

In July 2024, the Individual completed a Questionnaire for National Security Positions (QNSP) in connection with his employment with the DOE contractor. Ex. 6. On the QNSP, the Individual again responded “No” when asked if, in the last seven years, he had illegally used or been involved in the illegal purchase of any drugs or controlled substances. *Id.* at 74. He further responded “No” when asked if, in the last seven years, he had intentionally engaged in the misuse of prescription drugs. *Id.* at 75. When asked about his criminal record, the Individual disclosed that in 2007, while in a foreign country, he was charged and convicted of Possession of Cannabis and sentenced to 100 hours of community service. *Id.* at 73.

The Individual was interviewed by a background investigator on August 19, 2024. Ex. 10 at 204–09. During the interview, the Individual acknowledged his 2007 drug offense while studying abroad and admitted “he did have a small amount of marijuana in his bedroom.” *Id.* at 208 (summary notes of the investigatory interview). The Individual then disclosed that he used marijuana “intermittently on occasion” between approximately 2005 and November 2022. *Id.* The Individual went on to describe to the investigator the circumstances of his marijuana use, which he detailed further in a November 21, 2024, response to a Letter of Interrogatory (LOI) issued by the local security office (LSO). *Id.* at 208–09; Ex. 5.

When asked how often he consumed marijuana, the Individual indicated that it varied from zero to seven days per week. Ex. 5 at 22. He would sometimes smoke it and sometimes use it in edible form. *Id.*; Ex. 10 at 208. He used it alone to help him sleep and relax, and he used it socially with friends. Ex. 10 at 208–09; Ex. 5 at 22. He would purchase it “once every 6 weeks to 3 months” from local state dispensaries. Ex. 5 at 22. He would also obtain it from “friends of friends.” Ex. 10 at 209. The Individual stated he had no future intent to use illegal drugs and that he no longer associated with people who used them. *Id.*; Ex. 5 at 25.

Additionally, the Individual reported in his response to the LOI that he used the prescription drug Adderall on three occasions between 2019 and 2022. Ex. 5 at 25. The Adderall was provided to him by a friend, as the Individual did not have a prescription. *Id.* The Individual used it in an “attempt to improve [his] gaming performance and acumen.” *Id.*

As to the Individual’s failure to disclose his marijuana use on the 2019, 2023, and 2024 questionnaires, the Individual offered multiple, and in some cases conflicting, explanations. He stated that he believed his marijuana use was legal, because he purchased it from legal dispensaries, and therefore his omissions were not deliberate. Ex. 10 at 208; Ex. 5 at 26. However, at the same time, he admitted that he understood marijuana use was illegal under federal law. Ex. 5 at 23. The Individual also stated that he deliberately omitted his drug use from the questionnaires because he was “fearful [he] would lose [his] position at work and not be able to provide for [his] family if [he] answered truthfully.” *Id.* at 27. In addition, the Individual claimed that “recreational marijuana use was tolerated” at the federal job that he held between 2019 and 2024, and that this “culture” influenced his decision to deny any marijuana use when completing the questionnaires. *Id.* at 23. Finally, in his response to the LOI, the Individual volunteered that he intentionally omitted his past marijuana usage during an interview with a background investigator that occurred in May 2023. *Id.* at 29; *see also* Ex. 10 at 317 (reflecting that Individual was interviewed in August 2023, with a summary of the interview containing no mention of drug involvement).

On April 24, 2025, the LSO issued the Individual a letter in which it notified him that it possessed reliable information that created substantial doubt regarding his eligibility to hold a security clearance. Ex. 1 at 7–8. In a Summary of Security Concerns (SSC) attached to the letter, the LSO explained that the derogatory information raised security concerns under Guideline E (Personal Conduct) and Guideline H (Drug Involvement) of the Adjudicative Guidelines. *Id.* at 5–6.

The Individual exercised his right to request an administrative review hearing pursuant to 10 C.F.R. Part 710. Ex. 2. The Director of the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) appointed me as the Administrative Judge in this matter, and I subsequently conducted an administrative hearing. The LSO submitted ten exhibits (Ex. 1–10). The Individual submitted seven exhibits (Ex. A–G). At the hearing, the Individual testified on his own behalf and offered the testimony of three character witnesses, two of whom were friends and one of whom was the Individual’s colleague and supervisor at the federal agency where he worked previously.³ Transcript of Hearing, OHA Case No. PSH-25-0138 (Tr.) at 11, 98, 115, 131. The LSO did not call any witnesses.

II. THE NOTIFICATION LETTER AND THE ASSOCIATED SECURITY CONCERNS

The LSO cited Guideline E as the first basis for its substantial doubt concerning the Individual’s eligibility for access authorization. Ex. 1 at 5–6.

Conduct involving questionable judgment, lack of candor, dishonesty, or unwillingness to comply with rules and regulations can raise questions about an individual’s reliability, trustworthiness, and ability to protect classified or sensitive information. Of special interest is any failure to cooperate or provide truthful and candid answers during national security investigative or adjudicative processes.

Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 15. Two conditions that could raise a security concern under Guideline E are “deliberate omission, concealment, or falsification of relevant facts from any personnel security questionnaire . . . or similar form used to conduct investigations . . . [or] determine national security eligibility or trustworthiness” and “deliberately providing false or misleading information; or concealing or omitting information, concerning relevant facts to an . . . investigator . . . involved in making a recommendation relevant to a national security eligibility determination . . .” *Id.* at ¶ 16(a)–(b). In this case, according to the LSO, the Guideline E concern was raised by the Individual’s failure to disclose his illegal purchase and use of marijuana on the 2019, 2023, and 2024 questionnaires, his failure to disclose his misuse of Adderall on the 2024 QNSP, and his deliberate omission of his marijuana use during a 2023 interview with a background investigator. Ex. 1 at 5–6. The LSO’s invocation of Guideline E is justified.

The LSO cited Guideline H as the second basis for its substantial doubt concerning the Individual’s eligibility for access authorization. Ex. 1 at 6.

³ The Individual had originally intended to call six character witnesses. Tr. at 6, 73–74. However, based on the objection of DOE counsel, who argued at the prehearing conference that the testimony of six character witnesses would be irrelevant to the matters at issue in this case and duplicative of the letters they had authored and which were contained in the Individual’s Exhibit F, I instructed the Individual to limit his character witnesses to no more than three. *Id.* at 6–7.

The illegal use of controlled substances, to include the misuse of prescription and non-prescription drugs . . . can raise questions about an individual's reliability and trustworthiness, both because such behavior may lead to physical or psychological impairment and because it raises questions about a person's ability or willingness to comply with laws, rules, and regulations.

Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 24. Two conditions that could raise a security concern under Guideline H are "any substance misuse . . ." and "illegal possession of a controlled substance, including . . . purchase . . ." *Id.* at ¶ 25(a), (c). According to the LSO, the Guideline H concern was raised by the Individual's use and purchase of marijuana between approximately 2005 and November 2022, his use of Adderall that was not prescribed to him three times between 2019 and 2022, and his criminal charge of Possession of Cannabis while residing abroad in 2007. Ex. 1 at 6. The LSO's invocation of Guideline H is justified.

III. REGULATORY STANDARDS

A DOE administrative review proceeding under Part 710 requires me, as the Administrative Judge, to issue a Decision that reflects my comprehensive, common-sense judgment, made after consideration of all of the relevant evidence, favorable and unfavorable, as to whether the granting or continuation of a person's access authorization will not endanger the common defense and security and is clearly consistent with the national interest. 10 C.F.R. § 710.7(a). The regulatory standard implies that there is a presumption against granting or restoring a security clearance. *See Dep't of Navy v. Egan*, 484 U.S. 518, 531 (1988) ("clearly consistent with the national interest" standard for granting security clearances indicates "that security determinations should err, if they must, on the side of denials"); *Dorfmont v. Brown*, 913 F.2d 1399, 1403 (9th Cir. 1990) (strong presumption against the issuance of a security clearance).

The individual must come forward at the hearing with evidence to convince the DOE that granting or restoring access authorization "will not endanger the common defense and security and will be clearly consistent with the national interest." 10 C.F.R. § 710.27(d). The individual is afforded a full opportunity to present evidence supporting his eligibility for an access authorization. The Part 710 regulations are drafted so as to permit the introduction of a very broad range of evidence at personnel security hearings. Even appropriate hearsay evidence may be admitted. *Id.* § 710.26(h). Hence, an individual is afforded the utmost latitude in the presentation of evidence to mitigate the security concerns at issue.

IV. HEARING TESTIMONY

In his testimony, the Individual acknowledged his long history of marijuana use, which he represented ended in November 2022. Tr. at 25, 83. When he was younger, he testified, he smoked marijuana frequently with friends. *Id.* at 83. In more recent years, he consumed marijuana edibles largely to help him sleep and to cope with his high-stress job. *Id.* at 25, 83. During the seven years prior to November 2022, he estimated that recreational use accounted for only "10 percent" of his overall marijuana consumption. *Id.* at 83. The frequency of his use would vary. Sometimes he would consume an edible every night of the week, and sometimes he would go weeks or months without consuming any at all. *Id.* at 25–26. He would purchase the edibles, he claimed, from

dispensaries in his hometown where they were sold legally under state law. *Id.* at 26. On cross-examination, however, the Individual acknowledged that marijuana could not be purchased legally from dispensaries in his home state until early 2022. *Id.* at 38. Prior to that date, he admitted, he would drive to a bordering state to purchase marijuana edibles. *Id.* at 38–39. The Individual further acknowledged that, prior to “the 2016 time frame,” he would obtain marijuana from friends. *Id.* at 80.

The Individual testified that he was not subject to regular drug testing during his federal employment from 2019 through 2024. *Id.* at 23. Further, he testified, marijuana use was openly discussed among employees and tolerated within the office, as long as employees did not come to work under the influence. *Id.* at 24. Agency leadership “turned a blind eye” to rampant marijuana use, because otherwise they couldn’t “find any one [sic] to work anymore.” *Id.* at 66. The Individual claimed that “over 90 percent of the people [in one agency branch office] likely were consuming marijuana.” *Id.* at 65.

In November 2022, the Individual claimed, he made the decision to discontinue marijuana use. *Id.* at 27; *see* Ex. A (results of a May 30, 2025, hair follicle test indicating a negative result for marijuana).⁴ He had recently stopped consuming alcohol in January 2021, and this led him down a path of “self-discovery” where he began pursuing healthier activities, like working out, riding his bike, and coaching kids to ride bikes through a local organization. Tr. at 28, 31–33; Ex. G (local news article quoting the Individual regarding his volunteer work with this organization). In this context, he decided to abstain from marijuana because he “did not see that as something that was providing a benefit to [his] life, and also, it was inhibiting [him] in different ways.” Tr. at 29. Furthermore, he stated, he wanted to set a better example for his young children. *Id.* at 29–30. The Individual did not, however, seek professional help to address the sleep issues that he previously used marijuana to manage.⁵ *Id.* at 39–41. In addition, the Individual acknowledged that “virtually everyone” in his social circle continues to consume marijuana, but they respect his abstinence, and he makes every effort to avoid their presence when they consume it. *Id.* at 86–87. The Individual’s wife smokes marijuana “three to four times a week,” he stated, but she only smokes it in the garage or outside. *Id.* at 94–95. The Individual has experienced significant stress during the time since November 2022, including stress induced by the administrative review process, yet he testified that he has not been tempted to resume marijuana use. *Id.* at 33–34. The Individual is committed to abstaining from marijuana in the future. *Id.* at 34, 95–96.

The Individual acknowledged that he should have disclosed his marijuana use on the 2019, 2023, and 2024 questionnaires. *Id.* at 34–35. He continued to insist that he believed his marijuana use was legal at the state level, and for that reason, at the time he was completing the questionnaires, he did not think it was necessary to disclose it. *Id.* at 52. At the same time, however, he admitted that it was not legal to purchase and use marijuana recreationally in his home state for most of the time period in which he was using it. *Id.* The Individual also continued to assert that the “culture” of marijuana use at his federal job influenced his answers on the questionnaires, although he

⁴ There is nothing in the record that indicates the time period over which the hair follicle test would detect marijuana use.

⁵ The Individual did see a counselor for stress management after his daughter was born in 2022. Tr. at 40–41. He attended “a number of sessions.” *Id.* at 41.

admitted that nobody advised or instructed him to conceal his marijuana use when completing them. *Id.* at 59–60. The Individual was asked to explain his inconsistent statements on the LOI that his falsifications were not deliberate, because he believed his marijuana use was legal, and also deliberate, because he was fearful that the truth would cost him his job. *Id.* at 61–63. The Individual responded that he was “having difficulty getting the words out . . . to make sense of this,” but ultimately he could not reconcile the statements. *Id.* at 63.

The Individual decided to disclose his marijuana use voluntarily during the August 19, 2024, investigatory interview, he stated, because he had begun to realize the heightened sensitivity of his work for the DOE contractor, as opposed to his prior work at the federal agency, and he recognized the potential for blackmail. *Id.* at 35–36; *see also id.* at 66–69 (testifying that he now understands there is “a world of difference” between his prior uncleared federal position and his current position that requires a security clearance). On cross-examination, he was asked if his decision to come clean was also motivated by a concern that the investigator would learn about his marijuana use from the individuals he listed as references. *Id.* at 56. The Individual responded, “I – I don’t know. I don’t know if that was a factor or not.” *Id.*; *see also id.* at 55–56; Ex. 10 at 226 (investigator’s notes of an August 28, 2024, interview with the Individual’s friend, in which the friend reported the Individual’s past marijuana use).

The Individual did not disclose his Adderall use without a prescription on the July 2024 QNSP because, he claimed, it did not occur to him. Tr. at 56. He later disclosed it on the November 2024 LOI because “that was the first time [he] had scoured all of [his] activities” and concluded it was something he needed to report. *Id.* at 89; *see also id.* at 56–57, 87–89.

The Individual’s friend testified that he met the Individual playing competitive online video games, and they have since become “very close friends,” to the point where he attended the Individual’s wedding. *Id.* at 98, 102–03. He testified positively about the Individual’s integrity. *Id.* at 100–01. He stated that he admires the Individual’s ability to follow through on his commitments, including to pursue a higher educational degree, to get married and start a family, and to abstain from alcohol use – the latter of which influenced the witness to do the same. *Id.* at 103–06. The friend is aware of the Individual’s marijuana use, but they do not generally discuss it. *Id.* at 109. Recently, he heard the Individual mention that drug testing was “common” at his job with the DOE contractor and that the Individual had to “be ready for that.” *Id.* at 110.

A second friend of the Individual testified that he has known the Individual since eighth grade, and they remain in close contact. *Id.* at 116. He spoke highly of the Individual’s integrity and described him as “one of the most honest people I do know.” *Id.* at 117–18. He is aware of the Individual’s past marijuana use and stated “it’s been many years since he has used it.” *Id.* at 120. He believes the Individual will adhere to his commitment to abstain from marijuana, because he has shown a “great level of deep responsibility” in all aspects of his life. *Id.* at 126.

The Individual’s former colleague at the federal agency testified that he first met the Individual around 2016 in a social context. *Id.* at 131–32. They became coworkers in 2019, and in 2021 he became the Individual’s supervisor. *Id.* at 132. He described the Individual as “thoughtful” and “honest,” and stated, “I’ve rarely met somebody who puts more time into thinking about how they can improve themselves and better themselves.” *Id.* at 134, 138–39. He testified that he recently

became aware of the Individual's past marijuana use, and he believes the Individual discontinued such use around 2022. *Id.* at 134–35, 138. He confirmed that marijuana use is prohibited for all federal employees, although since it became legalized in his state, he understands that many employees at his agency use it without repercussion. *Id.* at 136, 141–42.

The Individual submitted ten letters authored by friends, neighbors, and colleagues, including the three who testified at the hearing. Ex. F. All ten references expressed a high opinion of the Individual's honesty, reliability, and integrity. *Id.*

V. ANALYSIS

A. Guideline E

Conditions that could mitigate security concerns under Guideline E include:

- (a) the individual made prompt, good-faith efforts to correct the omission, concealment, or falsification before being confronted with the facts;
- (b) the refusal or failure to cooperate, omission, or concealment was caused or significantly contributed to by advice of legal counsel or of a person with professional responsibilities for advising or instructing the individual specifically concerning security processes. Upon being made aware of the requirement to cooperate or provide the information, the individual cooperated fully and truthfully;
- (c) the offense is so minor, or so much time has passed, or the behavior is so infrequent, or it happened under such unique circumstances that it is unlikely to recur and does not cast doubt on the individual's reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;
- (d) the individual has acknowledged the behavior and obtained counseling to change the behavior or taken other positive steps to alleviate the stressors, circumstances, or factors that contributed to untrustworthy, unreliable, or other inappropriate behavior, and such behavior is unlikely to recur;
- (e) the individual has taken positive steps to reduce or eliminate vulnerability to exploitation, manipulation, or duress;
- (f) the information was unsubstantiated or from a source of questionable reliability;
- (g) association with persons involved in criminal activities was unwitting, has ceased, or occurs under circumstances that do not cast doubt upon the individual's reliability, trustworthiness, judgment, or willingness to comply with rules and regulations.

Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 17.

Although all of the Individual's alleged false statements and omissions raise security concerns, those that raise the greatest concern under the Adjudicative Guidelines are those that he made in 2023, in connection with his application for a public trust position, and especially those that he made in July 2024, in connection with his application for a security clearance. *See* Adjudicative

Guidelines at ¶ 15 (stating that “[o]f special concern is any failure to . . . provide truthful and candid answers during national security investigative or adjudicative processes”); *id.* (stating that “refusal to provide full, frank and truthful answers . . . in connection with a personnel security or trustworthiness determination” will “normally result in an unfavorable national security eligibility determination . . .”).

Regarding the condition set forth at paragraph (a), I am persuaded that the Individual corrected his false statements before being confronted with the facts. He voluntarily revealed his use and purchase of marijuana to the investigator in August 2024, and he voluntarily disclosed his Adderall use without a prescription on the November 2024 LOI. I am less persuaded, however, that the Individual’s efforts to correct his false statements were prompt, since more than five years had passed since he first concealed his drug use on the 2019 questionnaire. Even supposing I only consider the most serious of his falsifications on the July 2024 QNSP, although he came clean about his marijuana use one month later, he still failed to disclose his illicit Adderall use for a full three months after that. In addition, I have some doubt as to whether the Individual’s efforts to correct his false statements were made entirely in good faith. Although I believe the Individual has come to realize the heightened importance of honesty in connection with a national security position, the Individual was unable to confirm that his decision to reveal his drug use was not motivated, in part, by a desire to avoid being caught. Indeed, the Individual had good reason to fear that one of his references would reveal his past drug use, since the investigatory record reveals that at least one of them did so. Accordingly, I am unable to find that the Individual took prompt, good-faith efforts that would mitigate the Guideline E concerns.

The Individual confirmed he was not advised or instructed to omit his drug involvement from the 2019, 2023, or 2024 questionnaires, or from the 2023 investigatory interview. Accordingly, I am unable to find that the Guideline E concerns are mitigated pursuant to the condition set forth at paragraph (b).

As to the condition set forth at paragraph (c), the Individual’s falsifications and omissions were not minor, but rather concealed a lengthy history of illegal drug use, which bears directly on the Individual’s eligibility for a security clearance. The falsifications and omissions were made on three separate questionnaires and in one investigatory interview, over the course of five years, and were not fully corrected until one year prior to the hearing. As such, they did not occur so infrequently or so far in the past that they are unlikely to recur and do not cast doubt on the individual’s reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment. As to whether any unique circumstances excuse the Individual’s false statements, the Individual contends that marijuana use was legal at the state level and tolerated in his federal workplace during the time he made them, which influenced his decision to conceal his drug use. The Individual understood, however, that his marijuana use was illegal at the federal level and against workplace policy, and he certified that his answers on the questionnaires were “true, complete, and correct to the best of [his] knowledge and belief and [were] made in good faith.” Ex. 6 at 81; Ex. 7 at 117; Ex. 8 at 132. Therefore, the circumstances of the Individual’s behavior do not mitigate the security concerns that it raises under Guideline E.

Regarding the condition set forth at paragraph (d), the Individual has not fully acknowledged his behavior. In his response to the November 2024 LOI, and again at the hearing, the Individual

continued to insist that his false statements were not deliberate, because he believed his drug use was legal, while at the same time acknowledging that he deliberately concealed his drug involvement out of fear for losing his job. When asked, he was unable to reconcile these inconsistent statements. Furthermore, the Individual did not present any evidence of counseling or other positive steps he has taken to alleviate the factors that contributed to his behavior, and therefore I am unable to find the Guideline E concerns mitigated pursuant to mitigating condition (d).

None of the remaining mitigating conditions apply to the circumstances presented in this case, as the LSO did not allege vulnerability to exploitation, manipulation, or duress, the Individual did not dispute that he made the false statements and omissions alleged by the LSO, and the LSO did not allege that the Individual associated with persons involved in criminal activities. *See* Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 17(e)–(g).

For the foregoing reasons, I find the Individual has failed to resolve the concerns raised by the LSO under Guideline E.

B. Guideline H

Conditions that could mitigate security concerns under Guideline H include:

- (a) the behavior happened so long ago, was so infrequent, or happened under such circumstances that it is unlikely to recur or does not cast doubt on the individual's current reliability, trustworthiness, or good judgment;
- (b) the individual acknowledges his or her drug involvement and substance misuse, provides evidence of actions taken to overcome this problem, and has established a pattern of abstinence, including, but not limited to:
 - (1) disassociation from drug-using associates and contacts;
 - (2) changing or avoiding the environment where drugs were used; and
 - (3) providing a signed statement of intent to abstain from all drug involvement and substance misuse, acknowledging that any future involvement or misuse is grounds for revocation of national security eligibility;
- (c) abuse of prescription drugs was after a severe or prolonged illness during which these drugs were prescribed, and abuse has since ended; and
- (d) satisfactory completion of a prescribed drug treatment program, including, but not limited to, rehabilitation and aftercare requirements, without recurrence of abuse, and a favorable prognosis by a duly qualified medical professional.

As an initial matter, the condition set forth in paragraph (c) does not apply to the circumstances of this case, because the LSO has not alleged an abuse of prescription drugs that were prescribed to the Individual. In addition, I cannot find that the Individual has mitigated the Guideline H security concerns under the condition set forth in paragraph (d), because he has not completed a prescribed drug treatment program.

As to the condition set forth in paragraph (b), although the Individual has acknowledged his drug involvement and substance misuse and provided testimony that persuades me of his strong personal commitment to abstinence, he has not sufficiently established a pattern of abstinence such that I can feel confident he has overcome all drug involvement. The Individual has not disassociated from drug-using associates and contacts, which include his wife and “virtually” all of his friends. He did not provide evidence of any methods he uses to address the sleep issues that prompted his marijuana use previously. And, other than a single hair follicle test from May 2025, he provided no evidence – for example, additional test results or testimony from his wife – that could corroborate his claimed abstinence since November 2022. Although I was impressed by his many glowing references, all of whom characterized the Individual as a person of deep integrity who follows through on commitments, I cannot overlook that the Individual’s drug involvement spanned nearly twenty years, during which time he was convicted of a drug offense, he was employed by federal agency that prohibits such use, and he lived in a state where the purchase and use of marijuana was illegal until just months before he allegedly quit using. As such, I cannot find that the Individual has satisfied the mitigating condition set forth in paragraph (b).

Regarding the condition set forth in paragraph (a), I am persuaded that the Individual’s Adderall use was sufficiently infrequent – only three occasions of use between 2019 and 2022 – so as to mitigate the associated security concerns. The Individual’s involvement with marijuana, on the other hand, was not so infrequent. He purchased it every one-to-three months, and at times, he used it every day of the week. It did not occur under any exceptional circumstances, but rather was a regular part of the Individual’s social life and daily routine for approximately 17 years. Although the Individual testified he has not used marijuana since November 2022, which might be so long ago as to resolve any doubts about his current reliability and good judgment, the absence of sufficient corroborating evidence prevents me from crediting his testimony, particularly in light of the unfavorable circumstances described in the preceding paragraph.

For the foregoing reasons, I find the Individual has failed to resolve the concerns raised by the LSO under Guideline H.

VI. CONCLUSION

In the above analysis, I found that there was sufficient derogatory information in the possession of DOE to raise security concerns under Guidelines E and H of the Adjudicative Guidelines. After

considering all the relevant information, favorable and unfavorable, in a comprehensive, common-sense manner, including weighing all the testimony and other evidence presented at the hearing, I find that the Individual has not brought forth sufficient evidence to resolve the security concerns set forth in the Summary of Security Concerns under Guideline E or Guideline H. Accordingly, I have determined that the Individual's access authorization should not be granted. This Decision may be appealed in accordance with the procedures set forth at 10 C.F.R. § 710.28.

Matthew Rotman
Administrative Judge
Office of Hearings and Appeals