



CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS**

THIRD ADDENDUM TO RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2016-04933-4

Work-Product

COUNSEL: *Work-Product*

HEARING REQUESTED: YES

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

The Board reconsider his requests for the following based on allegations of reprisal pursuant to DoDD 7050.06, *Military Whistleblower Protection*, and 10 U.S.C. § 1034:

1. His Officer Performance Report (OPR) for the period 2 Nov 12 through 15 Jun 13 be voided and removed from his records.
2. His OPR for the period 16 Jun 13 through 27 May 14 be voided and removed from his records.
3. He be awarded an end of tour Meritorious Service Medal (MSM) for his time at Joint Base San Antonio-Lackland.
4. His Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF) for the P0414B Selection Board be voided and removed from his officer selection record (OSR).
5. His original rater, additional rater and reviewer be removed from his rating chain for the 2013 OPR.
6. His original rater, additional rater and reviewer be removed from his rating chain for the 2014 OPR.
7. Independent and non-biased officials be assigned as replacement raters of his rating chain and senior rater.
8. The replacement OPR be signed by the replacement raters of his rating chain and it be substituted for the 2013 OPR.
9. The replacement OPR be signed by the replacement raters of his rating chain and it be substituted for the 2014 OPR.
10. The records of his closest peers be mimicked for the 2016-2022 time period.
11. The Secretary of the Air Force (SECAF) submit his name to the President for promotion to major general (O-8).

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2016-04933-4
CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY**

Controlled by: SAF/MRB
CUI Categories: SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY
Limited Dissemination Control: N/A
POC: SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil

11. He be retired in the grade of major general (O-8) with 40 years of service as of 1 Jun 23.

12. He be awarded a Legion of Merit (LOM) for his exemplary service in light of the great injustices done to him by the United States Air Force.

13. He be provided all back pay and allowances without any offset or deductions as if he had been promoted to the grade of major (O-4) in 2014, lieutenant colonel (O-5) twice below-the-zone in 2017 and colonel (O-6) twice below-the-zone in 2020.

Counsel, on behalf of the applicant, also makes a new request that he be provided with copies of the Air Force Inspector General's (IG) complete report, to include any exhibits related to his allegations of reprisal and any other materials the Under Secretary submitted to the AFBCMR.

RESUME OF THE CASE

The applicant is a former Air Force captain (O-3).

The applicant completed a prior period of active duty service in the Regular Army from 1 Jun 91 to 1 Mar 95 as an infantry officer.

The applicant's OPR for the period 16 Jun 13 through 27 May 14 includes final comment in the additional rater's assessment, "Outspoken officer and chaplain; continue to challenge with more responsibility."

The applicant's PRF for the P0414B includes final comment, "Tremendous advocate for airmen; continue to challenge with deputy chaplain position next."

On 12 Dec 14, the applicant filed an IG complaint of reprisal against three responsible management officials (RMO). On 6 May 16, SAF/IGQ informed the DoD OIG the applicant's nine allegations of reprisal were **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

On 31 Jul 16, the applicant was honorably discharged in the grade of O-3 with a narrative reason for separation of "Non-selection, Permanent Promotion." He was credited with 9 years, 5 months and 3 days of active duty service. He was also credited with 3 years, 10 months and 16 days of prior active duty service.

On 19 Dec 19, the Board considered and denied his requests. The Board found no evidence the applicant's OPRs and PRF were not a true and accurate assessment of his potential or that there were any errors contrary to the governing instructions. Since the Board found no errors with the reports, the Board found insufficient evidence to recommend the OPRs be reaccomplished, he be considered by a special selection board (SSB) for promotion to the grade of O-4, he be awarded an MSM for his permanent change of station (PCS) assignment or that he be granted any of the requested relief. With respect to the applicant's allegation that he was the victim of reprisal in violation of 10 U.S.C. § 1034, the Board conducted an independent review and concluded the applicant was not the victim of reprisal. The Board in this case reviewed the Wing Inspector General (WG/IG) report of investigation (ROI), Concerning Allegations of Reprisal, 10 Jun 15 to 29 Dec 15.

On 15 Mar 21, the DoD OIG informed the applicant they reviewed his 5 Nov 20 DoD Hotline complaint requesting reconsideration of his IG reprisal complaint and found no basis to reverse the prior decision. The case remained closed.

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

On 11 Aug 21, the Board reconsidered and denied his requests. The Board applied liberal consideration; however, found the evidence insufficient to overturn the previous Board's decision. The applicant contended he suffered retribution and his first amendment rights were violated for expressing his religious views during a sermon. The Board again found no evidence his OPRs or PRF were incorrect as written to grant any of the requested relief. The applicant also alleged he was the victim of reprisal in violation of 10 U.S.C. § 1034. The Board noted the ROI included nine allegations and all nine allegations were **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Further, the wing judge advocate (WG/JA) found the ROI to be legally sufficient and concurred with the findings and conclusions. SAF/IGQ completed an Addendum to the ROI on 22 Apr 16 to provide clarity and to ensure the ROI included a proper application of the Acid Test for Abuse of Authority. SAF/IGQ concurred with the ROI findings that the applicant was not reprimed against and the RMOs did not abuse their authority. The Department of Defense (DoD) Oversight Branch Chief, Whistleblower Reprisal Investigations, declined to revise their prior determination. The Board conducted its own independent review and also concluded the applicant was not the victim of reprisal.

On 27 Mar 23, the Board reconsidered and denied the applicant's requests. The Board again applied liberal consideration and concluded the evidence was insufficient to overturn the previous Board's decision. On 15 Mar 21, the DoD OIG Oversight Branch Chief, Whistleblower Reprisal Investigation Office advised the applicant they found no basis to reverse their prior decision. The former DoD OIG Senior Investigator who conducted a review of the applicant's reprisal investigation provided the applicant a memorandum dated 26 Jan 22 stating he reviewed the applicant's case in the summer of 2021 and he found there were obvious errors, that taken together, could have substantiated the applicant's reprisal case. The applicant requested the Board obtain an unredacted copy of the DoD OIG report and contended the DoD OIG ROI would vindicate him. The AFBCMR was unsuccessful in obtaining a copy of the unredacted IG ROI. Notwithstanding, the Board noted SAF/IG, DoD OIG and previous AFBCMR Boards found insufficient evidence the applicant was reprimed against in violation of 10 U.S.C. § 1034.

For an accounting of the applicant's request and the rationale of the earlier decisions, see the AFBCMR Letter and Record of Proceedings at Exhibit M.

On 22 Sep 23, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness (OUSDP&R) informed the applicant's counsel, the applicant's reprisal case was remanded to the AFBCMR for reconsideration pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 1034(h) and DoDD 7050.06.

In a memorandum dated 6 Oct 23, the OUSDP&R remanded the applicant's case to the AFBCMR for consideration of the SAF/IG's complete report, including exhibits, related to the applicant's allegations of reprisal and all related material per 10 U.S.C. § 1034(h).

On 19 Oct 23, counsel, on behalf of the applicant, requested reconsideration of his request. In support of his reconsideration request, the applicant provided the following new evidence: (1) the declaration and memorandum for record (MFR) of the senior DoD OIG investigator who investigated the applicant's reprisal complaint; (2) Email thread outlining the illegal, unethical and immoral practices; (3) Facebook post on who was stratified above the applicant and (4) Problems with the reprisal investigation. Counsel hopes the Board will agree with the senior investigator the applicant was retaliated against, the investigations into his Whistleblower complaint were inadequate and incompetent, and that the IG failed to properly address his retaliation, which led to his illegal discharge. The new evidence includes the following:

a. The senior DoD OIG investigator provided a declaration in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (Civil Action). He stated he was the senior investigator who reviewed the applicant's case in the summer of 2021. He stated the unredacted version of the ROI facts demonstrate there was possible animus against the applicant because of his religious views,

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

which may have contributed to the overall decision to not investigate his reprisal allegations. In his review and opinion, the applicant's reprisal complaint was worthy of further examination by the DoD OIG and it was the recommendation he made to his management. In an MFR dated 13 Jan 21, the senior investigator added the information provided was his personal observation and it did not represent the DoD OIG's views. He stated the applicant made protected communication to his commander about the reading of basic military training (BMT) trainees' end of course (EOC) surveys before completion of BMT. In some cases, it led to the abuse of trainees and the disclosure did not sit well with the applicant. It was also the opinion of the senior investigator that later, after his PCS the applicant experienced bias by his immediate and additional rater. His rater and additional rater referred to the applicant's protected communication as "lack of officership." The senior investigator wrote that it was more than likely the applicant was retaliated against. Ultimately, the DoD OIG's failure to connect the evidence cost him his career.

b. The applicant provides an email showing on 28 Jan 14, he emailed the major command commander (MAJCOM/CC). He stated his IG complaint fixed the unethical and illegal practice of lying to trainees about the results of the EOC survey. However, no one had been held accountable for deceiving trainees in order to identify military training instructor (MTI) misconduct. The applicant noted sexual assaults and unprofessional relationships at BMT were a travesty; however, he and other BMT chaplains and MTIs believed BMT erred in the opposite direction and was no longer producing warrior airmen of character because the training was too soft. In a response dated 28 Jan 14, the MAJCOM/CC stated he was interested in his perspective and the perspective of other chaplains and asked the applicant to schedule a meeting to discuss specifics in order to gain better insight.

c. He provides an email dated 5 Mar 14 from the applicant to the MAJCOM Chaplain regarding the lack of leadership and professionalism exhibited by the chaplain leadership at his installation. In response, the MAJCOM Chaplain in an email dated 7 Mar 14 responded that the applicant's concerns had been considered at the highest levels of leadership within the MAJCOM. The applicant was thanked for his trepidations contributing to a better BMT environment.

d. The applicant asserts there were problems with the reprisal investigation. The investigating officer (IO) did not consider all of his protected communication, nor were they mentioned in the ROI. The ROI appears as if there was a predetermined outcome and the evidence was tailored to meet the objective. His removal from BMT and subsequent letter of counseling (LOC) form the basis of his unfavorable personnel actions.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit N.

Per the OUSD P&R remand memorandum dated 6 Oct 23, the Board reviewed the SAF/IGQ memorandum to the DoD/Whistleblower Reprisal Investigations dated 6 May 16, with unredacted ROI (ACTS FRNO 2014-22818/DCATS #20150107-029317), SAF/IGQ Addendum ROI and Exhibits. The ROI reflects on 12 Dec 14, the applicant filed an IG complaint of reprisal against three RMOs. The applicant's nine allegations of reprisal were **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. The IO also found the abuse of authority did not take place. The AF/JAA legal advisor reviewed the ROI and concurred with the findings and conclusions. The ROI includes the following allegations:

Allegation 1: On or about 5 Jun 14, [redacted] reprisal against the applicant by preparing a downgraded final line in his PRF in response to the applicant's protected communication. The IO stated [redacted] acted within their authority and that the recommendations for the PRF were based on personal observation and knowledge of the applicant's past behavior while he was assigned to the base chaplains' office. Reprisal: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

Allegation 2: On or about 5 Jun 14, [redacted] reprimed against the applicant by preparing a downgraded final line in his PRF in response to the applicant's protected communication. The evidence did not support [redacted] was motivated by reprimand. The IO found [redacted] acted within their authority and the recommendations for the applicant's PRF were based on existing records and discussions with his first line supervisor as well as with their own supervisor. Reprimand: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

Allegation 3: On or about 5 Jun 14, [redacted] reprimed against the applicant by providing a downgraded final line in his OPR in response to a protected communication. The preponderance of evidence establishes [redacted] acted reasonably when choosing words for incorporation into the final line of the applicant's OPR. The actions were based on personal observations and knowledge of the applicant's performance during the rating period. The evidence did not support the view [redacted] was motivated by reprimand for the applicant having made protected communication. Reprimand: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

Allegation 4: On or about 5 Jun 14, [redacted] reprimed against the applicant by providing a downgraded final line in his OPR in response to a protected communication. The preponderance of the evidence establishes [redacted's] actions were based on personal observations and knowledge of the applicant's behavior during the rating period. The evidence did not support the view [redacted] was motivated by reprimand for the applicant having made protected communication. The IO concluded [redacted] acted within their authority and the "downgraded" final line in the OPR accurately reflected his performance. Reprimand: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

Allegation 5: On or about 13 May 14, [redacted] failed to submit an end of assignment decoration in response to a protected communication. [Redacted] acted reasonably in discussions and the ultimate decision relative to the issuance of an end of tour decoration. There was no evidence [redacted] was motivated by reprimand for the applicant making protected communication. [Redacted] acted within their authority when determining to not recommend the applicant for an end of tour decoration and the action was based on the applicant's behavior during the period. Reprimand: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

Allegation 6: On or about 13 May 14, [redacted] failed to submit an end of assignment decoration in response to a protected communication. The preponderance of the evidence establishes that [redacted] acted reasonably in their discussions and ultimate decision relative to the applicant's end of tour decoration. The evidence did not support the view [redacted] was motivated by reprimand for the applicant having made protected communications. The evidence demonstrated the actions were based on the applicant's behavior during the period. Reprimand: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

Allegation 7: On or about 13 May 14, [redacted] failed to submit an end of assignment decoration in response to a protected communication. The preponderance of the evidence established the wing chaplain acted reasonably in his discussions with the applicant's supervisors and the collective decision relative to the issuance of an end of assignment decoration. There is no evidence to support the view [redacted] was motivated by reprimand for the applicant making protected communications. The

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

evidence demonstrated [redacted] acted reasonably when determining not to recommend the applicant for an end of assignment decoration and that the action was based on the applicant's behavior during the assignment. Reprisal: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

Allegation 8: On or about 26 Mar 14, [redacted] reprised against the applicant by providing him written counseling in the form of an MFR that was placed in the applicant's personnel information file (PIF) in response to protected communication. The preponderance of the evidence established that [redacted] acted reasonably in the decision to issue the applicant a written counseling in the form of an MFR for failing to properly utilize his chain of command. [Redacted] took the action to correct a pattern of behavior rather than to reprise against the applicant for having made protected communications. The actions were based on the applicant's behavior and a desire to correct the behavior. Reprisal: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

Allegation 9: On or about 5 Jun 14, [redacted] reprised against the applicant by preparing a downgraded final line in his PRF in a response to a protected communication. The IO found [redacted] acted within their authority and the recommendations for the applicant's PRF were based on personal observation and knowledge of the applicant's past behavior while he was assigned to the installation. Reprisal: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**. Abuse of Authority: **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

The ROI includes that the applicant was counseled. The unsigned AF Form 174, *Record of Individual Counseling (RIC)*, signed by the applicant on 21 Jun 13, reflects he was removed from serving in the training squadron and was required to coordinate all advice to leadership through the branch and installation chaplain in writing. The applicant was counseled for advising trainees that BMT did not prepare them to pull the trigger or see their friends die next to them and that their EOC surveys would be read before they completed BMT. The applicant also referred to the group commander's comments at staff meeting as "platitudes." The applicant was counseled it was never appropriate to undermine the commander. In a response dated 21 Jun 13, the applicant indicated he learned how to better advise leadership and apologized his comments discredited the Air Force. A memorandum of counseling from his branch chief dated 26 Mar 14 reflects he was counseled for failure to properly utilize his chain of command. On 27 Feb 14, the wing chaplain contacted the applicant's supervisor to set up a meeting for him with the applicant as requested by the applicant. Also, on 7 Mar 14, the branch chief was courtesy copied on an email from the MAJCOM chaplain to the applicant in a response to the applicant's email regarding perceived problems with the installation chaplain's leadership. The email was in response to the applicant's 5 Mar 14 email, which bypassed his chain of command. The memorandum of counseling noted the applicant had a pattern in which he addressed issues to his chain of command if he did not receive the desired answer. His tendency was to proceed up the chain without consulting his chain of command. It was noted that the behavior needed to stop. In a response dated 6 Apr 14, the applicant indicated he properly utilized his chain of command and requested the counseling be shredded or amended. The RIC and memorandum of counseling are not contained in the applicant's ARMS record.

The SAF/IGQ Addendum ROI noted there were anomalies in the ROI and an incorrect analysis on abuse of authority for allegations 4, 5, and 7. The IO erroneously stated that the mere potential of causing harm is by definition an adverse effect. The "potential to affect" is the correct standard when analyzing for reprisal but is not the standard for analyzing for abuse of authority. SAF/IGQ determined the error did not affect the findings and conclusion as the IO appropriately determined abuse of authority was **NOT SUBSTANTIATED** on all allegations. The errors also did not

affect the legal sufficiency of the ROI or its findings and conclusion. The IO did not follow the standard when analyzing each allegation for abuse of authority and used a narrative to complete his analysis. Although the IO did not list the reasons, reasonableness and consistency when determining whether the RMOs actions were arbitrary and capricious, it is clear the IO considered the necessary factors in the analysis. The abuse of authority analysis was determined legally sufficient. The investigation complied with all applicable legal and administrative requirements. On 9 May 16, AF/JAA found the ROI, as amended by the SAF/IGQ addendum, legally sufficient and indicated the case could be closed in accordance with AFI 90-301, *Inspector General Complaints Resolution*.

On 15 Mar 21, DoD OIG informed the applicant in response to his DoD Hotline complaint on 5 Nov 20, they reviewed the prior decision and found no basis to reverse the prior decision. The applicant's case would remain closed. Moreover, the DoD OIG determined he provided no evidence to dispute the fact that the actions taken were a violation of regulation or statute.

On 22 Sep 23, OUSD P&R informed the applicant's counsel his reprisal appeal was complete. If after reconsideration by the AFBCMR, the applicant, if desired, could submit a new appeal with appropriate supporting documentation and explanation.

APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE

Per 10 U.S.C. § 1034 and AFI 90-301 reprisal against military members for making protected disclosures is prohibited.

10 U.S.C. § 1034(g)(2), Correction of Records When Prohibited Action Taken. In resolving an application for which there is a report of the IG, the AFBCMR shall review the report of the IG.

10 U.S.C. § 1034(h), Review by the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF). Upon the completion of all administrative review, the member or former member who made the allegation, if not satisfied with the disposition of the matter, may submit the matter to the SECDEF. The SECDEF shall decide to reverse or uphold the decision of the Secretary of the military department concerned in the matter within 90 days after receipt of such a submittal.

DAFI 36-2907, *Adverse Administrative Actions*, Paragraph 2.3., Verbal Counseling and Records of Individual counseling. Commanders, first sergeants, supervisors and other individuals in the member's administrative or operational chain of command will assist airmen in developing skills, attitudes and behaviors that are consistent with Air Force standards. Members of the administrative or operational chain of command will routinely counsel airmen and verbally or in writing, to include verbal counseling, RIC and letters of counseling (LOC).

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed.
2. The applicant exhausted all available non-judicial relief before applying to the Board.
3. After reviewing all Exhibits, the Board remains unconvinced the evidence presented demonstrates an error or injustice. The Board reviewed the applicant's IG reprisal complaint (ACTS FRNO 2014-22818/DCATS #20150107-029317), to include the unredacted SAF/IGQ ROI, Addendum ROI and Exhibits as directed by OUSD P&R and as required by 10 U.S.C. § 1034. The Board also reviewed the new evidence provided in the applicant's reconsideration request. Having reviewed the sum of the evidence, the Board finds no evidence the applicant was the victim of reprisal or abuse of authority in violation of 10 U.S.C. § 1034. While the applicant

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

contends the investigation was inadequate and incomplete, the Board disagrees. The applicant's reprisal complaint underwent multiple legal reviews and was thoroughly reviewed by SAF/IGQ and DoD OIG. Due to anomalies, SAF/IGQ completed the Addendum to the ROI, which also was reviewed by AF/JAA, SAF/IGQ and the DoD OIG. The applicant's complaint was then again reviewed by the DoD OIG upon his DoD Hotline complaint and the DoD OIG found no basis to reverse the prior decision. While the ROI includes an RIC and a memorandum of counseling, the applicant's records include no unfavorable personnel actions. The applicant did not receive any referral OPRs or a negative PRF. The Board also finds the RIC and memorandum of counseling were not issued in reprisal but appeared to be an effort made by the applicant's supervision to improve his communication with BMT trainees and addressing issues through his chain of command. As stated in DAFI 36-2907, supervisors will routinely counsel airmen, to include verbal counseling, RICs and LOCs. The applicant has not sustained his burden of proof these counselings were in reprisal for making protected communication. The ROI includes nine allegations pertaining to the applicant's OPRs, PRF and the decision to not submit him for an award. All nine allegations were investigated and found to be not substantiated. The IO concluded there was no evidence the RMOs were motivated by reprisal. In all instances, the IO concluded the decisions on the wording of his OPRs and PRF and the decision to not recommend the applicant for an award were based on observations of his performance, past behavior, discussions with his first line supervisor and a review of his existing records. While it appears the applicant and his supervision differed in their opinions of his performance, there is no evidence the OPRs, PRF and the decision to not submit the applicant for a PCS award were in reprisal. The Board reviewed the concerns of the DoD OIG former senior investigator. The former senior investigator stated he believed the investigation possibly did not consider all the issues and may not have interviewed the necessary witnesses identified by the applicant. However, as noted by the former senior investigator, these were his opinions and beliefs and did not represent the views of the DoD OIG. The former senior investigator opined a review of the unredacted ROI would include the true and correct facts. He also noted the applicant experienced bias by his gaining unit; however, the applicant's allegations of reprisal were all directed at RMOs from his previous assignment. While the Board appreciates the views of the senior former investigator, the Board finds the applicant's reprisal complaint underwent multiple reviews by SAF/IG and DoD OIG and the findings and conclusion were determined to be legally sufficient. The Board finds no evidence the investigation was incomplete or inadequate. In view of the above, the Board concurs with the findings of the IO, SAF/IGQ, the DoD OIG and the decisions of the Board in their prior decisions that the applicant was not the victim of reprisal or abuse of authority in violation of 10 U.S.C. § 1034 . Counsel also requests he be provided a copy of the complete unredacted IG ROI; however, this Board is not a records repository and is unable to provide a copy of the unredacted ROI. Moreover, the IG ROI is a privileged document provided to the Board by SAF/IG with the understanding that it is not releasable but a privileged document. In view of the above, the Board finds the applicant has not sustained his burden of proof to warrant granting any of the requested relief. Therefore, the Board recommends against correcting the applicant's records.

4. The applicant has not shown a personal appearance, with or without counsel, would materially add to the Board's understanding of the issues involved.

RECOMMENDATION

The Board recommends informing the applicant the evidence did not demonstrate material error or injustice, and the Board will reconsider the application only upon receipt of relevant evidence not already presented.

CERTIFICATION

CUI//SP-MIL/SP-PRVCY

The following quorum of the Board, as defined in Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, paragraph 2.1, considered Docket Number BC-2016-04933-4 in Executive Session on 25 Jan 24:

<i>Work-Product</i>	Panel Chair
<i>Work-Product</i>	Panel Member
<i>Work-Product</i>	Panel Member

All members voted against correcting the record. The panel considered the following:

- Exhibit M: Second Addendum to Record of Proceedings, w/ Exhibits A-L, dated 30 Mar 23
- Exhibit N: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 19 Oct 23.
- Exhibit O: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit P: Memorandum, SAF/IGQ, w/ROI and atchs, dated 6 May 16
(WITHDRAWN).

Taken together with all Exhibits, this document constitutes the true and complete Record of Proceedings, as required by DAFI 36-2603, paragraph 4.12.9.

2/23/2024

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR
Signed by: USAF