missions only. The course will be voluntary and unfunded.

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

The 2010 October NEC approved course development. The 2011 Winter National Board was presented a detailed preview of the course structure and material during the National Operations Report. CAP-USAF and the National Headquarters staff have participated in the final review of this course.

PROPOSED NB ACTION:

That the National Board approve the implementation of the Air Crew Emergency Training course and request CAP-USAF to reconsider B AFAM status.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

Minimal.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS COMMENTS

Concur. Recommend that the ground training be modified to include a discussion of flight characteristics of various CAP aircraft as well as addressing night and IMC factors and challenges.

CAP-USAF COMMENTS

While we appreciate CAP taking the initiative on this program, we cannot grant B-mission status for this training. CAP-USAF has to clearly articulate a rationale for each Air Force non-combat mission flown by CAP. AFI 10-2701, para. 2.2.11 (Training Mission) states, "CAP may perform training missions to prepare its members to execute AFAMs. Normally, only training missions that are necessary to prepare CAP members to perform specialized or unique Air Force non-combat missions may be approved as

AFAMs. However, when necessary to meet specific Air Force requirements, training missions may include proficiency and upgrade training to FAA airman's ratings."

Mission observers are already trained and qualified to fulfill AFAMs. However, ACET training does not prepare CAP members to perform any specialized or unique AF non-combat mission.

Additionally, flying skills are perishable. As such, suggest CAP not limit participation to one time only. Members desiring to participate in this program should be afforded a "refresher" opportunity, if nothing more than the ground training portion.

ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

DCS-OPS: Concur. Although medical incapacity has created at least one incident and presents a potential, albeit rare, hazard to flight, there are a number of other potential incapacitation hazards including bird strikes, of which there have been 12 non-injury occurrences since 2008. Regardless of mission status, providing non-pilot mission observers with the opportunity to gain the knowledge, both ground school and hands-on airplane manipulation, that could give them the opportunity to successfully attempt a survivable landing, is an option we should be able to offer those members.

DCS/Support: Concur with the AI and CAP-USAF comments affording "refresher" opportunity on an appropriate time schedule.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

CAPR 60-1, *CAP Flight Management*

NB ACTION:

COL CHAZELL/CS, on behalf of the National Staff, MOVED and COL BEDGOOD/SER seconded the PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION

LT COL LESLIE VAZQUEZ/Project Officer presented a slide briefing explaining the Air Crew Emergency Training course.

THE MOTION CARRIED

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of the Air Crew Emergency Training Course, notification to the field, and change to CAPR 60-1, CAP Flight Management

AGENDA ITEM 4	DO	Action
SUBJECT: CAP G-1000 Training Course		
Author: Lt Col Vazquez	CAP/CS – Col Chazell	OPR: DO

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

The existing mechanism for transitioning pilots into G1000 flying in Civil Air Patrol is based on following Cessna's SEP/G1000 Scenario-based Training Course. The Cessna Course is designed to transition an IFR proficient pilot, already familiar with C182 flying, directly into C182 G1000 IFR operations. It consists of ground training, follow by three flights – VFR cross country, IFR cross county and partial panel VFR/IFR flight. All flights are encouraged to use the autopilot from shortly after takeoff to landing approach (or coupled IFR approach), including vertical navigation and flight plan tracking. Time spent on the normal aspects of VFR and IFR check outs (visual flight maneuvers, unusual attitude recovery, etc) is minimal. Most training is directed at cross country navigation using the G1000 and the autopilot.

Cessna's course does not adequately address CAP's primary mission flight requirements:

1. If pilots are trained to use the autopilot for every operation of the aircraft, the temptation to "stop flying" could go hand in hand with the temptation to "stop looking outside". Hands on the flight controls in VMC promote flying outside the cockpit.
2. Knowledge of flight planning, instrument procedures and autopilot vertical navigation are not "must have" items for CAP VFR-only pilots to fly the G1000. VFR flying of the G1000 aircraft requires that pilots understand how to read the PFD with just enough knowledge of the MFD system to accomplish "to-from" navigation" and effectively operate weather, terrain and traffic functions.
3. The current training options for G1000 instruction have been expanded in CAPR 60-1 from factory trained instructors only to also allowing CAP instructors trained in-house. At this point in time, however, factory trained instructors are most likely still conducting most of the in-house training. These Factory trained instructors attend the Cessna course only once and although wings are provided Cessna G1000 FITS Course updates each year including a Pilots Information Manual, G1000 transition PowerPoint presentation and the Garmin PC trainer, over time standardization may be compromised and may not necessarily provide proper quality control of the instruction process.

A CAP standardized G/1000 training curriculum option has been created to provide CAP mission oriented training to build upon the factory course and offer an alternative to those who do not qualify for the factory course or are unable to attend it. This CAP-specific curriculum minimizes use of autopilot during VFR instruction and makes a clear distinction between VFR and IFR operation while also providing a CAP G1000 Instructor

Course (attachment 1). The revision of the curriculum on the National level will provide a standardization of the training and, at the same time, improve the course focus on

CAP-specific flying operations that is not addressed in Cessna's G1000 transition course.

In order to accomplish our objectives, we believe the flight curriculum required a complete rewrite, especially when stressing less reliance on use of the autopilot early in the training. The revision of the curriculum on the National level will provide a standardization of the training, while at the same time improve the course to avoid some of the pitfalls that exist in the present G1000 transition course.

The Ground School course will consist of five (5) instructor led learning modules:

1. CAP G1000 VFR Course
2. CAP G1000 Autopilot VFR Course
3. CAP G1000 IFR Course
4. CAP G1000 Autopilot IFR Course
5. CAP G1000 Instructor Course

Modules 1 and 2 will include the VFR ground training and modules 3 and 4 will comprise the IFR ground training. The VFR Sortie(s) will require a minimum of 1.5 flight hours. There will be two (2) IFR Sorties (3.0 hours). The Instructor Course training will include two (2) sorties (3.0 hours), one for G1000 VFR instructor techniques and one for IFR instructor techniques.

This course is not intended to replace the instructors' Cessna factory training, which will still be available for those who wish to or can take it in-house, but rather would provide a more readily available standardized in-house training curriculum that highlights CAP needs; thus allowing wings to better manage the G1000 flight training program for their pilots wishing to transition.

PROPOSED NB ACTION:

That the National Board approve the implementation of the Civil Air Patrol G1000 training course for both VFR and IFR pilots and Ops Quals be adjusted to reflect both VFR and IFR G1000 qualifications. Additionally, those who have previously completed the Cessna factory course or any other course in accordance with CAPR 60-1, section 3.6, para 4c and are currently G1000 qualified, will not be required to take this course.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

Flight Costs.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS COMMENTS

Concur. This training will provide opportunities for more CAP pilots to qualify in G1000 aircraft and should result in increased utilization of G1000 aircraft. NHQ-funded Cessna factory training will continue to be available for qualified instructors who can spend a

week at the course in Independence, Kansas. We must ensure that this course does not infringe on Cessna's copyrighted training material without their permission.

CAP-USAF COMMENTS

Concur with NHQ comments. Further, CAP-USAF will review the final course prior to implementation.

ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

DCS-OPS: Concur. Having a standardized course available to our pilots that is tailored to CAP requirements not only makes sense, it will increase wing opportunities to provide more G1000 transition courses. As for CAP instructor and check pilots, it will be an alternative to the Cessna Factory Training for those who are unable to attend, not a replacement. Tracking both G1000 VFR and IFR pilots in Ops Quals is going to be an important component.

DCS/Support: Concur. IT will make the necessary modifications to Ops Quals including ensuring that previous training is properly documented.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

CAPR 60-1, *CAP Flight Management*

NB ACTION:

LT COL LESLIE VAZQUEZ/Project Officer presented a slide briefing explaining the G-1000 Training Course. She added that the course has been successfully beta tested by nine teams across the country. She summarized that this training course provides alternative G-1000 training for CAP needs; it creates a G-1000 VFR category for the transition process; and it establishes the instructor course be available on-line for download.

COL SUMNER/MS MOVED TO AMEND to add the following: "This course would replace the Cessna Factory Course."

THE AMENDMENT DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND

In response to a question, it was clarified that the proposed training course is optional, but can be taken in lieu of the Cessna Course. It was also clarified that the Train the Trainer Course is mandatory—instructors have to take that course.

In response to a question about funding for this course, there was clarification that funding would depend on CAP-USAF approval as an A or B Mission, which would first require a legal review.

COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO POSTPONE and COL BURKE/MI seconded the postponement of this agenda item for reconsideration following a review by Cessna of the curriculum.

It was determined, that since CAP is not using any of the slides or copyrighted materials of Cessna, there is no need for review by Cessna.

THE MOTION TO POSTPONE DID NOT PASS

DCS/Operations, Col Murrell, gave two clarifications on this agenda item: One, the instructor side, and two, the pilot. (1) On the instructor side, these pilots are allowed to go to Wichita, KS to take the Cessna Course, which is a resident course. Not every instructor can afford to be off work to take the Cessna course. For those who can't go, this proposed course is an alternative option. Whether they go or not won't impact the cost, which is included in the purchase of the aircraft. For those who do take the Cessna Course, it is recommended that they also take this course which has different emphasis for CAP operations. (2) On the pilot side, this proposal results in more classes for more people to get the G-1000 ground school and be able to transition to VFR if they are not IFR pilots. Then they can fly the G-1000 and work on their upgrades.

COL LEHMAN/WA MOVED TO AMEND and COL BUETHE/SWR seconded the amendment that, in addition to the 15-hour PIC requirement, that an instructor be required to take the instructor module as proposed in this agenda item.

COL LEHMAN/WA withdrew his motion in deference to an amendment to be proposed by Col Herrin/NLO; COL BUETHE/SWR agreed.

COL CHAZELL/CS stated that, as the maker of the original motion, it appeared that there is still work to be done with this proposal, and withdrew his motion.

COL SUMNER/MS stated that as the seconder of the original motion he did not concur with the withdrawal.

After the morning break, the following motion was made:

COL KARTON/GLR MOVED TO TABLE and COL SCARBROUGH/LA seconded the motion to table Agenda Item 4 and send it to the Stan-Eval Committee for further evaluation with a report back to the May 2012 NEC meeting.

THE MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED (9 no votes; 1 abstention)

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Referral to the Stan-Eval Committee with a report back to the May 2012 NEC meeting. Include in the May 2012 NEC agenda.

Attachment 1

G1000 Training Curriculum

IAW with CAPR 60-1, CAP should develop the following courses:

MODULE 1: CAP G1000 VFR

- A. VFR G1000 Ground School (instructor led only).
- B. VFR Sortie (1.5 hour flight). Consists of:
 - 1) Use and configuration of the PFD
 - 2) Takeoffs and Landings
 - 3) Slow flight/stalls/steep turns
 - 4) Use of “to-from” navigation, nearest airport function
 - 5) MFD information – terrain, weather and traffic
 - 6) Use of autopilot for straight and level, direct to navigation

MODULE 2: CAP G1000 AUTOPILOT VFR

- A. Basic use of autopilot

MODULE 3: CAP G1000 IFR

- A. IFR G1000 Ground School (instructor led only).
- B. IFR Sorties 1 and 2 (3.0 hours). Consists of:
 - 1) Configuration of MFD for IFR – Flight Plans – Procedures
 - 2) Instrument enroute and IFR maneuvers
 - 3) Approaches and Holding
 - 4) Use of autopilot for approaches, go-arounds, departures
 - 5) G1000 partial panel enroute and approach.

MODULE 4: CAP G1000 AUTOPILOT VFR

- A. Advanced use of autopilot

MODULE 5: CAP G1000 Instructor

- A. Ground school on how to teach the CAP G1000 VFR and IFR Courses
- B. VFR and IFR Sorties (3.0 hours). Consists of:
 - 1) G1000 VFR instructor techniques (1 flight)
 - 2) G1000 IFR instructor techniques (1 flight)

AGENDA ITEM 5**IG****Action****SUBJECT: Creation of a National Inspection Tracking System**

Author: Col Karton

GLR/CC – Col Karton

OPR: EX

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

Over the last ten years Civil Air Patrol has made tremendous strides in meeting partner and oversight agency expectations through web-based process monitoring, web based document storage, and electronic tracking of action items and requirements. These tools transformed programs as diverse as finance and accounting, mission management, operations training qualifications, safety reporting and fact finding, logistics inventories, and repeater site approval and monitoring.

Our compliance (CI) and subordinate unit inspection (SUI) processes have not made this transition. The program is dependent on locally developed tracking tools, document-based reporting, and distribution of “restricted” reports through unsecure nation-wide email lists. The results are that commanders at all levels are challenged to monitor SUI or CI findings, marginal consistency exists at the Wing-level in program management, and usable tools are not available to help National Board members assess the impact of policy and procedures we approve.

In just one Region in 2010, more than 40 local squadrons and flights across multiple wings were suspended from activities due to insufficiencies in managing the Subordinate Unit Inspection program. Similarly, a recent Inspector General Team newsletter showed CI findings from across the country open more than four years after the inspection. These data seem to indicate CAP cannot demonstrate we are meeting our obligations under the Statement of Work, and does not provide adequate tools for helping commanders at any level assess the effectiveness, efficiency or safety of our organization.

PROPOSED NB ACTION:

That the National Board approve the high priority development of an Inspection Tracking System designed by the National Headquarters staff and the National Inspector General team to automate the CAPR 123-3 inspection process. This new tool must provide web-based data entry, tracking of unit compliance with self-assessments and inspection timelines, online document storage, electronic coordination of inspection findings and responses, and trend analysis of both findings and best practices for commanders at all levels.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

To be determined.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS COMMENTS

Concur. The NHQ IT department, in concert with the CAP IG community, has been working on a project to provide this capability for some time and the results are now in testing. Once testing by the IG and staff are completed, the module will be available within eServices.

CAP-USAF COMMENTS

Concur. Such a tool will certainly assist Commanders in overseeing their programs, ensuring compliance, identifying trends and remedying deficiencies. Further, the sharing of benchmark and best practice information will help wings improve their programs and promote consistency across CAP.

ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

CAP/IG - I concur with the NHQ comment. NHQ IT in cooperation with the CAP and CAP-USAF IG communities has been working on a project to automate inspection findings for both CI and SUI. NHQ IT has encountered a number of significant technical issues that has delayed the implementation of this program.

Automation of inspection finding clearance would greatly benefit all stakeholders. However, an agenda item making this a priority would be redundant and would circumvent the National Commander's and Executive Director's authority to establish the priorities for Civil Air Patrol's limited IT resources.

As a note of comment, no Estimated Funding Impact was provided with this agenda item. Being familiar with "off the shelf" software systems for tracking this kind of data, I know the hours required to modify these systems to meet CAP's needs would be significant. Developing this system with in-house IT resources limits CAP's financial exposure in the acquisition of such a system.

DCS/Support: Concur.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

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

NB ACTION:

COL KARTON/GLR MOVED and COL SUMNER/MS seconded the PROPOSED NB ACTION.

In response to a request from Col Parris/IG, Mr. Dean/DO reported that this proposal has been on-going for about a year and is about 80 percent completed. Mr. Dean recommended completing this project in phases: Phase I would be to accommodate the CI process and those issues, and then move into the self-assessment and other

types of inspections as possible. He stated that everything that is requested in this proposal can be accomplished.

There was discussion on the IT priorities. The projected completion of Phase I is by the summer 2012 National Board, depending upon whether additional IG items are added. There was clarification that IT priorities are worked regularly by the DO in conjunction with the IT Committee under the DCS for Support.

COL HAYDEN/NER MOVED that the National Board table this agenda item until past minutes have been researched to determine if this is a duplication.

THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND

COL MESKILL/MA MOVED and COL LE CLAIR/ME seconded that this agenda item be dismissed.

THE PARLIAMENTARIAN ruled that there is a process to move to postpone indefinitely, but what the maker of the motion appeared to be asking for was a motion to defeat and, therefore, a no vote on the motion.

Col Karton/GLR raised a Point of Order and respectfully submitted that the motion was improperly stated; that the intent was that it be a no vote; it was not a motion to postpone and asked the chair to find that the motion was out of order.

THE CHAIR RULED THAT THE MOTION WAS OUT OF ORDER

THE ORIGINAL MOTION CARRIED

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Implementation of policy, notification to the field, and change to CAPR 123-3, Civil Air Patrol Compliance Assessment Program. Periodically, an update of IT priorities will be provided by NHQ/DO.

AGENDA ITEM 6**IG****Action****SUBJECT: IG Investigation Clarification**

Author: Col Karton

GLR/CC – Col Karton

OPR: EX

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

The intent of this agenda item is to clarify that the IG may only investigate complaints against senior level CAP officials if and when specifically tasked by a commander in the senior level CAP officials' chain of command and clarify the role of the NLO when personal misconduct or moral turpitude is alleged against National Commander or National Vice-Commander.

CAPR 123-2.7 & 8 provide that Complaints against senior level CAP officials shall be submitted to the commander or inspector general of the unit to which the complaint is assigned, that a complaint analysis shall then be made by the IG and, if the IG determines that an investigation is warranted, the National region or wing commander will appoint, in writing, an IG and/or IO. An IG may not conduct an investigation without having been appointed by an appropriate commander through an appointment letter. There is an exception: pursuant to 123-2.7.e, complaints against senior level CAP officials shall be submitted directly to the CAP/IG who notifies National Headquarters CAP/EX, CAP-USAF/IG, the Chair of the CAP BoG and the CAP National Commander. Thereafter, the IG is charged with ensuring that the allegations of misconduct, fraud, waste and/or abuse are investigated. There is no requirement that the IG proceed only after he has received a written, letter of appointment from an appropriate commander in the chain of command as is required in other cases. The IG should not have greater discretion and authority with less oversight and control when investigating a senior level CAP official than when investigating any other CAP member.

Furthermore, CAPR 123-2.7e (5) provides that the CAP/IG or an IO, appointed by the BoG, will handle all complaints against the national Commander or National Vice-Commander in accordance with this regulation. Any allegations of personal misconduct or moral turpitude will be promptly turned over to the National Legal Officer in accordance with the CAP Constitution and bylaws. The CAP National Legal Officer will determine if any action is warranted under CAPR 35-7, *Removal of National Commander or National Vice-Commander*. This provision is confusing in that it authorizes that all complaints against the National Commander or National Vice-Commander shall be made by the CAP/IG or an IO appointed by the BoG. It then directs any allegations of personal misconduct or moral turpitude will be promptly turned over to the National Legal Officer in accordance with the CAP Constitution and Bylaws. This should be clarified so that it is clear that the NLO will review every complaint against the National Commander or National Vice-Commander to evaluate if it contains allegations of personal misconduct or moral turpitude which might mandate action pursuant to CAPR 35-7. The legal analysis should be made by the NLO. The NLO should not be bound by delay or inaction on the part of the IG or IO appointed by the BoG or by delays by the BoG. The NLO should be able to comply with CAPR 35-7 independently of any action of the IG or IO appointed by the BoG or, indeed, any action

taken by the BoG unless the BoG specifically provides that its action preempts that of the NLO and NB.

PROPOSED NB ACTION:

That the National Board approve an amendment to CAPR 123-2.7.e to provide as follows:

e. Complaints against senior level CAP officials shall be submitted directly to the CAP/IG. Upon receiving such a complaint, the CAP/IG will:

(1) Notify National Headquarters CAP/EX, CAP-USAF/IG, the Chair of the CAP BoG, and the CAP National Commander.

(2) Ensure the allegations of misconduct, fraud, waste and/or abuse are investigated; however, before any such investigation may commence, the IG shall have obtained an appointment letter in writing from a commander in the chain of command of the person who is to be investigated or from the Chair of the CAP BoG after authorization of such investigation by a majority of the BoG given at a regular meeting of the BoG or a special meeting called for that purpose.

(3) The CAP/IG or an IO appointed by the BoG will handle all complaints against the national Commander or National Vice-Commander in accordance with the regulation. The CAP NLO shall receive prompt notification of any such complaints and shall be promptly provided with a copy of all complaints and any evidence submitted in support of the allegations. The CAP NLO shall determine if there are allegations of personal misconduct or moral turpitude and, if so, will determine what, if any, action is warranted under CAPR 35-7, *Removal of National Commander or National Vice-Commander*. The actions by the CAP NLO pursuant to this section may proceed simultaneously with and are independent from any other investigation or administrative procedures subject only to the specific direction to the contrary from the BoG by authority duly given at a regular or special meeting of the BoG called for that purpose.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

Minimal.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS COMMENTS

There is no mention of Senior Level Officials in paragraph 8, *Complaint Processing*, of CAPR 123-2. The text “the National region or wing commander will appoint, in writing, an IG and/or IO” is from a generic procedural step in the complaint handling process, delineated in paragraph 8, that prescribes actions for complaints at all organizational levels of CAP. It does not specifically list actions to be taken in resolving complaints against CAP Senior Level Officials.

CAPR 123-2 paragraph 7, *Complaint Submission*, discusses what is done when a complaint is received naming a senior level official. Said paragraph mandates that the

CAP/IG will ensure all senior level official complaints are investigated and what will be done with completed reports of investigation. It does not override the provisions of

paragraph 8 which indicates when an IG determines as investigation is warranted, the National region or wing commander will appoint, in writing, an IG and/or IO.

The draft CAPR 123-2, which was recently available for 30-day comment on the CAP website, refines the text in question to read, "When complaints against CAP senior level officials (see definition in CAPR 123-1, *The Civil Air Patrol Inspector General Program*, attachment 1) are determined to require investigation, the CAP Inspector General shall notify the CAP National Commander, the Chairman of the BoG, CAP-USAF/IG, and CAP National Headquarters General Counsel (NHQ/GC) of the pending investigation" and that the CAP/IG will "ensure the complaints of misconduct, fraud, waste and/or abuse against CAP senior level officials receive a thorough complaint analysis and are investigated or transferred to the appropriate investigation level as specified in paragraph 8c (3). Paragraph 8c (3) requires an appointment letter prior to the initiation of a complaint.

CAPR does 123-2 state, "The CAP/IG or an IO, appointed by the BoG, will handle all complaints against the National Commander or National Vice-Commander in accordance with this regulation." However, in accordance with CAPR 123-2 the first step in handling a complaint is to complete a complaint analysis. An analysis may result in a complaint 1) being dismissed due to not meeting the criteria of a complaint, 2) being referred to other channels more appropriate to address the issue, 3) being transferred to a more appropriate jurisdiction (in this case the NLO), 4) being resolved through assistance provided by the IG or IO, or 5) being investigated. This is well described in CAPR 123-2. There is confusion due to the age of CAPR 35-7. This regulation has long been in need of updating, to include some guidance as to what constitutes "personal misconduct or moral turpitude." Providing copies of all complaints involving the National Commander and Vice Commander, regardless of the allegation, to the National Legal Officer could result in a violation of the confidentiality provisions of the CAP complaints program.

The proposed National Board Action places specific criteria upon the BoG prior to appointing an IO for complaints against the National Commander/Vice Commander. The National Board may recommend but not mandate procedures/practices for the BoG.

CAPR 123-2 is currently being revised by the CAP/IG through eSSS coordination with NLO, GC, as well as other directorates and advisors.

In addition, CAPR 35-7 predates the creation of the Board of Governors and review of said regulation was referred to the Governance Committee.

Therefore, it is recommended that the proposed clarification be brought to the attention of the CAP/IG and the Governance Committee so that they may consider it as part of their ongoing tasks.

CAP-USAF COMMENTS

Concur with NHQ comments. Given the potential for changes to CAP's governance structure, this action should be sent to the CAP/IG and Governance Committee for thorough review.

ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

CAP/IG – Concur with the comments by the NHQ. Furthermore, the CAP/IG is entrusted by the National Commander upon his/her appointment and confirmation by the CAP National Board to maintain the integrity and high ethical standards of the Civil Air Patrol Investigations Program. Conduct of the CAP Investigations Program is clearly enumerated as the responsibility of the CAP/IG.

The CAP Inspector General Program is a command program. The CAP Constitution and Bylaws already provides sufficient oversight of the CAP/IG by the National Commander and the Board of Governors. (See Bylaws Section 10.7, paragraph f. below)

The CAP Constitution and Bylaws clearly state the CAP/IG is a corporate officer and is designated the “principal Inspector General of the corporation.” Bylaw Section 10.7 defines the CAP/IG's responsibilities as follows:

“Section 10.7 National Inspector General

The National Inspector General shall:

- a. Serve as the principal Inspector General of the corporation;
- b. Serve as an advisor to the Board of Governors, the National Commander, the National Board, the National Executive Committee, and the Executive Director;
- c. Develop and supervise the Civil Air Patrol Inspector General Program;
- d. Develop and supervise the Civil Air Patrol Inspection Program;
- e. Develop and operate a Civil Air Patrol Complaints Program to prevent, detect and correct any fraud, waste, mismanagement or deficiency, cadet protection issue, or abuse of authority, to include protection from reprisal of persons utilizing the Complaints Program;
- f. Conduct such investigations as may be assigned by the Board of Governors, the National Commander, or as otherwise provided by the Civil Air Patrol regulations, and prepare reports thereof;
- g. Conduct training programs for Inspectors General, Investigating Officers, Commanders and general membership of Civil Air Patrol;
- h. Appoint and remove Assistant National Inspectors General and Investigating Officers as required by the nature of the office; and
- i. Perform such other duties as the nature of the office may require.”

Approving this agenda item would amend the roles and responsibilities of the CAP/IG as stated in the CAP Constitution and Bylaws. Authority to amend the CAP Constitution

and Bylaws rests solely with the CAP Board of Governors and is outside the powers entrusted to the CAP National Board.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

CAPR 123-2, *Complaints*

NB ACTION:

COL KARTON/GLR MOVED and COL FAGAN/NCR seconded that the National Board reaffirm its policy that before any investigation of any complaint at any level may commence, the IG or IO shall have obtained an appointment letter in writing from a commander in the chain of command of the person(s) who is (are) to be investigated, or, in the case of the national commander or vice national commander, from the Chair of the BoG.

COL PARRIS/IG MOVED TO AMEND and COL HERRIN/NLO seconded to remove the words “or vice commander.”

THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED

There was clarification that, if an immediate commander is unwilling to sign an appointment letter for an investigation, that a higher level commander in the chain of command may do so.

THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED

The amended motion reads:

“That the National Board reaffirm its policy that before any investigation of any complaint at any level may commence, the IG or IO shall have obtained an appointment letter in writing from a commander in the chain of command of the person(s) who is (are) to be investigated, or, in the case of the national commander, from the Chair of the BoG.”

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Notification to the field, implementation of policy, and change to CAPR 123-2, *Complaints*.

AGENDA ITEM 7**Old Business****Action**

A. February 2010 NB Minutes: Item 3a**Uniform Change Approval Process**

CAP/CS – Col Chazell

Presenter: Col David Braun

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

A process action team was established by direction of the National Board at the February 2009 meeting (Agenda Item 27(a), February 2009). The mandate of the team was to review current processes for making changes to CAP uniforms and accoutrements and then make a recommendation to the National Commander to streamline the process in order for National Board time and effort to be used more effectively during Board meetings – rather than debating what are inherently administrative issues – and to provide a predictable and codified method for uniform changes. The report of the team is attached and includes the team's process recommendation and is presented to National Board for consideration.

PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION:

That the National Board approve the Process Action Report as presented and adopt the recommendation provided as the official method of processing requests for changes to CAP uniforms and associated accoutrements.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

None.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

CAP NHQ will draft the appropriate regulations changes based on the decision of the National Board.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Concur.

ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:**Uniform Committee**

- 1) Section 5. a. 1-4 a. 1st paragraph, last sentence. The Uniform Team Leader believes this sentence is not strong enough to convince Commanders they can help stop the out of control changes being offered to the uniform. As Commanders they have an obligation first to the corporation and CAP and second to their membership. It should be clear in the wording they should exercise their command responsibility. I would suggest that the sentence be split as follows "The chain to National Headquarters/DP. Commanders in the chain are obliged to review and approve or deny uniform changes as they see fit. Commanders are expected to hold the overall program above parochial or unit biased loyalties."
- 2) Section 5. a. 1-4 b. Comment: It is expected that the first appointed chair of the new uniform committee would select a board of qualified officers, establish a charter for the committee and document its internal working procedures. The board should be composed of a Chair, 2 sitting NB members, 1 senior Cadet to represent Cadets, 3 members-at-large, and the CAP CMS, Historian, and a representative from CAP-USAF as an ex-officio non-voting member.

Sr Advisor Support: Recommend approval and implementation of the PAT recommendations.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

CAPM 39-1, *CAP Uniform Manual*

NATIONAL BOARD ACTION

COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and COL CARR/GLR seconded the PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION.

COL DAVIDSON/NH MOVED TO POSTPONE and COL LEE/PA seconded the postponement until the first item of business on Saturday morning.

THE MOTION TO POSTPONE CARRIED

On Saturday morning, Agenda Item 3a, Uniform Change Approval Process, was brought from the table.

During discussion, Col Chazell/CS clarified that it was never the intention of the team to remove the authority for commanders to authorize items such as encampment tee shirts and shorts (activity-type). The focus of the team was to make modifications to approve uniforms, such as BDUs, which would be problematic if an approved tee shirt were combined with the BDU because that would be a modification to an approved Air Force-

type or corporate uniform. He further clarified that there is no intention to change those items already authorized for approval by commanders.

MS. PARKER/DP further clarified that there are provisions for commanders to determine what members will wear at a particular activity, on a temporary basis.

COL LEE/PAMOVED TO AMEND and COL BISHOP/OR seconded the amendment to change the Process Action Report as follows:

1. Paragraph 5.a. CAPM 39-1 (Draft), Paragraph 1-4, Changes to the Uniform, Paragraph a. How to Recommend Changes to the Uniform:

Strike the words: "This includes such specialty wear as distinctive shirts and other "informal" items worn by groups of members performing similar specialty CAP functions and duties."

2. Paragraph 5.a. CAPM 39-1 (Draft), Paragraph 1-4, Changes to the Uniform, Paragraph b. Composition of the Uniform Committee: The fourth paragraph amended to read as follows: "The committee will be comprised of one wing commander from each region selected by the region commander. The committee will also seek individuals with substantive knowledge of uniforms either from US military or CAP background. Various mission areas will be represented on the committee, as well as the National Historian and CAP Chief Master Sergeant, and a CAP-USAF advisor, appointed by the CAP-USAF/CC, will serve ex officio."
3. Paragraph 8. (ADDED). Uniform items will be vetted through and recommended by the Uniform Committee and (1) will be posted for a 30-day comment period, (2) will be submitted through the chain of command, and (3) comments from National Board members will be listed first and comments from members will follow.
4. Paragraph 9. (ADDED). A 2-year moratorium on uniform items, which will give National Headquarters Staff time to incorporate all current ICL changes into an updated CAPM 39-1, Uniform Manual so we will actually have a uniform manual that is set and ready to go.

Also, the Uniform Committee will perform a comprehensive review of all corporate uniforms and report to the National Board at the summer 2011 National Board meeting, giving the board and the membership time to review before action is taken at the 2012 boards.

THERE WAS CONSENSUS OF THE BOARD to delay this agenda item until after lunch to allow time for reviewing a printed copy, and also to delay all uniform agenda items until after lunch in case some of them may be impacted by this agenda item.

On Saturday afternoon, discussion continued on this item and the following printed version of the amendment to the Uniform Process Action Team Report, as further amended by the Process Action Team (to include adding the word “major” between “on” and “uniform” on line 1, paragraph 8, ITEM III), was presented: NOTE: A vote was taken on each item.

ITEM I

Paragraph 5.a. CAPM 39-1 (Draft), Paragraph 1-4, Changes to the Uniform: Paragraph a. How to Recommend Changes to the Uniform. Strike the following sentence: This includes such specialty wear as distinctive shirts and other “informal” items worn by groups of members performing similar specialty CAP functions and duties.

THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED

COL DAVIDSON/NH MOVED TO AMEND and COL BRITTON/AR seconded that the Uniform Process Action Team Report be amended as follows: Paragraph 5.a. 1-4, paragraph a., last sentence of the first paragraph: After the words “will be returned” delete the words “to National Headquarters/DP for announcement and implementation” and add the words: “to the National Board for approval/disapproval by an up or down vote.”

THE MOTION TO AMEND DID NOT PASS

ITEM II

Paragraph 5.a. CAPM 39-1 (Draft), Paragraph 1-4, Changes to the Uniform: Paragraph b. Composition of the Uniform Committee. Replace the second to last paragraph with the following: The committee shall be comprised of one wing commander from each region selected by the region commander. The committee will also contain individuals with substantive knowledge of uniforms either from US military or CAP backgrounds. Various mission areas will be represented on the committee, including the National Historian, the CAP Chief Master Sergeant, and the Chair of the National Cadet Advisory Council; a CAP-USAF advisor, appointed by the CAP-USAF/CC will serve ex-officio.

COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO SUBSTITUTE and COL CARR/GLR seconded that paragraph b. is changed to read as follows:

The Chair of the Uniform Committee will be selected using the same procedure used for all other National Staff positions. The Uniform Committee will report to the National Commander through the National Chief of Staff. The committee shall be comprised of one wing commander from each region selected by the region commander, the National Historian, the CAP Chief Master Sergeant, and the Chair of the National Cadet Advisory

Council; a CAP-USAF advisor, appointed by the CAP-USAF/CC will serve without vote. The committee will solicit input from individuals with substantive knowledge of uniforms

either from the US military or with CAP backgrounds. As members of the Uniform Committee, officers would be expected to hold the membership and overall program above parochial or unit-based loyalties. Internal operation of the Uniform Committee will be at the discretion of the Chair.

COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO AMEND and COL CARR/GLR seconded the amendment, as follows: (1) Strike the words: “comprised of 5-10 officers,” and the words: “and will be selected by Chair with prior approval by the National Chief of Staff and National Commander;” and (2) Delete the second paragraph under b.

THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED

THE SUBSTITUTE MOTION AS AMENDED CARRIED

ITEM III

Paragraph 8. (ADDED). A 2-year moratorium on major uniform items will give the national staff time to incorporate all current ICL changes into an updated CAPM 39-1, Uniform Manual. The Uniform Committee will perform a comprehensive review of corporate uniforms (service, utility, flight) and report to the National Board at the summer 2011 to give the board and the membership time to review before action is taken at the winter 2012 National Board.

Paragraph 9. (ADDED). All uniform items vetted through and recommended by the Uniform Committee will be posted for a 30-day comment period; comments will be submitted through the chain of command, and comments from National Board members specially identified.

THE MOTION TO AMEND CARRIED

COL GUIMOND stated that through the years in working uniform issues it has become a necessity to have a female member on the Uniform Committee. The board provided clarification and guidance that the chair of the Uniform Committee would have sufficient authority to appoint a female member if one were not in one of the de facto positions.

THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED

August 2011 NB Action:

In the absence of Col David Braun, Chairman of the Uniform Committee, Col Guimond presented the Interim National Uniform Committee Report and recommended actions. All old National Board uniform business items were closed. The Moratorium on uniform

items continues to August 2012. Appreciation was expressed to the members of the Uniform Committee for all their great work.

COL CHAZELL/CS MOVED and BRIG GEN CARR/CV seconded that the National Board accept the Report of the Uniform Committee as presented, that the work continue as outlined in the presentation, and that all action items be disposed of as recommended in the report.

There was clarification that the only alternate corporate style uniform is the blazer slacks/skirt combination. There was also clarification that ribbons on aviator shirt is not authorized; however, former military members do wear military decorations on aviator shirt on the Fourth of July and other national holidays.

THE MOTION CARRIED

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Work of the National Uniform Committee continues. Report back to the Winter 2012 National Board meeting. Include in Summer 2012 National Board agenda.

March 2012 NB Action:

COL LECLAIR/ME presented the National Uniform Committee Comprehensive Uniform Review (slide briefing) in the absence of the Committee Chair, Col Dave Braun.

Col Leclair noted that with reference to the 2-year moratorium on major uniform changes, the committee requested and the summer 2011 National Board approved an extension until the summer 2012 National Board meeting.

COL GLOYD/USAF was asked to comment on the status of USAF approval for CAP to wear the new AF ABU uniform. He stated that, while the initial response appeared to be a denial, he is pursuing approval and the door is not closed yet. He added that when he gets an answer from the Air Staff, if it is a "Yes" then the proposal will be submitted through the normal chain of command to get it to the Air Staff.

COL LECLAIR summarized that Phase I of the Comprehensive Uniform Review is completed; Phase II is being presented here (will not act on AF style uniforms until response from CAP-USAF on the ABU wear); Phase III, which is on specialized uniforms will be presented at the Summer 2012 National Board meeting, in Baltimore.

COL CHAZELL/CS clarified that, with the assistance of Ms. Parker/DP, all change letters to CAPM 39-1 have been consolidated into one letter incorporating all changes to date that have not been incorporated into the manual. That letter will be issued shortly

and can be used to supplement the CAPM 39-1 as it stands now. After the completion of the Comprehensive Uniform Review, CAPM 39-1 will be rewritten and updated.

COL HERRIN/NLO asked to revisit the issue of the 2-year moratorium with respect to some of the outstanding Uniform Committee items. He stated that there are three items on the list that are “payroll” items—not major items—that have been deferred for two plus years. He asked those three items be considered now and made the following motion.

COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED and COL PLUM/NE seconded that the National Board direct the Uniform Committee to begin the immediate implementation of their items numbered 9, 33, and 34 — the Air Patrol Ribbon, the Professional Military Education Faculty Ribbon, and the Recognition Ribbon for persons who receive National of the Year recognition — because they are not major uniform items.

COL HERRIN’S restated motion: “That this body directs the Uniform Committee to remove from the 2-year moratorium, as extended the committee’s items 9, 33, and 34 and begin the process of implementation.”

COL HERRIN’S second restatement of the motion: “That this body directs the Uniform Committee to consider its items numbered 9, 33, and 34 and begin the process of implementation, notwithstanding the 2-year moratorium.”

By CS request, Ms. Parker responded that, while these appear to be simple items, the design, wear policy, the placement in the order of precedence, etc. are all issues that the Uniform Committee considers which makes this matter considerably more involved than a simple approval. She expressed an opinion that these issues are the reason Col Chazell and most of the committee felt that waiting to consider approval of these items was the best option. She also added for consideration of the board, that approval of this motion would change the order of precedence charts in all the current regulations and would require members to then redo their ribbon racks which may change anyway if there are other additional changes to the uniform.

THE MOTION DID NOT PASS

National Uniform Committee Comprehensive Uniform Review will brief the final recommendations to the National Board at the meeting in August 2012.

B. August 2011 NB Minutes: Item 9**Safety Compliance Interval**

MER/CC – Col Vazquez

Presenter: Col Greg Cortum, Committee Chair

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

Presently, CAP members are required to attend mandatory safety education training once a month. Such classes may be online or given face to face at a local meeting. Online courses are automatically credited to the CAP Online Safety Education module in eServices, whereas local safety class attendance must be manually entered into that module by either the unit commander or safety officer. The privilege to enter safety class attendance is not assignable by a WSA, only by a duty assignment as either commander or safety officer.

Failure to attain the monthly safety education credit in e-services results in the following actions:

1. The member's qualifications (ES and Pilot) in OPS Quals are temporarily revoked.
2. That member is subject to an abrupt dismissal from any CAP activity when the activity director does not find a recent (last 30 days) entry for safety education credit.

There are two problems with the current system. While the present system guarantees that any CAP member has completed the monthly safety education requirement, it does not guarantee that the member received credit for safety training not entered into the system. The privilege to validate very important training is assignable to multiple individuals by a WSA (OPS Quals Validation for ES or Pilot), yet the privilege to enter safety training is restricted to only two persons for any given unit.

The second problem is the interval required. Civil Air Patrol has made great strides in promoting a safety first culture, to include ORM briefings at all activities, advanced safety training for activity leaders, and an expanded accident investigation system that will lead to accident avoidance through lessons learned. Adding too many mandatory training classes threatens to dilute that message.

The typical ratio of time devoted to regular safety training/meetings versus time on the job in industrial settings is about 1:330 (30 minutes a month for a 40 hour work week). Given active CAP members volunteer 3 hours of time a week, a typical 15 minute safety class every month yields a ratio of 1:50. For less active members (1 hour a week), that ratio becomes 1:16. And unlike their industrial counterparts, CAP members do not daily report to a work site to have multiple opportunities meeting a monthly requirement.

To alleviate these problems, the privilege to input safety training should be assignable to any member the unit commander designates, and the interval of mandatory training changed from monthly to quarterly (resulting in a more realistic ratio of 1 hour training for every 150 hours of volunteer time). Given ORM, the flight release system and other checks and balances already present within CAP, reducing the mandatory interval will give commanders more flexibility to ensure members are getting the safety education they need.

PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION:

That the National Board approve changing the interval of mandatory safety education compliance from monthly to quarterly, and that WSAs have the option to grant the Safety Education Input privilege to as many CAP members as deemed appropriate by the unit commander.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

The cost needed to change CAPR 62-1, and any programming changes necessary in eServices.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Concur with changing the interval of safety education to quarterly. Other professional organizations, such as AOPA, require quarterly formal safety education for their full-time professional aircrews.

Regarding increasing the number of people who can enter safety education completion, currently all unit commanders, deputy/vice commanders, and any member appointed as a safety officer or assistant safety officer can make these entries. If additional members are needed, unit commanders can always assign additional individuals these duty assignments as long as they meet the training requirements for the position.

Safety education completion is recorded automatically for members who complete the training online via the CAP website. Another possible way to do it for members who complete safety education via another non-online method would be to allow the member to enter safety education completion themselves much like is done for Ops Qual items and then require someone from the same group of people (commanders, vice commanders, safety officers, assistant safety officers) to validate completion.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

CAP-USAF supports increasing Safety Education Input privilege commensurate with the size of the unit/wing.

We do not concur with increasing the training interval from monthly to quarterly. While we agree that CAP has taken great strides in promoting a safety culture, changing the

training interval not only sends the wrong signal about the importance of safety, but is counter to why the interval should be increased. Individuals involved on a full-time

basis, such as the 40 hour per week employee, are daily immersed in the work environment and safety culture. Conversely, CAP members that participate on a less frequent basis are more reliant on recurring training to maintain their safety focus and perishable skills. The less frequent a CAP member participates, the more vulnerable they become to mission related risks.

ADVISOR / NATIONAL STAFF COMMENTS:

Sr Advisor Support: Concur with the comments made by the NHQ Staff.

Senior Advisor-Operations – Concur with National Headquarter comments.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

CAPR 62-1

NATIONAL BOARD ACTION

The gavel was passed to Brig Gen Carr/CV for this item because the chair stated a desire to participate.

COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED and COL SUMNER/MS seconded the PROPOSED NATIONAL BOARD ACTION, as read to include changing the word “quarterly” to read “every 90 days.”

COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED TO AMEND and COL MILLER/NV seconded the amendment to divide to consider separately the frequency for safety education and the issue of safety education.

THE MOTION TO DIVIDE CARRIED

PART I

COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED and COL RUSSELL E. CHAZELL/CS seconded the National Board approve that WSAs have the option to grant the Safety Education Input privilege to as many CAP members as deemed appropriate by the unit commander.

COL MILLER/NV MOVED TO SUBSTITUTE that members input their own safety achievement and entry would be validated as suggested by the National Staff Comments.

THE SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND

THE PART I MOTION CARRIED

PART II

COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED and COL LEE/PA seconded that the National Board approve changing the interval of mandatory safety education appliance from monthly to every 90 days.

MAJ GEN COURTER/CC MOVED TO TABLE and COL PARRIS/CA seconded the table until later in the meeting to allow time for board members to hear more insight from the advisors.

THE MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED

LATER IN THE MEETING

COL VAZQUEZ/MER MOVED TO REFER TO COMMITTEE and COL ROBINSON/AL seconded the referral and to bring back to the Winter 2012 National Board meeting

THE MOTION TO REFER TO COMMITTEE CARRIED

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Refer to committee. Include in Winter National Board agenda.

March 2012 NB Action:

BRIG GEN VAZQUEZ/CV noted the report of the safety committee entitled, "Safety Committee Recommendation on Safety Education Interval," included in the agenda. The committee recommends no change, at this time, to the safety education training interval.

BRIG GEN VAZQUEZ/CV MOVED and COL SUMNER/MS seconded to remove from the table Agenda Item 9, Safety Compliance Interval, Part II, Aug 2011 National Board.

THE MOTION TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE CARRIED

NOTE: The motion on the floor reads: "That the National Board approve changing the interval of mandatory safety education compliance from monthly to every 90 days."

COL COOK/FL emphasized that CAP needs to have a program that addresses the safety culture, not just getting a safety education talk each month. He added, "Metrics are important because they tell us how we are doing, but they shouldn't be driving the issue. We have to develop a culture and that culture has to be that every member thinks about safety all the time in everything they do."

COL CORTUM/RMR endorsed Col Cook's comments and recommended that the Safety staff should look into a reward program of some type, an incentive for positive reinforcement for safety.

MAJ GEN CARR/CC reminded that the safety program belongs to the commanders. He added "Whether you want to call it checking the box or filling a square, it is your program and is left up to you to ensure that your people are safety briefed. You as commanders need to do whatever you possibly can to encourage and enhance safety."

THE MOTION DID NOT PASS

THIS ITEM IS CLOSED

C. March 2011 NB Minutes: Agenda Item 13 A.**Commander's Guide for Performance Improvement**

SER/CC - Col Rushing

March 2012 NB Action:

COL CHAZELL/CS reported that this Old Business item from the March 2011 National Board meeting was not included in the agenda, and called on Col Rushing, Chairman of the Adverse Action Committee, for an update.

COL RUSHING, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN reported that the pamphlet that was presented earlier was started as the Adverse Action Handbook. The committee had changed the emphasis and reoriented it to what is called the "**Commander's Guide for Performance Improvement**" pamphlet. After the March 2011 meeting, the pamphlet was distributed electronically with a request for comments. The returned comments were incorporated into the product, and it is now ready for use as soon as it is placed on-line. The pamphlet is an on-line pamphlet rather than printed because it contains active links to the basic regulations.

COL CHAZELL/CS noted that since this product is a pamphlet, it is not directive in nature and does not need board approval. It will be published shortly on eServices.

THIS ITEM IS CLOSED

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Notification to the field, and post *Commander's Guide for Performance Improvement* pamphlet in eServices.

AGENDA ITEM 8**New Business****Action**

A. Executive Session Matter

COL HERRIN/NLO stated that, in view of discussions on Friday regarding command transparency, he made the following motion:

COL HERRIN/NLO MOVED and COL CORTUM/RMR seconded that the National Board consent to remove the content of two of the discussions in the Executive Session on Friday: (1) The briefing by Col Gloyd, USAF, and (2) Remarks by Col Parris/IG with the exception of those comments related to specific personnel.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MAJ GEN CARR/CC clarified that the reason the board went into such a lengthy Executive Session on Friday was because there was a scheduled IG briefing on the agenda but the sensitivity of the contents were not totally known. He added that we always want to have transparency in everything that we do whenever possible.

B. Request to Change “Religious Endorser” to “Character Reference” for CDI Appointment

CHAP, COL ELLIS MOVED and COL FAGAN/NCR seconded that the National Board approve removing the requirement for “Religious Endorser” (in any form or by any designation) from regulations as a qualification for “CDI appointment.” Also, to change the regulation to require CDI Applicants to be “Recommended” by a community member of repute.

COL SUMNER/MS MOVED TO TABLE and COL BEDGOOD/SER seconded the motion to table until after lunch to allow for informal discussion.

THE MOTION TO TABLE CARRIED

FOLLOWING LUNCH, THE MOTION WAS BACK ON THE FLOOR AS MOVED

COL KARTON/GLR stated that he did not see anything in this motion that is an emergency that needs to be addressed without having been put on the agenda with an opportunity to consider it like all the other agenda items in advance, and made the following motion:

COL KARTON/GLR MOVED TO TABLE and COL MYRICK/PCR seconded the motion to table and refer this item to the Chaplain's Committee for a report back to the May 2012 NEC meeting.

THE MOTION CARRIED (7 no votes)

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Referral to committee for proper staffing, with a report back to the May 2012 NEC meeting. Include in the May 2012 NEC agenda.

THE CHAIR reminded commanders of the need to respond to the call for agenda items for the National Board and NEC meetings so they can be fully staffed in advance of the meeting. The only exception should be emergency items.

CH, COL, ELLIS, provided the benediction.

THERE WAS A MOTION TO ADJOURN BY ACCLAMATION

Administrative Remarks

THE NATIONAL BOARD WAS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION FROM 1410 – 1700 ON FRIDAY, 2 MARCH 2012.

THE NATIONAL BOARD ADJOURNED AT 1405, SATURDAY, 3 MARCH 2012.

ADMINISTRATIVE ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Update remarks and slide briefings were presented by Maj Gen Carr, National Commander; Mr. Rowland, Executive Director; and Col Gloyd, USAF, CAP-USAF Commander.

Distinguished members and guests were recognized including members of the head table; other members of the NEC; Members of the Board of Governors, Chairman, Brig Gen Richard Anderson and past CAP National Commander; and Vice Chairman, Maj Gen John Speigel, USAF (Ret); other Past National Commanders, Maj Gen Dwight Wheless, Brig Gen Hal DuPont, and Brig Gen Paul Bergman; and Commander of CAP-USAF, Col Gloyd, USAF.

Brig Gen Vazquez/CV announced the following named new commanders attending the National Board for the first time. Maj Gen Carr presented their National Board badges:

NER	Col Sandra E. Bandon, PA Wing
MER	Col William S. Bernfeld, DE Wing
GLR	Col Rickey L. Oeth, IL Wing
SER	Col Luis A. Cubano, PR Wing
NCR	Col Gerald P. Rosendahl, MN Wing
RMR	Col Frederick H. Thompson, ID Wing
SWR	Col Brian N. Ready, AZ Wing
PCR	Col Jon L. Stokes, CA Wing
	Col Timothy F. Hahn, NV Wing, and
	Col Ken Parris, National Inspector General

Brig Gen Vazquez/CV announced that Col Regina M. Aye, Kansas Wing is the only National Board member attending the meeting for the last time, and expressed appreciation for her service.

The Paul E. Garber Award and the A. Scott Crossfield Award were presented to Colonel Charles E. Lynch, Jr. of the Montana Wing.

Mr. Rowland/EX announced that Skip Dotherow has joined the National Headquarters staff as the new Development Director. He has already met many NB members is

looking forward to hearing everyone's ideas, learning more about the organization, and helping CAP develop successful campaigns in the future.

BRIG GEN RICH ANDERSON, Chairman of the BoG, and MAJ GEN JOHN SPIEGEL, USAF (Ret), Vice Chairman of the BoG, in open session, in the spirit of transparency, discussed the constitutional issues affecting Civil Air Patrol—the Governance process, which has been in a working stage for a very long time and now is in a formalized process moving toward addressing and resolving a number of these issues. Gen Anderson stated that Gen Spiegel, one of the Secretary of the Air Force designated representatives to the Board of Governors, is leading the BoG effort of the governance process in his capacity as Chairman of the BoG Governance Committee. Also serving on the committee is Brig Gen Sandy Schlitt, USAF (Ret) who represents the industry segment of the board membership, and Gen Carr represents the CAP category of membership. Gen Anderson noted the commissioning of an outside organization, BoardSource, which specializes in governance issues regarding non-profits. They have done a study and made their recommendations to the BoG. Going parallel with that has been the process known as the CAP Ad hoc Governance Committee which Gen Courter appointed, is chaired by Col Verrett, and consists of a number of key leaders throughout the organization. The BoG Governance Committee has had one meeting at Maxwell AFB and soon will meet again at Maxwell to move to the next step. Gen Anderson emphasized that he wanted to talk to the board and get feedback, but more importantly to let the board members understand the flight path for the way ahead.

MAJ GEN SPIEGEL explained how the coordination process will move along with due diligence in the finalization of the recommendations provided. After the presentation of the recommendations at a regular BoG meeting, they will go to the Secretary of the Air Force. After receiving feedback on that meeting, the BoG would meet again to make needed adjustments, after which they will come back to the CAP Constitution and Bylaws Committee to work out the remainder of the details.

MAJ GEN SPIEGEL admitted that this is a tough issue and the data points will be worked in a deliberate manner with healthy discussions among all the key stakeholders in this process. He added that the BoG wants to protect and preserve the years of tradition and the volunteer nature of CAP.

GEN ANDERSON noted that there were six members of the BoG present and opened the floor for questions or comments. There were several questions, some of which surrounded how this process will impact the members. The answer was that this governance process will be almost completely transparent to the members. He added that as things began to firm up, he will work to provide an avenue to give board members more feedback and be ready to answer questions.

At the close of the National Board meeting, Gen Carr thanked all the board members for assisting with Legislative Day and for fulfilling their responsibilities as commanders.