

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD

Docket Number: 2018-010

**Discharge Issued**

**Character:** Honorable

**Narrative Reason:** Completion of Required Active Service

**SPD/RE Code:** JBK / RE3

**Authority of Discharge:** COMDTINST M1000.4 ART 1.B.11

**Date of Separation:** 2018-01-30

**DRB Decision**

**Character:** No Change

**Narrative Reason:** No Change

**SPD/RE Code:** No Change / RE-1

**New Authority:** No Change

**Discharge Review Board Discussion and Decision:**

DISCUSSION:

The applicant appeared before the Board telephonically. After a brief introduction, the Board President confirmed with the applicant that they are requesting to upgrade the Re-enlistment code on their DD Form 214 (block 27) from RE-3 to RE-1. The applicant indicated that they wished to give a sworn statement. The applicant was sworn in by the Board Recorder.

The applicant began their statement and related to the incident revolving around the allision. The former member describes the event as very minor and no damages or injuries were reported on either vessel. The former member concluded their statement reinforcing this event was very minor in nature and did not think it had to be reported to Command.

The Board asked several questions:

First question was how long was the member a qualified Coxswain on the platform?

Former members answer: approximately 18 months as a Coxswain and 12 month as a TAC Coxswain which was required for this mission.

Second Question could that mission have been accomplished as only a Coxswain?

Former member answer: No the mission required a TAC Coxswain.

Third question what is your definition of a collision and allision?

Former member answer: a collision is a violent action with damages and an allusion is a small bump with no damage or injuries.

Fourth question who makes that determination?

Former member answer: the Coxswain

Fifth question what is the threshold to report this type of event?

Former member answer: I am unable to answer that without the proper manuals.

Sixth question where you investigated for not showing up for duty?

Former member answer: yes but this was a miscommunication between me and the XPO.

The presiding officer asked the applicant if they had any final comments. The applicant admitted in hindsight that they probably should have reported the allision. The applicant went on to explain the command did not give them the ability to improve themselves. This portion of the board ended, and the applicant's phone line was disconnected.

The Board discussed the application and documentation provide by the former member and the Coast Guard policy and its relation to this case. The Board discussed the propriety aspects and how the Coast Guard failed this Member, the board discussed and found that an allision is a collision and reportable. The board discussed the timing of these investigations and how suspect they are to non-reenlistment decision.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Board deemed that the applicant's character of service, reason for separation are appropriate and should not be changed. The applicant's reenlistment code should be changed to an RE-1.

In reviewing discharges, the Board presumes regularity in the conduct of governmental affairs unless there is substantial credible evidence (to include evidence submitted by the Applicant) to rebut the presumption.