

**United States Department of Energy
Office of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of: Personnel Security Hearing)
)
Filing Date: April 10, 2026)
)
_____)

Case No.: PSH-26-0095

Issued: September 22, 2026

Administrative Judge Decision

Matthew Rotman, Administrative Judge:¹

This Decision concerns the eligibility of XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX (the Individual) to hold access authorization under the United States Department of Energy's (DOE) regulations, set forth at 10 C.F.R. Part 710, "Procedures for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Matter and Special Nuclear Material or Eligibility to Hold a Sensitive Position."² As discussed below, after carefully considering the record before me in light of the relevant regulations and the *National Security Adjudicative Guidelines for Determining Eligibility for Access to Classified Information or Eligibility to Hold a Sensitive Position* (June 8, 2017) (Adjudicative Guidelines), I conclude that the Individual's access authorization should not be restored.

I. BACKGROUND

The Individual holds access authorization in connection with his employment with a DOE contractor. Exhibit (Ex.) 1 at 6.³ On August 9, 2025, the Individual was arrested for Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) Alcohol, No Headlights When Required, and Operate Vehicle on Highway Without Valid or No License. Ex. 7 at 48–57. The Individual self-reported the arrest to the Local Security Office (LSO) on August 11, 2025. Ex. 6 at 27–28. The LSO issued the Individual a Letter of Interrogatory (LOI), to which the Individual provided responses on October 28, 2025. Ex. 7 at 30–43. In the LOI, the Individual admitted to consuming five or six beers prior to driving. *Id.* at

¹ On April 10, 2026, the Director of the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) appointed Administrative Judge Andrew Dam as the Administrative Judge in this matter. Administrative Judge Dam is no longer with DOE; therefore, on September 21, 2026, the Director of OHA appointed me as the Administrative Judge in this matter.

² The regulations define access authorization as "an administrative determination that an individual is eligible for access to classified matter or is eligible for access to, or control over, special nuclear material." 10 C.F.R. § 710.5(a). This Decision will refer to such authorization as "access authorization" or "security clearance."

³ The Local Security Office (LSO) combined Exhibits 1–13 into a single, Bates-stamped PDF workbook. This Decision references these exhibits by the exhibit number and the Bates stamp page number.

39. His arrest records reflect that a breath test estimated his blood alcohol content (BAC) at .181, over the .08 legal limit. *Id.* at 45; Ex. 8 at 60. The Individual has a previous arrest for DWI from August 11, 2007, when he consumed two alcoholic drinks before driving and his BAC registered 0.09%. Ex. 7 at 11; Ex. 11 at 124–25.

The LSO referred the Individual for a psychological evaluation with a DOE-contracted psychologist (DOE Psychologist) in December 2025. Ex. 9 at 65 (DOE Psychologist’s report). After the evaluation, the DOE Psychologist issued his report, wherein he found that the Individual engaged in binge drinking, and more specifically that the Individual “regularly consume[d] alcohol at a significantly high rate that is problematic.” *Id.* at 68. The DOE Psychologist opined that the Individual met sufficient diagnostic criteria for a diagnosis of Alcohol Use Disorder (AUD), Moderate, pursuant to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders – Fifth Edition – Text Revision (DSM-5-TR)*, and that the Individual had not demonstrated adequate evidence of rehabilitation or reformation. *Id.* at 68–69.

The LSO subsequently issued the Individual a Notification Letter advising him that it possessed reliable information creating substantial doubt regarding his eligibility for access authorization. Ex. 1 at 6–8. In the Summary of Security Concerns (SSC) attached to the letter, the LSO explained that the derogatory information raised security concerns under Guideline G of the Adjudicative Guidelines. *Id.* at 5. The Individual exercised his right to request an administrative review hearing pursuant to 10 C.F.R. Part 710. Ex. 2 at 10–14. The Director of the Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA) appointed Andrew Dam as the Administrative Judge in this matter, and Administrative Judge Dam conducted an administrative hearing.

The LSO submitted thirteen exhibits (Ex. 1–13). The Individual submitted nine exhibits (Ex. A–I).⁴ The Individual testified on his own behalf and offered the testimony of two additional witnesses: his wife (Wife) and his previous work supervisor (Supervisor). Hearing Transcript, OHA Case No. PSH-26-0095 (Tr.) at 7. The LSO offered the DOE Psychologist as its sole witness, and the Individual stipulated to the DOE Psychologist’s expertise in clinical psychology. *Id.*

II. THE SECURITY CONCERNS

Under Guideline G, “[e]xcessive alcohol consumption often leads to the exercise of questionable judgment or the failure to control impulses[] and can raise questions about an individual’s reliability and trustworthiness.” Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 21. Conditions that could raise security concerns include “alcohol-related incidents away from work, such as driving while under the influence [or] . . . disturbing the peace . . .,” “habitual or binge consumption of alcohol to the point of impaired judgment . . .,” and “diagnosis by a duly qualified medical or mental health professional . . . of alcohol use disorder.” *See id.* at ¶ 22(a), (c)–(d). In citing Guideline G, the LSO cited the DOE Psychologist’s report that concluded the Individual binge consumed alcohol to the point of impaired judgment and regularly consumed alcohol at a problematic rate, the DOE Psychologist’s opinion that the Individual met sufficient diagnostic criteria for a diagnosis of

⁴ The Individual submitted his Exhibits A through G as a single PDF file. The Individual also submitted two separate standalone PDFs during the hearing, which I labeled as Exhibit H and Exhibit I respectively. This Decision references the Individual’s exhibits by their exhibit letter and the PDF page number.

AUD, Moderate, and the Individual's 2007 and 2025 DWIs. Ex. 1 at 5. The DOE possesses sufficient derogatory information to raise security concerns under Guideline G.

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 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 access authorization. The Part 710 regulations are drafted to permit the introduction of a very broad range of evidence at personnel security hearings. Even appropriate hearsay evidence may be admitted. *Id.* at § 710.26(h). Hence, the Individual is afforded the utmost latitude in the presentation of evidence to mitigate the security concerns at issue.

IV. FINDINGS OF FACT

a. The Individual's Background and History of Alcohol Consumption

During his December 2025 evaluation with the DOE Psychologist, the Individual reported that he started drinking at age 17. Ex. 9 at 67.⁵ At around that age, he would consume three to six 12-ounce beers once a month. *Id.* Then, when his son was born in 2003, he wanted to stop drinking alcohol altogether. *Id.* He began drinking again in 2005, consuming one to three beers "once every two to three months." *Id.* He claimed that he maintained this pattern of drinking until 2025, though the DOE Psychologist's evaluation would produce evidence that the Individual consumed greater amounts of alcohol than he admitted. *Id.*; *but see id.* at 80 (DOE Psychologist's conclusion that the Individual underestimated or underreported his alcohol consumption). He noted that, during special events such as weddings or football games, he would consume three to six 12-ounce beers. *Id.* At the hearing, the Individual indicated that if he drank, "it was only on the weekends." Tr. at 46. For example, if he was "down in the garage, working on something in the garage, [he] would have some drinks then." *Id.* at 48. However, the Individual also testified that "a lot of the times, [he's] not really paying attention or counting how many [he's] having." *Id.* at 85. He and his Wife would "sometimes" go out and have a glass of wine with dinner. *Id.* at 47.

⁵ The Individual turned 17 in 2001. Ex. 11 at 100 (2018 Questionnaire for National Security Positions (QNSP) indicating his birth year as 1984).

b. The Individual's August 2025 Arrest

On August 9, 2025, the Individual hosted a get together with family and friends at his home and spent the day drinking, fishing, playing baseball, and swimming. Ex. 6 at 28; Ex. 7 at 39. In the evening, they decided to order pizza and the Individual “felt perfectly coherent [and] fine to drive” so he went to pick up the pizza. Ex. 6 at 28; Ex. 7 at 39. Another car was blocking the Individual’s vehicle, so one of his friends allowed the Individual to drive their vehicle. Ex. 6 at 28. The Individual did not realize that the vehicle did not have automatic headlights, so he was driving at dusk without the headlights on. *Id.* A police officer pulled the Individual over for driving without the headlights on. Ex. 7 at 39.

The police officer’s report indicated that the Individual crossed over the center line of the road for a distance of “a little over 100 yards” and that, upon pulling over the Individual, he could smell the odor of alcohol emitting from the vehicle. *Id.* at 49. The police officer also noted that the Individual left his wallet at his residence and that he had admitted to consuming three beers before leaving the residence. *Id.* at 49–50. The Individual later self-reported in the October 2025 LOI that “in hindsight [he] counted that [he] had probably consumed five or six beers.” *Id.* at 39. He declined a breath test at the scene because he “had been told in the past that it was a bad idea.” *Id.* However, he was willing to participate in the field sobriety tests during which he “failed to maintain heel-to-toe stance, stopped while walking to steady himself . . . [s]way[ed] while balancing, used arms for balance, and put his foot down.” *Id.* at 50. An additional police officer on the scene could “smell[] the odor of an intoxicating beverage coming from [the Individual’s] breath and person, along with watery and glassy eyes.” *Id.* Ultimately, the Individual submitted to a breath test during the booking process which resulted in a BAC of .181, well over the legal limit of .08, and the Individual was arrested and charged with DWI, No Headlights When Required, and Operate Vehicle on Highway Without Valid or No License. *Id.* at 48–57.

The Individual testified at the hearing that he did not stop drinking alcohol after his DWI arrest. Tr. at 86; Ex. 11 at 87. Abstaining from alcohol was not a condition of his release and he did not think he had a problem. Tr. at 86. The Individual acknowledged that when he responded to the LOI and questions from the DOE Psychologist about his alcohol use, he still did not think he had a problem. *Id.* at 86–87.

c. Psychological Evaluation and the DOE Psychologist’s Report

The Individual met with the DOE Psychologist for his evaluation on December 2, 2025. Ex. 9 at 66. As part of the evaluation, the DOE Psychologist (1) reviewed the Individual’s personnel security documentation; (2) conducted a 60-minute clinical interview with the Individual; and (3) reviewed a Phosphatidylethanol (PEth)⁶ test from a December 2025 sample, the result of which was 409 ng/mL. *Id.* at 65–71. During his interview, the Individual recounted the circumstances of his 2025 arrest for DWI and expressed surprise at how elevated his BAC had been at the time of the arrest. *Id.* at 67. He also reported his alcohol use within the 30 days leading up to the evaluation:

⁶ PEth levels “reflect[s] the average amount of alcohol consumed over the previous 28-30 days as red blood cells degrade and enzymatic action removed PEth.” Ex. 9 at 74. A PEth result “above 200 ng/mL indicates Heavy Consumption of alcohol (at least 4 drinks/day several days/week).” *Id.*

three to four 12-ounce beers on November 27, 2025, three or four beers on November 23, 2025, and two to three glasses of wine on November 30, 2025. *Id.* at 67. According to a medical doctor who reviewed the results of the PEth test collected in connection with the DOE Psychologist's evaluation, the Individual's positive PEth result was not consistent with his self-reported alcohol consumption in the prior 30 days and indicated that he had consumed substantially greater amounts of alcohol than he admitted. *Id.* at 74–75.

The DOE Psychologist issued his report on December 11, 2025, concluding that the Individual met sufficient criteria for an AUD diagnosis, pursuant to the *DSM-5-TR*. *Id.* at 68. Based on the opinion of the medical doctor regarding the PEth test result and the Individual's surprise at his BAC in connection with his most recent arrest, the DOE Psychologist concluded that the Individual was consuming substantially more alcohol than he recognized or admitted and that he habitually or binge consumed alcohol to the point of impaired judgment. *Id.* The DOE Psychologist also determined that the Individual had not demonstrated adequate evidence of rehabilitation or reformation. *Id.* The DOE Psychologist explained in his report that the Individual may demonstrate rehabilitation by (1) abstaining from alcohol, documented with PEth testing for one year; (2) participating in a weekly substance abuse program for a 16-week period; (3) after the initial 16 weeks, attending at least monthly relapse prevention or maintenance group therapy sessions; (4) attending a support group such as Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) or SMART Recovery⁷ (SR) at least weekly for a minimum of four months; and (5) working the 12 steps of AA and obtaining a sponsor, if applicable. *Id.* at 69. The DOE Psychologist explained that the above should be done in combination for a year and that any treatment the Individual sought out should be with a licensed provider with experience in alcohol abuse. *Id.*

d. Individual's Evidence of Post-Arrest Actions and Character Evidence

The Individual entered a diversion program for his criminal charges in November 2025. Ex. 7 at 40; Tr. at 45. The agreement included that the Individual would complete two years of unsupervised probation, eight hours of community service, an intervention program, and a victim impact panel. Ex. 7 at 40. The Individual completed a weekend-long intervention program in January 2026. Ex. A at 3; Tr. at 60, 78. According to the Individual, the program discussed “coping mechanisms . . . there's people telling their stories and, you know, their histories . . . [i]t was like three days of therapy.” Tr. at 78. He also completed the victim impact panel in January 2026. Ex. B at 5. The Individual testified at the hearing that “January 24 [of 2026] was the last time [he] had anything to drink.” Tr. at 66. He further testified that it was “right around the time that [he] found out [his] clearance had been suspended” and he “was very upset, but [he] knew that [he] had to make a change, so he [did] have some drinks that night” *Id.* To corroborate his claimed abstinence from alcohol, the Individual submitted documentation reflecting negative PEth test results from samples collected March through August 2026. Ex. F at 38–50; Ex. H at 1–3.

In late February 2026, the Individual sought out a therapist who specializes in substance abuse counseling and started attending one-on-one therapy sessions. Ex. C at 7; Ex. D. at 10, 12; Tr. at

⁷ SMART is “an evidenced-informed recovery method grounded in Rational Emotive Behavioral Therapy and Cognitive Behavioral Therapy” that helps people with substance abuse problems make behavioral changes through education and peer support. SMART RECOVERY USA, INC., WHAT IS SMART RECOVERY?, available at smartrecovery.org/what-is-smart-recovery (last visited Sept. 18, 2026).

74. He met with the therapist weekly throughout March, April, and May, and bi-weekly throughout June 2026. Ex. C at 7–8. The Individual is not currently meeting with the therapist due to the therapist’s high caseload, but the Individual testified that he would like to continue seeing her. Tr. at 72, 74. The Individual testified that therapy has been the most effective treatment for him because the therapist was able to help him see things in a way that he did not see them before. *Id.* at 61. For example, the Individual stated that “even though [he] didn’t have a problem with alcohol to the point where [he] could see other people in the world who are completely out of control, that [he] did have a problem when [he] measured [himself] up against [his] own values” *Id.* One of the skills that has really worked for the Individual is “a reframing sort of approach to things where like maybe [his] frame of mind for a certain situation was one way, and . . . [he] kind of step[s] back and reframe[s] the situation.” *Id.* at 64. With the assistance of his therapist, the Individual has identified his trigger for drinking alcohol as doing work around the house or in the garage because he was used to having drinks during those activities. *Id.* at 75. To address his trigger when it presents itself, the Individual changed his environment by turning his garage into a gym. *Id.* “[T]hat way I can strengthen my own body while . . . changing the environment that I was in to not kind of give me the trigger of, ‘oh, usually I would have drinks here, so.’” *Id.* The Individual is still working on a relapse prevention plan, but the Individual testified that “it heavily relies on [his] wife, [which] [his therapist] seemed to think was a healthy way to go about it.” *Id.* at 79.

The Individual submitted documentation that he attended eight virtual SR meetings at varying frequencies from March 26, 2026, to August 3, 2026. Ex. E at 16–37; Ex. I at 1. The Individual found SR meetings through the DOE Psychologist, who recommended the meetings in his report. Tr. at 52; Ex. 9 at 69. The meetings are “about an hour and a half each” on Monday nights and the Individual has continued going to meetings because he “got to know some people there, and [he] find[s] it helpful.” Tr. at 65–66. However, the Individual does not have any regular contact with any of the SR people outside of the recovery meetings. *Id.* at 89. The Individual testified that he has an app on his phone for SR meetings and “they have all kinds of different times that [he] could just tap in right [to] one, if [he] ever [has] a craving. . . .” *Id.* at 81. In addition to his Wife, the Individual testified that “the SMART meetings, of course, are a relapse prevention as well” *Id.* at 79.

The Individual’s Wife testified that she has known the Individual for approximately twenty-five years and they have two adult children together. *Id.* at 18, 20. She testified that she and the Individual host social get-togethers at their house, but that they never have alcohol during those events because the people in her family “aren’t big drinkers.” *Id.* at 22–23. She described her current relationship with the Individual as “great,” “phenomenal,” and “very good.” *Id.* at 25. The last time the Wife saw the Individual drink alcohol was in November 2025. *Id.* at 31. The Wife testified that she remembered “there was a time where . . . [the Individual] did come to [her] and say that he was feeling . . . an urge.” *Id.* at 36. The two of them drove around town and talked until the urge passed. *Id.* “We talk a lot, so he knows he can come to me whenever he’s having a struggle or an urge for something, and we’ll get through it together.” *Id.*

The Individual’s Supervisor testified that he supervised the Individual for a period of six months and the Individual was a dependable, punctual employee that met expectations. *Id.* at 58. However, the Supervisor did not ever associate with the Individual outside of work. *Id.* at 59.

The Individual testified that he and his wife go to restaurants where alcohol is served, and he does not experience the urge to drink alcohol. *Id.* at 47. He also continues to hang out with the friend that he was hanging out with on the night of his 2025 DWI and they can hang out without the presence of alcohol. *Id.* at 76. The Individual testified that his friend “has not offered [him] a thing” and that the friend is “not a huge drinker either, so it’s really a non-issue with him.” *Id.* Regarding his future intention with respect to alcohol, he stated that he likes being sober “so much better [than drinking alcohol] that [he] never want[s] to go back.” *Id.* at 84. He characterized himself as someone who “can never drink again.” *Id.* at 83.

e. Updated DOE Psychologist’s Opinion

After hearing the testimony of the Individual and his witnesses and reviewing the documentary evidence submitted, the DOE Psychologist provided an updated opinion. *Id.* at 99. The DOE Psychologist testified that the Individual’s SR meetings and one-on-one counseling meet the spirit of his recommendation for treatment. *Id.* The DOE Psychologist observed that the Individual “has a good treatment plan in place, he appears to be motivated for treatment, he appears to have positive events occurring in his life that he is aware of, and . . . he associates with having stopped drinking.” *Id.* However, the Individual has not maintained sobriety for one year in accordance with the DOE Psychologist’s recommendation, and the DOE Psychologist would like to see a full year of sobriety before concluding that the Individual is rehabilitated. *Id.* at 100. In order to show adequate rehabilitation, the Individual needs to resume monthly meetings with his therapist and continue with monthly PEth testing. *Id.* The DOE Psychologist gave the Individual an “excellent” prognosis given the Individual’s and his Wife’s testimony. *Id.* at 102; *see also* Ex. 9 at 71 (indicating that the DOE Psychologist’s scale for prognoses is poor, guarded, fair, good, and excellent). The DOE Psychologist testified that when he first met with the Individual, “he really did not acknowledge a problem, as he testified, and so his thoughts and insight have changed significantly, in [the DOE Psychologist’s] opinion.” Tr. at 102.

V. ANALYSIS

Conditions that could mitigate security concerns under Guideline G include:

- (a) so much time has passed, or the behavior was so infrequent, or it happened under such unusual circumstances that it is unlikely to recur or does not cast doubt on the individual’s current reliability, trustworthiness, or judgment;
- (b) the individual acknowledges his or her pattern of maladaptive alcohol use, provides evidence of actions taken to overcome this problem, and has demonstrated a clear and established pattern of modified consumption or abstinence in accordance with treatment recommendations;
- (c) the individual is participating in counseling or a treatment program, has no previous history of treatment and relapse, and is making satisfactory progress in a treatment program; and

- (d) the individual has successfully completed a treatment program along with any required aftercare, and has demonstrated a clear and established pattern of modified consumption or abstinence in accordance with treatment recommendations.

Adjudicative Guidelines at ¶ 23.

Regarding the first mitigating condition, the Individual's DWI occurred just one year prior to the hearing, and was preceded by another DWI seventeen years earlier. Additionally, the Individual represents that he has only maintained sobriety since January 24, 2026, and has provided documentation of negative PEth tests from March through August 3, 2026. Based on the record, I cannot find that "so much time has passed" since his problematic alcohol consumption, particularly considering that he continued to consume alcohol for several months after being arrested for DWI. Additionally, the Individual admitted to maintaining the same drinking habits for twenty years, during which time he was arrested for two DWIs. Thus, I cannot find the problematic alcohol consumption to have occurred infrequently. I cannot find his alcohol consumption and DWI arrests to have occurred under unusual circumstances, since he cited no unusual circumstances. For example, with respect to his August 2025 arrest, the Individual's alcohol consumption occurred while hanging out with a friend at home, during which he decided to drive his vehicle to get food. These are not unusual circumstances that would mitigate the lapse of judgment exhibited that night. Mitigating condition (a) does not apply.

Regarding the second mitigating condition, the Individual acknowledged his problematic relationship with alcohol in his hearing testimony. He also put forth some evidence of actions taken to overcome the problem, such as his participation in therapy, his attendance of a victim impact panel and occasional SR meetings, and his completion of a weekend-long intervention program. While the DOE Psychologist testified that these actions met the "spirit" of his recommendations, they did not meet the letter, and I have significant doubts that the Individual's current treatment regimen includes sufficient measures to hold him accountable for abstinence from alcohol. The Individual's relapse prevention plan depends heavily on his Wife, who is not an effective accountability partner as evidenced by her testimony that the last time the Individual consumed alcohol was in November 2025 which differed from the Individual's testimony that his last alcohol consumption was two months later on January 24, 2026. Further, the Individual claims that individual therapy has been the most helpful treatment method, but he did not see his therapist in July or August. Moreover, although the Individual established approximately seven months of abstinence with negative PEth tests results from March through August 2026, I cannot find that he has demonstrated a "clear and established" pattern of abstinence in accordance with treatment recommendations, which recommended one year of negative PEth tests. Mitigating condition (b) does not apply.

Regarding the third mitigating condition, I commend the Individual, again, for meaningfully engaging SR meetings and therapy with a substance abuse counselor. The DOE Psychologist opined that the Individual has met the spirit of the DOE Psychologist's recommendation by completing sixteen weeks of therapy with a substance abuse counselor and participating in SR meetings. The Individual does not have a previous history of treatment and relapse. The DOE

Psychologist's "excellent" prognosis indicates the Individual is making satisfactory progress. Accordingly, mitigating condition (c) applies.

Regarding the fourth mitigating condition, the Individual, by the time of the hearing, had not completed a treatment program, and he had not completed the treatment recommendations outlined by the DOE Psychologist. Furthermore, as stated above, he has not demonstrated a clear and established pattern of abstinence in accordance with treatment recommendations. Accordingly, mitigating condition (d) does not apply.

Although the Individual has established the presence of mitigating condition (c), the Adjudicative Guidelines provide that the mitigating conditions "*could*" mitigate the security concerns; the presence of a mitigating condition does not automatically mean that an individual has resolved applicable security concerns. *Id.* at ¶ 23. In applying the Adjudicative Guidelines, I am required to consider, among other things, the absence or presence of rehabilitation or reformation and other pertinent behavioral changes, the likelihood of continuation or recurrence, and other relevant and material factors. *See* 10 C.F.R. § 710.7(c). The Individual's history of underestimating or underreporting his alcohol consumption, the lack of accountability to his Wife who is his primary source of support, and his discontinuation of therapy despite its benefit cast doubt on the Individual's eligibility for access authorization. The DOE Psychologist opined that the Individual has a good treatment plan in place, but the Individual acknowledged that he is still working on a relapse prevention plan and that, so far, it relies largely on his Wife. However, the Individual has not been forthcoming with his Wife about his alcohol consumption because his Wife does not know that he consumed alcohol between November 2025 and January 2026. I do not agree with the DOE Psychologist that relying primarily on someone whom the Individual has not been entirely honest with is a good treatment plan, or that the Wife can be an effective source of accountability for the Individual. Further, the DOE Psychologist recommended sixteen weeks of therapy which the Individual completed. However, at the hearing, the DOE Psychologist testified that for the Individual to demonstrate rehabilitation, he would need to continue engaging in monthly therapy. The DOE Psychologist did not indicate whether the excellent prognosis was dependent upon the Individual resuming monthly therapy. Regardless, the Individual is currently non-compliant with treatment recommendations because he has not resumed therapy. Considering together the Individual's relatively brief period of abstinence from alcohol, my doubts as to his Wife being a source of accountability, and the uncertainty as to whether the Individual will return to therapy the DOE Psychologist testified was important to the Individual's recovery, significant doubt remains as to whether the Individual will return to maladaptive alcohol use.

Given the above, I find that the Individual has satisfied mitigating condition (c) under Guideline G, but that the Individual has not resolved the security concerns asserted by the LSO.

VI. CONCLUSION

Above, I found that there existed sufficient derogatory information in the possession of DOE to raise security concerns under Guideline G of the Adjudicative Guidelines. After considering all the relevant information, both 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 failed to bring forth sufficient evidence to resolve the security concerns set

forth under Guideline G. Accordingly, I find the Individual has not demonstrated that restoring his security clearance would not endanger the common defense and security and would be clearly consistent with the national interest. 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