




**Report on the Responses to the January 1 to July 1, 2013
Customer Satisfaction Survey for
Bureau of Forensic Fire and Explosives Analysis**

The following derives its data from a survey of seven questions sent to customers who submitted samples to the Bureau during the period from January 1, 2013 through July 1, 2013.

Carl Chasteen, Chief of Forensic Services
Julius Halas, Director, Division of State Fire Marshal
Jeff Atwater, Chief Financial Officer and State Fire Marshal



AN ASCLD/LAB-International ACCREDITED LABORATORY
(SINCE July 20, 2010 in the subdisciplines of Explosives, Analysis of Unknowns, and Fire Debris)


TABLE OF CONTENTS

Submitters.....	page 3
The Survey: Responses by Service	page 6
Overview of All Services.....	page 7
Fire Debris Analysis Service.....	page 9
Explosives Analysis Service.....	page 11
Unknown Chemicals Analysis Service.....	page 13
Digital Image Processing Service.....	page 15
Forensic Video Service.....	page 17
The Survey: Comments	page 19
Question #6 (Comments on Personnel).....	page 19
Question #7 (General Suggestions/Issues/Complaints).....	page 20

Submitters:

During the survey period, a total of 157 submitters were identified. They represented 15 Fire Departments, 10 Police Departments, 12 Sheriff’s Offices, 12 BFAI Field Offices, the Florida Department of Corrections, the State’s Attorney Office, The Office of Agricultural Law Enforcement, and the Office of Fiscal Integrity. The majority of physical evidence submissions (75.6%) were made by detectives from the Bureau of Fire and Arson Investigations (BFAI). Approximately 79% of submissions from Sheriff’s Offices were for identification of hazardous chemicals seized during clandestine drug laboratory investigations. BFAI was also responsible for 100% of Digital Image Submissions which are not considered in the table below. Internal Bureau created samples necessary for quality assurance, instrument validation, and proficiency evaluations were redacted from the totals.

Type of Agency	Number of Separate Agencies/Field Offices	Number of Submitters by Agency Type	Percent of Submissions
BFAI	12	82	75.6%
Fire Dept.	15	41	14.8%
Police Dept.	10	10	1.6%
Sheriff's Office	12	18	7.6%
Other (State Agencies)	4	6	0.4%
Totals	53	157	100%



Of the non-BFAI submitting agencies, eight (8) were identified as submitting 15 or more samples each.

Agency	samples
Lake County Sheriff	87
Hillsborough County Fire Marshal	78
Palm Beach County Fire Rescue	59
Miami Fire Dept.	50
Orlando Arson and Bomb Squad	19
Fort Lauderdale Fire Rescue	17
Jackson County Sheriff	16
Sumter County Sheriff	15

A breakout of the physical evidence submissions made by our largest customer, the Bureau of Fire and Arson Investigations, indicates that the average number of chemical analysis submissions per detective who submitted physical evidence items in the target time frame (78 detectives) was 17.3 samples per detective. The field office with the greatest number of chemical analysis submissions was Plantation followed by Jacksonville. The average number of digital image case submissions per detective who submitted Digital Image Cases in the target time frame (68 detectives) was 23.5 cases per detective. The field office with the highest number of Digital Image Case submissions was Jacksonville followed by Orlando.

Field Office	Samples	DI Cases
Plantation	208	176
Jacksonville	195	279
Fort Myers	159	139
Orlando	153	221
Pensacola	152	154
Tampa	126	104
Tallahassee	93	45
West Palm Beach	82	89
Daytona	55	101
Lake Wales	52	121
Ocala	38	84
Panama City	37	82
	1350	1595

The top ten (10) individual submitters of fire debris analysis requests are listed in the following table:

Detective	FO	Samples
Larry Brazile	Jacksonville	49
J. Baker	Jacksonville	48
Max Melendez	Tampa	48
Mike Miller	Pensacola	47
Jennifer Martell	Fort Myers	43
Joseph Pietrafesa	West Palm Beach	41
David Lepper	Fort Myers	40
Anthony Mozealous	West Palm Beach	32
Dan Yeager	Jacksonville	32
Joan Champion	Plantation	32

The top ten (10) individual submitters of digital image cases are listed in the following table:

Detective	FO	DI Cases
Anthony Mozealous	West Palm Beach	58
J. Baker	Jacksonville	52
David Young	Jacksonville	49
Wally Romero	Plantation	47
Max Melendez	Tampa	46
Adam Rivero	Fort Myers	45
James Little	Jacksonville	44
Larry Brazile	Jacksonville	43
Dan Yeager	Jacksonville	43
Nicholas Incontrera	Orlando	43

The Survey:

The Bureau's Customer Satisfaction Survey was in an electronic format and was sent to 157 of the identified submitters. Six (6) came back as undeliverable. A survey return percentage above 25% of those sent is considered "significant". A total of seventy-nine (79) of the customers (52.32%) provided responses for at least one of the five (5) BFFEA services listed before the survey deadline. Some customers who utilized more than one of our services provided responses for those services as well.

BFFEA services which the customers were asked to rank individually:

- Fire Debris Analysis
- Explosives Analysis
- Unknown Chemicals Analysis
- Digital Image Archival
- Forensic Video Examination

If a customer did not use a service, they did not provide responses. Each of the five services was assessed by four attributes:

- Level of satisfaction with the work product
- Usefulness of the work product in closing cases
- Impact on the investigator or their agency if the service were no longer available
- Quality of any personal contact with BFFEA staff

Again, if the customer did not wish to address a particular attribute they were allowed to pass without ranking it.

The ranking scale for all attributes was:

- Very High
- High
- Neutral
- Low
- Very Low

Thus there are different numbers of respondents for each of the attributes in each of the five services. A table showing the number of respondents for each service:


Respondents	Raw	Percent responding to a portion of the survey
Maximum number that responded to a portion of the survey	79	100.00%
Maximum Respondents to issues on fire debris service	72	91.14%
Maximum respondents to issues on explosives service	34	43.04%
Maximum respondents to issues on chemical unknown service	38	48.10%
Maximum respondents to issues on digital imaging service	37	46.84%
Maximum respondents to issues on forensic video service	21	26.58%

Overview of All Services

If all responses for the survey are merged regardless of the service category a comprehensive view of the Bureau’s overall performance is created. The following tables and graphs show the statistical customer perception of each of the four attributes for all services combined:


All Services Merged	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Total
Attribute	V. High	High	Neutral	Low	V. Low	
Satisfaction with the work product	120	45	34	1	1	201
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	110	53	36	1	1	201
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	123	40	34	2	2	201
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	120	30	41	1	1	193

All Services Merged	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V. High	High	Neutral	Low	V. Low
Satisfaction with the work product	59.70%	22.39%	16.92%	0.50%	0.50%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	54.73%	26.37%	17.91%	0.50%	0.50%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	61.19%	19.90%	16.92%	1.00%	1.00%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	62.18%	15.54%	21.24%	0.52%	0.52%



The scope of this evaluation by customers is examined by combining the percent of responses that rank the attributes at “Very High” and “High” against all the responses that rank the attributes at “Neutral”, “Low”, or “Very Low”. This evaluation period shows a drop in the percentages of “Very High” and “High” rankings from the previous evaluation period. As will be shown when we review the five services separately, this has been caused by a larger percentage of customers rating some of the services and attributes as “Neutral”. Even with this drop, the fact that all ratings of “Very High” plus “High” is between 77% and 83% is significantly positive.

All Services Merged	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V.High + High	Neutral, Low, + V.Low
Satisfaction with the work product	82.09%	17.92%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	81.10%	18.91%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	81.09%	18.92%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	77.72%	22.28%



This comprehensive ranking of all services by attribute shows that 77% or more of our customers rank each of the attributes (satisfaction, usefulness of the product, impact, and personal contact) at “High” or “Very High”. If we examine the statistics for the highest rating of only “Very High” the Bureau scores from 54.73% to 62.18% for each attribute.

Each of the services is evaluated separately by the four attributes to determine areas where potential improvements may be possible. The number of work units associated with each service is listed below. The category “Explosives” includes both explosive determinations as well as the determinations for unknown chemicals. This will be broken down further when the services are discussed.

01/01/2013 to 07/01/2013	Film SR	Fire Debris Samples	QA/QC	Explosives	Images	Video	Total
Work Units	84	1803	1680	1248	1603	17	6435

Fire Debris Analysis Service


Fire debris analysis is the primary service provided by the Bureau. The individual samples and associated quality assurance analyses compose 54.1% (3,483 of 6,435) of the total number of work units processed by the Bureau in the first six months of 2013. Fire debris analysis, where we examine material from the fire scene for trace amounts of ignitable liquids possibly used to accelerate a fire, is accomplished with the use of gas chromatography-mass spectrometry.

Of all forensic sub-disciplines under the general category of “Trace Evidence,” fire debris is notoriously difficult to analyze. Ignitable liquids are complex mixtures of organic chemicals. In a sample of fire debris, these are intermingled with additional complex mixtures of organic chemicals (some of which are the same as some of the components of ignitable liquids) coming from the fire debris. The level of scrutiny required is high and the guidelines for what can be determined are described by the American Society for Testing and Materials E1618, “Standard Test Method for Ignitable Liquid Residues in Extracts from Fire Debris Samples by Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry”. The number of negative determinations in fire debris analysis is higher than other disciplines either because the ignitable liquid did not survive the fire, was not on the sample submitted, or the components recovered do not meet the requirements of the ASTM Standard. For January 1, 2013 through July 1, 2013, the BFFEA had the following fire debris analysis determinations:

Description of Finding (per ASTM E1618)	Percent
No Ignitable Liquid Determined	61.63%
Gasoline and Gasoline Mixtures	28.78%
Petroleum Distillates and Distillate Mixtures	5.17%
Terpenes, Turpentine & Miscellaneous	2.73%
Isoparaffinic Products	0.54%
Aromatic Products	0.54%
Naphthenic/Paraffinic Products	0.18%
Normal Alkane (Normal Paraffinic) Products	0.18%
Oxygenated Products	0.12%


Our customers provided the following responses concerning their view of fire debris analysis service:

Fire Debris Service	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V. High	High	Neutral	Low	V. Low
Satisfaction with the work product	67.61%	28.17%	4.23%	0.00%	0.00%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	61.11%	33.33%	5.56%	0.00%	0.00%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	71.83%	21.13%	5.63%	1.41%	0.00%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	72.86%	20.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%



Again, the scope of this evaluation by customers is more impressive when the statistics are examined by simply viewing the percent of responses that rank the attributes at “Very High” plus “High” against all the responses that rank the attributes at “Neutral” or lower.

Fire Debris Service	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V.High + High	Neutral, Low, or V.Low
Satisfaction with the work product	95.78%	4.23%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	94.44%	5.56%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	92.96%	7.04%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	92.86%	7.14%



When 94.4% of customers rank the usefulness of the work product to close their case investigations at “Very High” or “High” it is clear that the fire debris analysis provided by BFFEA is a necessary component to fire investigation in the State of Florida.

Explosives/Unknown Chemicals Analysis Service


The determination of explosives, explosive residues, or unknown chemicals typically requires the use of multiple instruments on multiple sub-samples. Fire debris only requires a single analysis by gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS). Organic (compounds with a carbon atom “backbone”) explosives, residues and unknown chemicals may require multiple separate analyses by GC-MS, Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR), and/or Ion Mobility Spectrometry (IMS). Inorganic (compounds without the carbon atom backbone and that typically dissociate into positively and negatively charged ions) explosives, residues and unknown chemicals may require multiple separate analyses by ion chromatography- mass spectrometry (IC-MS), FTIR, Raman Spectroscopy, and/or X-Ray Fluorescence Spectroscopy (XRF). In addition, all explosives, residues and unknown chemicals typically require additional various classic wet chemical “spot” tests and determination of pH (level of how acidic or basic a liquid may be).

The Bureau’s statistics currently combine all explosives, explosive residues, and unknown chemicals (true unknowns as well as chemicals from clandestine drug laboratories) under the single heading of “explosives.” Originally the Bureau only had the identification of the unknown chemicals as a minor task and incorporated them into the more numerous explosives determinations.


This is not the case today. Because no other State laboratory performing testing of this type is available for investigators and that Florida Statutes criminalize possession of the chemicals used to construct a clandestine drug laboratory (FS 893.033(2), FS 893.13 (g), FS 893.135(1)(f)1, and FS 893.149(1)) there has been a steady increase in the number of these submissions. Of the 1,599 “explosives” analyses completed by the Bureau from January 1, 2013 through July 1, 2013, only 17.8% or 284 were for actual explosives while 82.2% or 1,315 were for unknown chemicals identification. This section will report the customer satisfaction rankings for the explosives analysis while unknown chemicals analysis will be covered in the next.

Explosives Service	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V. High	High	Neutral	Low	V. Low
Satisfaction with the work product	61.76%	14.71%	23.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	55.88%	17.65%	26.47%	0.00%	0.00%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	64.71%	11.76%	20.59%	2.94%	0.00%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	64.52%	9.68%	25.81%	0.00%	0.00%

To appreciate the scope of this evaluation by customers we will again examine the statistics by simply viewing the percent of responses that rank the attributes at “Very High” plus “High” against all the responses that rank the attributes at “Neutral” or lower.



Explosives Service	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V.High + High	Neutral, Low, or V.Low
Satisfaction with the work product	76.47%	23.53%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	73.53%	26.47%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	76.47%	23.53%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	74.20%	25.81%




Overall, the ratings of “Very High” and “High” are lower than in previous review periods with a significant shift in customer satisfaction to “Neutral”. It is not known at this time the cause for this shift, but an initiative will be launched to investigate and rectify. Still, when the lowest rated attribute of the usefulness of our work product is rated at “Very High” and “High” by 73.53% of our customers it is clear we are performing well above expectations.


Unknown Chemicals Analysis Service

As was discussed at the beginning of the section on Explosives Analysis, the 1,599 “Explosives” analyses can be broken down into 82.2% or 1,315 requiring analysis of unknown chemicals. In addition, organic based unknown chemicals may require multiple separate analyses by GC-MS, Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR), or Ion Mobility Spectrometry (IMS). Inorganic based unknown chemicals may require multiple separate analyses by ion chromatography- mass spectrometry (IC-MS), FTIR, Raman Spectroscopy, or X-Ray Fluorescence Spectroscopy (XRF) and will require screening by various classic wet chemical “spot” tests and determination of pH (level of how acidic or basic a liquid may be).

Unknown Chemicals Analysis Service	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V. High	High	Neutral	Low	V. Low
Satisfaction with the work product	63.16%	21.05%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	57.89%	23.68%	18.42%	0.00%	0.00%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	65.79%	18.42%	15.79%	0.00%	0.00%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	62.86%	17.14%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%



Unknown Chemicals Service	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V.High + High	Neutral, Low, or V.Low
Satisfaction with the work product	84.21%	15.79%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	81.57%	18.42%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	84.21%	15.79%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	80.00%	20.00%




As with the Explosives Analysis Service, our customer ratings have shifted to the center with a large increase of customers rating the attributes as “Neutral”. This will also be under investigation to determine the reason for this ranking shift. All attributes are at 80% or higher for “Very High” and “High” which indicates the vast majority of our customers have a strong positive view of the work we offer.

Digital Image Processing Service

As was stated earlier, this service is only performed for the investigators from the Bureau of Fire and Arson Investigations (BFAI). We act as the central repository for images from scene investigations. The images are provided to the laboratory where they are archived. Items sent after May 2012 are stored on a server that is backed up each night on a remote secondary server for Disaster Recovery purposes. This service includes transfer and archival of digital images plus fulfilling requests for reproduction of archived photographs and images. This comprises 26.2% of the work units processed by the Bureau from January 1, 2013 to July 1, 2013 (1,687 of 6,435 units).

Digital Imaging Service	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V. High	High	Neutral	Low	V. Low
Satisfaction with the work product	45.95%	27.03%	24.32%	0.00%	2.70%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	45.95%	27.03%	24.32%	0.00%	2.70%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	43.24%	27.03%	27.03%	0.00%	2.70%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	47.22%	13.89%	36.11%	0.00%	2.70%




For the four attributes ranked in this service, the percent of “Neutral” or “Low” rankings has increased from prior reporting periods. Detectives for BFAI compose 100% of the customers of this service. The detectives typically retain their images in an active storage area until after their investigation is closed. They request that BFFEA archive them only after they are reasonably certain the images will not be actively needed.

BFFEA does not process any images from the Detective’s storage folder until after the Detective transmits an email releasing the images. Because some Detectives only review their folder’s contents periodically to provide this permission, a buildup may result of images in their folders, storage issues on their server, and a backlog of items to be archived. When they eventually review the folders and transmit permission, the volume of items to be processed can inundate BFFEA Staff. To attempt to mitigate this occurrence, BFFEA Staff will often send numerous

reminders to investigators and their superiors that images must be archived on a regular basis. Once items are archived, most requests for retrieval or reproduction do not come from the investigators, but from attorneys or private investigators after the criminal investigations have closed.

Because there is minimal interaction between laboratory staff and investigators once the items are archived, investigators may have a greater tendency to view the work in this service area as meeting their needs or “Neutral”. This is seen in the table and chart below.


Digital Imaging Service	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V.High + High	Neutral, Low, or V.Low
Satisfaction with the work product	72.98%	27.02%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	72.98%	27.02%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	70.27%	29.73%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	61.11%	38.81%



Forensic Video Service


For the review period all reports were issued as reports from the BFAI detective who performed the examinations. BFFEA provides the facility, equipment, and an analyst in training to assist in this service area. .

Forensic Video Service	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V. High	High	Neutral	Low	V. Low
Satisfaction with the work product	47.62%	9.52%	38.10%	4.76%	0.00%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	40.00%	20.00%	35.00%	5.00%	0.00%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	42.86%	19.05%	33.33%	0.00%	4.76%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	42.11%	10.53%	42.11%	5.26%	0.00%



The value of the service and the information it can provide to the investigator is acknowledged by the customers. However, the ability to process and manage video is severely limited by the quality of the original camera that captured the image or the resolution of the data as it was stored. A low quality and low resolution camera will not capture images with sufficient detail that they have value. At the same time the storage capacity of digital systems can become an issue even when a high quality camera is used. In order to increase the number of hours of video that can be recorded on a drive or tape, the owner of the security system will lower the resolution. Thus, it is common to not be able to provide the investigator with all the information requested or to completely process the video. These are the direct component causes whereby this service has more “Neutral” and “Low” rankings of the four attributes by all service categories.

Forensic Video Service	Percent	Percent
Ranking	V.High + High	Neutral, Low, or V.Low
Satisfaction with the work product	57.14%	42.86%
Usefulness of the work product in closing cases	60.00%	40.00%
Impact on investigator or agency if service were lost	61.91%	38.09%
Quality of personal contact with BFFEA Staff	52.64%	47.37%



The Survey:

Input and comments from the customers were solicited in the last two questions. This report will provide an overview or synopsis of the most pertinent findings.

Question 6: Are there any BFFEA personnel you would like to identify regarding their work or contacts with you (positive or negative)?

There were no negative comments listed. Only positive comments were made. There were 9 comments praising Bureau staff in general for their willingness to assist customers in answering various questions and their degree of professionalism. Several staff members were listed specifically. All had positive comments about their ability, willingness to help, or professionalism. They are:

- Carl Lugviel (5)
- Perry Koussiafes (Mike) (5)
- Elizabeth Kamerick (4)
- Melissa Stephens (2)
- Pam Kenon (2)
- Ryan Bennett (1)
- Reggie Hurchins (1)
- Carl Chasteen (1)

One BFAI Detective, Brock Dietz, was also specifically praised for his efforts and work by two customers for his assistance to them in processing video evidence.

BFFEA staff members who were not named were Lynn Lee and Ann Walker. Mr. Lee, being the facility's Maintenance Mechanic, reserves most of his activities and skills in keeping the facility functioning and most of our customers do not have contact with him. Ms. Walker's contacts are primarily with individuals outside of the investigative process as they request public records. Most detectives and investigators do not have direct contact with her.

Question 7: Do you have any general comments or complaints regarding the work, personnel, or consultations? Do you have any suggestions for improvements we can make or additional services you would like to see?

While the majority of the comments provided were positive commendations and praise for the Bureau, five (5) comments need to be addressed. Questions 3 and 4 refer to the same issue thus there is a single comment for both. The responses *in italics* are the comments of Chief Chasteen:

1. I would like to have a forensic accountant assigned somewhere is BFAI. Overall, the lab is the one truly great shining example of public service.

Thank you for your confidence in our abilities. We try to offer the best service we can within the confines of responsible forensic and scientific parameters. There are many services that have been requested in the past. A forensic accountant or a forensic engineer is the most common. To add that service, we would need to add the personnel and the tools or equipment they would need to do their work. We would also need to write proper policies and manuals and add them to our scope of accreditation. All of this would require time and funding. At present, we are not in a place where additional personnel or budget to add these services are likely. If sufficient customers would request the services, there may be support for obtaining them.

2. Set your standard lower for the determination of ignitable liquids. Setting the standard lower means harder work on your part so do a better job.

We have measured that we can clearly see gasoline in a container full of debris where there is significant background interference at a level of 170 parts per billion. This is an extremely small amount. An example of the sensitivity of our instrumentation would be to imagine that we have a special satellite camera looking down on one billion people (1,000,000,000) from space. If only 170 of them had red hair our satellite (instrument) would be able to pick them out regardless of where they were standing. We have set our limitations with this level in mind.

If all the components necessary to determine an ignitable liquid cannot be clearly seen, we must call the sample negative. We cannot issue reports based on “gut” feelings or “suggestions”. We are required to offer our opinion testimony “to a reasonable degree of scientific certainty”. Our reports can only be issued based on facts. Our analysts perform very difficult work every day and are quite conscientious of the quality for which they stand. In addition, as every case is reviewed by a second analyst before a report is issued; there is a constant check and re-check of the quality of our work. To suggest that they are not working “harder” by being willing to accept results below a scientific threshold is to demean their ability.

3. I am concerned with the recent information that certain equipment that is used by BFFEA to identify these chemicals is currently broken and the funding not available to make the repairs. From my experience in working meth labs I can typically identify chemicals by their appearance but as we all know my word of what they are is no good in court until they have been confirmed by a lab and right now we don't have one. Whatever could be

done to get this equipment back to working order would be very beneficial to the outcome of these important cases.

4. Hope the meth lab equipment can get fixed soon, however, I understand that we all have to deal with budget problems.....I appreciate that you have kept me updated....thank you

This answer is for questions 3 and 4. The instrument in question is the mass detector attached to our ion chromatograph. Originally we thought the problem was with the nitrogen generator attached to it. We purchased parts to get the generator running, but the mass detector still did not work. We have had service engineers from the vendor and manufacturer going over the unit with a fine tooth comb to no avail. At this time we plan to ship the unit to the manufacturer to have it refurbished at a cost of \$15,000. It will take six to ten weeks.

You may wonder why we simply do not purchase a new unit. We do not have the extra \$100,000 in our budget. All we can do at this time is to fall back to a low tech approach to identify only the most common chemicals. This approach requires considerable more labor and time in order to produce results that are defensible in court. We request your understanding while we try to mitigate this unexpected instrument failure.

5. The fingerprint service was helpful when there was an item that needed to be analyzed for both ignitable liquids and prints.

We will not be restoring the fingerprint service. The service was limited to using chemical and alternate light sources to look for any potential prints. Our analysts do not have the expertise required to compare or classify prints. We also do not have access to the national database of known prints. We found that all our efforts to develop latent prints were being duplicated by FDLE when any evidence was sent to them. This was a wasted effort and took away from the time our analysts needed to devote to fire debris analysis.

Items can still be tested for ignitable liquids before they are sent on for fingerprint determination. Our method for extracting ignitable liquids is non-invasive of the sample so long as it is not heated. If you have a sample where both fire debris analysis and latent print examination is needed, send it to us first with a note in the remarks section of the submission form advising us that you plan to have it checked for prints. We can alter our method so we do not apply heat to the evidence and thus preserve it for later submission for print examination.

This ends the report on the responses to the survey for January 1, 2013 to July 1, 2013

This report may be used in the Bureau's Business Plan, Management Review, or to answer other questions regarding a statistical evaluation of the bureau's customers or their opinions on the quality of service received.