



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL

BILL LOCKYER

AUGUST 2003

Forensic laboratories are crucial to our criminal justice system. Forensic scientists in California's crime laboratories provide invaluable information that aids in the investigation and prosecution of crime through the scientific examination of physical evidence. Their efforts, carried out to the highest standards of scientific objectivity, integrity and quality, give voice to the "silent witness" of physical evidence and contribute to the cause of justice.

The criminal justice system increasingly relies on forensic science as new technology emerges at an ever-accelerating rate. The limited resources of our forensic delivery system are under increasing strain as the demand for scientific evidence continues to grow. To the extent that our laboratories are unable to meet the needs of their clients in a timely fashion, the efficiency and effectiveness of the entire criminal justice system can be undermined. We must ensure that pressure on the laboratories for more and faster results never reduces the accuracy and quality of their work, for that could result in injustice.

To address these challenges, I created the California Task Force on Forensic Services. The Task Force broadly represented California's criminal justice and forensic science communities. I asked the Task Force to assess the current status of our state's forensic service delivery system and to identify the steps we must take to ensure that California will continue to receive the highest quality crime laboratory service.

I am grateful for the expertise, commitment and hard work of the task force members. I strongly endorse the findings and recommendations outlined in this 2003 California Task Force on Forensic Services Force Report, which will provide a foundation and framework for future policy and funding decisions. I urge other public policy makers to lend their support as well.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bill Lockyer".

Bill Lockyer
Attorney General

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	<i>i</i>
Acknowledgments	<i>xi</i>

TASK FORCE REPORT

I. ASSESSING CALIFORNIA'S FORENSIC LABORATORIES

Introduction	1
Objectives of the Task Force Report	1
Study Methodology	3
A. Surveys	3
B. Data Limitations	4
C. Task Force Discussions	4

II. THE BIG PICTURE: NATIONAL TRENDS IN FORENSIC SCIENCE

Introduction	5
Automation and Computerized Databases	6
A. Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)	7
B. Automated DNA Databases (CODIS)	8
C. Automated Firearms Identification Databases (NIBIN)	9
Advances in Science and Technology	10
A. DNA Analysis of Biological Sample	10
B. Instrumental Chemical Analyses: Toxicology, Trace Evidence and Clandestine Laboratory Investigation	11
C. New Methods for Latent print Processing	12
D. Digital Evidence	13
Recognition of the Significance the Crime Scene	14
Professionalism: Quality Assurance, Accreditation, Certification, Training and Education	17
A. Quality Assurance	18
B. Laboratory Accreditation	19
C. Certification of Staff	21
D. Scientific Standards and Specialization	22
E. Training and Education	24

III. CALIFORNIA FORENSIC LABORATORY OPERATIONS

Overview and History	27
State Level Laboratories	30
State Forensic Laboratory Locations – Map	32
County and Municipal Forensic Laboratory Locations – Map	33
County-Managed Laboratories	34
Municipally-Managed Laboratories	35
Private Forensic Laboratories	36
Federal Forensic Laboratories	36

IV. ASSESSING CALIFORNIA'S FORENSIC LABORATORY WORKLOAD AND PERFORMANCE

Introduction	37
Forensic Laboratory Operations Within California	37
A. Services Provided	37
B. Staffing	38
C. Workload	40
D. Costs of Various Services	41
E. Turnaround Times/Timeliness of Results	43
F. Desired Turnaround Times: Urgent vs. Routine Requests	44
G. Laboratory Backlog	45
H. Laboratory Equipment and Facilities	47
I. Regionalization of Testing	49
Client Feedback: Sheriffs and Police Chiefs	50
A. Use of Private Laboratories	50
B. Law Enforcement Satisfaction with Public Laboratories	53
C. Unmet Needs: Services Not Requested	55
Client Feedback: District Attorneys	56
A. Use of Public Sector and Private Forensic Laboratories	56
B. District Attorney Satisfaction with Public Laboratories	58
C. Expert Witness Testimony from Laboratory Personnel	59
D. Unmet Needs: Services Not Requested	59
E. Prosecution vs. Investigation: Impact on Laboratories	60
Comparable State Laboratory Systems	61
A. Other States Surveyed	61
B. Other States Structure, Practices and Policies	61
C. Turnaround Times: California vs. Other States	62
D. Workload and Staff per Case Ratio	63
Shortfall in DNA Processing Capabilities	64
The Impact of Increasing Laboratory Capacity	65
Planning for the Future	66

V. TASK FORCE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Broad Trends and Impacts 67

- A. The pace of technological and scientific change is accelerating 67
- B. Enhanced crime-solving capabilities create expanded workload per case request 67
- C. New tools to identify suspects are viewed as resource-constrained and thus unavailable 68
- D. Accreditation improves product acceptance/ Effectiveness, but reduces staff efficiency 68
- E. Specialization impacts laboratory efficiency and organization 68

Organization and Performance 69

Planning for the Future 70

Demand for Service and Improved Turnaround 71

Quality Assurance and Accreditation 72

Use of Forensic Databases in Investigations 73

Education and Training 74

Equipment and Facilities Funds 75

Collection of Workload Data 76

Regionalized Services 77

VI. SELECTED REFERENCES AND WEBSITES 79

VII. APPENDIX: SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

APPENDIX A

Forensic Laboratory Survey 82

APPENDIX B

Forensic Labs in CA – Supplemental Questionnaire 90

APPENDIX C

Survey of Law Enforcement Forensic Lab Needs 92

APPENDIX D

Survey for California District Attorneys 94

APPENDIX E

Survey of [Other] States Forensic Labs 96

VIII. GLOSSARY 99