

Hi Dr. Clevenger,

Thank you for your interest in my story concerning my experience with the polygraph. I hope that this may be of some use to Sandia Corp. in its current discussions. I will let you be the judge.

I will recount my experience to the best of my recollection. There are some dates and names that I could probably dig up if I went through my files at home, but I have not done that.

I started work at SNL/NM in April, 1992. In approximately September or October of 1992 my QSP was found in a large stack on someone's desk at SNL. I was dismayed that it had been sitting around so long (especially since I had been given 5 days to complete it!), but at the same time I was informed that I was eligible for the "accelerated" Q-clearance process, because my paperwork had been "in the system" less than six months.

I elected to participate in the accelerated Q clearance process, which at that time was fairly new to DOE/AL (I believe that it had existed previously at another DOE facility, Rocky Flats in my recollection). The process involved a drug test (urine sample), an interview with a psychiatrist, and a polygraph, in that order.

I do not recall being given any options on the day or time of the polygraph. It is my recollection that I was told that I could come at a certain time on a certain day, or else I would be kicked out of the accelerated Q process. The time offered was 7 or 7:30 am, which I didn't like because I am not a morning person. I would have much preferred a time at 8:30 or 9, but I was told that was not possible.

I was met at the front of DOE/AL by a male person, I believe that he was a contract employee to the DOE program, and I know he told me that he had many years of experience with polygraphs in the military. He escorted me into DOE/AL. Since I was a new employee and did not have a clearance, I did not recognize my surroundings, and did not know exactly where I was (such as building number) within the AL complex.

As I recall, I had been told to bring identification with me. The written directions indicated that this could be a combination of social security card plus drivers license, or a passport. I had brought my passport, because I thought it was the best possible identification. The examiner photocopied it (although I believe the standard photocopy machine poster says that passports are NOT to be copied). He also grilled me extensively about why I had a passport, whether I had traveled overseas much, if I had plans to travel, etc. I told him that I believed that as a citizen it is my right to have a passport for identification, whether or not I had specific plans to travel, that I wanted to have the passport in hand so I wouldn't have to get one should I decide to travel abroad, etc. I was annoyed by the questioning, and felt that "they" shouldn't indicate that a passport could be used as identification if they were planning to grill me about it. I felt that the questioning was inappropriate, given that the passport itself did not carry any stamps for entry or exit of any foreign country.

We proceeded to the room where the polygraph equipment was located. I can't remember clearly whether there was only one examiner, or if there was another person involved--there may have been a second person who made a brief appearance. The examiner discussed the polygraph process, what to expect, etc. We discussed what questions were to be asked, and how I was to answer them. The process was, as I recall, also videotaped (or at least he pointed at a camera and told me it was being taped). I signed various release papers, and we did a "test" question which he had discussed before hand. It had something to do with giving me a \$10 bill, and then he asked me a question as to whether he had shown me a \$10 bill and I was to lie and say that he had not--this was supposed to be for some sort of calibration.

He then asked me a bunch of questions such as, "do you consider yourself an honest person" and "have you ever stolen anything," and "have you ever told a lie." I recall being asked to say

"yes" to being honest, "no" to having stolen anything" and so on. We had discussed the questions before hand, and I had discussed with him that I had stolen a toy from a cousin when I was a child, although I had never deliberately stolen anything as an adult. We had discussed saying "yes" to being an honest person, even though I sometimes mislead others by telling a "white lie" (such as telling someone that I feel "fine" even if I don't feel well, or telling someone they look "fine" when asked if I like their clothes, even if I feel that their clothes are unflattering--that sort of thing.)

I found the whole thing very stressful, because I felt that I was being directed to give incorrect answers, even though we had discussed all of these things before hand. I thought that I should have been allowed to answer fully and truthfully, rather than giving "yes" and "no" answers to complex questions. I thought that I should have been allowed to say, "No, I have never knowingly stolen anything as an adult, although as a child I did once take my cousin's toy" or "Yes, I consider myself to be an exceptionally honest person, although I do sometimes tell "white lies" in the course of normal social interactions."

Also, the polygraph equipment itself was making me physically uncomfortable--I remember one of my hands was going numb from the blood pressure cuff.

On top of all this stress, after he was "done" he took my chart and left me alone in the room, saying that he was going to another room to "read" the chart. Remember, I was uncleared, I was in a secure area, and I was being left unescorted. I was not sure how I was ever going to get out if my examiner did not return!

My examiner did return, and informed me that my charts were "unreadable." He told me that my only choices were to (1) terminate the accelerated Q process, or (2) submit to another polygraph immediately. He appeared to be somewhat upset that this was going to ruin his schedule for the day, that it was taking too long, etc. Although I was upset and nearly in tears, I told him that I wanted to continue the exam and the accelerated Q process, but that first I had to eat a snack, and asked him to escort me out to my vehicle. We went to my vehicle, I ate my snack, and we went back into the AL complex.

The second set of polygraph questions was much more straight forward. He asked direct questions like, "are you now or have you ever been a member of an organization plotting the overthrow of the US government," and "have you ever planned or performed an act of terrorism against the US government." Frankly, I was annoyed that he had not asked these questions the first time around. These were questions that I could answer with a "yes" or "no."

This, in a nut shell, is my story. I came away with the distinct impression that reading a polygraph "chart" is akin to reading tea leaves--that the examiner can see or not see anything that he wants to see. I had a strong impression that the examiner was unaccustomed to performing polygraph exams on female persons, and thought that the pressure of the blood pressure cuff was unreasonably tight. I felt that I should have been allowed to take the exam at more reasonable hour of the day without being threatened with being expelled from the accelerated Q process. I felt that the questions should have been pertinent and straight forward from the very beginning. I felt that the examiner should have had to answer for the security infraction of leaving me unescorted in a secure area, but I thought that I would be retaliated against by not receiving my clearance, or by having my story doubted, if I told anyone about it.

Thank you for allowing me to tell my story. There may be others from the accelerated Q program who might be willing to discuss their experiences. You may use my name when discussing this story with any member of Sandia Corporation management. I would prefer that my name not be associated with this story if it is discussed with anyone else, and also that identifying information be purged as much as possible if it is shared with persons not employed by Sandia Corporation.

Frankly, I still fear retaliation.

[NEXT Testimonial]

My experience with polygraphy was the most stressful single activity of a two-and-one-half decade SNL career. I was reasonably nervous going in to the process because I believed (as I still believe) that my career was "on the line," even if my job at SNL was not. (I say this because, despite the assurance of upper management that no one will lose his or her job because of a "failed" polygraph, I am certain that DOE would "administratively" pull my clearances [both Q and others] and I would be in a limbo state for a considerable period of time if not "forever" and would probably be assigned to a really exciting job inventorying material in reapplication for the remainder of my time here!)

I spent about three-and-one-half hours "in the chair" during my first session. I was told about midway through this session that my ability to respond deceptively when requested (i.e., to intentionally answer incorrectly to a set-up question) was not sufficient. In my words--I was being told that I couldn't lie well enough! Therefore, I had to repeat the entire process, trying harder to lie when I was supposed to. This was extremely stressful, in addition to being morally repugnant in some sense.

At the end of the three and one-half hours, I was told that I would need "to come back and try again." Needless to say, this was enormously disquieting--Had I failed? Was I going to loose my clearance and my job? How would I pay my mortgage? All of these thoughts, easily dismissed by a dispassionate observer as an emotional overreaction, were flooding my mind and continued to do so for the two days between the sessions. These two days were enormously unpleasant for me, my colleagues, and my family--I didn't sleep or eat and was irritable and nonproductive. I imagine that, looking back, my concerns were largely irrational but that does not make them any less real. (My understanding is that this is not an uncommon occurrence. Although I have not compiled rigorous statistics, I have talked to several individuals who have had to go back more than once, one individual had to go back five times--I pity him and his family during that ordeal!)

The second session (this time only two and one-half hours) was terrible--I forced myself to have a strong physiological response while knowingly answering incorrectly in ways that I found physically and morally degrading, but which I believed to be necessary for me to continue to work at the laboratory. This time I was told that I didn't need to come back. Note that I was not told that I had "passed," only that I did not need to come back. More stress!

The entire process was degrading and depersonalizing and was made all that much worse by my sense that this is a useless exercise from a security point of view. My own experience of "lying" did not give me great confidence that the responses they were getting had any real validity. I am probably no better informed on polygraphy than the average laboratory employee, but I have read some of the literature and talked a great deal about it and understand the implications of false positives, etc. In addition, the fact that people like Aldrich Ames and other "infamous" individuals have passed polygraphs, in some cases "with flying colors," does not enhance my sense that this will, in any way, enhance our laboratory's ability to detect/defeat espionage. The recent publicity that notes that of the several thousand who have taken it, none have "failed," does nothing to enhance my confidence since even the advocates' own statistics suggest that a few hundred people should have "failed" in this population

While I did not blame SNL for "forcing" me to take the polygraph examination, this experience did not enhance my morale nor make me more of an enthusiastic employee (I'm pretty enthusiastic about SNL as it is!) However, it is certainly a "morale downer" and was one of the low points of my SNL career.

(name removed)

Al,

I want to thank you for your persistence in waging the battle against polygraph tests. I currently am undergoing professional counseling for the second time because of the trauma I experienced in a polygraph test in 1994. Upon coming to Sandia, I opted to sign up for the accelerated clearance program, which required a polygraph test. The polygrapher behaved much as you describe in your op/ed piece in the Albuquerque Tribune. He badgered me time and again, saying I was holding back the truth and that I was failing. Obviously, that caused a great deal of anxiety, which just made the situation worse. I had visions of me not being able to keep my job at Sandia, with a wife and three kids to support.

The anxiety reached such a crescendo that I finally blurted out words about a sexual assault that I had been the victim of many years earlier. It was an incident I had repressed. Whereas I initially got therapy for the sexual assault (I was diagnosed soon after the polygraph test with post traumatic stress disorder) my therapist now believes much if not most of the trauma was the direct result of the polygraph test. I must say, I get anxious now just thinking about them. Thanks again for all that you're doing. As I have told others, the national labs couldn't have a better person to wage this battle. I admire your determination and courage.

(name removed)

My exam took 2 1/2 hours.

Prior to the conducting the polygraph the examiner asked me if I had ever previously been polygraphed. I don't think that has a bearing on the results - so why ask it? He may have asked about medication but I don't recall. It wasn't an issue at the time and since I'm not on medication, I'm not sensitive to people asking me if I am.

I believe polygraphs are subjective. As such they can "clear" the honest, "catch" the dishonest, "pass over" the dishonest, or "falsely identify" the honest. The last consequence is what concerns me.

I was asked (required was my impression) to fill out a questionnaire after it was over. I think the questions on it were roughly:

1. Did you find this experience embarrassing or humiliating?
2. Were you physically uncomfortable or feel threatened in any way?
3. Were the questions clear?
4. Does this process enhance the security of the nation (or on the job - I can't recall)?
5. If you were to change jobs and your new employer required a polygraph, would you submit to it?

Signing and dating the form was also required.

I was very uncomfortable with questions 4 and 5.

In general, I didn't find this to be as bad an experience as some have. It was certainly not fun but it wasn't degrading or threatening either. However, my exam had resulted in a "false positive", I'm quite certain that the resulting experience would be extremely degrading, threatening, and unsettling. There is the risk.

They were courteous, not really friendly - but not rude either. The examiner took a lot of time to make the 4 national security questions and the control question as clear as possible.

(name removed)

My polygraph experience

(name removed)

Thursday, July 18, 2002:

A large group meeting, run by our future polygrapher, was held for Sandians selected for counterintelligence polygraph screening. I do not recall the polygrapher's last name being given, but her first name is Charlene, her phone number is 505-846-6071, and her office/examination room is located in building 277 at 2801 Kirtland Drive. (I am not certain that this is the correct spelling of her name.) At the meeting it was stressed that we should not tell anyone we are having a polygraph examination as that fact and even the location were sensitive. We were shown an introductory video explaining the need for and process of polygraph screening. Charlene spoke for a while on the topic and at one point explained that, while she couldn't openly call movement on her chart a lie, it was after all the only realistic explanation. Attendees were asked if anyone had had previous polygraphs. With several others I raised my hand to indicate the polygraph I took in 1992 as part of an accelerated access program when I began work at Sandia. At the close of the meeting we were required to sign up for a time slot on her examination schedule. My time slot was August 26, 2002, at 7:30 a.m., a date she made a production of announcing as her birthday.

Tuesday, August 20, 2002:

Charlene left me a message indicating that she could not meet with me on the 26th and that I should call her to reschedule. I returned her call to find out that she needed to place someone else in my time slot and that the earliest openings she had were in October. She gave me a tentative date and I asked her to call me if any earlier openings became available.

Wednesday, August 21, 2002:

Charlene left me a message indicating that if I was available immediately she could fit me in. Before I received that message she left me another message indicating that she had a cancellation for the next afternoon. I returned her call and agreed to a 12:30 p.m. appointment the following day. She stressed that I should get plenty of sleep and eat a good lunch before showing up. I asked what time I should be there for the appointment and she replied that she would appreciate it if I could come a little earlier. I had no appointments that day and asked her to name a time. She suggested 11 a.m. and when I replied that would require a very early lunch she agreed and said she would see me then.

Thursday, August 22, 2002:

10:50 a.m.:

I arrived at the exam location and called Charlene. She met me at the door and had a discussion with a gentleman who happened to be there to do some work in her and her colleague's offices. We proceeded upstairs where she had me wait while she continued discussing the work to be done. She then had me wait in the hall while she went to speak with a

few people. After approximately 10 minutes she returned and escorted me to her office and had me take a seat to discuss the exam procedure before we began. She explained to me that the entire proceeding would be videotaped and retained for 60 days so that it could be reviewed to determine if any given response was due to physical movement. I asked for no credentials during the exam and none were proffered. I told her of my previous polygraph in 1992. She asked me how much sleep I had the previous night and if I followed her instructions to have a good lunch, I replied with about seven hours and an excellent late breakfast. **She asked me if I had any medical conditions. We discussed my recurring bronchitis, but as I was not currently suffering we both agreed that it was not necessary to indicate it on the form. She asked if I was taking any medications, prescription or otherwise, and I indicated that I was not. I was then required to sign a form to this effect.** There were a couple of other forms regarding the polygraph that I was required to sign. At one point during the early stages of the session the telephone rang and after a short conversation she disconnected the phone.

At approximately 11:15 we began what was referred to as a calibration test. I chose a number between 3 and 8 (6) and wrote it on a sheet of paper, which she then taped to the wall in front of me. I removed my watch and ring before she attached a wrist cuff to my left hand. She then placed a band around my upper chest and one around my lower chest. Finally sensors were attached to the index and ring fingers of my right hand. She explained to me that each test would begin with a statement that the test was about to start, at which point I should cease all movement, throat clearing, etc. and prepare for the questions. Then she would ask the questions and I should answer them. At the end she would state that the test was over and I should remain motionless until she had turned off the machine. She explained that she would ask me if the number I chose was 3, then if it was 4, and so on through each of the numbers. She instructed me to answer "no" to each question, including the number I had chosen. I asked her if it was practical to calibrate on a question that she had told me to lie on because I would be doing as she asked, and that wouldn't have nearly the emotional aspect of an a real lie. She seemed offended and responded that her machine did not detect emotional responses. She explained that when we speak, the sense of reality in our brain compares what we know to be true with what our mouth is saying and that any discrepancy between the two will set up a conflict. It was this conflict and not any emotional connotations that she detected with her machine. Concerned that further questions on the topic would irritate her, I acquiesced and we proceeded through the test as she had described it.

She explained to me the format for the rest of the tests. Each test would consist of three types of questions: intent to tell the truth, calibration lies, and the counterintelligence questions. The intent question simply asked if it was my intention to tell the truth at this polygraph exam. I believe this question was asked at the beginning of each individual test.

Charlene explained that I should not analyze the questions. I laughed and told her it was an occupational hazard, that as an engineer what I do is analyze questions. She said I would just have to not do it. I told her I would do my best but that that was how my mind worked and honestly for what reason would anyone not want to analyze a question. "To pass this test for one" was her reply.

There would be two calibration lies during each test which I would be required to answer falsely. The following are examples of the required lies that were used: Have you ever violated a traffic law? Is there anything in your life that you would change if you could? Have you ever done anything in your life which you regretted? Have you ever said anything that made someone angry with you? Has anyone ever done anything to make you angry? Have you ever said something which you later regretted? Did you ever do anything to get back at someone for something? Have you ever taken credit for something you did not do? (The last two were not used because I could not think of examples.) I was instructed that not only was I to answer "no" to the selected two questions during the individual test, but that I was to visualize intensely an incident which had occurred that made the "no" answer false. She stressed that it should be an event with as strong a memory as possible and that I should try to relive every aspect of it as though I were watching a movie in my mind. She asked me to work to remember every detail such as how it made me feel, how the other person's face looked, how long ago it happened, etc.

There would be two counterintelligence questions during each individual test. They took various forms like the following: Have you ever committed sabotage against the U.S. government? Have you ever been involved in terrorism against the U.S. government? Do you have any contacts with foreign nationals that you do not want to tell me about? Have you ever misused government equipment? Have you ever mishandled classified information? When the individual questions were presented to me she asked me to tell her any reservations I might have about answering them truthfully and anything I was worried might pop into my head when the question was asked during the actual test. When she brought up the foreign national question, I discussed with her a British foreign national colleague and friend of my wife whom I have occasional contact with. When I told her his last name, she gave me a very skeptical look and informed me he didn't sound British to her. **She required me to fill out an information sheet on the individual, which I did.** When she brought up the treatment of classified information question, I informed her of a self reported incident when I briefly and unintentionally brought a cell phone into the tech area, and a time when I walked away from some papers to be shredded which luckily were in the presence of team members from the time I left them until I very shortly and sheepishly came running back to them. At this point she seemed angry and accused me of not focussing on the question and getting away from the issue. I told her I was trying to obey her instruction to reveal to her anything that might pop into my head during questioning to the best of my ability. When she listed sharing passwords among the bad things to do, I explained that we have a team password on our shared classified disks, but that those disks are required to be locked in a classified safe whenever not in our immediate possession and that the password is not part of their protection. I had difficulty explaining as she kept interrupting with questions, but I thought I finally made myself understood. When she discussed personal use of government computers as a misuse of government property, I informed her that I receive personal email at work but that it is my understanding that limited personal use is allowed by Sandia policy. She said that was not what the question pertained to. She informed me that the questions could appear in any order during the individual test, but that they would only be the questions we discussed immediately before the test, the intent

question, the two calibration lies, and the two counterintelligence questions.

Before each test, when the counterintelligence questions were explained, she would ask me to define terms in the question such as sabotage, espionage, and foreign intelligence service. Before most of the individual tests I was repeatedly asked the definition of "intentionally" to which I always replied "on purpose" and she would reply with a list of additional synonyms. When asking me the counterintelligence questions before a test began, she would usually wait for my answer and then lean forward to ask me if I was absolutely sure, to which I responded either "yes" or "quite".

We then began the first of the real tests. I thought it went quite well but she was disappointed. She informed me that she couldn't use that test because I had moved and so we would just have to do it over. I told her that I didn't think I moved, but I did not want to press the issue so I promised to redouble my efforts to remain absolutely still. She also said that I needed to increase my breathing rate a good deal or the testing was going to take forever as she was required to wait at least three full breaths between each question. **I was worried because I was breathing normally, but I promised to try to maintain a faster breathing rate.** She repeated this request for me to breath faster numerous times throughout the examination.

We repeated the test, this time to her apparent satisfaction. At about this point she switched from a wrist cuff to a thumb cuff and appeared quite pleased with the difference. Throughout the remainder of the examination there were no further complaints of movement.

During each of the individual tests I recall the intent question being asked at the beginning, the calibration questions being asked at least once each, and the counterintelligence questions being asked at least twice each, usually in succession after one of the calibration lies.

We continued this process for some time, discuss the questions, **run the test, wait for her to analyze the results, and prepare for the next test.** Eventually she became clearly agitated, shaking her head and sighing while informing me that something wasn't right here. **She told me that there was too much indication to not be a response and too little indication to be a response.** She asked me what I was thinking about after different counterintelligence questions because she was seeing a response. I told her that all I was thinking about was the question; there was no doubt about my answer. She asked if I repeated the question in my head, and I said I did. She said I shouldn't do that, that I should think about nothing after I answer those questions, especially not what question might be coming up next. Contrarily, she said that I was not thinking strongly enough about the events I had chosen to concentrate on for the calibration lies. She said I must chose more vivid memories and really concentrate upon them as if I were playing them as a movie in my head. She also after several of the tests disgustedly claimed that **we couldn't use that test result because I had "lost my focus" near the end.** I asked her more than once to explain what this meant so I could avoid it, but I never got an answer I was able to understand and use. During one of the tests she audibly sighed, which did little to put me at ease.

Before each test I was required to think up different calibration lie scenarios for different questions and she explained that she had to ask the questions in different ways because that was a requirement of the process. At one point I noticed a pattern and, concerned that my pulse was still racing because of working so hard on the calibration lie memories, asked her why she always asked the counterintelligence questions after requiring me to concentrate on an unpleasant memory for the calibration lie. I asked if that was accidental or an intentional part of the process. I regretted the question immediately as she snapped her head toward me and replied, "nothing I do in here is accidental."

Still not liking what she was seeing, she asked me again what I was thinking about after some of the counterintelligence questions. There must be something she explained, because she was getting a response. She said that we needed to know what the problem was to prevent me from continuing to fail other tests. I informed her truthfully that, after answering honestly, I was thinking as best I could about nothing and waiting for the next question.

1:30 p.m.:

Charlene informed me that I looked like I needed a break and asked if I would like 15-20 minutes to recover. I thanked her but said that I would prefer to continue. She repeated the offer and I passed and thanked her again. Then she said that she needed 15-20 minutes to consult with a colleague about my test results so would I please go downstairs where there was a soda machine and come back and ring the bell after that amount of time. I retrieved my watch and went downstairs where I found a conference room to wait in. A gentleman stopped by and offered me use of the television in the conference room while I was waiting, and I gladly accepted his offer as there was nothing else to do. I would have preferred to take a walk outside but that would have required calling Charlene to gain re-entry, and I dared not interrupt her to ask if that was acceptable.

1:50 p.m.:

I returned to the entryway to Charlene's office wing and rang the bell for readmittance. She promptly arrived and escorted me back into her office where we began again. She told me that she thought my problem was that I wasn't thinking about my calibration lie memories quickly enough after answering the questions to get a response in time for her to use. She explained that any responses which occur too late can not be used and invalidated the test. This made no sense to me, but I did not want to appear argumentative, so I asked her if I should think about the event for a while before answering the question. She agreed that I should try that. I apologized and said that I was doing my best, that I definitely wanted to finish this process more than she did and was doing everything I could to follow her instructions. She became surprisingly serious and said that wasn't true, that she wanted it to be done more than I did. At this point in the process I couldn't imagine that being the case so I asked her to trust me on this and left it at that. We continued the testing cycles and while she didn't seem happy, she also did not seem to complain as much. As we were just finishing one of the individual tests the phone rang again, and after a brief conversation she again disconnected the phone.

2:45-2:50 p.m.:

Charlene announced that the test process was finished. **She indicated that she was concerned about the security measures for our classified disks and she had better write something down about it.** I explained to her that we have an authorized security plan, that those disks were either locked in a classified safe or in the immediate possession of a team member. I told her that they had a common team password so that all the team members, the only people with access to the safe, could use them. I had difficulty explaining this as **she kept interrupting my explanations with questions, such as what was the building, what were the offices, how many computers, where were the computers located, what was the project name, was the project name I just gave her classified (no), etc.** I answered her questions until she asked one I considered to be entirely inappropriate and suspicious; she asked me what the team password was. I was startled and I replied, "I'm sorry, I can't tell you that." She gave me a long hard glare and continued writing something on her notes for a while. Still wondering what was going on here I asked her, "Did you really think I would tell you a password?" She did not even acknowledge the question and eventually finished whatever notes she was taking.

I told her that she might encounter this topic again, as another team member was at the same meeting and had a polygraph appointment with her the following month. **She asked for the name and claimed to remember the individual.**

She explained that the test results were fine but that they were required to go through a number of levels of quality control review. She considered it highly unlikely that there would be any questions, but she was required to inform me that it was possible a future reviewer could request that I be called back to retake one or more tests. She explained that this process was quite backlogged and would take several weeks to months to complete. I asked if I would be notified upon successful completion of the review process. She replied that I would only be told if there was a problem, that I would not be notified of the completion of the review process.

As the final item before I left, she asked me to fill out an evaluation of the polygraph procedure. It was a single page form with a number of **questions and a portion at the bottom for comments regarding the examination.** She informed me that **I did not have to place my name on the form and that great stock was placed on these reviews at headquarters.** I was required to fill this out while Charlene sat next to me at her desk and I remained in the examination chair. She then had me place the form in an envelope and leave it with her.

She requested that I not tell anyone about the examination because even though I might think I'm helping them, it will actually make them more nervous about the test and make it more difficult for them.

3:00 p.m.:

I left Charlene's office with the apparent mutual expectation of seeing her again in five years or so whenever my next screening is due.

Monday, August 26, 2002:

It was barely over one business day since Charlene assured me that it was very unlikely the backlogged quality control review process would request retesting when I received another call from her. She left a message on my voicemail stating that we needed to do some "additional" testing and if I called she will try to get me scheduled. I called her and she offered 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 5, 2002. I accepted this appointment, and when I asked her why additional testing was required, she replied that she couldn't discuss it over an open line. This topped off growing concerns I have had over the testing procedure, and I arranged to speak with Dr. Zelicoff regarding this matter due to the public nature of his concerns about polygraph screening at Sandia.