

**RESPONSE TO  
ASCLD/LAB  
INSPECTORS'  
JULY 23, 2003,  
CORRESPONDENCE**

**NOVEMBER 2002 INSPECTION**

**SAN DIEGO SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT  
REGIONAL CRIME LABORATORY**

**August 07, 2003**



P.O. Box 427  
Riderwood, Maryland 21139-0427  
410-821-8523

July 23, 2003

Don Tapper  
Supervising Criminalist  
San Diego County Sheriff's Crime Laboratory  
5255 Mt. Etna Drive  
San Diego, CA 92117

Dear Don:

Reference the June 23, 2003 ASCLD/LAB Corrections to Remediation Response that was forwarded to the inspection team by Quality Manager Kathy Wagner. The team has completed its review of the documentation and the following comments are provided on each of the criteria identified in the report:

1.1.2.5: No additional remediation is appropriate at this time.

1.1.2.7: The additional information that has been provided is responsive to the issue identified in the May 6<sup>th</sup> letter. No further action is required. The revised manual sections will be reviewed at the time of a revisit.

1.3.3.1: The additional information that has been provided satisfactorily addresses the issues identified in the May 6<sup>th</sup> letter and this criterion is considered by the inspection team to be remediated.

1.4.2.4: Appendix 1 of the package provides "7.20.1 Quality System Review Team." There are no words in italics in the document and the information contained therein still does not appear to reflect what is required to conduct an annual review of the quality system.

**Response:** First, apologies for forgetting to italicize. The policy has been revised to indicate what is required to conduct an annual review of the quality system. We have included a copy of the Quality System Audit Checklist.

1.4.2.7: The additional information that has been provided is responsive to the issue identified in the May 6<sup>th</sup> letter. No further action is required. The revised manual sections will be reviewed at the time of a revisit.

1.4.2.8: In #1, 3 and 4, it is unclear as to the requirements for preparation and documentation of the specific tests. For example, under section 4, Water chlorides, Sulfates, a known latent impression composed of sweat is to be used. How is this impression to be prepared and documented? As an example of a procedure the team considers to be appropriate, the procedure for bloody component is very specific and requires recording preparation of the test cards.

Regarding #1, it is assumed that the examiner's case notes pertaining to the test impressions will reflect when, by whom and the specific test (amino acid or beef bouillon).

1.4.1.14: 1. The additional information that has been provided satisfactorily addresses the issues identified in the May 6<sup>th</sup> letter. Appropriate implementation will be further reviewed at the time of a revisit.

1.4.2.19: The response states that words in italics in appendix 6 indicate new or revised language in the manual. The document provided as appendix 6, 7.13.7 Proficiency Test Evaluation Results, does not contain any words in italics. Also, the policy states what must take place when a discrepancy is identified, which includes removing an examiner from casework. It does not identify as to what must take place in order to reinstate the examiner to casework.

All findings appear to be satisfactorily resolved with the exception of those issues commented above relating to criteria 1.4.2.4, 1.4.2.8 and 1.4.2.19. As soon as these remaining three criteria are satisfactorily addressed we will be in a position to schedule a revisit.

In the meantime, if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me. Until mid-September, my mailing address is 274 69<sup>th</sup> Street, Avalon, NJ 08202, and I can be reached by telephone at 609-368-5560.

Sincerely,

Richard S. Frank

cc: Ralph Keaton, ASCLD/LAB Executive Director  
Frank Fitzpatrick, ASCLD/LAB Board Coordinator  
Each inspector  
Kathy Wagner, SDCSCL Quality Manager

