

NEC MINUTES

**National Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
12-13 November 2004**



Atlanta GA

12-13 November 2004

Contents

OPEN SESSION

<u>Action Agenda Items</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Ratification of Regulations..... Col Kauffman	5
2. Board of Governors MemberMaj Gen Wheless	7
3. E-mail Communications..... Mr. Allenback	9
4. CAP Aircraft Checklists Col Kauffman	12
5. Mishap Reporting & Investigation..... Col Opland	14
6. Distribution of Computers to the Field Col Opland	17
7. Access to Member Qualifications Col Opland	19
8. CAP Newspaper Change..... Mr. Allenback	21
9. Committee Reports..... Col Kauffman	24
1. Finance Committee Col Angel	24
2. Operations..... Col Hartman	26
3. Cadet Programs (Sub Committee) Col Glasgow	27
4. IT Group..... Col Glass	28
5. Development Committee Col Robinson	28
6. Communications Committee..... Lt Col Thomas	28
7. Chaplains Service..... Col Sharp	29
8. Advanced Technology..... Col Alexa	29
10. Old Business	30
1. CAP ID Card.....	30
2. CAPR 900-6	30
3. VHF Infrastructure/Table of Allowances	31
4. CAP Foundation	31
5. Certification Boards	31
11. New Business.....	32
1. Commemorative Book..... Mr. Rowland	32
2. Authorization to Sign Form 270..... Col Angel	32
3. Wing Conference Schedules..... Col Robinson	33
4. Frequent Flyer Miles for Cadets..... Ms. Easter	33
5. FECA/FTCA..... Col Vogt	33
6. Authority of the National Operations Center..... Col Greenhut	34
 <u>Information Agenda Items</u>	
12. VHF Repeater Requirements Study..... Lt Col Thomas	36
13. e-JITI Briefing..... Mr. McChesney	37
14. IG Update on Compliance Inspection Checklist..... Col Charles	38

The minutes will be approved at the next National Executive Committee Meeting in May 2005.

ATTEST:

OFFICIAL:

APPROVED

APPROVED

**THEODORE R. CHAVEZ
Colonel, CAP
National Legal Officer**

**DWIGHT H. WHELESS
Major General, CAP
National Commander**

**The November 2004 NEC Minutes were approved by the NEC
at their meeting on 13 May 2005.**

Civil Air Patrol
National Executive Committee Minutes
12-13 November 2004
Atlanta GA

OPEN SESSION

CALL TO ORDER Maj Gen Dwight H. Wheless, CAP
INVOCATION Ch, Col Charles E. Sharp, CAP
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE Col Larry D. Kauffman, CAP
SAFETY PLEDGE Brig Gen Antonio J. Pineda, CAP
ROLL CALL Mr. Al Allenback, HQ CAP/EX

NATIONAL COMMANDER REMARKS Maj Gen Dwight H. Wheless, CAP
SAFETY BRIEFING Mr. Gary Woodsmall, HQ CAP/SE
..... Col Davis R. Bonner, CAP
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE Mr. Al Allenback, HQ CAP/EX
SENIOR AIR FORCE ADVISOR UPDATE Col George C. Vogt, USAF

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Maj Gen Dwight H. Wheless, CAP National Commander
Brig Gen Antonio J. Pineda, CAP National Vice Commander
Col George C. Vogt, USAF Senior AF Advisor
Col Larry D. Kauffman, CAP National Chief of Staff
Col Donald B. Angel, CAP National Finance Officer
Col Theodore R. Chavez, CAP National Legal Officer
Col George M. Boyd, CAP National Controller
Col Richard A. Greenhut, CAP Northeast Region Commander
Col Charles S. Glass, CAP Middle East Region Commander
Col William W. Webb, CAP Great Lakes Region Commander
Col Matthew R. Sharkey, CAP Southeast Region Commander
Col Rex E. Glasgow, CAP North Central Region Commander
Col Thomas L. Todd, CAP Southwest Region Commander
Col Lynda C. Robinson, CAP Rocky Mountain Region Commander
Col Merle V. Starr, CAP Pacific Region Commander

Non-voting members:

Col William S. Charles, CAP CAP Inspector General
Ch, Col Charles E. Sharp, CAP Chief of Chaplain Services

CORPORATE TEAM

Mr. Al Allenback	Executive Director
Mr. Don R. Rowland	Senior Director, Strategic Comm. & Plans
Mr. Paul J. Capicik	Chief Information Officer
Mr. James L. Mallett	Director, Leadership Dev. & Membership Services
Ms. Susan Easter	Chief Financial Officer
Mr. John A. Salvador	Director, Operations
Mr. Mike Stewart	Director, Logistics & Mission Support
Mr. Stanley Leibowitz	General Counsel
Mr. Jim Shea	Director, Strategic Partnerships

AGENDA ITEM - 1

LG

Action

**SUBJECT: Ratification of Regulations
CAP/CS – Col Kauffman**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

Constitution Article XX, effective 27 Feb 01, requires that, in the normal course of events, regulations shall be adopted and maintained by the National Commander and shall be ratified by a majority vote of the National Board.

The following regulations are ready for ratification:

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>
CAPR 67-1 C1	<i>CAP Supply Regulation</i>
CAPR 70-1 C1	<i>CAP Acquisition Regulation</i>
CAPR 173-4	<i>Grants/Fundraising/Donations</i>

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC vote to ratify the proposed regulations.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

Cost of printing and distribution.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

All of the above.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

The above regulations have not been reviewed by CAP-USAF.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

None.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

NEC ACTION:

CAPR 67-1 C1, (paragraph 4-6), CAP Supply Regulation

MAJ GEN WHELESS clarified that this change allows CAP non-corporate officer members to bid at the sale of surplus equipment, which was previously prohibited by CAP regulations—not federal regulations.

COL STARR/PCR MOVED and COL TODD/SWR seconded that the NEC ratify the proposed change to paragraph 4-6, CAPR 67-1, CAP Supply Regulation

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Printing and distribution to the field.

CAPR 70-1 C1, CAP Acquisition Regulation

This item was withdrawn

CAPR 173-4, Grants/Fundraising/Donations

COL VOGT stated that changes to this regulation were reviewed by the CAP Legal Review Committee. The concerns of the Legal Review Committee were then reviewed by CAP-USAF. All of these comments were compiled in a STAFF SUMMARY, dated 10 Nov 2004, and distributed to NEC members for their review prior to ratification of CAPR 173-4.

LATER IN THE MEETING, BY GENERAL CONSENT, THIS ITEM WAS TABLED INDEFINITELY

AGENDA ITEM - 2

EX

Action

**SUBJECT: Board of Governors Member
CAP/CC – Maj Gen Wheless**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to Article IX of the Constitution, Civil Air Patrol appoints two Members at Large to the Board of Governors. These members serve a single four year term. The term of Col Robert Bess will expire on 26 Feb 05 and a replacement is chosen by the NEC in accordance with the procedures in CAPR 35-9. CAP/LMM has sent out notice of the coming vacancy and has received applications from members. The closing date for nominations was 21 Oct 04. LMM has reviewed all nominations and prepared a summary of qualifications sheet for NEC review. Each NEC member has the opportunity to nominate one candidate by closed ballot. Once all nominations are submitted, a seconding motion will be requested and received. Following discussion, if any, there will be a vote for acceptance of all nominations to be included on the ballot. Ballots will be distributed and a closed vote will be taken. The candidate receiving a clear majority (at least 8 votes) will be appointed to the Board of Governors. If no candidate receives a clear majority, the procedures stated in CAPR 35-9 are followed until a candidate receives a clear majority.

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC vote to select an at-large member for the Civil Air Patrol Board of Governors.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

None.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

None.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

None.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

NEC ACTION:

MAJ GEN WHELESS reviewed the applicable provisions of CAPR 35-9 and stated that his understanding of the nominating process for selecting a CAP member to serve on the Board of Governors is different from the past practice. He interprets the regulation to mean that the NEC has the option of nominating up to two candidates other than those listed on the approved self-nominating slate. After which, a new slate of candidates would be compiled for a seconding nomination and voting by the NEC, as outlined in CAPR 35-9. The National Legal Officer agreed with this position. Gen Wheless added that, if there are additional nominations, the staff will access the computers at National Headquarters to be sure they meet the four qualifications for election.

Later in the meeting, the slate of self-nominees was distributed to each person voting. There was no discussion about anything contained in the applications. There were no additional nominations from the voting NEC members.

COL GREENHUT/NER MOVED and COL KAUFFMAN/CS seconded to accept the self-nomination list, which is now in order for consideration by the NEC.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

Ballots were distributed for a secret vote for one Board of Governors position.

ON THE FIRST BALLOT, BY MAJORITY VOTE, MAJ GEN RICHARD BOWLING WAS ELECTED AS A MEMBER-AT-LARGE TO THE CIVIL AIR PATROL BOARD OF GOVERNORS, EFFECTIVE 27 FEB 2005.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Notification of Gen Bowling and to the BoG.

**SUBJECT: E-mail Communications
HQ CAP/EX – Mr. Allenback**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

The CAP membership e-mail data base was recently used to advertise and market events such as the summer National Board & Conference and the National Conference on Aviation and Space Education. This was the first time that the e-mail data base had been used in this fashion and very good results were obtained. There was some concern voiced from a few members that there needed to be a policy set on what type of events or subjects warranted the use of the data base and that members should be given the option of not having their e-mail used in this fashion.

National HQ and other nonprofit organizations believe that the “Can-Spam Act of 2003” is not applicable to routine communications with members provided the primary purpose is to facilitate CAP activities, and not to sell a commercial product (such as rooms at a host hotel). The act requires that persons be given an opportunity to “opt out” of “commercial electronic mail messages”, defined as any electronic mail message the primary purpose of which is the commercial advertisement or promotion of a commercial product or service. A commercial electronic mail message does not include a “transactional or relationship message”, defined to include an electronic mail message the primary purpose of which is to facilitate, complete, or confirm a commercial transaction that the recipient has previously agreed to enter into with the sender; or to provide at regular periodic intervals, account balance information or other type of account statement with respect to a subscription, membership, account, loan, or comparable ongoing commercial relationship involving the ongoing purchase or use by the recipient of products or services offered by the sender; or to provide information directly related to an employment relationship or related benefit plan in which the recipient is currently involved, participating or enrolled. There is controversy in the non-profit industry as to whether the Can-Spam restrictions apply to routine communications with members, and the issue has not yet been tested in the courts.

The following are some suggested policy guidelines:

- A. Broadcast e-mail messages to CAP membership are restricted to:
 - 1. Official business items of national interest to CAP membership such as:
 - a. Policy changes
 - b. Regulation changes or release notification
 - c. Solicitation for membership on the CAP Board of Governors
 - 2. Information and updates on national activities such as:
 - a. The summer National Board and Conference
 - b. The National Conference on Aviation and Space Education
 - c. National Cadet Special Activities
 - d. National Senior Activities

November 2004 NEC Minutes

B. All messages that are to be broadcast to the entire membership will be approved by the National Chief of Staff prior to sending.

C. There will be no e-mail broadcast if the primary purpose is to advertise for any commercial endeavor or to solicit contributions. There will be no e-mail broadcast of sexually oriented material or false or misleading information.

D. Members will have the opportunity to “opt out” of any future e-mail traffic by following a link that will be at the end of each nationally broadcast e-mail or by updating their profile in e-Services.

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC vote to establish policies concerning all member broadcast e-mails.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

None.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

To be given at the NEC meeting.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

None.

NEC ACTION:

COL GLASGOW/NCR MOVED and COL WEBB/GLR seconded that the NEC endorse the National Commander establishing a policy concerning all member broadcast e-mails by incorporating the suggested policy guidance listed above in this agenda item, A through D, with the following changes:

Change paragraph A (1): Change “Official business” to read “CAP business” and allow the National Commander to itemize specific areas, if deemed necessary.

Change paragraph B: Delete “National Chief of Staff” and add “National Commander or designee.”

November 2004 NEC Minutes

Add a paragraph to change addressees to blind addressees and to disable “reply to or reply all” feature.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Commander policy letter.

AGENDA ITEM - 4

DO

Action

**SUBJECT: CAP Aircraft Checklists
CAP/CS – Col Kauffman**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

The May 2004 National Executive Committee approved the adoption of an aircraft checklist produced by CheckMate™ Aviation, Inc. contingent upon approval of its content by HQ CAP-USAF. After reviewing the checklist more thoroughly, HQ CAP-USAF felt the CheckMate™ checklist did not adequately address some items in the pilot's operating handbook.

The Kentucky wing has developed a more comprehensive checklist that HQ CAP-USAF likes better. This format should meet CAP's needs and will also be more cost effective than the CheckMate™ checklists. With the approval of CAP/CS, representatives from CAP, NHQ and CAP-USAF used the Kentucky checklists as a starting point to develop a standardized national template. A sample of their recommended checklist will be presented to the National Executive Committee.

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC vote to approve the proposed checklist as the national standard. After approval, NHQ will work with region representatives to develop checklists for every model of aircraft that CAP owns. Once this process is complete, the checklists would be printed at NHQ and distributed to the field.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

Approximately \$1,200 for checklists, to be taken out of NHQ DO appropriated funds.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Concur with this proposal.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Concur with this proposal.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

To be presented at the NEC meeting.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

None.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

NEC ACTION:

A revised agenda was distributed, which included committee comments.

COL WEBB/GLR MOVED and COL TODD/SWR seconded that the NEC approve the Kentucky wing checklist as the national template standard on the condition that CAP-USAF and HQ CAP/DO approve the content and that the content contain no less than the manufacturer's abbreviated checklist items as modified to reflect current STC data. The final version must be certified as accurate by an A & P for the specific aircraft.

BY CONSENT, THE ABOVE MOTION WAS WITHDRAWN

COL WEBB/GLR MOVED and COL TODD/SWR seconded that the NEC approve the Kentucky wing checklist as the national template standard on the condition that CAP-USAF and HQ CAP/DO approve the content and that the content contain no less than the manufacturer's abbreviated checklist items as modified to reflect current STC data. The final checklist for a specific aircraft will be coordinated with the State Director and the wing director of maintenance as containing the foregoing information. This policy will be implemented within 90 days from the date that CAP-USAF and HQ CAP/DO approve a template for a specific make or model aircraft

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: CAP-USAF and HQ CAP/DO approval of checklist content and implementation of policy.

**SUBJECT: Mishap Reporting & Investigation
DE Wg/CC – Col Opland**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

CAPF 78, *Mishap Report Form*, is required to be used to report CAP mishaps and is required to be distributed in hard copy to a multitude of locations for every type of mishap.

This form is primarily designed for serious aircraft mishaps. It is difficult to use and inappropriate for very minor mishaps, vehicle incidents, and bodily injuries not involving aircraft or vehicles. The reproduction and distribution process is cumbersome and time-consuming for the unit or activity commander.

The difficult nature of the process and requirement to collect detailed data (logbook time of pilots, aircraft maintenance data, etc.) may be preventing full reporting and disclosure of all CAP mishaps and is not in keeping with the stated intent of CAPR 62-2, *Mishap Reporting and Investigation*: “mishap prevention” (i.e., not blame-seeking).

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC vote to direct HQ CAP/SE and HQ CAP/GC to modify the mishap reporting and investigation process, and present proposed revisions to the 2005 Winter National Board for ratification:

1. Eliminate the CAPF 78 or modify it to facilitate streamlined electronic and/or verbal reporting;
2. Identify which categories of mishaps may be reported electronically and/or verbally and establish electronic mishap reporting distribution lists;
3. Delete personally-identifiable information of the mishap participants except information that is needed for insurance or legal purposes;
4. Define categories of mishaps based on severity and align mishap reporting and investigation requirements to an appropriate command echelon for each of those categories;
5. Modify CAPR 62-2, CAPF 78, and CAPF 79, *CAP Mishap Investigation Form*, IAW the preceding determinations, as appropriate.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

Modification of regulation and forms, as appropriate.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

1. Streamlined safety reporting is a great idea. In fact, an initiative to transition to a streamlined, web-based mishap reporting system has already been forwarded to the HQ CAP/IT Projects Group. Immediate reporting for death and serious injuries will still be required. The new system will involve online reporting, coordination, and tracking of mishap reports. Development will begin when prioritized by the IT Projects Group.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

2. All of the current mishap categories will be included in this initiative. Automated distribution lists make sense and would significantly reduce the reporting workload.
3. Personally-identifiable information should continue to be required – not for punitive reasons, but to identify people that might benefit from additional training and for analysis purposes.
4. Currently, CAP mishaps are defined by severity. Reporting and investigation requirements are also delegated to the local level. There must be, however, a means to quickly up-channel information so that leadership is kept in the loop and statistics can be kept on the safety performance of the organization as a whole. In addition, the timely reporting of information to National Headquarters is essential for evaluating insurance and CAP self-insurance claims. Developing separate reporting systems for claims purposes would be counterproductive to CAP's paperwork reduction efforts. The proposed online reporting and tracking system would accomplish these objectives.
5. Forms and regulations would be eliminated or modified, as appropriate, in the development process.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

CAP-USAF supports modifying the CAP's mishap investigation process in the following ways:

1. Electronically streamline the mishap investigation reporting process. This initiative was proposed by CAP-USAF/SE and HQ CAP/SE but has not been a priority item within HQ CAP/IT. The new online mishap reporting system will involve reporting, coordination and tracking of investigation results and corrective actions. This application would include a database that could be queried. Mishap history, status of reports/investigations/corrective actions, and staff coordination could be easily viewed by different groups depending on granted permissions. This reporting system and database will enable CAP to accurately report, track, and compile mishap data. This also includes the ability for geographically dispersed CAP units to view mishap investigation reports to learn the causes, findings, and recommendations.
2. Remove CAP flight suspension verbiage from CAPR 62-2 to separate mishap prevention from punitive actions against the crewmembers. Punitive actions are detailed in CAPR 60-1.
3. Establish mishap reporting distribution lists for clarity and ensure appropriate levels of review by CAP and CAP-USAF supervision are covered in accordance with reporting requirements in CAP regulations and the Statement of Work.
4. CAP-USAF is not opposed to a review of CAP's reportable mishaps/injuries, mishap reporting forms or investigation review process. However, all reportable mishaps will be documented and will include pertinent data from the individuals involved in the mishap.
5. CAP aircraft accidents are investigated by the NTSB and CAP is not granted military safety privilege. However, CAP-USAF is not opposed to CAP adopting an Air Force style separation of mishap prevention investigations from punitive action investigations within CAP regulations.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

Additional Comments from CAP-USAF:

Air Force mishap procedures clearly separate post-mishap actions into two very distinct processes--reporting and investigation. In other words, after a mishap, the first series of questions relate to reporting: Is this a reportable mishap? Who do I report it to? How do I report it (i.e. phone call, OPREP-3, e-mail, etc)? What is my timeline for reporting? The second series of questions are investigation related: What sort of investigation is required? Who conducts it? How to they conduct it? When the investigation is complete, who do the investigators present their findings to?

When redesigning the mishap reporting and investigation processes, we recommend the final processes continue to distinguish between the two separate processes.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

To be presented at the NEC meeting.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

CAPR 62-2 *Mishap Reporting and Investigation*
CAPF 78 *Mishap Report Form*
CAPF 79, *CAP Mishap Investigation Form*

NEC ACTION:

COL GLASS/MER MOVED and COL GREENHUT/NER seconded that the NEC charge the National Headquarters staff to revise the process of Forms 78 and 79 to provide total electronic reporting, incorporating the ideas proposed by CAP National Headquarters and HQ CAP-USAF that are submitted in this proposal.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters with work with the IT Committee in revising the process. Change to regulation, which will be submitted for ratification.

**SUBJECT: Distribution of Computers to the Field
DE Wg/CC – Col Opland**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

FY02 was the first year appropriated funds became available for buying computer systems for CAP units below wing level. The purpose of this funding was to develop the nationwide infrastructure to support the development of our national information system (e-Services), and the gradual conversion of our paper-based processes to electronic ones. This funding is recurring and based on a 5-year cycle. With judicious use of extra funding at year-end for the past three years, the first round of distributing one computer to every unit will be complete during FY05, with funding remaining to begin the second round of distributions.

In the past, distribution priorities were based on sending a proportionate share of the available computers to each wing based on the number of units in the wing and allowing the wing commander to designate the specific units to receive the computers, as long as no unit received more than one computer prior to every other unit receiving one. With all units having received at least one computer when the first round distribution is completed during FY05, it is appropriate to either reaffirm the current priorities for the second round of computers, or establish a new set of priorities.

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC vote to approve a set of distribution priorities/guidelines for the second round of new computer systems funded by appropriated dollars. Possible priority/guidelines could be:

- Continue the current plan – each unit will receive a second computer system before any unit receives a 3rd computer system. Wings will receive a proportionate share of each year's purchase based on number of active units, and the wing commander will determine which units receive computers.
- Specify that cadet units and/or units with aircraft receive the first computers from the second cycle, and then revert back to wing commander recommendation for the remainder of the units.
- Specify that, once all units have one computer (by later FY05), wing commanders may establish priorities based on need to include permitting larger units to receive a 3rd or even more computers before all units receive a 2nd computer.
- Some other policy established by the NEC.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

A decision for this agenda item has no funding impact. Funding is established at a set level.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Because computer availability is often a unit shortfall in using e-Services and other automated or online material, a prime consideration should be placement and distribution such that the most people and/or the most productive people have access to the resource. Units without a permanent location and/or without an available phone line present a difficult challenge. Member owned resources should also be a factor considered when issuing and locating these computers.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

No comment.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

None.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

None.

NEC ACTION:

MAJ GEN WHELESS suggested that this type of plan needs some flexibility, that computers need to go to mission bases and cadet programs, and a lot of calculations need to be made. He stated a preference not to lock in a policy unless the NEC feels there is some unfair distribution being made. He requested that the decision be left at the National Commander level to work with a group of region commanders to set up the parameters, similar to the aircraft distribution, to find out where the greatest needs are and then make the appropriate distribution. The NEC agreed and expressed a preference for the third option offered in the PROPOSED NEC ACTION.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Commander and working group to develop distribution parameters.

**SUBJECT: Access to Member Qualifications
DE Wg/CC – Col Opland**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

Currently, access to member qualification information is restricted in e-Services. Only personnel authorized by the Web Security Administrator (WSA) for the appropriate echelon can authorize members to view other members' qualifications for that echelon. This circumstance is severely limiting appropriate information flow in certain kinds of situations.

For example, during a mission when members from a unit other than the host unit participate, the host unit cannot access those members' qualifications. During events with members from multiple units (e.g., SLS, CLC, encampments, etc), the host unit cannot view the qualifications of members from other units. When members assigned to a higher echelon (e.g., region staff) participate in local activities (and are required to maintain qualifications, in some cases, with the local unit), the local unit cannot access the members' qualifications.

Member qualification information is separate and distinct from member "personal" information. Member personal information is that which is deemed private, such as telephone numbers, home addresses, etc.

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC vote to approve viewing ("read-only") access to all member qualification information in e-Services by any other member.

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

None.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Concur in principle. Currently Incident Commanders automatically receive permissions to access this data in the National IP restricted application once the IC qualification has been entered and/or approved in the MIMS system. If this item is passed, all members will be able to view training and qualification data for any member in the organization.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

Concur. Lack of timely, accurate data on member's qualifications could significantly detract from CAP's ability to respond to contingencies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

None.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

None.

NEC ACTION:

***COL GLASS/MER MOVED and COL GREENHUT/NER seconded* that the NEC vote to approve viewing (“read-only”) access to all member qualification information in e-Services by any other member. Qualification information is defined as emergency services achievements, senior member training achievements, and cadet training achievements.**

MOTION CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters staff action.

**SUBJECT: CAP Newspaper Change
HQ CAP/EX – Mr. Allenback**

INFORMATION BACKGROUND:

The NEC was briefed in Nov 03 that NHQ would study changing the *Civil Air Patrol News* from a 32-page newspaper to 40-page magazine format. This change would offer the following:

- Magazine format offers more professional corporate image to both internal and external audiences
- Magazine offers full-color [with bleed] option throughout entire magazine, giving design team a host of modern, dynamic design alternatives
- Lower cost compared to publishing newspaper

After research and evaluation, the following options were developed:

- **Option A: Bimonthly magazine**
 - Would require FY05 corporate publication budget of \$189,600
 - Results in increase of \$45,600 to annual budget currently at \$144,000
 - To offset publication frequency [bimonthly versus monthly], magazine will be augmented by both CAP News Online and biweekly broadcast e-mail initiative
 - For perspective, annual newspaper budget as monthly newspaper was \$288,000
 - Decrease of \$98,400
- **Option B: Quarterly magazine**
 - Would require FY05 corporate publication budget of \$126,400
 - Reduction of \$17,600 annual budget currently at \$144,000
 - To offset publication frequency [bimonthly versus monthly], magazine will be augmented by both CAP News Online and biweekly broadcast e-mail initiative
- **Option C: Continue publishing bimonthly newspaper**
 - Current FY05 budget of \$144,000
 - To offset publication frequency [bimonthly versus monthly], newspaper will be augmented by both CAP News Online and biweekly broadcast e-mail initiative

A *Civil Air Patrol News* May 03 survey had 200 respondents and a clear majority favored the current newspaper format.

PROPOSED NEC ACTION:

That the NEC consider one of the three options.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

ESTIMATED FUNDING IMPACT:

Option A: Bimonthly Magazine

	<u>Per Issue</u>	<u>Total for year</u>
Postage	\$15,000	\$90,000
Printing	\$14,600	\$87,600
Labeling/Sorting	\$2,000	\$12,000
	Total	\$189,600

Requires FY 05 annual budget increase of \$45,600.

Option B: Quarterly Magazine

	<u>Per Issue</u>	<u>Total for year</u>
Postage	\$15,000	\$60,000
Printing	\$14,600	\$58,400
Labeling/Sorting	\$2,000	\$8,000
	Total	\$126,400

Results in FY 05 annual budget decrease of \$17,600.

Option C: Continue Bimonthly Newspaper

	<u>Per Issue</u>	<u>Total for year</u>
Postage	\$11,800	\$70,800
Printing	\$10,200	\$61,200
Labeling/Sorting	\$2,000	\$12,000
	Total	\$144,000

Results in no change to FY 05 annual budget.

REGULATIONS AND FORMS AFFECTED:

None.

CAP NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

None.

CAP-USAF HEADQUARTERS' COMMENTS:

No comment.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

None.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

NEC ACTION:

Following discussion of the three options that were proposed, Mr. Allenback stated that he needed a sense from the NEC for what they would like the headquarters to do for planning purposes before proceeding.

BRIG GEN WHELESS asked that NEC members to think about this issue over night and provide guidance to Col Allenback as to possible options.

AGENDA ITEM - 9

NCS

Action

**SUBJECT: Committee Reports
NCS – Col Kauffman**

Committees

1. Finance Committee

Col Angel

COL ANGEL/NFO distributed copies of National Finance Committee (NFC) Minutes, 11 Nov 2004 (Atch 1); FY05 Corporate Financial Plan (Atch 2), and Statement of Investment Policy (Atch 3).

- a. COL ANGEL briefed the FY05 Corporate Financial Plan changes.
- b. The NFC minutes were reviewed and the following issues were discussed or actions taken:
 1. 2005 Corporate Budget Revision. Correction to Chaplain council strategic planning institute (change 95,000 to 7,500)
 2. Cost of Living Adjustment.

COL ANGEL/NFO MOVED and COL TODD/SWR seconded that the NEC endorse a 3.7 percent cost of living adjustment for the National Headquarters' corporate employees.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: FM and HR staff action and implementation of policy.

3. Hull Self Insurance (HSI)

COL WEBB/GLR MOVED and COL KAUFFMAN/CS seconded that the NEC approve a motion that the existing policy be amended such that the HSI fund is treated as a secondary fund only to be used when approved by the National Commander and when appropriated funds are not available or cannot be lawfully utilized for hull repairs.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters staff action to develop a National Commander emergency change to CAPR 900-6.

COL ANGEL also briefed in the area of salvage costs versus selling the aircraft when there is damage. At what point is the aircraft too costly to repair? The CAP insurance carrier provided the following guidelines:

November 2004 NEC Minutes

An insured value of \$250,000, estimated repair cost of \$100,000, and a salvage value of \$25,000—the rule would be to repair.

An insured value of \$250,000, estimated repair cost of \$200,000, and a salvage value of \$55,000—the rule would be to scrap.

To recap, the rule of the insurance company is to scrap an aircraft if the repair cost plus the salvage cost is equal to or greater than the value of the aircraft, regardless of percentages.

4. Aircraft Procurement Account (APA) Fund Liquidation Proposal.

COL ANGEL briefed that this fund will be liquidated and when CAP needs to buy new aircraft, CAP will have the money in advance from the Air Force without having to borrow money, which should simplify the purchase of aircraft. Ms. Mary Beth Tyler, Grants Officer, stated that cash advances had not been determined. The National Commander asked that a report be given after this issue has been resolved.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Report due on resolution of advance money from Air Force to purchase aircraft.

5. Plan for Unqualified Audit Opinion.

COL ANGEL stated that this is an information item requested by the BoG audit committee. Ms. Susan Easter, HQ CAP/FM briefed the two-phased approach to determining the feasibility of achieving an unqualified audit opinion which will involve going below wing level. Col Angel added that, if the BoG determines that CAP needs to proceed with this plan, a determination will have to be made as to funding involved in implementing this plan.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION. If directed by BoG, determination of funding for Phase II.

6. Per Diem for Air Force-Assigned Missions

The National Commander will write a policy letter endorsing the Air Force policy of using appropriated money for per diem when on Air Force assigned missions, with approval by the State Director, Wing Commander or by authority of the National Operations Center (NOC) (in advance) for safety reasons on a training mission.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Commander policy letter

c. Statement of Investment Policy

COL ANGEL reported that the BoG directed CAP to develop a statement of investment policy. The attached statement of investment policy has been reviewed by the finance committee. COL ANGEL stressed the importance for NEC members to understand that it is a policy to address avenues to take in financial responsibility. CAP investments will be invested using that modern portfolio theory to serve a moderate to conservative model with minimal risk.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

COL ANGEL/NFO MOVED and COL TODD/SWR seconded that the NEC approve the Statement of Investment Policy, as submitted, and provide a copy of the approved policy to the BoG, as requested.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Inclusion in the Dec 04 BoG agenda.

2. Operations

Col Hartman

COL HARTMAN reported on two items that are in the Operations Committee for action.

a. Reference Agenda Item 10, Old Business, 5. ITEM: Certification Boards; and an added attached document, COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS. He reported that the concerns raised in previous meetings have been addressed in the new CAPR 60-3 and the committee recommends no additional changes or directives to ensure that members are highly qualified and understand the responsibilities of emergency services personnel.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: Maj Gen Wheless asked the National Legal Officer to prepare a letter for his signature revoking the July 2002 policy letter establishing certification boards to the extent that it conflicts with the newly adopted CAPR 60-3, dated 26 May 2004.

b. Reference the proposal that the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal be considered for award to CAP aircrews. (NEC, Nov 2003, Agenda Item 13. Additional New Business, ITEM 5. Aircrew Decorations). At the August 2004 National Board, the committee reported a recommendation that this item be sent to the National Historian. A reply has been received and has been sent to NEC members. The National Historian also made a proposal to award the Distinguished Service Medal and the Exceptional Service Medal. There is no clear consensus of the Operational Committee in this matter (eight against; seven for; one abstention). The majority of the committee members felt that it would be very difficult to develop criteria to establish how this program would be administered. There was concern that some members may take unnecessary risks in order to earn those medals. Some committee members felt there are already adequate rewards.

COL GLASGOW/NCR MOVED and COL KAUFFMAN/CS seconded that the NEC rescind the action of the Nov 03 NEC directing the development of a Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal.

NOTE: A two-thirds majority vote is required to rescind a previous motion. If by majority vote, prior notice must be given to the body of intent to rescind

MOTION CARRIED BY MORE THAN A TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY

THIS ITEM IS CLOSED.

3, Cadet Programs Sub-Committee

Col Glasgow

Part I: Motion to Revise the Cadet Physical Fitness Standards

COL GLASGOW/NCR MOVED and COL ROBINSON/RMR seconded that the NEC task the National Cadet Programs Committee with writing a policy letter for CAP/CC signature that will implement the change to the Cadet Physical Fitness Test (CPFT), as described below in sub-paragraphs (a), (b), and (c). The National Commander shall issue this policy letter by 6 December 2004. It shall remain in effect through the August 2005 National Board, at which time the National Board shall rescind it or ratify a change to CAPR 52-16, and the related pamphlet, CAPP 52-18.

a. Amend the CPFT requirements proscribed in CAPR 52-16, *Cadet Program Management*, paragraph 1-3B; and describe in a related pamphlet, CAPP 52-18, *Cadet Physical Fitness Program*, chapter 5, as follows:

b. To pass the CPFT, cadets assigned to Physical Fitness Category I must meet the performance standards listed in CAPP 52-18 for the mile run or shuttle run, plus two of the three other CPFT events (curl-ups, right-angle push-ups, and the sit-and-reach).

c. Cadets assigned to Physical Fitness Category II, III, or IV are waived from one or more CPFT events due to a medical condition. Testing officers shall score each waived event as a "pass."

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION:

1. Task Cadet Programs Committee with writing policy letter for signature of the National Commander.
2. Develop changes to CAPR 52-16 and CAPP 52-18.
3. Include in the summer 2005 National Board agenda to rescind or ratify change to regulation and pamphlet.

PART II: National Cadet Competition 2005

There was a lengthy discussion on the added cost of moving the National Cadet Competition (NCC) to Washington DC, and the requirement to identify source funding. Col Angel/NFO recalled the established policy that neither the National Board nor the NEC would vote for mandated programs without providing a source of funding. He asked that this policy be extended to committees and that future committee recommendations should include a fairly accurate cost estimate.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

NOTE: Col Angel was directed to craft a motion in line with the proposal to move the NCC to Washington DC, identifying a source from which funds are expected to be paid, with the lease risk to the corporate treasury. The motion will be presented to Col Glasgow for concurrence and presentation so that the NEC can discuss further and vote.

Later in the meeting, the following motion was made:

COL GLASGOW/NCR MOVED and COL ANGEL/NFO seconded that the NEC approve the use of \$27,000.00 unallocated funds directed for NCC 2005 travel offset for a banquet at the NCC 2005. All available unrestricted corporate donations will be utilized first. NHQ/LMP is directed to conduct negotiations on the Hazy Center for banquet arrangements. The NEC tasks the Cadet Programs Sub-Committee to decide a banquet site. Any remaining balances of unallocated funds directed for NCC 2005 travel offset may be divided among the regions to help offset travel expenses.

THE MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS:

1. NHQ/LMP conduct Hazy Center negotiations
2. Cadet Programs Sub-Committee decide NCC banquet site
3. FM divide unallocated funds among regions

4. IT Group

Col Glass

COL GLASS, Chair, Information Technology (IT) Committee, distributed a MEMORANDUM FOR NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, dated 10 Nov 2004, Subject: Committee Report. See attachment 4.

5. Development Committee

Col Robinson

COL ROBINSON reported that several issues are under consideration by the Development Committee. Also, the committee is still being formed and has not yet met as a full committee.

6. Communications Committee

Lt Col Thomas

LT COL THOMAS expressed appreciation to the Air Force for funding and in recognizing priorities at the highest levels. He reported that there has been a communications sub-committee chartered and appointed. He plans to have discussions with the National Commander as to how he expects to see that sub-committee's work progress—how assigned, how handled, protocols, input and output,

November 2004 NEC Minutes

and reporting to the Operations Committee. There are some immediate concerns. The CAPR 100-1, CAPP 214, and communications training tracks are grossly out of date. As technology moves forward, there needs to be a regular process for review of CAPR 100-1. There is none right now. He stated that he has attended many National Board and NEC meetings and he hears about strategic planning. This is an obvious area for the sub-committee to look at—strategic planning for communications. As these technologies and processes evolve, CAP needs to urgently look at technology integration, particularly in the cockpit, in view of the fact that CAP is putting more and more electronics on board aircraft. There are also safety concerns. He emphasized the need for input from the wing level to support all the efforts at the national level. One of the key elements in the wing compliance inspections is the matter of utilization and accountability. CAP is receiving millions of dollars in new equipment and we need to make sure that equipment is getting to the field and is being employed to support the mission.

7. Chaplains Service

Col Sharp

CH COL SHARP reported on a teleconference with the Chaplain Services Advisory Council. There are now 945 Chaplain Service personnel appointed. This number includes moral leadership officers. The council discussed several issues including the awareness of the budget cuts. The region chaplain staff colleges will proceed on schedule with the reduced funding. There is still a need for more chaplains in a lot of the units. He added that the chaplains want to be of service and will work with all levels of CAP. He added that there are a number of CAP chaplains that are performing services for DoD in several states and overseas.

8. Advanced Technologies

Col Alexa

COL ALEXA presented a slide briefing on Advanced Technologies initiatives including the ARCHER—the hyperspectral imaging program, the Visual Computing Network, and Satellite Digital Imaging System (Atch 5).

AGENDA ITEM - 10

Action

SUBJECT: Old Business

1. ITEM: ID Card; Agenda Item 12 from the August 2003 National Board, Agenda Item 12-1 from the November 2003 NEC, Agenda Item 15-4 from the March 2004 National Board, Agenda Item 11-2 from the May 2004 NEC, and the special telephone NEC, 8 September 2004. Possible designs and cost estimates may be discussed.

COL TODD/SWR briefed the current status. Two potential designs of cards were shown on the screen. One was the Air Force approved card. The other one included changes from the previous CAP card, except for the addition of the blue stripe. The consensus of CAP members was to approve the CAP designed card in a landscape format. These are the proposals that went forward to Col Sciss.

COL SCISS explained a presidential directive specifically dealing with ID cards. The directive is to make sure that the government has a standard approach to how IDs card are created that allow access to military installations. In complying with this directive, he stated that the CAP ID card will have to be visibly distinctive and different from the DoD cards. A different background to the card was suggested, hence the dark blue stripe on the Air Force suggested card. Since CAP doesn't like the blue strip, Col Sciss suggested a background image, such as a flag or emblem. There was also a suggestion to move the CAP seal to the middle of the card for a background image.

MS. PARKER clarified that, for members that will be issued the volunteer-type cards from the Air Force (a different card), they must have certain security clearances, such as a National Agency Check.

There was a lengthy discussion on possible designs of the CAP ID card with guidance as to what the Air Force probably would or would not approve.

Later in the meeting, Col Webb offered to go with Col Sciss to the office that approves DoD cards to talk and see what kind of card they would be able to get approved to bring back to the table. Gen Wheless had no objection as long as Col Sciss was comfortable with this arrangement. Col Sciss indicated that he agreed with Col Webb's proposal. The NEC agreed and there was also agreement that, if the card can be worked out at higher levels of authority, a fax vote would be taken to close this item.

2. ITEM: CAPR 900-6 - Hull Self Insurance Program; Agenda Item 11-1b from the May 2004 NEC. NEC voted to assess wings \$60 per aircraft per quarter to replenish the Hull Self Insurance fund. CAPR 900-6 was rewritten to implement this action.

This item was covered under Item (3) of the Finance Committee Report.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

3. ITEM: VHF Infrastructure/Table of Allowances; Agenda Item 13-8 from the May 2004 NEC. Repeater requirements plan due. See agenda Item 12.

This item was covered in Agenda Item 12, VHF Repeater Requirements Study.

4. ITEM: CAP Foundation; Agenda Item 5 from the May 2004 NEC, Agenda Item 2 from the June 2004 BoG. The NEC and BoG approved the concept of the CAP Foundation. The BoG requested that they be given an opportunity to review the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws at the December 2004 meeting prior to them being filed. This is an update to the NEC on what is going to be presented to the BoG in December.

MR. LEIBOWITZ/GC provided a slide briefing (Atch 6).

5. ITEM: Certification Boards; Agenda Item 17 from the August 2003 National Board, Agenda Item 12-4 from the November 2003 NEC. Mission Crew Certification Boards were established by a policy letter in July 2002. The agenda item ask for them to be replaced. The item will be addressed in the Operations Committee update.

This item was covered in Part I of the Operations Committee Report.

AGENDA ITEM - 11

Action

SUBJECT: Additional New Business

1. ITEM: Commemorative Book

MR. ROWLAND, HQCAP/XP, briefed an opportunity offered by Turner Publishing Company for a history book, 8 x 12 hard bound with a dust cover, that tells the story of Civil Air Patrol. Turner Publishing hopes to have this published for the 64th Anniversary of CAP, December 2005, and have it ready for people to buy as Christmas gifts. There is no cost or financial risk to the corporation. Turner Publishing will bear all costs, but because of that, CAP's return will be very low—only 5 percent. The cost of the book would be \$42.95, and at that rate, for every 1,000 books sold, the return would be \$2,000. Turner Publishing Company would like to mail out flyers on this proposal, which would require release of the mailing list for that purpose only. CAP will have edit rights and will own the Copyright when completed.

COL ANGEL/NFO MOVED and COL TODD/SWR seconded that the NEC direct National Headquarters to pursue this opportunity either with Turner Publishing Company or another competitive publisher, and authorize National Headquarters to accept the best offer to publish a CAP book, as proposed.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION: National Headquarters to check other competitive publishers and accept the best offer to publish book on the history of CAP.

2. ITEM: Authorization to Sign Form 270.

COL ANGEL/NFO briefed the administrative need to have someone at CAP HQ available to sign the Form 270. This is the form used to request reimbursement from appropriated dollars after we have already spent the money to buy aircraft and equipment. Our commander is a very busy person and, because of his travels, it is not feasible for him to be able to sign this form in a timely manner. The current Executive Director, Mr. Allenback, is not eligible to sign this form because he was instrumental in developing the CAP Cooperative Agreement and Statement of Work while he was still on active duty with the Air Force. Therefore, the following motion was made:

COL ANGEL/NFO MOVED and COL KAUFFMAN/CS seconded that the NEC authorize the HQ CAP Senior Director, in this case, Don R. Rowland, to request payment reimbursement from the government of funds for Civil Air Patrol under the Cooperative Agreement by whatever means are authorized by such request.

During discussion, Mr. Rowland clarified that he was being given authorization to sign the request for reimbursement in addition to (not in lieu of) the Executive Director. Gen Wheless clarified that this motion is only authorizing Don Rowland to sign the request;

November 2004 NEC Minutes

that at such time as the Executive Director is eligible to sign, this matter will be revisited, if needed.

MOTION CARRIED WITH NO DISSENTING VOTES

FOLLOW-ON ACTION. Mr. Rowland designated to sign Forms 270.

3. ITEM: Wing Conference Schedules

COL ROBINSON/RMR requested that region commanders provide all NEC members with copies of the scheduled wing conferences to avoid conflicts.

MAJ GEN WHELESS also made a request to region commanders. He stated that there are three wing conferences scheduled at the time of the next NEC meeting, which means that no corporate command official or region commanders will be attending three wing conferences. He asked that the region commanders help the wings de-conflict their conference meeting dates with the established NEC dates. He added that if we are not setting the dates for NEC meetings far enough in advance, to let him know.

FOLLOW-ON ACTION:

1. Region commanders to provide wing conference schedules.
2. Region commanders help de-conflict three wing conferences with May 05 NEC meeting.

4. ITEM: Frequent Flyer Miles for Cadets

MS. EASTER/FM stated that Delta Airlines names an Organization of the Quarter for the purpose of donating frequent flyer miles. She plans to write a letter to Delta asking if CAP could be selected as an organization of the quarter to benefit cadet travel. As an alternative, Delta suggested that anyone that has frequent flyer miles can use those miles to purchase a ticket for another person. Anyone contributing frequent flyer miles for cadets to travel to NCC would be appreciated.

5. ITEM: FECA/FTCA Brochures

COL VOGT/ SR AF ADVISOR distributed draft copies of informational brochures which explain FTCA and FECA. He stated that many people in the wings do not understand what FTCA and FECA mean and he believed these brochures would help. He invited input from CAP. There was a suggestion to lump these two brochures into one. Col Vogt added that he felt this idea could be expanded to other issues that some members may not fully understand.

MAJ GEN WHELESS asked that feedback be sent to HQ CAP-USAF/CV.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

6. ITEM: Authority of the National Operations Center (NOC)

MAJ GEN WHELESS referred to Col Greenhut's question about the authority of the NOC, as to whether it was a coordination/de-confliction authority or a mission approval authority.

COL GREENHUT/NER stated that he and the HQCAP/DO, Mr. Salvador had talked about this off-line and one of the issues about the C-14 and C-18 missions had to do with only the NOC having the ability to say "Yes". They agreed that the concept was that the NOC needed to act as a clearing house. There can be no CAP missions without the NOC being aware of it for de-confliction purposes. But, to consider rather than having the NOC being the people who can say "Yes," have them be the people who can say "No." Then, the wing commander or designee can then call the NOC and say, "I have a C-18 homeland security mission," and provide the particulars. The NOC can review it and, if there is an issue or if the Air Force says "No", they can call back and say, "The mission cannot go on because of the following reasons." Rather than the NOC being the gatekeeper and require them to say "Yes" before you can move ahead, require that the wing commander or designee has checked out the mission, approved it, and then verified it when we go to the NOC for de-confliction. The NOC is in a position to double-check and look over our shoulder before we put our people in harm's way.

MAJ GEN WHELESS asked Col Greenhut if he were satisfied with that discussion. Col Greenhut replied that he was.

MR. SALVADOR asked if he understands correctly, that DO will change that table so the mission is approved by the wing commander.

COL GREENHUT/NER replied that the wing commander or designee is required to call the NOC as they are in any mission for de-confliction and possible Air Force issues. It is a good safety backup and should happen on all CAP missions. He stated that he was uncomfortable with the fact that a corporate officer, including the National Commander, would not be able to approve these missions without going through the NOC.

COL GLASS/MER expressed concern about changing the procedure that has been established.

MAJ GEN WHELESS stated that he was uncomfortable with the discussion insofar as trying to rush in and change any procedure that has been in place. He asked the NEC if there needs to be more discussion about this than the time allotted right now.

COL GLASS expressed an opinion that it needs to be further discussed because he is not in favor of inserting more bureaucracy into the program.

Later in the meeting, Col Greenhut stated that he, Col Glass and Col Salvador had an agreed position to amend the regulation. The current policy precludes anyone other than the NOC approving C-14 or C-18 missions, which are corporate only missions—disaster relief or homeland security in nature. The new proposed agreement is that,

November 2004 NEC Minutes

since those were the only missions that could not be approved at the lowest possible level, to create an intermediate level for these two missions that would allow the wing commanders or designees to approve those two kinds of missions with the proviso that they need to contact the NOC as soon as possible for de-confliction and other possible issues that might invalidate the mission. Col Greenhut felt strongly that the wing commander needed to be in the loop as being able to say "Yes" and not wait for NOC contact and approval, but let NOC de-conflict after the fact during the mission in order to get people moving.

MAJ GEN WHELESS tasked Col Greenhut/Col Glass to draft a proposed change to regulation and submit it to the National Commander. If he deems that it has urgency then he could adopt as an emergency change. If not, it would go through the normal coordination process.

**SUBJECT: VHF Repeater Requirements Study
Lt Col Moe Thomas**

BACKGROUND

In May the NEC tasked the staff to conduct a study of the current and future requirements for VHF repeaters across the country. The purpose of the study is to develop a national repeater distribution plan that will: 1) meet Air Force mission requirements and, 2) fall within the budget allowed by the Air Force. An online database system was created to simplify and standardize the process. The system allows wings to input their requirements for consideration at regional and national levels. A National Repeater Coordination Group has been formed to perform the national level review. The requirements study is in progress and Lt Col Thomas will update the NEC on the current status of the project.

LT COL THOMAS presented a slide briefing (Atch 7).

LT COL THOMAS reported that the study revealed that a lot of the wings did not have a repeater plan—a requirements study done in coordination with operations and emergency services personnel—all of the people who depend on the repeater system for mission support. For a variety of reasons, some of the plans were not on file or the knowledge base was lost. The wings have been requested to look at their history, mission profiles, distribution of personnel, where they needed that key support and bring those requirements forward. Then there needed to be a region level review, involving the region director of communications and repeater committees if they existed in the regions. After that review, these requirements were requested to be sent to National Headquarters for approval. He reminded that the template provide for input of the key data includes a very important block—justification, in addition to location of sites, etc. The National Repeater Coordination Group needs further input from regions in order to present final results at the winter National Board.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS:

1. Further justification of requirements from regions.
2. Inclusion of final results in the winter 2005 National Board agenda.

**SUBJECT: e-JITI Briefing
Mr. McChesney**

BACKGROUND

e-JITI (electronic - Just In Time Information) is a company focused on assisting organizations to significantly improve documentation management from creation through life-cycle updating and distribution. Through contacts with Mr. McChesney, CEO of e-JITI, the company agreed to research, at their own expense, if their products and services could help CAP in its effort to automate the documentation processes and reduce costs. In early September, Mr. Ismael Diaz, the CIO/COO of e-JITI, spent a day at CAP NHQ in order to understand our documentation needs and to obtain the necessary information from various NHQ program managers. Their goal is to provide a sound business case to implement a program that could arm CAP with the necessary tools to increase the quality of CAP documentation while decreasing costs.

MR. ALLENBACK reminded that 2 years ago he briefed on how he intended to transform the National Headquarters, which would result in a \$1.5M per year savings. Some of that savings was lost to budget cuts in appropriated funds, but most of it went to enhance programs. That was a personnel cut and an organizational change. We did not address processes. Now we have an opportunity to attack processes and reap even more benefits. He introduced Mr. Jeff McChesney, a retired USAF colonel, and now the president and CEO of e-JITI.

MR. McCHESNEY presented a slide briefing.

MR. ALLENBACK stated that he was not looking for an NEC decision at this time but would like a sense of the board to proceed with details for presentation at a later time.

MAJ GEN WHELESS stated that, from the comments, there is a general consensus that we can't afford to go with the highest technology in our aircraft and the lowest technology at headquarters. He thanked Mr. McChesney for the briefing and stated that, after discussing with Col Allenback, they would let him know how CAP wants to proceed.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION. Discussion between National Commander and Executive Director, and reply to Mr. McChesney.

**SUBJECT: IG Update on Compliance Inspection Checklist
CAP IG/Col Charles**

BACKGROUND

Col Charles will update the National Executive Committee on the research and process he is using to update and rewrite the current Compliance Inspection checklist.

COL CHARLES/IG distributed a document entitled, "CAP WING COMPLIANCE INSPECTION GUIDE," dated 1 February 2004. He asked for comments from the region commanders so that a coordinated document can be submitted to the National Commander and the Commander, CAP-USAF by 15 Dec 2004, for approval, in anticipation of publishing the checklist by 1 Jan 05.

COL CHARLES/IG asked permission for Lt Col Donald Herring, USAF, CAP-USAF/IG to brief the NEC on compliance inspections. The NEC agreed.

There was a lengthy discussion on how compliance inspections are generally conducted, the results of their effectiveness, and how inspections are received in the field. There was general agreement that the checklist needs further review.

MAJ GEN WHELESS appointed a commander's ad hoc study group regarding compliance inspections, which will be chaired by Brig Gen Pineda. The other members are: Col Kauffman/CS, Col Boyd/NC, and Col Robinson/RMR. The study group will be tasked to take the challenge that the IG has presented—what would we, as commanders, make of the compliance inspections; what information do we want the compliance inspections to show us.

BRIG GEN PINEDA also asked that the Executive Director and National Headquarters staff take a good look at this proposed inspection guide. Then these comments can be considered along with those of the study group.

COL VOGT recommended that the study group keep the checklists as they are as a resource, not an all-encompassing guide, and review them for any regulatory problems. The qualifications and training for team members need to be explored, and codified. He recommended limiting reports and just inspect for compliance or non-compliance and let the commanders take care of the fix, unless the commanders seek help from the IG team. He added that the bottom line for him is what the statement of work says, that the CAP shall have an IG program and shall have a wing inspection program similar to the Air Force program as directed in the 90 series.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

Administrative Announcements

1. The new CAP Membership Kit for cadets was distributed. There was clarification that the CAP Membership Kit for senior members is the same except for the cadet module.
2. Maj Gen Wheless presented NEC badges to the newest members of the National Executive Committee: Col George Boyd, National Controller; Col Theodore Chavez, National Legal Officer; Col Matthew Sharkey, Southeast Region Commander; and Ch Col Charles Sharp, Chief of Chaplain Services.
3. Maj Gen Wheless referenced a recent memorandum sent out to the members and reiterated the following policies/procedures:
 - a. He asked that NEC members wait to be recognized before speaking out both for organization and for clarify of the recording tape. There will be no objection to sidebar discussions if they are handled quietly and privately.
 - b. He stated that for the conduction of business at National Board and NEC meetings:
 - (1) Region commanders will be shown as the sponsor for agenda item originating in the field. Wing commanders may offer agenda items for the NEC but only after coordination with the region commander and they will be included on the agenda at the discretion of the region commander. In rare instances, someone may contact the National Commander for exceptions to this procedure. Otherwise, the opportunity for all wing commanders is twice a year at the National Board meetings to fulfill their legislative roles.
 - (2) A majority vote of 34 is required at National Board meetings (67 voting members) and a majority of 8 votes is required at NEC meetings (15 voting members) to pass motions. However, abstentions cut down on the overall number, and a majority would be more than half of the remaining number.
 - (3) In order to move actions recommended by committee, motions must be made and seconded by board or committee members in the spirit of the legislative body determining the agenda. Committee chairs may or may not be members of the National Board or NEC.
 - c. He does not favor more than one region or wing vice commander, so that there will be no question about the chain of command. Gen Wheless asked that commanders discuss special instances, which may deserve consideration, with him before appointing a second vice commander.
 - d. He emphasized that the sequence of succession from wing commander level to region commander level requires that region commanders should appoint only someone who has had experience at the command level as a vice commander.

November 2004 NEC Minutes

That will create a likely succession because that vice commander will be given deference in making the decision about the appointment of the region commander. He stated that he would not be inclined to appoint anyone a region commander who has not held a wing command.

4. Maj Gen Wheless noted the following command activities:
 - a. The first three months have involved a focus to make eye-to-eye contacts with people who affect the future of CAP—the Air University Commander, several people on the Air Staff, Commander of 1st Air Force, and the Administrator of FAA. Gen Wheless announced that has asked Col Palermo to work with FAA officials and try to change the way CAP's exemptions work with FAA.
 - b. The second phase of his term will deal with the organizational structure in getting committees fully vested. After compiling the list, a diagram will be developed showing the way the three levels of structure will work, how they will interface, and how their talents will be used to integrate CAP.
 - c. During the following 3 months, he plans to continue visiting appropriate officials including the Secretary of the Air Force.
5. Maj Gen Wheless noted the need to have a seamless boundary in CAP aircraft, vehicles, and service. He asked the region commanders to advise wing commanders not add any local logos or other identification to equipment that may need to be moved to other areas where they are most needed and can best serve the mission.
6. Maj Gen Wheless also noted the need to take CAP's new technology down to the level that will service our customers—the squadron level. To accomplish the needed training, he would like to create regional training centers and asked for input from the region commanders. He appointed Col Drew Alexa to work with region commanders to help develop regional training centers.
7. Mr. Gary Woodsmall, HQ CAP/SE presented a Safety Briefing. By request, a copy of the briefing slides was made available to NEC members. Col Davis Bonner, CAP National Safety Officer also presented a briefing that outlined the members and goals of the National Safety Committee.
8. Maj Gen Wheless announced the appointment of Col Earnest Pearson to the MARB. He will request BoG ratification of this appointment at the next meeting of the Board of Governors.
9. Mr. Al Allenback/EX presented an update of National Headquarters activities, which included a close out of FY04 funds, investments, a review of the FY05 budget, a plan for the FY06 budget, membership and mission statistics, and a status report of staff agency activities.
10. Col George Vogt, USAF, Senior AF Advisor presented a briefing on appropriated budget activities. He also reviewed the Secretary of the Air Force letter to the Board of

November 2004 NEC Minutes

Governors, dated October 27, 2004, with attached HQ Air Force Update on the 12 CAP Priority Issues.

11. Two issues were brought up relating to insurance that need to be further discussed:

- a. Col Glass—insurance vs. Air Force-assigned missions due to fewer and fewer Air Force missions, and
- b. Col Todd—self-insurance (hull and other). Gen Wheless will ask Col Glass/MER, Col Todd/SWR, and probably one or two others to discuss these issues with Col Chavez/NLO, and Col Leibowitz/GC and any other desired headquarters personnel, develop a proposal, and bring it back to the NEC.

12. Maj Gen Wheless stated there was one other issue talked about but no conclusions reached—the issue of whether, in the opinion of the NEC, our structure in the Air Force is appropriate or whether we want to discuss further whether we would be better positioned under some other command or in some other type of structure. Currently, we are aligned with Air Education and Training Command (AETC). He added, “I would strongly commend to you that this is not an appropriate time for us to be looking for another partner. I really am quite well satisfied with the type of representation that we have gotten from Lt Gen Reggni and from the representations which he and I made to each other to personally to do all that is necessary to make that relationship work very nicely.” Note was made that there is an ongoing study to determine placement of CAP-USAF in the Air Force structure. Gen Wheless added that, unless he hears anything contrary, he will relate to Col Sciss and Col Vogt that, from a CAP position, CAP is properly situated in the structure. Col Vogt added that CAP-USAF, as one of the options, will pursue staying in the same structure but streamline the resource advocacy, etc.

THE NEC WENT INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION, 3:20 – 3:38 PM ON SATURDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2004

THE NEC ADJOURNED AT 3:40 PM, SATURDAY, 13 NOVEMBER 2004