

Current Readiness & Enterprise AIRSpeed Newsletter



Volume 8, Issue 1

[Click here to subscribe](#)

Ship-wide CPI activities now under CNAF N422

By Jacquelyn Millham, Current Readiness/
Enterprise AIRSpeed Public Affairs

Since USS *John C. Stennis* (CVN 74) first prototyped AIRSpeed aboard a ship in 2006, continuous process improvement (CPI) events on aircraft carriers have been conducted primarily in ships' aircraft intermediate maintenance departments (AIMD).

There were a few notable exceptions. For example, USS *George Washington* (CVN 73) standardized its berthing cleaning lockers and reduced the time to muster for man-overboard drills to 12 minutes or less using AIRSpeed tools; and USS *Theodore Roosevelt* (CVN 71) used CPI to revise its air department's training program.

But the use of CPI throughout the entire ship will be accelerated in part due to the December 2009 realignment of the Operational Process Improvement and

(Activities continued on Page 4)

Future Readiness aims to affect tomorrow's readiness today

By Jacquelyn Millham, Current Readiness/
Enterprise AIRSpeed Public Affairs

Today's managers of Naval Aviation readiness often find themselves operating in environments dictated by yesterday's decisions – sometimes made long before the systems entered their initial operating capability phases.

Recognizing the need to influence readiness issues beyond the execution year, Naval Aviation Enterprise (NAE) senior leader-

(Future continued on Page 6)

Understanding why we must change our behavior

Editors' note: Below is a letter written by Capt. Craig "Spot" Yager, Strike Fighter Wing Atlantic (CSFWL) commander and Air Launched Weapons Team lead, on how decisions to increase sortie rates affect aircraft life cycles and workforce morale. While it was written to CSFWL squadron commanders, all type/model/series communities face similar issues.

Skippers,

I wanted to give you an update on our F/A-18 aircraft situation and explain some of the challenges we continue to face. If nothing else, this information might help you understand the predicaments; it may also lead you to prioritize or schedule in such a way that you fulfill your training requirements.

There are essentially three types of aircraft definitions we think about:

1. Primary Assigned Aircraft



Capt.
Craig "Spot" Yager

(PAA) refers to how many aircraft are assigned to the squadron (usually 12 for an E/F type/model/series (TMS), and 10 for an A+/C TMS). Of the PAA, some are usually out of reporting for reasons such as modifications, and in-service repair. Flight Line Standard refers to the number of aircraft assigned to a command and are in reporting, which includes those aircraft that are desig-

(Decisions continued on Page 2)

In this issue:

1. [Ship-wide CPI activities now under CNAF N422](#)
Change will accelerate, better align afloat CPI activities. Page 1
2. [Future Readiness aims to affect tomorrow's readiness today](#)
CFT to focus on sustainment, total ownership cost. Page 1
3. [Understanding why we must change our behavior](#)
Capt. Craig "Spot" Yager's message to CSFWL squadron commanders is relevant to all TMS. Page 1
4. [Survey points to successes, gaps](#)
Future communication efforts to target squadron-level commands. Page 2
5. [Iron Nickel Sailors brief NAE flag officers on AIRSpeed, ship issues](#)
USS Peleliu is the third L-class ship to host NAE leadership. Page 3
6. [NAE Master Schedule](#) (link)
7. [Links of interest](#) Page 7

(Decisions continued from Page 1)

nated for support (e.g., TOPGUN, the Navy's premier tactical fighter training program).

3. Ready basic aircraft (RBA)/ready for tasking (RFT) refers to the number of full mission capable aircraft a squadron is supposed to have for their use.

Each R+month has a defined number of desired flight line standard aircraft and RBA/RFT aircraft. For example, R+X month might call for 7.4 aircraft as the flight line standard (The number would be rounded up to 8) and 5.6 as the RBA/RFT (again, it would be rounded up to 6). Our contract, and in fact the funding, supply, etc., is built around maintaining each squadron, day in and day out, with the ability to fly fully mission capable aircraft at their prescribed RBA/RFT numbers.

Squadrons tend to want to fly more than their RBA/RFT number of aircraft, which is understandable. But the cost of doing so is either: (1) more pressure on the funding/maintenance supply system (which has become more and more difficult as budgets have contracted), (2) increasing the support to one squadron at the expense of another, or (3) excessively laborious efforts within the squadron actions to produce more flyers (cannibalizations).

Each of the three has challenges and implications:

1. On the supply / Fleet Readiness Center (FRC) side, funding is certainly a challenge - we simply do not have funds to procure excess items. But beyond the fiscal challenges, simple parts availability becomes an issue. For example, there are not enough radar receivers and radar transmitters on the flight line. Even with funds, the pieces/parts/materials to repair those items are often not readily available. We are facing the same issues for the high pressure turbine HPT nozzle forward seals. The cost, therefore, of flying beyond our means can be a decrease in specific desired

systems as we wear through those items at a greater rate relative to what we should be doing or have available.

2. Increasing the support to one squadron at the expense of another means that if one squadron desires, say, to go on a detachment with eight RBA/RFT aircraft when their entitlement is six, then somewhere else on the flight line someone is going to be below their RBA/RFT numbers (unless we revert back to (1) and put more pressure on the supply/FRC system and/or continue to eat into our total available systems).
3. Internal actions and cannibalizations may allow a squadron to create more RBA/RFT aircraft, but again there is a cost. One, we are utilizing items at a greater rate and they will, eventually, need to be replaced; two, the movement of parts in and of itself can be damaging; and three, there is an obvious cost in human labor as our Sailors take the time to move

things back and forth.

I ask that you consider these challenges and implications, and in your leadership role help be better stewards of our limited (and dwindling) resources. My wing policy is that we will do everything we can to honor our RBA/RFT contract to each squadron, but we will retain discipline to not go above these numbers (i.e., we will avoid overstressing an already stressed supply system, and we will avoid redirecting resources and entitlements from one squadron to support another).

This should also help extend the life of our aircraft and mitigate potential strike fighter shortfalls in the future. From your standpoint, attempting to operate within your entitled numbers will be of benefit to the entire wing both now and in the future. Relief from internal actions to produce more full-up aircraft also will hopefully provide better utilization of your Sailors.

Respectfully,
"Spot" ■

Survey points to successes, gaps

By Jacquelyn Millham, Current Readiness/Enterprise AIRSpeed Public Affairs

Over the past three years, stakeholders' understanding of, support for and involvement in the Naval Aviation Enterprise (NAE) has increased significantly and that a need exists to increase its communication efforts to squadron-level commands, according to the results of the NAE Strategic Communication Impact Assessment conducted in October 2009 and briefed to the NAE Air Board Jan. 8.

The assessment, which was distributed to NAE stakeholders and other Navy personnel in October 2009, included responses from more than 300 respondents. Follow-up interviews were held to gather additional qualitative data.

"We compared the results with data from the first assessment, which was conducted more than three years ago. There was significant improvement in the use of improvement tools and in the awareness of NAE recognition programs," said Gary ShROUT, NAE Strategic Communications coordinator.

Percentages in those areas increased from 25 and 23 percent to 75 and 79 percent, respectively. "Stakeholders see NAE recognition reflected in their FITREPs [fitness reports] and in other unit and individual awards. Coins handed out during "Boots-on-the-Ground" and "Boots-on-the-Deck" site visits are regarded as a tool that provides immediate recognition," he said.

(Gap continued on Page 5)

Iron Nickel Sailors brief NAE flag officers on AIRSpeed, ship issues

By MCI(SW/AW) Jason McKnight, USS Peleliu Public Affairs
and Jacquelyn Millham, Current Readiness/Enterprise AIRSpeed Public Affairs

Several Sailors aboard *USS Peleliu* (LHA 5) got the rare chance to discuss their thoughts about a major Navy-wide program with multiple flag officers and other senior officials and federal civilians Dec. 10.

Listening to the "Iron Nickel" Sailors were Major Gen. Thomas L. Conant, Commanding General of 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing; Rear Adm. Raymond E. Berube, Commander, Naval Inventory Control Point (Mechanicsburg/Philadelphia); and Rear Adm. Timothy S. Matthews, Fleet Readiness Centers Commander and Naval Air Systems Command Assistant Commander for Logistics and Industrial Operations. Representatives from the Office of Naval Research; Commander, Naval Surface Force Atlantic; Amphibious Assault Ship Squadron (LHDRON); Surface Warfare Enterprise (SWE); Program Executive Officer, Strike Weapons and Unmanned Aviation; Defense Logistics Agency; Marine Forces Pacific; and Commander, Naval Air Forces (CNAF) also attended the site visit.

Peleliu completed the first phase of her AIRSpeed implementation in September. The Calibration Laboratory was slated as the first department for improvement because its processes impacted almost every area on the ship.

With the help of AIRSpeed tool-sets, Sailors identified and relocated excess gear and individual materials readiness list equipment for offload; created an e-mail alert system in Outlook to inform Sailors when equipment was due for maintenance; instituted a policy that required customers to pick-up their ready-for-issue gear within three days of notification; standardized the calibration laboratory's guidance and instruction binders; increased petty officer training; displayed Metrology Equipment Recall and Report cards in a centralized and easily accessible location; located high-use publications in a centralized location within the

work center and stored seldom-used publications in an offsite area; placed and properly stored commonly-used equipment, such as calibration equipment, closer to the point-of-use; updated standard operating procedures to include new and changed processes; reorganized the shop to improve work flow by moving induction and receipt to the front of the shop; and labeled and color-coded every item on the shelves and benches for easy recognition.

What used to take Calibration Laboratory Sailors an average of 42 hours to complete an on-site calibration now takes 46 minutes. The time to calibrate equipment in the calibration shop was reduced from 65 minutes to 45 minutes. Ship-wide, calibration readiness has improved

from an average of less than 79 percent to almost 90 percent.

Peleliu Sailors also talked about the barriers they encountered during the improvement events including network connectivity and how it prevents them from actively using the Calibration Due Outlook Calendar.

Calibration Laboratory Sailors also said that they envision future calibration procedures using calibration tools positioned near equipment or by performing calibrations remotely.

"The admirals and general were really attentive and asked questions," said Aviation Electronics Technician 2nd Class (AW/SW) Kevin Evick, the ship's Calibration Laboratory leading petty officer. "They listened to my brief

(Peleliu continued on Page 5)



Aviation Electronics Technician 2nd Class (AW/SW) Kevin Evick, USS Peleliu's Calibration Laboratory leading petty officer (left) talks with (from left to right) Major Gen. Thomas L. Conant, Commanding General of 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing; Rear Adm. Timothy S. Matthews, Fleet Readiness Centers Commander and Naval Air Systems Command Assistant Commander for Logistics and Industrial Operations; and Col. Carmine Borrelli, Marine Corps Aviation Logistics deputy director, about the improvements in the Calibration Laboratory. U.S. Navy photo by Mass Communication Specialist 3rd Class Andrew J. Dunlap.

(Activities continued from Page 4)

Standardization (OPIS) Team from the Carrier Readiness Team (CRT) to Commander, Naval Air Forces, Force Aircraft (CNAF N422). OPIS also was renamed CPI-Afloat (CPI-A).

The change designated N422 as the “assistant chief of staff” for CPI and created a single point of contact for CPI training resources and scheduling. The office will be responsible for planning and coordination of funding requirements and will continue to coordinate with CRT on CPI matters.

“This gives us a way-forward to implement CPI ship-wide,” said John Vilicich, CNAF N422 AIRSpeed coordinator. “Instead of just focusing on two areas, we will bring CPI toolsets to 23 divisions – the 10 major areas aboard ship. The schedule, which includes the L-class ships as well, is slated to be completed by late 2011.”

Sailors in other departments will soon begin contribute to ship-wide readiness. “Responsibility for the CPI office now resides in the AIMD. We envision CPI leadership and cadre coming from other departments throughout the ship, such as Engineering or Reactor. Their experiences and skills will cross-pollinate,” he said.

As a policy maker, CNAF N422 will also direct the use of CPI aboard ships. “The CNAF CPI Instruction was recently updated and not only re-emphasizes the requirement to use CPI, it indicates what resources ships can access, describes the products available for their use and establishes the responsibilities of department heads and steering committees,” said Vilicich.

CPI-A is to be completed in three phases; its concepts are similar to the ones used by the Maintenance and Supply Integration Performance Improvement Branch and OPIS. During the first phase, CPI experts will visit the ships, deliver the Buffer Management Tool (BMT) to AIMD and Supply and conduct

Kudos!

Two Naval Aviation employees were nominated for *Aviation Week & Space Technology* 2010 Laureate Awards.

MH-60 Romeo/Sierra Team Member Capt. Dean Peters, PMA-299 program manager, along with contractors from Sikorsky and Lockheed Martin, were nominated for their work on the deployment of the new MH-60R to the USS John Stennis Carrier Strike Group in 2009. The Romeo, along with its sister aircraft, the MH-60S, performed for the first time as a team. Deployment highlights included a 95 percent sortie completion rate.

Scott O’Neill, executive director of the China Lake Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division was nominated for his efforts in leading the

Naval Air Systems Command effort to reinstitute China Lake and Point Mugu as the Navy’s one-stop facility for air weapons research. Work there is investigating the potential of speed-of-light and speed-of-electricity weapons to include non-lethal, electronically disruptive and cyber attack devices. The effort includes redefining what a weapon is, accurately predicting second-third-order effects of non-kinetic weapons and conducting research on U.S. needs for a national cyber warfare test range.

Aviation Week’s Laureate Awards were conceived more than 50 years ago to recognize the extraordinary achievements of individuals and teams in aerospace, aviation and defense. Winners will be announced on March 17. ■

Green Belt classes for the core team. Yellow Belt classes are also planned to familiarize Sailors in other departments with CPI terms and to ingrain continuous improvement into ships’ culture. Additional Green Belt classes may be offered as well.

“The more Sailors we get involved, the more they will imagine and see the improvements they can achieve with the tools,” said Vilicich.

Ships will become self-sufficient during Phase 2. Each ship will have a Black Belt assigned to her to assist in the practical application of the tools and for follow-up. Distance support will be provided in Phase 3.

Leveraging the expertise of CPI practitioners and replicating best practices will be a renewed focus of CPI-A. “Sailors and artisans from Fleet Readiness Centers will play a major role in introducing and sustaining CPI-A,” said Vilicich. “There is a high turnover of Sailors and when they are assigned to ships, they can apply what they have learned, function as they did in their last assignment, operate under the same business rules and teach others.”

Plans are also underway to improve ships’ access to the CPI Man-

agement System, a software solution that is a repository for best practices that have been identified and proven by other CPI practitioners.

Metrics will become increasingly important as CPI-A is rolled out to the fleet. “We will be an enabler of the Naval Aviation Enterprise (NAE) in its achievement of its PESTO [People, Equipment, Sustainment, Training and Ordnance] Pillar goals and objectives. BMT will be used to pull data that will be reported each month to the NAE Air Board and even to the higher-level enterprises. This increased visibility will allow each ship to see how she measures up to others,” he said.

(To view the NAE Strategic Plan, go to <https://n1.fcc.navy.mil/tools/get.aspx?ID=138>)

To date five aircraft carriers – *USS Nimitz* (CVN 68), *Theodore Roosevelt*, *John C. Stennis*, *George Washington*, *USS Dwight D. Eisenhower* (CVN 69) – and one L-class ship (*USS Peleliu* (LHA 5)) have completed AIRSpeed implementation. Five aircraft carriers and two L-class ships are scheduled for 2010. ■

(Peleliu continued from Page 3)

about the changes we'd made and our comments on the improvements and the gripes we had."

Evick said he felt the flag officers were truly concerned and fully intended to address and try to solve his shop's problems.

"They wrote our complaints down, and then even asked us more specifically about what was wrong," said Evick. "After they got that accurate, they asked us if we had any recommendations or solutions for those gripes."

The Calibration Laboratory was only one stop during the site visit where AIRSpeed played a direct impact on the ship's mission readiness. At each point, Iron Nickel Sailors were listened to intently to find out how the program affected them and their work.

According to the ship's AIRSpeed leading petty officer, Aviation Structural Mechanic 1st Class (AW) Eric Trial, AIRSpeed focuses on process improvement, but unlike some prior similar attempts, he said these tools work.

"AIRSpeed is better. It's much more thought out and it's grown since it was first implemented [in the fleet] three or four years ago," said Trial. "As with any change on a major scale, the biggest hurdle is overcoming the resistance to change and that inertia to just keep things as they have been."

Trial said Lean is one of the coolest parts about AIRSpeed. "Lean is all about eliminating waste from your process, whatever that process might be," said Trial. "You do things like analyzing where your worker has to walk, where they have to reach for tools, how much time every single point of work takes them...then you eliminate the unnecessary steps, or physically move the tools to where they're going to be used.

"It's so simple, but so effective that whenever we complete the process in a work center, the workers there always say things are better, even the ones who were most resistant," said Trial.

Naval Aviation Enterprise leadership not only acknowledged the

progress Peleliu Sailors had made in such a short time but also talked about how instrumental junior enlisted are to readiness. "NAE reporting construct has provided all levels of leadership with greater visibility into the readiness of our aircraft, Sailors and Marines," said Matthews. "But leadership also recognizes that junior Sailors and Marines have to be a part of the solution because they are the ones maintaining and managing aircraft on a day-to-day basis. The site visits are opportunities to understand the working-level logistic issues that impact readiness and cost they encounter each day and let them know that senior leadership is listening to and acting upon their concerns."

"USS Peleliu received its initial training only a few months ago and I can see that she has already embraced continuous process improvement," said Matthews. "Junior Sailors and Marines must continue to use the toolsets to identify and resolve barriers in their areas. They also should research and replicate the best practices of other commands. Their contributions are an important part of the readiness of Naval Aviation."

Future events aboard Peleliu include: combining the aircraft intermediate maintenance department's Aeronautical Material Screening Unit and Supply Component Control Section; improve the process flow for technical directive screening and incorporation; applying 5S and Lean to ground support equipment; conducting value stream analysis and rapid improvement events (RIE) to identify projects in Supply; conducting RIEs to hazardous materials (HAZMAT) and to Rip and Stowe.

NAE and Peleliu leadership also discussed the realignment of Continuous Process Improvement – Afloat (formerly the Operational Process Improvement and Standardization Team) from the Carrier Readiness Team to CNAF Force Supply; collaboration with LHDron to implement continuous process improvement on all aircraft carriers and L-Class ships; embarkation of the V-22 "Osprey" and the Joint Strike Fighter; duplicative reporting

requirements; relocation of the ship's HAZMAT Crimp Installation; and H-60 logistics issues.

NAE and SWE representatives took these issues back to their commands for review and possible resolution. ■

(Gap continued from Page 2)

NAE leadership also learned that the *NAE Vision Book*, *NAE Air Plan* and the *NAE Strategic Plan* are the most widely known media. Sixty-two percent said that they use the Air Plan to better understand the NAE mission and 58 percent said that they use the *Current Readiness/Enterprise AIRSpeed Newsletter* to better understand NAE issues.

Squadron-level leadership, however, scored questions on their application of improvement tools and their involvement with the NAE to remove barriers lower than those in higher level commands. "This clearly shows a need for additional engagement," said Shrout. "We will conduct additional research on the causes and determine what other communication opportunities to pursue."

Responses to the assessment also recommended more face-to-face interaction by leadership at all level delivering NAE messages, constructing communications messages that are targeted toward specific audiences and to continue to highlight how actions are measured.

The way ahead for NAE strategic communications include making better use of NAE and Navy-wide internal media, targeting communication efforts to those at the squadron level, and increasing outreach efforts to outside audiences through non-NAE events. ■

The NAE is the preeminent partnership of operators, sponsors and providers who champion the efficient delivery of the right force, with the right readiness at the right time. . . today and in the future.

(Future continued from Page 1)

ship stood up the Future Readiness Cross-functional Team (FR CFT) during its annual off-site meeting in May 2009.

The NAE also stood-down the Future Capabilities CFT.

Less than six months later, the team completed two major milestones: In September, it submitted its charter and way-ahead to the NAE; and it submitted recommendations on Program Objective Memorandum (POM) 12 funding investments in October. The recommended investments cut across multiple Naval Aviation platforms to reduce ownership costs and improve system readiness, including both “quick-win” initiatives that produce benefits in the near term, as well as initiatives that will take longer to yield returns.

The process of developing readiness cannot be accomplished by a single functional organization; it takes dedicated and coordinated efforts from many organizations to accomplish the goal.

~ 2010 NAE Strategic Plan

The bridge between current readiness and future capabilities is called future readiness. Building that bridge takes analytical insight, due diligence and a discerning sense of prioritization. Our future depends on it.

~ Rear Adm. Deke Philman

Director, Air Warfare Division,
Office of the Chief of Naval Operations

rine Corps aviation acquisition programs, the FR CFT will engage stakeholders to effectively produce required levels

of future readiness while reducing fielded and planned systems' total costs of ownership. It is comprised of representatives from Naval Air Systems Command; Office of the Chief of Naval Operations; Air Warfare Division and Fleet Readiness Division; Commander, Naval Air Forces; Commander, Naval Air Forces Atlantic; Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition; Office of Naval Research; Naval Inventory Control Point; Headquarters, Marine Corps, Aviation Support and Logistics; Chief Technology Officer, and Program Executive Office of Science and Technology (S&T).

The team is currently developing a process to identify readiness and cost degraders for fielded systems and sustainment infrastructure; establishing business case methodology, model, and criteria for issue consideration; and defining NAE engagement actions in POM/Program Review cycle.

Future activities include:

- identifying areas of opportunity where culture is impacting the ability to achieve Future Readiness objectives. They are also developing solutions to improve the culture which may include improved processes, policies, communications, training and recognition;
- informing key NAE Executive Committee members of acquisition reviews, issues and background;
- reviewing the process for early development programs prior to Milestone C Review. (Milestone C Review determines if a system's low rate initial production can begin);
- linking sustainment/readiness strategies to S&T objectives and roadmaps
- Developing FR Life Cycle Cost metrics/measures of effectiveness for use in S&T project selection. ■

A new focus

Whereas the Future Capabilities CFT focused on improving the planning and execution of Navy and Ma-

NAE Strategic Objective 4 (Future Readiness)

- 4.1: Aggregate, prioritize and elevate issues for fielded systems & sustainment infrastructure
- 4.2: Champion Future Readiness issues
- 4.3: Identify stakeholders and engage them in required culture changes
- 4.4: Engage in the development-level program gates and reviews to ensure readiness issues and total ownership costs are championed
- 4.5: Incorporate relevant sustainment objectives in requirements documentation
- 4.6: Leverage Science and Technology for the benefit of Future Readiness

Links of interest

1. Naval Aviation Enterprise Strategic Plan 2010- 2017

The NAE Strategic Plan provides strategic objectives and initiatives that provide the foundation for Enterprise actions in support of Naval Aviation readiness requirements.

<https://n1.fcc.navy.mil/tools/get.aspx?ID=138>

2. NAE AIRSpeed Green Belt Training and Certification Guidebook

The purpose of this guidebook is to define the training, development and certification processes which will be used to ensure that highly capable Green Belts are trained and developed organically within the DoN to meet this important demand

<https://n1.fcc.navy.mil/tools/get.aspx?ID=129>

3. In VECTOR: Teamwork on tape

Vector now features a new video series titled, "Flight Ready." Each video gives an opportunity to see and hear Naval Air Systems Command teammates talk about how they work through the phases of research, development, training and evaluation and find everyday solutions to technical challenges. Watch as the lead systems engineer for Integrated Diagnostics and Test Systems describes how the tools they are developing help aircraft maintainers support the fleet and Naval aviation maintenance.

<https://mynavair.navair.navy.mil/portal/server.pt?space=CommunityPage&cached=true&parentname=MyPage&parentid=1&control=SetCommunity&PageID=0&CommunityID=1075>

4. DoN CPI Gram

Learn about the FY10 National Defense Authorization Act Business Process Re-engineering requirements.

<https://n1.fcc.navy.mil/tools/get.aspx?ID=124>

5. The NAVSEA December Snapshot

This video chronicles projects and activities that support NAVSEA's readiness efforts

<http://www.navsea.navy.mil/VideoLibrary/DEC%20Snapshot-Web.wmv>

6. Rhumb Lines

- **Learning and Development Roadmaps: Sailors Climb the LaDR to Brilliance**

This Rhumb Lines discusses Learning and Development Roadmaps, tools used by Sailors, supervisors and mentors to guide Sailors' career progression and ensure our ready and agile force is "Brilliant on the Basics."

<https://n1.fcc.navy.mil/tools/get.aspx?ID=139>

- **Navy Unmanned Aircraft Systems and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles**

This Rhumb Lines addresses the Navy's unmanned aircraft systems and aerial vehicles and the alternative solutions they provide for addressing warfighter capabilities and how they operate across the seas and littorals.

<https://n1.fcc.navy.mil/tools/get.aspx?ID=123>

7. NAE Air Plan - January 2010 edition

Read about the NAE's 2009 Calendar Year accomplishments that resulted in the more efficient delivery of readiness to the Fleet

<https://n1.fcc.navy.mil/tools/get.aspx?ID=140>

