VOLUNTEER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

FINAL REPORT TO THE

ARRL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

An Evaluation Of The ARRL's Field Organization.

Director Wade Walstrom WØEJ, Chair
Director Bernie Fuller N3EFN
Director Rick Roderick K5UR
Director Greg Milnes W7OZ
Director Frank Butler W4RH
Director Jim Maxwell W6CF (Silent Key)
Vice Director "Rev" Morton WS7W
Vice President Fried Heyn WA6WZO
Rosalie White, K1STO, Manager, Field & Educational Services

Introduction

At the 2001 Annual Meeting of the Board of Directors, the Volunteer Resources Committee (VRC) was assigned the task described in Minute 67 which is included below:

67. On motion of Mr. Race, seconded by Mr. Heyn, it was VOTED unanimously to ADOPT the following resolution:

> WHEREAS, it has been 20 years since the Field Organization was reorganized; and
> WHEREAS, the social and emergency uses of Amateur Radio have been affected by the advance of technology;
> NOW THEREFORE, it is moved that the VRC study the Field Organization and its operation; and it is further
> MOVED, a preliminary report shall be presented to the Board at the July 2001 Meeting; and it is further
> MOVED, a final report and recommendations shall be presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Board.

This document is the final report of the VRC on its assigned in-depth study.

Included in the following sections of this report are evaluations of the National Traffic System, the Amateur Radio Emergency Service, as well as the positions of Section Manager, Section Traffic Manager, Section Emergency Coordinator, State Government Liaison, Official Observer Coordinator, Technical Coordinator, Affiliated Club Coordinator, Bulletin Manager, and Public Information Coordinator. At the conclusion of each section are specific recommendations related to the evaluation contained in that section.

Statement of Recognition and Appreciation

The Volunteer Resources Committee has spent the last two and a half years evaluating the Field Organization. Several sources of information were used for this evaluation, but the largest source of information was supplied by the Section Managers who are the top rung of the Field Organization ladder. Section Manager input was solicited using several surveys in 2001 and 2002 and a more comprehensive survey was sent to all the Section Managers in early 2003. The participation in the 2003 survey exceeded the VRC goals when 60 of the 71 Section Managers responded.

The VRC had expected that each Section Manager might spend one half hour to an hour providing responses to the 2003 survey. One Section Manager noted he had spent more that 5 HOURS in formulating his response! In looking at all of the responses it is obvious that many more Section Managers spent at least 5 hours and probably more providing their responses. The quality of the responses received and the thoughtfulness that these responses showed reiterates the dedication exhibited by the Section Managers of the American Radio Relay

League! The VRC wishes to thank the Section Managers for their expert assistance with the surveys used in this evaluation and acknowledge their dedication to the American Radio Relay League.

Those Section Managers who responded to the 2003 survey are listed below:

Delaware	WBØJJX	Randall Carlson
Eastern Pennsylvania	WB3FPL	Eric Olena
Northern New York	KF2GC	Tom Dick
Southern New Jersey	KA2YKN	Jean Priestley
Western New York	W2LC	Scott Bauer
Western Pennsylvania	N3MSE	John V. Rodgers
Illinois	N9SH	Shari Harlan
Indiania	K9ZBM	James S. Sellers
Wisconsin	W9IXG	Donald E. Michalski
Minnesota	KMØD	Randy Wendel
North Dakota	KAØLDG	Kent Olson
South Dakota	NØPV	Richard L. Beebe
Arkansas	WB5VUH	Bob Ideker
Louisiana	K5MC	Mickey Cox
Mississippi	W5XX	Malcolm Keown
Tennessee	KB4KA	Terry A. Cox
Kentucky	NB4K	John D. Meyers
Michigan	KA8YKK	Debbie Kirkbride
Ohio	K8QOE	Joe Phillips
Northern New Jersey	W2UDT	Bill Hudzik
Iowa	NØJL	Jim Lasley
Kansas	KBØDTI	Ron Cowan
Missouri	KØKY	Dale Bagley
Nebraska	KEØXQ	Bill McCollum
Connecticut	K1EIC	Betsy Doane
Eastern Massachusetts	K9HI	Phil Temples
Rhode Island	W1YRC	Bob Beaudet
Western Massachusetts	W1UD	William C. Voedisch, Jr.
Idaho	K7BDS	John J. Cline
Western Washington	W7JWJ	Harry Lewis
East Bay	K6DF	Dennis G. Franklin
	N6AJO	Andy Oppel
Nevada	W6OLD	Dick Flanagan
Pacific	AH6J	Bob Schneider
Sacramento Valley	W6RFF	Jettie Hill
San Francisco	WA6KLK	Len Gwinn
San Joaquin Valley	W6DPD	Charles McConnell
Santa Clara Valley	WB6W	Glenn Thomas
North Carolina	W4CC	John Covington
South Carolina	N2ZZ	Jim Boehner
Virginia	W4CAC	Carl Clements

West Virginia	KC8FS	Hal Turley
Colorado	KØRM	Jeff Ryan
New Mexico	W5PDY	Joe T. Knight
Utah	AC7CP	Mel Parkes
Wyoming	N7LKH	Bob Williams
Alabama	KR4TZ	Bill Cleveland
Georgia	AF4FO	Susan Swiderski
Northern Florida	WA4PUP	Rudy Hubbard
Puerto Rico	KP4PQ	Victor Madera
Southern Florida	W4STB	Sherri Brower
Virgin Islands	NP2B	John Ellis
West Central Florida	AE4MR	Dave Armbrust
Arizona	KD6XH	Clifford E. Hauser
Los Angeles	W6BF	Phineas J. Icenbice, Jr.
Orange	W6UBQ	Joe H. Brown
San Diego	K6FQ	Kent Tiburski
North Texas	KA5TXL	Larry Melby
Oklahoma	K5TTT	Charlie Calhoun
South Texas	N5NAV	Ray Taylor
West Texas	AE5B	John Dyer

The VRC also wishes to acknowledge inputs received from the following individuals, either directly or indirectly: James Wades, WA8SIW, Joseph A. Nollmeyer, W3YVQ, Chet Carruth, AB4XK, Dean Seaver, W8IM, Earl Leach, WX4J, Jim Belanger, N1NH, Gary Ferdinand, W2CS, Ed Summers, KC8LBZ, Dennis Bombardier, W8YS, Jerry Ver Duft, ADØA, Carolyn Morris, KM5YL, Thomas Legget, N5KWB, Jim Morris, N5JU, Marcia Forde, KW1U, Dr. Stanley Kaplan, WB9RQR, Jim Leist, KB5W, and Rob Griffin, K6YR. There is always a danger when listing those to thank that someone will be inadvertently omitted. If any were omitted, the VRC Chair regrets the oversight. Any such omission in no way diminishes the impact of the input provided.

Section Manager

Leadership in the Field Organization.

Looking at the structure of the Field Organization one can be sure that each of the 71 Sections functions because a strong, capable *leader* has been elected to head up the Section. Right? Wrong! The average Section Manager is elected for one or more reasons totally unrelated to leadership ability. These reasons may include he's a great Dxer, he has been a Ham for a long time, he's a friend of mine, he's very popular and well-known, etc.

The list could go on for pages, but the main point is that through the election process that has been traditionally espoused by the ARRL one cannot be sure that the individual elected as the Section Manager is capable of leading the

Section. Granted, by pure chance there are a number of outstanding **leaders** among the Section Managers now in charge of the Sections, but they are in the minority.

In rendering this report, the Volunteer Resources Committee has recommended changes to the Section structure; noted shortcomings of the traditional structure; pursued an analysis of the ability and willingness of the Section Managers to appoint appropriate qualified individuals to Field Organization positions. The question of leadership was not specifically addressed.

If the Field Organization is to function as an effective arm of the ARRL, there must be qualified leaders as Section Managers. Given the vagaries of the current election process, it is essential that ARRL provide leadership training to each Section Manager. This can be done through resident courses during the Section Manager's Orientation, by correspondence, or through providing an on-line course. These training sessions should be mandatory for all Section Managers. Providing a leadership course in "Leadership of Volunteers" will pay major dividends in increasing the professionalism of the Field Organization.

In his book,*" The Five Pillars of TQM",*Bill Creech had this to say about leadership:

> "Leading involves determining the right things to do. It involves creating the favorable organizational dynamics to get people to commit themselves, energetically and enthusiastically, to bringing those right things about. It most definitely is not the centralist business of just telling employees what to do, how to do it, and when to do it."

Unchallenged, many people slide into mediocrity. It is the job of the Board of Directors of the ARRL to challenge those who are appointed or elected, and refuse to accept that they are doing their jobs simply because they hold a position in the Field Organization. But, before a positive response can be expected to this challenge, the opportunity to learn the basics of **leadership** must be provided*.*

Summary Evaluation

It is important to remember that the SMs, while elected to their positions, are still volunteers. However, in accepting their election to this position, they are acknowledging the expectations that the members of the American Radio Relay League have of them in this position.

In the recent VRC Survey of the SMs, several general observations became apparent. First, as stated in the previous section, some SMs are not in their positions because of their leadership skills. For example, in several responses, some SMs indicated that there were Section level appointees that were not performing their duties as specified, but the SMs were reluctant to replace them for fear of the political fallout or other potential repercussions in the Section. This is not the sign of an effective leader.

Second, while some SMs are not in their positions for their leadership skills, they are also not necessarily in their positions for their management skills, either. In reviewing the VRC survey responses, it was not clear that all of the SMs understood what each of the Section level appointees were expected to be doing. (The Official ARRL Field Organization Appointment Descriptions for the Section level appointees is contained in Appendix 2 of this report for reference.) A second observation is that many SMs are not holding their Section level appointees accountable for their performance. All too often, an SM will appoint someone to one of the Section level appointments and the tasks of that appointment are never accomplished. This was revealed in many of the responses to the recent VRC survey. The SM needs to go over the appointment description with each new appointee in detail, either in person, preferably, or at least over the telephone. The SM also makes clear his or her expectations of the new appointee and should provide goals and a means of feedback from the appointee to assess the appointee's performance. The SM should also have expectations in place for each Section level appointee and review those expectations and the appointee's performance annually, or better yet, semi-annually. If an appointee is not performing the appointed task to the SMs satisfaction, it is the SM's responsibility to find someone else who will perform the task.

Recommendations:

- Each new SM shall be **required** to participate in a Section Manager orientation training session. Such a session will be held in person at ARRL Headquarters or offered as a formal web based course. Veteran SMs are encouraged to retake the course every few years for a "refresher".
- The Section Manager orientation training shall include at least one section on leadership.
- SMs must closely monitor the performance of their Section level appointees and hold those appointees accountable for their performance.

National Traffic System

The National Traffic System (NTS) was developed as a systematic way of relaying traffic locally to nationally via Amateur Radio in an era prior to the internet, e-mail, 800 numbers, and cellular telephone and when long distance telephone, telegraph, and facsimile services were much more expensive relative to an individual's per capita income. NTS provided an alternative way of transferring meaningful information to most locations in the country. NTS flourished in the 1950s and 1960s until the relative cost of commercially available communications started to become more economically within the reach of more and more individuals.

This mission of NTS has not changed, but the paradigm that NTS finds itself in has.

In the past, one of the byproducts of the NTS, at the national level, has been that it is an effective, backup communications network in the event of an emergency. With newer communications technologies currently available to the Amateur Radio community and the need for faster emergency communications capabilities, NTS is no longer as effective a backup as it should be.

The recent VRC survey of SMs revealed a wide range of perceptions of NTS. When asked, "How would you rate the quality and quantity of message traffic being passed in and through your Section?" their answers are excerpted below. Because the SM comments cover the complete spectrum, excerpts are provided rather than attempting to summarize the comments. It should be noted that NTS describes the nationwide system. Most of the responses of the SMs to the VRC survey use NTS to describe the system of handling traffic at the Section level which may be why the responding perceptions of NTS vary so widely.

> "…most of the traffic is filler …"
> "Nonexistent. The NTS has been replaced by the telephone and the internet. In times of disaster, we have had no problems getting traffic out. We don't accept incoming traffic until normal lines of communication are reestablished for obvious reasons."
> "Traffic has become the laughing stock of the amateur radio frequencies. The amount of meaningful traffic has declined to the point that amateurs … are refusing to accept traffic for their areas unless they hear what the text is first."
> "Our traffic count is extremely good…"
> "…[this section] has an EXCELLENT NTS program."
> "The practice of many NTS stations to send basically useless messages back and forth between themselves just to run up message counts is a big "turn off" for me as well as many other Hams. Even the "canned" messages create a certain amount of embarrassment to some of the receivers."
> "The quality and quantity of messages Tfx being passed in our section is not good. "
> "I don't know."
> "Low and low – unfortunately."
> "Like most of NTS, the volume has been in steady decline for years."
> "I do believe the volume of traffic in the NTS has been decreasing over the past few years."
> "Very little "high quality" traffic is being passed. Many object to passing junk traffic."
> "Message traffic that I have seen being passed through … has been respectable in volume, thanks to our single active ORS."
> "…I'm discouraged by the drop in both quantity and quality of traffic and its handling. I trust few messages to NTS these days…"
> "…our section nets are in relatively good shape and handle an adequate amount of quality traffic to provide important training."
> "Poor"

"The number of messages … has increased over the past year. We have quite a few young hams (as young as 12) who've gotten involved. Many of the ARES groups around the state have been actively training their members in traffic handling."

"The quantity of messages is fairly high but the quality of messages is a disappointment."

"Pretty much unchanged in my near 20 yrs involvement with NTS."

"The quality of message traffic is good … The quantity of message traffic is down significantly from the 70's and 80's."

"…we have an active local traffic system…"

"Overall volume has declined both VHF and HF. Quality is still up and a majority of NTS traffic is being handled digitally. "

"Message traffic … is practically non-existent."

"I feel that [our section] is quite fortunate for having one of the best traffic systems in the entire country."

"Poor quality and little quantity."

"Very good."

"I would rank them both a little low."

"The amount of traffic being passed is down …"

"…the NTS seems to have lost its mission …"

"The formal traffic is very good …"

"I feel the quality is more indicative of the mode than anything. I see more accuracy with digital and CW than phone."

"A bunch of worthless crap is being disseminated to rack up points. The traffic handlers in this section are all elderly, set in their ways, don't want any new folks coming in and changing things. They have refused to move their traffic nets to the Gen portion of the band effectively eliminating participation by many. … They don't seem to be concerned with improving their abilities in traffic handling so they can put them into practical use during an emergency."

"The quantity is adequate … The quality is generally poor …"

"The quantity of traffic is good, but the quality could be better."

"Message traffic is very low. We have had two great Traffic Operators …"

"I guess fair."

"On the air message traffic quantity is very low …"

"Message traffic for my section is average."

"The traffic quality is generally good. The quantity is quite low."

"Poor."

"Fair and good."

"Excellent."

"One a scale of 1 to 10, a good solid 2."

"NTS very nearly has not existed in this part of the world for many years …"

"Traffic is almost null. Active operators resigned to their positions because of the type of traffic received."

The general perception of the responding SMs is not favorable to NTS. Many attributed this to ARES not utilizing the NTS. Most unfavorable responses blamed the lack of quality messages being passed, though many SMs excused this as a means of training operators. There is, generally, a serious problem with the NTS, overall.

There are, of course, exceptions. The system in Michigan is a notable one and will be covered in more detail later in this section. As noted above, West Virginia claims an effective system.

There are several shortcomings to NTS overall that diminish its effectiveness as a viable emergency backup nationwide communications system.

1. There are delays in delivering messages. To be truly effective in handling traffic, especially emergency traffic, traffic must be handled in as short a time possible. In a true emergency it would not be an uncommon expectation that a message be delivered in less than an hour from time it was initiated. Except for local originations and deliveries, the current NTS structure would have extreme difficulty with such a requirement. In the current NTS structure, a message could take days to go from coast to coast.
   Messages arriving at the destination locale will some times languish for days waiting for someone to deliver it. This must never happen in an emergency.

2. An overall reluctance to embrace newer communications technologies. In previous VRC surveys, NTS area chairs were asked if given a clean sheet of paper, what would the new NTS look like? The overwhelming common answer is that it would look just like it does today. The NTS leadership seems to be stuck in the past and looking to the future. There are some excellent thinkers involved in NTS activities, but these same people are not in the top NTS leadership positions. The system needs to change to meet new expectations and the top leaders are not able to recognize the need for change, much less how to make change happen.

3. In some of the SM responses to the recent VRC survey and in responses from others to previous VRC surveys, there is a lament that ARES is not utilizing the NTS capabilities. Part of that lament could be alternately phrased that ARES is not coming to NTS to use NTS in its function. It could be that ARES only sees NTS passing birthday greetings or license renewal notices and as a result does not see what NTS might have to offer. The question now becomes, why is NTS not approaching ARES to show what NTS can do for ARES? This has been a continuing complaint for years that has still not been resolved. If Amateur Radio is about communicating, why are these two groups not communicating?

4. As many SMs pointed out in the recent VRC survey, the interest in NTS is dwindling making it harder for NTS to perform its old mission in a time of a new paradigm.

There are exceptions to these shortcomings in a few Section level NTS operations. Michigan has revitalized its statewide NTS by forming a closer liaison with the state ARES and by implementing a structure that makes real use of new technology modes at all levels of the system. As a result, interest and participation in the system have increased.

At the national level the effectiveness of NTS is unclear, at best, especially in times of emergency. Examples which highlight this uncertainty occur every year during the summer and early fall months when hurricane emergency nets are often established to deal with all aspects of a hurricane emergency on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. It is not obvious that NTS is ever involved directly or via a liaison to the hurricane nets. These emergency nets occur with some regularity during the year so it would seem logical that NTS might have found a function in these activities, but NTS seems to be absent. The paradigm of today is providing emergency communications when necessary, but the current NTS mission apparently has not found a purpose in this paradigm.

Recommendations:
- Since NTS is self directed and the connection with ARRL is no longer a direct one, it is recommended that financial support to NTS at the national level by ARRL be discontinued.
- If the NTS is to be a viable option in emergency communications in the future, it is strongly recommended that STMs, earn Level 1, 2, and 3 certification as soon as possible.
- Furthermore, it is strongly recommended that NMs earn at least Level 1 and 2 certification as soon as possible.
- STMs strongly encourage all NTS members to earn Level I certification in order to prepare them for possible future disasters and in order to prepare them to become future leadership officials.
- NTS operators should acquaint themselves with ARES and its leaders.

Amateur Radio Emergency Service

The SMs were asked in the recent VRC survey to list the five (5) most important functions in the Field Organization. When the results were compiled the most important function reported by those responding was emergency communications. One SM summarized this response, "ARES is the highest level of importance in Amateur Radio today." Another punctuated that with, "… more important than ever…" And another, "Providing emergency communications and public service is the number one validation for our frequency allocations."

When asked in that same survey in what areas each SM spends most of their time, the second highest response was emergency communications. As one SM put it, "… ARES is my top activity and priority."

To finalize the significance most SMs place on emergency communications, in this same survey most SMs indicated that the Section Emergency Coordinator was the most difficult appointment to fill with the right person.

The SMs fully recognize the natural perils and terrorist threats now faced by the United States and the service Amateur Radio can provide through ARES. Now that ARRL is an official affiliate of the Department of Homeland Security's Citizens Corps, the role of ARES has now become even more important.

The establishment of the Amateur Radio Emergency Communications certification courses has helped many enhance and elevate their skills in managing emergency communications situations and has elevated the standing of those who serve in ARES with the agencies that are served. The response to the Amateur Radio Emergency Communications courses, at all three (3) levels, continues to be high. In the recent VRC survey one SM said of the Section Emergency Coordinator appointment, "I would require this to be filled by a ARECC Level III graduate."

The ARES organization at the Section level, overall, appears to be adequate, but some Sections are better coordinated than others. With the increased emphasis being placed on emergency communications at all levels and with the ARRL's new responsibilities as an official affiliate of the Citizens Corps, as WA8SIW noted, there needs to be a minimum level of consistency to each Section's ARES organization to provide some assurance that quality emergency communications coverage is maintained throughout all Sections.

One area where conflict appears in many Sections is how to interface ARES with the Radio Amateur Civil Emergency Service (RACES). Far too often ARES and RACES view each other as competitors for the same resources or, worse, adversaries and often work against each other instead of working together toward the common goal. This type of relationship diminishes the effectiveness of both services and wastes the resources of both, as well. This should not happen. The solution to this problem found in Wisconsin is superb. The organizational structures of both ARES and RACES are, in effect, overlaid so that a position in RACES is filled by the same person filling the comparable position in ARES, from the SEC on down. Every ARES Amateur Radio operator in Wisconsin is also a RACES operator, and vice versa. (Thanks WB9RQR) Other Sections may have also taken this same or similar approach to coordinate and harmonize the operations of ARES and RACES. Those Sections that have not taken this step, should strongly consider it.

Coordination and the ability to pass emergency traffic within the Section seems to be reasonably well in place in most Sections, though some minimum standards need to be implemented as noted by WA8SIW earlier. What is lacking is the ability to pass emergency traffic across the country quickly and efficiently. This was supposed to be an NTS task, but as noted in another section of this evaluation, NTS is no longer well suited for this function.

A new network to allow rapid transfer of emergency traffic between Sections needs to be developed. Such a network should be automated as much as

practical, preferably using available digital modes such as packet, PSK 31, etc. but must have the flexibility to easily incorporate new modes as they become available and practical. If necessary, the network must also be flexible enough to insert conventional voice or CW nets to augment the movement of emergency traffic if gaps in coverage of the new network are caused by the nature of the disaster or emergency being worked. Likewise, commercial communications systems, such as conventional telephone, cellular telephone, facsimile, internet, etc. should be allowed in this network where practical to boost the speed and performance of this network.

Key features of this new network need to be speed of transferring emergency traffic and accuracy in communicating the information. Special attention must be given to delivering the emergency traffic at its destination locale in an emergency when the traffic arrives and not let it languish for non-delivery. Near immediate traffic delivery is crucial in emergency situations.

Access to this new network by each Section's network system should also be flexible. Sections currently with effective NTS liaisons (like Michigan and West Virginia) should continue to use those connections to access the new national network as long as the minimum levels of performance are maintained. Otherwise, a Section must choose an effective way to otherwise access the new network.

The planning and developing of this network is beyond the scope of the VRC in this evaluation. An ad hoc committee should be formed exclusively for this purpose.

While each Section is encouraged to hold an Simulated Emergency Test (SET) once a year and preferably at the same time, coordination between Section SETs is not often done. With the new nationwide network in place, it is important that the entire network system gets exercised in a nationwide SET at least once a year. Such a test would not only exercise each Sections emergency communications networks, but also the nationwide network and the interfaces between each Section and the network.

Recommendations:
- It is recommended that all SECs, earn Level 1, 2, and 3 certification as soon as possible;
- It is recommended that DECs earn at least Level 1 and 2 certification as soon as possible;
- It is further recommended that ECs and OESs earn at least Level 1 certification as soon as possible.
- SECs strongly encourage all ARES members to earn at least Level I certification in order to prepare them for possible future disasters and in order to prepare them to become future leadership officials.
- SECs strongly encourage all ARES members to take advantage of other continuing education opportunities that may not be available through the ARRL.

- A minimum level of consistency to each Section's ARES organization be established to provide assurance that quality emergency communications coverage is maintained throughout all Sections.
- Increase emphasis from both HQ and SMs to improve participation in a Section level SET.
- Establish a nationwide SET-like activity to exercise the functions and interfaces of the new nationwide emergency network.
- Coordinate the efforts of ARES with RACES and other governmental first responder agencies.
- ARES leaders should acquaint themselves with NTS and its operators, and learn how NTS practices might be modified to benefit ARES.
- Establish an ad hoc committee to develop a comprehensive program to enhance current ARES emergency communications capability to include fast handling of long range (inter-state national and international) emergency communications.

Section Traffic Manager

The Section Traffic Manager (STM) is the top level appointment in each Section to interface with the Nation Traffic System (NTS). Many of the responses dealing with the STM position in the VRC survey of the SMs were strongly favorable to this appointment or strongly opposed. The summary of the top five (5) most important functions in the Section did not include the STM or any traffic handling function. On the other hand, the summary five (5) least important functions showed STM, Official Relay Station, and Net Manager tied with Official Emergency Station for second least important. While, overall, responses from the SMs dealing with the STM were not favorable, this is not a unanimous response. Several SMs stated that the traffic handling programs in their Sections were strong (Michigan and West Virginia are two on this list) and the STM appointment tied for fourth place as the appointment giving the SMs the most difficult to fill with the right person.

One of the published duties of the STM is to "… coordinate with the Section Emergency Coordinator so that traffic nets and emergency nets in the section present a unified public service front." The general response from the SMs in the recent VRC survey would indicate that in possibly most Sections this is not happening. It is likely that responsibility for this lack of coordination can be shared by the STM, SEC, and SM. To varying degrees, based on the VRC survey results, the effectiveness of NTS and STMs in Section emergency communications is low in most Sections.

The SM must expect the STM to perform this function as specified.

Recommendations:
- Increase emphasis on SM expectations of STMs. SMs should expect more and better performance from their STMs.

- STMs should be encouraged to earn Level 1, 2, and 3 emergency communications certification as soon as possible.
- To better describe the function of this appointment and avoid confusion in the future, it is recommended that this appointment be renamed Section NTS Liaison.

Section Emergency Coordinator

The Section Emergency Coordinator (SEC) is the top level appointment in each Section to deal with emergency preparedness through other emergency preparedness appointees in the Section and ARES. Emergency communications was the top most important function to the SMs who responded to the VRC survey. Emergency communications was second on this list of functions that required most of the SMs time. SMs also reported that the SEC appointment was the most difficult for them to fill with the right person.

Recognizing the natural perils and now terrorist threats that face the United States and now that the ARRL is an official affiliate of the Department of Homeland Security's Citizens Corps, the role of the SEC is more important than ever.

One of the published duties of the SEC is to "… coordinate with the Section Traffic Manager so that emergency nets and traffic nets in the section present a united public service front..." As stated elsewhere in this report, the general response from the SMs in the recent VRC survey would indicate that in possibly most Sections this is not happening. It is likely that responsibility for this lack of coordination can be shared by the STM, SEC, and SM.

The SM must expect the SEC to perform this function as specified.

Recommendations:
- Increase emphasis on SM expectations of SECs. SMs should expect more and better performance from their SECs.
- SECs in each Section must establish a Section Emergency Plan (where do you go, who do you talk to, etc).
- SECs are encouraged to earn Level 1, 2, and 3 emergency communications certification as soon as possible.
- DECs are encouraged to earn at least Level 1 and 2 emergency communications certification as soon as possible.
- ECs and OES appointees are encouraged to earn Level I emergency communications certification as soon as possible.
- SECs strongly encourage all ARES members to earn at least Level I emergency communications certification in order to prepare them for possible future disasters and in order to prepare them to become future leadership officials.

- SECs strongly encourage all ARES members to take advantage of other continuing education opportunities that may not be available through the ARRL.
- Increase emphasis from both HQ and SMs to improve participation in a Section level SET. Furthermore, Sections are strongly urged to participate in a national SET where all facets of the national emergency communications network can be exercised and tested.

State Government Liaison

The most recent VRC survey indicated the State Government Liaison (SGL) appointment is one that Section Managers (SM) expressed a large amount of frustration toward, both with finding good qualified people for the appointment and with the performance of current appointees. To a lesser degree, the Local Government Liaison position presents SMs with similar frustrations at the local level.

The contributions of an effective SGL are increasingly important. Most SMs who responded to the survey understood this, but seemed to be at a loss at how to get the task effectively done.

Some SMs in states with multiple Sections stated they did not have an SGL and did not need one since the state capitol was not in their Section. Some states, such as Pennsylvania and Florida, appear to coordinate the included Sections activities well at their respective state capitols. Other states have difficulty with this coordination or do not coordinate at all.

Many SMs indicated they had trouble finding qualified SGL appointees. Much of the difficulty likely stems from the fact that many SMs do not know, or do not think they know, people who are qualified to be an SGL and also be a licensed Amateur Radio operator who is a member of the ARRL.

One SM knows exactly what the qualifications of an effective SGL are, "The SGL must have the dedication of Senator Goldwater. The energy and people skills of Jim Haynie."

There were also some SMs who did not understand the value of an active, qualified SGL.   Some said they had no need for one while several thought the primary job of the SGL was to shepherd PRB-1 legislation through their local state legislatures.

The recent VRC survey asked the SMs about training for SGLs. The responses received covered the spectrum, but one, paraphrased here, may be close to the actual answer: If you have to train someone to be an SGL, you have the wrong person.

Recommendations:

- Establish a solid single point of contact at HQ for SGLs. This contact should coordinate federal efforts as well as state and local efforts. The VRC was working with Steve Mansfield to do just this prior to his untimely death. There is currently a void here.
- Provide Chwat state data directly to SGLs. This is extremely timely data that should be shared with those who can make the most use of it.
- HQ needs to provide greater support to SMs in filling this post. This can be done during new SM orientations. A HQ focal point can continue to help SMs with this priority.
- Encourage Sections in states with multiple Sections to coordinate their efforts at their common state capitols. Some states, such as Pennsylvania and Florida, already appear to do this well. An HQ focal point would be extremely helpful in encouraging this kind of coordination.
- Increase emphasis on SM expectations of SGLs. If SMs expect more and better performance from their SGLs, they will likely get it. Likewise, an HQ focal point should also emphasize greater expectations from the SMs in the performance of their SGLs.
- Define the relationship between the SGL and LGL(s).
- Set up an SGL reflector. (This has been done.)
- Add to the SGL appointment description that the SGL must be a Full member of the ARRL.

Official Observer Coordinator

Most Section Managers responding to the recent VRC survey indicated they considered the Official Observer Coordinator (OOC) an important function. The Official Observer (OO) function was the 5th most important function in the VRC survey and the OOC was tied for 4th as the appointment that SMs had most difficulty filling. In general, the responding SMs had a firm understanding of the function of the OOC and fully appreciated the importance of that function. There were a few SMs who expressed concern that there were so few OO appointments in their Sections that they were questioning the need for an OOC in their Section.

It is not certain how many current OO appointees were active in the Amateur Auxiliary during the period when the FCC was not enforcing the Amateur Radio regulations. The Amateur Auxiliary, as a group, performed a large amount of excellent work that was never utilized by the FCC. This had to be demoralizing to those appointees at that time.

The job of an OO in the Amateur Auxiliary is an important one. An OO is often requested by the FCC via ARRL HQ to help gather data in specific cases to help the FCC in enforcement matters. Gathering such data correctly is of extreme importance to the FCC to complete its cases thoroughly and properly. An OO

applicant is required to pass a comprehensive written examination on this and other aspects of being an OO.

Since OOCs often are intimately involved with cases that the OOs being coordinated are working on, it must be a requirement that an OOC must have passed the comprehensive written examination to become an OO. Going further, it is desirable that an OOC has been an OO for a minimum of two (2) years before being appointed to the OOC position.

Recommendations:
- Modify the Specific Duties of the Official Observer Coordinator to require that an OOC has passed the comprehensive written examination and is an OO. It is further recommended that OOC appointees have been OOs for a minimum of two (2) years to be appointed. OOCs shall maintain their active OO status while holding the OOC appointment.
- SMs and their OOC appointees need to recruit additional qualified Amateur Radio operators to OO appointments in the Amateur Auxiliary. Qualified people are sometimes difficult to find for this appointment, but they are out there.
- As with other Section staff appointees, SMs are encouraged to maintain high expectations of their OOC.
- SMs should encourage their constituents to contact the OOC or local OO for assistance with a problem prior to contacting the FCC.
- The ARRL must find ways of further recognizing the members of the Amateur Auxiliary for the high quality service they continuously provide in this important function.

Technical Coordinator

The Technical Coordinator (TC) is another position that many SMs who responded to the recent VRC survey have trouble utilizing. The TC function was not rated in the top 5 most important nor the 5 least important functions by the responding SMs. Some SMs indicated they had some difficulty in filling this appointment, but many also indicated that it was not needed. Based on the responses from many SMs to the latest VRC survey, it is not obvious that these SMs who do not have a TC in their Section or who do not see the need for the appointment are not familiar with the duties of this appointment.

Many SMs need to reconsider not having a TC and expect performance from their TCs.

In some Sections the TC cooperates with their district FCC offices in resolving interference issues. The TCs and TSs are ideally suited for this type of task. A different type of amateur auxiliary might be possible in all Sections where TCs could develop a working relationship with their local FCC district offices in resolving interference complaints of all types.

Recommendations:

- Improve coordination with Technical Information Service program at HQ.
- SMs should encourage members to contact the Section TC for help with technical questions before contacting ARRL HQ.
- Enhance coordination with SGL/LGL for TC/TS to provide technical expertise to SGL/LGL efforts.
- Emphasize to clubs and the ACC that access to TC/TS is a benefit of membership.
- Emphasize to the SMs that they must increase their expectations of their TC appointees.
- Explore the possibility of ARRL HQ coordinating with the FCC on how to establish working relationships with district FCC offices closest to each Section where TCs and TSs could assist the FCC in resolving interference issues.

Affiliated Club Coordinator

The Affiliated Club Coordinator (ACC) is another position that some SMs have trouble utilizing to the fullest extent. The ACC did not make the top 5 list of most important functions in the latest VRC survey of SMs, though several listed working with clubs as one of the more important tasks they have. Several responding SMs listed the ACC as least important. The ACC was the 6th most difficult to fill appointment in this same survey.

As a group, the VRC feels that clubs play an important role in insuring the survival of Amateur Radio. Clubs can serve as a source of adhesion to help current radio amateurs maintain their interest in Amateur Radio as well as be a strong recruiting tool of new hams.

As one SM stated in the survey, "A creative ACC can work with clubs to increase activity at club meetings as a speaker, or provide resources for clubs to acquire guest speakers/topics for their meetings." Several SMs who responded to the recent VRC survey indicated they had outstanding ACCs while other SMs reported difficulty in finding qualified people to serve in this appointment. One observation has been that there seem to be a lot of affiliated clubs who do not submit reports to ARRL Headquarters each year to remain affiliated. This is a stated task of the ACC and it seems that some ACC appointees are not performing as is expected.

Recommendations:
- Encourage more ACC travel to club meetings throughout the Sections.
- Encourage SMs, where possible, to share funding with the ACC to help cover their travel expenses.
- The ACC should become a resource of programs for individual club meetings.
- Emphasize to the SMs that they must increase their expectations of their ACC.

- The ACC appointment description that the ACC must be a full member of the ARRL.

Bulletin Manager

The Bulletin Manager (BM) position is one that has outlived its usefulness. In the recent VRC survey of the Section Managers (SM), 28 of the 61 respondents, 46%, rated the BM as one of the least important Field Organization positions. Overall, the BM ranked as the least important position to the SM respondents. Also related was the fact that 17 respondents indicated that the Official Bulletin Station was one of the least important appointments. In response to the question of who was the "customer" for each of the Field Organization appointments, 20 respondents stated that hams were the customers of the BM while 13 indicated that there were no customers of the BM. Several SMs indicated that they currently have no BM and are not looking for one.

On the other hand, some SMs still make real use of their BMs.

The BM and Official Bulletin Station functions have been taken over by the e-mail and the ARRL Web Site. ARRL members can have bulletins e-mailed directly to them from HQ and receive them within minutes of bulletin transmission. Non-members have access to portions of the ARRL Web Site and have Amateur Radio news available to them as well. Many clubs have their own web sites with links to the ARRL web site. Likewise, many clubs republish ARRL bulletins received via e-mail in their news letters. W1AW official bulletins are still available over the air to all radio amateurs. The continued need for a BM appointment and Official Bulletin Station appointment is no longer present.

Recommendations:
- Cease to issue new BM and Official Bulletin Station appointments. Current BM and Official Bulletin Station appointments may continue to be renewed at the discretion of the SM.
- SMs who desire to appoint someone to a BM like position can appoint them as an Assistant Section Manager with a specific responsibility.

Public Information Coordinator

Good public relations are critical to Amateur Radio today. With public issues dealing with the ability to put up a tower, interference, the aging of our fellow amateurs, etc. it is important that the Amateur Radio message get out to the public. The Amateur Radio message of public service at all levels, local, regional, national, international needs to be spread far and wide. To recruit new

Amateur Radio operators Amateur Radio needs to spread its message. It is amazing how many people both inside and outside government still equate Amateur Radio and citizens band or how many people who do not know Amateur Radio even exists! There are a lot of opportunities to spread this message at the Section and local levels.

The Section Managers in the most recent VRC Section Manager Survey placed public information as the fourth most important function in the Field Organization. Interestingly enough, several responding SMs felt that the public information function was one of the least important.

Responses to other portions of this same survey indicate that a large majority of the responding SMs do not manage this function well at all. When asked who were the "customers" of the Public Information Coordinator (PIC) appointment, 16 indicated the public, 13 indicated the media, 13 indicated hams, and 11 said ARRL members.

One specific question asked of the SMs in the latest survey was if their PIC maintained a public speakers bureau to give effective presentations on Amateur Radio to non-Amateur Radio audiences. (Maintenance of such a bureau is a specified task of the PIC!) The responses were extremely disappointing. Only four (4) stated that their PIC had such a bureau. Three (3) stated that they "sort of" had a bureau. At least one of those three stated that this bureau was maintained by the SM. The responses of 51 indicated that their PICs did NOT have such a bureau or their responses indicated that they did not understand the purpose of such a bureau. Some of those who did not understand the purpose of such a bureau stated that the clubs used this bureau, which is not the purpose for which it is intended to be. Some indicated that their "bureaus" were not widely used.

The conclusion to be drawn is that most SMs do not understand what the PIC is supposed to do or the importance of the appointment to Amateur Radio. There were several who responded that did not have a PIC! Several indicated that their PICs were not effective, but did not indicate that they were taking steps to correct that situation. From those SMs who responded, it seems clear that the public information function is one that, in general, is not being done well at the Section level.

Recommendations:
- SMs must understand the importance of public relations to the survival of Amateur Radio. SMs need to be familiar with the position description for the PIC. With a higher SM awareness of the public information function, SMs must be shown how to better use the PICs and help in selecting effective people.
- Improve and increase HQ public information resources and direction to PICs.
- Implement a special web page for PICs.
- Emphasize to the SMs that they must increase their expectations of their PIC.

- Better coordinate PIC activities with clubs that are doing or want to do public relations work to non-hams.
- Educate SMs and PICs on the importance of establishing a speakers bureau to give the Amateur Radio story to non-ham radio audiences.
- Add to the PIC appointment description that the PIC must be a full member of the ARRL.

Conclusion

The conclusion of the Volunteer Resources Committee is that the state of the Field Organization is "Fair". The Field Organization is not what it should be to meet the overall ARRL obligations to provide emergency communications, especially at the national level. Likewise, the ARRL membership will be better served by the Field Organization when closer attention is given to all of its aspects at the Section level. There are bright spots in the Field Organization, however, and these should be used to improve the deficient areas.

This Study was based on significant input and analysis. The scope and magnitude of the work were substantial. As a result, this report contains over fifty (50) recommendations to improve the emergency communications and other field organization programs of the ARRL.

The analysis revealed areas and programs that were lacking and needing improvement, many of which centered on improving the duties and responsibilities of field appointments and improving the alignment within the Field Organization. Some of the recommendations will require significant time and effort to implement, while others will be merely administrative in nature. To implement these recommendations, it will require closer coordination between Headquarters Staff and the Field Organization, especially with the Section Managers.

An important point to consider is that it has been at least twenty-three (23) years since the Field Organization was evaluated overall. Over that time, some programs have become inefficient and need significant change, i.e. NTS as referenced herein. The Board of Directors should not allow such time to pass before the next review. There must be an ongoing process of review and adjustment of the Field Organization, and the Board of Directors must elevate its oversight in this area to assure that this gets done.

The recommendations contained in this report are necessary to bring the Field Organization current with the needs of the ARRL and its members today. Because it has been a long time since the Field Organization was reorganized, it is anticipated that implementing the recommendations in this Study will be met with some resistance. However, change is warranted, and a departure from the past is necessary to accomplish this mission. It is imperative that the Board of

Directors institute action to implement these recommendations in a timely manner, and to provide closer oversight thereafter.