

DUSTOFF Hall of Fame Nomination Criteria

The following criteria stand as the portal for the selection process of nominees being considered for induction into the DUSTOFF Hall of Fame. These criteria were modeled after those of the Army Aviation Hall of Fame when the Association began the process of honoring men and women who, by their career and contributions, merited special recognition by induction into the DUSTOFF Hall of Fame. These are the criteria:

The DUSTOFF Association-sponsored Hall of Fame honors those persons who have made a) an outstanding contribution to DUSTOFF Aviation over an extended period, b) a doctrinal or technical contribution, c) an innovation with an identifiable impact on DUSTOFF Aviation, d) efforts that were an inspiration to others, or e) any combination of the foregoing. The DUSTOFF Hall of Fame records the excellence of their achievements for posterity. All persons are eligible for induction, except active duty Generals and Colonels. Membership in the DUSTOFF Association is not a requirement for nomination for the DUSTOFF Hall of Fame. A two-year waiting period must elapse following the death of a nominee. Any individual, military or civilian, may nominate an individual for the DUSTOFF Hall of Fame consideration.

Explanation and expansion on criteria:

An outstanding contribution to DUSTOFF Aviation over an extended period. Probably the best example of this would be MG Spurgeon Neel's contributions in the area of Aviation Medicine. Over his entire career he was the first to do things, such as expanding the use of helicopters for the evacuation of the sick and injured. His leadership was instrumental in establishing Aviation Medical Officers as a military specialty. The best examples of contributions are those that have had lasting value, e.g., innovations that were put into practice, were/are still used, or those that made a measurable difference. Critical parts of this criterion are the words "DUSTOFF Aviation." Many officers make great contributions to the Army Medical Department. Few make lasting contributions to DUSTOFF Aviation.

A doctrinal or technical contribution. There are few AMEDD Officers, Warrant and Commissioned, or Enlisted Soldiers who have had the opportunity to work in areas where doctrine is written or technology is developed. This criterion is rarely used, but if used, it would be marked by demonstrable pieces of equipment or contributions to doctrinal publications. Those who served as Aviation Consultants to The Surgeon General or in positions of responsibility in Combat Developments, who can be cited for specific accomplishments, would be viewed favorably. A possible example could be Ben Knisely and his role as medical planner for Desert Shield and the quotations of senior commanders about his work cited in his nomination. Another list of candidates would be those who served in highly visible and pivotal positions during those critical years of Aviation Transformation when command and control of DUSTOFF units moved from medical operational control to the Aviation Brigade structure.

An innovation with an identifiable impact on DUSTOFF Aviation. Two officers come to mind for examples here. The first was MG Spurgeon Neel's efforts in the design of the Huey. No action went forward in the design process that did not support the use of that airframe for patient

evacuation. Another example could be, Charles Webb's efforts in the same line of work, as he worked on the design criteria for The Army Surgeon General for the Blackhawk. John Temperilli's ground-breaking leadership in the first full-scale combat deployment of an Air Ambulance unit might be another example. Certainly, Tom "Egor" Johnson's development and fielding of the DUSOFF Association has had an impact. However, the use of the term "innovation" would more than likely lead one to look for a piece of equipment or a technique for accomplishing the mission.

Efforts that were an inspiration to others. This criterion clearly leads us to those who do great things in combat. Charles Kelly comes to mind immediately when one thinks of those who inspired others. To this day, his words bring dedication to the forefront for DUSTOFF Warriors. Certainly the missions that resulted in the award of the Medal of Honor for Patrick Brady, Mike Novosel, and Louis Rocco come to mind. This leads one into a gray area where we have the most difficulty deciding where to start and where to stop in terms of "metrics." These include numbers of medals, numbers of missions, numbers of patients evacuated, numbers of hoist missions, and the number of combat tours. The list could go on and on.

The next challenge comes when one starts to compare the Vietnam War with Panama, Grenada, Desert Storm, Bosnia, OEF, and OIF. When seeking guidance in this area of consideration, one must rely on those with combat experience to make the determination between a really exceptional example and an example that isn't set apart from what has become a "norm" for DUSTOFF missions. Missions in combat, where unarmed aircraft are landed in the midst of a battle to evacuate the wounded, inspire most everyone—especially the wounded and their comrades. Trust is built as a result.

However, there are distinct missions where there is more to the mission than simply sitting on the ground taking fire. Possibly the most recent example would be the Rescue of the Year, which resulted in the award of the German Crosses to CW3 Jason LaCrosse and his multi-ship crews. More than a listing of a nominee's awards is expected. A well-written example that concisely depicts the mission as a part of the 1200-word narrative is strongly suggested. This example must clearly illustrate and explain the mission for which a medal was awarded, e.g., what was done, why it was an inspiration, and how it demonstrated the Kelly ethos.

Any combination of the foregoing. Here is where very well-written narratives shine—somebody who has a great combat record, has done things *for DUSTOFF Aviation*, and has left behind a clear mark on our profession will have examples of many of the above criteria from which to write examples. Long careers where a large amount of time is spent in the conduct of, command of, and or management of DUSTOFF Aviation are fertile ground for nominations using this combination criterion.

The greatest distinction between a great Hall of Fame nomination and a "run of the mill no better than any other candidate" narrative is the *overuse of superlatives*. Buzz words that are used without examples simply "ring hollow" in a narrative. A great example of how to avoid this and how to seal the deal for a great DUSTOFF Hall of Fame nomination is to be able to use the following—"COL Smith exemplified excellence *as evidenced by*. . . ." If the nominator cannot cite specific and tangible examples of evidence, the narrative should be questioned outright. The

DUSTOFF Hall of Fame was *not* designed to honor those who reach the grade of Colonel, Sergeant Major, or Master Warrant. Grade has nothing to do with Hall of Fame quality. Hall of Fame quality in DUSTOFF means plucking from those who represent the top 10% of the Army (DUSTOFFers) those top 1% of our profession. That is a tall order, and it should *not* be a cookie-cutter exercise. Nor should it result in poorly documented examples of the above mentioned criteria.