RS&A

Ron Smith & Associates, Inc.

P.O. Box 670 • Collinsville• Mississippi • 39325
Toll Free: 1-866-TEAM RSA (832-6772) • Office (601) 626-1100 • Fax (601) 626-1122 •
www.ronsmithandassociates.com

September 10, 2009

Timothy O. Oettmeier
Executive Assistant Chief
Support Operations
1200 Travis Street
Houston, Texas 77002

Re: Results of Technical Performance Audit
Latent Print Comparison Laboratory

Assistant Chief Oettmeier,

In accordance with the terms of our agreement, during the week of August 31 – Sept 4, 2009, our team of three (3) I.A.I. Certified Latent Print Examiners conducted a limited scope Technical Performance Audit. This audit included visual case examinations performed by Houston Police Department Latent Print Examiners Ralph Saldivar and Jim Schraub and contract Latent Print Examiner Jerry Werner. The audit was conducted by RS & A, Inc. contract latent print examiners Anne Steinmetz, John Lazzaretto and Ken Smith.

The goal of the Technical Audit was to evaluate immediate past performance of these three (3) aforementioned employees as it relates to department and Latent Print Unit expectations.

For purposes of understanding the technical terminology used in this report, a glossary is included at the end of this report which can be used to further define terms and phrases which are commonly used during latent print examinations.

Process Sequence

The Audit Team conducted a technical audit of fifty eight (58) individual latent print case files completed by Latent Print Examiner Ralph Saldivar, sixty (60) latent print case files completed by Jim Schraub, and fifty nine (59) latent print case files completed by Jerry Werner; for a total of one hundred seventy seven (177) latent print case files. These case files were randomly selected from latent print cases completed between the dates of January 2008 through August 2009. The case files were randomly selected by HPD

Deputy Administrator Aristotle Arceo, according to the predetermined distribution patterns designated by Ron Smith & Associates, Inc. This distribution pattern included the following three (3) categories of cases:

Category #1: One third (1/3) of the case files represented cases in which latent print evidence (latent lifts) was evaluated and determined to be "insufficient for further analysis".

Category #2: One third (1/3) of the case files represented cases in which latent print evidence (latent lifts) was evaluated and determined to contain latent prints "sufficient for further analysis", with comparisons being conducted and **no** identifications being effected.

Category #3: One third (1/3) of the case files represented cases in which latent print evidence (latent lifts) was evaluated and determined to contain latent prints "sufficient for further analysis", with comparisons being conducted and identifications to one or more individuals being effected.

Note: At the present time, Latent Print Examiner Walter Rowe's scope of daily responsibilities does not include independent casework, but rather, launching of automated fingerprint searches through the local and state AFIS terminals and verification of identifications made by the three (3) other HPD Latent Print Examiners. Therefore, there were no case files available in which he had reported his own conclusions and no case files to be examined under the scope of this audit.

Case Audit Methodology Employed:

Based upon the reported experience levels of each of the three (3) Latent Print Examiners, this performance audit was conducted under the following assumptions:

1. The Latent Print Examiners have been trained to competency and recognize if friction ridge detail is sufficient for further analysis.

2. The Latent Print Examiners' comparisons and identifications of latent prints follow recognized and common industry principles resulting in accurate conclusions.

As previously discussed in other written communications, the HPD Latent Print Laboratory does not currently have an operational Standard Operating Procedures Manual (SOP) which provides a standardized method or basis for the employees to arrive at conclusions. Therefore, prior to conducting the casework audit, it became necessary to

interview the three (3) HPD Latent Print Examiners to determine the unwritten standard or standards under which they were functioning during the period covered by this performance audit. All three (3) HPD Latent Print Examiners agreed collectively that they consistently conduct their examinations of casework utilizing the following criteria:

1. A latent print is determined to be "sufficient for further analysis" if it contains seven (7) clear distinct Galton details.

2. All latent prints that are determined to be "sufficient for further analysis" are compared to all the known finger and palm prints of individuals in the case. Specifically, when an individual is "identified", the comparisons do not halt, but will continue until all latent prints have been compared to the individuals and a conclusion is reached.

3. All identifications are verified by a second Latent Print Examiner.

4. If an identification is based on 10 or less Galton details or "points", it is verified by a second and third Latent Print Examiner.

The Technical Performance Audit of these HPD Latent Print Unit cases was based upon the above listed criteria and the findings are specific to these "agreed upon" criteria.

Findings (General)

It should be noted that, generally speaking, the most significant error which could be found in friction ridge comparisons is an "erroneous identification", which is the incorrect determination that two areas of friction ridge impressions originated from the same source. There were no erroneous identifications found in the sampling of case files examined in the audit.

Based upon the previously established criteria, there were however, a significant number of technical errors which may, or may not, have had an impact on the investigations which were represented by these cases.

The following table summarizes, by individual examiner, both the distribution and frequency of cases which contained technical errors discovered during the audit process:

	Saldivar	Schraub	Werner
Number of Cases Audited	58	60	58
Cases Without Technical Errors	31 (54 %)	25 (42%)	31 (54%)
Cases With Technical Errors	27 (46%)	35 (58%)	27 (46%)

The technical errors noted previously for all examiners were not restricted to a specific time frame, but were consistent in occurrence throughout the entire review period.

Findings (Specific)

There were two (2) particular types of errors discovered repeatedly which potentially could have the greatest impact on ongoing investigations. They are:

1. Cases which were reported as not being "sufficient for further analysis", when in fact they did indeed contain latent prints which were sufficient for comparison purposes. This error was noted in a large percentage of cases examined.

2. Cases which were reported as not containing any latent print identifications, in which there was a latent print identification, or cases in which some latent print identifications were reported but additional latent print identifications were not reported.

The following table summarizes, by individual examiner, the number of cases in which the above listed errors occurred. It should be noted that some cases contained both types of errors in the same case.

	Saldivar	Schraub	Werner	Totals	Combined Percentage
Cases with Additional Latent Prints "Sufficient for Further Analysis"	24	32	46	102/177	58%
Cases with Additional Latent Print Identifications Not Reported	8	7	6	21/177	12%

Of the one hundred and two (102) cases that were determined to have additional prints "sufficient for further analysis", thirty-three (33) of them were originally reported as having no latent prints of value for comparison purposes in the case. Investigators having read the original reports in these cases would have had to assume that there was no latent print evidence which might be used as an investigative tool in the case, when in fact latent fingerprint evidence was available for analysis and comparison.

Of the twenty-one (21) cases where additional identifications were discovered during the case file audit, in eighteen (19) of these cases the subject(s) had previous been identified by the HPD Latent Print Examiner, and the additional identifications were either on the

same surface or a different surface within the same case. Most likely these additional identifications would not have any significant impact on the investigation of these cases.

The two (2) remaining cases in the above listed category may prove to have a significant impact on these investigations because the named subject had not been previously identified, but rather listed in the case notes as "excluded". This is an example of an erroneous exclusion. The cases that contained this error are listed in red on the attached spreadsheet.

Special Note:

During the course of this audit several procedural issues and concerns were observed and although they were not within the scope of this Technical Performance Audit, they were noted and will be addressed at a later point in this performance contract period.

Summary:

All identifications which have been reported by the three (3) HPD Latent Print Examiners have been correctly reported.

Based upon the "agreed upon" criteria, numerous errors in determining "sufficiency for further analysis" were noted as well as numerous instances of not identifying all the latent prints which could, and should, have been identified.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ron Smith

Anne Steinmetz, CLPE
Project Manager
Ron Smith & Associates, Inc.

Ron Smith, CLPE
President
Ron Smith & Associates, Inc.

Glossary of Terms

Comparison	The direct side-by-side observation of friction ridge detail to determine whether the detail in two impressions is in agreement based upon similarity, sequence and spatial relationship.
Erroneous Exclusion	The incorrect determination that two area of friction ridge detail do not originate from the same source.
Evaluation	Conclusion based upon analysis and comparison of friction ridge impressions.
Exclusion	The result of the comparison of two friction ridge impressions containing sufficient (quality) clarity and quantity of friction ridge detail which is not in agreement.
Exemplar	The known prints of an individual, recorded electronically, photographically, by ink, or another medium.
Friction Ridge Detail	An area of skin comprised of the combination of ridge flow, ridge characteristics, and ridge structure.
Galton Details	Term referring to friction ridge characteristics attributed to the English research pioneer Sir Francis Galton
Inconclusive	The conclusion reached that neither sufficient agreement reached exists to individualize nor sufficient disagreement exists to exclude.
Individualization (Identification)	The result of the comparison of two friction ridge impressions containing sufficient quality (clarity) and quantity of friction ridge detail which is in agreement. Individualization occurs when a latent print examiner determines that two friction ridge impressions originated from the same source.
Sufficiency	The examiner's determinations that adequate unique details of the friction ridge source area are revealed in the impression. An impression that contains sufficient quality and quantity of friction

ridge detail can be individualized to, or excluded from a source.

Verification The independent examination by another qualified examiner resulting in the same conclusion.

Case Number	Examiner	Original Finding	No Errors Found	Addl LOV found	Missed Identifications	Comments
42609008-K	J. Schraul	NV	1			
42647208-C	J. Schraul	NV	1			
43035708-N	J. Schraul	NV			1	
44397008-C	J. Schraul	NV	1			
44405208-G	J. Schraul	NV	1			
44501608-I	J. Schraul	NV			1	
44536608-U	J. Schraul	NV			1	
44624008-K	J. Schraul	NV			1	
13655708-N	J. Schraul	NV	1			
13434308-J	J. Schraul	NV	1			
13348608-K	J. Schraul	NV	1			
13298108-Z	J. Schraul	NV			1	
12923208-U	J. Schraul	NV	1			
12801008-U	J. Schraul	NV	1			
12561508-R	J. Schraul	NV	1			
12408308-T	J. Schraul	NV	1			
11485508-V	J. Schraul	NV			1	
11459708-X	J. Schraul	NV			1	
11935808-A	J. Schraul	NV			1	
11867308-R	J. Schraul	NV			1	
59332908-R	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Neg to subject
62634308-L	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Homicide Case
63116708-Z	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Neg to subject
70490108-X	J. Schraul	Non-Ident	1			
71979608-U	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Neg to subject
125997208-U	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Homicide-needs AFIS Run - Neg to subject
60299508-L	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	declared by JS/Report by RS - no notes in case file
139211608-G	J. Schraul	Non-Ident	1			
12053908-L	J. Schraul	Non-Ident	1			
186586707-K	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Neg to subject
188124607-X	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	No report in case file
44632208-O	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Neg to subject
44720908-R	J. Schraul	Non-Ident	1			
45316108-P	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Neg to subject
50396608-Q	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Neg to subject
51216808-C	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Reported as neg - need palms of subject
52498908-F	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Reported as neg - need fingers of subject
52781508-X	J. Schraul	Non-Ident			1	Reported as neg - need palms of subject
182668207-H	J. Schraul	Ident			1	Same subject - same surface
55686808-I	J. Schraul	Ident		1		4 addl ID's - same subject
632308-N	J. Schraul	Ident		1		Same subject - same surface

920408-I	J. Schraul	Ident		1		
3001808-W	J. Schraul	Ident		1	1	Neg to subject
3379508-D	J. Schraul	Ident	1			Same subject - different surface
37145908-F	J. Schraul	Ident		1	1	
108461208-E	J. Schraul	Ident	1			Same subject - same surface
79357508-L	J. Schraul	Ident		1		
32331308-L	J. Schraul	Ident	1			Neg to subject
36979608-G	J. Schraul	Ident	1			
36994808-C	J. Schraul	Ident	1			
13620508-Z	J. Schraul	Ident				
13698908-D	J. Schraul	Ident		1		Need palms - subject
28070408-Q	J. Schraul	Ident	1			Same subject - claimed as NV
29172308-L	J. Schraul	Ident	1			
29259608-A	J. Schraul	Ident	1			
90821508-R	J. Schraul	Ident		1	1	Same subject
90946308-R	J. Schraul	Ident		1	1	Same subject - same surface
92348908-D	J. Schraul	Ident	1			
103800908-T	J. Schraul	Ident		1	1	Cox -Subject previously excluded
11702608	J. Schraul	Ident	1			

Number of Cases Audited	60	
No Errors Observed	25	42%
Errors Observed	35	58%
Additional Latents of Value	32	53%
Additional Identifications	7	12%

Case Number	Examiner	Original Finding	No Errors Found	Addl LOV found	Missed Identifications	Comments
100292007-D	J. Werner	Ident		1		
9641307-M	J. Werner	Ident		1		Need better exemplars
850308-J	J. Werner	Ident		1		
6674508-L	J. Werner	Ident		1		Need palms - subject
11648908-R	J. Werner	Ident				Neg to subject
11754508-H	J. Werner	Ident		1		Reported exclusion - need better palms to finish
13749408-O	J. Werner	Ident	1		1	Same subject
14497708-J	J. Werner	Ident		1		Ofc. Personal information in file
14686308-X	J. Werner	Ident		1	1	Same subject - different surface
76689407-F	J. Werner	Ident				Neg to subject
79519607-T	J. Werner	Ident			1	Same subject
97982707-Y	J. Werner	Ident			1	Same subject - need palms to complete
91882107-O	J. Werner	Ident		1		Neg to subject
90317507-U	J. Werner	Ident		1		Neg to subject
90286307-U	J. Werner	Ident		1		Neg to subject
25726408-C	J. Werner	Ident	1			
138559707-M	J. Werner	Ident	1			
153585807-T	J. Werner	Ident		1		Neg to subject
190833407-T	J. Werner	Ident		1	1	Same subject - need better palms
79218908-D	J. Werner	NV		1		Neg to subject
79292508-L	J. Werner	NV		1		
79552108-H	J. Werner	NV	1			
80656808-E	J. Werner	NV		1		
80797708-J	J. Werner	NV	1			
80860008-I	J. Werner	NV		1		
80922408-I	J. Werner	NV		1		
81007108-X	J. Werner	NV		1		
81012408-Y	J. Werner	NV		1		
18183308-X	J. Werner	NV		1		
93689407-R	J. Werner	NV		1		
93932107-A	J. Werner	NV		1		
94059007-V	J. Werner	NV		1		
94066007-N	J. Werner	NV		1		
94075607-F	J. Werner	NV	1			
94097507-Q	J. Werner	NV		1		
94255607-L	J. Werner	NV		1		
94097907-U	J. Werner	NV		1		
94135707-I	J. Werner	NV		1		
94173907-A	J. Werner	NV	1			
141239307-C	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
160498107-I	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject

175285107-Q	J. Werner	Non-Ident	1			
148164507-Q	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
56674208-C	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Need better palms
55898107-Q	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
158639407-L	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Need better palms
102581007-V	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
145900307-U	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Need better prints
13772007-F	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
151265307-G	J. Werner	Non-Ident	1		1	Same subject
103348507-S	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
103376807-P	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
62230008-Y	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
44547408-Y	J. Werner	Non-Ident	1			
173702007-T	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
40379408-W	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
103422207-B	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
160603107-S	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		
164912907-I	J. Werner	Non-Ident		1		

Number of Cases Auditec	59	
No Observed Errors	10	17%
Errors Observed	49	83%
Additional Latents of Valu	46	78%
Additional Identifications	6	10%

Case Number	Examiner	Original Finding	No Errors Found	Addl LOV found	Missed Identifications	Comments
172324307-W	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
173127107-Q	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
173138407-Z	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
173228207-N	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
173330807-Z	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
173362207-B	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
173578507-G	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
173703607-J	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
173742907-M	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
174091807-R	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
110887208-G	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
111017608-K	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
111148908-X	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
111239308-R	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
111282008-C	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
111426008-M	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
111633808-K	R. Saldiva	NV		1		
111778708-D	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
111782508-P	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
102203808-M	R. Saldiva	NV	1			
59519108-H	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
120659208-S	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
107571408-Y	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
112551908-N	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
118003808-K	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
121114708-X	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
119721908-F	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
106161608-S	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
95965709-G	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
58979708-V	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
71178508-R	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
95072808-U	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
182605707-G	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
4275508-T	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
59486708-V	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
75671608-U	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident			1	Same subject
89362608-O	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident		1		Neg to subject
182816307-G	R. Saldiva	Non-Ident	1			
29777308-D	R. Saldiva	Ident		1		
111753508-L	R. Saldiva	Ident		1		1 Bray - New subject - previously excluded
70214608-Y	R. Saldiva	Ident		1		Neg to subject

100007208-Q	R. Saldiva Ident			
103364108-T	R. Saldiva Ident		1	1 Ident to latent called NV
105701708-V	R. Saldiva Ident	1		
106393308-V	R. Saldiva Ident			1 Same subject
106938108-J	R. Saldiva Ident	1		
86522509-G	R. Saldiva Ident	1		
106053208-A	R. Saldiva Ident	1		
107436109-Y	R. Saldiva Ident		1	Neg to subject
109096709-Q	R. Saldiva Ident		1	Neg to subject
113103707-S	R. Saldiva Ident		1	
188360007-L	R. Saldiva Ident	1		
1928808-E	R. Saldiva Ident	1		
8099508-N	R. Saldiva Ident		1	1 Same subject
149980207-Z	R. Saldiva Ident	1		
189849807-L	R. Saldiva Ident		1	1 Same subject
24506808-A	R. Saldiva Ident		1	1 Same subject
34822008-K	R. Saldiva Ident		1	1 Same subject
				Unable to complete - need better exemplars

Number of Cases Audited	58	
No Errors Observed	31	53%
Errors Observed	27	47%
Additional Latents of Value	24	41%
Additional Identifications	8	14%

	Schraub	Werner	Saldavar	Totals	Percentage
Number of Cases Auditec	60	59	58	177	
No Observed Errors	25	10	31	66	37%
Errors Observed	35	49	27	111	63%
Additional Latents of Valu	32	46	24	102	58%
Additional Identifications	7	6	8	21	12%

RS&A

Ron Smith & Associates, Inc.

P.O. Box 670 • Collinsville• Mississippi • 39325
Toll Free: 1-866-TEAM RSA (832-6772) • Office (601) 626-1100 • Fax (601) 626-1122 •
www.ronsmithandassociates.com

October 20, 2009

Timothy O. Oettmeier
Executive Assistant Chief
Support Operations
1200 Travis Street
Houston, Texas 77002

Re: Results of Technical Performance Audit
Latent Print Comparison Laboratory

Assistant Chief Oettmeier,

In accordance with the terms of our agreement, during the week of September 28th – October 2nd, 2009, our team of five (5) I.A.I. Certified Latent Print Examiners conducted a limited scope Technical Performance Audit. This audit was an expansion of the audit conducted in early September, and included visual case examinations performed by Houston Police Department Latent Print Examiners Ralph Saldivar and Jim Schraub and contract Latent Print Examiner Jerry Werner. The audit was conducted by RS & A, Inc. Senior Consultants Sam Durrett, Kevin Fitzgerald, Dwane Hildebrand, John Lazzaretto and Anne Steinmetz.

The goal of the Technical Audit was to evaluate immediate past performance of these three (3) aforementioned employees as it relates to department and Latent Print Unit expectations.

Process Sequence

The Audit Team conducted a technical audit of one hundred twenty-one (121) individual latent print case files completed by Latent Print Examiner Ralph Saldivar, one hundred twenty-six (126) latent print case files completed by Jim Schraub, and one hundred twenty-four (124) latent print case files completed by Jerry Werner; for a total of 371 latent print case files. The case files were randomly selected from latent print cases completed between the dates of January 2008 through August 2009. The case files were randomly selected by HPD Deputy Administrator Aristotle Arceo, according to the

predetermined distribution patterns designated by Ron Smith & Associates, Inc. This distribution pattern included the following three (3) categories of cases:

Category #1: One third (1/3) of the case files represented cases in which latent print evidence (latent lifts) was evaluated and determined to be "insufficient for further analysis".

Category #2: One third (1/3) of the case files represented cases in which latent print evidence (latent lifts) was evaluated and determined to contain latent prints "sufficient for further analysis", with comparisons being conducted and **no** identifications being effected.

Category #3: One third (1/3) of the case files represented cases in which latent print evidence (latent lifts) was evaluated and determined to contain latent prints "sufficient for further analysis", with comparisons being conducted and identifications to one or more individuals being effected.

Case Audit Methodology Employed:

Because this Technical Performance Audit was an expansion of the original audit from early September of this year, the cases which were examined by the audit team used the same criteria to establish a baseline by which the audit would be conducted. The criteria are as follows:

1. A latent print is determined to be "sufficient for further analysis" if it contains seven (7) clear distinct Galton details.

2. All latent prints that are determined to be "sufficient for further analysis" are compared to all the known finger and palm prints of individuals in the case. Specifically, when an individual is "identified", the comparisons do not halt, but will continue until all latent prints have been compared to the individuals and a conclusion is reached.

3. All identifications are verified by a second Latent Print Examiner.

4. If an identification is based on 10 or less Galton details or "points", it is verified by a second and third Latent Print Examiner.

Assistant Chief Oettmeier
Results of Technical Audit
Latent Print Lab
October 20, 2009

Findings (General)

First and foremost, the audit team did not find any "erroneous identifications" in the 371 cases reviewed during their visual inspection. An erroneous identification is the incorrect determination that two areas of friction ridge impressions originated from the same source.

There where however, a number of technical errors, which may, or may not have an impact on the original case findings which were reported by the HPD examiners. The following table establishes the number of cases in which technical errors were found, and the reporting examiner.

	Saldivar	**Schraub**	**Werner**
Number of Cases Audited	121	126	124
Cases without Technical Errors	59 (49%)	44 (35%)	60 (48%)
Cases with Technical Errors	58 (48%)	81 (64%)	64 (52%)
Cases with Incomplete Analysis	4 (3%)	1 (< 1%)	0

As with the previous audit, the technical errors noted for all examiners were not restricted to a specific time frame, but were consistent in occurrence throughout the entire review period.

Findings (Specific)

There were two (2) particular types of errors that were found consistently by the audit team which has the greatest potential impact on the ongoing investigations. They are:

1. Cases which were reported as being "insufficient for further analysis", when in fact they contained latent prints which were sufficient for comparison purposes. This error was noted in 50% of cases examined.

2. Cases which were reported as not containing any latent print identifications, in which there was a latent print identification, **or** cases in which some latent print identifications were reported but additional latent print identifications were found by the audit team and not reported by the HPD examiner.

The following table summarizes, by individual examiner, the number of cases in which the above listed errors occurred. It should be noted that some cases contained both types of errors in the same case.

	Saldivar	Schraub	Werner	Totals	Combined Percentage
Cases with Additional Latent Prints "Sufficient for Further Analysis"	58	64	64	186/371	50%
Cases with Additional Latent Print Identifications Not Reported	12	10	6	28/371	7.5%

These percentages are slightly different than the results from the initial Technical Performance Audit in which 58% of the cases contained additional latents that were "sufficient for further analysis" and 12% of the cases contained additional identifications that were not reported.

Of the one hundred and eighty six (186) cases that were determined to have additional prints "sufficient for further analysis", eighty four (84) of them (45%) were originally reported as having no latent prints of value for comparison purposes in the case. Investigators having read the original reports in these cases would have reached the conclusion that there was no latent print evidence which might be used as an investigative tool in the case, but, the cases did contain latent fingerprint evidence that is available for analysis and comparison. These cases still need to be researched to determine if there are subject(s) to compare against the crime scene latents and/or reviewed for AFIS suitability and searched through the local and state databases.

The second type of error, additional identifications that were not reported, was found in twenty-eight (28) cases during the audit. Twenty-five (25) of these cases the subject(s) had previously been identified by the HPD Latent Print Examiner, and the additional identifications were either on the same surface or a different surface within the same case. Because the original report already associated the subject(s) with the crime scene latents, we believe there would be minimal impact on the investigation. Some of the latents on these cases, which were not identified to the subject(s) in the case file, are sufficient to conduct an automated search of both the local and state database. At this time, they may still have probative value to the case investigation.

The three (3) remaining cases in the above listed category may prove to have the most significant impact on the investigations, because the named subject had not been previously identified, but rather listed in the case notes as "excluded". This is an example of an erroneous exclusion. The cases that contained this error are classified as

two Homicide and one Aggravated Robbery investigations, and are listed in red on the attached spreadsheet.

Five (5) cases reviewed during the Technical Performance Audit were considered to have an incomplete analysis. An incomplete analysis is one in which the known exemplars (inked prints) of the individual(s) are not sufficient quality to complete the comparative analysis on the case. Most often this is because a portion of the inked prints are incorrectly recorded or missing completely on the records. If a new set of inked prints are supplied or retrieved from a database, then the examination could be continued. The cases associated with an incomplete analysis are recorded in blue on the attached spreadsheet.

Summary

In total, five hundred forty-eight (548) cases were reviewed by the audit teams in the original and expanded audit. Although all the identifications reported by the HPD examiners were correct in their results, the technical errors continued to fall into the same two categories:

1. Additional latents which were determined to be "sufficient for further analysis"
2. Additional identifications found on the case that were not reported originally by the examiners.

The table below lists the total distribution of the errors by examiner.

	Saldivar	Schraub	Werner	Totals	Percentage
Cases with Additional Latent Prints "Sufficient for Further Analysis"	82/179	96/186	110/183	288/548	53%
Cases with Additional Latent Print Identifications Not Reported	20/179	17/186	12/183	49/548	9%

The errors again were dispersed throughout the time frame of which casework was conducted by the HPD examiners. Some of the cases also have latents which are sufficient for an automated search through the local and state system. The searches may yield additional identifications that could be helpful on pending investigations.

If there are any questions on the above listed data, please feel free to contact either of us for clarification.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Steinmetz

Anne Steinmetz, CLPE
Project Manager
Ron Smith & Associates, Inc.

Ron Smith

Ron Smith, CLPE
President
Ron Smith & Associates, Inc