

1. Applicant's Name:

- a. **Application Date:** 27 May 2024
- b. **Date Received:** 4 June 2024
- c. **Counsel:** Yes

2. REQUEST, ISSUES, BOARD TYPE, AND DECISION:

a. **Applicant's Requests and Issues:** The current characterization of service for the period under review is general (under honorable conditions). The applicant through counsel, requests an upgrade to honorable and changes to the SPD and RE codes, and narrative reason.

b. The applicant through counsel, seeks relief contending, in effect, to having PTSD and other mental health issues. Equity to follow upon hearing date.

c. **Board Type and Decision:** In a telephonic person appearance hearing conducted on 3 February 2025, and by a 5-0 vote, the Board denied the request upon finding the separation was both proper and equitable.

Please see Section 10 of this document for more detail regarding the Board's decision.

(Board member names available upon request)

3. DISCHARGE DETAILS:

a. **Reason / Authority / Codes / Characterization:** Unacceptable Conduct / AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2B / JNC / General (Under Honorable Conditions)

b. **Date of Discharge:** 6 July 2009

c. **Separation Facts:**

(1) **Date of Notification of Intent to Separate:** 28 October 2008

(2) **Basis for Separation:** The applicant was informed to show cause for retention on active duty under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2b for misconduct, moral, and professional dereliction, due to the following reasons:

(a) Between 22 and 24 June 2008, the applicant wrongfully used cocaine, a controlled substance in violation of Article 112a, Uniformed Code of Military Justice and AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2b(10).

(b) The applicant adulterated the urine specimen the applicant provided during a urinalysis in order to hide the applicant's cocaine use and interfere with administrative proceedings in violation of AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2b(8).

(3) **Legal Consultation Date:** NIF

(4) Board of Inquiry (BOI): On 20 November 2008, the applicant requested consideration of their case before a BOI.

(5) GOSCA Recommendation Date / Characterization: On 21 May 2009, the GOSCA reviewed the applicant's request for a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service, however recommended the applicant be involuntarily eliminated from service. / Under Other Than Honorable Conditions

(6) DA Board of Review for Eliminations: NIF

(7) Separation Decision Date / Characterization: NIF

4. SERVICE DETAILS:

a. Date / Period of Appointment: 27 February 2003 / Indefinite

b. Age at Appointment: / Education: 26 / 2 years of college

c. Highest Grade Achieved / MOS / Total Service: CW2 / 153D, UH-60 Pilot / 13 years, and 25 days

d. Prior Service / Characterizations: RA, 12 June 1996 – 26 February 2003 / HD

e. Overseas Service / Combat Service: Korea, SWA / Iraq (27 September 2005 – 20 August 2006)

f. Awards and Decorations: AM, ARCOM-2, AAM-4, AGCM-2, NDSM, GWOTSM, KDSM, ICM-CS, NCOPDR, ASR, and OSR-4

g. Performance Ratings: 21 January 2004 – 1 July 2006 / Best Qualified
2 July 2006 – 22 April 2008 / Best Qualified

h. Disciplinary Action(s) / Evidentiary Record:

(1) Memorandum for Record, subject: Log in Error of DD Form 2624 (Drug Test Results) Form Number 0019781XX, 15 July 2008, states: on 30 June 2008,

(a) On 30 June 2008, while logging in form number 0019781XX, C__ Y__ inadvertently scanned the number 12 specimen as the number 2 specimen into the Laboratory Information Management System. The number 2 specimen was then logged in as the number 3 specimen, and so forth. Subsequently each specimen social security number thereafter was incorrectly identified with the wrong LAN.

(b) J__ M__ during the review process missed the error in which the logger made on the DD Form 2624 associated with form number 0019781XX.

(c) Upon discovery of this error the IT officer corrected the database in the Laboratory Information Management System.

(2) Electronic Copy of DD Form 2624, 16 July 2008, shows the applicant tested positive for COC (cocaine), during an Inspection Unit (IU) urinalysis testing, conducted on 24 June 2008.

(3) CID Form 94 (Agent's Investigation Report), 25 July 2008, states prior to the applicant being read the applicant's legal rights, the applicant made the following spontaneous statement, "It's not possible (applicant) urine tested positive for Cocaine." A search of the applicant's living quarters and locker resulted in no evidence being found. The command judge advocate opined there was probable cause to believe the applicant committed the offense of Wrongful Use of Controlled Substance, when the applicant provided a urine specimen that tested positive for cocaine.

(4) CID Report of Investigation - Initial Final, 28 July 2008, shows an investigation established probable cause to believe the applicant committed the offense of Wrongful Use of a Controlled Substance when the applicant submitted a urine specimen on 24 June 2008, during the conduct of a unit urinalysis test, which subsequently tested positive for Cocaine.

(5) Memorandum for Record, subject: Adulteration Suspect Specimen, 30 June 2008, states the processing technician observed the applicant's urine specimen had a musty odor and looked like water.

(6) Forensic Toxicology Drug Testing Laboratory, memorandum, subject: Suspected Adulterated Specimen, 17 July 2008, informed the applicant's command that the applicant's urine specimen was potentially adulterated and an official investigation may be initiated through the local CID office.

(7) Forensic Toxicology Drug Testing Laboratory, memorandum, subject: Validity Results, 11 September 2008, states the creatinine and specific gravity test results for the applicant's specimen were not consistent with ranges attributed to normal human urine.

(8) General Officer Memorandum of Reprimand, 24 September 2008, states the applicant wrongfully used cocaine. In addition, the applicant adulterated the specimen provided during the unit's urinalysis in order to hide the applicant's cocaine use and interfered with administrative proceedings. On this same date, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the GOMOR.

(9) Applicant's memorandum for U.S. Army South Commanding General, subject: Response to Letter of Reprimand, 2 October 2008, states the applicant is not guilty of the allegation of a positive urinalysis test. The applicant did not know how or why their urine sample allegedly tested positive. The applicant did not know if there was an error in the collection/testing process or if the applicant somehow unknowingly/ innocently ingested some amount of cocaine. The applicant does know that the applicant did not knowingly and consciously use cocaine.

(10) Headquarters, Joint Task Force Bravo, memorandum, subject: Request for Disposition of Case (Applicant), 21 October 2008, shows the senior commander recommended the applicant's case for a letter of reprimand and a show cause separation board.

(11) The applicant provided:

(a) Headquarters, U.S. Army South Trail Counsel, subject: Chain of Command Filing Recommendations, 21 October 2008, showing the chain of command recommended permanently filed of the applicant's GOMOR with no additional comments.

(b) Headquarters, U.S. Army South Commanding General, subject: Filing of GOMOR, (Applicant), 24 October 2008, showing the separation authority directed the GOMOR be permanently filed in the applicant's official military personnel file.

(12) Headquarters, U.S. Army South Commanding General, memorandum for applicant, subject: Initiation of Elimination, 24 October 2008, shows the applicant had to show cause for retention on active duty under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, subparagraphs 4-2b because of misconduct, moral, and professional dereliction, due to the reasons in subparagraph 3c(2) above.

(13) Applicant's Memorandum for Commander, subject: Acknowledgement of Notification for Initiation of Elimination Action, under the provisions of AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2b - (Applicant), 28 October 2008, shows the applicant acknowledged receipt.

(14) First Endorsement to Commanding Officer, U.S. Army South, subject: Initiation of Elimination on (Applicant), 20 November 2008, shows the applicant elected to request appearance before a BOI.

(15) DA Form 1574 (Report of Proceedings by Investigating Officer/Board of Officers), 15 February 2009, shows:

(a) Findings:

(1) The board found the allegation of wrongful use of cocaine between 22 and 24 June 2008 was supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

(2) The board found the allegation of the adulterated urine specimen provided during a unit urinalysis in order to hide the applicant's cocaine use and interference with administrative proceedings in violation of AR 600-8-24, paragraph 4-2b(8) was supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

(3) There was sufficient evidence to prove that the applicant's actions could be considered misconduct, moral, and professional dereliction.

(b) Recommendation: The board recommended the applicant be separated from the U.S. Army with an under other than honorable characterization of service.

(16) On 21 April 2009, the GOSCA approved the findings and recommendation of the BOI.

(17) Headquarters, U.S. Army South, Commanding General, memorandum, subject: BOI Report, 21 April 2009, shows the GOSCA provided the BOI report to the applicant.

(18) The applicant's memorandum for U.S. Army South Commanding General, subject: Request for General Characterization of Service, 20 May 2009, shows the applicant requested their 17 years of spotless military service be considered which included combat and overseas tours and a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service.

(19) Headquarters, U.S. Army South, Commanding General, memorandum to the Human Resources Command, subject: Recommendation for Elimination and Characterization of Service, (Applicant), 21 May 2009, shows the GOSCA reviewed the BOI report and the applicant's request for a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service, and recommended the applicant be discharged with a characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions.

(20) The applicant's DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty), shows the applicant was discharged on 6 July 2009 under the authority of AR 600-8-24, Chapter 4, paragraph 4-2b, by reason of Unacceptable Conduct with a general (under

honorable conditions) characterization of service. The DD Form 214 was authenticated with the applicant's electronic signature.

b. Lost Time / Mode of Return: None

c. Behavioral Health Condition(s):

(1) Applicant provided: VA Rating Decision, 14 December 2023 and VA Benefits Letter, 19 December 2023, showing the applicant was rated 70 percent disabled for PTSD.

(2) AMHRR Listed: None

5. APPLICANT-PROVIDED EVIDENCE: DD Form 293; DD Form 214; copies of military personnel records; VA Rating Decision; VA Benefits Letter; American Airlines Instructor/Evaluator Indoctrination; volunteer appreciation award; and two character statements.

6. POST SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS: American Airlines Instructor/Evaluator Indoctrination and received a volunteer appreciation award as a planning and zoning commander.

7. STATUTORY, REGULATORY AND POLICY REFERENCE(S):

a. Section 1553, Title 10, United States Code (Review of Discharge or Dismissal) provides for the creation, composition, and scope of review conducted by a Discharge Review Board(s) within established governing standards. As amended by Sections 521 and 525 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020, 10 USC 1553 provides specific guidance to the Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards when considering discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), sexual trauma, intimate partner violence (IPV), or spousal abuse, as a basis for discharge review. The amended guidance provides that Boards will include, as a voting board member, a physician trained in mental health disorders, a clinical psychologist, or a psychiatrist when the discharge upgrade claim asserts a mental health condition, including PTSD, TBI, sexual trauma, IPV, or spousal abuse, as a basis for the discharge. Further, the guidance provides that Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records and Discharge Review Boards will develop and provide specialized training specific to sexual trauma, IPV, spousal abuse, as well as the various responses of individuals to trauma.

b. Multiple Department of Defense Policy Guidance Memoranda published between 2014 and 2018. The documents are commonly referred to by the signatory authorities' last names (2014 Secretary of Defense Guidance [Hagel memo], 2016 Acting Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Carson memo], 2017 Official Performing the Duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Kurta memo], and 2018 Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness [Wilkie memo].

(1) Individually and collectively, these documents provide further clarification to the Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records when considering requests by Veterans for modification of their discharge due to mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Liberal consideration will be given to Veterans petitioning for discharge relief when the application for relief is based in whole or in part on matters relating to mental health conditions, including PTSD; TBI; sexual assault; or sexual harassment. Special consideration will be given to Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) determinations that document a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment potentially contributed to the circumstances resulting in a less than honorable discharge characterization. Special consideration will also be given in cases where a

civilian provider confers diagnoses of a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment if the case records contain narratives supporting symptomatology at the time of service or when any other evidence which may reasonably indicate that a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment existed at the time of discharge might have mitigated the misconduct that caused a discharge of lesser characterization.

(2) Conditions documented in the service record that can reasonably be determined to have existed at the time of discharge will be considered to have existed at the time of discharge. In cases in which a mental health condition, including PTSD; TBI; or sexual assault/harassment may be reasonably determined to have existed at the time of discharge, those conditions will be considered potential mitigating factors in the misconduct that caused the characterization of service in question. All Boards will exercise caution in weighing evidence of mitigation in cases in which serious misconduct precipitated a discharge with a less than Honorable characterization of service. Potentially mitigating evidence of the existence of undiagnosed combat related PTSD, PTSD-related conditions due to TBI or sexual assault/harassment as causative factors in the misconduct resulting in discharge will be carefully weighed against the severity of the misconduct. PTSD is not a likely cause of premeditated misconduct. Caution shall be exercised in weighing evidence of mitigation in all cases of misconduct by carefully considering the likely causal relationship of symptoms to the misconduct.

c. Army Regulation 15-180 (Army Discharge Review Board), sets forth the policies and procedures under which the Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to review the character, reason, and authority of any Servicemember discharged from active military service within 15 years of the Servicemember's date of discharge. Additionally, it prescribes actions and composition of the Army Discharge Review Board under Public Law 95-126; Section 1553, Title 10 United States Code; and Department of Defense Directive 1332.41 and Instruction 1332.28.

d. Army Regulation 600-8-24 (Officer Transfers and Discharges), sets forth the basic authority for the separation of commissioned and warrant officers.

(1) Paragraph 1-23a, states an officer will normally receive an honorable characterization of service when the quality of the officer's service has met the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty, or the final revocation of a security clearance under DODI 5200.02 and AR 380-67 for reasons that do not involve acts of misconduct for an officer.

(2) Paragraph 1-23b, states an officer will normally receive a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service when the officer's military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge. A separation under general (under honorable conditions) normally appropriate when an officer: Submits an unqualified resignation; Separated based on misconduct; discharged for physical disability resulting from intentional misconduct or neglect; and, for final revocation of a security clearance.

(3) Paragraph 4-2b, prescribes for the elimination of an officer for misconduct, moral or professional dereliction, or in the interests of national security.

(4) Paragraph 4-20a (previously 4-24a), states an officer identified for elimination may, at any time during or prior to the final action in the elimination case elect one of the following options: (1) Submit a resignation in lieu of elimination; (2) request a discharge in lieu of elimination; and (3) Apply for retirement in lieu of elimination if otherwise eligible.

e. Army Regulation 635-5-1 (SPD Codes) provides the specific authorities (regulatory or directive), reasons for separating Soldiers from active duty, and the SPD codes to be entered on

the DD Form 214. It identifies the SPD code of "JNC" as the appropriate code to assign commissioned officers who are discharged under the provisions of Army Regulation 600-8-24, Chapter 4-2b, unacceptable conduct.

8. SUMMARY OF FACT(S): The Army Discharge Review Board considers applications for upgrade as instructed by Department of Defense Instruction 1332.28.

a. The applicant through counsel, requests an upgrade to honorable and changes to the SPD and RE codes, and narrative reason. The applicant's AMHRR, the issues, and documents submitted with the application were carefully reviewed.

b. The applicant's DD Form 214 for the period under review, shows the applicant served 6 years, 4 months, and 10 days during which the applicant served 3 years, 9 months and 26 days of foreign service between Korea and Iraq. On 15 February 2009, a BOI found the applicant wrongfully used cocaine, adulterated the urine specimen provided during a unit urinalysis in order to hide the applicant's cocaine use, and interfered with administrative proceedings. The board and GOSCA recommended the applicant be discharged with a characterization of service of under other than honorable conditions. The applicant's AMHRR is void of the Deputy Assistant Secretary's (Army Review Boards) decision, however, the applicant's DD Form 214 shows the applicant was involuntarily eliminated from the U.S. Army with a general (under honorable conditions) characterization of service.

c. The applicant through counsel, requests the narrative reason for the discharge be changed. The applicant was separated under the provisions of Chapter 4, paragraph 4-2b, AR 600-8-24 with a general (under honorable conditions) discharge. The narrative reason specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under this paragraph is "Unacceptable Conduct," and the separation code is "JNC." Army Regulation 635-8, Separation Processing and Documents, governs preparation of the DD Form 214 and dictates the entry of the narrative reason for separation, entered in block 28 and separation code, entered in block 26 of the form, will be exactly as listed in tables 2-2 or 2-3 of AR 635-5-1 (SPD Codes). The regulation further stipulates no deviation is authorized. There is no provision for any other reason to be entered under this regulation.

d. The applicant through counsel, requests the SPD code to be changed. The SPD codes are three-character alphabetic combinations that identify reasons for, and types of, separation from active duty. The primary purpose of SPD codes is to provide statistical accounting of reasons for separation. They are intended exclusively for the internal use of DoD and the Military Services to assist in the collection and analysis of separation data. The SPD Codes are controlled by OSD and then implemented in Army policy AR 635-5-1 (SPD Codes) to track types of separations. The SPD code specified by Army Regulations for a discharge under Chapter 4, paragraph 4-2b, is "JNC."

e. The applicant through counsel, requests an RE code change. Block 27 (RE Code) of the applicant's DD Form 214 shows as "NA." There is no basis for changing the DD Form 214.

f. The applicant through counsel contends, in effect, to having PTSD and other mental health issues. The applicant provided a VA Rating Decision and VA Benefits letter for review.

g. The applicant contends to having completed the American Airlines Instructor/Evaluator Indoctrination and receiving a volunteer appreciation award as a planning and zoning commander. The Army Discharge Review Board is authorized to consider post-service factors in the recharacterization of a discharge. No law or regulation provides for the upgrade of an unfavorable discharge based solely on the passage of time or good conduct in civilian life after

leaving the service. The Board reviews each discharge on a case-by-case basis to determine if post-service accomplishments help demonstrate previous in-service misconduct was an aberration and not indicative of the member's overall character.

h. The third party statements provided with the application reflect the applicant has the highest character and moral fiber very deserving of a discharge upgrade regardless of whatever past transgressions. The applicant may have had dealings with issues and struggles as most combat veterans experience however the applicant has truly evolved into a upstanding man worthy of that honor. Due to being a former NCO, the applicant's knowledge and motivation helped others during and after service in a humanitarian way.

i. Published Department of Defense guidance indicates that the guidance is not intended to interfere or impede on the Board's statutory independence. The Board will determine the relative weight of the action that led to the discharge and whether it supports relief or not. In reaching its determination, the Board shall consider the applicant's petition, available records and/or submitted documents in support of the petition.

9. DOCUMENTS / TESTIMONY PRESENTED DURING PERSONAL APPEARANCE: In addition to the evidence in the record, the Board carefully considered the additional document(s) and testimony presented by the applicant at the personal appearance hearing.

a. The applicant submitted the following additional document(s): N/A.

b. The applicant presented the following additional contention(s): Applicant, character witness, and counsel provided oral arguments in support of the contentions they provided in their written submissions and in support of their documentary evidence.

c. Counsel / Witness(es) / Observer(s): Mr. B.Y. (counsel), Mr. J.W. (witness)

10. BOARD DISCUSSION AND DETERMINATION:

a. As directed by the 2017 memo signed by A.M. Kurta, the board considered the following factors:

(1) Did the applicant have a condition or experience that may excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor, a voting member, reviewed the applicant's DOD and VA health records, applicant's statement, and/or civilian provider documentation and found that the applicant has the following potentially-mitigating diagnosis: PTSD.

(2) Did the condition exist or experience occur during military service? **Yes.** The Board's Medical Advisor found Trauma for PTSD occurred during military service.

(3) Does the condition or experience actually excuse or mitigate the discharge? **Partially.** The Board's Medical Advisor applied liberal consideration and opined that given the trauma occurred prior to the misconduct and nexus between PTSD and substance use, the applicant's misconduct of wrongful cocaine use is mitigated. However, providing a contaminated urine sample is a conscious act to avoid detection. There is no nexus between PTSD and the willful and conscious act to avoid detection.

(4) Does the condition or experience outweigh the discharge? **No.** After applying liberal consideration to the evidence, including the Board Medical Advisor opine, the Board determined that the available evidence did not support a conclusion that the applicant's PTSD outweighed

the basis for the applicant's separation –providing a contaminated urine sample during a urinalysis test.

b. Response to Contention(s):

(1) The applicant through counsel contends, in effect, to having PTSD and other mental health issues.

The Board considered this contention and determined the applicant is diagnosed with PTSD. Ultimately, the Board voted the applicant's discharge is proper and equitable as the applicant's PTSD does not mitigate the applicant's misconduct of providing a contaminated urine sample during a urinalysis test.

(2) The applicant contends to having completed the American Airlines Instructor/Evaluator Indoctrination and receiving a volunteer appreciation award as a planning and zoning commander.

The Board considered this contention and determined the applicant's completion of the American Airlines Instructor/Evaluator Indoctrination and receiving a volunteer appreciation award as a planning and zoning commander is to be commended, however the post-service accomplishments do not outweigh or excuse the applicant's basis for separation, providing a contaminated urine sample during a urinalysis test.

c. The Board determined that the discharge is, at this time, proper and equitable, in light of the current evidence of record. The applicant has exhausted their appeal options available with ADRB. However, the applicant may still apply to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records. The applicant is responsible for satisfying the burden of proof and providing documents or other evidence sufficient to support the applicant's contention(s) that the discharge was improper or inequitable.

d. Rationale for Decision:

(1) The Board voted not to change the applicant's characterization of service because, despite applying liberal consideration of all the evidence before the Board, the applicant's PTSD did not excuse or mitigate the offenses of providing a contaminated urine sample during a urinalysis test. Aside from no medical mitigation for the basis of separation, the Board noted the applicant offered no explanation regarding how the urine specimen could have left the chain of custody and how the applicant's urine specimen may have become contaminated. The discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation, was within the discretion of the separation authority, and the applicant was provided full administrative due process. Therefore, the applicant's General (Under Honorable Conditions) discharge was proper and equitable, as the applicant's misconduct fell below that level of meritorious service warranted for an upgrade to Honorable discharge.

(2) The Board voted not to change the applicant's reason for discharge or accompanying SPD code under the same rationale, as the reason the applicant was discharged was both proper and equitable.

(3) The RE code will not change, as the current code is consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the regulation.

ARMY DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD CASE REPORT AND DIRECTIVE

AR20240007533

11. BOARD ACTION DIRECTED:

- a. Issue a New DD-214 / Separation Order: No
- b. Change Characterization to: No Change
- c. Change Reason / SPD Code to: No Change
- d. Change RE Code to: No Change
- e. Change Authority to: No Change

Authenticating Official:

3/20/2025

X

Presiding Officer, COL, U.S. ARMY

Army Discharge Review Board

Legend:

AWOL – Absent Without Leave
AMHRR – Army Military Human
Resource Record
BCD – Bad Conduct Discharge
BH – Behavioral Health
CG – Company Grade Article 15
CID – Criminal Investigation
Division
ELS – Entry Level Status
FG – Field Grade Article 15

GD – General Discharge
HS – High School
HD – Honorable Discharge
IADT – Initial Active Duty Training
MP – Military Police
MST – Military Sexual Trauma
N/A – Not applicable
NCO – Noncommissioned Officer
NIF – Not in File
NOS – Not Otherwise Specified

OAD – Ordered to Active Duty
OBH (I) – Other Behavioral
Health (Issues)
OMPF – Official Military
Personnel File
PTSD – Post-Traumatic Stress
Disorder
RE – Re-entry
SCM – Summary Court Martial
SPCM – Special Court Martial

SPD – Separation Program
Designator
TBI – Traumatic Brain Injury
UNC – Uncharacterized
Discharge
UOTHC – Under Other Than
Honorable Conditions
VA – Department of Veterans
Affairs