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§ 53:49 ——Driving BAC lower than test BAC
§ 53:50 Cross of defendant’s expert
§ 53:51 ——Opinions based on history from defendant
§ 53:52 ——Basis for “rising BAC” opinion
§ 53:53 ——Basis for opinion, blood test would have been exculpatory
§ 53:54 ——“Confidence limits” of breath testers
§ 53:55 ——What did defendant eat and drink?
§ 53:56 ——Medications used? affect test results?
§ 53:57 ——Was defendant affected by alcohol use?
§ 53:58 ——Defendant’s drink consumption and effects
§ 53:59 ——Does expert say all machines unreliable?
§ 53:60 ——Significance of simulator result
§ 53:61 ——What occurs if hoses connected wrong?
§ 53:62 Distinguishing test and earlier driving BAC’s
§ 53:63 Simulator results: Acceptability range
§ 53:64 Subject breath tests: Acceptability range
§ 53:65 State’s calibration procedures
§ 53:66 This expert’s test procedures on machine performance
§ 53:67 Calibration tests of machine in this case
§ 53:68 Effect of acetone in sample
§ 53:69 Occupation and credentials
§ 53:70 New regulations of department
§ 53:71 Regulations about outside testing
§ 53:72 Present test requirements
§ 53:73 All machines in state tested by department?
§ 53:74 Testing of machines upon request
§ 53:75 Installation of present computer program, and availability
§ 53:76 Operation of the test machine: Simulator not hooked up properly
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CHAPTER 54. PRE-TRIAL CHALLENGE OF A “NEW” BREATH TEST DEVICE

[TRANSCRIPT]

§ 54:1 Scope of this chapter
§ 54:2 Preliminary hearings and depositions in breath test cases
§ 54:3 The Frye hearing
§ 54:4 The machine in question: The Alco-Sensor
§ 54:5 Court’s first query: Can defendant produce cases which show device does not meet “Kelley-Frye” standard?
§ 54:6 Court seeks to bypass full hearing on issues
§ 54:7 Counsel insists on full hearing
§ 54:8 Alco-Sensor use by police: Not in compliance
§ 54:9 Qualification of device by state’s expert
§ 54:10 Objections to preserve the record
§ 54:11 Citations of scientific literature
§ 54:12 Qualification of the witness as expert
§ 54:13 Further qualification of the device: In “use” in the jurisdiction
§ 54:14 Title and qualifications
§ 54:15 Classes in science for Master’s degree: Relevant?
§ 54:16 This expert’s “field test” of the device
§ 54:17 Tests and experiments with this device by the witness
§ 54:18 Cite specific studies relied upon
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§ 54:19 Further exam on qualifications: Another bite at the apple
§ 54:20 The Alco-Sensor: A breath test is a breath test is a breath test
§ 54:21 Has the witness published? Get details?
§ 54:22 Present employment of witness: Does it imply bias?
§ 54:23 Are the records (logs) of test results relevant at a Frye hearing?
§ 54:24 “Police” work by witness: Relevant?
§ 54:25 Can witness cite scientific literature to support his opinions?
§ 54:26 Were correct scientific procedures used in this instance, with this machine? is that relevant at a “Kelly-Frye” type hearing?
§ 54:27 Witness has no personal knowledge of the performance of this particular device
§ 54:28 DOT listing of device: How is “approval” decided?
§ 54:29 Qualification of defense expert
§ 54:30 Distinction between “criminalist” and “scientist”
§ 54:31 Two types of scientific research: Experimental and theoretical
§ 54:32 Has witness performed “peer review” assignments for professional or academic journals?
§ 54:33 Publications by the witness
§ 54:34 Theoretical research (analyzing the data from published experimental studies): An important area
§ 54:35 The literature and the alco-sensor: What conclusions does witness draw?
§ 54:36 The alco-sensor: Has it been scientifically accepted as a reliable device for measuring and reporting BAC?
§ 54:37 Work in the field by this witness
§ 54:38 Does witness have any law enforcement connection?
§ 54:39 Employment history of witness
§ 54:40 Has witness testified for defense only?
§ 54:41 Payment for services of witness
§ 54:42 Is “motivation” to testify relevant?
§ 54:43 Criticism by, and of, the witness
§ 54:44 Is the device itself admissible at hearing?
§ 54:45 Direct comment on opposing expert: Proper?
§ 54:46 Court’s comment on witness’ motivation
§ 54:47 Cross of defendant’s expert: Experience with Alco-Sensor results
§ 54:48 Who has “approved” this device?
§ 54:49 Is device regularly used by law enforcement agencies?
§ 54:50 Is the witness biased for the defense?
§ 54:51 Redirect of defendant’s expert: What does DOT “listing” mean?
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§ 54:52 “Health” issue introduced by court earlier
§ 54:53 What are the issues in a “Kelly-Frye” type hearing?
§ 54:54 Frye hearing evidence: Is specific performance of this particular device relevant?
§ 54:55 Court reconsiders its prior decision on relevant evidence
§ 54:56 Can defense call officer who gave test? Is his testimony relevant on hearing like this?
§ 54:57 Defendant’s argument on the “Kelly-Frye” issues: What is the “test”?
§ 54:58 Can forensic “technicians” speak for the scientific community?
§ 54:59 Does the scientific literature support the expert’s position?
§ 54:60 The expert’s “personal” work: Was this explanation enough?
§ 54:61 Citing qualifications of defense expert
§ 54:62 Court finds device acceptable under “Kelly-Frye” based on witness credibility
§ 54:63 Effective cross of the evasive or biased expert: One of the most difficult tasks for the trial lawyer
§ 54:64 Transcripts in general: The value of hindsight

CHAPTER 55. GLOSSARY OF TERMS FOR PHYSIOLOGY, PHARMACOLOGY, AND TOXICOLOGY OF ALCOHOL

§ 55:1 A through D
§ 55:2 E through H
§ 55:3 I through L
§ 55:4 M through P
§ 55:5 Q through T
§ 55:6 U through Z

CHAPTER 56. UNCERTAINTY IN FORENSIC BREATH ALCOHOL TESTING

§ 56:1 Introduction
§ 56:2 Breath-test results: a fundamental uncertainty in the reported number
§ 56:3 Measurement uncertainty
§ 56:4 —Generally
§ 56:5 Traditional error analysis is incomplete
§ 56:6 The “Uncertainty approach” builds on error analysis
§ 56:7 Understanding the concept of measurement uncertainty: the coverage interval
§ 56:8 Quantification of uncertainty in measurement.
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§ 56:9 Moving from systematic effects (bias) to all relevant sources of uncertainty
§ 56:10 Adding sources of uncertainty together
§ 56:11 The “final uncertainty budget”
§ 56:12 A measurement result is meaningless without a statement of uncertainty
§ 56:13 Measurement uncertainty—Forensics
§ 56:14 Reporting results as “naked” numbers.
§ 56:15 Measurement uncertainty—Breath-alcohol testing
§ 56:16 Combined and expanded uncertainty in breath-alcohol analysis.
§ 56:17 The “safety margin” approach to “uncertainty.”
§ 56:18 Measurement uncertainty: accreditation—Generally
§ 56:19 —Ensuring that reported results are not misleading
§ 56:20 Breath-testing a case study in Washington State
§ 56:21 —Measurement uncertainty in breath-testing
§ 56:22 Determining pre-test bias and uncertainty
§ 56:23 DataMaster QAP certification: uncertainty not reported
§ 56:24 Further uncertainty considerations; biological/sampling uncertainty
§ 56:25 Biological/sampling uncertainty must be included in combined test uncertainty
§ 56:26 Example: estimating uncertainty.
§ 56:27 Washington State’s failure to account for uncertainty in breath-test results
§ 56:28 Addressing the failure to report breath-test uncertainty: applicable law
§ 56:29 Comparing the admissibility of “breath-test” and DNA evidence
§ 56:30 The NAS Report on measurement of uncertainties
§ 56:31 Case law supports reporting information needed to interpret the evidence offered
§ 56:32 Known bias not reported to courts, juries or defendants
§ 56:33 Accounting for uncertainty in the presentation of breath-test result
§ 56:34 Without information concerning its uncertainty, a measurement cannot be interpreted or understood
§ 56:35 Reporting quantitative uncertainty
§ 56:36 Proper reporting of breath-test results: result = measured value ± uncertainty
§ 56:37 Glossary of Acronyms
§ 56:38 References
CHAPTER 57. ATTORNEY'S GUIDE TO ISO 17025 AND COMPLIANCE BY FORENSIC LABORATORIES

§ 57:1 Introduction: forensic science in the 21st century—New standards of acceptable practice are essential

§ 57:2 Voluntary compliance with ISO 17025: an essential step in the march forward

§ 57:3 Ambiguous roots of some forensic science disciplines and offered test results

§ 57:4 What constitutes a “forensic laboratory” in the United States?

§ 57:5 Traditional accreditation of testing and calibration laboratories

§ 57:6 The FBI and laboratory accreditation practices

§ 57:7 Many accrediting bodies have existed with varying accreditation requirements

§ 57:8 Certificates of accreditation

§ 57:9 Always check on the current accreditation status of the lab

§ 57:10 The Legacy Program and accreditation by ASCLD/LAB

§ 57:11 Formation of the ASCLD and the LAB accreditation program

§ 57:12 The dawn of a new age in accountability: implementation of ISO 17025

§ 57:13 The ISO approach is one of long-standing accomplishment

§ 57:14 Adoption of ISO standards does not assure uniformity of practice

§ 57:15 Uniformity of methodology and reporting is important but it does not assure reliability of the results reported by forensic laboratories

§ 57:16 Control charting: an important statistical tool

§ 57:17 Dates by which conformity with ISO 17025 is required for those forensic laboratories voluntarily seeking accreditation

§ 57:18 What do forensic laboratories have to do to obtain accreditation under ISO 17025?

§ 57:19 What immediate changes in present practice will the ISO 17025 transition effect?

§ 57:20 Some immediate changes in blood alcohol and drug-test practice should be evident

§ 57:21 Should we expect “budgetary limitations” to be raised as an excuse for noncompliance and nonaccreditation by some forensic laboratories?

§ 57:22 ASCLD/LAB and ASCLD Consulting, LLC: when does a symbiotic relation become incestuous?

§ 57:23 New accreditation requirements and the “CSI Effect”
§ 57:24 Cross-examination themes that may arise during the transition of laboratories to ISO 17025 accreditation status and continue after
§ 57:25 Information gathering on ISO 17025 issues through informal interviews, discovery, and FOIA requests
§ 57:26 Sidestepping “uncertainty” reporting: the customer is always right
§ 57:27 Conclusion: ISO 17025 is here, it is making itself felt, but its impact will take time to determine
§ 57:28 Glossary of acronyms
§ 57:29 A glossary of technical terms
§ 57:30 Appendices

CHAPTER 58. [Reserved]

CHAPTER 59. [Reserved]

PART VII. EVALUATING LABORATORY PROCEDURES: CRIMINAL AND CIVIL CASES

CHAPTER 60. PREPARATION FOR THE DEPOSITION OF THE LABORATORY TECHNICIAN
§ 60:1 Initial considerations: Should you depose the laboratory at all?
§ 60:2 Who should be deposed: Technician, supervisor, or both?
§ 60:3 Basic objectives of a deposition of a laboratory
§ 60:4 Does the lab promulgate uniform test procedures for its technicians to follow?
§ 60:5 The original test notes and records: Are they available?
§ 60:6 Locating problem areas and sources of “error”: The “paper record”
§ 60:7 Check state statutes, department rules and regulations applicable to your test
§ 60:8 Informal guidelines for tests: Technician’s knowledge of details
§ 60:9 Technician’s awareness of “trouble” areas in sample handling and procedures: Where errors “might” occur
§ 60:10 “Outside” monitoring of lab’s work and results
CHAPTER 61. TAKING THE DEPOSITION OF THE FORENSIC LABORATORY TECHNICIAN, SUPERVISOR OR DIRECTOR

A. INTRODUCTION

§ 61:1 The deposition: Some general considerations
§ 61:2 “The Green case”: A useful case, with illustrative transcript
§ 61:3 Requiring document production: Notices, subpoenas, court orders
§ 61:4 The case deposition: Background facts

B. EXAMINATION OF LABORATORY TECHNICIAN

§ 61:5 Deponent's qualifications
§ 61:6 —Employment experience at lab
§ 61:7 —Prior jobs
§ 61:8 —Education
§ 61:9 Qualifications of the testing technician (if different person than deponent)
§ 61:10 —Tester's employment at lab (as opposed to deponent's)
§ 61:11 Use of typed request for information
§ 61:12 Review documents produced
§ 61:13 —The laboratory “certificate”
§ 61:14 —Laboratory form re this test sample: Two “versions”
§ 61:15 —The test chromatogram (G.C. “tracing”)
§ 61:16 General log books of lab for test results?
§ 61:17 Records kept on equipment calibrations?
§ 61:18 —Records on equipment repairs and maintenance
§ 61:19 —Daily calibration
§ 61:20 —Chemical batch numbers with standard deviations
§ 61:21 —Internal standards: Made up in lab or outside?
§ 61:22 —The “known” solutions: When, how prepared
§ 61:23 Written manuals or “guidelines” for performing tests
§ 61:24 The “green” test: How performed?
§ 61:25 —What G.C. was used? (details on age and cost)
§ 61:26 —Operating principles of test equipment
§ 61:27 —Identifying the presence of other alcohols
§ 61:28 —Importance of documents not produced
§ 61:29 —Other prior “runs” needed to get test BAC values
§ 61:30 Sample handling in lab: From “front door” to test
§ 61:31 —Conway diffusion test: (Alcohol screening test)
§ 61:32 —Drug screen ordered: Done? (how? by whom?)
§ 61:33 The blood alcohol test
§ 61:34 —Follow written procedures for test?
§ 61:35 —That day’s calibrations
§ 61:36 —No check on linearity of G.C. results
§ 61:37 —Other checks on equipment performance
§ 61:38 —Procedural steps with blood sample
§ 61:39 —How many “runs” of the test sample? (two if “alive,” one if “dead”)
§ 61:40 Errors do occur with laboratory tests
§ 61:41 —The “two test” run: An important check on results
§ 61:42 Monitoring of technician's or lab's performance
§ 61:43 —Technician would not rely on “one” test if performance being tested
§ 61:44 —No “blind monitoring” of lab performance
§ 61:45 Is technician aware of test “problem” areas?
§ 61:46 —Condition of sample as received
§ 61:47 —Assuring that a specific amount of sample is analyzed
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§ 61:48 Facts about this case known to technician
§ 61:49 Opinions of witness: Facts not considered
§ 61:50 —Post-mortem vs “in vivo” samples: Accident victims
§ 61:51 —Eating and drinking history on victim: Rising or falling BAC
§ 61:52 —Food or alcohol in stomach at death
§ 61:53 —Injuries and contamination of heart blood alcohol level
§ 61:54 —Bacteria and sugar in blood sample at collection
§ 61:55 —Alcohol production in blood sample: Preservatives, anticoagulants used
§ 61:56 —No “normal” blood values determined for samples (“in vivo” or post-mortems)
§ 61:57 Calculations as to alcohol consumed (the “magic 02”)
§ 61:58 Familiarity with literature, authors
§ 61:59 Qualifications of witness
§ 61:60 Demand for missing documents to be provided on a new date

C. FIGURES

§ 61:61 Figures

CHAPTER 62. DEPOSITION OF THE LABORATORY TECHNICIAN: THE “SECOND DAY”

§ 62:1 Objectives
§ 62:2 —Examination: Preliminary remarks
§ 62:3 Qualifications of “tester”
§ 62:4 Tester’s personal notes and records
§ 62:5 “Log” records concerning “green” test
§ 62:6 —Handwritten log sheet: Lab “handling” of sample
§ 62:7 —Typed log sheet: Lab “handling” of sample
§ 62:8 Laboratory procedures
§ 62:9 —Procedure sheet: Blood alcohol tests
§ 62:10 —Make request on record for missing information
§ 62:11 —Lab’s manual entry on test G.C
§ 62:12 —Calculation formula
§ 62:13 —Test chromatogram, by itself, not verifiable
§ 62:14 —Lab’s “recipe” for standards
§ 62:15 —Records on use of standards
§ 62:16 —Request for exemplar chromatograms for test G.C
§ 62:17 —Repair and maintenance records
§ 62:18 —Information on specific chemicals used
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CHAPTER 63. DEPOSITION OF LABORATORY TECHNICIANS: THE CALIFORNIA EXAMPLE

I. DEPOSITION OF FIRST LAB TECHNICIAN

A. INTRODUCTION

§ 63:1 Another typical forensic lab: A “second look” at blood alcohol test procedures
§ 63:2 The “Mack case”
§ 63:3 —Examine documents carefully as presented
§ 63:4 —Background considerations

B. DIRECT EXAMINATION

§ 63:5 Depoent's credentials: First technician
§ 63:6 Licensing requirements: Technician and lab
§ 63:7 Ever testify before: Qualify as expert?
§ 63:8 The gas chromatograph test equipment (the “G.C.”)
§ 63:9 —Training, experience with test equipment (G.C.)
§ 63:10 Report of toxicological analysis
§ 63:11 Lab procedures: Custody of sample
§ 63:12 —Labeling of sample bottle
§ 63:13 —“Medical report” form
§ 63:14 —Sample bottle label: What information provided
§ 63:15 —Handling of sample
§ 63:16 —After arrival, where does sample go?
§ 63:17 —Others have access to samples?
§ 63:18 Technician’s notes re alcohol “runs” on test date
§ 63:19 Operation of G.C. by tester
§ 63:20 —The chromatogram (or peak height chart)
§ 63:21 —Quality control chromatogram
C. CROSS-EXAMINATION

§ 63:40 Opinion: BAC at time of accident
§ 63:41 Opinion: Was this man under the influence at time of accident?
§ 63:42 Sample custody: Collection to lab
§ 63:43 The gas chromatograph: Condition of equipment
§ 63:44 Specific repairs and maintenance
§ 63:45 What records on equipment problems?

D. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

§ 63:46 Daily performance of G.C. checked by technician
§ 63:47 Laboratory licensed to perform BAC tests

E. RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION

§ 63:48 Problems: G.C. column
§ 63:49 Use of “other” alcohols
§ 63:50 Use of even numbered slots: “Wash solutions”
§ 63:51 Other G.C.’s in use

F. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

§ 63:52 Test sample peaks
§ 63:53 Sample contamination

G. DEPOSITION CONCLUDED

§ 63:54 Have you learned what you need to know from the “tester”? 

II. DEPOSITION OF SECOND LAB TECHNICIAN

A. DIRECT EXAMINATION

§ 63:55 Credentials of witness
§ 63:56 —Licenses obtained
§ 63:57 —Previously qualified as “expert”
§ 63:58 Report of alcohol analysis
§ 63:59 What was role of licensed technician?
§ 63:60 Documents reviewed
§ 63:61 —Test chromatogram
§ 63:62 —Computer printout
§ 63:63 —QC results
§ 63:64 —Average QC values plotted
§ 63:65 —Purpose of review
§ 63:66 Operation of the G.C.: Technician’s training
§ 63:67 Review of documents: Looking for what?
§ 63:68 Opinion on validity of reported test values
§ 63:69 The difference in reported values
§ 63:70 No actual supervision of tests
§ 63:71 Training of “tester” by supervisor
§ 63:72 Supervisor signs Q.C. runs
§ 63:73 Opinion on validity of Q.C. results
§ 63:74 Opinion on condition of equipment
§ 63:75 Blood sample: What information given?
§ 63:76 Removing seal and label: Blood sample container
§ 63:77 Opinion: Effect of delay on BAC value
§ 63:78 —Opinion: Alcohol formed in sample
§ 63:79 Significance: 0.18% BAC
§ 63:80 Opinion: “Under influence” under state law
§ 63:81 Deterioration of blood sample
§ 63:82 Test equipment problems: The computer
§ 63:83 —Three parts of this G.C. system
§ 63:84 —Manual computation of “unknown” ethanol peaks
§ 63:85 Licensing of lab

B. CROSS-EXAMINATION

§ 63:86 What formula did technician use to check results?
III. OVERVIEW OF THE TWO DEPOSITIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

§ 63:99 Generally

B. UNASKED QUESTIONS

§ 63:100 Generally
§ 63:101 The sample containers
§ 63:102 The test procedure
§ 63:103 The G.C
§ 63:104 Quality control “runs”
§ 63:105 If tester has formed “firm” opinions what facts were relied upon?
§ 63:106 Records: “Permanent” records
§ 63:107 Condition of sample as received in lab
§ 63:108 Reporting procedure
§ 63:109 State monitoring of lab: Annual test
§ 63:110 Licensed tester required (a fatal flaw?)
§ 63:111 No check for linearity
§ 63:112 A post-deposition “find”: That lab runs “serum” not “whole blood” values

IV. FIGURES

§ 63:113 Figures
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CHAPTER 64. TAKING THE DEPOSITION OF THE MEDICAL EXAMINER

A. DIRECT EXAMINATION

§ 64:1 Deposition background: The “Green case”
§ 64:2 Qualifications of medical examiner
§ 64:3 Documents produced by M.E
§ 64:4 —Lab certificate
§ 64:5 —Doctor’s notes
§ 64:6 —No other “records”
§ 64:7 The doctor’s notes: Content
§ 64:8 —Time between death and blood sample collection
§ 64:9 —Doctor’s notes on physical exam, injuries
§ 64:10 —Doctor’s “diagnosis”: Cause of death
§ 64:11 —Blood alcohol result
§ 64:12 —Doctor’s notes: When made?
§ 64:13 —“Other” notes not brought to deposition
§ 64:14 Compliance with notice
§ 64:15 The injuries: How complete are the notes?
§ 64:16 —What ribs fractured, on which side?
§ 64:17 —Internal injuries: How diagnosed?
§ 64:18 Time of sample collection
§ 64:19 Collection of sample
§ 64:20 —From what body site?
§ 64:21 —What equipment used
§ 64:22 —Collection by “chest puncture”
§ 64:23 —The sample container
§ 64:24 Sample delivery to lab
§ 64:25 Report from lab
§ 64:26 Opinion of the medical examiner regarding sobriety of the driver
§ 64:27 Eating and drinking history at odds with reported BAC
§ 64:28 Contamination at scene of collected sample
§ 64:29 Contamination by chest puncture
§ 64:30 Injuries and stomach contents
§ 64:31 Steering wheel impacts and resulting injuries
§ 64:32 —Surface injuries can indicate site of internal injuries
§ 64:33 How certain is time between accident and death?
§ 64:34 Blood loss, internal bleeding
§ 64:35 Blood alcohol sample by chest puncture: Poor practice
§ 64:36 —Use of textbooks as “authority”
§ 64:37 Presence of other fluids in blood sample after accident  
§ 64:38 Fluids from rest of body also contain alcohol  
§ 64:39 Samples from other body sites  
§ 64:40 —Obtaining femoral blood at autopsy  
§ 64:41 Neo-formation of alcohol: Elevated sugars and bacteria  
§ 64:42 Collecting heart blood: “Left side” preferred  
§ 64:43 Custody of blood after M.E. draws sample  

B. CROSS-EXAMINATION  
§ 64:44 Credentials of doctor  
§ 64:45 A change in practice regarding autopsies  
§ 64:46 This medical examiner is not a pathologist  
§ 64:47 —No autopsy in this case  
§ 64:48 Normal procedures followed by “experienced M.E.”  
§ 64:49 —Got “normal” blood sample  
§ 64:50 —No “recollection” of collection problems  
§ 64:51 —Kept record in notebook  
§ 64:52 Heart blood sample for BAC  
§ 64:53 —Obtained before embalming  
§ 64:54 Opinion regarding sobriety  

C. REDIRECT EXAMINATION  
§ 64:55 Generally  
§ 64:56 Doctor’s medical training: What he is not!  

D. OVERVIEW  
§ 64:57 Generally  

E. FIGURES  
§ 64:58 Figures  

CHAPTER 65. ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN BLOOD ALCOHOL TEST CASES: DISCOVERY GUIDELINES FOR TRIAL ATTORNEYS 
§ 65:1 Collection of blood ethanol results  
§ 65:2 Collection of blood: certification, licensing, and authorization  
§ 65:3 Collection: clean containers, appropriate preservatives and anticoagulants  
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§ 65:4 Collection: blood draw procedures with and without “kits”
§ 65:5 Mailing and/or transportation of blood ethanol samples
§ 65:6 Breaks in chain of custody and opportunities for contamination of samples: what should counsel be looking for?
§ 65:7 Each of the issues above can create “fallout”: a specific example
§ 65:8 Permanent retention of original label: blood on that label?
§ 65:9 The laboratory number: to avoid confusion of samples, to assure anonymity
§ 65:10 The failure to make proper notations on the condition of the containers and the samples as they arrive creates uncertainty
§ 65:11 In your follow–up discovery, locate those things not always spelled out in the material provided
§ 65:12 Mailing transportation and delivery of the samples
§ 65:13 The testing of the ethanol samples: first considerations
§ 65:14 Finding the documentation; effectively reviewing the documents
§ 65:15 Reporting of blood ethanol results: use of conversion table
§ 65:16 Identifying the kind of ethanol values reported: “serum/plasma” v. “whole blood”
§ 65:17 The first examination of the test documents provided
§ 65:18 Ethanol values in accident cases: further considerations
§ 65:19 Be aware of possible “bias” in the statements reviewed
§ 65:20 When possible, visit the laboratory, examine the original of documents, conduct your own “view” of equipment and laboratory procedures
§ 65:21 If your request for a view and inspection is refused
§ 65:22 The informal visit made upon your request; document your observations
§ 65:23 Don’t write voluminous notes during informal visit: keep them brief–don’t “scare off” the person being interviewed
§ 65:24 In some cases, tape recording the interview may be appropriate–caution!
§ 65:25 In blood ethanol cases, watch out for the expert’s pre–trial “written opinion”: other collateral and “hidden” opinions may also come out at trial
§ 65:26 A specific example of “unmentioned” opinion evidence ruled admissible
§ 65:27 Retrograde extrapolation opinions: no matter how general the pre–trial written opinion, be prepared for specifics (an opinion to two decimal places)
§ 65:28 In alcohol test cases, always be prepared for impairment

Intoxication Test Evidence
opinions, whether offered in written pre–trial discovery
opinions or not

CHAPTER 65A. INTERPRETING OFFICIAL
REPORTS FROM CRIME AND TOXICOLOGY
LABORATORIES

§ 65A:1 Introduction: finding one's way through laboratory reports
§ 65A:2 It is helpful to read this chapter in context of Chapters 65
and 66
§ 65A:3 Typical structure of toxicology reports
§ 65A:4 Letterhead information
§ 65A:5 Identifying case number (one link in chain of custody)
§ 65A:6 Times and dates of specimen collection, handling, and
delivery to lab
§ 65A:7 A typical collection kit
§ 65A:8 Sheathed needle and needle holder typically used
§ 65A:9 Expiration dates and potential loss of vacuum
§ 65A:10 Date of report and all dates referenced in it
§ 65A:11 Requesting agency or client
§ 65A:12 Name of the individual; take nothing for granted
§ 65A:13 Evidence as received by the laboratory
§ 65A:14 Results and conclusions in the report as issued
§ 65A:15 Broad categories are typical
§ 65A:16 Gas chromatography
§ 65A:17 Indirect enzymatic analyses
§ 65A:18 Notation method of reporting results differs from lab to lab
§ 65A:19 Uncertainty of results unreported
§ 65A:20 Comparison of specimen results important
§ 65A:21 Volatiles other than ethanol
§ 65A:22 Drug-screening results
§ 65A:23 Confirm the signer of report (analyst, supervisor, or
director)
§ 65A:24 Appendices

CHAPTER 66. INFORMAL AND FORMAL
PRE-TRIAL INTERVIEWS OF THE
FORENSIC ANALYST

§ 66:1 Introduction: mining for gold with the forensic specialist
§ 66:2 Informal and formal pre-trial interviews
§ 66:3 Pre-trial questions of the opposing expert: helpful or
harmful?
§ 66:4 Preparation for cross: harvesting pre-trial facts discovered
§ 66:5 Interview goals: acquire information and identify areas of agreement and disagreement
§ 66:6 Making small deficits in procedures count
§ 66:7 Protect the candid and helpful witness
§ 66:8 Depleted standards and controls
§ 66:9 Assigning a value to whole blood controls
§ 66:10 Verifiers and the illusion of accuracy
§ 66:11 Accuracy to plus or minus a given percent
§ 66:12 Duplicate breath testing
§ 66:13 Breath testing and radio frequency interference (RFI)
§ 66:14 Calibrating breath-test equipment
§ 66:15 The “blank” report and the “ambient subtract”: be aware of this troublesome tool
§ 66:16 Reprocessed or reanalyzed results: how can you tell if this has occurred?
§ 66:17 Breath-testers and electronic data: what is retained?
§ 66:18 Obtaining pre-trial information: “you didn't ask twice!”
§ 66:19 Conclusion: the government witness

CHAPTER 67. QUALIFYING THE EXPERT WITNESS: A PRACTICAL VOIR DIRE
§ 67:1 Introduction: objective of chapter
§ 67:2 Basis and function of the expert witness
§ 67:3 Categories of expert witnesses
§ 67:4 Standard of review: “Daubert Trilogy”
§ 67:5 Qualifications and competency requirements
§ 67:6 Evaluating the competency and knowledge of the witness
§ 67:7 Voir dire of the proffered expert: an essential and integral procedure
§ 67:8 Voir dire: scope of examination
§ 67:9 Pre-testimonial disclosure: a written summary opinion
§ 67:10 Disclosure: continuing duty
§ 67:11 Previous testimony as expert
§ 67:12 Occupational or official titles: imprimatur of expertise
§ 67:13 Competency to testify and actual knowledge of the subject matter
§ 67:14 Legal and factual relevance
§ 67:15 Federal rules
§ 67:16 Voir dire questionnaire
§ 67:17 Conclusion
§ 67:18 References
CHAPTER 68. FORENSIC CRIME LAB
WORK PRODUCT QUALITY:
ACCREDITATION AND AUDIT
CONSIDERATIONS FOR TRIAL LAWYERS

§ 68:1 Introduction
§ 68:2 Some recent failures by forensic laboratories
§ 68:3 Federal Government and Academia concerned with these problems
§ 68:4 Are “independent” crime laboratories a solution?
§ 68:5 All lab reports require careful review by attorneys
§ 68:6 Threshold considerations for attorneys to begin with
§ 68:7 There are specific questions and issues for attorneys to keep in mind when laboratory results are reported
§ 68:8 Discovery Item One: evidence collection forms and logs
§ 68:9 Discovery Item Two: Chain of custody
§ 68:10 Discovery Item Three: lab records on receipt, handling, identification of evidence
§ 68:11 Discovery Item Four: subsampling procedures
§ 68:12 Discovery Item Five: documentation of written protocols, technical procedures (SOPs) for time testing performed
§ 68:13 Discovery Item Six: proficiency test results for the analysts
§ 68:14 Discovery Item Seven: traceability documentation (standards and references)
§ 68:15 Discovery Item Eight: sample preparation records
§ 68:16 Discovery Item Nine: bench notes, logs, records of the analyst
§ 68:17 Discovery Item Ten: run logs for standards, references, blanks, rinses and controls
§ 68:18 Discovery Item Eleven: instrument operation and criteria variables
§ 68:19 Discovery Item Twelve: instrument maintenance
§ 68:20 Discovery Item Thirteen: getting the raw data
§ 68:21 Discovery Item Fourteen: information on the spectral match library
§ 68:22 Discovery Item Fifteen: computer estimates of illicit drug production yield
§ 68:23 Discovery Item Sixteen: operation and calibration of analytical balances
§ 68:24 Discovery Item Seventeen: gravimetric determinations
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§ 68:25 Discovery Item Eighteen: contamination control surveys  
§ 68:26 Discovery Item Nineteen: internal reviews of subject data  
§ 68:27 Discovery Item Twenty: method validation records  
§ 68:28 Discovery Item Twenty One: the quality assurance manual  
§ 68:29 Discovery Item Twenty Two: accreditation application and reviews  
§ 68:30 Discovery Item Twenty Three: qualifications of analysts  
§ 68:31 Discovery Item Twenty Four: on-site inspection reports  
§ 68:32 Discovery Item Twenty Five: internal audit reports  
§ 68:33 Discovery Item Twenty Six: instrumentation available in lab  
§ 68:34 Discovery Item Twenty Seven: productivity and work load of lab  
§ 68:35 Conclusion: effective discovery by attorneys in forensic science cases is critical  
§ 68:36 Afterword: the willingham arson case (Texas)  
§ 68:37 Checklist for Discovery of Laboratory Work Product  

CHAPTER 69. [Reserved]  
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PART VIII. PREPARATION AND TESTIMONY OF THE EXPERT WITNESS IN ALCOHOL TEST CASES  

CHAPTER 70. EXPERT OPINIONS ON POST-ACCIDENT AND POST-MORTEM BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS: WHEN EXPERTS MISS THE MARK  
§ 70:1 Initial questions as to all post-accident and post-mortem BAC's  
§ 70:2 —Threshold questions when the subject was injured (survived)  
§ 70:3 —Threshold questions when breath was the sample  
§ 70:4 —Threshold questions when blood was the alcohol sample  
§ 70:5 —Threshold questions with post-mortem samples  
§ 70:6 —Caution needed before “firm” opinions formed  
§ 70:7 Weight, type, totality of evidence varies  
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§ 70:8 —Sources of information
§ 70:9 —Failure to acknowledge “uncertainties”
§ 70:10 The “typical” expert: Forensic expediency, oversimplification, encouraged
§ 70:11 The fight to keep state forensic experts independent of police influence: A losing battle?
§ 70:12 The “Dutch case”: BAC sample collection after serious injuries (motorcycle accident)
§ 70:13 —The lab technician’s opinion: Dutch was “drunk”
§ 70:14 —The laboratory’s test procedures
§ 70:15 —Never assume reliability at outset
§ 70:16 The Copper case (head-on collision: Police “stop” and pre-accident release of driver)
§ 70:17 —No initial investigation of other possible causes of the conduct
§ 70:18 —No autopsy performed
§ 70:19 —The search for “deep pocket” civil defendants
§ 70:20 —The initial blood alcohol report
§ 70:21 —Opinions of doctor who performed BAC analysis
§ 70:22 —The “serum” against “whole blood” problem again
§ 70:23 —All information about test must be obtained pre-trial
§ 70:24 —Gaps in chain of custody (“two” bodies)
§ 70:25 —Failure to consider effect of injuries
§ 70:26 —Opinions of Mr. Deep: Another “typical” expert
§ 70:27 Oversimplification of the significance of results: What does a single test tell us?
§ 70:28 The “Chappaquiddick Incident”: The Mary Jo Kopechne example
§ 70:29 —The post-mortem value: “Reported” significance of the 0.09%
§ 70:30 —Actual significance of the one BAC result: Very ambiguous
§ 70:31 —Relating reported BAC to alcohol consumption
§ 70:32 —The “part-time” M.E. at work
§ 70:33 —No autopsy ordered: Decision-making splintered
§ 70:34 —Opinions based on one Kopechne BAC unfounded
§ 70:35 —Unasked questions about Kopechne BAC
§ 70:36 —Alternatives consistent with “one” post-mortem BAC
§ 70:37 —Relating time of “death” to time of “accident”
§ 70:38 —Drowning and post-mortem BAC’s
§ 70:39 —Possible effects of other injuries
§ 70:40 —One reported BAC becomes “the” BAC of the person
§ 70:41 The experienced forensic specialist: Similar “errors”
§ 70:42 The William Holden example: The decomposed body BAC
§ 70:43 —The post-mortem value: “Reported” significance of the 0.22%
§ 70:44 —Decomposition and neo-formation of alcohol ignored by pathologist-medical examiner
§ 70:45 —False “decomposed value” as evidence of sobriety
§ 70:46 —Will “everyone” (male or female) be “heavily intoxicated” at 0.22%?
§ 70:47 —Tolerance and individual differences: BAC effects are not “fixed”
§ 70:48 The Natalie Wood example: The drowned body BAC
§ 70:49 —The post-mortem BAC: “Reported” significance of the 0.14%
§ 70:50 —Actual significance of 0.14%: Very ambiguous
§ 70:51 —Other unasked questions
§ 70:52 —“Effect” on Wood of the 0.14%
§ 70:53 —“One” BAC reported: The “predictable” interpretation offered
§ 70:54 Holden and Wood: “Plasma” values
§ 70:55 The “typical” expert: Where does personal prejudice stop, and science begin?

CHAPTER 70A. POST-TRAUMA ALCOHOL-TEST REPORTS: A HARD LOOK AT TRADITIONAL ASSUMPTIONS OF REGULARITY AND RELIABILITY
§ 70A:1 Introduction: the scope of this chapter
§ 70A:2 The offer of questionable opinions in typical accident-trauma cases
§ 70A:3 The battle for full disclosure from the forensic science community
§ 70A:4 The NAS Report totally ignores alcohol test problems and impairment issues: these remain the “sleeping giant” of poor forensic science practices and questionable testimonial evidence
§ 70A:5 The reliability of alcohol-tests after trauma: the “orphan child” of the alcohol-test field
§ 70A:6 From accident to hospital admission (or discharge); get facts
§ 70A:7 Stress and the physiological effects and changes that result when it precedes or accompanies an accident
§ 70A:8 Trauma-induced amnesia: is “the sweet bliss of forgetfulness” helpful or harmful to driver/accident victims?
§ 70A:9 Stress and physiological changes in the human system
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§ 70A:10 There are many additional physiological changes related to stress

§ 70A:11 The “Alarm Stage” is particularly important in terms of severe stress reactions and later reported blood-alcohol levels

§ 70A:12 The Endocrine system and the release of hormones due to physical or mental stress

§ 70A:13 The Peripheral Nervous System (PNS)

§ 70A:14 Stress and shock: Release of Norepinephrine (NE) and Epinephrine (Epi) and elevated glucose levels

§ 70A:15 Abnormal BAC profile just from “nervousness” associated with stress

§ 70A:16 Elevated blood sugars and contaminants in blood within vacutainer collection tubes: when might we have ethanol neogenesis in vitro and/or in vivo?

§ 70A:17 Pre-accident (and pre-trauma) food and drink consumption: an important consideration in all alcohol-test cases

§ 70A:18 Documents to collect in trauma and injury alcohol-test cases

§ 70A:19 Carefully review hospital reports and medical records: do not overlook salient portions

§ 70A:20 When the medical records are extensive or the issues relating to the reliability of a later test result are complex, get help

§ 70A:21 Tracking “trouble areas” in hospital reports and records in post-accident and post-injury alcohol-test cases

§ 70A:22 Physiological factors often disrupt the normal pharmacokinetics of ethanol in the body after trauma and injuries

§ 70A:23 Use medical records to systematically assess all physical and mental insults to the patient from trauma and injuries

§ 70A:24 First considerations: shock and metabolic acidosis

§ 70A:25 Hypotension and shock: disruption of the cardiovascular system and EtOH values

§ 70A:26 The “overshoot” and overestimations of BAC and BrAC

§ 70A:27 Injuries to heart or blood vessels and the reliability of later collected ethanol samples

§ 70A:28 Always find and confirm hematocrit (Hct) results in hospital records

§ 70A:29 Critical physiological indices to be reviewed

§ 70A:30 Most common conditions after trauma affecting cardiovascular status

§ 70A:31 Injuries to, or problems with, the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) can affect breath-test results
§ 70A:32 Injuries to, or problems with, the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) can affect blood-test results
§ 70A:33 Document those injuries observed on scene and on way to hospital
§ 70A:34 Checklist of medical treatment of driver on scene and on way to hospital
§ 70A:35 Documentation of vital signs and observations in records
§ 70A:36 The Glasgow Coma Scale
§ 70A:37 Checklist of record entries to look for in EMT and ER records when EtOH samples are collected after trauma and injuries
§ 70A:38 Forensic laboratory EtOH reports against hospital or clinical results
§ 70A:39 Attempts at retrograde extrapolation opinions that ignore the affects of trauma and injuries: pushing science out of the way

CHAPTER 70B. POSTMORTEM ALCOHOL SAMPLE COLLECTION, HANDLING, AND REPORTING: BRINGING DEAD ISSUES TO LIFE
§ 70B:1 Introduction: responsible collection, testing, and reporting of postmortem alcohol values—A slow and uneven march forward
§ 70B:2 In hindsight, many postmortem opinions offered and accepted over many decades were patently and demonstrably inappropriate
§ 70B:3 The failure to test the multiple samples collected at autopsy: an important opportunity to validate whole body ethanol distribution lost
§ 70B:4 Why should DUI specialists, who are essentially criminal law practitioners, be concerned with postmortem alcohol results?
§ 70B:5 Prior chapters of this text are companions to this material
§ 70B:6 In postmortem cases, collection of preautopsy specimens for alcohol testing is an unacceptable and forensically unsound practice
§ 70B:7 A word about medical examiners and coroners today
§ 70B:8 Critical facts regarding collection, handling and testing of specimens
§ 70B:9 All intervening events, from accident to sample collection need evaluation
§ 70B:10 Postmortem ethanol reports: some general concerns about reliability
§ 70B:11 Responsible interpretation of the reliability and significance of a reported postmortem result always requires cautious investigation first

§ 70B:12 The rise and fall of the BAC: evidence, when available on this issue, is critical to interpreting the true significance of later reported EtOH samples

§ 70B:13 Do we have competent evidence to establish whether, at the time of the accident and/or at the time of death, the driver’s BAC was rising, or was at or about the peak, or was declining?

§ 70B:14 Reported postmortem ethanol results: what is the source of that alcohol (ethanol ingestion or postmortem production)?

§ 70B:15 Collection and testing of multiple body fluid samples (blood, urine, vitreous): an essential first step to sound forensic opinions in postmortem cases

§ 70B:16 Comparison of alcohol values in multiple samples collected

§ 70B:17 Three key factors that affect postmortem ethanol analysis

§ 70B:18 Another investigative tool for evaluating the probability of postmortem ethanol production: the urine serotonin metabolite ratio

§ 70B:19 Both increases and decreases may occur in ethanol concentration over time

§ 70B:20 An instructive case history: a finding that neoformation had occurred in a postmortem blood specimen due to faulty preservation of the blood specimen

§ 70B:21 A second and important source of error in the use of n-propyl alcohol (n-propanol) as the ISTD in postmortem cases

§ 70B:22 Acetaldehyde also detected in the Wigmore and Chow case of postmortem ethanol neogenesis

§ 70B:23 Sampling considerations: great care is required at every stage of the collection and handling of specimens to avoid neoformation of ethanol

§ 70B:24 Vitreous humor: collection and testing of this specimen needs special attention in this chapter

§ 70B:25 Identifying a useful and acceptable range of conversion factors for blood and vitreous humour

§ 70B:26 One important but often unused tool for identifying neoformation of ethanol in postmortem specimens: a microbiological assay of blood and vitreous

§ 70B:27 Conclusion: postmortem ethanol determinations—Not a completed subject but a work in progress

§ 70B:28 Appendices

§ 70B:29 Sources and references
CHAPTER 71. PREPARATION AND TESTIMONY OF THE EXPERT WITNESS

A. INTRODUCTION
§ 71:1 Generally
§ 71:2 Experts not used in typical OUI case
§ 71:3 Policy of “benign neglect”
§ 71:4 More, not less, use of experts anticipated

B. ADMISSIBILITY OF EXPERT TESTIMONY
§ 71:5 Generally
§ 71:6 The “strict necessity” rule
§ 71:7 The “if helpful” standard (the majority view)
§ 71:8 Discretion of the court
§ 71:9 “Learned treatise” exception to hearsay rule on cross-examination
§ 71:10 Other limitations
§ 71:11 Undue prejudice

C. QUALIFICATIONS
§ 71:12 Generally
§ 71:13 Exploring the basis for “expertise”

D. EXPERT OPINIONS ON “ULTIMATE ISSUE”
§ 71:14 Generally
§ 71:15 Ultimate issue opinions in intoxication cases
§ 71:16 One result of these “typical” opinions: “Per se” laws

E. EXPERT OPINIONS: THE SPECIFIC OPINIONS
§ 71:17 Memorandum on scope of testimony
§ 71:18 Qualifications of your witness
§ 71:19 “Certainty” and “uncertainty” in scientific practice
§ 71:20 “Reasonable scientific (medical) certainty”: A special status
§ 71:21 An exclusion danger: “Fatal” opinion language
§ 71:22 Acceptable opinion language
§ 71:23 The choice of language has many ramifications
§ 71:24 Prior review of opinion “questions and answers”
§ 71:25 Multiple reports: Evaluation

F. LOCATING AN EXPERT WITNESS: SOURCES
§ 71:26 Generally
§ 71:27  “Traditional” experts: The search for objectivity
§ 71:28  A variety of sources

G.  TRIAL PREPARATION OF THE EXPERT

§ 71:29  Timely preparation
§ 71:30  What should the witness bring to court?: The “file”
§ 71:31  Proper organization of the “testimony file”

H.  THE TESTIMONY ITSELF: SOME PROBLEM AREAS

§ 71:32  Warn the witness: The memory lapse
§ 71:33  Is trial opinion supported by original notes and findings?
§ 71:34  Pressure on witnesses to “improve” opinion
§ 71:35  “That’s not important”: Trap for the unwary witness
§ 71:36  Responsible handling of “new” or unconsidered facts
§ 71:37  The “sine qua non” for the expert’s initial examination: An open minded inquiry
§ 71:38  Keeping facts in perspective: Avoiding the “domino” effect
§ 71:39  The “nice guy” cross-examiner; another trap for the unwary witness
§ 71:40  “Just one last point, doctor”: The floodgates open
§ 71:41  The “non-opinion” opinion: A disturbing trend
§ 71:42  The “percentage probability” opinion
§ 71:43  “The scientific community has found . . .”
§ 71:44  Exploring the basis for expert opinion: The “hundreds of studies” gambit
§ 71:45  Going to the source: Challenging firm opinions which are based on flawed data
§ 71:46  Accident probability and the grand rapids study: A case in point
§ 71:47  Accident probability opinions and the expert witness; the skewed curve of the grand rapids study
§ 71:48  Forensic use of the grand rapids study: Valuable lessons lost
§ 71:49  Attacking the integrity of the expert in the courtroom: Justified and unjustified attacks
§ 71:50  —Measuring the actual integrity of witnesses
§ 71:51  —Witnesses with integrity: Essential to our system
§ 71:52  —Inappropriate attacks on the expert’s integrity
§ 71:53  —Appropriate areas of cross-exam which “touch” integrity
§ 71:54  —Compensation and bias
§ 71:55  —Personal attacks on the expert: The “last refuge” of incompetent counsel
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§ 71:56 Figures

CHAPTER 72. THE EFFECTIVE QUALIFICATION OF YOUR EXPERT WITNESS: NOT A CHORE—A REAL OPPORTUNITY

§ 72:1 Qualification of the expert: Annoying hurdle or major opportunity?
§ 72:2 Qualifying the witness; building your credibility as well as that of your witness
§ 72:3 Take your time; do the job right
§ 72:4 Your witness and you: Your witness and the jury/court
§ 72:5 Early and thorough attention to qualifications; the sine qua non of effectively presenting your expert
§ 72:6 Getting the witness “qualified” as expert is only one of the goals of this phase
§ 72:7 When your witness fails to impress, whose fault is it?
§ 72:8 The disorganized, arrogant, or recalcitrant expert
§ 72:9 The “disorganization-arrogance” lecture
§ 72:10 Cross-examine your own witness
§ 72:11 Your message to court and jury: This witness is a thoroughbred
§ 72:12 Some factors do tend to block proper qualification
§ 72:13 When qualifications must go in by written C.V
§ 72:14 Qualifying an expert does not have to be a bore
§ 72:15 The first rule of preparation of the expert: Find out what is different, unique, special about your witness
§ 72:16 The expert’s dilemma in every case: The “severity of the drinking-driving problem” against the “reliability of the evidence”
§ 72:17 Shortchanging the preparation of your expert
§ 72:18 Failing to bring your expert and his (her) qualifications “alive”: A recurrent problem with the qualification stage
§ 72:19 The first rule of qualifying your witness: Experts are “whole” persons
§ 72:20 Become a real “fan” of your expert: Get that across to court and jury
§ 72:21 Finding and using the personal side of the witness
§ 72:22 If you’re not a “fan” of your witness, no one else will be
§ 72:23 Form a plan for using facts about your expert: For working into the testimony things you want everyone to know
CHAPTER 73. WHEN YOU PREPARE TO CONSULT AN EXPERT: “TILL THE SOIL”

§ 73:1 What is the attorney’s obligation before the expert is consulted?
§ 73:2 Reading “science”: Is this trip necessary?
§ 73:3 Why should an expert get involved in your case: You must get the expert’s attention and interest
§ 73:4 Reading the work of your potential expert before consultation
§ 73:5 Caveat: An expert’s opinions can change over time
§ 73:6 Finding opinion contradictions beforehand
§ 73:7 Read every alcohol article and text by your expert
§ 73:8 New or different facts: New and different opinions
§ 73:9 When attorney doesn’t do science “homework,” important issues can be overlooked or neglected
§ 73:10 The expert witness and overlooked or neglected issues: Experts are not infallible
§ 73:11 Overly broad findings and conclusions of expert
§ 73:12 Important lines of inquiry not explored
§ 73:13 Preparation of the expert: Anticipating trial issues
§ 73:14 Attorney’s reading, work on science: Also critical to effective cross of opposing experts
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CHAPTER 74. EXAMINING BIASED, DIFFICULT OR EVASIVE EXPERTS

§ 74:1 Identify your goals: Know what you want to demonstrate or establish by your cross-examination

§ 74:2 Effectively establishing “police team” bias; some suggested questions

§ 74:3 Daily association with “fellow” law enforcement personnel?

§ 74:4 Does witness view self as part of law enforcement?

§ 74:5 Does witness carry a “badge” or official I.D.?

§ 74:6 The “bias” issue: Closing argument and the appeal record

§ 74:7 If we view criminalists as “cops,” should we view defense attorneys as “criminals”?

§ 74:8 “Doctor cops” are not exclusively an American problem

§ 74:9 Effective cross of the evasive expert on uncited articles and “personal work”: Cutting off the angles

§ 74:10 Set some ground-rules for your exam

§ 74:11 Establish: No reason witness should not be prepared on issues of case and have his or her data and sources ready

§ 74:12 Ask for specific titles of articles and studies

§ 74:13 Ask for names of specific authors of articles on this device and this subject matter

§ 74:14 Show why knowing authors, titles, and the location of articles in the literature is important for the expert

§ 74:15 Not just “reading” but “studying” new articles and texts is required to absorb and use the material

§ 74:16 Articles on a new device or new “use” of device

§ 74:17 Does witness make and keep own notes on new articles with own evaluation and comments

§ 74:18 If expert made notes on articles on this device, did witness review those notes before coming to court?

§ 74:19 Under such questioning, witness may backtrack on basis of opinion: Did not rely on articles

§ 74:20 Your own expert’s testimony must counterbalance the criticisms you offer of the opposing expert

§ 74:21 Relate the subject matter of articles witness says were read to “personal work” being done at time

§ 74:22 If witness uses “pretty sure” or “almost positive” in answer to your questions

§ 74:23 Witness did not bring articles or data, but can “look them up”

§ 74:24 The witness knows: You cannot cross-examine on unidentified articles

§ 74:25 If the articles referred to by witness are not identified, no one else can critique comments
CHAPTER 75. THE PROSECUTOR AND THE DEFENDANT’S EXPERT: SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR EFFECTIVE CROSS-EXAMINATION

§ 75:1 Some prosecutors misled by their prior experience: The “not ready for prime time” players
§ 75:2 Some judges misled by the same experience
§ 75:3 Breath test “seminars” for the bench and prosecutors: Critically educational or a “sales pitch”?
§ 75:4 Traditional oversimplification of breath test issues has ramifications for prosecutors
§ 75:5 Prosecutors tend to rely on the office “DWI manual” which does not deal adequately with inherent variables
§ 75:6 Prosecutors must understand inherent ambiguities and “play” in breath test devices which typical manuals pass over
§ 75:7 The prosecutor and the defense expert in criminal cases: Seeing “openings” which can turn the tables
§ 75:8 Taking the low road: Attacking the messenger
§ 75:9 Defendant’s strong expert testimony may still have very useful “openings”
§ 75:10 Begin with basic principles about alcohol consumption, the rise and fall of the BAC, impairment effects
§ 75:11 Applying those principles to the facts
§ 75:12 Cross-examination of the defendant’s expert: Keep your own objectivity
§ 75:13 Cross-examination of the defendant’s expert: A powerful weapon for prosecutors who have done their homework
§ 75:14 —The number of “drinks” consumed: Has expert done that math on this case
§ 75:15 —The calculation result (average and low)
§ 75:16 —If defendant drank at least the low amount (or one even closer to the average), was that irresponsible?
§ 75:17 —Even more alcohol would have been consumed if defendant was drinking longer than was reported
§ 75:18 —Even more alcohol would have been consumed if test value used for “drink” calculations was not the peak
§ 75:19 —If this individual was on the high side of “average” rather than low, more alcohol would have been consumed
§ 75:20 —Peak BAC could have been higher: If it was, more alcohol consumed than calculations indicate
§ 75:21 Comparing expert’s “drink count” with defendant’s testimony
§ 75:22 After your “drink count” cross-exam of defendant’s expert, relate the discrepancy to defendant’s credibility
§ 75:23 —Confirm disparity between defendant’s “drink count” and expert’s calculations
§ 75:24 —The disparity: It could be because drinkers forget how much alcohol was really consumed
§ 75:25 —Defendant may be reluctant to tell us how much he drank if a lot was consumed
§ 75:26 Re-examine defendant’s “history”: Look for missing “drinking time”

CHAPTER 76. THE ADMISSIBILITY OF EXPERT TESTIMONY: THE IMPACT OF DAUBERT, JOINER, & KUMHO

§ 76:1 Introduction
§ 76:2 The multiplication of experts and new areas of expertise: Why Frye is inadequate for the Long-run resolution of admissibility questions
§ 76:3 The rigidity of Frye must yield to the more accommodating rule of Daubert over time
§ 76:4 The Daubert decision: Court unanimous that Frye has been superseded by federal rules of evidence
§ 76:5 The Daubert decision: Court splintered (7-2) as to trial judge’s new role and meaning of “scientific validity”
§ 76:6 The Daubert majority view (Blackmun and Six)
§ 76:7 Additional “general observations” (the majority)
§ 76:8 The Daubert dissent: (Rehnquist and Stevens)
§ 76:9 “General acceptance” by the “scientific community”
§ 76:10 At state level, is Frye already morphing into Daubert?
§ 76:11 The flexible “Two Prong” test of Daubert: Proof of Relevancy and Reliability by whatever evidence satisfies (or fails to satisfy) the trial court
§ 76:12 Daubert’s four factors: Determining whether “scientific methodology” was employed? (The first, but nonexclusive, line of inquiry.)
§ 76:13 The limited application of Daubert’s “Four Factors”
§ 76:14 Admissibility under Daubert other than by the four factors
§ 76:15 General Electric Co. v. Joiner
§ 76:16 Kumho Tire v. Carmichael
§ 76:17 Daubert, its progeny, and forensic science in general
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§ 76:18 Conclusion: *Frye* states beware—“general acceptance” is an inadequate standard which will move toward *Daubert* or die

CHAPTER 77. THE EFFECTIVE QUALIFICATION OF THE EXPERT WITNESS: SPECIFIC QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS (DOMINICK LABIANCA EXAMPLE)

§ 77:1 Introduction
§ 77:2 *Curriculum vitae* of Dominick Labianca (May, 1996)
§ 77:3 Publications of Dominick Labianca (May, 1996)
§ 77:4 Personal information
§ 77:5 Education
§ 77:6 High school—“First” in class
§ 77:7 Undergraduate degree with highest distinction
§ 77:8 College major and related courses
§ 77:9 Athletics or other extra-curricular activities
§ 77:10 Graduate school: Study for doctorate
§ 77:11 Role of faculty mentors (first mentor—Overberger)
§ 77:12 Qualified for, received grants, funding, fellowships
§ 77:13 Postdoctoral grants and fellowships
§ 77:14 Doctoral work at Brooklyn Polytech and Michigan
§ 77:15 Professional title of “doctor”
§ 77:16 To Caltech as a NSF Postdoc
§ 77:17 Research at Caltech: Photochemistry under Hammond (a 2d mentor)
§ 77:18 Private industry for two years (Union Carbide)
§ 77:19 Returns to Academia: Brooklyn College of CUNY
§ 77:20 Interdisciplinary teaching of science: A major interest
§ 77:21 Academic promotion: Intense, competitive performance evaluations
§ 77:22 Academic promotions of this witness
§ 77:23 Award of tenure
§ 77:24 Promotion to full professor: Special requirements
§ 77:25 Teaching, research and writing interests
§ 77:26 Origin of professional interest of this witness in alcohol test evidence
§ 77:27 Election to memberships
§ 77:28 Witness featured in newspaper and magazine articles
§ 77:29 Professional presentations and symposiums—On chemical education
§ 77:30 —On drugs and chemical criminals
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§ 77:31 —Before legal and bar groups
§ 77:32 Define “peer-reviewed professional journals”
§ 77:33 This witness is a reviewer for such journals
§ 77:34 On editorial board of DWI journal: Law and science
§ 77:35 The “Gustav Ohaus” awards (four time winner)
§ 77:36 A time check on qualification questions of witness
§ 77:37 Effective use of the non-alcohol publications of your witness
§ 77:38 Give a general overview first
§ 77:39 The doctoral dissertation and a related paper (#1, 7)
§ 77:40 Does early work relate generally to alcohol testing
§ 77:41 Paper with second mentor (Hammond)
§ 77:42 Research chemist in private industry
§ 77:43 Academic publications: The broad range
§ 77:44 Articles relating chemistry to literature and history
§ 77:45 Articles for fellow scientists and medical doctors
§ 77:46 Biological and physiological evaluations by chemist
§ 77:47 Credentials properly expand scope of testimony
§ 77:48 The alcohol publications: Cover every one
§ 77:49 The request that witness be qualified

CHAPTER 78. AN IMPORTANT FIRST STEP
AFTER QUALIFICATION OF THE EXPERT:
“DEFINE YOUR TERMS”
§ 78:1 Introduction: A “definition phase” needed
§ 78:2 When basic terms have not already been defined, the
resistance to opinions is high
§ 78:3 Undefined terms lead can lead to loss of control
§ 78:4 When “definitions” and “opinions” are mixed, your
presentation plan may be totally disrupted
§ 78:5 When “definitions” and “opinions” are mixed, the credibility
of your expert may suffer
§ 78:6 Long answers with “new” material can imply evasion
§ 78:7 Counsel may entrap own expert by poor questions
§ 78:8 When should the “general” science be put in?
§ 78:9 Cover basic definitions and concepts in small doses
§ 78:10 Familiarity breeds acceptance: Facts are lovelier the second
time around
§ 78:11 Use checklist to prompt witness as to overlooked issues
§ 78:12 “New” information: Jurors want to be “led” not “pushed”
§ 78:13 Expert’s goal: “Share” knowledge with jury and court
§ 78:14 Definitions help jury (court) to see the larger picture
§ 78:15 While some experts “may” turn off juries, a poor presentation
is guaranteed to do that
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§ 78:16 Setting the stage before your expert takes the stand
§ 78:17 The three-step approach gives jury a chance to use and benefit from the “education” provided by your witness
§ 78:18 Juror’s recognition of terms defined: A definite plus
§ 78:19 Attorney’s preparation with expert; most fail to review basic terms and definitions adequately with expert
§ 78:20 Pressed for time, attorneys shortcut preparation of expert, and suffer accordingly
§ 78:21 The preparation before “eve of testimony” critical
§ 78:22 Time is at premium on eve of trial
§ 78:23 The three-step presentation (qualify, define terms, specifics): Cumulative benefits to this approach
§ 78:24 Conclusion: Use the full potential of expert

CHAPTER 79. CROSS-EXAMINATION OF DEFENDANT’S EXPERT: FURTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR PROSECUTORS
§ 79:1 Introduction: A primary goal for prosecutors—Identify the science you need to understand in alcohol cases
§ 79:2 A check-list of questions for prosecutors: How literate are you on alcohol test issues?
§ 79:3 The physiology of alcohol consumption
§ 79:4 The single test Result—Significance
§ 79:5 Breath test mechanics and operation
§ 79:6 Police breath test procedures
§ 79:7 Alcohol calculations in general
§ 79:8 Specific alcohol calculations—Your case
§ 79:9 Specific preparation for opposing expert
§ 79:10 A trap for prosecutors: Attacking the messenger can limit your options (your use of defense expert)
§ 79:11 Personal attacks on experts can backfire when closing arguments emphasize omissions
§ 79:12 The expert witness is not “the enemy”: Avoid the “dog in the manger” approach
§ 79:13 Learn to use the knowledge of defendant’s expert: Don’t jettison an important asset by personal attacks
§ 79:14 For effective cross: Study and know the real qualifications of the expert witnesses on both sides
§ 79:15 Find likely or probable “areas of agreement” between the positions you are urging and knowledge of expert
§ 79:16 Use those “areas of agreement” and “areas of possible agreement” to frame questions for opposing expert
§ 79:17 When you go after “areas of agreement,” do not hand the reins to the opposing expert
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§ 79:18 To control “areas of agreement” with opposing expert use clear, simple, direct, leading questions
§ 79:19 Facts change from case to case, but the technique of effective cross remains the same
§ 79:20 When possible, to avoid quibbles, use “words” of expert from the direct exam
§ 79:21 Don’t gloat or react: Keep exam low key even if you are scoring points for your side
§ 79:22 Don’t try to force opinions, or a change of opinion
§ 79:23 “White hats and black hats”: It’s us against them
§ 79:24 Expert witnesses as a group: Admirable professionals
§ 79:25 Figure

CHAPTER 80. CROSS-EXAMINATION OF THE FORENSIC BLOOD ALCOHOL EXPERT
§ 80:1 Introduction: The hypothetical case
§ 80:2 Cross of the expert witness: First considerations
§ 80:3 Preparation for a frontal attack in cross-examination
§ 80:4 First preparation step: Review materials
§ 80:5 prepare alternative paths for cross which do not depend on the expert’s precise words
§ 80:6 “Not with my expert, you won’t!”
§ 80:7 Using “areas of likely agreement” to frame questions
§ 80:8 After you cover your general concepts, go back, tie them to specific problems in your case
§ 80:9 Beginning cross: The “fire in the hole” approach
§ 80:10 Starting points on cross with the velvet glove
§ 80:11 The documents produced: For cross-examination, there’s gold in them thar hills!
§ 80:12 Paul Johnson hypothetical case: Omitted documents
§ 80:13 Some prime questions suggested by the documents set out in §§ 80:28–80:42
§ 80:14 Review: The factual scenario in § 80:28
§ 80:15 Review: Police officers arrest form in § 80:29
§ 80:16 Review: Uniform traffic accident report in § 80:30
§ 80:17 Review: The hospital lab report in § 80:31
§ 80:18 Review: Evidence submission form in § 80:32
§ 80:19 Review: Receipt, samples signed by lee (7/28/97)
§ 80:20 Review: “Picture” of package with seal
§ 80:21 Review: Forensic toxicological analysis report
§ 80:22 Review: Toxicology casework worksheet, summary in § 80:36
§ 80:23 Review: Ethanol and volatiles analysis worksheet

xc
CHAPTER 80A. IMPROPER ATTACKS ON THE COMPETENCY AND INTEGRITY OF DEFENSE EXPERTS: TIME TO DRAW THE LINE

§ 80A:1 Overview: the goals of this chapter

§ 80A:2 Never allow the fees of your expert to be mentioned for the first time on cross-examination: deal with this issue properly in early stages and on direct

§ 80A:3 Examples of improper attacks on the integrity of the witness on cross: pretended “shock and awe” at the fees charged by the witness

§ 80A:4 Improper attacks on the competency of defense experts to testify on alcohol-test issues

§ 80A:5 First prong of the attack: the witness has no “hands on” experience

§ 80A:6 “Hands on” experience can be a good starting point toward genuine expertise

§ 80A:7 “Hands-on” employment is not essential to genuine expertise on the true significance of alcohol-test results
§ 80A:8 Unfamiliarity with texts on the subject and with the peer-reviewed literature

§ 80A:9 Second prong of the attack: what the witness “is not.”

§ 80A:10 Prosecutor's list of what the defense witness “is not.”

§ 80A:11 Defense experts are drawn from the available pool of witnesses: they come, of necessity, from many non-exclusive disciplines and backgrounds

§ 80A:12 Justified attacks on the character, honesty and integrity of some witnesses: a different issue

§ 80A:13 Presentation of forensic evidence through expert testimony is critical to many prosecutions

§ 80A:14 Prosecutors do not usually have to seek and find their expert witnesses

§ 80A:15 Properly preparing your expert to testify: the first and essential step toward protecting the defense expert from improper attacks

§ 80A:16 Forensic evidence in this era of CSI television programs

§ 80A:17 Defendants have a constitutional right to present expert witnesses

§ 80A:18 The step-by-step approach to defending expert witnesses from improper and factually insupportable attacks at each stage of the proceedings: a check-list

§ 80A:19 Send letter to the prosecutor on the fees of the experts

§ 80A:20 If the prosecutor refuses to provide the requested information, file a motion to compel, or in the alternative, to limit the questions on fees

§ 80A:21 Expert witnesses and their fees: a two-part list for pre-trial and trial use

§ 80A:22 Prepare an instruction to the Jury on the fees of your expert with the list attached and an affidavit

§ 80A:23 Prepare the expert witness for direct testimony on the fees charged

§ 80A:24 Send the prosecutor a notice letter on information the government witness should bring to court on income received

§ 80A:25 Prepare brief comments for your opening statement to the jury about the fact that experts brought to court by the defense are paid for their services

§ 80A:26 When you know that the prosecutor is going to ask your witness about fees prepare to similarly examine the government witness

§ 80A:27 When you know or suspect that the prosecutor is going to use the attack of what your witness “is not,” preempt that issue with the opposing witness

§ 80A:28 Mention of the expert’s fees in your closing argument
§ 80A:29 Using the public records and freedom of information statutes to get information on the salaries of government employees (the laboratory personnel)

§ 80A:30 Relate the education and training of your expert to whatever discipline his expertise is drawn from: professor of chemistry as example

§ 80A:31 Conclusion: do not let attacks on the integrity and competence of your witnesses go unanswered

CHAPTER 80B. NYSTAGMUS TESTING FOR ALCOHOL AND DRUGS

§ 80B:1 Introduction: the scope of this chapter

§ 80B:2 The definition of nystagmus

§ 80B:3 The visual system and nystagmus, generally

§ 80B:4 Types and forms of nystagmus

§ 80B:5 Medical conditions associated with nystagmus

§ 80B:6 Causative agents associated with nystagmus

§ 80B:7 Nystagmus testing (generally)

§ 80B:8 Nystagmus equipment

§ 80B:9 The history of the development of the horizontal gaze nystagmus test

§ 80B:10 The NHTSA horizontal gaze nystagmus test procedure

§ 80B:11 The HGN 82-second timing rule

§ 80B:12 The correlation of HGN scoring and clues to blood alcohol concentration

§ 80B:13 The correlation of the HGN test to actual impairment

§ 80B:14 Uneven scoring of the HGN test—The Circle of Willis

§ 80B:15 Tharp’s equation—Calculating blood alcohol levels based upon angle of onset

§ 80B:16 Vertical gaze nystagmus

§ 80B:17 The American Optometric Association’s 1993 resolution regarding the HGN test

§ 80B:18 Scientific and medical studies and publications regarding horizontal gaze nystagmus

§ 80B:19 Police nystagmus tests (HGN and VGN) and monocular vision

§ 80B:20 Legal issues involving the HGN test—Generally

§ 80B:21 —Whether the HGN test is a scientific test

§ 80B:22 —Whether the HGN test is a valid and reliable indicator of intoxication

§ 80B:23 —What (if any) specific procedures must be employed prior to its admissibility?

§ 80B:24 —Qualifications for administering nystagmus testing
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CHAPTER 80C. A MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL LOOKS AT POLICE HGN TESTING FOR ALCOHOL: HOW MUCH SCIENCE MAKES IT TO THE ROADSIDE?

§ 80C:1 Introduction
§ 80C:2 Adherence to essential standards and uniformity of practice: the sine qua non of any police HGN testing procedures
§ 80C:3 Juries and the medical-technical terminology of police HGN testing
§ 80C:4 Definitions needed for the subject matter of this chapter
§ 80C:5 Police roadside HGN testing and medical uses of HGN testing: significant and important differences must be recognized
§ 80C:6 Visual fixation: mechanism of the action
§ 80C:7 Background: police HGN testing and SFSTs
§ 80C:8 Minimally qualifying a subject for administration of police HGN testing
§ 80C:9 Police HGN tests: proper administration is essential but variations and deviations from course instructions are commonplace
§ 80C:10 The positioning of the subject for police HGN testing
§ 80C:11 HGN testing in vehicles: positional interference with results
§ 80C:12 HGN testing and the essential distance, position and movement requirements of the target/stimulus
§ 80C:13 HGN testing: the eye muscles and eye movement
§ 80C:14 Passes with the target/stimulus: the number and timing
§ 80C:15 Relationship of some medical conditions to the proper administration of HGN testing
§ 80C:16 HGN scoring can be affected by how the officer performs the test
§ 80C:17 No scientific validation that the clues used for police HGN testing genuinely distinguish alcohol intoxication from other CNS malfunctions
§ 80C:18 Nystagmus onset below a forty-five (45°) degree angle and higher BAC assumptions
PART IX. CHECKLISTS

CHAPTER 81. CHECKLISTS: FOR EVALUATING BAC EVIDENCE IN WRITTEN REPORTS

§ 81:1 Introduction
§ 81:2 The EMT report
§ 81:3 The hospital report
§ 81:4 The autopsy report
§ 81:5 Clinical and forensic laboratory reports

CHAPTER 82. CHECKLISTS: FOR INFORMAL DISCOVERY OF BAC EVIDENCE (BY TELEPHONE, LETTER, VISIT TO FACILITY, ETC.)

§ 82:1 Questions to ask EMT's
§ 82:2 Questions to ask hospital ER & other personnel
§ 82:3 Questions to ask laboratory technicians

CHAPTER 83. LIST OF FIGURES

§ 83:1 List of Figures
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APPENDIX A. Percentages of Laboratories Reporting Results of “Unacceptable Proficiency”

APPENDIX B. Percentage of Responding Laboratories Having “X”%
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APPENDIX C. Summary of “Unacceptable Proficiency” Criteria
APPENDIX D. Blood Analysis
APPENDIX E. Breath Test Evidence: A Brief Overview of Certain Basic Problems
APPENDIX F. Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 90, Section 24 et seq. (The new “Safe Roads Act”) [See “per se” license suspension provisions, Section 24N]
APPENDIX G. 501 CMR 2.00 (Code of Massachusetts Regulations) [New Breath Test Regulations of Office of Alcohol Testing]
APPENDIX H. Report Number One (Swanson)
APPENDIX I. Report Number Two (FBI)
APPENDIX J. Report Number Three (Bohn)
APPENDIX K. Commonwealth v James Crowell Case
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APPENDIX O. State v Downie Case
APPENDIX P. Amid concern, state mortuary slated for move
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APPENDIX R. Publications by Contributors to Chapter 36 (alphabetical order)
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Definitions, 55:1
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Evasive expert witnesses, 74:22
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See also Deep Lung Samples
Definitions, 55:1

ALVEOLI
Definitions, 55:1
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Definitions, 55:1
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Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:14
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Expert witnesses, 73:13

ANTICOAGULANTS
Definitions, 55:1
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Forensic lab work product quality, 68:29
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Alco-Sensor, 54:28, 54:48
### ARBITRARINESS
- Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)
- Retrograde extrapolation, arbitrarily selecting only one elimination rate or arbitrarily assuming declining BAC, **22:11, 22:12, 22:14**

### AREAS OF AGREEMENT
- Cross-examination, **79:15 to 79:18**

### ARGUMENTS OF COUNSEL
- Breath Alcohol Tests (this index)

### ARRAIGNMENT
- Opening discussions, **50:14**
- Prima facie showing, challenge of, **51:9**

### ARREST
- Cross-examination of forensic blood alcohol expert, police officers arrest form, **80:15, 80:29**
- Motion to dismiss, arresting officer’s testimony, **53:35 to 53:39**
- Time interval from arrest to breath alcohol test, **50:18**

### ARROGANT EXPERT WITNESSES
- Qualifications, **72:8, 72:9**

### ARTIFACTS
- Definitions, **55:1**

### ASCITES
- Definitions, **55:1**

### ASSIGNMENT
- Peer review assignment for professional or academic journals, **54:32**

### ASSUMED RATIO
- Breath alcohol testing and reporting, deviations from assumed ratio and effect on guilt or innocence, **33:8**

### ASSUMPTIONS
- Evaluation of test results by law office, **13:10**
- Infrared spectrophotometry, **31:11**
- Intoxilyzer, **32:2**
- Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, assumptions and factors ignored or evaded, **23:4, 23:5**
- Post-mortem alcohol determinations, **21:2 to 21:4, 21:11, 70:15**
- Retrograde extrapolation, lacking reasonable assumptions in opinions, **22:6**
- Single BAC test in criminal and civil practice, **4:8, 21:4**

### ASTHMA
- Definitions, **55:1**

### ASYMMETRIC STRETCHING VIBRATIONS
- Infrared spectrophotometry, **31:9**

### ATAXIA
- Definitions, **55:1**

### ATOMS
- Infrared spectrophotometry, **31:4**

### ATROPHY
- Definitions, **55:1**
ATTITUDE
Expert witnesses, qualifications, 72:27

ATTORNEY DOCUMENTS
Law office management and technology, 14:29, 14:33

ATTORNEY REVIEW OF LAB REPORTS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:5 et seq.

ATTORNEYS. See lines throughout this index

ATTORNEY’S TRANSITION PLAN
Law office management and technology, 14:35

AUDIT REPORTS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:32

AUTHORITY AND AUTHORIZATION
Discovery, collection of blood, 65:2
Law office management and technology, credit card authorization, 14:39

AUTHORS
Expert witness’ knowledge of, 74:13, 74:14

AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION
Expert witnesses, 72:26

AUTOPSY
Definitions, 55:1
Depositions, medical examiner, 64:40, 64:45, 64:47
Physiology of consumption, testimony supported by prior autopsy notes and records, 2:11 to 2:13
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

AUTOPSY—Cont’d
Post-Mortem Alcohol Determinations (this index)

AVAILABILITY OF EVIDENCE
Lab records, 60:23
Library, 60:21, 60:22
Library of lab, 60:21
Original test notes and records, 60:5
Writings, expert witnesses, 74:26

AVAILABILITY OF WITNESS TO PROSECUTION
Expert witnesses, 80A:14

AVERAGE BETA
Generally, 3:6, 11:22, 11:23

AVERAGE DATA VALUES
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, unacceptable use of average data values, 23:18

AVERAGE MALE R
Widmark in practice, 3:10

AVERAGE PERSON
Limitations of calculations, 11:22

AVERAGE R
Limitations of calculations, 11:22

AVERAGE RESULTS
Cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:15, 75:16

AVERAGE TIMES TO REACH BAC PEAK
Women, 5:12

AVERAGE WOMAN
Generally, 5:16 to 5:18

AVOIDANCE TACTICS
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, avoidance of key issues by use of admissibility language, 23:4, 23:5
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AWARDS
   Expert witnesses, 72:29

AWARENESS OF TROUBLE AREAS
   Depositions, 60:9

BAC (BASIC ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS). See lines throughout this index

BACKGROUND FACTS
   Deposition of technician, supervisor or director, 61:4
   Expert witnesses, 80A:11

BACKTRACKING
   Expert witnesses, 74:19

BACTERIA
   Depositions, 61:54, 64:41

BADGE
   Biased expert witnesses, 74:5

BARIATRIC SURGERY
   Definitions, 55:1

BASAL METABOLISM
   Definitions, 55:1

BASELINE MEASURE
   Definitions, 55:1

BASIC ALCOHOL CALCULATIONS OR CONCENTRATIONS (BAC). See also lines throughout this index
   Generally, 11:1 et seq.

BASIS FOR OPINION
   Expert witnesses, 53:53, 71:44

BATCH NUMBERS
   Depositions, equipment calibration records, 61:20

BEER’S LAW
   Definitions, 55:1

BELIEFS
   Expert Witnesses (this index)

BENCH NOTES
   Forensic lab work product quality, 68:16

BENIGN NEGLECT
   Expert witnesses, 71:3

BENZALKONIUM CHLORIDE
   Collection of samples, contaminated swabs, 18:4

BETA
   Generally, 11:6, 11:7
   Alcoholics, r and beta variables, 11:23
   Allowance for beta variables, 11:11
   Average, 3:6, 11:22
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   Physiological differences, impact of, 4:6
   Women, 5:16 to 5:18, 5:25, 5:27

BEVERAGES
   Cross examination of defendant’s expert as to beverages consumed by defendant, 53:55
   Ounces, 39:6

BIAS
   Bias or Prejudice (this index)

BIASED, DIFFICULT, OR EVASIVE EXPERT WITNESSES
   Generally, 74:1 et seq.
   Admissibility of expert testimony, 71:11
   Alco-Sensor, 54:50, 54:63
   Almost positive, 74:22
   Appeal record, 74:6
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   Authors, knowledge of, 74:13, 74:14
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Retrograde extrapolation, 25:22

Sac (serum alcohol concentration), 19:1, 19:7

**BLOOD-BRAIN BARRIER**

Definitions, 55:1

**BLOOD/BREATH RATIO**

Generally, 41:7 to 41:9

Dubowski, 42:2

Simulators, 37:9, 37:11

**BLOOD DRAW KITS**

Discovery, blood draw procedures with and without, 65:4

**BLOOD ETHANOL**

Discovery (this index)

Gas Chromatographic Alcohol Test Results (this index)

**BLOOD LOSS AND FLUID REPLACEMENT**

Collection process, 21:19

Deposition of medical examiner, 64:34

© 2013 Thomson Reuters, 6/2013

Index-13
BLOOD PATHS
Women, blood paths to liver, 5:29

BLOOD SUGARS AND CONTAMINANTS
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Percent error, 42:6

BRAIN ALCOHOL
Downie Case (this index)

BREATH ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION (BRAC)
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Replicate Breath-Alcohol Testing (this index)
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Mathematical and scientific concepts, terms, and measurements, 41:2, 41:3, 41:13
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Physiological differences, impact of, 4:5
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BREATH TESTS
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BRENT-STILLER
Prediction of probable BAC’s or alcohol amounts, Widmark in practice, 3:12

BREVITY
Discovery, note-taking during laboratory visit, 65:23
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Definitions, 55:1
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Definitions, 55:1

BUDGET
Medical Examiner (this index)

BURDEN OF PROOF
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:54

BURLING APPROACH
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BUSINESS RECORDS
Law office management and technology, 14:33

CALCULATIONS. See also more specific topics in this index
Generally, 11:1 to 13:29, 39:1 to 44:28
Simulators
calculating appropriate alcohol concentration for simulator calibrators, 37:5
facile calculations, 37:4
hypothetical case, alcohol calculations, 37:18

CALENDARS
Law office management and technology, 14:30

CALIBRATION OF MACHINE
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Evidenzers and nanopuls, inc., 34:56
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:23
Inspection, 35:2
CALIBRATION OF MACHINE
— Cont’d
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Simulators
flaw of simulator calibrations, 37:5
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CALIBRATION RECORDS
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CARBON-HYDROGEN (C-H)
BOND
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:8
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Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:30
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Conversion ratio, serum/plasma to whole blood, 19:10, 19:15
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See also Gas Chromatographic Alcohol Test Results (this index)
Appearance, order of appearance, 20:13
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Expert witnesses, 70:19, 70:26
Ez-ALC™ Computer Program, 12:5
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Individual Differences and Single Test Results (this index)
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Discovery, collection of blood, 65:3

CLEAR QUESTIONS
Cross-examination, 79:18
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Law office management and technology, 14:11

CLIENT INTAKE QUESTIONNAIRES
Law office management and technology, 14:18, 14:42
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Law office management and technology, 14:34

CLINICAL LABORATORIES
Blood alcohol tests, 18:5, 18:6, 18:14, 19:1

CLINICAL LABORATORY SCIENCE
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Definitions, 55:1

CLOSING ARGUMENTS
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:6
Expert witnesses, 80A:28
Motion to dismiss, 53:87, 53:88

COBRA SYSTEMS
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:29

COGNITION
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Definitions, 55:1
COLLATERAL MEDICAL PROBLEMS
Motion to dismiss, 53:12
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Discovery, 65:25
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COMMONWEALTH V JAMES CROWELL
Generally, App. K
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COMPARISON OF PEAK HEIGHTS
Chromatograms (this index)

COMPENSATION
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COMPLIANCE
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Cross-examination of forensic blood alcohol expert, chromatograms: computer data (ethanol runs), 80:24, 80:38
Depositions, 63:23, 63:62, 63:82
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Definitions, 55:1
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Replicate Breath-Alcohol Testing (this index)
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Expert witnesses, 80A:17
Future of DUI practice, 6:9

CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION
Chromatograms (this index)

CONTAINER OF SAMPLES
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)

CONTAMINATION
Chest puncture, contamination by, 64:29
Discovery, 65:6
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Heart blood alcohol level, contamination of, 61:53
Intoxilyzer 8000 (this index)
Potential of contamination, 41:6
Scene of collected sample, contamination at, 64:28
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CONTAMINATION CONTROL SURVEYS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:25
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whole blood, 19:11, 19:15
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Medical Examiner (this index)
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COST AND EXPENSES
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Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:13

COUNTERBALANCING EXPERT TESTIMONY
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Comments of court
final decision on pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:72
license restoration decision in pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:67 to 50:70
witness’ motivation, 54:46
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Expert witnesses, qualification, 72:4, 72:11
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Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:23
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Law office management and technology, 14:7
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Motion to dismiss, 53:69
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Alco-Sensor, 54:62
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Law office management and technology, 14:39

CRIME AND TOXICOLOGY LABORATORY REPORT INTERPRETATION
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Comparison of specimen results, 65A:20
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Notation methods, 65A:18
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Results and conclusions of report, 65A:14
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Uncertainty of results, 65A:19
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Retrograde extrapolation, typical scenario, 22:7
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Alco-Sensor, 54:30
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:7
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Forensic lab work product quality, 68:18
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Expert witnesses, 80A:13
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Admirable professionals, viewing experts as, 79:24
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Alco-Sensor, 54:47, 54:63
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CRIMINAL CASES
Generally, 1:1 et seq.
Breath Alcohol Tests (this index)
Expert witnesses, 74:7, 75:7
Individual Differences and Single Test Results (this index)
CROSS-EXAMINATION—Cont’d
Conversion of serum/plasma value to whole blood value, lack of foundation, 19:6
Direct questions, 79:18
Dog in the manger approach, avoiding, 79:12
Expert witnesses, generally, §§ 79:1 et seq.; and see lines throughout this index topic
Figure, 79:25
Forcing opinion, refraining from, 79:22
Forensic analyst, pre-trial interviews, preparation for cross-examination, 66:4
Forensic Blood Alcohol Expert, Cross-Examination of (this index)
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Framing questions for opposing expert, using areas of agreement, 79:16
Gloating, refraining from, 79:21
Integrity of expert, 71:53
Knowledge of defendant’s expert, learning to use, 79:13
Leading questions, 79:18
Low key approach, 79:21
Mathematical and scientific concepts, terms, and measurements, 41:19
Motion to Dismiss (this index)
Nice guy cross-examiner, 71:39
Omissions, personal attacks backfire when closing arguments emphasize, 79:11
Own witness, cross-examination of, 72:10
Personal attacks on experts, generally, 79:10, 79:11, 79:13
Physiology of alcohol consumption, 79:3
Police breath test procedures, 79:6

CROSS-EXAMINATION—Cont’d
Preparation, pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:4
Pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, preparation for cross-examination, 66:4
Prosecutors’ goals, generally, 79:1 et seq.
Qualifications of expert witnesses, 72:10, 72:30, 79:14
Quibbles, avoiding, 79:20
Reacting, refraining from, 79:21
Research references, 79:26
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Simple questions, 79:18
Single test result, significance, 79:4
Specific alcohol calculations, 79:8
Specific preparation for opposing expert, 79:9
Technique, consistency from case to case, 79:19
White hats and black hats, 79:23
Words of expert, using, 79:20
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Definitions, 55:1

CROWELL CASE
Questionable Statutory Language (this index)

CUBIC MEASURES
Generally, 40:10

CUSTODY OF SAMPLES
Copper Case, 70:24
Discovery, breaks in chain of custody, 65:6
Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:43
Technician, deposition of, 63:11, 63:42

CUTANEOUS
Definitions, 55:1
INToxicAtion Test Evidence

CYTOCHROME P450
Definitions, 55:1

CYTOPLASM
Definitions, 55:1

DATA CURVE READING
Generally, 39:11

DATAMASTER QAP CERTIFICATION
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:23

DATAMASTERS AND NATIONAL PATENT ANALYTICAL SYSTEMS
Generally, 34:35

DATE
Time (this index)

DAUBERT V MERRELL DOW PHARMACEUTICALS
Expert witnesses, generally. EXPERT WITNESSES (this index)

DEATH
Blood Alcohol Tests (this index)
Expert Witnesses (this index)
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Medical Examiner (this index)
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Post-Mortem Alcohol Determinations (this index)

DECISION OF COURT
Alco-Sensor, 54:55
Final Decision (this index)
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:66, 50:67, 50:72
Syllabus by reporter of decisions, App. Q

DECOMPOSED BODY BAC
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

DEDUCTIONS
Dubowski’s 0.025 deduction requirements, 28:4

DEEP-LUNG SAMPLES
Intoxilyzer, 32:13
Reexamination of traditional assumptions regarding breath alcohol testing, 29:1 et seq.

DEEP POCKET CIVIL DEFENDANTS
Copper Case, 70:19, 70:26

DEFECTS
Certificate, 50:60

DEFENDANTS
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:32

DEFENSE ROLE
Future of DUI practice, 6:5

DEFICIENCIES
Making small procedural deficits count, pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:6
Post-mortem alcohol determinations, 21:5

DEFINITIONS
Mathematical and scientific concepts, terms, and measurements, 40:7
Physiology, pharmacology, and toxicology of alcohol, 55:1 to 55:6
Science and HGN testing, 80C:4

DELAY
Consumption, 2:5, 2:12
Deposition of lab technician, 63:33, 63:77, 63:90
INDEX

DELAY—Cont’d
Retrograde extrapolation, delayed gastric emptying, 22:17
Women, delay or prevention of gastric ADH production and gastric metabolism, 5:33

DELIBERATION OF COURT
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:64

DELIRIUM
Definitions, 55:1

DELIVERY OF SAMPLES
Deposition of medical examiner, 64:24
Discovery, 65:12

DEMAND FOR PRODUCTION
Breath alcohol test machine, 53:42
Missing documents, 61:60

DEMENTIA
Definitions, 55:1

DENSITY
Facile approach, volume-to-weight conversions, 43:7

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (DOT)
Alco-Sensor, 54:28, 54:51

DEPOSITIONS
Generally, 60:1 to 64:59
Alco-Sensor, 54:2
Calibration Records (this index)
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Medical Examiner (this index)

DEPRESSANTS
Definitions, 55:1

DETERIORATION OF BLOOD SAMPLE
Deposition of lab technician, 63:81

DETERMINING PRE-TEST BIAS
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:22

DEVICES AND EQUIPMENT
Alco-Sensor (this index)
Breath Alcohol Tests (this index)
Calibration Records (this index)
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Infrared Spectrophotometry (this index)
Nystagmus testing for alcohol and drugs, 80B:8
Performance of Equipment (this index)
Repair and Maintenance (this index)

DIABETES
Definitions, 55:1

DIAGNOSIS
Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:17
Notes of doctor, 64:10

DIETHYL ETHER
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:5

DIFFERENCES
Individual Differences and single Test Results (this index)

DIFFERENTIAL VOLTAGE MEASUREMENT (DVM)
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:19

DIFFICULT EXPERTS
Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)

DIGESTIVE SYSTEM
Definitions, 55:1

DIMETHYLSULFOXIDE
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:4
DIRECT QUESTIONS
Cross-examination, 79:18
Expert witnesses, fees, 80A:2, 80A:23

DISCIPLINE
Expert witnesses, 80A:11

DISCLOSURE
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:10

DISCOVERY—Cont’d
Checklist of matters for follow-up discovery, 65:11
Clean containers, collection of blood, 65:3
Collateral and hidden opinions, 65:25
Collection of blood
  blood ethanol results, 65:1
certification, licensing, and authorization, 65:2
clean containers, appropriate preservatives and anticoagulants, 65:3
ethanol results, 65:1
kits, blood draw procedures with and without, 65:4
Condition of containers and samples upon arrival, importance of notating, 65:10
Conducting personal view of equipment and laboratory equipment, 65:20 et seq.
Confusion of samples, use of laboratory numbers to avoid, 65:9
Contamination of samples, 65:6
Conversion table, use of in reporting blood ethanol results, 65:15
Custody of samples, breaks in chain of custody, 65:6
Delivery of samples, 65:12
Documentation of laboratory visit, 65:22
Errors. See entries throughout this topic
Examination of laboratory equipment, 65:20 et seq.
Examination of original documents, 65:20
Expert or opinion evidence
  admissibility of unmentioned opinion evidence, 65:26
alcohol test cases, impairment opinions, 65:28
pre-trial written opinions, 65:25, 65:27

Blood alcohol tests, generally, 65:1 et seq.
Accident cases, ethanol values, 65:18
Admissibility of unmentioned opinion evidence, 65:26
Anticoagulants, collection of blood, 65:3
Authorization, collection of blood, 65:2
Bias, 65:19
Blood draw kits, procedures with and without, 65:4
Blood ethanol
  see also other entries throughout this topic
  collection of results, 65:1
  conversion table, use of in reporting blood ethanol results, 65:15
  first considerations in testing of ethanol samples, 65:13
  mailing and/or transportation of samples, 65:5
  reporting blood ethanol results, 65:15, 65:16
Brevity of notes, laboratory visit, 65:23
Certification, collection of blood, 65:2
Chain of custody, breaks in, 65:6

Blood draw kits, procedures with and without, 65:4
Blood draw kits, procedures with and without, 65:4
Blood ethanol
  see also other entries throughout this topic
  collection of results, 65:1
  conversion table, use of in reporting blood ethanol results, 65:15
  first considerations in testing of ethanol samples, 65:13
  mailing and/or transportation of samples, 65:5
  reporting blood ethanol results, 65:15, 65:16
Brevity of notes, laboratory visit, 65:23
Certification, collection of blood, 65:2
Chain of custody, breaks in, 65:6
DISCOVERY—Cont’d

Expert or opinion evidence—Cont’d
retrograde extrapolation opinions,
65:27
written opinions, 65:25, 65:27, 65:28
Fallout of case, 65:7
Finding documentation, effectively reviewing documents, 65:14
First examination of materials provided, 65:17
Follow-up discovery, 65:11
Forensic analyst, pre-trial interviews, 66:1 et seq.

Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Hidden opinions, watching for, 65:25
Identifying kind of ethanol values reported, serum/plasma v/ whole blood, 65:16
Impairment opinions, alcohol test cases, 65:28
Interviews
forensic analyst, of, 66:1 et seq.
laboratory visits, at, 65:23, 65:24
Labeling of samples, 65:7, 65:8
Laboratory equipment, examination and inspection, 65:20 et seq.
Laboratory numbers to avoid confusion of samples, 65:9
Laboratory visits, 65:20 et seq.
Law office management and technology, advising the client, 14:13
Licensing, collection of blood, 65:2
Mailing and/or transportation of blood ethanol samples, 65:5, 65:12
Mistake or error. See entries throughout this topic
Notations on condition of containers and samples upon arrival, importance, 65:10
Omissions. See entries throughout this topic

DISCOVERY—Cont’d

Original documents, examination of, 65:20
Original label, presence of blood on, 65:8
Permanent retention of original label, presence of blood on label, 65:8
Preservatives, collection of blood, 65:3
Pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:1 et seq.
Pre-trial written opinions by experts, 65:25, 65:27, 65:28
Refusal of request to view and inspect laboratory and investigate equipment and procedures, 65:21
Reporting blood ethanol results, use of conversion table, 65:15, 65:16
Request to view and inspect laboratory and investigate equipment and procedures, 65:20 et seq.
Retention of original label, presence of blood on label, 65:8
Retrograde extrapolation opinions, 65:27
Reviewing documents, 65:14
Serum/plasma vs. whole blood ethanol values, 65:16
Tape-recording at laboratory interviews, 65:24
Testing of ethanol samples, first considerations, 65:13
Transportation of blood ethanol samples, 65:5, 65:12
View of equipment and laboratory procedures, 65:20 et seq.
Visiting laboratory, 65:20 et seq.
Whole blood, ethanol values, 65:16
Written opinions by experts, 65:25, 65:27, 65:28

DISCRETION OF COURT

Admissibility of expert testimony, 71:8
DISMISSAL
Motion to Dismiss (this index)

DISORGANIZATION
Expert witnesses, qualifications, 72:8, 72:9

DISTINCTIONS OF EXPERT
Qualifications, 72:29

DISTRIBUTION
Definitions, 55:1

DIURETIC
Definitions, 55:1

DMSO
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:4

DNA
Definitions, 55:1
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:29

DOCTOR
Physician (this index)

DOCUMENTING THE DRINKING INCIDENT
Case evaluation, 26:7

DOCUMENTS
As to records, generally. Records and Recording (this index)
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Law office management and technology, attorney documents, 14:29, 14:33
Motion to dismiss, 53:27, 53:29, 53:33

DOG IN THE MANGER APPROACH
Cross-examination, 79:12

DOMINO EFFECT
Expert witnesses, 71:38

DOPAMINE
Definitions, 55:1

DOT (DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION)
Alco-Sensor, 54:28, 54:51

DOWNIE CASE
Generally, 44:1 et seq.; App. O
Absorption, 44:6, 44:24 to 44:26
Accuracy of breath alcohol measurements, 44:21
Arterial and venous systems, generally, 44:1 et seq.
Blood, see lines throughout this index topic
Brain alcohol, generally, 44:1 et seq.
Breath alcohol tests accuracy, 44:21
Downie sidestep, absorption, 44:26
relevance of results, 44:17
series of calculations, 44:22, 44:23
validity, 44:18, 44:20
Calculations for breath test results, 44:22, 44:23
Capillary blood, 44:24
Consumed alcohol in blood, 44:10
Downie sidestep, 44:26, 44:27
Errors, physiological errors, 44:9 to 44:11
Evaluation of Downie, 44:14
Examination of accuracy of breath alcohol measurements, 44:21
Impairment standards, 44:19
Intestines, consumed alcohol in blood derived from, 44:10
Intoxication standards, 44:19
Lag, 44:6
Language of decision, 44:3 to 44:5, 44:9 to 44:11
Manufacturers of breath test, 44:20
Measurements, 44:21, 44:24
Misstatements and misconceptions, 44:2
Physiological errors, 44:9 to 44:11
Index

DOWNIE CASE—Cont’d
Postabsorption phases and arterial and venous alcohol, 44:6
Relevance of breath alcohol test results, 44:17
Reliability of breath test, 44:3
Sidetrip, 44:12, 44:13
Sound measurement in capillary blood, 44:24
Stomach, consumed alcohol in blood derived from, 44:10
Validity of breath test, 44:18, 44:20
Venous and arterial systems, generally, 44:1 et seq.

DRAEGER ALCOTEST 7110 MK III
Generally, 34:36 et seq.

DRAM-SHOP CASES
Retrograde extrapolation, driver’s condition when alcohol served, 22:4

DRINKING HISTORY
Generally, 11:2, 13:8
Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:27
Technician, deposition of, 61:51

DRINKS
Comparison of count of expert with defendant’s testimony, 75:21, 75:22
Converting fluid ounces to drinks, 13:24
Disparity in count, 75:23, 75:24
Estimation of Alcohol Amounts or Drinks Consumed (this index)
Motion to dismiss, 53:58
Number consumed, generally, 75:14
Peak test value for drink calculations, 75:18
Prediction of probable BACs based on reported drink consumption with use of equation, 11:9 to 11:12

DRIVER
Generally, 1:6, 1:7
Medical examiner, opinion regarding sobriety of driver, 64:26

Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations
(this index)
Pre-accident release of driver. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Retrograde Extrapolation (this index)

DRIVING BACs
Blood alcohol tests, relation back of BAC values to Driving BAC, 19:13
Breath alcohol tests, 53:62

DRIVING TIME
Certificate relating test to driving time, 50:58
Comment relating to the test of driving time, 50:68

DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED
See entries throughout this index

DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED MANUALS
Expert witnesses, 75:5

DROWNED BODY BAC
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

DRUG
Definitions, 55:1

DRUG RECOGNITION EVALUATION TEST
Nystagmus testing for alcohol and drugs, 80B:24

DRUG RECOGNITION EXPERT (DRE)
Future of DUI practice, 6:19
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRUG SCREEN</td>
<td>Deposition of technicians, 61:32 Interpretation of crime and toxicology reports, 65A:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRUNK</td>
<td>Forensic lab technician’s opinion, 70:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUBOWSKI’S ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Percent Error (this index)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE PROCESS</td>
<td>Impairment proof, 53:91 Questionable statutory language, pretrial appellate review of, 51:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUID</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUODENUM</td>
<td>Collection process, duodenum contents, 21:16 Definitions, 55:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUTCH CASE</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 70:12 to 70:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUTY OF DISCLOSURE</td>
<td>Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI. See entries throughout this index</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI MANUAL</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 75:5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYSTONIA</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EATING HISTORY</td>
<td>Forensic laboratory technician, deposition of, 61:51 Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIRS AND INTOXIMETERS, INC.</td>
<td>Generally, 34:46 to 34:52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC IMPACT OF CHANGES</td>
<td>Future of DUI practice, 6:8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSTASY</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEMA</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>Deposition of forensic laboratory technician, 61:8 Qualifications of expert witnesses, 72:28, 80A:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTROMAGNETIC SPECTRUM</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIMINATION</td>
<td>Allowance for elimination over time, 11:6 Definitions, 55:2 Increasing test value to adjust for, 13:21 Women, elimination rates of Frezza-Lieber, 5:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIMINATION RATE</td>
<td>Blood alcohol tests, 25:11, 25:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELISA</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBALMING</td>
<td>Heart blood sample, 64:53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIT</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

EMPLOYEE HANDBOOKS
Law office management and technology, 14:9, 14:36

EMPLOYMENT
Alco-Sensor, 54:22, 54:39
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Law Office Management and Technology (this index)

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY
Alco-Sensor, 54:39

EMPTY STOMACH ABSORPTION
Evaluation of test results by law office, 13:16
Physiology of consumption, 2:4
Relation back of BAC values, 19:13
Retrograde extrapolation, 22:15

ENCOURAGEMENT
Expert witnesses, 70:10

ENDOCRINE GLANDS
Definitions, 55:2
Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:12

END OF THE YEAR PROJECT
TIME
Law office management and technology, 14:31

ENDOGENOUS
Definitions, 55:2

ENDOPLASMIC RETICULUM
Definitions, 55:2

ENDOCRINOLOGY
Definitions, 55:2

ENERGY
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:6, 31:7

ENTRAPMENT
Expert witnesses, entrapment of own witness by poor questions, 78:7

ENVIRONMENTAL CIRCUMSTANCES
Coroners and medical examiners, facilities and budget, 21:30

ENZYMATIC METHODS FOR ALCOHOL DETERMINATION
Generally, 18:11
Case evaluation, 26:112

ENZYME LINKED IMMUNOSORBENT ASSAY (ELISA)
Definitions, 55:2

ENZYME MULTIPLIED IMMUNOASSAY (EMIT)
Definitions, 55:2

ENZYMES
Definitions, 55:2

EPIDEMIOLOGY
Definitions, 55:2

EPILEPSY
Definitions, 55:2

EQUIPMENT
Devices and Equipment (this index)

EQUIVALENT EXPRESSIONS
Generally, 40:1

ERASABLE PROGRAMMABLE READ ONLY MEMORY (EPROM)
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:21

ERRONEOUS CALCULATIONS IN COURTROOM
Basic alcohol calculations for law office and courtroom, 11:16

ERROR
Mistake and Error (this index)

ERYTHROCITES
Definitions, 55:2
ESOPHAGUS
Definitions, 55:2

ESTERS
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:16
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:6

ESTIMATION OF ALCOHOL AMOUNTS OR DRINKS CONSUMED
Generally, 11:4 et seq.
Beta factor, 11:6
Beta variables, 11:7
Credibility of client, protecting client's credibility with math analysis, 11:24
Elimination over time, allowing for, 11:6
Figures, 11:25
Fluid ounces conversion to beverage ounces, 11:8
Full range of results, allowing for, 11:7
Guest-host cases, at home consumption, 11:20 to 11:24
Limitations of calculations, 11:19
Number of drinks estimated, 11:8
Overestimation of BAC by Breath Test Devices (this index)
R factors, estimating range of results for different R factors, 11:5
R variables, 11:7
Simplified equation, 11:4

ESTIMATION OF UNCERTAINTY
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:26

ETG (ETHYL GLUCURONIDE)
Definitions, 55:2

ETHANOL—Cont'd
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:10, 31:15
Intoxilyzer, physiological responses to ethanol, 32:15
Manual computation of unknown ethanol peaks, 63:84
Technician, deposition of, 63:24, 63:26, 63:84

ETHERS
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:16

ETHYL GLUCURONIDE (ETG)
Definitions, 55:2

ETHYL SULFATE (ETS)
Definitions, 55:2

ETOH OF 0.014%
Deposition of technician, 63:29

ETS (ETHYL SULFATE)
Definitions, 55:2

EVALUATING COMPETENCY AND KNOWLEDGE
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:6

EVASIVE ANSWERS
Evaluation of test results by law office, 13:11

EVASIVE EXPERTS
Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)

EVIDENCE COLLECTION FORMS AND LOGS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:8

EVIDENZERS AND NANOPULS, INC.
Generally, 34:53 to 34:57

EXAMINATION
Discovery, examination of original documents, 65:20
EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Admissibility of expert testimony
—Cont’d
Daubert v Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, generally, 76:1 et seq.
discovery, admissibility of unmentioned opinion evidence, 65:26
discretion of court, 71:8
dissent, 76:8
Federal Rules of Evidence (Holding 1), 76:4
flexible two-prong test of Daubert: proof of relevancy and reliability by whatever evidence satisfies trial court, 76:11
forensic science, generally, 76:17
four factors of Daubert, 76:12 to 76:14
Frye. See entries throughout this group
Frye superseded by Federal Rules of Evidence (Holding 1), 76:4
general acceptance, 76:9, 76:18
General Electric v. Joiner, 76:15
general observations, 76:7
hearsay rule, 71:9
if helpful standard, 71:7
inadequacy of general acceptance standard, 76:18
Kumho Tire v. Carmichael, 76:16
learned treatise exception, 71:9
limitations, generally, 71:10
limited application of Daubert’s four factors, 76:13
majority view, 76:6
multiplication of experts and new areas of expertise: why Frye is inadequate for long-run resolution of admissibility questions, 76:2
other than Daubert’s four factors, admissibility under Daubert, 76:14

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Admissibility of expert testimony
—Cont’d
prejudice, 71:11
rigidity of Frye must yield to more accommodating rule of Daubert, 76:3
scientific community, 76:9
scientific methodology, determining, 76:12
scientific validity, 76:5
state level: Frye morphing into Daubert, 76:10
strict necessity rule, 71:6
two-prong test of Daubert: proof of relevancy and reliability by whatever evidence satisfies trial court, 76:11
undue prejudice, 71:11
Affidavit of fees, 80A:22
Alcohol-related publications, 72:31, 72:33
Alcohol tests
see also Retrograde Extrapolation (this index)
breath alcohol tests, infra
competency and integrity, improper attacks on, 80A:4 to 80A:10
Alco-Sensor (this index)
Almost positive, evasive expert, 74:22
Ambiguity of BAC results, 70:30
Amount of alcohol consumed, generally, 75:14 to 75:20
Answers, 71:24, 80A:31
Anticipation of trial issues, 73:13
Appeal record, 74:6
Arrogance, 72:8, 72:9
Association with law enforcement personnel, 74:4
Assumption of reliability, 70:15
Attacking witness, 75:8
Attitude, 72:27
Authors, knowledge of, 74:13, 74:14
INDEX

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Automatic qualification, 72:26
Autopsy, 70:18, 70:33
Availability of witness to prosecution, 80A:14
Availability of writings, 74:26
Average results, 75:15, 75:16
Awards, 72:29
Background of witness, 80A:11
Backtracking, 74:19
Badge, carrying of, 74:5
Basic principles, 75:10, 75:11
Basis for opinion, 53:53, 71:44
Benign neglect, 71:3
Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)
Blood alcohol
Forensic Blood Alcohol Expert, Cross-Examination of (this index)
hands on experience, 80A:5 to 80A:7
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
retaining an expert, 25:3
serum/plasma value, conversion to whole blood value, 19:2, 19:5
Books, 72:35
Breath alcohol tests
cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:3, 75:4, 75:6
post-accident and post-mortem blood alcohol concentrations, 70:3
pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:12
Calculations, cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:14, 75:15, 75:18
Case evaluation, 26:8
Certainty and uncertainty, 70:9, 71:19
Challenging of opinion, 71:45
Changing of opinion, 73:5

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Chappaquiddick Incident. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Character, justified attacks, 80A:12
Checklist for defending expert from improper and insupportable attacks, 80A:18
Checklist to prompt witness as to overlooked issues, 78:11
Chemistry, generally, 41:19
Civil cases
generally, 70:19, 70:26
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Closing argument, 80A:28
Comments to jury regarding expert pay, 80A:25
Compensation, integrity of expert, 71:54
Competency and integrity, improper attacks on generally, 80A:1 et seq.
affidavit of fees, 80A:22
alcohol-test issues, 80A:4 to 80A:10
answer to attack, necessity of, 80A:31
availability of witness to prosecution, 80A:14
background of witness, 80A:11
character, justified attacks, 80A:12
check list, defending expert from attacks, 80A:18
closing argument, 80A:28
comments to jury, 80A:25
costitutional right to expert witness, 80A:17
critical presentation of forensic evidence, 80A:13
cross-examination, fee discussion, 80A:2
direct examination, fees, 80A:2, 80A:23
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EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Competency and integrity, improper attacks on—Cont’d
education of expert, 80A:30
expertise, hands on experience of expert, 80A:6, 80A:7
failure to answer attacks, 80A:31
fees, discussion, 80A:2, 80A:3, 80A:19 to 80A:26, 80A:28
feigned shock and awe at fees, 80A:3
forensic evidence, 80A:13, 80A:16
freedom of information statutes, 80A:29
government witness, 80A:24, 80A:26
hands on experience, competency to testify on alcohol-test issues, 80A:5 to 80A:7
honesty, justified attacks, 80A:12
identification of pre-trial and trial fees, 80A:22
income received by government witness, 80A:24
instruction to jury regarding fees, 80A:22
jury instruction on fees, 80A:22
justified attacks, 80A:12
letter to prosecutor, 80A:19, 80A:24
limit to fee questions, motion for, 80A:20
list of what witness is not, 80A:10
list separating pre-trial and trial fees, 80A:22
media and forensic evidence, 80A:16
motion to compel or limit fee information, 80A:20
necessary presentation of forensic evidence, 80A:13
nonexclusive discipline, 80A:11
notice letter to prosecutor, 80A:11
opening statement comments to jury, 80A:25

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Competency and integrity, improper attacks on—Cont’d
peer-reviewed literature, familiarity, 80A:8
preemption of attack, 80A:27
preparation of witness, 80A:15, 80A:23
pretend shock and awe at fees, 80A:3
pre-trial use, fee information, 80A:21
public records, 80A:29
salaries of government employees, 80A:29
shortcomings of witness, 80A:9, 80A:10
texts on subject, familiarity, 80A:8
timeliness of fees discussion, 80A:2
training of expert, 80A:30
trial use, fee information, 80A:21
what witness is not, 80A:9, 80A:10
Computer chips with response, expert’s request for, App. M
Constitutional right to expert witness, 80A:17
Consultation with expert, preparation for generally, 73:1 et seq.
anticipation of trial issues, 73:13
article by expert, reading of, 73:7
changing of opinion, 73:5
contradictions in opinion, 73:6
cross examination of opposing expert, 73:14
facts, new or different, 73:8
findings and conclusions, overly broad findings and conclusions, 73:11
interest of expert in case, 73:3
neglecting issues, 73:9, 73:10
EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Consultation with expert, preparation for—Cont’d
new or different facts, 73:8
obligation of attorney, 73:1
overlooking issues, 73:9, 73:10
overly broad findings and conclusions, 73:11
publications, reading of, 73:7
questions unasked, 73:12
reading science, 73:2
reading work of potential experts, 73:4, 73:7
text by expert, reading of, 73:7
Consumption of alcohol, generally, 75:14 to 75:20
Contradictions in opinion, 73:6
Control, loss of, 78:3
Copper Case. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Court, qualifications, 72:4, 72:11
Credentials of Expert Witness (this index)
Credibility of Witness (this index)
Criminal cases, 74:7, 75:7
Critical presentation of forensic evidence, 80A:13
Cross-Examination (this index)
C.V., written, qualifications, 72:13
Daubert v Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals. Admissibility of intoxication test evidence, supra
Death. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Decomposed body BAC. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Definition of terms generally, 78:1 et seq.
cost, loss of, 78:3
credibility, loss of, 78:5
Definition of terms—Cont’d
entrapment of own witness by poor questions, 78:7
evasion, long answers with new material, 78:6
eve of testimony, preparation critical, 78:21, 78:22
full potential of expert, utilizing, 78:24
general science, when to use, 78:8
introduction: need for definition phase, 78:1
jury, generally, 78:12 et seq.
jury’s recognition of terms defined, favorability of, 78:18
larger picture, getting jury (and court) to understand through definitions, 78:14
leading not pushing jurors, 78:12
mixed opinions and definitions, disruption of presentation plan and loss of credibility, 78:4, 78:5
new information or facts, 78:6, 78:12
overlooked issues, checklist to prompt witness as to, 78:11
poor presentation’s impact on jury, 78:15
preparation with expert, generally, 78:19 to 78:22
qualify, define terms, specifies - three step preparation’s benefits, 78:23
repetition of facts, 78:10
research references, 78:25
resistance to opinions when terms undefined, 78:2
reviewing basic terms and definitions thoroughly with expert, 78:19
setting the stage for expert, 78:16
sharing knowledge with court and jury, 78:13
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EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Definition of terms—Cont’d
shortchanging preparation with expert, 78:19, 78:20
small doses, covering basic definitions and concepts in, 78:9
three-step approach/presentation, 78:17, 78:23
Difficult witnesses. Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)
Direct examination, fees, 80A:2, 80A:23
Discipline, 80A:11
Discovery (this index)
Discretion of court, admissibility of expert testimony, 71:8
Disorganized expert, 72:8, 72:9
Disruption of presentation plan, mixed opinions and definitions, 78:4
Distinctions of expert, 72:29
Doctor. Physician, infra
Domino effect, 71:38
Drowning victims. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Educational experience, qualifications, 72:28, 80A:30
Entrapment of own witness by poor questions, 78:7
Evaluation multiple reports, 71:25
new articles, notes, evaluation and comments of witness, 74:17
writings, 74:26
Evasion, long answers with new material, 78:6
Evasive witnesses. Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)
Eve of testimony, preparation critical, 78:21, 78:22

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Experience judges misled by prior experience, 75:2
misleading prior experience, 75:1, 75:2
qualifications, 72:28
Expertise, generally, 72:27, 72:28
EZ-ALC™ Computer Program (this index)
Facts cross-examination of defendant’s expert, applying basic principles to facts, 75:11
new or different facts, preparation for consultation with expert, 73:8
qualifications, facts about expert, 72:23
Failure to answer attacks on expert, 80A:31
Familiar with texts on subject, 80A:8
Fatal opinion language, 71:21
Federal Rules of Evidence (Holding 1), 76:4
Fees, discussion during attacks on witness, 80A:2, 80A:3, 80A:19 to 80A:26, 80A:28
Feigned shock and awe at fees, 80A:3
Findings and conclusions, overly broad findings and conclusions, 73:11
Flawed data, 71:45
Forensic Blood Alcohol Expert, Cross-Examination of (this index)
Forensic evidence, 80A:13, 80A:16
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Forensic science and admissibility questions, 76:17
Four factors of Daubert, 76:12 to 76:14

Index-40
EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Freedom of information statutes, 80A:29
Frye, generally. Admissibility of expert testimony, supra
Frye superseded by Federal Rules of Evidence (Holding 1), 76:4
Full potential of expert, utilizing, 78:24
General acceptance, 76:9, 76:18
General acceptance—inadequacy of standard, 76:18
General Electric v. Joiner, admissibility of intoxication test evidence, 76:15
General science, when to use, 78:8
Government witness compensation, 80A:24, 80A:26
Grand Rapids study, 71:46 to 71:48
Hands on experience, competency to testify on alcohol-test issues, 80A:5 to 80A:7
Head-on collision. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Hearsay rule, 71:9
Holden, William, example. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Honesty, justified attacks, 80A:12
Honors, 72:29
Hundreds of studies gambit, 71:44
Identification of pre-trial and trial fees, 80A:22
If helpful standard, 71:7
Impressive witness, 72:7
Improvement of opinion, 71:34
Income received by government witness, 80A:24
Incompetence of attorney, 71:55
Initial examination, 71:37
Initial questions. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Concentrations (this index)
Inspection, 35:2
Instruction to jury regarding fees, 80A:22
Integrity of expert generally, 71:49 to 71:55
attacking integrity in courtroom, 71:49
bias, 71:54
compensation, 71:54
competency and integrity, improper attacks on, above cross-examination, 71:53
improper attacks on defense expert, 80A:1 to 80A:31
inappropriate attacks, 71:52
incompetence of attorney, 71:55
measuring actual integrity, 71:50
personal attacks, 71:55
Interest of expert in case, 73:3
Jury, 72:4, 72:11, 78:12 et seq.
Jury instruction on fees, 80A:22
Justified attacks on competency and integrity of expert, 80A:12
Just one last point, 71:40
Knowledge generally, 72:30
Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)
cross-examination, learning to use knowledge of defendant’s expert, 79:13
drinker’s forgetfulness, 75:24
sharing knowledge with jury, 78:13
technician, deposition of, 60:8, 61:48, 62:19, 63:54
Kumho Tire v. Carmichael, admissibility of intoxication test evidence, 76:16
Language, 71:21 to 71:23
EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Law enforcement
association with law enforcement, 74:4
biased, difficult or evasive expert witnesses, 74:2, 74:7, 74:8
breath alcohol tests, 1:3, 1:4
part of law enforcement, view of witness as, 74:3
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem
Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Law office management and technology, 14:25, 14:49
Leading not pushing jurors, 78:12
Learned treatise exception, 71:9
Letter to prosecutor, 80A:19, 80A:24
Limitations
Admissibility of expert testimony, supra
fee questions, 80A:20
Limited application of Daubert’s four factors, 76:13
Limit to fee questions, motion for, 80A:20
List, pre-trial and trial fees, 80A:22
List, what witness is not, 80A:10
Locating an expert, 71:26 to 71:28
Loss of license hearing, 50:12, 50:52, 50:70
Media and forensic evidence, 80A:16
Medical Examiner (this index)
Memorandum on scope of testimony, 71:17
Memory lapse, 71:32
Mentor of expert, 72:25
Mixed opinions and definitions, disruption of presentation plan and loss of credibility, 78:4, 78:5
Motion to compel or limit fee information, 80A:20
Motion to Dismiss (this index)
Multiple reports, 71:25
EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Multiplication of experts, inadequacy of Frye for long-run resolution of admissibility questions, 76:2
Necessary presentation of forensic evidence, 80A:13
Neglect, benign neglect, 71:3
Neglecting issues, 73:9, 73:10
New areas of expertise, inadequacy of Frye for long-run resolution of admissibility questions, 76:2
New material, information, or facts, 71:36, 73:8, 78:6, 78:12
Nice guy cross-examiner, 71:39
Non-alcohol publications, 72:31
Non-alcohol related publications, 72:32
Nonexclusive discipline, 80A:11
Non-opinion opinion, 71:41
Notice letter to prosecutor, 80A:24
Objectivity, 71:27, 75:12
Obligation of attorney, 73:1
Opening statement comments to jury, 80A:25
Open-minded inquiry, 71:37
Opinion, generally, 70:1 to 76:18
Original notes and findings, opinion supported by, 71:33
Oui case, generally, 71:2
Overlooking issues, 73:9, 73:10, 78:11
Overly broad findings and conclusions, 73:11
Oversimplification, 70:10, 70:27, 75:4
Peer journals, 72:33
Peer review, 72:34
Peer-reviewed literature, familiarity, 80A:8
Percentage probability opinion, 71:42
Performance of machine, expert’s test procedures on, 53:66
Per se laws, 71:16
Personal attacks, 71:55
Personal experience, 72:28
INDEX

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Personal side of witness, 72:21
Personal work, 74:9, 74:21, 74:26, 74:27
Physician
  biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:8
  Medical Examiner (this index)
    post-accident and post-mortem blood alcohol concentrations, 70:21
Poor presentation’s impact on jury, 78:15
Poor questions, entrapment of own witness by, 78:7
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations
  (this index)
Post-mortem blood alcohol concentrations. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Pre-accident release of driver. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Predictions, 3:7, 70:53
Preemption, attack based on what witness is not, 80A:27
Prejudice
  generally, 70:55, 71:11
Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)
Preparation and testimony, generally, 71:1 et seq., 78:19 to 78:22, 80A:15, 80A:23
Pressure to improve opinion, 71:34
Pretend shock and awe at fees, 80A:3
Pre-trial information, 70:23
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:52, 50:70
Pre-trial questions of opposing expert, 66:3

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Pre-trial use, fee information, 80A:21
Probability of accident, 71:46, 71:47
Publications
  alcohol-related publications, 72:31, 72:33
  non-alcohol publications, 72:31
  non-alcohol related publications, 72:32
  qualifications, generally, 72:28, 72:31 to 72:36
  reading of, 73:7
Qualifications and qualifying, generally, 35:2, 72:1 et seq.
Questions unasked, 70:35, 70:51, 73:12
Reading publications, 73:2, 73:4, 74:15
Reasonable scientific (medical) certainty, 71:20
Recalcitrant expert, 72:8
Records and recording
  appeal record, 74:6
  original notes and findings, opinion supported by, 71:33
  public records, 80A:29
  review of notes on articles on device, 74:18
  testimony file, 71:30, 71:31
Relevancy, two-prong test of
  Daubert: proof of relevancy and reliability by whatever evidence satisfies trial court, 76:11
Reliance and reliability
  assumption of reliability, 70:15
  qualifications, reliability of evidence, 72:16
  two-prong test of Daubert: proof of relevancy and reliability by whatever evidence satisfies trial court, 76:11
Repetition of facts, 78:10
Reports and reporting
  generally, 71:25, 75:17
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EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Reports and reporting—Cont’d
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Research references, 78:25
Resistance to opinions when terms undefined, 78:2
Review, 71:24, 74:18, 74:26
Reviewing basic terms and definitions thoroughly with expert, 78:19
Rigidity of Frye, admissibility questions, 76:3
Salaries of government employees, 80A:29
Scientific community, 71:43, 76:9
Scientific literature, expert’s position supported by, 54:59
Scientific methodology, determining, 76:12
Scientific validity, 76:5
Setting the stage for expert, 78:16
Severity of drinking/driving problem, 72:16
Shock and awe at fees charged, 80A:3
Shortchanging preparation with expert, 78:19, 78:20
Shortcomings of witness, improper attacks on competency and integrity, 80A:9, 80A:10
Sine qua non, 71:37, 72:5
Skewed curve of Grand Rapids study, 71:47
Sources, locating an expert, 71:26 to 71:28
State level, admissibility: Frye morphing into Daubert, 76:10
Strict necessity rule, 71:6
Testimony, generally, 71:1 et seq.
Testimony file, 71:30, 71:31
Texts, 73:7, 74:15, 80A:8
Three-step approach/presentation, 78:17, 78:23

EXPERT WITNESSES—Cont’d
Time
accident and death, time of, 70:37
consumption of alcohol, generally, 75:14 to 75:20
fees discussion, 80A:2
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
missing drinking time, 75:26
qualifications, 72:3
reported time length of consumption, 75:17
Timely preparation, 71:29
Traditional experts, 71:27
Training of expert relative to expertise, 80A:30
Trial preparation of expert, 71:29 to 71:31
Trial use, fee information, 80A:21
Two-prong test of Daubert: proof of relevancy and reliability by whatever evidence satisfies trial court, 76:11
Typical expert and opinions, 70:10, 70:55, 71:16
Ultimate issue, opinions on, 71:14 to 71:16
Unconsidered facts, 71:36
Undue prejudice, 71:11
Validity, scientific validity, 76:5
Voire Dire (this index)
Warning, 71:32
What witness is not, 80A:9, 80A:10, 80A:27
Whole blood, 63:112, 70:22
Whole person, 72:19
Wood, Natalie, example, Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Work experience, 72:28
Written C.V., 72:13

EXTERNAL PROFICIENCY TEST
Definitions, 55:2
INDEX

EXTRACELLULAR FLUID
Definitions, 55:2

EXTRAPOLATION
Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)
Retrograde Extrapolation (this index)

EXTRAVASCULAR
Definitions, 55:2

EZ-ALC™ COMPUTER PROGRAM
Generally, 12:1 et seq.
Civil cases, 12:5
Expert witness, 12:3
Law office evaluation, 12:2
Prosecution, 12:4

FACILE APPROACH
Generally, 43:1 et seq.
Conversions, generally, 43:4 to 43:8
Density as a factor, volume-to-weight conversions, 43:7
Equation, selecting conversion factors for, 43:4
Fractions, 43:5
Givens, 43:3
Grains, milligrams to grains, 43:9
Knowns, 43:3
Milligrams to grains, 43:9
Unit-factor approach, 43:1, 43:2
Unit-factor method, 43:5
Volume-to-volume conversions, 43:6
Volume-to-weight conversions, 43:7
Weight-to-weight conversion, 43:8

FACILITIES
Post-Mortem Alcohol Determinations (this index)

FACTS
Deposition of technician, 61:48

FACTS—Cont’d
Expert witnesses, 61:48, 72:23, 73:8, 75:11
Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination of, 80:14, 80:28
Inferential weight of, 13:5
New or different facts, 73:8
Retrograde extrapolation, lacking facts in opinions, 22:6
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:14

FAEE (FATTY ACID ETHYL ESTER)
Definitions, 55:2

FAHRENHEIT
Generally, 39:10

FAILURES BY FORENSIC LABORATORIES
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:2

FAILURE TO ACCOUNT FOR UNCERTAINTY
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:27, 56:28

FAILURE TO ANSWER ATTACKS ON EXPERT
Expert witnesses, 80A:31

FALLACIES REGARDING ALCOHOL TEST EXTRAPOLATIONS
Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)

FALSE ASSUMPTIONS
Deep lung testing, 29:1 to 29:17
Evaluation of test results by law office, 13:10

FALSE BREATH TEST SCORES
Intoxilyzer, 32:6
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FALSE LOWS
Simulators, 37:10

FALSE NEGATIVE RATE
Definitions, 55:2

FALSE POSITIVE RATE
Definitions, 55:2

FALSE POSITIVES
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:13
Intoxilyzer, 32:5

FAMILIAR
Expert witnesses, texts on subject, 80A:8

FAMILY APPROACH TO OFFICE INTERVIEWS
Law office management and technology, 14:4

FATAL OPINION LANGUAGE
Expert witnesses, 71:21

FAT CONTENT
Women, 5:28

FAT TO LEAN DIFFERENCE
Women, 5:17, 5:18, 5:21, 5:22

FATTY ACID
Definitions, 55:2

FATTY ACID ETHYL ESTER (FAEE)
Definitions, 55:2

FATTY LIVER
Definitions, 55:2

FCV (FORCED VITAL CAPACITY)
Definitions, 55:2

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:3

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE (HOLDING 1)
Expert witnesses, 76:4

FEES
Expert witnesses, 80A:2, 80A:3, 80A:19 to 80A:26, 80A:28
Future of DUI practice, 6:7

FEIGNED SHOCK AND AWE
Expert witnesses, 80A:3

FEMALES
Women (this index)

FEMORAL BLOOD
Deposition of medical examiner, 64:40

FERMENTATION
Definitions, 55:2

FIBROSIS
Definitions, 55:2

FIELD TEST
Expert’s field test of Alco-Sensor, 54:16

FIELD WORK
Alco-Sensor, 54:37
Simulator results in breath-test cases, conforming products specifications and results in the field, 54:37

FIGURES
Generally, 83:1
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:19

FILES AND FILING
Records and Recording (this index)

FILTERS
Design and operating principles, 30:14

FILTER WHEEL
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:5

FINAL DECISION
Motion to dismiss, 53:89, 53:90
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:72
INDEX

FINALE UNCERTAINTY BUDGET
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:11

FINANCE
Law office management and technology, 14:10

FINDING DOCUMENTATION
Discovery, effectively reviewing documents, 65:14

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
Overly broad findings and conclusions, 73:11

FINE TUNING OF TEST EQUIPMENT
Depositions, 60:13

FIRE IN THE HOLE APPROACH
Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination of, 80:9

FIRST EXAMINATION
Discovery, first examination of materials provided, 65:17

FIRST-PASS METABOLISM
Definitions, 55:2
Women, 5:8

FLAWED DATA
Breath alcohol tests, 28:9
Expert witnesses, 71:45

FLAWED PROTOCOL
Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations
(this index)

FLORIDA STUDY
Standard Field Sobriety Tests (SFST), validation studies of, 27:3, 27:6

FLUID OUNCES
Generally, 39:5 to 39:7, 41:5
Beverage ounces, conversion to, 11:8
Drinks, converting to, 13:24

FLUID REPLACEMENT
Post-mortem alcohol determinations, collection process, 21:19

FLUORESCENCE
Polarization
IMMUNOASSAY (FPIA)
Definitions, 55:2

FOLLOW-UP DISCOVERY
Generally, 65:11

FOOD
Deposition of technician, 61:52
Eating History (this index)
Motion to dismiss, 53:55
Physiology of consumption, 2:5, 2:9
Post-mortem alcohol determinations, collection process, 21:16
Women, 5:32, 5:33

FORCED EXPIRATORY VOLUME IN ONE SECOND (FVC1.0)
Definitions, 55:2

FORCED VITAL CAPACITY (FCV)
Definitions, 55:2

FORENSIC
Definitions, 55:2

FORENSIC ANALYST, PRE-TRIAL INTERVIEWS
Generally, 66:1, 66:2, 66:19
Accuracy
illusion of, 66:10
plus or minus a given percent, 66:11
Agreement and disagreement, identifying areas, 66:5
Ambient subtract, breath testing, 66:15
Blank reports, breath testing, 66:15
Breath testing
accuracy to plus or minus a given percent, 66:11
ambient subtract, 66:15
blank reports, 66:15
FORENSIC ANALYST, PRE-TRIAL INTERVIEWS—Cont’d
Breath testing—Cont’d
calibrating breath-test equipment, 66:14
depleted standards and controls, 66:8
duplicate breath testing, 66:12
electronic data, retention of, 66:17
radio frequency interference (RFI), and, 66:12
reanalyzed results, 66:16
reprocessed results, 66:16
retention of electronic data, 66:17
Verifiers and the illusion of accuracy, 66:10
whole blood controls, assigning a value to, 66:9
Calibrating breath-test equipment, 66:14
Cross-examination, preparation for, 66:4
Deficits, procedural, making count, 66:6
Depleted standards and controls, 66:8
Duplicate breath testing, 66:12
Electronic data, retention of, 66:17
Information, acquiring, 66:5
Interview goals, 66:5
Obtaining information, 66:18
Opposing experts, questions of, 66:3
Preparation for cross-examination, 66:4
Procedural deficits, making count, 66:6
Protect candid and helpful witnesses, 66:7
Questions of opposing experts, 66:3
Radio frequency interference (RFI) and breath testing, 66:12
Reanalyzed results, breath testing, 66:16
Reprocessed results, breath testing, 66:16
Retention of electronic data, 66:17

FORENSIC BLOOD ALCOHOL EXPERT, CROSS-EXAMINATION OF
Generally, 80:1 et seq.
Accident reports, 80:16, 80:30, 80:42
Alternative paths for cross which do not depend on expert’s precise words, 80:5
Areas of likely agreement, framing questions within, 80:7
Arrest form, 80:15, 80:29
Chromatograms, computer data (ethanol runs), 80:24, 80:38
Computer data (ethanol runs), 80:24, 80:38
Critical nature of evidence, 80A:13
Ethanol, 80:23 to 80:27, 80:37 to 80:41
Evidence submission form, 80:18, 80:32
Factual scenario, 80:14, 80:28
Figures, 80:43
Fire in the hole approach, 80:9
First considerations in cross-examination, 80:2
Framing questions within areas of likely agreement, 80:7
Frontal attack, preparation, 80:3
Hospital lab report, 80:17, 80:31
Hypothetical case, 80:1, 80:12
Introduction, 80:1
Known ethanols
linearity chart for, 80:25, 80:39
summary of, 80:27, 80:41
INDEX

FORENSIC BLOOD ALCOHOL EXPERT, CROSS-EXAMINATION OF—Cont’d
Linearity chart for known ethanols, 80:25, 80:39
Media, 80A:16
Not with my expert, you won’t, 80:6
Omitted documents, hypothetical case, 80:12
Order of test runs (handwritten), 80:26, 80:40
Package with seal, picture of, 80:20, 80:34
Paul Johnson hypothetical case: omitted documents, 80:12
Picture of package with seal, 80:20, 80:34
Precise words of expert, alternative paths for cross which do not depend on, 80:5
Prime questions suggested by documents, 80:13
Production of documents, 80:11
Receipt, samples, and signature, 80:19, 80:33
Reviewing materials, 80:4, 80:14 et seq.
Second accident report (2nd accident), 80:42
Signature, samples, 80:19, 80:33
Specific problems in case, tying general concepts to, 80:8
Summary of ethanol knowns, 80:27, 80:41
There’s gold in them thar hills, 80:11
Toxicological analysis report, 80:21, 80:35
Toxicology casework worksheet, summary, 80:22, 80:36
Tying general concepts to specific problems in case, 80:8
Uniform traffic accident report, 80:16, 80:30

FORENSIC BLOOD ALCOHOL EXPERT, CROSS-EXAMINATION OF—Cont’d
Velvet glove, starting points on cross with, 80:10
Volatile analysis worksheet, ethanol, 80:23, 80:37

FORENSIC LABORATORY
Attorney’s guide to ISO 17025 and compliance by laboratories, 57:1 to 57:29
Bac, generally. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Clinical laboratory, differences in, 18:6
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Personnel. Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Plasma (serum) values against whole blood values, 18:15, 19:1
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Post-Mortem Alcohol Determinations (this index)
Quality assurance. Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Work product. Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)

FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL
Generally, 60:1 to 64:59
Age, Green test, 61:25
Alco-Sensor, 54:58
Annual test, monitoring of lab by state, 63:109
Anticoagulants, 61:55
Authors, familiarity with, 61:58
Availability of evidence, 60:5, 60:21 to 60:23
FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Awareness of test problem areas, 60:9, 61:45 to 61:47
Background facts, 61:4
Bacteria, 61:54, 64:41
Blank, run of, 63:29
Blind monitoring of lab, 60:11, 61:44
Blood Alcohol Concentrations, generally. Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)
Blood alcohol tests, generally, 61:33 to 61:39
Bottle label, information on, 63:14
Calculations, 61:57, 62:12
Calibration Records (this index)
California example, generally, 63:1 et seq.
Capping of sample container, 63:27
Cause of death, doctor’s notes, 64:10
Certificate of laboratory, 61:13, 64:4
Challenging deponent’s opinions, 60:26
Chromatograms generally, 61:15, 62:13
column, 63:48
condition of G.C., 63:95
cross-examination of technician, 63:43, 63:44
daily performance of G. C. checked by technician, 63:46
direct examination of technician, 63:8, 63:9
documents reviewed by technician, 63:61
Green test, 61:25
linearity of, 61:36
manual entry, 62:11
parts of G.C. system, 63:83
production of exemplar chromatograms, 62:24
questions unasked, 63:103
request for exemplar chromatograms, 62:16

FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Chromatograms—Cont’d
tester, operation by, 63:20
training of technician, 63:66
whole system, term used for, 63:94
Civil cases, see lines throughout this index topic
Collection of samples
Medical Examiner (this index)
technicians, 61:54, 63:33, 63:42, 63:90
Computer and computer printouts, 63:23, 63:62, 63:82
Condition of equipment, 63:25, 63:43, 63:74, 63:95
Condition of sample as received, 61:46, 63:107
Consumption, calculations as to, 61:57
Container, 63:27, 63:76, 63:96, 63:101
Contamination of sample, 61:53, 63:53
Conway diffusion test, 61:31
Cost, Green test, 61:25
Covering of sample container, deposition of lab technician, 63:27, 63:96
Credentials, 63:5, 63:55 to 63:57
Cross-examination of first lab technician generally, 63:40 to 63:45
collection to lab, 63:42
condition of equipment, gas chromatograph, 63:43
custody of sample, 63:42
gas chromatograph, 63:43, 63:44
opinion, 63:40, 63:41
records on equipment problems, 63:45
repairs and maintenance, 63:44
specific repairs and maintenance, 63:44
time of accident, 63:40, 63:41

Index-50
FORENSIC LABORATORY
PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Cross-examination of first lab technician—Cont’d
under influence at time of accident, 63:41
Cross-examination of second lab technician
generally, 63:86 to 63:93
collection, delay before collection or test of sample, 63:90
date, duties on test date, 63:87
delay before collection or test of sample, 63:90
equipment breakdowns, 63:92, 63:93
formula used to check results, 63:86
Mack Test supervision, 63:88
oversight of test by witness, 63:91
prior communications with counsel or third persons, 63:89
Custody of sample, 63:11, 63:42
Data on test instrument, 62:22
Date. Time, infra
Demand for missing documents, 61:60
Deterioration of blood sample, 63:81
Determinations. Post-Mortem
Alcohol Determinations (this index)
Devices and equipment
generally, 60:14
breakdowns, 63:92, 63:93
Calibration Records (this index)
computers, 63:82 to 63:84
condition of equipment, 63:25, 63:43, 63:74, 63:95
experience with test equipment, 63:9
Green test, operating principles of test equipment, 61:26
performance checks, 61:37
problems, record of, 63:45

FORENSIC LABORATORY
PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Devices and equipment—Cont’d
repair and maintenance of equipment, 60:13, 61:18, 62:17, 63:44
training with test equipment, 63:9
Diagnosis, 64:10
Direct examination of first lab technician
generally, 63:5 to 63:39
blank, run of, 63:29
blood sample, generally, 63:38
bottle, information on sample bottle label, 63:14
capping of sample container, 63:27 chromatograph, 63:8, 63:9
condition of equipment, 63:25
container, capping of sample container, 63:27
credentials, 63:5
custody of sample, 63:11
delay, effect of delay after death to sample collection, 63:33
ethanol, 63:24, 63:26
EtOH of 0.014%, 63:29
exhibit A, second version of, 63:34, 63:35
experience with test equipment, 63:9
expert, qualifications as, 63:7
files, 63:36, 63:39
form, medical report form, 63:13
handling of sample, 63:15
information on sample bottle label, 63:14
initials of unlicensed technician, 63:35
labels and labeling, 63:12, 63:14
lab procedures, generally, 63:11 to 63:17
licensing requirements, 63:6
Mack test samples, 63:28 to 63:30
medical report form, 63:13
FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Direct examination of first lab technician—Cont’d
notes re alcohol runs on test date, 63:18
opinion of technician, 63:31, 63:33
paperwork, filing of, 63:39
prior testimony, 63:7
production of documents, 63:36
quality control, 63:30, 63:32
records and recording, 63:18, 63:36, 63:37, 63:39
reports, 63:10, 63:13, 63:24
signature of supervisor, 63:35
significance of BAC values, 63:31
technician licensing requirements, 63:6
tester, operation of G. C. by, infra
third persons, access to sample, 63:17
time and date, 63:18, 63:32, 63:33
toxicoological analysis, report of, 63:10
training with test equipment, 63:9
two quality control runs, 63:30
two tests, 63:24, 63:26
unlicensed technician, initials of, 63:35

Documents
chromatogram, test, 63:61
computer printout, 63:62
demand for missing documents, 61:60
examination by first lab technician, 63:3
generated by tester of chromatogram, 63:22
post deposition documents, 62:21 to 62:24
purpose of review, 63:65
quality control, 63:63, 63:64
reviewed by second lab technician, generally, 63:60 to 63:65, 63:67, 63:95

FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Documents—Cont’d
review of produced documents, 61:12 to 61:15
Drinking history on victim, 61:51
Drug screen ordered, 61:32
Eating history on victim, 61:51
Education of lab technician, 61:8
Employment of technician, 61:6, 61:7, 61:10
Equipment. Devices and equipment, supra
Ethanol, 63:24, 63:26, 63:84
Etoh of 0.014%, 63:29
Examination of documents, 63:3
Exhibit A, second version of, 63:34, 63:35
Expediency of expert, 70:10
Experienced forensic specialist, 70:41
Experience of technician, 61:6, 63:9
Facts about case known to technician, 61:48
Fine tuning of test equipment, 60:13
First lab technician generally, 63:1 et seq.
blood alcohol test procedures, generally, 63:1
chromatograms, 63:46, 63:48, 63:51
contamination of sample, 63:53
cross-examination of first lab technician, supra
direct examination of first lab technician, supra
examination of documents, 63:3
knowledge from tester, 63:54
licensing of lab to perform BAC tests, 63:47
Mack Case, 63:2 to 63:4
other alcohols, 63:49
peaks of test sample, 63:52
performance of G. C. checked by technician, 63:46
FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
First lab technician—Cont’d
re-cross examination, 63:48 to 63:51
redirect examination, 63:46, 63:47, 63:52, 63:53
tester, knowledge from, 63:54
wash solutions, 63:50
Food in stomach at death, 61:52
Forensics, generally, 60:12
Formation of alcohol in sample, opinion, 63:78
Forms, 61:14, 63:13
Formula used to check results, 63:86
Gas chromatograms:
   Chromatograms, supra
G.C. Chromatograms, supra
General log books of lab for test results, 61:16
Green Case. Green test, infra
Green test
   generally, 61:2, 61:24 to 61:29
   age, 61:25
cost, 61:25
gas chromatogram used, 61:25
identifying presence of other alcohols, 61:27
log records concerning Green Test, 62:5 to 62:7
operating principles of test equipment, 61:26
prior runs needed for test BAC values, 61:29
production of documents, 61:28
Guidelines for tests, 60:8, 61:23
Handling of sample, 60:9, 62:6, 62:7, 63:15
Handwritten log sheet, 62:6
Heart blood alcohol level, 61:53
History, eating and drinking history on victim, 61:51
Identifying presence of other alcohols, 61:27
Information, typed request for, 61:11

FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Information on sample bottle label, 63:14
Initials of unlicensed technician, 63:35
Injuries, 61:53, 64:9
Instructions of lab for sample submission, 62:20
Internal standards, 61:21
Interruptions, 60:18
In vivo samples, 61:50, 61:56
Justice system, how lab relates to, 60:15
Knowledge, 60:8, 61:48, 62:19, 63:54
Labels and labeling, 63:12, 63:14, 63:76
Laboratory, generally, 60:1
Laboratory procedures, generally, 62:8 to 62:20, 63:11 to 63:17
Law office as deposition site, 60:17
Library, 60:21, 60:22
Licenses
   lab licensing, 63:47
   questions unasked, licensed tester, 63:110
   requirements, 63:6
   role of licensed technician, 63:59
   second lab technician, 63:56, 63:85
Linearity check, 63:111
Literature, familiarity with, 61:58
Log books, 61:16
Log records concerning Green Test, 62:5 to 62:7
Log sheet, 62:6, 62:7
Mack tests, 63:2 to 63:4, 63:28 to 63:30, 63:88
Magic 02, 61:57
Manual computation of unknown ethanol peaks, 63:84
Manual entry on test G. C., 62:11
Manuals for performing tests, 61:23
Medical Examiner (this index)
FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Medical report form, 63:13
Missing information, request for, 62:10
Mistake and error, 60:6, 61:40, 61:41
Monitoring of lab, 60:10, 60:11, 61:42 to 61:44, 63:109
Monitoring of technician, 61:42 to 61:44
Normal blood values for samples, 61:56
Notes
date, notes of test date, 63:18
doctor’s notes. Medical Examiner (this index)
original test notes and records, 60:5
personal notes and records of tester, 62:4
Notices for production of documents, 61:3
Objectives, generally, 60:3, 62:1
One test run, 61:39, 61:43
On site depositions, 60:19
Opinion of witness, generally, 61:49 to 61:56
Order of court, 60:20, 61:3
Original test notes and records, 60:5
Outside library, 60:22
Outside monitoring of lab’s works and results, 60:10
Oversight of test by witness, generally, 61:91
Paper record, 60:6
Paperwork, filing of, 63:39
Peaks of chromatogram, 63:20, 63:52
Permanent records, 63:106
Personal notes and records of tester, 62:4
Physical examination, doctor’s notes, 64:9
Portable lab records, 60:23
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Post-deposition documents, 62:21 to 62:24
Post-deposition finds, 63:112
Preliminary remarks, 62:2
Present opinions of witness and facts relied upon for form them, 60:25
Preservatives, 61:55
Prior communications with counsel or third persons, 63:89
Prior jobs of lab technician, 61:7
Prior runs needed for test BAC values, 61:29
Prior testimony, 63:7
Procedures, generally, 63:1
Procedure sheet, 62:9, 62:23
Production of alcohol in blood sample, 61:55
Production of documents, 61:3, 61:12 to 61:15, 61:28, 63:36
Production of exemplar chromatograms, 62:24
Qualifications
generally, 61:59
direct examination of first lab technician, 63:7
second lab technician, 63:57
technician, generally, 61:5 to 61:8
tester, 62:3
testing technician, 61:9, 61:10
Quality control
generally, 62:19, 63:21
results, 63:63
runs, 63:30, 63:72, 63:73, 63:104
values, 63:32, 63:64
Questions unasked
generally, 63:100 to 63:112
annual test, monitoring of lab by state, 63:109
chromatograms, 63:103
condition of sample received in lab, 63:107
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FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Questions unasked—Cont’d
containers, sample containers, 63:101
licensed tester, 63:110
linearity check, 63:111
monitoring of lab by state, 63:109
opinions of tester, 63:105
permanent records, 63:106
post deposition finds, 63:112
quality control runs, 63:104
records, 63:106
reporting procedure, 63:108
serum runs, 63:112
state monitoring lab, 63:109
tester, 63:105, 63:110
test procedure, 63:102
whole blood values, 63:112
Records and recording
generally, 63:37, 63:39
availability of lab records, 60:23
equipment problems, 63:45
general log books, 61:16
Green test, log records concerning,
62:5 to 62:7
knowns, record of, 62:19
notes, supra
paper record, 60:6
production of documents, 63:36
questions unasked, 63:106
repair and maintenance records,
62:17
standards, records on use of standards, 62:15
Re-cross-examination
first lab technician, 63:48 to 63:51
motion to dismiss, 53:34
second lab technician, 63:98
Redirect examination
first lab technician, 63:46, 63:47, 63:52, 63:53
second lab technician, 63:94 to 63:97
FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Regulations of department, 60:7
Repair and maintenance of equip-
ment, 60:13, 61:18, 62:17, 63:44
Reports
generally, 63:58
difference in reported values, 63:69
ethanol values reported, 63:24
medical report form, 63:13
opinion of validity of reported test values, 63:68
questions unasked, reporting pro-
cedure, 63:108
toxicological analysis, 63:10
Request for information, 61:11,
62:10, 62:16
Review of documents. Documents, supra
Rules of department, 60:7
Runs of test sample, 61:39
Screening test, 61:31, 61:32
Seal and label of blood sample container, removal of, 63:76
Second day of deposition, generally, 62:1 et seq.
Second lab technician
generally, 63:55 et seq.
BAC of 0.18%, 63:79
BAC post-mortem, change in, 63:97
BAC rising, 63:98
BAC value, opinion on delay on, 63:77
blood sample, generally, 63:75
change in BAC post-mortem, 63:97
chromatogram, 63:66, 63:83, 63:94, 63:95
computer problems, 63:82
condition of equipment, 63:74, 63:95
container, 63:76, 63:96
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FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Second lab technician—Cont’d
covering of sample container, 63:96
credentials, 63:55 to 63:57
cross-examination of second lab technician, supra
delay, opinion on delay on BAC value, 63:77
deterioration of blood sample, 63:81
documents reviewed by second lab technician, supra
ethanol, manual computation of unknown ethanol peaks, 63:84
expert qualifications, 63:57
formation of alcohol in sample, opinion, 63:78
label of blood sample container, removal of, 63:76
licenses, 63:56, 63:59, 63:85
manual computation of unknown ethanol peaks, 63:84
qualifications as expert, 63:57
quality control, 63:72, 63:73
re-cross-examination, 63:98
redirect examination, 63:94 to 63:97
report of alcohol analysis, 63:58
reports, 63:58, 63:68, 63:69
seal and label of blood sample container, removal of, 63:76
signature of supervisor, Q.C. runs, 63:72
state law, under influence under, 63:80
supervisors and supervision, 63:70 to 63:72
test equipment problems, 63:82 to 63:84
tester, training of tester by supervisor, 63:71
time from accident to death, 63:98

FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Second lab technician—Cont’d
training, 63:66, 63:71
under influence under state law, 63:80
unknown ethanol peaks, manual computation of, 63:84
validity of tests, 63:68, 63:73
Second version of exhibit A, 63:34, 63:35
Serum runs, questions unasked, 63:112
Signature of supervisor, 63:35, 63:72
Site of deposition, 60:17
Space in laboratory, 60:14
Standards, 62:14, 62:15
State forensic experts, 70:11
State laws, 60:7, 63:80
State monitoring lab, 63:109
Statutes, 60:7
Stomach, food or alcohol in stomach at death, 61:52
Submission, instructions of lab for sample submission, 62:20
Subpoenas for production of documents, 61:3
Sugar in blood sample at collection, 61:54
Supervisors and supervision generally, 60:2
Mack test, 63:88
signature of supervisor, 63:35, 63:72
technician, 63:70
training of tester by supervisor, 63:71
Supplemented, 62:23
Technician, generally, 60:2
Tester chromatogram, generally, 63:19 to 63:23
computer printout, 63:23
documents generated, 63:22
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FORENSIC LABORATORY PERSONNEL—Cont’d
Tester—Cont’d
employment at lab, 61:10
knowledge from, 63:54
licensed tester, 63:110
opinions of tester, 63:105
peak height chart, 63:20
personal notes and records of
tester, 62:4
qualifications, 61:9, 61:10, 62:3
quality control chromatogram,
63:21
training of tester by supervisor,
63:71
Test procedure, questions unasked,
63:102
Third persons, 63:17, 63:89
Time or date
accident, time of, 63:40, 63:41
accident and death, time between,
63:98
BAC at time of accident, 63:40
delays, 63:33, 63:77, 63:90
demand for missing documents
provided on new date, 61:60
doctor’s notes, 64:8, 64:12
duties on test date, 63:87
notes, 63:18, 64:8, 64:12
performance of task, 60:14
quality control values, plot of over
time, 63:32
under influence at time of accident,
63:41
Toxicological analysis, report of,
63:10
Training, 63:9, 63:66, 63:71
Typed log sheet, 62:7
Under influence, 63:41, 63:80
Uniform test procedures of labora-
tory, 60:4
Unknown ethanol peaks, manual
computation of, 63:84
Unlicensed technician, initials of,
63:35

FORENSIC LAB WORK PRODUCT
QUALITY
Generally, 68:1 to 68:37
Academic concerns, 68:3
Accreditation application and
reviews, 68:29
Analyst bench notes, logs, and
records, 68:16
Analyst qualifications, 68:30
Analytical balances, operation and
calibration, 68:23
Application for accreditation, 68:29
Attorney review of lab reports, 68:5
et seq.
Audit reports, internal, 68:32
Bench notes of analyst, 68:16
Blanks, run logs for, 68:17
Calibration of analytical balances,
68:23
Chain of custody, 68:9
Checklist, 68:37
Computer estimates, illicit drug pro-
duction yield, 68:22
Contamination control surveys, 68:25
Controls, run logs for, 68:17
Criteria variables, instrument opera-
tion and, 68:18
Discovery
generally, 68:8 to 68:35, 68:37
accreditation application and
reviews, 68:29
analyst bench notes, logs, and
records, 68:16
analyst qualifications, 68:30
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FORENSIC LAB WORK PRODUCT
QUALITY—Cont’d
Discovery—Cont’d
analytical balances, operation and calibration, 68:23
application for accreditation, 68:29
audit reports, internal, 68:32
bench notes of analyst, 68:16
blanks, run logs for, 68:17
calibration of analytical balances, 68:23
chain of custody, 68:9
checklist, 68:37
computer estimates, illicit drug production yield, 68:22
contamination control surveys, 68:25
controls, run logs for, 68:17
criteria variables, instrument operation and, 68:18
discovery items 1-27, 68:8 to 68:34
documentation, traceability (standards and references), 68:14
documentation of written protocols, technical procedures (SOPs) for time testing performed, 68:12
evidence collection forms and logs, 68:8
forms, evidence collection, 68:8
gravimetric determinations, 68:24
handling of evidence, lab records on, 68:10
identification of evidence, lab records on, 68:10
illicit drug production yield, computer estimates, 68:22
information on spectral match library, 68:21
inspection reports, on-site, 68:31
instrumentation available in lab, 68:33
instrument maintenance, 68:19

FORENSIC LAB WORK PRODUCT
QUALITY—Cont’d
Discovery—Cont’d
instrument operation and criteria variables, 68:18
internal audit reports, 68:32
internal reviews of subject data, 68:26
lab records on receipt, handling, identification of evidence, 68:10
logs, evidence collection, 68:8
logs of analyst, 68:16
method validation records, 68:27
on-site inspection reports, 68:31
operation of analytical balances, 68:23
preparation records, samples, 68:15
productivity of lab, 68:34
proficiency test results for analysis, 68:13
qualifications of analysts, 68:30
quality assurance manual, 68:28
raw data, getting, 68:20
receipt of evidence, lab records on, 68:10
records, method validation, 68:27
records of analyst, 68:16
references, run logs for, 68:17
reports, internal audits, 68:32
reports, on-site inspection, 68:31
reviews, accreditation, 68:29
reviews of subject data, internal, 68:26
rinses, run logs for, 68:17
run logs for standards, references, blanks, rinses, and controls, 68:17
sample preparation records, 68:15
spectral match library information, 68:21
standards, run logs for, 68:17
standards and references, traceability documentation, 68:14
FORENSIC LAB WORK PRODUCT
QUALITY—Cont’d
Discovery—Cont’d
subject data, internal reviews, 68:26
subsampling procedures, 68:11
technical procedures (SOPs), documentation, 68:12
traceability documentation (standards and references), 68:14
work load of lab, 68:34
written protocols, documentation, 68:12
Documentation
traceability (standards and references), 68:14
written protocols, technical procedures (SOPs) for time testing performed, 68:12
Evidence collection forms and logs, 68:8
Failures by forensic laboratories, recent, 68:2
Federal government concerns, 68:3
Forms, evidence collection, 68:8
Gravimetric determinations, 68:24
Handling of evidence, lab records on, 68:10
Identification of evidence, lab records on, 68:10
Illicit drug production yield, computer estimates, 68:22
Independent crime laboratories, 68:4
Information on spectral match library, 68:21
Inspection reports, on-site, 68:31
Instrumentation available in lab, 68:33
Instrument maintenance, 68:19
Instrument operation and criteria variables, 68:18
Internal audit reports, 68:32
Internal reviews of subject data, 68:26

FORENSIC LAB WORK PRODUCT
QUALITY—Cont’d
Issues, specific questions for attorneys to consider, 68:7
Lab records on receipt, handling, identification of evidence, 68:10
Lab reports, review by attorneys, 68:5 et seq.
Logs, evidence collection, 68:8
Logs of analyst, 68:16
Method validation records, 68:27
On-site inspection reports, 68:31
Operation of analytical balances, 68:23
Preparation records, samples, 68:15
Productivity of lab, 68:34
Proficiency test results for analysis, 68:13
Qualifications of analysts, 68:30
Quality assurance manual, 68:28
Questions, specific questions for attorneys to consider, 68:7
Raw data, getting, 68:20
Receipt of evidence, lab records on, 68:10
Recent failures by forensic laboratories, 68:2
Records, method validation, 68:27
Records of analyst, 68:16
References, run logs for, 68:17
Reports, internal audits, 68:32
Reports, on-site inspection, 68:31
Reports, review by attorneys, 68:5 et seq.
Review of lab reports by attorneys, 68:5 et seq.
Reviews, accreditation, 68:29
Reviews of subject data, internal, 68:26
Rinses, run logs for, 68:17
Run logs for standards, references, blanks, rinses, and controls, 68:17
Sample preparation records, 68:15
FORENSIC LAB WORK PRODUCT QUALITY—Cont’d
Spectral match library information, 68:21
Standards, run logs for, 68:17
Standards and references, traceability documentation, 68:14
Subject data, internal reviews, 68:26
Subsampling procedures, 68:11
Technical procedures (SOPs), documentation, 68:12
Threshold considerations, 68:6
Traceability documentation (standards and references), 68:14
Willingham arson case (Texas), 68:36
Work load of lab, 68:34
Written protocols, documentation, 68:12

FORENSIC MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:13

FORENSIC SCIENCE
Generally, 1:9
Expert witnesses and admissibility questions, 76:17
Grand Rapids study, 71:48
Retrograde extrapolations, 4:14

FORENSIC SCIENTISTS
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, rally cry to stop following and take lead, 23:24

FORGOTTEN RANGE OF R AND BETA
Widmark in practice, 3:7

FORMATION OF ALCOHOL IN SAMPLE
Deposition of technician, 63:78

FORMS
Evidence submission form, 80:18, 80:32
Forensic lab work product quality, evidence collection, 68:8
Invalid tests, 50:38
Law Office Management and Technology (this index)
Medical report form, 63:13
Police officers arrest form, 80:15, 80:29
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:38, 50:47, 50:61
Re this test sample forms, 61:14
Rights form, App. L
Sequentially numbered report forms, 50:47

FOUR STANDARD SOLUTIONS
Gas Chromatographic Alcohol Test Results (this index)

FPIA (FLUORESCENCE POLARIZATION IMMUNOASSAY)
Definitions, 55:2

FRACTIONS
Facile approach, 43:5

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION STATUTES
Expert witnesses, 80A:29

FREE RADICALS
Definitions, 55:2

FREQUENCY
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:7

FREZZA-LIEBER STUDY
Women (this index)

FRONTAL ATTACK
Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination of, 80:3

FRYE
Expert Witnesses (this index)
INDEX

FRYE HEARING
Alco-Sensor (this index)

FUNCTIONAL SWITCH BOARD ASSEMBLY
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:30

FUNCTION OF EXPERT WITNESS
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:2

FUTURE OF DUI PRACTICE
Generally, 6:1 et seq.
Caseload, 6:7
Constitutional right to trial, 6:9
Defense role, 6:5
Drug Recognition Expert (DRE), 6:19
Economic impact of changes, 6:8
Expanding practice into related fields, 6:17 et seq.
Fees, 6:7
Ignition-interlock devices, 6:3, 6:10 et seq.
Impairment standards, 6:2
New technology, 6:15 to 6:16
Public attitude, 6:4
Raman spectroscopy, 6:14
Referral programs, 6:9
Roadside testing devices, 6:19
Sentencing practices, 6:2
Specialty training and education, 6:6
Trends, 6:3, 6:10 et seq.

FVC1.0 (FORCED EXPIRATORY VOLUME IN ONE SECOND)
Definitions, 55:2

GABA
Definitions, 55:2

GAS CHROMATOGRAPHIC ALCOHOL TEST RESULTS
—Cont’d

Generally, 24:1 et seq.
See also Chromatograms (this index)
Ability to verify results, generally, 24:11

Adequacy of test procedures, 24:11
Attorneys, peak area equation’s usefulness to, 24:1, 24:12
Blood ethanol values, generally, 24:8, 24:10
Comparison of subject’s reported ethanol values with calculated values (Table 3), 24:10
Figures, 24:13
Four standard solutions peak area data (Table 1), 24:6
separately analyzing subject’s blood ethanol (Table 3), 24:8
simplified view of data from (Table 2), 24:7
Internal standards generally, 24:3
see also Four standard solutions, supra
blood ethanol, using four internal standards in turn to separately analyze, 24:8
Lab reports, comparison of subject’s reported ethanol values with calculated values (Table 3), 24:10
Long form equation, sample calculation, 24:9
Peak area equation, generally, 24:4
Peak heights vs. peak areas, 24:2
References, 24:14
Sample calculation, long form equation, 24:9
Simplified peak height equation for initial attorney use, 24:12
Table 1, peak area data, 24:6
Table 2, simplified view from four standard solutions, 24:7
Table 3 comparison of subject’s reported ethanol values with calculated values (Table 3), 24:10
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GAS CHROMATOGRAPHIC ALCOHOL TEST RESULTS — Cont’d
Table 3—Cont’d using four internal standards in turn to separately analyze subject’s blood ethanol, 24:8
Test procedures, 24:5, 24:11
Usefulness to attorneys, generally, 24:1, 24:12
Verifying, generally, 24:10, 24:11
GAS CHROMATOGRAPHY
See also Gas Chromatographic Alcohol Test Results (this index)
Analysis of blood and body fluids, § 18:8, 18:8 to 18:10
Definitions, 55:2
GASTRECTOMY
Definitions, 55:2
GASTRIC ADH PRODUCTION
Women, 5:33
GASTRIC BYPASS
Definitions, 55:2
GASTRIC METABOLISM
Women, 5:14, 5:17, 5:20, 5:32, 5:33
GASTROESOPHAGEAL REFUX DISEASE (GERD)
Definitions, 55:2
GASTROINTESTINAL TRACT
Physiology of consumption, 2:10
Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:32
G.C. Chromatograms (this index)
GENERAL ANESTHETIC
Definitions, 55:2
GENERAL ELECTRIC v. JOINER
Expert witnesses, admissibility of intoxication test evidence, 76:15
GENERAL LOG BOOKS
Depositions, 61:16
GENERIC
Definitions, 55:2
GENES
Definitions, 55:2
GENOTYPE
Definitions, 55:2
(GERD) GASTROESOPHAGEAL REFUX DISEASE
Definitions, 55:2
GESTATIONAL DIABETES
Definitions, 55:2
GLOATING
Cross-examination, 79:21
GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:37
GLP (GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICE)
Definitions, 55:2
GLUCAGON
Definitions, 55:2
GLUCONEOGENESIS
Definitions, 55:2
GLUTAMATE
Definitions, 55:2
GLUTATHIONE (GSH)
Definitions, 55:2
GLYCOGEN
Definitions, 55:2
GLYCOGENESIS
Definitions, 55:2
GLYCOGENOLYSIS
Definitions, 55:2
INDEX

GLYCOLYSIS
Definitions, 55:2

GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICE (GLP)
Definitions, 55:2

GOOD POINTS/BAD POINTS
Law office management and technology, 14:19, 14:43

GOUT
Definitions, 55:2

GOVERNMENT
Expert witnesses, motion to dismiss, 53:22

GOVERNMENT EXPERTS
Compensation, 80A:24, 80A:26

G-PROTEINS
Definitions, 55:2

GRAINS
Facile approach, milligrams to grains, 43:9

GRAMS
Generally, 39:5 to 39:7
Blood alcohol tests, grams per drink, 25:9

GRAND RAPIDS STUDY
Expert witnesses, 71:46 to 71:48

GRAVIMETRIC DETERMINATIONS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:24

GREEN TEST
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)

GSH (GLUTATHIONE)
Definitions, 55:2

GUEST-HOST CASES
At home consumption, basic alcohol calculations, 11:20 to 11:24
GUEST-HOST CASES—Cont’d
Retrograde extrapolation, driver’s condition when alcohol served, 22:4

GUIDELINES FOR TESTS
Depositions, 60:8, 61:23

GUILT AND ASSUMED RATIO
Simulators, 33:8

HALITOSIS
Definitions, 55:2

HALLUCINOGENS
Definitions, 55:2

HANDLING OF SAMPLE
Depositions, 60:9, 62:6, 62:7, 63:15
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:10

HANDS ON EXPERIENCE
Expert witnesses, 80A:5 to 80A:7

HANDWRITTEN LOG SHEET
Depositions, 62:6

HEAD-ON COLLISION
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

HEADSPACE ANALYSIS
Chromatograms, 18:9

HEALTH ISSUE
Alco-Sensor, 54:52

HEALTHY MALES
Generally, 41:11

HEARINGS
Alco-Sensor (this index)
Kelly-Frye hearings. Alco-Sensor (this index)
Law office management and technology, administrative suspension, 14:16
Loss of License Hearing (this index)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEARINGS—Cont'd</td>
<td>Motion to dismiss, 52:2, 53:1, 53:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARSAY RULE</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 71:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEART</td>
<td>Post-mortem alcohol determinations, collection process, 21:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEART BLOOD</td>
<td>Injuries and contamination of heart blood alcohol level, 61:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:42, 64:52, 64:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAVY DRINKERS</td>
<td>Physiological differences, impact of, 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELIOBACTER PYLORI</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMATOCRIT</td>
<td>Breath alcohol tests, 28:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMATOCRIT RATIO</td>
<td>Serum/plasma values against whole blood values, 18:13, 19:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMOLYSIS</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRY'S LAW</td>
<td>Intoxilyzer, 32:1, 32:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulators, 33:2 to 33:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPATIC VEIN</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPATITIS</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEPATOCYTE</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITABILITY</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIDDEN OPINIONS</td>
<td>Discovery, watching for hidden opinions, 65:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH PERFORMANCE LIQUID</td>
<td>CHROMATOGRAPHY (HGLC) Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINDSIGHT</td>
<td>Alco-Sensor, 54:64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRING</td>
<td>Law office management and technology, 14:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTOGRAMS</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>Drinking History (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eating and drinking history, 61:51, 64:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment history of witness, 54:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion based on history from defendant, 53:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-examine defendant’s history, 75:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Techniques for obtaining true drinking history, 13:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLASTALA’S NEW PARADIGM</td>
<td>Generally, 29:1 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deep lung samples, erroneous beliefs regarding, 29:1 et seq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLDEN, WILLIAM</td>
<td>Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMEOSTASIS</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONESTY</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 80A:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONORS</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 72:29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Index-64
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORMONES</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSES</td>
<td>Mistake and error, 53:32, 53:61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSPITAL CLINICAL LABORATORY</td>
<td>Blood alcohol tests, 18:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSPITAL LABORATORIES</td>
<td>Cross-examination of forensic blood alcohol expert, hospital laboratory report, 80:17, 80:31  Plasma (serum) values against whole blood values, 18:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSPITALS</td>
<td>Generally, 40:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>Guest-Host Cases (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING AUTHORITY</td>
<td>Law office management and technology, suspension letters to client from housing authority, 14:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPLC (HIGH PERFORMANCE LIQUID CHROMATOGRAPHY)</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. PYLORI</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNDREDS OF STUDIES GAMBIT</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 71:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROCARBON</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROPHILIC</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROXYL GROUP (-O-H)</td>
<td>Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPERGLYCEMIA</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPERTENSION</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOGLYCEMIA</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOTENSION</td>
<td>Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOTHEtical CASES</td>
<td>Alcohol calculations, 37:18  Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination of, 80:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOTHEtical INSTANT PEAK BAC</td>
<td>Prediction of probable BAC’s or alcohol amounts, initial attempts, 3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOVENTILATION</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOXIA</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF HELPFUL STANDARD</td>
<td>Admissibility of expert testimony, 71:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGNITION-INTERLOCK DEVICES</td>
<td>Design and operating principles, 30:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AND SINGLE TEST RESULTS
— Cont’d
Physiological differences, impact of
— Cont’d
organs
function of, 4:3
normal size, shape, and location of, 4:2
proficiency of organs and structures, 4:3
R values, individual differences reflected in range of, 4:6
second metabolic pathway, 4:4
structures
function of, 4:3
normal size, shape, and location of, 4:2
Post-accident and post-mortem blood alcohol concentrations, 70:47
Proficiency of organs and structures, 4:3
Retrograde extrapolations, 4:14
R values, individual differences reflected in range of, 4:6
Second metabolic pathway, 4:4
Second test, 4:12, 4:13
Single test in criminal and civil practice
generally, 4:7
assumptions to support single BAC test practice, 4:8
figures, 4:15
forensic science, retrograde extrapolations, 4:14
retrograde extrapolations, 4:14
second test, 4:12, 4:13
time, relating one later test to time of incident BAC, 4:9
two inferences, 4:10, 4:11
Structures
function of, 4:3
normal size, shape, and location of, 4:2

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AND SINGLE TEST RESULTS
— Cont’d
Time, relating one later test to time of incident BAC, 4:9
Two inferences, 4:10, 4:11
Women, 5:9

INFERENTIAL WEIGHT OF FACTS
Evaluation of test results by law office, 13:5

INFORMATION
Acquiring, pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:5
Obtaining, pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:18
Sample bottle label, 63:14
Typed request for, 61:11

INFRARED
Generally. See terms beginning: IR
Definitions, 55:3

INFRARED SPECTROPHOTOMETRY
Generally, 31:1 et seq.
Absorption of IR radiation, 31:10
Acetone, 31:12
Acetone screening method, 31:11
Analysis, 31:5
Anti-inflammatory agents, 31:16
Assumptions, 31:11
Asymmetric stretching vibrations, 31:9
Atoms, 31:4
Bond principle, 31:4
Bond stretching, 31:6, 31:8, 31:10, 31:15
Carbon-hydrogen (C-H) bond, 31:8
Carbon-oxygen (C-O) bond, 31:15
Chemical devices, 31:1
INFRARED SPECTROPHOTOMETRY — Cont’d
Chemical glue holding atoms together, 31:4
Cough drop vapor, 31:13
Design and operating principles, 30:9
Energy, 31:6, 31:7
Esters, 31:16
Ethanol measurement, 31:10
Ethanol specificity, 31:15
Ethers, 31:16
False positive values, 31:13
Frequency, 31:7
Hydroxyl group (-O-H), 31:3
Improvements in machinery, 31:14
Interferents, 31:11, 31:12, 31:16
Intoxilyzer (this index)
Ir analysis, 31:8, 31:15
Ir breath tester, 31:12
Ir radiation, 31:6, 31:7, 31:10
Ir technology, 31:2
Kerosene, 31:13
Molecular structure of alcohol, 31:2
Molecules, 31:4, 31:6
Organic solvents, 31:13
Physical methods, 31:1
Solvents, 31:16
Stretching vibrations, 31:9
Symmetric stretching vibrations, 31:9
Unidentified interferents, 31:16
Wavelength, 31:7, 31:9

INHERENT AMBIGUITIES
Expert witnesses, 75:6

INHERENT DEFICIENCIES
Post-mortem alcohol determinations, 21:5

INHERENT FLAWS
Simulator calibrations, 37:7

INHERENT PROBLEMS
Breath alcohol tests, generally, 28:1 et seq.

INHERENT VARIABLES
Expert witnesses, 75:5

INITIAL BLOOD ALCOHOL REPORT
Expert witnesses, 70:20

INITIAL EXAMINATION
Expert witnesses, 71:37

INITIAL INVESTIGATION
Expert witnesses, 70:17

INITIALS
Unlicensed technician, 63:35

INJURIES
Medical examiner, deposition of,
64:9, 64:15 to 64:17, 64:30 to 64:32
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations
(this index)
Technician, deposition of, 61:53

INNOCENCE AND ASSUMED RATIO
Simulators, 33:8

INSPECTION
Calibration and recertification process, 35:2
Discovery, 35:2
Expert witness role, 35:2
Facilities, 21:35
Forensic lab work product quality,
on-site inspection reports, 68:31
Machine, 53:20
Motion to dismiss, 53:24
Per se DUI charge, 35:2
Qualifications of expert witness, 35:2
Right to inspect breath alcohol machines, 35:1, 35:2
Standard of proof, 35:2
Voir dire, 35:2
INDEX

INSTRUCTIONS
Jury instructions regarding expert witness fees, 80A:22
Science and HGN testing, 80C:9, 80C:24
Technician, deposition of, 62:20

INSTRUMENTS AND INSTRUMENTATION
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)

INSULIN
Definitions, 55:3

INTAKE-BAC FINDINGS
Evaluation of test results by law office, 13:25

INTAKE QUESTIONNAIRES
Law office management and technology, 14:18, 14:42

INTEGRITY OF EXPERT
Expert Witnesses (this index)

INTERFERANT DETECT
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:17

INTERFERANT SUBTRACT
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:16

INTERFERENTS
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:11, 31:12, 31:16

INTERFERING SUBSTANCE
Definitions, 55:3

INTER-INDIVIDUAL VARIATION
Definitions, 55:3

INTERNAL AUDIT REPORTS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:32

INTERNAL INJURIES
Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:16, 64:17, 64:32

INTERNAL PRINTER BOARD ASSEMBLY
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:32, 34:33

INTERNAL REVIEWS OF SUBJECT DATA
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:26

INTERNAL STANDARDS
Equipment calibration records, 61:21
Gas Chromatographic Alcohol Test Results (this index)
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:6

INTERPRETATION
Crime and Toxicology Laboratory Report Interpretation (this index)
Post-mortem alcohol sample collection, handling, and reporting, 70B:11
Predictable interpretation, 70:53
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:6
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:34

INTERRUPTIONS
Depositions, 60:18

INTERSTITIAL FLUID
Definitions, 55:3

INTERVENING EVENTS
Post-mortem alcohol determinations, 21:3
Post-mortem alcohol sample collection, handling, and reporting, 70B:9

INTERVIEWS
Discovery, interviews at laboratory visits, 65:23, 65:24
Forensic Analyst, Pre-Trial Interviews (this index)
INTESTINES
Downie Case, consumed alcohol in blood derived from intestines, 44:10

INTOXICATION STANDARDS
Downie Case, 44:19

INTOXILYZER 5000—Cont’d
Introduction, 34:1
Ir (infrared) detector, 34:7
Ir (infrared) light source, 34:2
Microprocessor, 34:22
Optical bench, summary of, 34:9
Parallel input output device (PIO), 34:24
Processor board, 34:10
Processor signal, tracking, 34:10 to 34:29
Random access memory (RAM), 34:26
Real time clock (RTC), 34:25
Rectification, 34:14
Sample and hold, 34:18
Sample chamber, 34:4
Sample chamber lenses, 34:3
6800 and 6801 series intoxilyzers, 34:8
Summary of optical bench, 34:9
System circuit descriptions, 34:30, 34:31
Time
establishing timing and base separation of channels, 34:13
real time clock (RTC), 34:25
Tracking processor signal, 34:10 to 34:29

INTOXILYZER 8000
Generally, 34:34, 38:1 et seq.
Attorneys, suggested questions for trial attorneys, 38:9
Contaminants
diethyl ether, 38:5
dimethylsulfoxide, 38:4
DMSO, 38:4
esters, 38:4
other, 38:7
Contamination, generally, 38:1 et seq.
Diethyl ether, 38:5
Dimethylsulfoxide, 38:4
DMSO, 38:4
INTOXILYZER 8000—Cont’d
Esters, 38:6
Problems with specificity, 38:4
References, 38:10
Specificity, generally, 38:1 et seq.
Suggested questions for trial attorneys, 38:9
Trial attorneys, suggested questions for, 38:9
Uncertainty, 38:8
Use of two measurements, 38:3

INTOXILYZERS
Generally, 32:1 et seq.
See also Intoxilyzer 5000 (this index); Intoxilyzer 8000 (this index)
Absorption, 32:10, 32:11
Arterial-venous differences, 32:11
Assumptions inherent to use, 32:2
Blood against breath values, 32:9
Blood relationship to breath, 32:12
Checklist for infrared testing devices, 32:16
Compounds, generally, 32:5
Concentration of alcohol, determining, 32:4
Deep-lung sample, 32:13
Ethanol, physiological responses to, 32:15
False breath test scores, 32:6
False positives in test results, 32:5
Henry’s Law, 32:1, 32:12
Incomplete fingerprint, 32:7
Infrared spectrophotometry, see lines throughout this group
Intoxilyzer spectrophotograph, 32:3
Lambert-beer Law, 32:4
Non-specificity, 32:7
Operation of device by police officer, 32:14
Physiological responses to ethanol, 32:15
Police officer, 32:14
Pressure sensors, 32:13

INTOXILYZERS—Cont’d
6800 and 6801 series intoxilyzers, 34:8
Slope detectors, 32:13
Specificity, 32:8
Toluene, 32:6
Wavelengths for measurements, 31:9

INTRACELLULAR FLUID
Definitions, 55:3

INTRA-INDIVIDUAL VARIATION
Definitions, 55:3

INTRAVASCULAR
Definitions, 55:3

INVESTIGATION
Law office management and technology, 14:14, 14:41
Post-accident and post-mortem blood alcohol concentrations, 70:17

IN-VITRO
Definitions, 55:3

IN-VIVO
Definitions, 55:3

IN VIVO SAMPLES
Technician, deposition of, 61:50, 61:56

IR (INFRARED) ANALYSIS
Breath alcohol tests, 31:8, 31:15

IR (INFRARED) BREATH TESTER
Breath alcohol tests, 31:12

IR (INFRARED) DETECTOR
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:7

IR (INFRARED) LIGHT SOURCE
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:2

IR (INFRARED) RADIATION
Breath alcohol tests, 31:6, 31:7, 31:10

IR (INFRARED) TECHNOLOGY
Breath alcohol tests, 31:2
| **ISCHEMIA** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **ISO 17025** | Attorney’s guide to ISO 17025 and compliance by laboratories, 57:1 to 57:29 |
| **ISOENZYME** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **ISOTOPES** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **ISOZYME** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **JEJUNUM** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **JOB DESCRIPTIONS** | Law office management and technology, 14:7 |
| **JOURNALS** | NSC-CAOD Source Code Resolution, 30A:9 |
| | Peer review assignment for professional or academic journals, 54:32 |
| | Replicate breath-alcohol testing, journal references, 45:8 |
| **JOYE-LOVETT** | Prediction of probable BAC’s or alcohol amounts, Widmark in practice, 3:12 |
| **JUDGE** | Breath test seminars, 75:3 |
| | Misleading prior experience, 75:2 |
| | Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:14 |
| **JUDICIAL REVIEW** | Appeal and Review (this index) |
| **JURISDICTION** | Alco-Sensor, 54:13 |
| **JURY** | Attorney’s message to, 72:11 |
| | Expert witnesses, 72:4, 72:11, 78:12 et seq. |
| | Leading jurors as opposed to pushing jurors, 78:12 |
| | Qualifications of expert witnesses, 72:4, 72:11 |
| | Science and HGN testing, 80C:3 |
| | Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:32 |
| **JURY INSTRUCTION** | Expert witnesses, fees, 80A:22 |
| **JUSTIFIED ATTACKS** | Expert witnesses, 80A:12 |
| **JUST ONE LAST POINT** | Expert witnesses, 71:40 |
| **KELLY-FRYE HEARING** | Alco-Sensor (this index) |
| | Federal Rules of Evidence (Holding 1), 76:4 |
| **KEROSENE** | Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:13 |
| **KETONE BODIES** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **KETONEMIA** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **KETONURIA** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **KETOSIS** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **KIDNEYS** | Definitions, 55:3 |
| **KILOGRAMS** | Conversion of pounds to kilograms, 39:4 |
INDEX

KINETIC PROPERTIES
Definitions, 55:3

KNOWLEDGE
Alco-Sensor, 54:27
Awareness of test problem areas, 61:45 to 61:47
Cross-examination, knowledge of defendant’s expert, learning to use, 79:13
Expert witnesses
Generally, Expert Witnesses (this index)
Biased, Difficult or Evasive Expert Witnesses (this index)
voir dire, 67:6, 67:13
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:28, 50:34

KNOWLEDGEABLE PROSECUTOR
Motion to dismiss, 52:9

KNOWN BIAS
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:32

KNOWN ETHANOLS
Summary, cross-examination of forensic blood alcohol expert, 80:27, 80:41

KNOWNS
Facile approach, 43:3

KNOWN SOLUTIONS
Equipment calibration records, 61:22

KOPECHNE, MARY JO
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

KUMHO TIRE v. CARMICHAEL
Expert witnesses, admissibility of intoxication test evidence, 76:16

LABELS AND LABELING
Bottle, labeling of, 63:12, 63:14
Discovery, labeling of samples, 65:7, 65:8
Information on sample bottle label, 63:14
Removal of label of blood sample container, 63:76

LABIANCA ARTICLE
Breath alcohol tests, 28:9

LABIANCA’S EQUATION
Percent error, 42:5

LABORATORY
Case evaluation, procedures of testing laboratory, 26:14
Clinical laboratory, 18:5, 18:6
Discovery (this index)
Forensic Laboratory (this index)
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Gas chromatographic alcohol test results, comparison of subject’s reported ethanol values with calculated values (Table 3), 24:10
Medical Examiner (this index)
Site of deposition, 60:17

LACTIC ACID
Definitions, 55:3

LAG
Downie Case, 44:6

LAMBERT-BEER LAW
Intoxilyzer, 32:4

LANGUAGE
Downie Case, language of decision, 44:3 to 44:5, 44:9 to 44:11
Expert witnesses, 71:21 to 71:23
Questionable Statutory Language (this index)
Intoxication Test Evidence

LAW ENFORCEMENT
Alco-Sensor (this index)
Arrest form, cross-examination of forensic blood alcohol expert, 80:15, 80:29
Breath alcohol tests, generally, 1:3, 1:4
Breath test procedures, cross-examination, 79:6
Expert Witnesses (this index)
Intoxilyzer, 32:14
Motion to dismiss, 53:6, 53:15, 53:32, 53:35 to 53:39
Nystagmus testing for alcohol and drugs, 80B:19
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:20, 50:29, 50:35, 50:46
Questionable statutory language, pre-trial appellate review of, 51:8
Science and HGN Testing (this index)
Test population, 41:11

LAW OFFICE MANAGEMENT
AND TECHNOLOGY
Generally, 14:1 to 14:50
Administrative suspension hearing, 14:16
Advice and consent, pleas, 14:22, 14:46
Advising the client
discovery procedures, 14:13
need for a private investigator, 14:14
private investigator, need for, 14:14
Attorney and client, finance, 14:10
Attorney documents, 14:29, 14:33
Attorney’s transition plan, 14:35
Authorization, credit card, 14:39
Business records, attorney documents as, 14:33
Calendars, 14:30
Candidates for employment, use of resumes to screen, 14:3

LAW OFFICE MANAGEMENT
AND TECHNOLOGY—Cont’d
Case disposition, 14:23, 14:47
Case management, 14:21, 14:45
Client, explanation of operation of court system to, 14:17
Client communications, time line letters, 14:12
Client file, 14:11
Client intake questionnaires, 14:18, 14:42
Client notice records, 14:34
Clients, suspension letters to client from housing authority, 14:15
Continuous references, 14:50
Contracts, 14:37
Court locations, 14:32
Court system, explanation of operation to client, 14:17
Creating job descriptions, 14:7
Credit card authorization, 14:39
Discovery procedures, 14:13
Documents, attorney, 14:29, 14:33
Employees
handbooks, 14:9, 14:36
hiring, 14:2
paying new employees, 14:6
qualifying tests for new employees, 14:5
training, 14:8
End of the year project time, 14:31
Expert witnesses, 14:25, 14:49
Explanation of operation of court system to client, 14:17
Family approach, office interviews, 14:4
Files and filing, client file, 14:11
Finance, attorney and client, 14:10
Forms
advice and consent, pleas, 14:46
authorization, credit card, 14:39
case disposition, 14:23, 14:47
case management, 14:45
client intake questionnaire, 14:42
INDEX

LAW OFFICE MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY—Cont’d
Forms—Cont’d
continuous references, 14:50
contract, 14:37
credit card authorization, 14:39
employee handbook, 14:36
expert witness questionnaire, 14:49
good points/bad points, 14:19, 14:43
intake questionnaire, client, 14:42
investigations, 14:41
letters
pretrial, 14:44
time sequence, 14:40
plea advice and consent, 14:22
pleas advice and consent, 14:46
pretrial letter, 14:44
promissory note, 14:38
pros and cons, 14:43
questionnaires
client intake, 14:49
expert witness, 14:49
time sequence letter, 14:40
video analysis, 14:24, 14:48
witnesses, expert witness questionnaire, 14:49
Good points/bad points, 14:19, 14:43
Hearings, administrative suspension, 14:16
Hiring employees, 14:2
Housing authority, suspension letters to client from housing authority, 14:15
Ideas, small law office, 14:27
Intake questionnaires, client, 14:18, 14:42
Investigations, 14:41
Job descriptions, creation, 14:7
Letters
pretrial, 14:20, 14:44
suspension letters to client from housing authority, 14:15

LAW OFFICE MANAGEMENT AND TECHNOLOGY—Cont’d
Letters—Cont’d
continuing references, 14:50
time line letters to clients, 14:12
time sequence, 14:40
Location of court, 14:32
Need for a private investigator, 14:14
New employees
paying, 14:6
qualifying tests, 14:5
Notice, client notice records, 14:34
Office calendars, 14:30
Office interviews, family approach, 14:4
Operation of court system, explanation to client, 14:17
Paying new employees, 14:6
Plea advice and consent, 14:22, 14:46
Pretrial letters, 14:20, 14:44
Private investigator, need for, 14:14
Pro and con, good points/bad points form, 14:19
Project time, end of the year, 14:31
Promissory note, 14:38
Qualifying tests for new employees, 14:5
Questionnaires
client intake, 14:18, 14:42
expert witness, 14:49
witness, 14:26
Records and recording
attorney documents as regular business records, 14:33
client notice records, 14:34
Resumes, use for screening candidates, 14:3
Screening candidates, use of resumes, 14:3
Small firms, employee handbook for, 14:9
Small law office ideas, 14:27
Suspension letters to client from housing authority, 14:15
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Time and date, end of the year project time, 14:31
Time line letters, client communications, 14:12
Time sequence letter, 14:40
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Transition plan, attorney’s, 14:35
Video analysis, 14:24, 14:48
Wages, what to pay new employees, 14:6
Witnesses, expert, 14:25, 14:49
Witness questionnaires, 14:26
LEADING QUESTIONS
Cross-examination, 79:18
LEAN TO FAT DIFFERENCES
Women, 5:17, 5:18, 5:21, 5:22
LEARNED TREATISE
EXCEPTION
Admissibility of expert testimony, 71:9
LEFT SIDE OF HEART
Collection of heart blood, 64:42
LEGAL MEMORANDA
Motion to dismiss, 52:14
LEGAL RELEVANCE
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:14
LETTERS
Law Office Management and Technology (this index)
LETTER TO PROSECUTOR
Expert witnesses, 80A:19, 80A:24
LIBRARY
Depositions, 60:21, 60:22

LICENSES AND LICENSING
Discovery, collection of blood, 65:2
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Loss of License Hearing (this index)

LICT
Definitions, 55:3

LIMITATIONS
Calculations, Limitations of Calculations (this index)
Expert Witnesses (this index)
Loss of License Hearing (this index)
Mathematical and scientific concepts, terms, and measurements, 41:19
Women, threshold limitations of Frezza-Lieber, 5:15

LIMITATIONS OF CALCULATIONS
Generally, 11:17 to 11:19
Average beta, 11:22
Average person, 11:22
Average R, 11:22, 11:23
Beta, average beta, 11:22, 11:23
Calculations, generally, 11:21
Consumed alcohol amounts, generally, 11:17 to 11:24
Estimation of alcohol ingestion, 11:19
Later BAC prediction based on, 11:19
Possibility to estimate, 11:19
Possibility to predict, 11:18
Probable BAC’s, generally, 11:17 to 11:19

LIMIT OF DETECTION (LOD)
Definitions, 55:3

LIMIT OF QUANTITATION (LOQ)
Definitions, 55:3
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Cross-examination of forensic blood alcohol expert, linearity chart for known ethanols, 80:25, 80:39
G.C. results, 20:14
Questions unasked, linearity check, 63:111

LINEAR REGRESSION
Definitions, 55:3

LIPASE
Definitions, 55:3

LIPID PEROXIDATION
Definitions, 55:3

LIPIDS
Definitions, 55:3

LIPOGENESIS
Definitions, 55:3

LISTING BY DOT
Alco-Sensor, 54:28, 54:51

LIST OF FIGURES
Generally, 83:1
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Expert witnesses, 80A:10, 80A:22

LITERATURE
Alco-Sensor (this index)
Articles (this index)
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, disregarding peer-reviewed literature, 23:15
Technician, deposition of, 61:58

LIVE BLOOD SAMPLES
Collection process, 21:13

LIVER
Examination of, 21:17
Physiology of consumption, 2:13
Women, blood paths to liver, 5:29

LOCATION OF COURT
Law office management and technology, 14:32

LOD (LIMIT OF DETECTION)
Definitions, 55:3

LOG BOOKS
Technician, deposition of, 61:16

LOG RECORDS
Green Test, 62:5 to 62:7

LOGS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:8, 68:16

LOG SHEET
Handwritten log sheet, 62:6
Typed log sheet, 62:7

LOGS RECORDS
Kelly-Frye hearing, 54:23

LONG FORM EQUATION
Gas chromatographic alcohol test results, sample calculation, 24:9

LOOKING UP ARTICLES AND DATA
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:23

LOQ (LIMIT OF QUANTITATION)
Definitions, 55:3

LOSS OF LICENSE HEARING
Generally, 50:1 et seq.
Acceptability margin of test results, 50:49
Appeal rights, 50:32
Argument of counsel, generally, 50:54 to 50:60
Arraignment judge, 50:14
Arrest, time interval from arrest to test, 50:18
Blood tests, 50:32, 50:55, 50:71
Burden of proof, 50:54
LOSS OF LICENSE HEARING  
—Cont’d
Certificates  
defects of prima facie certificate, 50:60  
deficiencies in, 50:55 to 50:58  
prima facie sufficiency of, 50:13  
recertification of officer, 50:46  
recertification of testing officer, 50:35  
training, certification of officer training, 50:20  
Changes in laws, generally, 50:62  
Checklist for testimony, 50:44, 50:45  
Comment of final decision, 50:72  
Comment on license restoration decision, 50:67 to 50:70  
Correction of defects of prima facie certificate, 50:60  
Correction of problem by operator, 50:26  
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Decision, 50:66, 50:67, 50:72  
Defects of prima facie certificate, 50:60  
Defense argument, 50:55 to 50:58  
Deliberation of court, 50:64  
Department regulations, valid test results, 50:39  
Driving time, 50:58, 50:68  
Errors, checklist for testimony, 50:45  
Expert witnesses, 50:12, 50:52, 50:70  
Final decision, comment of, 50:72  
Forms, 50:38, 50:47, 50:61  
Hearing, generally, 50:8 et seq.  
Identity of machine, 50:19  
Interpretations, 50:6  
Invalid printouts, records of, 50:48  
Invalid tests, forms, 50:38  
Judge, 50:14  
Knowledge, 50:28, 50:34  
License restoration, 50:60, 50:66, 50:67  
LOSS OF LICENSE HEARING  
—Cont’d
Limitations of breath test, see lines throughout this group  
Malfunctioning of machine, 50:24  
Memorandum of law, 50:65  
Minor intrusion, 50:63  
Observation of 15 minutes, 50:30, 50:31  
Offering of expert testimony, 50:52  
Offer of proof, 50:53  
Officer, 50:20, 50:29, 50:35, 50:46  
Opening discussions generally, 50:9 to 50:18  
arraignment judge, 50:14  
certificate, prima facie sufficiency of, 50:13  
expert witnesses, 50:12  
judge, 50:14  
records of machine, availability at time of hearing, 50:16  
restoration of license, 50:15  
review, statutory limitation of review, 50:10  
showing, sufficiency of prima facie showing, 50:12  
statutory limitation of review, 50:10  
statutory science upside down, 50:11  
upside down, statutory science upside down, 50:11  
Operator of breath test, testimony of, 50:28  
generally, 50:17 to 50:34  
appeal rights, 50:32  
arrest, time interval from arrest to test, 50:18  
blood tests, 50:32  
certificate, 50:28  
certification of officer training, 50:20  
correction of problem by operator, 50:26  
identity of machine, 50:19
INTOXICATION TEST EVIDENCE

LOST PAPER TAPE
Motion to dismiss, 53:17

LOW BUT CORRECT
Simulators, 33:1

MACHINES
Devices and Equipment (this index)

MACK CASE
Medical examiner, 21:34
Technician, deposition of, 63:2 to 63:4, 63:28 to 63:30, 63:88

MACRONUTRIENTS
Definitions, 55:4

MAGIC 02
Technician, deposition of, 61:57

MAGIC 0.02 APPROACH
Generally, 11:16

MAIL
Discovery, mailing blood ethanol samples, 65:5, 65:12

MAINTENANCE OF DEVICES AND EQUIPMENT
Repair and Maintenance (this index)

MALE AVERAGE R
Prediction of probable BAC’s or alcohol amounts, 3:6, 3:10

MALE- FEMALE DIFFERENCES
Generally, 5:28

MALES
Healthy males, 41:11
Heavily intoxicated, 70:46

MALFUNCTIONING OF MACHINE
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:24

MALNUTRITION
Definitions, 55:4

MANUAL COMPUTATION
Unknown ethanol peaks, 63:84

MANUAL ENTRY
Chromatograms, 62:11

MANUALS
Expert witnesses, 75:6
Performance of tests, 61:23

MANUFACTURERS
Breath alcohol tests, 44:20

MARGIN OF ERROR
Breath alcohol tests, 28:6

MASKED (BLIND) SAMPLE
Definitions, 55:1

MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL LAWS, CHAPTER 90, SECTION 24 ET SEQ.
(The New Safe Roads Act), App. F

MASS SPECTROMETRY (MS)
Definitions, 55:4

MASTER’S DEGREE
Alco-Sensor, 54:15

MATA v. STATE
Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)

MATH
Alcohol test extrapolations. Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)
Client’s credibility protected with math analysis, 11:24

Office Evaluations of Test Results (this index)

MATHEMATICAL AND OTHER FALLACIES IN ALCOHOL TEST EXTRAPOLATIONS
Generally, 23:1 et seq.
MATHEMATICAL AND OTHER FALLACIES IN ALCOHOL TEST EXTRAPOLATIONS
—Cont’d
Admissibility, local experts learn to talk the talk, 23:3 et seq.
Arbitrary assumptions, 23:8
Arbitrary dismissal by witness of facts which do not conform to opinions offered, 23:14
Assumptions and factors ignored or evaded, 23:4, 23:5
Average data values, unacceptable use of, 23:18
Avoidance of key issues by use of admissibility language, 23:4, 23:5
Bac in real cases, 23:17 et seq.
Bac prediction percentage based on range of r values instead of just average, 23:19
Calculations of blood alcohol and predictability, shooting at an ever-moving target, 23:13
Controlled laboratory studies, individual differences and spiking phenomenon, 23:16
Easy but wrong methodology, 23:11
Erroneous retrograde extrapolation opinions, acceptance by courts, generally, 23:2
Explanation as to why erroneous retrograde extrapolation opinions accepted by courts, 23:2
Figures, 23:25
Flawed protocol, generally, 23:7
Forensic scientists, rally cry to stop following and take lead, 23:24
Formation of retrograde opinions, complicating scenario further complicates, 23:12
Individual differences, 23:16 et seq.
Mata v. State. See entries throughout this topic

MATHEMATICAL AND OTHER FALLACIES IN ALCOHOL TEST EXTRAPOLATIONS
—Cont’d
Methodology, flawed and unscientific, 23:11
Peer-reviewed literature, disregard of, 23:15
Predictability, calculations of blood alcohol and predictability—shooting at an ever-moving target, 23:13
Predicting % BAC using range of r values instead of just average, 23:19
Retrograde mathematical extrapolation opinions, generally, 23:1 et seq.
Sample calculation, first demonstration of importance of individual differences, 23:20
Scientific methods and standards, failure to apply, generally, 23:11, 23:14
Selected factors, use of a few, 23:9
Simplest scenario, 23:10
Spiking phenomenon, controlled laboratory studies, 23:16
Trial bar’s burden to demonstrate effectively inadequacies of retrograde extrapolation opinions, 23:6
Typical retrograde extrapolation, generally, 23:8 et seq.
Uniformity, unsupported assumptions, 23:17 et seq.
Victimization by typical retrograde extrapolations, generally, 23:23
Watkins and Adler study, 23:22
Widmark-Osterlind range of r and β in practice, 23:21

MATHEMATICAL CONCEPTS
Blood alcohol tests, 25:7, 25:8

MATRIX
Definitions, 55:4
MATRIX EFFECTS
Definitions, 55:4

MCV (MEAN CORPUSCULAR VOLUME)
Definitions, 55:4

MEAN CORPUSCULAR VOLUME (MCV)
Definitions, 55:4

MEASUREMENT UNCERTAINTY
Uncertainty in Forensic Breath Alcohol Testing (this index)

MEDIA
Coroners and medical examiners, 21:32
Expert witnesses, 80A:16

MEDIAN
Definitions, 55:4

MEDICAL CONDITIONS
Nystagmus testing for alcohol and drugs, 80B:5

MEDICAL EXAMINER—Cont’d
Delivery of sample to lab, 64:24
Depositions, generally, 64:1 et seq.
Determinations, generally, 21:20 to 21:35
Determinations. Post-Mortem Alcohol Determinations (this index)
Diagnosis, 64:17
Direct examination, generally, 64:1 to 64:43
Drinking history, 64:27
Driver, opinion regarding sobriety of, 64:26
Eating history, 64:27
Embalming, obtaining heart blood sample before, 64:53
Environmental circumstances, facilities and budget, 21:30
Equipment used in sample collection, 64:21
Experience, 64:48 to 64:51
Expertise, 21:27
Facilities and budget
generally, 21:28 to 21:35
environmental circumstances, 21:30
inspection of facilities, 21:35
laboratory budget, space, and personnel, 21:29
Los Angeles County, generally, 21:33
Mack Case, 21:34
media, 21:32
qualifications of blood collectors, 21:31
Femoral blood, 64:40
Forensic interest, generally, 21:25
Forensic specialists, generally, 21:20
Green Case, 64:1
Heart blood sample, 64:42, 64:52, 64:53
History, eating and drinking history, 64:27
Holden, William, example, 70:44
MEDICAL EXAMINER—Cont’d
Injuries, 64:9, 64:15 to 64:17, 64:30 to 64:32
Inspection of facilities, facilities and budget, 21:35
Internal bleeding, 64:34
Internal injuries, 64:16, 64:17, 64:32
Laboratory budget, space, and personnel, 21:29
Left side of heart, collection of heart blood, 64:42
Loss of blood, 64:34
Mack Case, facilities and budget, 21:34
Media, facilities and budget, 21:32
Medical training, 64:56
Neo-formation of alcohol, 64:41
New medical examiner, 21:25
Normal blood sample, 64:49
Notebook, record kept in, 64:51
Notes of doctor generally, 64:5, 64:7 to 64:13
blood alcohol result, 64:11
cause of death, 64:10
diagnosis, 64:10
injuries, physical examination, 64:9
physical examination, 64:9
time, when notes made, 64:12
time between death and blood sample collection, 64:8
Notice, compliance with, 64:14
Office of coroner, 21:21, 21:22
Opinion regarding sobriety, 64:26, 64:54
Pathologist, 64:46, 64:47
Physician medical examiners, 21:24
Post-Mortem Alcohol Determinations (this index)
Post-Mortem Alcohol Sample Collection, Handling, and Reporting (this index), 70B:7
Production of documents, 64:3 to 64:6

MEDICAL EXAMINER—Cont’d
Qualifications of blood collectors, facilities and budget, 21:31
Qualifications of medical examiner, 64:2
Recollection of collection problems, 64:50
Record kept in notebook, 64:51
Redirect examination, 64:55, 64:56
Reports and reporting, 64:25, 64:27
Ribs fractured, 64:16
Site of sample collection, 64:20, 64:39, 64:40
Sobriety, opinion regarding, 64:26, 64:54
Statutes, 21:22
Steering wheel impacts, injuries from, 64:31, 64:32
Stomach contents, 64:30
Sugars elevated, 64:41
Surface injuries, 64:32
Time, 64:18, 64:33
Training, medical training, 64:56
Untrained specialists, 21:23

MEDICAL MATH
Frezza-Lieber, 5:10

MEDICAL PROBLEMS
Motion to dismiss, 53:12

MEDICAL REPORTS
Generally, 40:3
Forms, 63:13

MEDICAL TRAINING
Deposition of medical examiner, 64:56

MEDICAL TREATMENT OF DRIVER, CHECKLIST
Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:34

MEDICATIONS
Motion to dismiss, 53:56
MELLANBY EFFECT
Definitions, 55:4

MEMORANDA
Expert witnesses, 71:17
Legal memoranda, 52:14

MEMORANDUM OF LAW
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:65

MEMORY LAPSE
Expert witnesses, 71:32

MENTAL ACUITY
Motion to dismiss, 52:11

MENTOR
Expert witnesses, 72:25

MEOS (MICROSOMAL ETHANOL OXIDIZING SYSTEM)
Definitions, 55:4

META-ANALYSIS
Definitions, 55:4

METABOLIC ACIDOSIS
Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:24

METABOLIC PATHWAYS
Physiological differences, impact of, 4:4

METABOLISM
Blood alcohol tests, 25:21
Definitions, 55:4
Women, 5:28

METABOLITE
Definitions, 55:4

METHODOLOGY
Frezza-Lieber study, 5:7
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, 23:11

METHOD VALIDATION RECORDS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:27

METHYL ALCOHOL
Measure of alcohol in blood, 18:7

METROLOGY
Definitions, 55:4

MICRONUTRIENTS
Definitions, 55:4

MICROPROCESSOR
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:22

MICROSOMAL ENZYMES
Definitions, 55:4

MICROSOMAL ETHANOL OXIDIZING SYSTEM (MEOS)
Definitions, 55:4

MICROSOMES
Definitions, 55:4

MICROVILLI
Definitions, 55:4

MILLIGRAMS TO GRAINS
Facile approach, 43:9

MILLIMOLS/LITER
Generally, 39:8

MINOR INTRUSION
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:63

MISLEADING PRIOR EXPERIENCE
Cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:1

MISSING DRINKING TIME
Cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:26

MISSING INFORMATION
Request for, 62:10
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MISSTATEMENTS AND MISCONCEPTIONS
Downie Case, 44:2

MISTAKE AND ERROR
Blood alcohol reports, 18:12, 70:20
Checklist for testimony, 50:45
Code, error code, 53:19
Depositions, 60:6, 61:40, 61:41
Discovery (this index)
Error defined, 55:2
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Hoses, 53:32, 53:61
Margin of error, 28:6
Omissions (this index)
Percent Error (this index)
Physiological errors, 44:9 to 44:11
Retrograde extrapolation, erroneous retrograde extrapolations in courtroom, 22:5
Simulator improperly hooked up, 53:76
Uncertainty in Forensic Breath Alcohol Testing (this index)

MITOCHONDRIA
Definitions, 55:4

MOLE
Generally, 40:11
Equivalents, 41:14
Reduction, 41:17
Unit, 40:12

MOLECULAR STRUCTURE OF ALCOHOL
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:2

MOLECULES
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:4, 31:6

MONITORING
Blind monitoring of lab’s works and results, 60:11

MONITORING—Cont’d
Outside monitoring of lab’s works and results, 60:10
Performance of technician or lab, 61:42 to 61:44
State, monitoring of lab by, 63:109

MOST PROBABLE ALCOHOL INTAKE
Evaluation of test results by law office, 13:22

MOTION TO COMPEL OR LIMIT FEE INFORMATION
Expert witnesses, 80A:20

MOTION TO DISMISS
Generally, 52:1 to 53:92
Aborted tests, 53:10, 53:41
Acceptability range, 53:63, 53:64
Accuracy of breath alcohol tests, 53:47
Acetone, 53:21, 53:68, 53:82
Affidavits, 52:14
Arresting officer’s testimony generally, 53:35 to 53:39
giving test, 53:39
machine problems, 53:38
observation of test by officer, 53:36
paper tape generation, 53:37
reading, 53:37
Assisted test officer, 53:15
Basic Alcohol Concentration (BAC) actual, 53:46
driving lower, 53:49
meaning of 0.09 to defendant, 53:14
rising BAC opinion, 53:52
test, 53:46, 53:49
text distinguished from driving, 53:62
Basis for opinion, cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 53:53
Beverage consumed by defendant, 53:55
MOTION TO DISMISS—Cont’d
Certification of test machine, 53:79, 53:81
Closing arguments, 53:87, 53:88
Collateral medical problems, 53:12
Comments on final decision ordering dismissal, 53:90
Confidence limits of breath testers, 53:54
Conviction, impairment proof, 53:91
Copy of aborted test, 53:10
Credentials of expert, 53:69
Cross-examination of defendant’s expert generally, 53:50 to 53:61
alcohol use, affected by, 53:57
BAC, rising BAC opinion, 53:52
basis for opinion, 53:53
beverage consumed by defendant, 53:55
blood test, 53:53
confidence limits of breath testers, 53:54
drink consumption, 53:58
exculpatory evidence, 53:53
food consumed by defendant, 53:55
history, opinion based on history from defendant, 53:51
hoses connected wrong, 53:61
medications, 53:56
mistake and error, hoses connected wrong, 53:61
opinion based on history from defendant, 53:51
reliability of machines, 53:59
simulator results, 53:60
Defendant’s, generally, 53:16 to 53:25

MOTION TO DISMISS—Cont’d
Defendant’s direct testimony generally, 53:3 to 53:11
aborted test, copy of, 53:10
blood test, right to, 53:4
copy of aborted test, 53:10
observation, time observed before second test sequence, 53:7
opinion, defendant’s influence opinion, 53:11
right to blood test, 53:4
second test sequence, 53:7 to 53:9
time observed before second test sequence, 53:7
warnings, 53:4
Defendant’s test observations, 53:13
Demand for production of machine, 53:42
Demonstration of machine operation, 53:86
Devices and equipment, 53:25, 53:38, 53:73, 53:78
Documents, 53:27, 53:29, 53:33
Drink consumption, 53:58
Driving BACs, 53:62
Due process, impairment proof, 53:91
Elected capabilities of machine, 53:83
Error code, 53:19
Exculpatory Evidence (this index)
acetone check of machines, 53:21
calibration of test machine, 53:25
cross-examination of defendant’s expert, supra
defendant’s, generally, 53:16 to 53:25
error code, 53:19
exculpatory evidence lost, 53:17
government’s check on machine performance, 53:22
MOTION TO DISMISS—Cont’d
Second day
generally, 53:40 to 53:49
aborted test results, 53:41
BAC, actual, 53:46
BAC, driving lower, 53:49
BAC, test, 53:46, 53:49
blood test, 53:45, 53:47
breath tester, 53:47
computer chip, 53:43, 53:48
demand for production of machine, 53:42
direct of defendant’s expert, 53:44
exculpatory evidence, 53:41, 53:45
expert testimony, 53:43, 53:44
opening discussion, 53:40
production of machine, demand for, 53:42
Second test sequence, 53:7 to 53:9
Self-diagnostic capability of machine, 53:23
Simulator, 53:60, 53:63, 53:76 to 53:78
Sobriety, 52:11
Software for acetone identification and reporting, 53:82
Start of test procedures, 53:5
State, 53:65, 53:73
Subject breath tests, 53:64
Suppression of evidence, 52:6 to 52:8
Testing of machines, 53:74, 53:76
Text BACs, 53:62
Third parties, access to computer program chip, 53:31
Time observed, 52:6, 52:7
Upkeep of machine by Department, 53:80
Warnings, 52:4, 53:4
Witnesses. Expert witnesses, supra

MOTIVATION
Alco-Sensor, 54:42, 54:46
Court’s comment on witness’ motivation, 54:46

MOTORCYCLE ACCIDENTS
Post-accident and post-mortem blood alcohol concentrations, 70:12 to 70:15

MOTOR FUNCTION
Definitions, 55:4

MS (MASS SPECTROMETRY)
Definitions, 55:4

MULTIPLE REPORTS
Expert witnesses, 71:25

MULTIPLE SAMPLE TESTING
Post-mortem alcohol sample collection, handling, and reporting, 70B:3

MULTIPLICATION OF EXPERTS
Expert witnesses, inadequacy of Frye for long-run resolution of admissibility questions, 76:2

NAD (NICOTINAMIDE ADENINE DINUCLEOTIDE)
Definitions, 55:4

NAKED NUMBERS
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:14

NAMES
Authors, 74:13

NANOMOLES/LITER
Generally, 39:9, 39:10

NAS REPORT ON MEASUREMENT OF UNCERTAINTIES
Erroneous assumptions regarding deep lung samples, 29:1 et seq.
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:30

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORT ON MEASUREMENT OF UNCERTAINTIES
Erroneous assumptions regarding deep lung samples, 29:1 et seq.
NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORT ON MEASUREMENT OF UNCERTAINTIES—Cont’d
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:30

NECROSIS
Definitions, 55:4

NEGLECT
Benign neglect, 71:3
Expert witnesses, 73:9, 73:10

NEO-FORMATION OF ALCOHOL
Medical examiner, deposition of,
64:41
Post-accident and post-mortem blood alcohol concentrations, 70:44

NEURON
Definitions, 55:4

NEUROTRANSMITTER
Definitions, 55:4

NEW ARTICLES
Expert witnesses, 74:17

NEW BREATH TEST REGULATIONS OF OFFICE OF ALCOHOL TESTING
Generally, App. G

NEW EMPLOYEES
Law office management and technology, 14:5, 14:6

NEW INFORMATION OR FACTS
Definition of terms, 78:6, 78:12
Expert witnesses, 71:36, 73:8, 78:6, 78:12

NICE GUY CROSS-EXAMINER
Expert witnesses, 71:39

NICOTINAMIDE ADENINE DINUCLETIDE (NAD)
Definitions, 55:4

NICOTINAMIDE ADENINE NUCLEOTIDE
Blood alcohol tests, 18:11

NMDA
Definitions, 55:4

NON-ALCOHOL PUBLICATIONS
Expert witnesses, qualifications, 72:31

NON-ALCOHOL RELATED PUBLICATIONS
Expert witnesses, qualifications, 72:32

NONEXCLUSIVE DISCIPLINE
Expert witnesses, 80A:11

NON-OPINION OPINION
Expert witnesses, 71:41

NON-SPECIFICITY
Intoxilyzer, 32:7

NORMAL
Physiological differences, impact of, 4:1

NORMAL BLOOD SAMPLE
Depositions, 61:56, 64:49

NORMAL POPULATION
Women, 5:26

NOTATIONS
Blood alcohol tests, 19:1, 19:2
Discovery, notations on condition of containers and samples upon arrival, 65:10

NOTES
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:17, 74:18
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Medical Examiner (this index)
Original notes and findings, opinion supported by, 71:33
NOTES—Cont’d
Physiology of consumption, testimony supported by prior autopsy notes and records, 2:11 to 2:13
Review of notes on articles on device, 74:18

NOTICES
Expert witnesses, 80A:24
Law office management and technology, client notice records, 14:34
Production of documents, 61:3

N-PROPANOL USE AS SOURCE OF ERROR
Post-mortem alcohol sample collection, handling, and reporting, 70B:21

NSC-CAOD SOURCE CODE RESOLUTION
Generally, 30A:1 et seq.
Conclusion, 30A:11
Contradictions, 30A:4
Creation, 30A:3
Good science, 30A:5
IACT’s Source Code Resolution, 30A:8
Journal of Analytical Toxicology, 30A:9
Legal misrepresentations, 30A:6
Misconduct, 30A:2
Prosecutorial misuse, 30A:10
Recent developments, 30A:12

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
Breath alcohol tests, 28:13

NYSTAGMUS TESTING FOR ALCOHOL AND DRUGS
—Cont’d
Correlation of HGN test to impairment and BAC concentration, 8B:13, 80B:12
Definitions, 55:4, 80B:2
Drug recognition evaluation test, 80B:24
Equipment, 80B:8
HGN 82-second timing rule, 80B:11
History of development of test, 80B:9
Medical conditions, 80B:5
Police testing, 80B:19
Procedures, 80B:10, 80B:23
Purpose for which testing may be admitted, 80B:24
Qualifications for administering testing, 80B:24
Reliability, 80B:22
Scientific and medical studies, 80B:18
Tharp’s equation, 80B:15
Types and forms of nystagmus, 80B:4
Uneven scoring, 80B:14
Vertical gaze nystagmus, generally, 80B:16
Visual system, generally, 80B:3

OBESITY
Definitions, 55:4

OBJECTIONS
Preservation of record, 54:10

OBJECTIVES
Depositions, 60:3

OBJECTIVITY
Expert witnesses, 71:27, 75:12

OBSERVATION
Defendant’s test observations, 53:13
Police officer, observation of test by, 53:36
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OBSERVATION—Cont’d
Simulators, 33:7
Time observed, 50:30, 50:31, 53:6, 53:7

OCCUPATION OF EXPERT
Motion to dismiss, 53:69
Voir dire, 67:12

OFFERING OF EXPERT TESTIMONY
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:52

OFFER OF PROOF
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:53

OFFICE CALENDARS
Law office management and technology, 14:30

OFFICE EVALUATIONS OF TEST RESULTS
Generally, 13:1 et seq.
Absorption, 13:15, 13:16
Adjustments, increasing test value to adjust for elimination, 13:21
Alcoholic defendant, 13:7
Alcohol intake, 13:22, 13:23
Answers, 13:11
Assumptions, 13:10
Bac continuum, 13:14
Checklist of overlooked questions, 13:12
Constants, numerical constants as high, 13:27
Conversion, converting fluid ounces to drinks, 13:24
Data needed, 13:4, 13:5
Defendant as alcoholic, 13:7
Drinking history, 13:8
Drinks, converting fluid ounces to drinks, 13:24
Elimination, increasing test value to adjust for, 13:21
Empty stomach absorption, 13:16

OFFICE EVALUATIONS OF TEST RESULTS—Cont’d
Equations, generally, 13:19 to 13:23
Evasive answers, 13:11
False assumptions, 13:10
Figures, 13:28
Fluid ounces, converting to drinks, 13:24
High numerical constants, 13:27
High R factors, 13:27
History, techniques for obtaining true drinking history, 13:8
Identification of problem drinker, 13:6
Individual absorption rates, 13:15
Inferential weight of facts, 13:5
Intake-BAC findings incorporated into overall evaluation, 13:25
Math, generally, 13:13, 13:14
Most probable alcohol intake, 13:22
Numerical constants as high, 13:27
Ounces, converting fluid ounces to drinks, 13:24
Overall evaluation, 13:25
Overlooked questions, 13:12
Probability, most probable alcohol intake, 13:22
Problem drinker, identification of, 13:6
Questions, 13:12
Range of alcohol intake, 13:23
Rate of absorption, 13:15
Reported intake, 13:19
R factors as high, 13:27
Severity of intoxication symptoms, 13:18
Stomach, empty stomach absorption, 13:16
Symptoms, severity of, 13:18
System, fate of alcohol in, 13:17
Test results, comparing to reported intake, 13:19
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Test value, increasing test value to adjust for elimination, 13:21
Triability, 13:4, 13:5
Trial strategy, 13:7
Understanding by client, 13:10
Weight, inferential weight of facts, 13:5

OFFICE INTERVIEWS
Law office management and technology, 14:4

OFFICERS
Law Enforcement (this index)

OFFICIAL I.D.
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:5

OFFICIAL TITLES
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:12

OMISSIONS
Cross-examination, personal attacks backfire when closing arguments emphasize, 79:11
Discovery (this index)
Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination of, 80:12
Report omissions, 52:11

0.10% SOLUTION
Simulators, 37:6

ONE-SIDED REPORT
Motion to dismiss, 52:5

ONE TEST RUN
Depositions, 61:39, 61:43

ON SITE DEPOSITIONS
Generally, 60:19

ON-SITE INSPECTION REPORTS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:31

OPENING DISCUSSIONS
Loss of License Hearing (this index)
Motion to dismiss, 53:2, 53:40

OPENINGS
Cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:7, 75:9
Expert witnesses, comments to jury, 80A:25

OPEN-MINDED INQUIRY
Expert witnesses, 71:37

OPERATING UNDER THE INFLUENCE CASE (OUI)
Expert Witnesses (this index)

OPERATION OF ANALYTICAL BALANCES
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:23

OPERATION OF COURT SYSTEM
Law office management and technology, explanation to client, 14:17

OPERATOR OF BREATH TEST, TESTIMONY OF
Loss of License Hearing (this index)

OPINION EVIDENCE
Expert Testimony (this index)

OPTICAL BENCH
Intoxilyzer 5000, summary of optical bench, 34:9

ORDER OF COURT
Comments on final decision ordering dismissal, 53:90
Depositions, view of lab, 60:20
Production of documents, 61:3

ORDINAL SCALE
Definitions, 55:4

ORGANIC SOLVENTS
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:13
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<td>65:20</td>
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<td>Generally,</td>
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<td>Definitions,</td>
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<td>OSTLUND HDL STUDY</td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Women,</td>
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<td>OUI CASE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Witnesses (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUNCES</td>
<td>39:6</td>
<td>Beverage ounces,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Converting fluid ounces to drinks,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:24</td>
<td>Fluid ounces,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTLIER</td>
<td>55:4</td>
<td>Definitions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE LIBRARY</td>
<td>60:22</td>
<td>Depositions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE MONITORING</td>
<td>60:10</td>
<td>Depositions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE TESTING</td>
<td>53:71</td>
<td>Motion to dismiss,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERLOOKED QUESTIONS AND ISSUES</td>
<td>78:11</td>
<td>Checklist to prompt witness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:12</td>
<td>Evaluation of test results by law office,</td>
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<td>73:9, 73:10, 78:11</td>
<td>Expert witnesses,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERSIGHT OF TEST</td>
<td>63:91</td>
<td>Depositions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERSIMPLIFICATION</td>
<td>70:10, 70:27, 75:4</td>
<td>Expert witnesses,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prediction of probable BAC’s or alcohol amounts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXIDATION</td>
<td>55:4</td>
<td>Definitions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41:15</td>
<td>Reduction/oxidation reaction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC (PLASMA ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION)</td>
<td>19:1, 19:7</td>
<td>Generally,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANCREAS</td>
<td>55:4</td>
<td>Definitions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANCREATITIS</td>
<td>55:4</td>
<td>Definitions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPER RECORD</td>
<td>60:6</td>
<td>Depositions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPER TAPE</td>
<td>53:17, 53:18, 53:30, 53:37</td>
<td>Motion to dismiss,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPERWORK</td>
<td>63:39</td>
<td>Depositions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARALLEL INPUT OUTPUT DEVICE (PIO)</td>
<td>34:24</td>
<td>Intoxilyzer 5000,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART-TIME MEDICAL EXAMINER</td>
<td>70:32</td>
<td>Chappaquiddick Incident,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHOLOGIST</td>
<td>64:46, 64:47</td>
<td>Depositions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHOLOGIST-MEDICAL EXAMINER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holden, William, example,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHOLOGY</td>
<td>55:4</td>
<td>Definitions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYING NEW EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Law office management and technology,</td>
</tr>
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PAYMENT FOR SERVICES OF WITNESS
Alco-Sensor, 54:41

PEAK AREA EQUATION
Gas Chromatographic Alcohol Test Results (this index)

PEAK BAC
Chromatograms (this index)
Comparison of peak heights.
Chromatograms (this index)
Cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:18, 75:20
Depositions, 63:52
Questionable statutory language, pre-trial appellate review of, 51:6
Retrograde Extrapolation (this index)
Women, peak bac values reached by subjects, 5:11

PEAK HEIGHTS VS. PEAK AREAS
Gas chromatographic alcohol test results, 24:2

PEER JOURNALS
Expert witnesses, 72:33
Retrograde Extrapolation (this index)

PEER REVIEW
Alco-Sensor, 54:32
Definitions, 55:4
Expert witnesses, 72:34, 80A:8
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, disregard of literature, 23:15
Retrograde Extrapolation (this index)

PEPTIDE
Definitions, 55:4

PERCENTAGE PROBABILITY OPINION
Expert witnesses, 71:42

PERCENT ERROR
Generally, 42:1 et seq.
Blood-to-breath alcohol ratios, 42:2
Brac, 42:6
Calculations, generally, 42:4
Deduction, 28:4, 42:5
Direct reporting of breath alcohol, 42:6
Dubowski’s analysis, see lines throughout this index topic
Labianca’s equation, 42:5
Post-Serrano modification by Dubowski, 42:7
Pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:11
Ratios, Dubowski’s blood-to-breath alcohol ratios, 42:2
Reporting of breath test results, 42:3
Safety factor, 42:1, 42:5
Subtraction factor, Dubowski’s 0.025, 42:1 et seq.

PERFORMANCE OF EQUIPMENT
Alco-Sensor, 54:27, 54:54
Checks, motion to dismiss, 53:84
Daily performance of G. C. checked by technician, 63:46
Monitoring technician’s or lab’s performance, 61:42 to 61:44
Motion to dismiss, 53:25

PERIPHERAL NERVOUS SYSTEM (PNS)
Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:11

PERMANENT RECORDS
Depositions, questions unasked, 63:106
Discovery, permanent retention of original label, 65:8

PEROXISOME
Definitions, 55:4

PER SE ALCOHOL LIMITS
Definitions, 55:4
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PER SE LAWS AND VIOLATIONS
  Breath alcohol tests, 28:8
  Expert witnesses, 71:16
  Inspection, 35:2
  Loss of License Hearing (this index)
  Motion to dismiss, 53:91

PERSONAL ATTACKS
  Cross-examination, 79:10, 79:11, 79:13

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE
  Expert witnesses, 72:28

PERSONAL INJURIES
  Injuries (this index)

PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE
  Alco-Sensor, 54:27

PERSONAL NOTES AND RECORDS
  Depositions, 62:4

PERSONAL SIDE OF WITNESS
  Expert witnesses, 72:21

PERSONAL WORK
  Alco-Sensor, 54:60
  Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:9, 74:21, 74:26, 74:27

PERSONNEL
  Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)

PHARMACODYNAMICS
  Definitions, 55:4

PHARMACOGENETICS
  Definitions, 55:4

PHARMACOKINETICS
  Definitions, 55:4

PHARMACOLOGY OF ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION
  Definitions, 55:1 to 55:6

PHASE II REACTIONS
  Definitions, 55:4

PHASE I REACTIONS
  Definitions, 55:4

PHENOTYPE
  Definitions, 55:4

PHOSPHATIDYLETHANOL
  Definitions, 55:4

PHYSICAL DEPENDENCE
  Definitions, 55:4

PHYSICAL EXAMINATION
  Depositions, doctor’s notes, 64:9

PHYSICAL METHODS
  Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:1

PHYSICIAN
  Expert Witnesses (this index)
  Medical Examiner (this index)

PHYSIOLOGY
  Case evaluation, 26:2, 26:3
  Consumption. Physiology of Alcohol Consumption (this index)
  Downie Case, 44:9 to 44:11
  Individual Differences and single Test Results (this index)
  Intoxilyzer, 32:15
  Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:9 et seq.
  Simulators, physiological variables, 37:15

PHYSIOLOGY OF ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION
  Generally, 2:1 et seq.
  Absorption and elimination of alcohol in human system generally, 2:1 to 2:5
  empty stomach absorption, 2:4
  food delays absorption, 2:5
  small intestine, 2:3
  stomach, 2:2
PHYSIOLOGY OF ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION—Cont’d

Autopsy, testimony supported by prior autopsy notes and records, 2:11 to 2:13

Basic alcohol calculations (BAC) generally, 2:6 to 2:10

food effect of BAC curves, 2:9

Gastrointestinal tract, importance of careful notation of, 2:10

possibilities, 2:8
typical curves, 2:6

unpredictability, 2:8

water content of structures, 2:7

Cross-examination, 79:3
Definitions, 55:1 to 55:6

Delay, 2:5, 2:12
Elimination, 2:13

Empty stomach absorption, 2:4

Food, 2:5, 2:9

Gastrointestinal tract, importance of careful notation of, 2:10

Liver, 2:13

Notes, 2:11 to 2:13

Records, 2:11 to 2:13

Small intestine, 2:3

Stomach, 2:2, 2:4

Unpredictability, 2:8

Water content of structures, 2:7

PLACEBO
Definitions, 55:4

PLASMA
Blood Alcohol Tests (this index)
Definitions, 55:4

PLAY IN BREATH TEST VALUE REPORTED
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:33

PLEA ADVICE AND CONSENT
Law office management and technology, 14:22, 14:46

POLICE OFFICERS
Law Enforcement (this index)

POLYCYTHEMIA
Definitions, 55:4

POLYMORPHISM
Definitions, 55:4

POPULATION SAMPLES
Women, 5:16 to 5:18

PORTABLE LAB RECORDS
Depositions, 60:23

PORTAL VEIN
Definitions, 55:4

POSTABSORPTION
Downie Case, 44:6
Uncertainty range, 28:5

POST-ACCIDENT AND POST-MORTEM BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS
Generally, 70:1 et seq.

Acknowledgment of uncertainties, 70:9

Ambiguity of BAC results, 70:30

Assumption of reliability, 70:15

Autopsy, 70:18, 70:33

Bac of 0.09%, 70:29

Bac of 0.14%, 70:49, 70:50

Bac of 0.22%, 70:43, 70:46

Blood alcohol report, 70:20

Blood sample, generally, 70:4

Breath sample, 70:3

Causation for conduct, 70:17

Caution before firm opinion formed, 70:6

Certainty, acknowledgment of uncertainties, 70:9

Change in BAC, 63:97

Chappaquiddick Incident generally, 70:28 to 70:40

ambiguity of BAC results, 70:30

Index-96
POST-ACCIDENT AND POST-MORTEM BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS—Cont’d
Chappaquiddick Incident—Cont’d autopsy, 70:33
consumption of alcohol, 70:31
death, time of accident and death, 70:37
decision-making process, 70:33
drowning and BAC, generally, 70:38
injuries, 70:39
Kopechne, Mary Jo, example, generally, 70:28 et seq.
medical examiner, 70:32
opinions, 70:34
part-time medical examiner, 70:32
post-mortem BACs, 70:29, 70:36, 70:38
questions unasked, 70:35
reported BAC, 70:31, 70:40
time of accident and death, 70:37
unfounded opinions, 70:34
Civil defendants, 70:19, 70:26
Conduct, causation for, 70:17
Copper Case
generally, 70:16 to 70:26
autopsy, 70:18
blood, serum versus whole, 70:22
blood alcohol report, 70:20
causation for conduct, 70:17
civil defendants, 70:19, 70:26 conduct, causation for, 70:17
custody, 70:24
deep pocket civil defendants, 70:19, 70:26
doctor, opinions of doctor performing BAC analysis, 70:21
initial blood alcohol report, 70:20
initial investigation, 70:17
injuries, 70:25
investigation, 70:17

POST-ACCIDENT AND POST-MORTEM BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS—Cont’d
Copper Case—Cont’d
opinions of doctor performing BAC analysis, 70:21
pre-trial information, 70:23
report, blood alcohol report, 70:20
serum blood, 70:22
test information, pre-trial information, 70:23
two bodies, 70:24
whole blood, 70:22
Custody, 70:24
Decision-making process, 70:33
Decomposed body BAC
Holden, William, example, infra
Deep pocket civil defendants, 70:19, 70:26
Driver. Copper Case, supra
Drowned body BAC
Chappaquiddick Incident, supra
Wood, Natalie, example, infra
Drunk, lab technician’s opinion, 70:13
Dutch Case, 70:12 to 70:15
Encouraged, 70:10
Expediency of expert, 70:10
Experienced forensic specialist, 70:41
Females, heavily intoxicated, 70:46
Firm opinion, 70:6
Head-on collision. Copper Case, supra
Heavily intoxicated at 0.22%, 70:46
Holden, William, example
generally, 70:42 to 70:47
BAC of 0.22%, 70:43
decomposed body BAC, see lines throughout this group
females, heavily intoxicated, 70:46
heavily intoxicated at 0.22%, 70:46
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POST-ACCIDENT AND POST-MORTEM BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS—Cont’d
Holden, William, example—Cont’d
individual differences, 70:47
males, heavily intoxicated, 70:46
medical examiner, pathologist-medical examiner, 70:44
neo-formation of alcohol, 70:44
pathologist-medical examiner, 70:44
plasma values, 70:54
post-mortem value, 70:43
sobriety, 70:45
tolerance, 70:47
Individual differences, 70:47
Initial blood alcohol report, 70:20
Initial investigation, 70:17
Initial questions, generally, 70:1 to 70:6
Injured subjects, 70:2
Injuries
Chappaquiddick Incident, 70:39
Copper Case, 70:25
serious injuries, 70:12 to 70:15
Interpretation, predictable interpretation, 70:53
Investigation, 70:17
Kopechne, Mary Jo, example. Chappaquiddick Incident, supra
Laboratory test procedures, 70:14
Lab technician’s opinion, 70:13
Males, heavily intoxicated, 70:46
Medical examiner, 70:32, 70:44
Motorcycle accidents, 70:12 to 70:15
Neo-formation of alcohol, 70:44
Oversimplification, 70:10, 70:27
Part-time medical examiner, 70:32
Pathologist-medical examiner, 70:44
Physician, opinions of doctor performing BAC analysis, 70:21
Plasma values, 70:54
Police, 70:11

POST-ACCIDENT AND POST-MORTEM BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS—Cont’d
Police stop. Copper Case, supra
Pre-accident release of driver. Copper Case, supra
Predictable interpretation, 70:53
Prejudice, 70:55
Pre-trial information, 70:23
Questions, generally, 70:1 to 70:6
Questions unasked, 70:35, 70:51
Reliability, assumption of, 70:15
Reports and reporting, 70:20, 70:31, 70:40, 70:53
Science, generally, 70:55
Serious injuries, 70:12 to 70:15
Serum blood, 70:22
Sobriety, 70:45
Source of information, 70:8
Specialists, experienced forensic specialist, 70:41
State forensic experts, 70:11
Surviving injured subjects, 70:2
Test information, pre-trial information, 70:23
Time of accident and death, 70:37
Tolerance, 70:47
Totality of evidence, 70:7 to 70:9
Two bodies, 70:24
Type of evidence, 70:7 to 70:9
Typical expert, 70:10, 70:55
Unfounded opinions, 70:34
Weight of evidence, 70:7 to 70:9
Whole blood, 70:22
Wood, Natalie, example generally, 70:48 to 70:53
BAC of 0.14%, generally, 70:49, 70:50
interpretation, predictable interpretation, 70:53
plasma values, 70:54
post-mortem BAC, 70:49
predictable interpretation, 70:53
POST-ACCIDENT AND POST-MORTEM BLOOD ALCOHOL CONCENTRATIONS—Cont’d
Wood, Natalie, example—Cont’d questions unasked, 70:51
reported BAC, 70:53

POST DEPOSITION
Documents, 62:21 to 62:24
Finds, 63:112

POST-MORTEM ALCOHOL DETERMINATIONS
Generally, 21:1 et seq.
Aiming for heart, collection process, 21:18
Assumptions, 21:2 to 21:4, 21:11, 70:15
Autopsy, collection process, 21:14, 21:15
Bacs, generally, 21:1 to 21:4
Better practice, 21:12
Blood, see lines throughout this index topic
Budget. Medical Examiner (this index)
Checklist, 21:11
Chest wall, needle puncture of chest wall, 21:18
Collection process
generally, 21:7, 21:13 to 21:19
aiming for heart, 21:18
autopsy, 21:14, 21:15
blood loss and fluid replacement, 21:19
chest wall, needle puncture of chest wall, 21:18
duodenum contents, 21:16
examination of liver, 21:17
fluid replacement, 21:19
food and alcohol, 21:16
heart, aiming for, 21:18
live blood samples, 21:13
liver, examination of, 21:17

POST-MORTEM ALCOHOL DETERMINATIONS—Cont’d
Collection process—Cont’d
multiple blood samples, 21:6
needle puncture of chest wall, 21:18
other alcohol samples, 21:8
puncture, needle puncture of chest wall, 21:18
qualifications of blood collectors, 21:31
replacement of fluid, 21:19
serious injuries, 21:9, 21:10
stomach contents, 21:16
Coroners. Medical Examiner (this index)
Deficiencies, 21:5
Duodenum contents, collection process, 21:16
Figures, 21:36
Fluid replacement, collection process, 21:19
Food and alcohol, collection process, 21:16
Heart, aiming for, 21:18
Inherent deficiencies, 21:5
Injuries, collection of samples after serious injuries, 21:9, 21:10
Intervening events, assumption of no intervening events, 21:3
Live blood samples, 21:13
Liver, examination of, 21:17
Loss of blood and fluid replacement, 21:19
Medical Examiner (this index)
Needle puncture of chest wall, 21:18
Opinions, unsupported opinions common under present practice, 21:10
Puncture, needle puncture of chest wall, 21:18
Quantity, collection of blood samples, 21:7
Replacement of fluid, 21:19
Serious injuries, 21:9, 21:10
POST-MORTEM ALCOHOL DETERMINATIONS—Cont’d
Status quo, 21:2, 21:11
Stomach contents, 21:16
Studies, 21:5
Unsupported opinions common under present practice, 21:10

POST-MORTEM ALCOHOL SAMPLE COLLECTION, HANDLING, AND REPORTING
Generally, 70B:1 et seq.
Acetaldehyde, 70B:22
Critical facts, 70B:8
Historical failures, 70B:2
Interpretation, 70B:11
Intervening events, 70B:9
Medical examiners and coroners, generally, 70B:7
Microbiological assay of blood and vitreous, 70B:26
Multiple sample testing, 70B:3, 70B:15
N-propanol use as source of error, 70B:21
Preautopsy specimens, 70B:6
Preservation of sample, faulty, 70B:20
Purposes of post-mortem tests, 70B:4
Reliability of ethanol reports, 70B:10 et seq.
Sampling considerations, generally, 70B:23
Source of alcohol (ingestion or post-mortem production), 70B:14
Trend of blood alcohol content at time of death, 70B:13
Urine serotonin metabolite ratio, 70B:18
Vitreous humor, 70B:24 et seq.
Whole body ethanol distribution, multiple samples, 70B:3

POST-SERRANO MODIFICATION BY DUBOWSKI
Percent error, 42:7

POST-TRAUMA ALCOHOL-TEST REPORTS
Generally, 70A:1 et seq.
Alarm stage, 70A:11
Amnesia, 70A:8
Blood sugars and contaminants, 70A:16
Cardiovascular status, 70A:30
Complex issues, need for assistance, 70A:20
Documents to collect, 70A:17
Endocrine system, 70A:12
Fact collection, 70A:6
Gastrointestinal tract, 70A:32
Heart or blood vessel injuries, 70A:27
Hypotension, 70A:25
Medical treatment of driver, checklist, 70A:34
Metabolic acidosis, 70A:24
Peripheral Nervous System (PNS), 70A:11
Physiological changes in human system, 70A:9 et seq.
Record entries, checklist, 70A:34
Reliability of tests, 70A:5
Shock, 70A:24, 70A:25
Stress, 70A:7 et seq.

POTENTIATION
Definitions, 55:4

POUNDS
Conversion of pounds to kilograms, 39:4

PRE-ACCIDENT RELEASE OF DRIVER
Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

PRECISE WORDS OF EXPERT
Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination techniques, 80:5
PRECISION
Definitions, 55:4

PREDICTION OF PROBABLE BACs OR ALCOHOL AMOUNTS
Generally, 3:1 et seq., 11:9 to 11:12
Average beta, 3:6
Average male R, hidden use of, 3:10
Beta, forgotten range of, 3:7
Beta average, 3:6
Brent-Stiller, 3:12
Derivation of numerical constants, 11:14
Experts and texts, generally, 3:7
Forgotten range of r and beta, 3:7
Hidden use of average male R, 3:10
Hypothetical instant peak BAC, 3:4
Initial attempts
   generally, 3:1 to 3:5
   blood, alcohol in, 3:3
   hypothetical instant peak BAC, 3:4
   ration between alcohol in blood and body, 3:3
R factor, 3:5
Widmark Laboratory Approach, generally, 3:2
Joye-Lovett, 3:12
Male average R, 3:6, 3:10
Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)
Oversimplification, 3:8, 3:9
Ratio between alcohol in blood and body, 3:3
Simplification of equation for easy use, 11:15
13.1, use of, 3:10
Unexplained use of male average R, 3:10
Water, Watson Total Body Water Equation, 3:13
Watson Total Body Water Equation, 3:13

PREDICTION OF PROBABLE BACs OR ALCOHOL AMOUNTS—Cont’d
Widmark in practice, generally, 3:6 to 3:13
Women, 5:13, 5:21 to 5:23, 5:30, 5:31

PREDICTIONS
Expert witnesses, 70:53
Probable BACs or alcohol amounts, Prediction of Probable BACs or Alcohol Amounts (this index)

PREEMPTION
Expert witnesses, attack on, 80A:27

PREJUDICE
Bias or Prejudice (this index)

PRELIMINARY HEARINGS
Alco-Sensors, 54:2

PRELIMINARY REMARKS
Depositions, 62:2

PREPARATION RECORDS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:15

PRESENTATION OF BREATH-TEST RESULT
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:33

PRESENT EMPLOYMENT OF WITNESS
Alco-Sensor, 54:22

PRESENT OPINIONS OF WITNESS
Depositions, 60:25

PREERVATION OF RECORD
Objections to, 54:10
Replicate breath-alcohol testing, reproducibility, 45:6
PRESERVATIVES
Depositions, 61:55
Discovery, collection of blood, 65:3

PRESSURE SENSORS
Intoxilyzer, 32:13

PRESSURE TO IMPROVE OPINION
Expert witnesses, 71:34

PRESumptive TESTS
Definitions, 55:4

PRETEND SHOCK AND AWE
Expert witness fees, 80A:3

PRE-test BIAS
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:22

PRE-testimonial DISCLOSURE
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:9

PRE-TRIAL MATTERS
Breath Alcohol Tests (this index)
Discovery, pre-trial written opinions by experts, 65:25, 65:27, 65:28
Expert witnesses, 70:23, 80A:21
Forensic Analyst, Pre-Trial Interviews (this index)
Law office management and technology, 14:20, 14:44

PRETTY SURE
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:22

prevAlence
Definitions, 55:4

PREVENTION
Women, prevention of gastric ADH production and gastric metabolism, 5:33

PREVIOUS TESTIMONY
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:11

PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE OR MATTERS
Defects of prima facie certificate, 50:60
Loss of license hearing, 50:12, 50:57
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:7, 50:13
Questionable statutory language, 51:9
 Sufficiency of certificate, pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:13

PRIOR COMMUNICATIONS
Depositions, prior communications with counsel or third persons, 63:89

PRIOR DECISION
Reconsideration of court of prior decision on relevant evidence, 54:55

PRIOR JOBS
Lab technician, 61:7

PRIOR TESTIMONY
Depositions, 63:7

PRIOR TESTS
Depositions, 61:29

PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS
Law office management and technology, 14:14

PROBABILITY
Blood/breath ratio, 41:9
Expert witnesses, probability of accident, 71:46, 71:47
Most probable alcohol intake, 13:22
Prediction of Probable BAC’s or Alcohol Amounts (this index)

PROCEDURES
Case evaluation, 26:14
Making small deficits in procedures count, pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:6
PROCEDURES—Cont’d
Nystagmus testing for alcohol and drugs, 80B:23

PROCESSOR BOARD
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:10

PROCESSOR SIGNAL
Intoxilyzer 5000, tracking processor signal, 34:10 to 34:29

PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOL IN BLOOD SAMPLE
Depositions, 61:55

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
Exemplar chromatograms, 62:24
Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination of, 80:11
Green test, 61:28
Medical examiner, 64:3 to 64:6
Motion to dismiss, 53:30, 53:33
Review of produced documents, 61:12 to 61:15
Technician, deposition of, 61:3, 63:36

PRODUCTION OF MACHINE
Demand for, 53:42

PRODUCTIVITY OF LAB
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:34

PRODUCT SPECIFICATIONS
Simulator results in breath-test cases, conforming products specifications and results in the field, 54:37

PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS
Peer review assignment for, 54:32

PROFICIENCY OF ORGS AND STRUCTURES
Physiological differences, impact of, 4:3

PROFICIENCY TESTS
Definitions, 55:4

PROFICIENCY TESTS—Cont’d
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:13

PROGRAMMING OF TEST MACHINE
Motion to dismiss, 53:79

PROJECT TIME
Law office management and technology, 14:31

PROMISSORY NOTES
Law office management and technology, 14:38

PROPORTIONAL CHANGES
Peak heights and areas, 20:10

PROTEIN BINDING
Definitions, 55:4

PROTEINS
Definitions, 55:4

PSYCHOMOTOR FUNCTIONS
Definitions, 55:4

PSYCHOTROPIC DRUG
Definitions, 55:4

PUBLICATIONS
Alco-Sensor (this index)
Expert Witnesses (this index)

PUBLIC ATTITUDE
Future of DUI practice, 6:4

PUBLIC HEARINGS
Motion to dismiss, 53:28

PUBLIC RECORDS
Expert witnesses, 80A:29

PYLORUS
Definitions, 55:4

PYRUVIC ACID
Definitions, 55:4

QUALIFICATIONS
Alco-Sensor (this index)
QUALIFICATIONS—Cont’d
Expert witnesses generally. Expert Witnesses (this index)
voir dire, 67:5
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:30
Law office management and technology, 14:5
Nystagmus testing for alcohol and drugs, 80B:24
QUALITY ASSURANCE
Definitions, 55:5
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
QUALITY CONTROL
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
QUANTITATIVE UNCERTAINTY
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:8, 56:35
QUESTIONABLE STATUTORY LANGUAGE
Generally, 51:1 et seq.
Arraignment challenge of prima facie showing, 51:9
Bac, time to peak BAC, 51:6
Blood, subsequent blood test, 51:7
Challenges, arraignment challenge of prima facie showing, 51:9
Crowell Case, generally, 51:1 et seq.
Due process, 51:5
Peak BAC, time to, 51:6
Police duplicity, 51:8
Prima facie showing, arraignment challenge of, 51:9
Subsequent blood test, 51:7
Time to peak BAC, 51:6
QUESTIONNAIRES
Law office management and technology, 14:18, 14:26, 14:42, 14:49
QUESTIONNAIRES—Cont’d
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:16
QUESTIONS BY COURT
Breath test results, pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:51
QUESTIONS BY TRIAL ATTORNEY
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:9
QUESTIONS UNASKED
Bacs, post-accident and post-mortem, 70:35, 70:51
Consultation with expert, preparation for, 73:12
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
QUIBBLES
Cross-examination, avoiding quibbles, 79:20
RADIATION
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:6, 31:7, 31:10
RADIO FREQUENCY INTERFERENCE (RFI) AND BREATH TESTING
Forensic analyst, pre-trial interviews, 66:12
RADIO IMMUNOASSAY (RIA)
Definitions, 55:5
RADIOISOTOPE
Definitions, 55:5
RAINEY STUDY
Conversion ratio, serum/plasma to whole blood, 19:9, 19:15
RAMAN SPECTROSCOPY
Future of DUI practice, 6:14
RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY (RAM)
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:26
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RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS
Definitions, 55:5

RANGE
Definitions, 55:5

RAW DATA
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:20

REACTION TIME
Definitions, 55:5

READINESS OF MACHINE
Motion to dismiss, 53:19

READINESS OF WITNESS
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:11

REAL TIME CLOCK (RTC)
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:25

REASONABLE ASSUMPTIONS
Retrograde extrapolation, lacking reasonable assumptions in opinions, 22:6

REASONABLE SCIENTIFIC (MEDICAL) CERTAINTY
Expert witnesses, 71:20

RECALCITRANT EXPERT
Qualifications, 72:8

RECEIPT OF EVIDENCE
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:10

RECEPTOR
Definitions, 55:5

RECERTIFICATION
Inspection, 35:2
Officer, 50:35, 50:46
Test machine, 53:81

RECOLLECTION
Depositions, 64:50

RECONSIDERATION OF COURT
Relevancy of evidence, 54:55

RECORDS AND RECORDING
See also Reports and Reporting (this index)
Alco-Sensor, 54:10, 54:23
Autopsy, testimony supported by prior autopsy notes and records, 2:11 to 2:13
Availability of machine records at time of hearing, 50:16
Breath alcohol tests
Alco-Sensor, 54:10, 54:23
availability of machine records at time of hearing, 50:16
Frye Hearing, 54:23
inculpatory facts recorded, 52:5
memorandum of law, 50:65
objections to preserving of records, 54:10
preservation of record, 50:53
printouts, records of invalid printouts, 50:48
review test procedures for record, 50:23
Calibration Records (this index)
Expert Witnesses (this index)
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Frye Hearing, 54:23
Inculpatory facts recorded, 52:5
Law Office Management and Technology (this index)
Memorandum of law, 50:65
Objections to preserving of records, 54:10
Preservation of Record (this index)
Printouts, records of invalid printouts, 50:48
Review test procedures for record, 50:23
Women, recorded bacs, 5:17
RECOVERY
  Definitions, 55:5

RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION
  Deposition of lab technician, 63:48 to 63:51, 63:98
  Motion to dismiss, 53:34

RECTIFICATION
  Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:14

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
  Alco-Sensor, 54:51
  Forensic laboratory technician, deposition of, 63:46, 63:47, 63:52, 63:53, 63:94 to 63:97
  Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:55, 64:56

REDUCTION
  Definitions, 55:5

REDUCTION/OXIDATION REACTION
  Generally, 41:15
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  Forensic lab work product quality, 68:17
  Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:38

REFERENCE STANDARD
  Definitions, 55:5

REFERRAL PROGRAMS
  Future of DUI practice, 6:9

REFUSAL OF EXPERT TESTIMONY
  Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:52, 50:70

RELATION BACK
  Blood alcohol test, relating converted BAC values back to Driving BAC, 19:13

RELEVANCE, LEGAL AND FACTUAL
  Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:14

RELEVANCY OF EVIDENCE
  Alco-Sensor, 54:42, 54:54 to 54:56
  Motivation of witness, 54:42
  Police officer as defense witness, 54:56
  Reconsideration of court of prior decision on relevant evidence, 54:55
  Specific performance of device, 54:54

RELIABILITY OF TESTS
  Nystagmus testing for alcohol and drugs, 80B:22
  Post-mortem alcohol sample collection, handling, and reporting, 70B:10 et seq.
  Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:5

REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE
  Generally, 60:13
  Calibration records, 45:6, 61:18
  Cross examination of lab technician, 63:44, 63:92, 63:93
  Motion to dismiss, 53:25, 53:78
  Records, 61:18, 62:17
  Simulator solutions, maintenance of, 53:78

REPEATABILITY
  Definitions, 55:5

REPETITION OF FACTS
  Expert witnesses, definition of terms, 78:10

REPLACEMENT OF FLUID
  Post-mortem alcohol determinations, collection process, 21:19

REPLICATE BREATH-ALCOHOL TESTING
  Generally, 45:1 to 45:9
REPLICATE BREATH-ALCOHOL TESTING—Cont’d
Accuracy, 45:4
Calibration: preservation of records on equipment use, calibration, and maintenance, 45:6
Concept of, 45:2
Concluding comments, 45:7
Confirming reproducibility in breath-alcohol testing. See entries throughout this topic
Documentation: preservation of records on equipment use, calibration, and maintenance, 45:6
Figures, 45:9
Journal references, 45:8
Maintenance of equipment, 45:6
Precision, 45:3
Preservation of records on equipment use, calibration, and maintenance, 45:6
Single testing and, 45:5

REPORTER OF DECISIONS
Syllabus, App. Q

REPORT NUMBER ONE
(Swanson), App. H

REPORT NUMBER THREE
(Bohn), App. J

REPORT NUMBER TWO
(FBI), App. I

REPORTS AND REPORTING
See also Medical Reports; Records and Recording (this index)
Accident reports, generally, 80:16, 80:30, 80:42
Acetone identification and reporting, 53:82
Alco-Sensor, BAC measuring and reporting by using, 54:36
Bac, generally, 1:8

REPORTS AND REPORTING—Cont’d
Blood alcohol report, 18:12, 19:2, 70:20
Chappaquiddick Incident, reported BAC, 70:31, 70:40
Crime and Toxicology Laboratory Report Interpretation (this index)
Discovery, use of conversion table in reporting blood ethanol results, 65:15, 65:16
Drinking history and reported BAC, 11:2
Errors, blood alcohol reports, 18:12, 70:20
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Hospital laboratory report, 80:17, 80:31
Intake reported, 13:19
Measurements, generally, 40:17
Medical examiner, deposition of, 64:25, 64:27
Medical report form, 63:13
Multiple reports, 71:25
Omissions in report, 52:11
One-sided report, 52:5
Percent error, 42:3
Play in breath test value reported, 50:33
Post-Trauma Alcohol-Test Reports (this index)
Prediction of probable BACs based on reported drink consumption with use of equation, 11:9 to 11:12
Report Number One (Swanson), App. H
Report Number Three (Bohn), App. J
Report Number Two (FBI), App. I
REPORTS AND REPORTING
—Cont’d
Sequentially numbered report forms, 50:47
Time length of consumption, 75:17
Toxicological analysis, forensic blood alcohol expert, 80:21, 80:35
Uncertainty in Forensic Breath Alcohol Testing (this index)
Uniform traffic accident report, 80:16, 80:30
Wood, Natalie, example, reported BAC, 70:53
REPRODUCIBILITY
Definitions, 55:5
REQUESTS
Discovery, request to view and inspect laboratory and investigate equipment and procedures, 65:20 et seq.
Exemplar chromatograms for test G. C., 62:16
Machine, testing, 53:74
Missing information, 62:10
Typed information, 61:11
RESEARCH
Generally, 39:7
Experimental research, 54:31
Scientific research, 54:31
Theoretical research, 54:31, 54:34
RESPIRATORY MEMBRANE
Definitions, 55:5
RESPONSE LATENCY
Definitions, 55:5
RESTORATION OF LICENSE
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:15, 50:60, 50:66, 50:67
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Law office management and technology, 14:3
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RETROGRADE EXTRAPOLATION—Cont’d
Bac (basic alcohol concentrations) curve—Cont’d
arbitrarily assuming declining BAC, 22:12, 22:14
arbitrarily selecting only one elimination rate, 22:11
calculation of. See entries throughout this group
conversion from hospital SAC to forensic BAC, calculation problems involved, 22:13
decrease of. See entries throughout this group
general opinions estimating probable BAC curve over time as opposed to specific extrapolations, 22:3
increase of. See entries throughout this group
peak BAC, 22:10 et seq.
SAC value, BAC rate of decline used with—(mixing apples and oranges), 22:10
Blood alcohol tests, 25:22
Calculating BAC and SAC levels.
BAC (basic alcohol concentrations) curve, supra
Case evaluation, opinion, 26:9
Checklist of variables in accident and death situations preventing retrograde extrapolations, 22:19
Civil case, typical scenario, 22:8 et seq.
Conclusion, 22:19
Conversion from hospital SAC to forensic BAC, calculation problems involved, 22:13
Courtroom, erroneous retrograde extrapolations in, 22:5
Criminal and civil practice, single test in, 4:14
Criminal case, typical scenario, 22:7
Critical analysis of, 22:1 et seq.

RETROGRADE EXTRAPOLATION—Cont’d
Decrease of BAC and SAC levels.
BAC (basic alcohol concentrations) curve, supra
Definitions, 22:2, 55:5
Delayed gastric emptying, 22:17
Discovery, 65:27
Dram-shop cases, driver’s condition when alcohol served, 22:4
Drivers, generally, 22:2 et seq.
Drunk driving, generally, 22:2 et seq.
Empty stomach absorption, 22:15
Erroneous retrograde extrapolations in courtroom, the norm not aberration, 22:5
Essential facts, 22:6
General opinions estimating probable BAC curve over time as opposed to specific extrapolations, 22:3
Guest-host cases, driver’s condition when alcohol served, 22:4
Hospital SAC to forensic BAC, calculation problems, 22:13
Host-guest cases, driver’s condition when alcohol served, 22:4
Increase of BAC and SAC levels.
BAC (basic alcohol concentrations) curve, supra
Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)
Opinions estimating probable BAC curve over time as opposed to specific extrapolations, 22:3
Peak BAC, 22:10 et seq.
Peer-reviewed journal data on alcohol elimination rates, generally, 22:16
Probable BAC curve, general opinions estimating probable BAC curve over time as opposed to specific extrapolations, 22:3
RETROGRADE
EXTRAPOLATION—Cont’d
Reasonable assumptions, lacking, 22:6
Sac (serum alcohol concentration) calculations at driving time generally, 22:9 et seq.
see also BAC (basic alcohol concentrations) curve, supra
Single test in criminal and civil practice, 4:14
Spiking phenomenon and absorption side of curve, 22:18
Typical scenarios
civil case, 22:8 et seq.
criminal case, 22:7
Variables in accident and death situations preventing retrograde extrapolations, checklist, 22:19
Walking back the cat, 22:1 et seq.

REVIEW
Discovery, reviewing documents, 65:14
Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)
Notes on articles on device, 74:18
Opinion, 71:24
Peer review assignment for professional or academic journals, 54:32
Produced documents, 61:12 to 61:15
Statutory limitation of review, 50:10
Test procedures for record, 50:23
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:4
Writings, 74:26

R FACTOR
Serum/plasma to whole blood conversions, variability, 19:8
Women (this index)

RFI AND BREATH TESTING
Forensic analyst, pre-trial interviews, 66:12

RIA (RADIO IMMUNOASSAY)
Definitions, 55:5
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Definitions, 55:5
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Medical examiner, fractured ribs, 64:16

RIGHTS FORM
Generally, App. L
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Forensic lab work product quality, 68:17

RISKS
Women, 5:4

ROADSIDE TESTING DEVICES
Future of DUI practice, 6:19

ROBUSTNESS
Definitions, 55:5

RODOMISTA
Breath test results, 52:10, 52:13, 53:8

RUBBING ALCOHOL
Measure of alcohol in blood, 18:7

RUGGEDNESS
Definitions, 55:5

RUN LOGS
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:17

SAC (SERUM ALCOHOL CONCENTRATION)
Blood alcohol tests, 19:1, 19:7
Retrograde extrapolation, SAC calculations at driving time, 22:9 et seq.

SACCADIC EYE MOVEMENTS
Definitions, 55:5
SAFE ROADS ACT
Generally, App. F
Breath test results, motion to dismiss, 53:26

SAFETY MARGIN APPROACH
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:17

SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
Expert witnesses, 80A:29

SAMPLING
Evidenzers and nanopuls, inc., 34:57
Intoxilyzer 5000, 34:18
Post-Mortem Alcohol Sample Collection, Handling, and Reporting (this index)
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:24, 56:25

SAN DIEGO STUDY
Standard Field Sobriety Tests (SFST), validation studies of, 27:3, 27:5

SCATTER PLOT
Definitions, 55:5

SCENE OF ARREST OR ACCIDENT
Case evaluation, 26:10

SCIENCE, SCIENTISTS, AND SCIENTIFIC MATTERS
Admissibility of intoxication test evidence, scientific validity, 76:5
Cross-examination, identifying science needed in alcohol cases, 79:1
Experimentation and the validation studies of Standard Field Sobriety Tests (SFST), 27:9
HGN testing. Science and HGN Testing (this index)

SCIENCE, SCIENTISTS, AND SCIENTIFIC MATTERS —Cont’d
Reporting forensic alcohol values, scientific notation, 19:2

Science and HGN Testing (this index)

SCIENCE AND HGN TESTING
Generally, 80C:1 et seq.
Background, 80C:7
Conclusion, 80C:25
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Distinguishing alcohol intoxication from other CNS malfunctions, 80C:17
Eye muscles and eye movement, 80C:13
In-vehicle testing, 80C:11
Juries and medical-technical terminology, 80C:3
Medical and drug causes of positive HGN results, 80C:21
Multiple opportunities for errors during field administration, 80C:22
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Passes with target/stimulus, 80C:14
Police vs. medical use of testing, 80C:5
Positional interference with results, 80C:11
Positioning of subject, 80C:10
Qualifying subject for police testing, 80C:8
Relationship of some medical conditions, 80C:15
Scoring affected by manner of administering test, 80C:16
Standards and uniformity, 80C:2
Symmetrical and asymmetrical results, 80C:20
Variations and deviations from instructions, 80C:9
SEVERITY OF INTOXICATION
SYMPTOMS
Generally, 13:18

SEX-RELATED DIFFERENCES IN
RESULTING BACS
Women, 5:3

SHAPE OF BODY
Physiological differences, impact of, 4:2
Women, 5:29 to 5:31

SHOCK
Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:24, 70A:25

SHOCK AND AWE
Expert witness fees, 80A:3

SHORTCOMINGS
Expert witnesses, 80A:9, 80A:10

SIGNATURES AND SIGNING
Cross-examination of forensic blood
alcohol expert, samples, 80:19, 80:33
Depositions, signature of supervisor, 63:35, 63:72

SIMPLE QUESTIONS
Cross-examination, 79:18

SIMPLIFIED EQUATION
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EQUATION
Gas chromatographic alcohol test
results, initial attorney use, 24:12

SIMPSON ARTICLES
Addendum, App. N
Breath alcohol tests, 28:5

SIMULATORS
Generally, 33:1 et seq., 41:12, 53:63

SIMULATORS—Cont’d
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breath-alcohol ratio (BBR) vari-
ability, 37:11
Actual and observed BACs, 33:7
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Alcohol calculations, hypothetical
case, 37:18
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solution, 33:6
Assumed ratio, 33:8
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Blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol ratio
(BBR) variability and simulator
solutions, 37:9
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centration for simulator
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Conforming products specifications
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Facile calculations, 37:4
Flaw of simulator calibrations, inher-
ent, 37:7
Guilt and assumed ratio, 33:8
Henry’s Law, 33:2 to 33:5
Hypothetical case, alcohol calcula-
tions, 37:18
Improperly hooked up, 53:76
Inherent flaw of simulator calibra-
tions, 37:7
Innocence and assumed ratio, 33:8
Limitations
generally, 37:1, 37:3, 37:16
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to breath-alcohol ratio (BBR)
variability, 37:11
alcohol calculations, hypothetical
case, 37:18
blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol
ratio (BBR) variability and
simulator solutions, 37:9
SIMULATORS—Cont’d
  Limitations—Cont’d
    breathing pattern, variable of, 37:14
    calculating appropriate alcohol concentration for simulator calibrators, 37:5
    conforming products specifications and results in the field, 37:2
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    overestimated blood-alcohol contents (BACs) and defendant’s evidence, 37:12
    physiological variables, 37:14
    references, 37:17
    simulator false low does not mean test will show false low, 37:10
    State v. Day, 37:19
    temperature, variable of, 37:13
    truncation of results, 37:6
    variability
      absorptive state, 37:11
      blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol ratio (BBR), 37:8
      breathing pattern, 37:14
      physiological, 37:15
      simulator solutions, blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol ratio (BBR), and, 37:9
      temperature, 37:13
      0.10% solution, 37:6
    Low but correct, 33:1
    Measurement of breath alcohol and Henry’s Law, 33:3
    Observed BACs, 33:7
    0.10% solution, 37:6
    Overestimated blood-alcohol contents (BACs) and defendant’s evidence, 37:12

SIMULATORS—Cont’d
  Physiological variables, 37:15
  Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:50, 50:69
  Ratio of 2100:1, 33:4
  Reading, 53:77
  References, 37:17
  Simulator false low does not mean test will show false low, 37:10
  Solution, 33:6, 53:78
  State v. Day, 37:19
  Temperature, variable of, 37:13
  Truncation of results, 37:6
  Variability
    absorptive state and blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol ratio (BBR), 37:11
    blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol ratio (BBR), 37:8
    breathing pattern, 37:14
    physiological, 37:15
    simulator solutions, 37:9
    temperature, 37:13
    0.10% solution, 37:6
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  Expert witnesses, 71:37, 72:5

SINGLE TEST RESULT
  Cross-examination, 79:4
  Individual Differences and Single Test Results (this index)
    Replicate breath-alcohol testing vs. single testing, 45:5
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  Collection of sample, 64:20
  Depositions, 60:17
  Medical examiner, 64:20, 64:39, 64:40
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  Generally, 34:8
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Physiological differences, impact of, 4:2

SKEWED CURVE OF GRAND RAPIDS STUDY
Expert witnesses, 71:47

SLOPE DETECTORS
Intoxilyzer, 32:13

SLURRED SPEECH
Definitions, 55:5

SMALL FIRMS
Law office management and technology, 14:9, 14:27

SMALL INTESTINE
Absorption and elimination of alcohol in human system, 2:3

SOBRIETY
Expert witnesses, 64:26, 64:54, 70:45
Motion to dismiss, 52:11

SOFTWARE
Acetone identification and reporting, 53:82

SOLUTION
Simulators, 33:6, 53:78
0.10% solution, 37:6

SOLVENTS
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:16

SOP
Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) (this index)

SOPORIFICS
Definitions, 55:5

SOUND MEASUREMENT
Downie Case, sound measurement in capillary blood, 44:24

SOURCE OF INFORMATION
Expert witnesses, 70:8

SPECIALISTS
Experienced forensic specialist, 70:41
Future of DUI practice, 6:6

SPECIFICITY
Definitions, 55:5
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:1 et seq.
Intoxilyzer, generally, 32:8

SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE OF DEVICE
Alco-Sensor, 54:54

SPECIFIC TITLES OF ARTICLES AND STUDIES
Biased, difficult or evasive expert, 74:12

SPECTRAL MATCH LIBRARY INFORMATION
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:21

SPECTROGRAPHY
Generally, 32:3

SPECTROPHOTOMETRY
Infrared Spectrophotometry (this index)

SPIKING PHENOMENON
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, 23:16
Retrograde extrapolation, spiking phenomenon and absorption side of curve, 22:18

SPIROMETER
Definitions, 55:5

SPLEEN
Definitions, 55:5

STANDARD FIELD SOBRIETY TESTS (SFST), VALIDATION STUDIES OF
Generally, 27:1 to 27:10
STANDARD FIELD SOBRIETY TESTS (SFST), VALIDATION STUDIES OF—Cont’d
Colorado study, 27:3, 27:4
Florida study, 27:3, 27:6
San Diego study, 27:3, 27:5
Scientific experimentation, basic principles, 27:9

STANDARD OF REVIEW
Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:4

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE (SOP)
Definitions, 55:5
Forensic lab work product quality, documentation, 68:12

STANDARDS AND CONTROLS
Controls defined, 55:1
Forensic analyst, pre-trial interviews depleted, 66:8
whole blood controls, assigning a value, 66:9
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:14, 68:17
Science and HGN testing, 80C:2
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Calibration procedures, 53:65
Expert witnesses, admissibility: Frye morphing into Daubert, 76:10
Forensic experts, 70:11
Mortuary slated for move, App. P
Qualification of device by state’s expert, 54:9
Questions unasked, 63:109
Statutes, 60:7
Testing of machines, 53:73
Under the influence, 63:80
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Compliance with regulations, 50:56
Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:12
Unsupported, 50:57

STATE V. DAY
Simulators, 37:19
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Assumptions, 21:2, 21:11

STATUTES
Coroners and medical examiners, 21:22
Depositions, 60:7
Limitation of review, 50:10
Questionable Statutory Language (this index)
Science upside down, 50:11
Upside down science, 50:5

STATUTORY LANGUAGE
Questionable Statutory Language (this index)

STEERING WHEEL IMPACTS
Medical examiner, 64:31, 64:32

STIMULANTS
Definitions, 55:5

STOMACH
Absorption and elimination of alcohol in human system, generally, 2:2, 2:4
Collection process, 21:16
Contents, generally, 64:30
Downie Case, 44:10
Empty Stomach Absorption (this index)
Food or alcohol in stomach at death, 61:52

STRESS
Post-trauma alcohol-test reports, 70A:7 et seq.

STRETCHING VIBRATIONS
Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:9

STRICT NECESSITY RULE
Admissibility of expert testimony, 71:6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Chromatograms, 20:8, 20:11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay (this index)</td>
<td>Expert Witnesses (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)</td>
<td>Intoxilyzer 5000 (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law office management and technology, end of the year project time, 14:31</td>
<td>Observation time, 53:6, 53:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:18, 50:26, 50:58, 50:68</td>
<td>Questionable statutory language, pre-trial appellate review of, 51:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single test in criminal and civil practice, relating one later test to time of incident bac, 4:9</td>
<td>Women, untypical drinking time, 5:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME LINES</th>
<th>Law office management and technology, 14:12, 14:40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMELY PREPARATION</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 71:29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLES</th>
<th>Alco-Sensor, 54:14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert witness’ knowledge of, 74:12, 74:14</td>
<td>Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOLERANCE</th>
<th>Definitions, 55:5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert witnesses, 70:47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOLERANCE INTERVAL</th>
<th>Definitions, 55:5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOXICITY</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOXICITY OF ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION</th>
<th>Definitions, 55:1 to 55:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forensic blood alcohol expert, cross-examination of, 80:22, 80:36</td>
<td>Report of, 63:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACEABILITY</th>
<th>Definitions, 55:5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRADITIONAL EXPERTS</td>
<td>Definitions, 55:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRADITIONAL OVERSIMPLIFICATION</th>
<th>Cross-examination of defendant’s expert, 75:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING</th>
<th>Certification, 50:20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chromatogram training, 63:66</td>
<td>Expert witnesses, 80A:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law office management and technology, 14:8</td>
<td>Medical training, 64:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists, untrained, 21:23</td>
<td>Test equipment, 63:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tester, trained by supervisor, 63:71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFERRIN
Definitions, 55:5

TRANSITION PLANS
Law office management and technology, 14:35

TRANSPORTING SAMPLES
Discovery, transportation of blood ethanol samples, 65:5, 65:12

TRAUMA
Post-Trauma Alcohol-Test Reports (this index)

TRIABILITY
Generally, 13:4, 13:5

TRIAL ATTORNEYS
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:9

TRIAL STRATEGY
Generally, 13:7
Expert witnesses, fee information, 80A:21

TRIGLYCERIDES
Definitions, 55:5

TRUNCATION OF RESULTS
Simulators, 37:6

TRYPSIN
Definitions, 55:5

TWO BODIES
Expert witnesses, 70:24

TWO ETHANOL RESULTS
Depositions, 63:24, 63:26

TWO INFERENCES
Single test cases, 4:10, 4:11

TWO-PRONG TEST
Expert witnesses and Daubert: proof of relevancy and reliability by whatever evidence satisfies trial court, 76:11

TWO SAMPLE PROCEDURE
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:41

TWO TESTS
Breath alcohol tests, 28:10
Depositions, 61:39, 61:41, 63:24
Pre-trial loss of license hearing, 50:43
Quality control runs, 63:30

TYPED LOG SHEET
Depositions, 62:7

TYPE I DIABETES
Definitions, 55:5

TYPE II DIABETES
Definitions, 55:5

TYPICAL EXPERT
Generally, 70:10, 70:55

TYPICAL OPINIONS
Expert witnesses, 71:16

U-CREATININE
Definitions, 55:6

ULTIMATE BACS
Women, ultimate BACs greater than fat to lean differences would predict, 5:21

ULTIMATE ISSUE
Expert witnesses, 71:14 to 71:16

ULTRAVIOLET
Definitions, 55:6

UNACCEPTABLE PROFICIENCY
Percentages of labs reporting results of, App. A
Summary of criteria, App. C

UNCERTAINTY
Definitions, 55:6
Expert witnesses, certainty and uncertainty, 70:9, 71:19
UNCERTAINTY—Cont’d
Uncertainty in Forensic Breath Alcohol Testing (this index)

UNCERTAINTY IN FORENSIC BREATH ALCOHOL TESTING
Generally, 56:1 to 56:38
Absorption, range for postabsorptive and absorptive subjects, 28:5
Accreditation generally, 56:18
ensuring reported results are not misleading, 56:19
Acronym glossary, 56:37
Adding sources of uncertainty together, 56:10
Admissibility of breath-test and DNA evidence compared, 56:29
Applicable law, failure to report breath-test uncertainty, 56:28
Bias, 56:9, 56:22
Biological uncertainty, 56:24, 56:25
Breath-alcohol analysis, combined and expanded uncertainty, 56:16
Case law, 56:31
Case study (Washington state), 56:20, 56:21
Certification, DataMaster QAP, 56:23
Combined uncertainty generally, 56:16
inclusion of biological/sampling uncertainty, 56:25
Courts, known bias not reported to, 56:32
Coverage interval, 56:7
DataMaster QAP certification, 56:23
Defendants, known bias not reported to, 56:32
Determining pre-test bias, 56:22
DNA and breath-test evidence, admissibility compared, 56:29
Ensuring reported results are not misleading, 56:19

UNCERTAINTY IN FORENSIC BREATH ALCOHOL TESTING—Cont’d
Error analysis, 56:5, 56:6
Estimation of uncertainty, 56:26
Expanded uncertainty, breath-alcohol analysis, 56:16
Failure to account for uncertainty, Washington state, 56:27
Failure to report breath-test uncertainty, applicable law, 56:28
Final uncertainty budget, 56:11
Forensic measurement uncertainty, 56:13
Fundamental uncertainty, 56:2
Further uncertainty considerations, 56:24
Glossary of acronyms, 56:37
Incompleteness, traditional error analysis, 56:5
Interpretation of measurements, 56:34
Intoxilyzer 8000, 38:8
Juries, known bias not reported to, 56:32
Known bias not reported to courts, juries or defendants, 56:32
Measurement uncertainty, 56:15
Measurement uncertainty, generally, 56:3, 56:4
Naked numbers, reporting results, 56:14
NAS report on measurement of uncertainties, 56:30
National Academy of Sciences report on measurement of uncertainties, 56:30
Presentation of breath-test result, accounting for uncertainty, 56:33
Pre-test bias, determining, 56:22
Quantification of uncertainty in measurement, 56:8
### VALIDITY—Cont’d
- Printouts, records of invalid printouts, 50:48
- Quality control runs, 63:73
- Reported test values, opinion on, 63:68
- Scientific validity, 76:5
- Widmark calculations, validity, 5:13

### VARIABILITY AND SIMULATORS
- Absorptive state and blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol ratio (BBR), 37:11
- Blood-alcohol to breath-alcohol ratio (BBR), 37:8, 37:9
- Breathing pattern, 37:14
- Physiological, 37:15
- Temperature, 37:13

### VARIANCE
- Peak heights, 20:6, 20:7
- Serum/plasma to whole blood alcohol conversions, variability of range, 19:8
- Simulator solution result, 50:50

### VASODILATION
Definitions, 55:6

### VASOPRESSIN
Definitions, 55:6

### VC (VITAL CAPACITY)
Definitions, 55:6

### VEIN
Definitions, 55:6

### VENOUS AND ARTERIAL SYSTEMS
Downie Case (this index)

### VERIFICATION
- Accuracy, illusion of and verifiers, 66:10
- Chromatograms, 20:2 to 20:5, 62:13

### VH (VITREOUS HUMOR)
Definitions, 55:6

### VIBRATIONS
- Infrared spectrophotometry, stretching vibrations, 31:9

### VICTIMIZATION
- Mathematical and Other Fallacies in Alcohol Test Extrapolations (this index)

### VIDEO ANALYSIS
- Law office management and technology, 14:24, 14:48

### VIEW
- Defendant before testing, view of, 50:40
- Lab, view of, 60:16, 60:20
- Technician of lab, 60:15

### VISCERA
Definitions, 55:6

### VISIBLE
Definitions, 55:6

### VISUAL CHARACTERISTICS
- Chromatograms, peaks, 20:13

### VITAL CAPACITY (VC)
Definitions, 55:6

### VITREOUS HUMOR (VH)
Definitions, 55:6
- Post-mortem alcohol sample collection, handling, and reporting, 70B:24 et seq.

### VOIR DIRE
- Actual knowledge of subject matter, expert witnesses, 67:13
- Basis of expert witness, 67:2
- Categories of expert witness, 67:3
- Competency, expert witnesses, 67:5, 67:6, 67:13
- Continuing duty of disclosure, expert witnesses, 67:10
- Daubert Trilogy, standard of review for expert witnesses, 67:4
VOIR DIRE—Cont’d
Disclosure, continuing duty, expert witnesses, 67:10
Evaluating expert witnesses, 67:6
Expert witnesses
Generally, 67:1 et seq.
actual knowledge of subject matter, 67:13
basis of expert witness, 67:2
categories of expert witness, 67:3
competency
evaluating, 67:6
requirements, 67:5
testify, to, 67:13
continuing duty of disclosure, 67:10
Daubert Trilogy, standard of review, 67:4
disclosure, continuing duty, 67:10
evaluating
competency, 67:6
knowledge, 67:6
evaluating competency and knowledge, 67:6
factual relevance, 67:14
federal rules, 67:15
figures, 67:19
function of expert witness, 67:2
knowledge
evaluating, 67:6
subject matter, actual, 67:13
legal relevance, 67:14
occupational titles, 67:12
official titles, 67:12
pre-testimonial disclosure, written summary opinion, 67:9
previous testimony, 67:11
qualifications, 67:5
questionnaire, 67:16
references, 67:18
relevance, legal and factual, 67:14
requirements, competency, 67:5
scope of voir dire, 67:8

VOIR DIRE—Cont’d
Expert witnesses—Cont’d
standard of review, Daubert Trilogy, 67:4
subject matter, actual knowledge of, 67:13
testimony
competency to testify, 67:13
previous, 67:11
titles, occupational and official, 67:12
voir dire questionnaire, 67:16
written summary opinion, pre-testimonial disclosure, 67:9
Factual relevance, expert witnesses, 67:14
Federal rules, expert witnesses, 67:15
Figures, expert witnesses, 67:19
Function of expert witness, 67:2
Inspection, 35:2
Knowledge, expert witnesses, 67:6, 67:13
Legal relevance, expert witnesses, 67:14
Occupational titles, expert witnesses, 67:12
Official titles, expert witnesses, 67:12
Pre-testimonial disclosure, written summary opinion, expert witnesses, 67:9
Previous testimony, expert witnesses, 67:11
Qualifications, expert witnesses, 67:5
Questionnaire, expert witnesses, 67:16
References, expert witnesses, 67:18
Relevance, legal and factual, expert witnesses, 67:14
Requirements, expert witnesses, 67:5
Scope of voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:8
Standard of review for expert witnesses, Daubert Trilogy, 67:4
Subject matter, actual knowledge of, expert witnesses, 67:13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOIR DIRE—Cont’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testimony, expert witnesses, 67:11, 67:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles, occupational and official, expert witnesses, 67:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voir dire questionnaire, expert witnesses, 67:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written summary opinion, pre-testimonial disclosure, expert witnesses, 67:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLATILES ANALYSIS WORKSHEET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-examination of forensic blood alcohol expert, ethanol, 80:23, 80:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUME-TO-VOLUME CONVERSIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facile approach, 43:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUME-TO-WEIGHT CONVERSIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facile approach, 43:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 17025, 57:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law office management and technology, 14:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKING BACK THE CAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrograde Extrapolation (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood alcohol tests, 50:55, 50:71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breath alcohol tests, 50:71, 52:4, 53:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert witnesses, 70:6, 71:32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty in forensic breath alcohol testing, 56:20, 56:21, 56:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH SOLUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositions, 63:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson total body water equation, 3:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER/AIR ALCOHOL RATIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, 41:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER CONTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, 2:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATKINS AND ADLER STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, 23:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATSON TOTAL BODY WATER EQUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction of probable BACs or alcohol amounts, 3:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAVELENGTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions, 55:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrared spectrophotometry, 31:7, 31:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGHT OF EVIDENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert witnesses, 70:7 to 70:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferential weight of facts, 13:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEIGHT-TO-WEIGHT CONVERSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facile approach, 43:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WET CHEMICAL MACHINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, 41:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT WITNESS IS NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert witnesses, 80A:9, 80A:10, 80A:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE HATS AND BLACK HATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-examination, 79:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLE BLOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, 40:15, 40:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood Alcohol Tests (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls, assigning a value, pre-trial interviews of forensic analyst, 66:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery, ethanol values, 65:16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHOLE BLOOD—Cont’d
Expert witnesses, 63:112, 70:22

WHOLE PERSON
Expert witnesses, qualifications, 72:19

WIDMARK
Definitions, 55:6

WIDMARK CALCULATIONS
Prediction of Probable BACs (this index)

WIDMARK-OSTERLIND
Mathematical and other fallacies in alcohol test extrapolations, Widmark-Osterlind range of r and B in practice, 23:21

WIDMARK’S BETA-FACTOR
Definitions, 55:6

WIDMARK’S RHO FACTOR
Definitions, 55:6

WIGMORE STUDY
Conversion ratio, serum/plasma to whole blood, 19:11, 19:15

WILLINGHAM ARSON CASE (TEXAS)
Forensic lab work product quality, 68:36

WINEK STUDY
Conversion ratio, serum/plasma to whole blood, 19:10, 19:15

WITNESSES—Cont’d
Forensic Analyst, Pre-Trial Interview (this index)
Forensic Laboratory Personnel (this index)
Law Office Management and Technology (this index)
Medical Examiner (this index)
Motion to Dismiss (this index)
Re-Cross-Examination (this index)
Redirect Examination (this index)

WOMEN
Generally, 5:1 et seq.
Alcoholics, 5:24 to 5:26
Apples, body shape, 5:29
Average times to reach BAC peak, 5:12
Average woman, 5:16 to 5:18
Beta factor, 5:16 to 5:18, 5:25, 5:27
Blood paths to liver, 5:29
Body shape, 5:29 to 5:31
Delay or prevention of gastric ADH production and gastric metabolism, 5:33
Elimination rates of Frezza-Lieber, 5:26
Fat content, 5:28
Fat to lean, 5:17, 5:18, 5:21, 5:22
First-pass metabolism, 5:8
Food, 5:32, 5:33
Frezza-Lieber Study, generally, 5:2
Gastric ADH production, 5:33
Gastric metabolism generally, 5:14, 5:17
eventual peak BACs, 5:20
food, 5:32, 5:33
Heavily intoxicated, 70:46
Individual results, limited data, 5:9
Liver, blood paths to liver, 5:29
Male-female differences, 5:28
Medical math of Frezza-Lieber, 5:10
Metabolism
gastric metabolism, supra
male-female differences, 5:28
### Index

**WOMEN—Cont’d**
- Methodology of Frezza-Lieber Study, 5:7
- Normal population, 5:26
- Ostlund HDL Study, 5:30
- Peak BAC values, 5:11
- Pears, body shape, 5:29
- Population samples, 5:16 to 5:18
- Prediction of probable bacs or alcohol amounts, 5:13, 5:21 to 5:23, 5:30, 5:31
- Quantities of food, 5:33
- Recorded BACs, 5:17
- R factor differences in Frezza-Lieber generally, 5:16 to 5:19, 5:24
- critical spread, disappearance at higher levels, 5:23
- fat to lean predictions, 5:22
- gastric metabolism and eventual peak BACs, 5:20
- higher BACs, 5:22, 5:23
- low levels, 5:21
- ultimate BACs, 5:21
- Risks, 5:4
- Sex-related differences in resulting BACs, 5:3
- Shape, body shape, 5:29 to 5:31
- Symptomatic effects not measured by Frezza-Lieber, 5:5
- Threshold limitations of Frezza-Lieber, 5:15
- Time, untypical drinking time, 5:34
- Ultimate BACs, 5:21
- Widmark’s calculations, 5:13, 5:21 to 5:23, 5:30, 5:31

**WOOD, NATALIE**
- Post-Accident and Post-Mortem Blood Alcohol Concentrations (this index)

**WOOD ALCOHOL**
- Measure of alcohol in blood, 18:7

**WORK EXPERIENCE**
- Expert witnesses, 72:28

**WORK LOAD OF LAB**
- Forensic lab work product quality discovery, 68:34

**WORK PRODUCT**
- Forensic Lab Work Product Quality (this index)

**WRITTEN OPINIONS**
- Discovery, expert witnesses, 65:25, 65:27, 65:28
- Voir dire, expert witnesses, 67:9

**WRITTEN PROTOCOLS**
- Forensic lab work product quality, 68:12

**XENOBIOTIC**
- Definitions, 55:6

**X % OR ACCEPTABLE RESPONSE CATEGORY**
- Percentage of responding laboratories having, App. B

**YEAST INFECTION**
- Definitions, 55:6

**ZEPHIRAN**
- Collection of samples, contaminated swabs, 18:4

**ZERO-TOLERANCE LAWS**
- Definitions, 55:6

**Z-SCORES**
- Definitions, 55:6