

**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS**

Application for the Correction of
the Coast Guard Record of:

BCMR Docket No. 2014-135

██████████
██████████ SA/E-2 (former)

FINAL DECISION

This is a proceeding under the provisions of section 1552 of title 10 and section 425 of title 14 of the United States Code. The Chair docketed the case after receiving the applicant's completed application on May 14, 2014, and assigned it to staff member ██████████ as required by 33 C.F.R. § 52.61(c).

This final decision, dated February 12, 2015 is approved and signed by the three duly appointed members who were designated to serve as the Board in this case.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST AND ALLEGATIONS

The applicant asked the Board to correct her record to show that she was medically discharged because of a physical disability, rather than for unacceptable conduct. In support of her request, the applicant submitted documents including some of her medical records, various documents from her military record, and a letter from the Department of Veterans Affairs that awarded her a 30-percent disability for a depressive disorder, which are included in the summary of the record below.

SUMMARY OF THE RECORD

On November 2, 2005, at age 19, the applicant enlisted in the Coast Guard through its delayed entry program. After she joined the regular Coast Guard on January 17, 2006, she advanced to seaman apprentice (SA/E-2) and reported to a Coast Guard station.

On her first enlisted employee review (EER)¹ for her work at the station, effective July 31, 2006, the applicant received mostly average and above average marks² of 4 and 5. She

¹ The EER is a series of web pages in the Coast Guard Human Resources Management System used to report the performance evaluations of Coast Guard enlisted personnel.

² Article 10.B.6.a. of the Personnel Manual (Changes 1 to 41), COMDTINST M1000.6A, describes the marks that may be assigned by a member's rating chain. There are 7 possible marks, which range from "Unacceptable" for a

received one excellent mark of 6 for the “Adaptability” competency and was recommended for advancement to E-3 by her command.³

On January 12, 2007, the applicant was counseled as documented on an administrative remarks page (Page 7),⁴ regarding a failure to follow unit security procedures.

On her second EER, effective February 28, 2007, the applicant received mostly average and above average marks of 4 and 5. She received one excellent mark of 6 for the “Integrity” competency and was recommended for advancement.

On June 11, 2007, the applicant had an altercation with a shipmate. According to one of the Page 7s issued on July 23, 2011 addressing the incident, the applicant threw an object at her shipmate, with the possible intent of harming the shipmate or damaging the property. As a result of this incident, the applicant received a Page 7 counseling her that she was receiving a “Not Recommended” for advancement mark and directing her to go to anger management counseling. She received a second Page 7, also issued July 23, 2007, counseling her regarding her options to seek action against her shipmate. It stated that an investigation had been conducted, which concluded that the applicant’s behavior had been inappropriate. The second Page 7 also informed her of her right to file a complaint with a civil rights officer or the command chief if she disagreed with the investigation’s finding.

On July 20, 2007, the applicant left work without permission, for which she was counseled as documented on a Page 7 dated July 24, 2007.

On July 24, 2007, the applicant had a meeting with her commanding officer (CO), executive officer (XO), and her department head. A Page 7 was issued on the same day, which stated that the applicant left the meeting without permission and failed to return when ordered to do so. The Page 7 noted that the applicant’s behavior demonstrated a lack of respect for her command and any further actions of the sort would receive administrative action.

On July 28, 2007, the applicant was examined at an inpatient mental health unit at an Air Force medical center and diagnosed with DSM IV code: 309.0 Adjustment Disorder with Depressed Mood, chronic.⁵ According to a memorandum issued by a medical officer at the

mark in the first spot to a high of “Superior” for a mark in the seventh spot. A mark of 4, “Average,” represents the expected performance level of all enlisted personnel.

³The Coast Guard EER form includes a section entitled “Recommendation for Advancement.” Article 10.B.7. of the Personnel Manual provides that an enlisted service member’s rating chain must address this independent section each time an EER is completed. A member is marked as “Recommended” if his or her rating chain determines that he or she is “fully capable of satisfactorily performing the duties and responsibilities of the next higher pay grade.” A member is marked “Not Recommended” if the member is deemed not capable of the same.

⁴ Under Section 10.A. of the Coast Guard’s Personnel and Pay Procedures Manual, HIRSIINST M1000.2A, an Administrative Remarks page (Page 7) provides a means of recording miscellaneous entries, which are not recorded elsewhere in a Personnel Data Record (PDR). Administrative Remarks entries are made to document counseling or to record any other information required by current directives, or considered to be of historical value.

⁵ Adjustment disorders are defined as the development of emotional or behavioral symptoms in response to an identifiable stressor(s) occurring within three months of the onset of the stressor(s). DSM-V, p. 286. The symptoms are considered clinically significant when evidenced “marked distress that is out of proportion to the severity or intensity of the stressor, taking into account the external context and the cultural factors that might influence

medical center on July 31, 2007, the applicant was admitted to ensure her safety and the safety of her unit. The memorandum stated that the applicant's diagnosis caused her to be "administratively unsuitable for duty" and recommended that she be separated from the Coast Guard as soon as possible. It also noted that the applicant had been informed of the recommendation, agreed with, and desired separation. The memorandum stated that the applicant was deemed fit to return to duty for immediate processing for administrative separation.

On August 28, 2007, the applicant was issued a notification of intent to discharge her by reason of unsuitability, pursuant to Article 12.B.16.b.3 of the Coast Guard's Personnel Manual, COMDTINST M1000.6. The notice stated its recommendation for discharge was based on the report of the Air Force medical officer regarding her diagnosis. The applicant signed a receipt acknowledging the notification of her proposed discharge. She also indicated on the form that she was waiving her right to submit a statement on her behalf and that she did not object to the discharge.

On September 5, 2007, the captain for the parent Sector of the applicant's unit issued a memorandum recommending the applicant for discharge "for adjustment disorder, DSM IV code 309.0 adjustment disorder with depressed mood, chronic." This recommendation was endorsed by the captain for the parent District of the Sector on October 6, 2007. The endorsement also recommended that the applicant be given a reenlistment code that precludes future military service.

The applicant was discharged on November 16, 2007. Her Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty, DD 214, shows that she was discharged due to unacceptable conduct,⁶ denoted by a JNC separation code, and was not eligible to reenlist, denoted by an RE-4 reenlistment code. In the "Remarks" block of the DD 214, it was noted that the applicant was issued a DD Form 257CG.⁷ However, in the "Character of Service" block, the applicant's discharge is characterized as "Honorable."⁸ According to a Separation Authorization, dated October 18, 2007, the applicant was honorably discharged.

In support of her request, the applicant provided medical records dating from October 2011, but did not provide medical records from her time in military service. According to her records, in 2011, the applicant filed a disability claim with the Department of Veterans' Affairs (DVA). Following up on her claim, the applicant was given a compensation and pension

symptom severity and presentation" and/or "[s]ignificant impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning." *Id.* Adjustment disorders disappear within six months when the stressor or its consequences have terminated. *Id.* at p. 287. Pursuant to the Coast Guard Medical Manual in effect at the time in question, adjustment disorders are not considered physical disabilities, but when the adjustment disorder persists or treatment is deemed to be prolonged or non-curative, members are administratively (not medically) discharged. Coast Guard Medical Manual, COMDTINST M6000.1C, Art. 5.B.3. (Change 11, Feb. 16, 2007).

⁶ According to the Separation Program Designator (SPD) Handbook, the JNC separation code means that a member has been involuntarily discharged for acts of unacceptable conduct, such as moral or professional dereliction.

⁷ Article 1.E. of COMDTINST M1900.4D, the manual for completing DD 214s, lists the different discharge certificates that may be issued and noted on a member's DD 214. It notes that a DD Form 257CG is for a general discharge under honorable conditions.

⁸ Pursuant to Article 1.E. of COMDTINST M1900.4D, the discharge certificate that should be issued pursuant to an honorable discharge is a DD Form 256CG.

medical examination on October 12, 2011 by a DVA physician, where she was diagnosed with a depressive disorder, not otherwise specified (NOS).⁹ In discussing her history at the examination, she discussed, among other life events, her discharge from the Coast Guard. She reported that she had good adjustment to the Coast Guard until “conflict arose between her and her friend. She indicated that the friend ‘punched’ her; this vet reported the incident to her CO. After reporting the event, she felt that ‘the entire station turned against me. Nobody would even talk to me.’” She also reported becoming depressed and overdosing on medication at an attempt at self-harm, which led to her discharge from the Coast Guard. Regarding the discharge, she stated she feels like a “loser.” She told the physician at the examination that she was taking antidepressant medication but had a continued depressed mood.

Two days later, on October 14, 2011, the applicant was seen for elevated scores on depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) screens. The applicant requested and was referred to a mental health clinic for psychotherapy and depression. At the appointment, she also discussed the circumstances leading to her discharge from the Coast Guard and stated that she was devastated and shocked by what she experienced as a betrayal and had been mourning the loss of her career ever since. She also clarified that her overdose was an attempted suicide. Her suicide risk at the time was determined to be low.

On November 2 and 3, 2011, the applicant was seen for an initial assessment at an outpatient PTSD clinic. It was determined that the applicant should continue care at the mental health clinic, and not the PTSD clinic, to continue her care with her physician there.

On November 16, 2011, the DVA provided a medical opinion on the applicant’s disability claim. The reviewing physician found that the applicant’s condition was related to her service with the Coast Guard:

The currently diagnosed depressive disorder, nos [,] is deemed the natural progression of the mood disorder identified in the service diagnosed as adjustment disorder with depressed mood. Her depressed mood has not been in remission since first diagnosed in the service, and a central feature of her current ruminations is the perceived injustice done to her in the military.

On November 18, 2011, the applicant also received cognitive/behavioral psychotherapy from the DVA and in May and October 2012 was referred to the DVA for management of her antidepressant medication.

On January 10, 2012, the applicant received a decision letter from the DVA regarding an increase in disability compensation claim¹⁰ the applicant had filed. The decision letter stated that

⁹ The physician noted that the applicant had “Depressive Disorder, NOS” (unspecified depressive disorder). Depressive disorders are characterized by the presence of sad, empty, or irritable mood, accompanied by somatic and cognitive changes that significantly affect the individual’s ability to function. DSM-V, p. 155. An unspecified depressive disorder is applied when symptoms characteristic of a depressive disorder that cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning predominate, but do not meet the full criteria of any of the other disorders in the depressive disorders diagnostic class. *Id.* at p.184.

¹⁰ Pursuant to 38 U.S.C. §§ 1110 (wartime disability) and 1131 (peacetime disability), the DVA pays out disability compensation to veterans with disabilities that are the result of a disease or injury incurred or aggravated during

the applicant had been approved for a monthly entitlement, and attached a rating decision. The rating decision referenced the applicant's 2007 diagnosis of an adjustment disorder while in the Coast Guard and the DVA examinations to find that the applicant's depressive disorder was connected to her military service with the Coast Guard. Based upon her level of impairment, she was given a 30 percent rating.

The applicant submitted her request for relief from this Board on September 11, 2012.

VIEWS OF THE COAST GUARD

On September 10, 2014, the Judge Advocate General (JAG) of the Coast Guard submitted an advisory opinion in which he recommended that the Board grant alternative relief in this case. In so doing, he adopted the findings and analysis provided in a memorandum prepared by the Coast Guard Personnel Service Center (PSC).

PSC stated that the applicant's application to the Board was not timely as she was discharged in 2007.

PSC explained that after the applicant was discharged from the Coast Guard in 2007, a new "Adjustment Disorder" separation designation narrative and code had been created pursuant to a Coast Guard service-wide message, ALCOAST 252/09, on April 29, 2009. The new code was determined necessary by the Coast Guard to better fit the reason for discharge when an individual is "unable to adapt to military life." This change was meant to remove any negative connotation previously associated with the only available code, JNC (unacceptable conduct), for members who were discharged due to an adjustment disorder diagnosis.

PSC recommended that the Board grant alternative relief by issuing the applicant a DD 214 to change the reason for her discharge from "Unacceptable Conduct" (JNC) to "Adjustment Disorder" (JFY) and to upgrade her reenlistment code from RE-4 (not recommended for reenlistment) to RE-3G (eligible to reenlist with a waiver) to more accurately reflect the nature of her discharge pursuant to ALCOAST 252/09.

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE VIEWS OF THE COAST GUARD

On October 9, 2014, the Chair sent a copy of the views of the Coast Guard to the applicant and invited her to respond in writing within 30 days. The applicant submitted her response on November 10, 2014.

The applicant did not agree with the Coast Guard's recommendation that her discharge code be changed to JFY. The applicant noted that the definition of the JFY code indicates that it is used when an adjustment disorder exists that does not amount to a disability. However, the applicant emphasized that she had been discharged with a chronic adjustment disorder, which she alleged does amount to a disability. The applicant also noted that ALCOAST 252/09 states that the separation codes listed therein (including the JFY code) were added to better fit the cause

active military service. The benefit amount is graduated according to the degree (expressed in percentage) of the veteran's disability, pursuant to a rating schedule established in 38 C.F.R. Part 4.

for discharge when a member is unable to adapt to military life. She stated that she had not had a problem adjusting to military life and cited her first two positive EERs in support. Rather, the applicant stated:

I developed severe symptoms of depression after I was physically assaulted by a shipmate and retaliated against by many members of [her station] after seeking appropriate punishment for the shipmate who assaulted me. I felt hopeless about my Coast Guard career, and no longer felt safe living at [the station]. That incident, and the actions of members of the station, ruined my Coast Guard career. No one should be expected to adapt to the environment that I was dealing with at [the station].

The applicant also disputed the Coast Guard's finding that her application was not timely. She stated that when her discharge had been processed, she had not been told that she was receiving an administrative discharge and this fact was also not noted on her DD 214. The applicant alleged that she only discovered the nature of her discharge and its corresponding lack of benefits when she attempted to use her veteran's education benefit and was not able to do so in 2012, after which she submitted her application to this Board.

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

Article 12.B.16.b.3. of the Coast Guard Personnel Manual, (Changes 1 to 41), COMDTINST M1000.6A, in effect in 2007, authorizes enlisted personnel to be administratively discharged for unsuitability due to a diagnosed adjustment disorder.

In 2007, the Medical Manual, COMDTINST M6000.1C, established the Coast Guard's medical policies and instructions for active duty personnel at the time in question. Physical standards applicable to all Coast Guard Personnel are described in Chapter 3.F. of the manual, which also includes a non-exhaustive list of medical conditions and defects that are disqualifying, including adjustment disorders at Chapter 3.F.16.e. Chapter 3.F.16.e. states, "Transient, situational maladjustment due to acute or special stress does not render an individual unfit because of physical impairment. However, if these conditions are recurrent and interfere with military duty, are not amenable to treatment, or require prolonged treatment, administrative separation should be recommended (see Chapter 5 Section B)."

Guidelines for the disposition of adjustment disorder cases are listed in Chapter 5.B.3 of the manual, which states that adjustment disorders "are generally treatable and not usually grounds for separation. However, when these conditions persist or treatment is likely to be prolonged or non-curative (e.g. inability to adjust to military life/sea duty, separation from family/friends) process in accordance with [Article 12 of the Personnel Manual] is necessary."

Article 12.B.16.d. of the Personnel Manual provides that every member discharged under the article shall be notified of the reason he is being considered for discharge and shall be allowed to submit a statement on his own behalf.

Article 12.B.12.a.12. of the Personnel Manual authorizes enlisted personnel with a diagnosed “condition that, though not a physical disability, interferes with performance of duty” to be discharged for the convenience of the Government.

Article 1.E. of COMDTINST M1900.4D, the manual for completing DD 214s, states the following:

Block 18. Remarks. Entries in this block consist of information not shown elsewhere on the form...

12. Type of Certificate Issued.

- a. Enter the appropriate statement concerning the type of discharge certificate issued: “DD Form 256CG”, “DD Form 257CG”, “DD Form 259CG”, or “DD Form 260CG”.

• • •

Block 24. Character of Service (includes upgrades). Only "Character of Service" is to be entered--do not include or indicate the type of discharge certificate being issued.

1. Enlisted Personnel.

- a. Discharge Certificate Issued. Enter in capital letters "HONORABLE"; "UNDER HONORABLE CONDITIONS"; "UNDER OTHER THAN HONORABLE CONDITIONS"; OR "DISHONORABLE", as appropriate and consistent with the reason and authority for separation, unless otherwise directed by the MPC (SEP).

b.

<u>Type of Certificate</u>	<u>Character of Service</u>
DD Form 256CG-Honorable	Honorable
DD Form 257CG-General	Under Honorable Conditions
DD Form 794CG-Under Other Than Honorable Cond.	Under Other Than Honorable Cond.
DD Form 259CG-Bad Conduct	Under Other Than Honorable Cond.
DD Form 260CG-Dishonorable	Dishonorable

• • •

Block 25. Separation Authority.

1. Enlisted Personnel. Enter the appropriate separation authority associated with a particular authority and reason for separation...

Block 26. Separation Code. Enter the appropriate separation code (SPD) associated with a particular authority and reason for separation as shown in the SPD Handbook or as stated by the MPC-SEP in the message granting discharge authority.

Block 27. Reenlistment Code.

1. Enlisted Personnel. Enter the appropriate reenlistment code to denote whether or not the member is recommended for reenlistment...

Block 28. Narrative Reason for Separation. Only the narrative reason, i.e. UNSUITABILITY, MISCONDUCT, etc. is to be entered--do not enter additional information, i.e. "Due to frequent involvement with civil authorities, financial irresponsibility, etc."

ALCOAST 252/09, issued on April 29, 2009, states that historically, when members have been discharged for an inability to adjust to military life, the only available separation code was JNC with a narrative reason of unacceptable conduct. However, the Department of Defense has recognized the need for additional separation codes and narrative reasons and created new separation codes, specifically for members diagnosed with an adjustment disorder not amounting to a disability. The ALCOAST specifies that the new separation code JFY, narrative reason adjustment disorder, may be used for "[i]nvoluntary discharge directed by an established directive when an adjustment disorder exists, not amounting to a disability, which significantly impairs the members[sic] ability to function effectively in the military environment." The ALCOAST also establishes that the re-entry code assigned can be either RE-3G or RE-4.

ALCOAST 125/10, issued on March 18, 2010, states that, to align Coast Guard policy more closely to that of the Department of Defense, "[i]n cases where individuals are separated for cause and there is an option of assigning an RE-1 (eligible for reenlistment), RE-3 (eligible for reenlistment except for disqualifying factor), or RE-4, the RE-3 is the normal standard unless a different code is authorized by the discharge authority." For example, the ALCOAST notes that for members discharged because of alcohol incidents, an RE-3 code is prescribed unless the member engages in misconduct by, for example, incurring a DUI or refusing rehabilitative treatment, in which case an RE-4 code is prescribed. In addition, the ALCOAST eliminated the sub-categories denoted by RE-3 code letters (RE-3F, RE-3G, RE-3P, etc.) so that only the code "RE-3" appears on the DD 214.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Board makes the following findings and conclusions on the basis of the applicant's military record and submissions, the Coast Guard's submissions, and applicable law:

1. The Board has jurisdiction over this matter under 10 U.S.C. § 1552(a).

2. Under 10 U.S.C. § 1552(b), an application to the Board must be filed within three years after the applicant discovers the alleged error or injustice. The applicant in this case was administratively discharged, rather than medically discharged, approximately five years before her application was submitted to the Board for relief. Therefore, the application is not timely.

3. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 1552(b), the Board may excuse the untimeliness of an application if it is in the interest of justice to do so. In *Allen v. Card*, 799 F. Supp. 158, 164 (D.D.C. 1992), the court stated that to determine whether the interest of justice supports a waiver of the statute of limitations, the Board “should analyze both the reasons for the delay and the potential merits of the claim based on a cursory review.” The court further instructed that “the longer the delay has been and the weaker the reasons are for the delay, the more compelling the merits would need to be to justify a full review.”¹¹ Because the applicant’s delay in filing her application was not very long and a cursory review of the merits reveals that the Coast Guard has recommended that the Board grant alternative relief, the Board finds that it is in the interest of justice to excuse the untimeliness of the application and consider the case on its merits.

4. The applicant alleged that she should have been discharged for medical reasons, rather than by reason of unacceptable conduct. Since the applicant was discharged in 2007, the Coast Guard has acknowledged the negative connotation associated with a discharge by reason of “unacceptable conduct,” and has created new separation codes and narrative reasons for instances of discharge when a member is unable to adapt to military life pursuant to ALCOAST 252/09. In this case, the Coast Guard has recommended that the Board correct the applicant’s DD 214 to show separation code JFY and “adjustment disorder” as the narrative reason for separation. The applicant disagreed with the Coast Guard’s recommendation. The applicant argued that her diagnosed chronic adjustment disorder was a disability and that she did not have an issue adjusting to military life until her June 2011 fight with her shipmate, which led to symptoms of depression (and her diagnosis). However, the applicant does not allege that her symptoms and mental state following the June 2011 incident and its related events were incorrectly diagnosed while she was still in the service as an adjustment disorder. Under the Coast Guard’s policies, the disposition for a chronic adjustment disorder case is administrative separation. In discussing disqualifying conditions for duty, Chapter 3.F.16.e. of the Medical Manual establishes that if an adjustment disorder is recurrent, interferes with military duty, is not amenable to treatment, or requires prolonged treatment, administrative separation should be recommended. The Board finds that a preponderance of evidence in the record shows that no law or policy was violated by the applicant’s administrative discharge from the Coast Guard and that none would be violated by the correction of her DD 214 to show separation code JFY, with narrative reason “adjustment disorder.”

It should be noted that the applicant submitted her DVA disability claim decision in support of her allegation that she should have received a medical discharge. However, the DVA’s disability claim determinations are made according to very specific rules and purposes, pursuant to Title 38 of the United States Code and Title 38 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The DVA’s determinations do not apply to or govern Coast Guard separations and do not govern the applicant’s 2007 discharge from the Coast Guard. There is insufficient evidence supporting

¹¹ *Allen v. Card*, 799 F. Supp. 158, 164-65 (D.D.C. 1992); see *Dickson v. Secretary of Defense*, 68 F.3d 1396 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

the applicant's claim that she was unfit for duty in 2007 because of a mental disability or entitled to processing for a medical separation under the Physical Disability Evaluation System.

5. The Coast Guard also recommended that the Board change the applicant's reenlistment code, which is currently RE-4 (ineligible to reenlist). ALCOAST 252/09 allows members to be discharged with the JFY separation code to be assigned either a RE-4 or RE-3G code, which allows them to reenlist with a waiver if they convince the accessing service that the condition that caused their discharge will not prevent them from successfully performing active duty in the future. ALCOAST 125/10 updated the Coast Guard's reenlistment codes to remove the letter designations from RE-3 codes. Given the Board's decision to change the applicant's DD 214 to account for the change in the Coast Guard's policies and the Coast Guard's recommendation that her reenlistment code be changed, the Board agrees that the reenlistment code on the applicant's DD 214 should be upgraded to RE-3.

6. The Board's review of the record revealed an inconsistency with the applicant's DD 214. The applicant's discharge was noted as "Honorable" in the "Character of Service" block on her DD 214; however, the "Remarks" block notes that a DD Form 257CG was issued. Pursuant to Article 1.E. of COMDTINST M1900.4D, the discharge certificate that should be issued pursuant to an honorable discharge is a DD Form 256CG (honorable discharge) and not a DD Form 257CG (general discharge under honorable conditions). The Separation Authorization for the applicant indicates that the applicant was honorably discharged, and the Board has also confirmed with the Coast Guard that the applicant was honorably discharged and the use or notation of the use of a DD Form 257CG (general discharge under honorable conditions) was in error.

7. Accordingly, the applicant's request for a medical separation should be denied, but alternative relief should be granted by reissuing her DD 214 to show "Adjustment Disorder" as the narrative reason for separation, a JFY separation code, a RE-3 reenlistment code, and issuance of a DD Form 256CG—an honorable discharge certificate.

(ORDER AND SIGNATURES ON NEXT PAGE)

ORDER

The application of former SA [REDACTED] USCG, for correction of her military record is denied, but alternative relief is granted in that the Coast Guard shall issue her a new DD 214 reflecting the following corrections:

- Correct the remarks in block 18 by adding the remark, "ACTION TAKEN PURSUANT TO ORDER OF BCMR.";
- Correct the remarks in block 18 to show that a DD Form 256CG (honorable discharge certificate) was issued;
- Correct the separation code in block 26 to JFY;
- Correct the reentry code in block 27 to RE-3; and
- Correct the narrative reason for separation in block 28 to "Adjustment Disorder".

No other relief is granted.

February 12, 2015

