

Comments made at the three SB1623 roundtable sessions on Saturday, March 12, 2005.

“Title 17 is not going away. It will remain, mostly intact with some modifications.”

“Title 17 was a well written, needed law that just needs some tweaking.”

“Title 17 needs to be better organized with clearly defined, easy to find requirements.”

“Title 17 should get a more holistic renovation, rather than a simple red penciling of the parts folks don't like. It really needs a complete reorganization and streamlining.”

Paraphrase: CAP and ASCLD-LAB requirements for method validation, proficiency testing, training, quality assurance, documentation and virtually every aspect of doing and proving good forensic work are far more stringent than the way Title 17 is now being administered.

“I'm concerned about laboratory directors inspecting their friends' laboratories.”

“The ASCLD-LAB inspections are mostly done by bench analysts, not directors or management.”

“The ASCLD-LAB inspections I've seen tend to find more problems than actually exist.”

“I've never seen an ASCLD-LAB inspection that did not find some deficiency or make some suggestion about how to do something better.”

“It will be nice to get an analyst doing work without having to wait three months or more for DOH proficiencies to qualify them.”

“We should keep DHS oversight of personnel qualifications at three levels. It is important to have independent review of analysts' credentials. “

“We should eliminate DHS oversight. Judicial and attorney review is sufficient to show compliance with qualification criteria in Title 17. “

“Someone has to oversee that Title 17 labs are doing it right.” This comment was made, in one form or another, concerning method development or validation, training of analysts, proficiency testing, quality assurance of analysis, etc.

“If they are doing their job right the prosecution and defense attorneys will be able to ask all the proper questions to present to the court what labs are doing.” This comment was made, in one form or another, concerning method development or validation, training of analysts, proficiency testing, quality assurance of analysis, etc.

“Title 17 should have more broad qualification requirements, similar to the ASCLAD/LAB educational requirements. Title 17 should not require specific courses, like Quant.”

“Title 17 should require periodic requalification (assuming DHS oversight). “