



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 32,
Cannon Air Force Base, NM,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 100 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 32,
Cannon Air Force Base, NM,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 100 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 6 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 32,
Cannon Air Force Base, NM,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 100 of the Bill.

Realigns Cannon AFB, NM; establishes single site IFF.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, NM, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 6 and 7 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the entire recommendation and insert in its place “**Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM** by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Relocate from Moody AFB, GA, all Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals (IFF) Training for Pilots, IFF Training for Weapons Systems Officers, IFF Training for Instructor Pilots, and all associated training assets and aircraft, including all AT-38/T-38C aircraft, to Cannon AFB, NM.”, and that the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions as appropriate and assign the missions to Cannon AFB; and, that the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions, as appropriate, and assign those missions to Cannon AFB; and, that the

Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 32,
Cannon Air Force Base, NM
Appearing at Chapter III, Section 100 of the Bill

Realigns Cannon AFB, NM; establishes a enclave until the date of December 31, 2008

Offered by: _____
Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, NM, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 6 and 7 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the entire recommendation and insert in its place "Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorization (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
- After disestablishing the 27th fighter wing, the Air Force shall establish an enclave at Cannon Air Force Base which enclave shall remain open until December 31, 2008 during which time the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions for possible assignment to Cannon Air Force Base NM. If the Secretary designates a mission for Cannon Air Force Base during this period, the enclave status would revert to the status appropriate for the designated

mission. If the Air Force does not find a mission for Cannon Air Force Base by December 31, 2008 Cannon Air Force Base and the enclave shall be closed.

- Nothing in this directive shall prohibit the State of New Mexico and the Department of Defense from entering into an agreement to close the enclave at Cannon Air Force Base earlier than December 31, 2008.⁹
- That the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 32,
Cannon Air Force Base, NM,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 100 of the Bill.

Realigns Cannon AFB, NM; establishes single site IFF.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, NM, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 6 and 7 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the entire recommendation and insert in its place "**Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM** by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Relocate from Moody AFB, GA, all Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals (IFF) Training for Pilots, IFF Training for Weapons Systems Officers, IFF Training for Instructor Pilots, and all associated training assets and aircraft, including all AT-38/T-38C aircraft, to Cannon AFB, NM.", and;
- that the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions, as appropriate, and assign those missions to Cannon AFB; and,

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 32,
Cannon Air Force Base, NM,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 100 of the Bill.

Conditions the closure of Cannon AFB, NM on a Secretary of Defense determination that the installation is no longer required based upon his review of the strategic situation on March 15, 2008.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____


Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, NM, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 6 and 7 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the entire recommendation and insert in its place "Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the primary Aircraft Authorization (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
- After disestablishing the 27th fighter wing, the Air Force shall establish an enclave at Cannon Air Force Base which enclave shall remain open until December 31, 2009, during which time the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions for possible assignment to Cannon Air Force Base, NM. If the Secretary designates a mission for Cannon Air Force Base during this period, the enclave status would revert to the status appropriate for the designated mission. If the Air Force does not find a

mission for Cannon Air Force Base by December 31, 2009, Cannon Air Force Base and the enclave shall be closed.

- Nothing in this directive shall prohibit the State of New Mexico and the Department of Defense from entering into an agreement to close the enclave at Cannon Air Force Base earlier than December 31, 2009.
- That the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 33,
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, New York,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 101 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 33,
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, New York, is consistent with the Final
Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 33,
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, New York,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 101 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 33, Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, New York, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 33,
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 101 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and other related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 33, Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and insert in its place **“Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (ARS), NY.”** Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 10 PAA KC-135R/T at the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, Maine. The 101st Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aircraft Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.
- All personnel allotted to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place

and form an Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve associate wing with the 914th Airlift Wing. Establish a contiguous enclave for the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), etc. Guard personnel will be provided the training necessary to support the airlift mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the New York Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.”, and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 33,
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 101 of the Bill.

Establishes an Air National Guard enclave at the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 33, Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission insert the language “Establish a contiguous enclave for the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operation of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Reserve Station as a civilian airport.”, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 34,
Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, New York,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 102 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 34,
Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, New York, is consistent with the
Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 34,
Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, New York,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 102 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 34, Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, New York, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criterion 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 34,
Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY
appearing at Chapter III, Section 102 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 34, Schenectady Country Airport Air Guard Station, NY, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 3 the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and insert in its place "Establish 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft (PAA) (L)C-130H at the 109th Airlift Wing (ANG), Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY." and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 35,
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, Pittsburg International Airport Air Reserve
Station, Pennsylvania, and Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 103 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 35,
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, Pittsburg International Airport Air Reserve
Station, Pennsylvania, and Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia, is consistent
with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 35,
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, Pittsburg International Airport Air Reserve
Station, Pennsylvania, and Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 103 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 35, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, Pittsburg International Airport Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania, and Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 35,
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania, and Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 103 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 35, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania, and Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the text of paragraph "a" of Chapter III, Section 103 of the Bill and insert in its place, "**Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina.** Distribute the 25 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 43^d Air Lift Wing and the 36 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 23^d Fighter Group to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 16 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pope Army Air Field, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.
 - Establish 48 PAA A-10 aircraft at Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

Transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43^d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron. The Air Force will establish an Air Support Operations Group to provide unity of command of Air Force units on Pope Army Air Field, mission execution planning, and management of efficient loadout of Fort Bragg assets. The Air Force will provide sufficient permanent flying assets to ensure satisfaction of XVIII Airborne Corp, 82^d Airborne Division, and other units based at Fort Bragg. The Air Force will operate Pope Army Airfield in accordance with Fort Bragg mission requirements.”, and;

- that the Commission strike the text of paragraph “b” of Chapter III, Section 103 of the Bill and insert in its place, “**Realign Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas.** Distribute 42 of the C-130 aircraft assigned to Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 143^d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, Rhode Island;
 - Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California;
 - Establish 9 PAA C-130 aircraft at 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base.”, and;
- that the Commission strike the text of paragraph “c” of Chapter III, Section 103 of the Bill and insert in its place, “**Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia.**
 - Establish 8 PAA C-130H aircraft at Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia..”,
- that the Commission strike the text of paragraph “d” of Chapter III, Section 103 of the Bill and insert in its place, “**Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania.**

- Establish 8 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania.
- The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected. Establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan and the National Response Plan.", and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 37,
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 104 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 37,
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, is consistent with the Final Selection
Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 37,
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 104 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 37, Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 37,
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota
appearing at Chapter III, Section 104 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and other related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 37, Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 3 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (12 aircraft), which retires its eight KC-135E aircraft; the 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC (eight aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; the 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (four aircraft), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI; the 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (four aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; and the 22^d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (eight aircraft), which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR)" and insert in its place the language, "Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense,

as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish the following KC-135R/T PAA:

- The 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (eight PAA KC-135R/T). The 126th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft;
- The 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit;
- The 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI;
- The 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (12 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit, and;
- The 22^d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (48 PAA KC-135R/T), which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR);

Modify infrastructure at Grand Forks AFB to accommodate the emerging Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) mission. The Secretary of Defense will maintain eight KC-135 aircraft at Grand Forks Air Force Base to facilitate an efficient and cost effective bed down of UAVs. The Secretary will keep the tankers in place until the UAVs are operational at Grand Forks, but not later than 31 Dec 2010 unless otherwise required by the Department of Defense for National Emergencies.

- that the Commission strike the language "Realign McConnell Air National Guard (ANG) Base by relocating the 184th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) nine KC-135R aircraft to the 190th Air Refueling Wing at Forbes Field AGS, KS, which will retire its eight assigned KC-135E aircraft." and insert in its place, "Realign McConnell Air National Guard (ANG) Base by distributing the 184th Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) nine KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish 12 Primary Aircraft

Authorization KC-135R/T aircraft at the 190th Air Refueling Wing, Forbes Field AGS, KS. The 184th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the AMARC at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.”, and:

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 38,
Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, North Dakota,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 105 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 38,
Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, North Dakota, is consistent with
the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 38,
Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, North Dakota,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 105 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 38, Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, North Dakota, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 38,
Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, North Dakota
appearing at Chapter III, Section 105 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 38, Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, North Dakota, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1 and 2 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “The 119th Fighter Wing’s F-16s (15 aircraft) retire,” and insert in its place “With the consent of the State of North Dakota, as expressed in the Governor’s August 4th letter to the Commission, and consistent with Air Force plans, the 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) will be redesignated as an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle wing; the Armed Forces Reserve Center planned for construction on Hector Field will be expanded to include sufficient facilities to accommodate at minimum the UAV ground control and intelligence analysis functions and expeditionary combat support elements, including fire, crash and rescue services, of the 119th Wing (ANG), in addition to the units already identified in Army Recommendation 73, Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota; and the Air Force will retain, adapt or construct appropriate facilities on Grand Forks Air Force Base appropriate to launch, recover, maintain and support the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles assigned to the 119th Wing (ANG).”;

- that the Commission explicitly rejects the language contained in justification to the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense that there will be “no flying mission backfill” at Hector Field, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Additional statement: This motion, even though it deletes the language “the 119th Fighter Wing’s F-16s retire,” does not preclude the Air Force from executing the already programmed retirement of the aircraft currently based at Hector Field. All that deletion is intended to do is to ensure flexibility for the Air Force and to keep the Commission out of business that is purely programmatic, outside the realm of the Base Closure Act. If the Air Force isn’t permitted to retire those aircraft as programmed, this action wouldn’t make any sense.



Motion # 106-1

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 39,
Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 106 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 39,
Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio, is consistent with
the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 39,
Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 106 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 39, Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 39,
Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH
appearing at Chapter III, Section 106 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and other related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 39, Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 6 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the entire text of the recommendation and insert in its place the language, "**Realign Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), OH**. Distribute the 179th Airlift Wing's C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 8 C-130H PAA at the 908th Airlift Wing (AFR), Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.
- Establish a contiguous enclave for the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

- If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state." and,
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 107-1

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 40,
Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 107 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 40,
Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio, is consistent with
the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 40,
Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 107 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 40, Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 40,
Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 107 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that:

- the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 40, Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 2 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan; that the Commission strike the language in the subject recommendation and insert in its place
- that the Commission strike the entire text of the recommendation and insert in its place **“Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH.** Distribute the 18 F16 aircraft assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 140th Wing (ANG), Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado.
 - Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 149th Wing (ANG), Lackland Air Force Base, Texas.
- Establish a contiguous enclave for the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and

compatible with joint use of the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

- If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.”, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 108-1

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 41,
Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 108 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 41, Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 41,
Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 108 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 41, Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 41,
Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 108 of the Bill.

Rejects realignment of 142^d FW (ANG).

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 41, Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon,, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "**Realign the 142^d Fighter Wing (ANG)** by distributing the wing's F-15 aircraft to the 177th Fighter Wing (ANG), Atlantic City, NJ (six aircraft) and the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS, LA (nine aircraft). The 142^d Fighter Wing's expeditionary combat support elements, along with the 244th and 272^d Combat Communications Squadrons (ANG), will remain at Portland and Portland will continue to support a Homeland Defense alert commitment. The 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR) at Portland is realigned to McChord Air Force Base, WA, with no aircraft involved.", and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 41,
Portland international Airport Air Guard Station
appearing at Chapter III, Section 108 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 41, Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, he deviated from Final Selection Criterion 1 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language, “**Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR)** by distributing the wing’s KC-135R aircraft to the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK (four aircraft); the 190th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Forbes Field Air Guard Station, KS (three aircraft); and by reverting one aircraft to backup inventory. Operations and maintenance manpower for four aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing is realigned with the aircraft to Tinker Air Force Base. The 939th Air Refueling Wing’s remaining manpower, to include expeditionary combat support, is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA.” and insert in its place, “**Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR)**. Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK as a twelve Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) KC-135R/T wing. Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Holloman AFB, NM. The 939th Air Refueling Wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.”, and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 43,
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota and Dyess Air Force Base, Texas,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 109 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 43,
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota and Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, is
consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 43,
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota and Dyess Air Force Base, Texas,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 109 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 43, Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota and Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 44,
Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 110 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 44,
Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee, is consistent with
the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 44,
Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 110 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 44, Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 44,
Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 110 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 44, Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criterion 1 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and insert in its place “Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Assigned Aircraft (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 182nd Airlift Wing (ANG), Greater Peoria Airport, AGS, Illinois.
 - Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 123rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Louisville International Airport Air Guard Station, Kentucky.”
- Establish a contiguous enclave for the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Nashville International Airport as a civilian airport.

- If the State of Tennessee decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 118^h Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force all personnel allotted to the 118th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Tennessee and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.
- This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Tennessee Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 118^h Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state," and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 45,
Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 111 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 45,
Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria
and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 45,
Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 111 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 45, Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 45,
Ellington Air Guard Station, TX,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 111 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move that:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 45, Ellington Air Guard Station, TX, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1 and 2 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "The 147th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) will retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place." and insert in its place "Distribute the 15 F16 aircraft assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
- Establish a contiguous enclave for the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of Ellington Field as a civilian airport.
- If the State of Texas decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will

remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Texas and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Texas Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.”, and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and Force Structure Plan.

111-5A

I move that we amend Section 111 (Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX: AF-45) to state:

“Establish 15 primary aircraft authorization (PAA) F-16 aircraft at the 147th Fighter Wing (Air National Guard) at Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas.”



11

1

Motion # 112-1

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 46,
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 112 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 46,
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria
and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 46,
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 112 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 46, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 47,
Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air
Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base,
Nevada,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 113 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 47,
Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air
Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base,
Nevada, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 47,
Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air
Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada
appearing at Chapter III, Section 113 of the Bill (AFR/ANG F-16).

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

That the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 47, Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, he deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 3, 4, and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

- The Commission delete the entire text of the recommendation, and insert in its place the language “Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 419th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission:
- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 482nd Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL.
- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth, TX.
- The AFMC F-16s will remain in place at Hill Air Force Base.
- Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; and Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating base-level LANTIRN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) pods at Hill Air Force Base.
- Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV, by relocating base-level F-110 engine intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a CIRF for F-110 engines at Hill.”; and,
- The Commission find that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 47,
Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air
Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base,
Nevada,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 113 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 47, Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 49,
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 114 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 49,
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria
and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 49,
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 114 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 49, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 50,
Richmond Air Guard Station, Virginia, and Des Moines International Airport Air
Guard Station,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 115 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 50,
Richmond Air Guard Station, Virginia, and Des Moines International Airport Air
Guard Station, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure
Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 50,
Richmond Air Guard Station, Virginia, and Des Moines International Airport Air
Guard Station,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 115 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 50, Richmond Air Guard Station, Virginia, and Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 50,
Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, and
Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 115 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and other related recommendations.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 50, Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, and Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 2 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the entire text of the recommendation and insert in its place “**Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 192^d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 24 F-16 Primary Aircraft Authorized (PAA) aircraft 482^d Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida.

- Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station real property accountability will transfer to the Department of the Army. The 192^d Fighter Wing's manpower will associate with the 1st Fighter Wing.
- Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Virginia Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 192^d Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.
- **Realign Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA.**
Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 132^d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish 18 F-16 PAA 132^d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa.
 - Establish 18 F-16 PAA 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio.
 - Establish 21 F-16 PAA 138th Fighter Wing, Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.”, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and Force Structure Plan.



1

1



Motion # 116-1

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 51,
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 116 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 51,
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, is consistent with the Final Selection
Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 51,
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 116 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 51, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 51,
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington
appearing at Chapter III, Section 116 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and other related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 116, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 3 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and insert in its place, "**Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA.** Distribute the 141st Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
 - Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa. The 185th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

- Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 161st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport Air Guard Station, AZ.
- If the State of Washington decides to change the organization, composition and association of the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:
 - establish the 141st Air Refueling Wing as an associate flying wing of the 92^d Air Refueling Wing, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, with the 92nd's Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;
 - provide opportunity for 141st Air Refueling Wing personnel to operate the future tanker replacement aircraft as determined by the Secretary of Defense
 - The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242^d Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated to Fairchild Air Force Base
 - all other personnel allotted to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Washington and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Washington Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state", and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 52,
General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, Wisconsin,
Appearing Chapter III, Section 117 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 52, General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, Wisconsin, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 52,
General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, Wisconsin,
Appearing Chapter III, Section 117 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 52, General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, Wisconsin, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 2 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 52,
General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI
appearing at Chapter III, Section 117 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and other related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 52, General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI
- he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 440th Airlift Wing to the 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (four aircraft), and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR (four aircraft). Realign the 440th Airlift Wing’s operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Fort Bragg, NC.” and insert in its place the language, “Distribute the 440th Airlift Wing’s C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following C-130H PAA:
 - The 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (8 PAA C-130H)

- The Air Force Reserve/Active Duty unit (designation to be determined) at Pope Army Airfield, NC (16 PAA C-130H);
 - Realign the 440th Airlift Wing's operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Pope Army Airfield, NC.
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



4

1



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 53,
Air Force Logistics Support Centers,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 118 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 53,
Air Force Logistics Support Centers, is consistent with the Final Selection
Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 53,
Air Force Logistics Support Centers,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 118 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 53, Air Force Logistics Support Centers, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 55,
F100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 119 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 55,
F100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities, is consistent with the
Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 55,
F100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 119 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 55, F100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



'

1



A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 5,
Aviation Logistics School,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 120 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 5, Aviation Logistics School, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 5,
Aviation Logistics School,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 120 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 5, Aviation Logistics School, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 6,
Combat Service Support Center,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 121 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 6, Combat Service Support Center, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 6,
Combat Service Support Center,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 121 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 6, Combat Service Support Center, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 122-1

A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 7,
Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 122 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 7, Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 7,
Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 122 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 7, Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 8,
Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 123 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 8, Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 8,
Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 123 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 8, Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criterion 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 124-1

A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 9,
Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 124 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 9, Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 9,
Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 124 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 9, Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Recommendation 10,
Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 125 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Recommendation 10, Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Recommendation 10,
Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 125 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Recommendation 10, Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 12,
Net Fires Center,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 126 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 12, Net Fires Center, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 12,
Net Fires Center,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 126 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 12, Net Fires Center, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

.....



A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 13,
Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 127 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross
Service Group Recommendation 13, Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood,
Missouri, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 13,
Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 127 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 13, Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

.....



A Motion to Approve
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14,
Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 128 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Education and Training Joint Cross
Service Group Recommendation 14, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training,
is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14,
Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 128 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14,
Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 128 of the Bill.

Deletes distribution of IFF program to multiple sites.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Randolph Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; and relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.", replace it with "relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots, Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers and Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to a location to be specified in a later amendment to the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense.", and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14,
Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 128 of the Bill.

Deletes distribution of IFF program to multiple sites.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Randolph Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; and relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.”, replace it with “relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots, Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers and Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to a location to be specified in a later amendment to the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense.”, and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14,
Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training,
appearing at Chapter IV, Section 128 of the Bill.

Deletes distribution of IFF program to multiple sites.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 14, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Randolph Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; and relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.”, replace it with “relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots, Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers and Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to a location to be specified in a later amendment to the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense.”, and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



1

1



A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 3,
Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard
Headquarters Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 129 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 3, Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 3,
Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard
Headquarters Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 129 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 3, Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 3,
Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard
Headquarters Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 129 of the Bill.

Deletes all realignments contained in the recommendation except the National Guard headquarters in Jefferson Plaza 1, leased space in Arlington VA.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 3, Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike paragraphs "a" through "m" of Chapter V, Section 129 of the Bill, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Handwritten signature

Motion # 129-3A

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 3,
Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard
Headquarters Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 129 of the Bill.

Deletes all realignments contained in the recommendation except the National Guard headquarters in Jefferson Plaza 1, leased space in Arlington VA.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 3, Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike paragraphs "a" through "m" of Chapter V, Section 129 of the Bill, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

•

1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 5,
Co-locate Defense/Military Department Adjudication Activities,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 130 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Joint Cross Service Group Activities Recommendation 5, Co-locate Defense/Military Department Adjudication Activities, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 5,
Co-locate Defense/Military Department Adjudication Activities,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 130 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 5, Co-locate Defense/Military Department Adjudication Activities, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 5,
Co-locate Defense/Military Department Adjudication Activities,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 130 of the Bill.

Substitutes "realign" for "close" in subsection regarding Elkridge Landing Road in Linthicum, MD to account for remaining organizations and functions.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 5, Co-locate Defense/Military Department Adjudication Activities, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 7 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the word "Close" in paragraph "b" and replace it with the word "Realign", and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 8,
Co-locate Military Department Investigative Agencies with DoD
Counterintelligence and Security Agency,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 131 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 8, Co-locate Military Department Investigative Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 8,
Co-locate Military Department Investigative Agencies with DoD
Counterintelligence and Security Agency,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 131 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 8, Co-locate Military Department Investigative Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 8,
Co-locate Military Department Investigative Agencies with DoD
Counterintelligence and Security Agency,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 131 of the Bill.

Conditions transfer of the Counterintelligence Field Activity and Defense Security Service to the Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DoD CSA), an organization that does not currently exist, on the establishment of DoD CSA.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 131, Co-locate Military Department Investigative Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “Disestablish CIFA and DSS, and consolidate their components into the newly created Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency.” and insert in its place “Disestablish Counterintelligence Field Activity and Defense Security Service, and consolidate their components into the Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency, if that agency is established by law or directive.”, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 10,
Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 132 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Joint Cross Service Group Activities Recommendation 10, Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 10,
Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 132 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 10, Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



4

1



A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 12,
Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased
Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 133 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 12, Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 12,
Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased
Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 133 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 12, Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 12,
Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased
Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 133 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 3, Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike paragraphs “a” through “d” and “f” through “r” of Chapter V, Section 133 of the Bill, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Motion # 134-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 15,
Co-locate Missile and Missile Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 134 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 15, Co-locate Missile and Missile Defense Agencies, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 15,
Co-locate Missile and Missile Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 134 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 15, Co-locate Missile and Missile Defense Agencies, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 15,
Co-locate Missile and Missile Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 134 of the Bill.

Substitutes "realign" for "close" in subparagraph relating to leased space in Huntsville, AL to account for remaining DoD tenants.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 15, Co-locate Missile and Missile Defense Agencies, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criterion 1 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the word "Close" where it appears in paragraph "b", Chapter V, Section 134, and insert in its place "Realign", and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



1

1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 17,
Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and
Training Professional Development and Technology Center,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 135 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 17, Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development and Technology Center, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 17,
Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and
Training Professional Development and Technology Center,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 135 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 17, Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development and Technology Center, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



4

1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 18,
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 136 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 18, Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 18,
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 136 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 18, Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters & Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 18,
Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 136 of the Bill.

(Brief description)

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters & Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 18, Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criterion 1 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “relocating and consolidating Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) with its subcomponents at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD” and insert in its place “relocating Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) to Fort Belvoir, VA.”, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 19,
Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs) within each Military Department
and the Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 137 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 19, Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs) within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 19,
Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs) within each Military Department
and the Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 137 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 19, Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs) within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 19,
Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office Within Each Military Department and the
Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 137 of the Bill.

Deletes realignment of Rock Island, IL CPOC and Stennis Space Center, MS HRSC-Southeast; limits realignment of Wright-Patterson AFB, OH CPO to transactional functions, and; retains capability to perform personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, Robins AFB, GA, Hill AFB, UT, Tinker AFB, OK, and Bolling AFB, DC.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 19, Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office Within Each Military Department and the Defense Agencies, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike paragraphs "b" and "d" of Chapter V, Section 137;
- that in paragraph "h" of Chapter V, Section 137, the Commission strike the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office**", and insert in its place the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office**";
- append the sentence "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-

transactional functions, necessary to support Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH civilian workforce.” to paragraph “g” of Chapter V, Section 137;

- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Robins Air Force Base, GA civilian workforce.” to paragraph “h” of Chapter V, Section 137;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Hill Air Force Base, UT civilian workforce.” to paragraph “i” of Chapter V, Section 137;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Tinker Air Force Base, OK civilian workforce.” to paragraph “j” of Chapter V, Section 137, and;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Bolling Air Force Base, DC civilian workforce.” to paragraph “k” of Chapter V, Section 137, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 19,
Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office Within Each Military Department and the
Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 137 of the Bill.

Deletes realignment of Rock Island, IL CPOC; limits realignment of Wright-Patterson AFB, OH CPO to transactional functions, and; retains capability to perform personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, Robins AFB, GA, Hill AFB, UT, Tinker AFB, OK, and Bolling AFB, DC.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 19, Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office Within Each Military Department and the Defense Agencies, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike paragraph "b" of Chapter V, Section 137;
- that in paragraph "h" of Chapter V, Section 137, the Commission strike the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office", and insert in its place the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office";
- append the sentence "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH civilian workforce." to paragraph "g" of Chapter V, Section 137;

- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Robins Air Force Base, GA civilian workforce.” to paragraph “h” of Chapter V, Section 137;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Hill Air Force Base, UT civilian workforce.” to paragraph “i” of Chapter V, Section 137;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Tinker Air Force Base, OK civilian workforce.” to paragraph “j” of Chapter V, Section 137, and;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Bolling Air Force Base, DC civilian workforce.” to paragraph “k” of Chapter V, Section 137, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 19,
Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office Within Each Military Department and the
Defense Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 137 of the Bill.

Limits realignment of Wright-Patterson AFB, OH CPO to transactional functions, and; retains capability to perform personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, Robins AFB, GA, Hill AFB, UT, Tinker AFB, OK, and Bolling AFB, DC.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 19, Consolidated Civilian Personnel Office Within Each Military Department and the Defense Agencies, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that in paragraph "h" of Chapter V, Section 137, the Commission strike the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office", and insert in its place the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office";
- append the sentence "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH civilian workforce." to paragraph "g" of Chapter V, Section 137;
- append the sentence "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and

non-transactional functions necessary to support Robins Air Force Base, GA civilian workforce.” to paragraph “h” of Chapter V, Section 137;

- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Hill Air Force Base, UT civilian workforce.” to paragraph “i” of Chapter V, Section 137;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Tinker Air Force Base, OK civilian workforce.” to paragraph “j” of Chapter V, Section 137, and;
- append the sentence “Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support Bolling Air Force Base, DC civilian workforce.” to paragraph “k” of Chapter V, Section 137, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 138-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 22,
Consolidate Correctional Facilities in Joint Regional Correctional Facilities,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 138 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 22, Consolidate Correctional Facilities in Joint Regional Correctional Facilities, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 22,
Consolidate Correctional Facilities in Joint Regional Correctional Facilities,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 138 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 22, Consolidate Correctional Facilities in Joint Regional Correctional Facilities, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 139-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 26,
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional and
Hopewell, Virginia Offices,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 139 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 26, Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional and Hopewell, Virginia Offices, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 26,
Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional and
Hopewell, Virginia Offices,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 139 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 26, Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional and Hopewell, Virginia Offices, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 27,
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR
D&A Capability,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 140 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 27, Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR D&A Capability, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 27,
Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR
D&A Capability,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 140 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 27, Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR D&A Capability, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 30,
Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 141 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 30, Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 30,
Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 141 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 30, Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



'

1



Motion # 142-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 31,
Consolidate Transportation Command Components,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 142 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 31, Consolidate Transportation Command Components, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 31,
Consolidate Transportation Command Components,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 142 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 31, Consolidate Transportation Command Components, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 33,
Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel and Recruiting Centers for
Army and Air Force,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 143 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 33, Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel and Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 33,
Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel and Recruiting Centers for
Army and Air Force,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 143 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 33, Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel and Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Vertical text or markings along the left edge of the page, possibly a scanning artifact or a very faint column of text.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 33,
Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel and Recruiting Centers for
Army and Air Force,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 143 of the Bill.

Deletes relocation of ARPC from Buckley Annex, CO.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Recommendation 33, Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, ~~2~~4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center processing functions to Randolph Air Force Base, TX, and consolidating them with the Air Force Personnel Center at Randolph Air Force Base, TX, and" of Chapter V, Section 143,";
- that the Commission strike paragraph "c" of Chapter V, Section 143, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 33,
Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel and Recruiting Centers for
Army and Air Force,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 143 of the Bill.

Relocates functions performed at Buckley Annex, CO to Buckley AFB, CO;
deletes realignment of Robins AFB, GA.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Recommendation 33, Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language in paragraph "b" of Chapter V, Section 143 of the Bill "by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center processing functions to Randolph Air Force Base, TX, and consolidating them with the Air Force Personnel Center at Randolph Air Force Base, TX," and insert in its place "by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center to Buckley Air Force Base, Denver CO.";
- that the Commission strike paragraph "c" of Chapter V, Section 143, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 33,
Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel and Recruiting Centers for
Army and Air Force,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 143 of the Bill.

Deletes realignment of Robins AFB, GA.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Recommendation 33, Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 3 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike paragraph "c" of Chapter V, Section 143, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 144-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 35,
Create Joint Mobilization Sites,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 144 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 35, Create Joint Mobilization Sites, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 35,
Create Joint Mobilization Sites,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 144 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 35, Create Joint Mobilization Sites, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 145-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 37,
Defense Finance and Accounting Service,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 145 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 37, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 37,
Defense Finance and Accounting Service,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 145 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved

Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 37, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Recommendation 37,
Defense Finance and Accounting Service,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 145 of the Bill.

Closes DFAS Denver; retains Rome, NY and Limestone, ME; directs DFAS assign functions to provide for strategic redundancy.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Recommendation 37, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 3, 4 and 6 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the entire recommendation, and insert in its place **“Close the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) sites at Denver, CO; Rock Island IL; Pensacola Saufley Field, FL; Norfolk Naval Station, VA; Lawton, OK; Pensacola Naval Air Station, FL; Omaha, NE; Dayton, OH; St. Louis, MO; San Antonio, TX; San Diego, CA; Pacific Ford Island, HI; Patuxent River, MD; Charleston, SC; Orlando, FL; Lexington, KY; Kansas City, MO; Seaside, CA; San Bernardino, CA; and Oakland, CA. Relocate the functions performed at these locations to the DFAS sites at Cleveland, OH, Columbus, OH, Indianapolis, IN Limestone, and ME, Rome, NY, grow the DFAS site at Cleveland, OH, to not less than 1500 Work Years; grow the DFAS site at Limestone, ME to not less than 600, and grow the DFAS site at Rome, NY to not less than 1000 Work Years; maintain not less than the current FTEs at the DFAS sites at Columbus, OH, and Indianapolis, IN. Assign functions among the DFAS**

sites retained to provide for strategic redundancy in all critical tasks.

Realign the Arlington, VA site by relocating all functions to the remaining DFAS sites except the minimum essential DFAS liaison staff to support the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Military Service Chief Financial Officers, and Congressional requirements, which will be retained in the National Capital Region.”, and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 41,
Joint Basing,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 146 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 41, Joint Basing, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 41,
Joint Basing,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 146 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 41, Joint Basing, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 41,
Joint Basing,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 146 of the Bill.

Deletes a reference apparently consolidating the Naval Research Laboratory, a Navy Working Capital Fund Activity, with dissimilar organizations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 41, Joint Basing, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “Naval Research Laboratory (NRL),” where it appears in paragraph “d”, Chapter V, Section 146 of the Bill, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

And, that further, the Commission makes the additional statement: “NRL is a Secretary of the Navy Working Capital Fund Activity. Real property and BOS functions integral to the research and industrial functions at NRL will remain with the Commanding Officer. Because of Navy’s centralization of installation management functions, Naval District Washington provides non-mission related

services to NRL already, such as Morale, Welfare, and Recreation and food services. This is not intended to alter that relationship.”

And further, as pertains to the entire Joint Basing recommendation, the Commission states that, “Manpower savings shall not be directed, as they are in the DoD proposal, but must be derived from standard manpower and functional analysis studies, and cooperative joint determinations between the affected installations. Moreover, the Department of Defense must provide DoD-wide standards for delivery of services and common definitions for those services before installation management functions are relocated from the losing activities.”



Motion # 147-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 44,
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 147 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint
Cross Service Group Recommendation 44, Relocate Air Force Real Property
Agency, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 41,
Joint Basing,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 146 of the Bill.

Deletes a reference apparently consolidating the Naval Research Laboratory, a Navy Working Capital Fund Activity, with dissimilar organizations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 41, Joint Basing, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "Naval Research Laboratory (NRL)," where it appears in paragraph "d", Chapter V, Section 146 of the Bill, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

And, that further, the Commission makes the additional statement: "NRL is a Secretary of the Navy Working Capital Fund Activity. Real property and BOS functions integral to the research and industrial functions at NRL will remain with the Commanding Officer. Because of Navy's centralization of installation management functions, Naval District Washington provides non-mission related

services to NRL already, such as Morale, Welfare, and Recreation and food services. This is not intended to alter that relationship.”

And further, as pertains to the entire Joint Basing recommendation, the Commission states that, “Manpower savings shall not be directed, as they are in the DoD proposal, but must be derived from standard manpower and functional analysis studies, and cooperative joint determinations between the affected installations. Moreover, the Department of Defense must provide DoD-wide standards for delivery of services and common definitions for those services before installation management functions are relocated from the losing activities.”

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 44,
Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 147 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 44, Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 148-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 46,
Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 148 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 46, Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 46,
Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 148 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 46, Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion # 149-1

A Motion to Approve
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 49,
Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 149 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 49, Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group
Recommendation 49,
Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations,
appearing at Chapter V, Section 149 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 49, Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.



Motion #150-1

A Motion to Approve
Industrial Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 4,
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California,
appearing at Chapter VI, Section 150 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Industrial Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 4, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Strike
Industrial Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 4,
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California,
appearing at Chapter VI, Section 150 of the Bill.

Offered by: -----

Seconded by: -----

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Industrial Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 4, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Motion to Amend
Industrial Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation 4,
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California,
appearing at Chapter VI, Section 150 of the Bill.

Deletes relocation of tactical missile maintenance.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Navy Recommendation 9, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language “; relocate the depot maintenance of Other Components to Anniston Army Depot, AL; and relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA.”, and replace it with the language “; and relocate the depot maintenance of Other Components to Anniston Army Depot, AL.”, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.