



Applicant for Security Clearance

For Government: Cassie L. Ford, Esq., Department Counsel
For Applicant: Sean Rogers, Esq.

08/12/2026

Decision

BORGSTROM, Eric H., Administrative Judge:

Statement of the Case

On October 10, 2025, the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) issued a Statement of Reasons (SOR) to Applicant detailing security concerns under Guideline G (alcohol consumption). The DCSA acted under Executive Order (EO) 10865, *Safeguarding Classified Information within Industry* (February 20, 1960), as amended; Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 5220.6, *Defense Industrial Personnel Security Clearance Review Program* (January 2, 1992), as amended (Directive); and the adjudicative guidelines (AG) implemented on June 8, 2017.

In Applicant's January 2, 2026 response to the SOR (Answer), he admitted, with explanations, SOR ¶¶ 1.a.-1.f. and 1.h.-1.p. He denied SOR ¶¶ 1.g. and 1.q. He attached 12 documents, which were later marked and admitted into the record at hearing. He requested a hearing before a Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) administrative judge. (Answer)

Government proffered 17 evidentiary exhibits, which I admitted as Government Exhibits (GE) 1 through 11, without objection. Applicant and two witnesses testified. Applicant submitted the 12 exhibits previously attached to the Answer, which I admitted as Applicant Exhibits (AE) A through L, without objection. At Applicant's request, the record remained open until June 18, 2026, to provide him with an opportunity to supplement the evidentiary record. DOHA received the hearing transcript (Tr.) on June 11, 2026. Applicant did not submit any additional evidentiary exhibits, and the record closed on June 18, 2026.

Findings of Fact

Applicant is 34 years old. He graduated from high school in June 2010 and attended some college courses. From October 2012 to December 2017, Applicant served on active duty in the U.S. Navy, from which he received a General Discharge Under Honorable Conditions for misconduct. He married in April 2015, separated in about May 2017, and divorced in January 2019. He has been employed by a federal contractor since September 2023, currently as a quality control specialist. (GE 1; GE 2; AE G; Tr. 20, 24, 25, 37, 39, 40-41, 48)

The SOR alleges alcohol consumption security concerns based upon multiple alcohol-related incidents, binge alcohol consumption, diagnoses of alcohol use disorder (AUD), and continued alcohol consumption following these diagnoses.

SOR ¶ 1.p. Applicant first consumed alcohol at age 16, and he estimated that he consumed alcohol once a month from ages 16 to 18. From ages 18 to 20, he consumed alcohol weekly to the point of "mild intoxication." While attending college, he once consumed approximately 10 beers and passed out on the quad. Law enforcement officers took him into custody, and he was charged with public intoxication, a misdemeanor. He was fined, he was required to take an alcohol-awareness class, and adjudication of this charge was deferred by the court. (Answer; GE 1; GE 4 at 14-15, 24; Tr. 41-42, 47)

SOR ¶ 1.o. In October 2012, Applicant enlisted in the U.S. Navy, and, during a deployment in late 2016 or early 2017, he experienced a severe panic attack and passed out onboard a submarine. In about February 2017, he was scheduled to return to the submarine, and he experienced suicidal ideations. He disclosed that he had frequent thoughts of shooting himself, and he would get drunk and play with a gun and bullets. He was hospitalized and spent two weeks in a mental-health ward. He participated in group and individual sessions, and he was prescribed medication for depression and anxiety. He was also diagnosed with AUD, severe. (Answer; GE 2 at 28; GE 4 at 12; GE 5 at 3; GE 6 at 7, 132-33; Tr. 19, 47)

SOR ¶ 1.n. Applicant was reassigned from submarine duty to a support command. In May 2017, he separated from his wife. In June 2017, he consumed alcohol to the point of intoxication at a restaurant. He was driving home, got a flat tire, and crashed into a stone wall. Law enforcement officers administered a breathalyzer, and his blood alcohol content (BAC) tested over the legal limit. He was charged with operating a motor vehicle under the influence of alcohol (OUI). After this OUI incident, Applicant was recommended

by his command to participate in the Navy's Substance Abuse Rehabilitation Program (SARP), but he declined, believing that alcohol was not an issue. (Answer at 5; GE 2 at 18; GE 4 at 7-12; GE 10 at 5; GE 11; Tr. 22, 48-51)

SOR ¶ 1.m. In September 2017, Applicant consumed alcohol to the point of intoxication while out with friends. He knocked on the door of a private residence to borrow a phone charger. He was charged with breach of peace, a misdemeanor. (Answer at 5; GE 4 at 13; GE 10 at 5; Tr. 21, 52)

SOR ¶ 1.l. In October 2017, Applicant consumed alcohol to the point of impairment. He swerved while driving, failed a field sobriety test, and was charged with OUI. He admitted that he had consumed approximately six alcoholic beverages in the previous two hours. In March 2018, Applicant pled no contest to all three civilian criminal charges (SOR ¶¶ 1.l.-1.n.). He was sentenced to six months in jail, of which six months were suspended. He was placed on probation for two years and fined approximately \$500. (Answer at 5; GE 2 at 30-34; GE 4 at 13; GE 5 at 3; GE 10 at 5; Tr. 52-53)

SOR ¶ 1.k. Applicant also received non-judicial punishment (NJP) from the Navy for disorderly conduct and public drunkenness in October 2017; however, the underlying conduct was identical to the conduct alleged in SOR ¶ 1.m. He was reduced in rank, received an oral reprimand, and was required to complete 20 days of extra duty. (Answer at 5; GE 2 at 18; GE 4 at 7; Tr. 54-55)

SOR ¶ 1.j. In October 2017, Applicant ingested 20-30 prescription pills of trazadone and a large quantity of wine with the intent to commit suicide. When his attempt was unsuccessful, he was taken by his command to the hospital. At the DOHA hearing, Applicant admitted that his alcohol consumption negatively impacted his mental health. (Answer at 5; GE 2 at 29; GE 4 at 11; GE 5 at 4; GE 6 at 7; Tr. 51, 55-56)

SOR ¶ 1.i. Applicant received NJP from the Navy for driving under the influence; however, the underlying conduct was identical to the conduct alleged in SOR ¶ 1.l., above. He was reduced in rank, received an oral reprimand, and was placed on restriction for 60 days. (GE 2 at 18; GE 4 at 7; Tr. 72)

SOR ¶¶ 1.g. and 1.h. In November 2017, Applicant was diagnosed with AUD, severe, by the Navy's SARP. He was recommended for inpatient treatment, and he attended a 28-day inpatient alcohol treatment program. While attending the treatment program, he admitted he had previously consumed six to seven alcoholic beverages daily, and he was diagnosed with alcohol dependence. He also admitted that he experienced suicidal thoughts frequently between March and October 2017. He completed the treatment program. Treatment records noted that Applicant "concurred with his primary [AUD], severe, diagnosis and plans on trying to use[] his resources to include 12-step meetings and family." Upon discharge, he was provided a copy of his continuing care plan, but he was a no-show for a subsequent scheduled appointment. At the DOHA hearing, Applicant admitted that he had been informed of the AUD diagnosis during SARP

treatment and that he was likely recommended to abstain from alcohol. (Answer at 5-6; GE 2 at 40; GE 4 at 11; GE 5 at 4; GE 6 at 1-4, 7; Tr. 57-58, 74)

SOR ¶ 1.f. In December 2017, Applicant was separated from the Navy with a General Discharge Under Honorable Conditions due to his alcohol-related offenses. (Answer; GE 2; GE 5 at 3; Tr. 60)

SOR ¶ 1.e. In January 2020, Applicant was involved in a verbal altercation with his then girlfriend. This altercation became physical, and he was charged with (1) disorderly conduct; and (2) assault – third degree. During a subsequent counseling session while in treatment with the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), he reported that his girlfriend had accused him of choking her, which he denied. He acknowledged that he had ripped her shirt and that she had a mark on her neck from when he tried to restrain her. He admitted that he was intoxicated at the time of this altercation – having consumed approximately 10 alcoholic beverages over a four-hour period – and that his impaired condition exacerbated the circumstances. He was required to complete a domestic violence program and participate in alcohol treatment, and a 30-day protective order was placed against him. This January 2020 arrest prompted his probation officer to charge him with violation of probation. Although Applicant did not believe his probation was extended, court records indicate that his probation terminated in March 2021. (GE 2 at 35-36; GE 4 at 14; GE 8 at 13; GE 10 at 5; Tr. 28-29, 61, 72, 74, 79-81)

SOR ¶ 1.d. From March to May 2020, Applicant attended a court-ordered outpatient alcohol treatment program. He was diagnosed with AUD, severe, and alcohol dependence. During the program, he reported that he had been drinking alcohol daily prior to the altercation with his girlfriend. At the DOHA hearing, Applicant testified that he abstained from alcohol consumption for about a month following completion of the rehabilitation program. He denied that he was advised of the AUD diagnosis during this rehabilitation program, but he admitted that he was likely advised to abstain from alcohol. (GE 2 at 28, 39; GE 5 at 4; GE 7 at 5, 12; GE 8 at 13; AE F; Tr. 29, 62, 74-75)

On July 21, 2021, Applicant was interviewed by an authorized investigator on behalf of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). He admitted his alcohol-related offenses in college, during his military service, and in January 2020. He also admitted his mental-health treatment and alcohol rehabilitation stints as discussed above. Prior to alcohol rehabilitation in 2020, he had consumed alcohol “daily to severe intoxication.” He claimed that he had abstained from alcohol for an unspecified period following his 2020 alcohol rehabilitation. Then his alcohol consumption again increased such that he was drinking to intoxication once or twice a week. As of the July 2021 interview, he consumed alcohol once a week to “mild intoxication” (**SOR ¶¶ 1.a., 1.q.**). (GE 4 at 14-15)

SOR ¶ 1.c. Applicant testified that he received medical treatment through the VA from his December 2017 discharge to at least March 2026. The record evidence includes VA medical records spanning April 2022 to April 2024. In February 2023, he contacted the Outpatient Additional Recovery Services for alcohol treatment, noting that his work was being affected by his alcohol consumption and that work stress contributed to his

increased alcohol consumption. From July 2018 to May 2023, Applicant had been employed full time as a quality technician for a private company. During VA counseling sessions, he reported that he had consumed 10 to 12 beers daily between October 2022 and April 2023. He also disclosed that his alcohol consumption had contributed to his absenteeism or tardiness, arriving at work approximately an hour late at least once a month, and led to his termination. He was prescribed naltrexone to help reduce his urge to consume alcohol. The VA records noted that Applicant's alcohol consumption fluctuated, increasing in April 2023, drinking 6 to 10 beers every other day in December 2023, and drinking weekly in March 2024. He admitted that he experienced cravings for alcohol as he passed the restaurant where he would meet his friends and consume alcohol. During appointments in June 2022 and October 2023, lab results revealed elevated liver enzymes, which medical professionals attributed to his alcohol consumption. The VA staff recommended that Applicant not consume more than two drinks per day on average and no more than four drinks at any one sitting, due to his elevated liver enzymes. VA records reflect his continued AUD, severe, diagnosis. (GE 5 at 4-6; GE 8; GE 9 at 16, 25, 41, 48, 55, 58, 65, 75; AE J)

At the DOHA hearing, Applicant testified that VA medical professionals recommended that he reduce his alcohol consumption, but he denied that they recommended he abstain from all consumption. He admitted that he reduced his alcohol consumption in general but that he did at times consume alcohol to intoxication. He also admitted that his alcohol consumption negatively impacted his work performance at his previous employer and that he had been verbally counseled by his then supervisor for his tardiness. He denied that alcohol consumption was the basis for his termination. (AE J; Tr. 26, 30, 38-39, 63-66, 76-79, 82-83)

In his February 23, 2024 response to DOD interrogatories, Applicant admitted that he had consumed 10 to 12 alcoholic beverages daily from October 2022 to April 2023. He had most recently blacked out in November 2023. As of February 2024, he consumed alcohol to the point of intoxication about once a week, and he intended to continue to consume alcohol in the future. He also admitted that his alcohol consumption had resulted in his termination from his employment in May 2023. (GE 3 at 4-6)

SOR ¶ 1.b. On April 12, 2025, Applicant participated in a clinical interview and diagnostic testing with a licensed psychologist (Dr. N) as part of his security clearance investigation. Dr. N also reviewed Applicant's 2021 e-QIP, the 2021 OPM investigation, records from the 2017 Navy hospitalizations, VA medical records, 2020 alcohol treatment records, and Applicant's February 2024 response to DOD interrogatories. During the clinical interview, Applicant admitted his history of mental health treatment, his suicidal ideation and attempt, his alcohol-related offenses, hospitalizations, two stints in alcohol treatment programs, and VA alcohol counseling beginning in February 2023. Dr. N concluded:

While the depression and anxiety disorders appear to be in remission, their risk for recurrence is elevated in light of his alcohol use, as there is a well-established link between alcohol consumption and the onset and/or

exacerbation of these mental health issues. Further, [Applicant's] alcohol use raises a separate Guideline G concern, as he has a substantial history of heavy and problematic alcohol consumption.

The Alcohol Use Disorder appears to be at a mild level, with no significant impact on his overall functioning at this time. There is not likely to have an impact on his judgment, reliability, or trustworthiness concerning classified information at the present. However, this condition has been severe in the past, and the continued use of alcohol places him at high risk for recurrence of heavy and problematic drinking which could adversely impact his judgment, reliability, and/or trustworthiness concerning classified information in the future. (GE 5 at 8)

In his January 2026 Answer, Applicant admitted that he had consumed alcohol, at times to the point of intoxication, between 2008 and at least April 2025 (**SOR ¶ 1.a.**). He stated that he had last consumed alcohol in early December 2025. He attached VA medical records spanning May to December 2025. He admitted weekly alcohol consumption during his May and August 2025 VA appointments, consuming approximately four to five drinks per week. During his November 13, 2025 VA appointment, he admitted that he continued to consume alcohol once a week (about three to five drinks per sitting). During his December 4, 2025 VA appointment, he admitted the challenges in socializing with his friends but not consuming alcohol. He also attached the results December 16, 2025 Phosphatidylethanol (PeTH) test screen, noting that he had tested negative. The screening instructions state that the PeTH test screens for alcohol consumption within the previous one to two weeks. (AE C; AE E)

At the hearing, Applicant testified that he had last consumed alcohol to the point of intoxication on October 31, 2025, and he had last consumed any alcohol on or about November 7, 2025. He submitted a November 13, 2025, signed, statement of intent to abstain from alcohol consumption in the future. Until November 2025, he had consumed alcohol once a week when he met up with friends at a particular restaurant. He attributed his decision to abstain from alcohol to two circumstances – beginning a weight-management medication in October 2025 that eliminated his desire to consume alcohol and to observing the declining health and then passing of one of his drinking buddies. He also acknowledged having received the SOR in October 2025. He has not participated in any inpatient treatment since 2020. As of the hearing, he had not met with a VA counselor in a couple of months, but claimed he intended to return to counseling. Until March 2026, he had met with a VA counselor or psychologist about once every other month. (AE C; AE D; Tr. 24-25, 30, 32-34, 67-68, 85-93)

Applicant acknowledged that he had previously attempted multiple times to abstain from alcohol consumption and had relapsed. He does not participate in Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) or any sobriety-support program; however, he denied any urge to consume alcohol. He engages in hobbies and still socializes with his friends who meet weekly at the same restaurant and who consume alcohol in Applicant's presence. He is interested in continuing mental health counseling through the VA, but he had not initiated

any contacts to schedule an appointment. He testified that his supervisor is vaguely aware of his previous alcohol issues. (Tr. 69-70, 85-93)

Whole Person

Two witnesses testified on behalf of Applicant's clearance eligibility. One witness, a former colleague, has known Applicant for approximately nine years. He described Applicant as reliable and honest, and he never observed Applicant have any issues with alcohol at his prior employment. He learned of Applicant's intent to abstain from alcohol in December 2025 or January 2026 and is supportive of that decision. This witness also provided a character-reference letter in support. (Tr. 97-105; AE K)

The second witness has known Applicant for approximately nine or ten years. They met at the restaurant where Applicant and others gathered on Friday nights to socialize and consume alcohol. He was unaware of Applicant's problematic alcohol consumption and treatment; however, he believed that Applicant left his previous employment for an alcohol-related reason. While he has known Applicant, he has not observed any significant increases or decreases in his alcohol consumption, but he was aware that Applicant had abstained from alcohol since October or November 2025. He trusted Applicant and has invited him on multiple family trips. He corroborated that their mutual friend had recently died from a chronic illness either resulting from or exacerbated by his alcohol consumption. This witness also provided a character-reference letter in support. (Tr. 110-124; AE K)

Applicant's supervisor submitted a character-reference letter in support of his clearance eligibility. He attested to Applicant's integrity, sound judgment, and strict adherence to security requirements. (AE K)

Applicant provided his 2023 and 2024 performance reviews and his 2025 mid-year review. He met expectations in each appraisal. His supervisor noted, "[Applicant] embodied each core value in his work performance. He has shown commitment to excellence and behave[d] with integrity and purpose in terms of the quality of his work and his commitment to earning his level 1 and his ability to take on any task that is thrown at him." (AE I)

During his military service, Applicant was awarded the National Defense Service Medal and Global War on Terrorism Service Medal. (AE H)

Policies

When evaluating an applicant's suitability for a security clearance, the administrative judge must consider the adjudicative guidelines. In addition to brief introductory explanations for each guideline, the adjudicative guidelines list potentially disqualifying conditions and mitigating conditions, which are to be used in evaluating an applicant's eligibility for access to classified information.

These guidelines are not inflexible rules of law. Instead, recognizing the complexities of human behavior, administrative judges apply the guidelines in conjunction with the factors listed in the adjudicative process. The administrative judge's overarching adjudicative goal is a fair, impartial, and commonsense decision. According to AG ¶ 2(a), the entire process is a conscientious scrutiny of a number of variables known as the "whole-person concept." The administrative judge must consider all available, reliable information about the person, past and present, favorable and unfavorable, in making a decision.

The protection of the national security is the paramount consideration. AG ¶ 2(b) requires that "[a]ny doubt concerning personnel being considered for national security eligibility will be resolved in favor of the national security."

Under Directive ¶ E3.1.14, the Government must present evidence to establish controverted facts alleged in the SOR. Under Directive ¶ E3.1.15, the applicant is responsible for presenting "witnesses and other evidence to rebut, explain, extenuate, or mitigate facts admitted by the applicant or proven by Department Counsel." The applicant has the ultimate burden of persuasion to obtain a favorable security decision.

A person who seeks access to sensitive information enters into a fiduciary relationship with the Government predicated upon trust and confidence. This relationship transcends normal duty hours and endures throughout off-duty hours. The Government reposes a high degree of trust and confidence in individuals to whom it grants access to sensitive information. Decisions include, by necessity, consideration of the possible risk the applicant may deliberately or inadvertently fail to safeguard sensitive information. Such decisions entail a certain degree of legally permissible extrapolation of potential, rather than actual, risk of compromise of sensitive information.

Section 7 of EO 10865 provides that adverse decisions shall be "in terms of the national interest and shall in no sense be a determination as to the loyalty of the applicant concerned." See *also* EO 12968, Section 3.1(b) (listing multiple prerequisites for access to classified or sensitive information).

Analysis

Guideline G: Alcohol Consumption

The security concern for alcohol consumption is set out in AG ¶ 21:

Excessive 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.

The guideline notes several conditions that could raise security concerns under AG ¶ 22. The following are applicable in this case:

(a) alcohol-related incidents away from work, such as driving while under the influence, fighting, child or spouse abuse, disturbing the peace, or other incidents of concern, regardless of the frequency of the individual's alcohol use or whether the individual has been diagnosed with alcohol use disorder;

(c) habitual or binge consumption of alcohol to the point of impaired judgment, regardless of whether the individual is diagnosed with alcohol use disorder;

(d) diagnosis by a duly qualified medical or mental health professional (e.g., physician, clinical psychologist, psychiatrist, or licensed clinical social work) or alcohol use disorder; and

(f) alcohol consumption, which is not in accordance with treatment recommendations, after a diagnosis of alcohol use disorder.

The record evidence established Applicant's five alcohol-related offenses (SOR ¶¶ 1.p, 1.n., 1.n., 1.l., and 1.f.) spanning February 2011 through January 2020. These offenses precipitated his separation from the Navy and General Discharge Under Honorable Conditions for misconduct (SOR ¶ 1.f.). By his own admission, Applicant's alcohol consumption exacerbated his mental health struggles and contributed to his suicidal ideation and attempted suicide (SOR ¶¶ 1.o. and 1.j.). AG ¶ 22(a) applies. Because Applicant's NJP did not arise from additional alcohol-related incidents but those alleged elsewhere, I find SOR ¶¶ 1.i. and 1.k. for Applicant.

Applicant's admissions and the treatment records reflect habitual and binge consumption of alcohol spanning 2011 through at least October 31, 2025. Applicant admitted that he last consumed alcohol to intoxication on October 31, 2025. AG ¶ 22(c) applies.

Applicant was repeatedly diagnosed with AUD, severe, in 2017 (SOR ¶¶ 1.o., 1.g., 1.h.), during 2020 outpatient treatment (SOR ¶ 1.d.), throughout his VA treatment (SOR ¶ 1.c.), and in the April 2025 evaluation (SOR ¶ 1.b.). He admitted that he had been aware of his AUD, severe, diagnosis as early as 2017, and this diagnosis was discussed during his 2020 treatment and his VA treatment beginning in February 2023. At the DOHA hearing, Applicant admitted that he was likely advised to abstain from alcohol. AG ¶¶ 22(d) and 22(f) apply.

Conditions that could mitigate the alcohol consumption security concerns are provided under AG ¶ 23. The following are potentially applicable:

(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; and

(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.

Although Applicant's alcohol-related offenses were largely concentrated during 2017, his alcohol consumption contributed to his February 2011 and January 2020 criminal conduct. He completed inpatient treatment in December 2017 and was aware of the AUD, severe, diagnosis. He acknowledged he was likely advised to abstain from alcohol consumption, and he abstained from alcohol consumption following treatment. He was also aware that his alcohol consumption triggered his Navy separation and exacerbated his mental-health conditions, yet he resumed consuming alcohol by 2019. While in outpatient treatment in early 2020, he disclosed that he had regularly consumed alcohol to intoxication leading up to his January 2020 arrest. Following completion of outpatient treatment in May 2020, he abstained from alcohol for about a month and then resumed alcohol consumption. His VA medical records and other evidentiary exhibits detail Applicant's weekly consumption of alcohol to intoxication or "mild intoxication" until October 2025, notwithstanding the VA staff's recommendations to reduce or abstain from alcohol consumption.

While I found Applicant's testimony as to his abstinence since November 2025 to be credible, this seven-month period of abstinence is not a clear and established pattern of abstinence in light of over 14 years of problematic alcohol consumption. Of note, there is no record evidence that any medical professional endorsed Applicant's weekly consumption of alcohol, at times to intoxication, subsequent to his AUD diagnosis. In addition, Applicant is not currently engaged with a VA counselor or any sobriety-support program. His primary social support group remains the group of friends he visits weekly at the restaurant where he regularly consumed alcohol and often felt the urge to consume alcohol. The intertwined nature of Applicant's social support group and his past alcohol consumption raises concerns given his past relapses. None of the alcohol consumption mitigating conditions fully apply.

Whole-Person Concept

Under the whole-person concept, the administrative judge must evaluate an applicant's eligibility for access to classified information by considering the totality of the

applicant's conduct and all relevant circumstances. The administrative judge should consider the nine adjudicative process factors listed at AG ¶ 2(d):

(1) the nature, extent, and seriousness of the conduct; (2) the circumstances surrounding the conduct, to include knowledgeable participation; (3) the frequency and recency of the conduct; (4) the individual's age and maturity at the time of the conduct; (5) the extent to which participation is voluntary; (6) the presence or absence of rehabilitation and other permanent behavioral changes; (7) the motivation for the conduct; (8) the potential for pressure, coercion, exploitation, or duress; and (9) the likelihood of continuation or recurrence.

Under AG ¶ 2(c), the ultimate determination of whether to grant eligibility for a security clearance must be an overall commonsense judgment based upon careful consideration of the guidelines and the whole-person concept. I considered the potentially disqualifying and mitigating conditions in light of all the facts and circumstances surrounding this case. I have incorporated my comments under Guideline G and the factors in AG ¶ 2(d) in this whole-person analysis.

Applicant is well regarded by his supervisor, former colleague, and longtime friend. Although his alcohol-related criminal offenses were concentrated in 2017, his continued alcohol consumption to the point of intoxication – given the negative impact on his Navy career, his mental-health struggles, and his previous employment – does not reflect good judgment and reliability. He has not yet demonstrated an established pattern of abstinence in light of his lengthy history of problematic alcohol consumption. He did not mitigate the alcohol consumption considerations security concerns. Eligibility for access to classified information is denied.

Formal Findings

Formal findings for or against Applicant on the allegations set forth in the SOR, as required by section E3.1.25 of Enclosure 3 of the Directive, are:

Paragraph 1, Guideline G:	AGAINST APPLICANT
Subparagraphs 1.a.-1.h.:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.i.:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.j.:	Against Applicant
Subparagraph 1.k.:	For Applicant
Subparagraph 1.l.-1.q.:	Against Applicant

Conclusion

In light of all of the circumstances presented by the record in this case, I conclude that it is not clearly consistent with the national interest to grant Applicant's eligibility for access to classified information.

Eric H. Borgstrom
Administrative Judge