

**San Diego Police Department
Crime Laboratory**

Latent Print Unit Manual

Approved by: Stacey Houg, Supervising Latent Print Examiner
Janine Miller, Supervising Criminalist

September 10, 2019

1.0 UNIT REVIEW

The Latent Print Unit is located in the Crime Laboratory, on the 6th floor, room 670 of the San Diego Police Department Headquarters building. The Crime Laboratory address is 1401 Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101, Mail Station 725.

The Latent Print Unit is composed of two supervisors, one Latent Print Examiner III (Technical Lead), and a staff of Latent Print Examiners and Latent Print Examiner Aides.

The Latent Print Unit is an integral part of the San Diego Police Department Crime Laboratory. The unit is charged with the responsibility of analyzing, comparing, and evaluating latent print evidence while maintaining evidence integrity.

The Latent Print Unit door will remain closed and locked at all times. The unit is considered a secure evidence storage room. Only the electronic card key will be used to unlock the door.

Latent Print Unit personnel will ensure case evidence in their custody is secured in a manner to prevent the loss or damage of any items. This can be done by packaging the evidence in the original envelope, placing the evidence in a folder, or securing the evidence with a binder or paper clip. Case evidence that is in progress should be placed in an area that is accessible by the Latent Print supervisors if needed.

2.0 LATENT PRINT UNIT WORK FLOW

2.1 Latent Print Unit Work Requests

Latent Print Unit work requests can be used for cases that involve the following:

- Manual comparison to a known subject
- Complex ALPS cases
- Collection of Major Case Prints

Work requests are routinely received and processed through the Laboratory's Clerical Unit via LabLynx. Requests can also be received and processed by the Latent Print Unit supervisor or a supervisor OCA via LabLynx.

Work requests will be initialed, case managed, and assigned by the Latent Print Unit supervisor or a supervisor OCA.

Priority of rush work requests must be approved by the Latent Print Unit supervisor or a supervisor OCA prior to the commencement of work.

Latent Print Unit work requests will be kept as a note page in the examiner's case notes.

2.2 Proactive Program

The Latent Print Unit works all cases proactively with the exception of:

- Cases with a known suspect that requires manual comparison
- Complex ALPS cases
- Homicide Cases

Cases assigned proactively do not require a work request but are managed by the Latent Print Unit supervisor or a supervisor OCA.

Latent Print Unit personnel will send an email notification informing the detective to submit a work request for cases with a known suspect and for complex ALPS cases.

Priority or rush proactive case work must be approved by the Latent Print Unit supervisor or a supervisor OCA prior to the commencement of work.

3.0 EVIDENCE HANDLING

3.1 Incoming Latent Print Evidence

Latent print evidence will be received through the property room by Latent Print Unit personnel for routine cases.

Latent Print Unit personnel will ensure all evidence received from the property room is sealed. If the evidence is not sealed, property room personnel will be notified.

Latent print envelopes will contain either a barcode label or property tag number.

Latent print evidence with a barcode label will be scanned by property room personnel indicating that the evidence was checked out to the examiner receiving it. For cases with property tag numbers, examiners will follow property room procedures to receive the evidence (e.g., sign the property room check-out log, sign the back of the property tag, etc.)

Latent Print Unit personnel will initial and date the latent print envelope when evidence is received from the property room.

For routine Proactive case assignment, Latent Print Unit personnel will:

- Re-initial and include an additional date on the envelope if the evidence is not assigned the date it was received
- Scan the barcode label indicating that the evidence was received into the unit
- Scan the barcode label from the unit to the examiner indicating that the evidence has been assigned to the examiner
- Distribute the latent print evidence to the assigned examiner either in-person or in their in-box

Latent print evidence associated with urgent requests can be provided directly to the Latent Print Unit by a detective or officer and will include:

- Supervisor approval prior to the commencement of work
- Documentation of the transfer of evidence in the case notes. This documentation will include the individuals transferring and receiving the evidence; a description or barcode number of the evidence being transferred; the date of the transfer; and the condition of the evidence (sealed or unsealed)
- A barcode number and work request. These will be provided by the requestor as time permits but prior to the completion of the case

3.2 Documentation of Incoming Latent Print Evidence

3.2.1 Latent print envelopes with incomplete or incorrect documentation will be completed as followed:

Latent Print Unit personnel will ensure the envelope containing latent print evidence will be identified by a unique barcode number or property tag number.

Latent Print Unit personnel will ensure the following information is documented on the latent print envelope. If the information is missing or incorrect, Latent Print Unit personnel will write in the correct information. If this is not possible, Latent Print Unit personnel will

notify the officer to come to the unit and add the correct documentation on the envelope, to include:

- Case/incident number
- Name of the victim (if applicable)
- Contents (e.g., number of latent print cards, elimination prints, discs, images, scans, etc.)
- Barcode number on the barcode label
- Incident number on the barcode label

Latent Print evidence will be repackaged if the evidence is not properly secured to prevent any loss or damage. The original packaging will be kept inside the new envelope and the case information listed above will be written on the new envelope.

3.2.2 Latent print evidence with incomplete or incorrect documentation will be completed as followed:

The examiner will ensure the correct case/incident number is documented on the latent print evidence (e.g., latent print cards, elimination prints, discs, etc.). If the case/incident number is missing or incorrect, the examiner will write in the correct information.

The examiner will ensure the following information is documented on the latent print evidence in order to proceed with an examination:

- Name of the lifting officer
- Date of recovery
- Location from which the lifts were taken

Latent print evidence that does not have the required documentation listed above cannot be examined unless:

- The examiner can acquire the information by contacting the lifting officer or from a case record management system (e.g., CRMS or NetRMS). Case information acquired by any of these means will be included in the case notes along with supporting documentation when applicable e.g., email, communication log, etc.)
- The case results in a no value opinion and interpretation. However, if the latent print evidence has no case information (blank), the examiner will write in the case/incident number and the barcode number on the evidence
- Latent Print Unit personnel notify the officer to come to the unit to complete the required documentation

In addition to the unique barcode or property tag number on the latent print envelope, each latent print card will be uniquely identified with a sequential number. Sequential numbering of latent print cards will be marked as 1, 2, 3, etc. or 1 of 3, 2 of 3, etc. (not 1, 1a, 2, 2a, etc.).

Latent print cards that are numbered incorrectly will be re-numbered by the examiner.

Latent print cards taped together will be numbered by the examiner if not already numbered by the officer.

Latent print cards with hinge lifters that are received securely attached on top of one another (e.g., taped or stapled) will be considered one latent print card.

Non-latent print evidence (e.g., shoe impression lifts, fabric impression evidence, etc.) that contains friction ridge detail will be inventoried in the report and case notes. Latent Print Unit personnel will notify the officer of the additional evidence in the latent print envelope.

Non-latent print evidence that does not contain any friction ridge detail requires Latent Print Unit personnel to notify the officer to come to the unit, repackage, and re-impound the non-latent print evidence into the property room.

3.2.3 Documenting incoming latent print evidence

The examiner will mark all latent print evidence that is examined with their initials and exam date.

Subsequent examinations by the initial examiner requires re-marking the evidence with their initials and new exam date.

3.3 Latent Print Evidence Disposition

The disposition of latent print evidence will be included in the report and case notes.

Latent print evidence will be sealed prior to being returned to the property room. The seal will include the examiner's initials and date and flow from the tape to the envelope.

The examiner will seal, initial and date the latent print evidence that will be returned to the property room.

The examiner will place the latent print evidence in the Latent Print Unit file for return to the property room or return the evidence to the property room in person.

Latent print evidence being returned to the property room from the Latent Print Unit file will be scanned from the examiner to the Latent Print Unit, then returned to the property room by Latent Print Unit personnel in person.

Evidence will not remain in the possession of an examiner for greater than one year unless the Latent Print Supervisor approves an extension.

4.0 TECHNICAL RECORD

4.1 Latent Print Opinions and Interpretations

4.1.1 Suitability for comparison

The examiner will perform a visual examination of the latent print evidence and use the following suitability guideline to determine which impressions are of sufficient quality to compare. This guideline was implemented as a quality assurance measure to provide a minimum standard for determining suitability.

A latent print will be determined to be suitable for comparison if it contains a minimum of eight clear minutiae that are easily discernible in a finger, toe, or phalange (middle and lower joints), and a minimum of twelve clear minutiae that are easily discernible in a palm or foot print. These minutiae are located during analysis, prior to comparison. In addition, the latent print must meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Discernible source area
- Discernible orientation
- At least one focal point (e.g., core, delta, crease, scar)
- At least one target area (a target area is the friction ridge detail in the latent print that has been selected for search to the known exemplar)

Latent prints that do not meet this guideline may be compared at the discretion of the examiner.

4.1.2. Suitability for exclusion

The examiner will perform a visual examination of the latent print evidence and use the following suitability guideline to determine which impressions are of sufficient quality to exclude. This guideline was implemented as a quality assurance measure to provide a minimum standard for determining suitability.

A latent print will be determined to be suitable for exclusion if it meets all of the following criteria:

- Discernible source area
- Discernible orientation
- At least one focal point (e.g., core, delta, major crease, scar)
- First and second level detail (second level detail around a focal point is required)
- More than one target area (a target area is the friction ridge detail in the latent print that has been selected for search to the known exemplar)

Latent prints that do not meet this guideline may be excluded at the discretion of the examiner.

4.1.3 Annotating comparison quality impressions:

The examiner will annotate, in red, each comparable impression with:

- A letter to indicate the impression on the latent print card/image has been analyzed. This can be done on each latent print card (corresponding with the matrix) or consecutively when there is one lift attached to multiple latent print cards
- An arc over the top of fingers or fingertips
- Two lines, one on either side of phalanges (middle and lower joints)
- A line at the base of palm prints and foot prints
- A circle when the orientation and/or source area is not discernible

Any impression that is incidental to the lifting process (e.g., lifting officer print), at a minimum, will be marked in the case notes (e.g., possible lifting officer prints, possible officer prints, etc.).

4.1.4 Using the ACE-V process

ACE-V is an acronym that stands for Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification. This process will be used by examiners during their examination of latent print evidence.

Analysis:

The examiner will perform a visual examination of the latent print evidence to determine which impressions have sufficient quantity and quality of friction ridge detail to compare. The analysis is conducted prior to comparison and can include:

- First level detail—includes overall pattern, source area, ridge flow, orientation, core and delta placements, and ridge count
- Second level detail – includes ridge characteristics (bifurcations, ridge endings, dots), their locality and spatial relationship, clarity, and direction
- Third level detail – includes ridge structure, shape, width, relative pore location, and any creases or scarring

If the latent print evidence is determined to be of no value (not suitable for comparison), no further examination is performed.

Comparison:

The examiner will perform a side by side comparison of the latent and known impressions to determine correspondence between them. The comparison is performed by:

- Choosing target area(s)
- Examining first, second, and third level detail for similarities and dissimilarities

Evaluation:

The examiner formulates an opinion and interpretation based upon the analysis and comparison between the latent and known impressions. This evaluation is based upon the significance of agreement or disagreement of friction ridge detail. An examiner can come to the following opinions and interpretations:

Identification: Due to corresponding friction ridge detail, the latent and known impressions were determined to have originated from the same source.

Exclusion: Due to non-corresponding friction ridge detail, the latent and known impressions were determined to have not originated from the same source.

Inconclusive: There was insufficient quality and/or quantity of friction ridge detail present in the latent impression to identify or exclude. Reasons for an inconclusive determination can include:

- **Orientation (OR):** The orientation of the impression could not be determined
- **Source area (SA):** The source area of the impression could not be determined
- **Orientation/Source area (O/S):** The orientation and source area of the impression could not be determined
- **Insufficient clarity and/or detail (ICD):** The impression lacks sufficient clarity and/or detail to identify or exclude
- **Reliability is uncertain (RU):** The reliability of the friction ridge detail in the impression is uncertain
- **Not suitable for exclusion (NSE):** The friction ridge detail observed does not meet the suitability for exclusion guideline

Incomplete: Known exemplars are needed to complete the examination (e.g., major case prints, palm prints, fingertips, additional fingerprints, etc.).

Verification:

All identifications and exclusions will be verified by a second qualified examiner.

The verifier will complete the “ACE” portion of the ACE-V process. The examiner performs an independent analysis, comparison, and evaluation of the latent and known impressions.

4.1.5 Documenting identifications on evidence and known exemplars

Latent Print Evidence:

Identifications will be documented in red and placed as close as possible to the identified latent impression without interfering with any other latent impression(s). The following information will be included:

- Name of the individual that was identified
- Area of friction ridge skin that was identified to include the finger number or palm. The description can be abbreviated or written out (e.g., RT #1, #1 right thumb, LP, Left palm, etc.)
- Initials of the examiner that made the identification
- Date of the identification

Known Exemplars:

Known exemplars used for identifications will be documented in red and include the following:

- Initials of the examiner that made the identification
- Date of the identification (if there are multiple identifications in the case to the same known exemplar and source area, only the first identification date is needed)

Verifier:

The verifier, if in agreement, will document, in red, their initials and date of verification on the latent print evidence and the known exemplars as close to the case examiner's notations without interfering with any other latent impression(s).

4.1.6 Latent to latent comparisons and documenting multiple lifts or images

When a latent to latent comparison is performed, and the opinion and interpretation is that the two impressions have been identified as coming from the same source due to corresponding features, the following will occur:

- The examiner will generate a side-by-side comparison which will be included in the case notes. This side-by-side will include the words "latent to latent," corresponding features, and the date the comparison was performed
- The technical reviewer will handwrite "I agree" on the case examiner's side-by-side comparison
- At their discretion, the examiner can mark the evidence (e.g., impression A comes from the same source as impression A on latent print card 2)

Multiple tape lifts or images of the same impression can be documented on the latent print card(s) or images if not already indicated by the individual recovering the evidence. No side by side comparison or verification is required. The evidence can be marked as:

- Impression A appears to be the same as impression B on latent print card 3
- Impression A appears to be the same as impression B on image 5

4.2 Automated Latent Print System (ALPS)/Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)

4.2.1 Suitability for determining ALPS quality impressions

The examiner will perform a visual examination of the latent print evidence and use the following suitability guideline to determine which impressions are ALPS quality and suitable for a computer search in ALPS. This guideline was implemented as a quality assurance measure to provide a minimum standard for determining suitability.

FINGERS: A finger print will be determined to be suitable for a computer search in ALPS if it contains at least eight clear minutiae that are easily discernible, form a cluster, and are not scattered throughout the print. These minutiae are located during the analysis. In addition, the latent print must meet one or more of the following:

- Discernible orientation
- An approximate core location

Due to repeatability factors, if the following areas are searched, then the latent print must include at least twelve clear minutiae that are easily discernible, form a cluster, and are not scattered throughout the print:

- Only the delta
- Only the area below the pattern area
- Only the area above the pattern area

PHALANGES: A phalange (middle and lower joints) will be determined to be suitable for a computer search in ALPS if it contains at least twelve clear minutiae that are easily discernible, form a cluster, and are not scattered throughout the print. These minutiae are located during the analysis.

Phalanges will be searched as palm prints in the database(s) due to their placement on the known record. An additional search as a finger in the database(s) is at the discretion of the examiner.

PALMS: A palm print will be determined to be suitable for a computer search in ALPS if it contains at least twelve clear minutiae that are easily discernible, form a cluster, and are not scattered throughout the print. These minutiae are located during the analysis.

For large palm prints with an abundance of minutiae, multiple searches should be performed in different areas of the impression.

4.2.2 Annotating ALPS quality impressions

The examiner will annotate, in red, each finger impression searched with:

- A letter to indicate the finger impression on the latent print card/image has been analyzed. This can be done on each latent print card (corresponding with the matrix) or consecutively when there is one lift attached to multiple latent print cards
- An arc over the top of fingers or fingertips
- A circle when the orientation and/or source area is not discernible
- A “P” number to indicate the finger impression was searched in the ALPS database

The examiner will annotate, in red, each phalange or palm impression searched with:

- A letter to indicate the phalange or palm impression on the latent print card/image has been analyzed. This can be done on each latent print card (corresponding with the matrix) or consecutively when there is one lift attached to multiple latent print cards
- A line at the base of palm prints
- Two lines, one on either side of phalanges (middle and lower joints)
- A circle when the orientation and/or source area is not discernible
- A “PP” number to indicate the phalange or palm impression was searched in the ALPS database

4.2.3 Database Searches

All ALPS quality impressions will be searched, at minimum, in the following databases:

- For property crimes – Local
- For person crimes – Local and FBI

It is at the discretion of the examiner to search additional databases to include DOJ, FBI, or a Dataset.

- If an impression is searched in a dataset which results in a Hit, no additional database searches are required

- If an impression is searched in a dataset which results in a No Hit, additional database searches are required based upon crime type

The examiner will communicate the extent of the database(s) searched (Local, DOJ, FBI, Dataset) in the case notes.

The examiner will include a minimum of ten candidates for all database searches when available.

The examiner will perform an on-screen side by side comparison of the latent impression that was searched to the candidate's known exemplar.

- A Hit is determined when a candidate cannot be eliminated on screen. A Hit is a preliminary, unconfirmed result
- A No Hit is determined when a candidate can be eliminated on screen

If a search results in a Hit, the case notes will include:

- A side-by-side of the latent impression that was searched and the candidate's known exemplar (e.g., Search Confirmation page)
- The candidates list, when available, which is a list generated by the database of the known exemplars

4.2.4 Enrolling ALPS quality impressions

If an impression meets the ALPS suitability guideline and does not result in a hit, the impression will be enrolled in the unsolved database.

The examiner, at their discretion, can search an impression that does not meet the ALPS suitability and determine if the impression will be enrolled in the unsolved database.

4.2.5 Tenprint/Palm Print to Latent Inquiry (TLI/PLI)

TLI/PLI's are known impressions that are automatically searched against the unsolved database when an individual is fingerprinted via live scan at a detention facility.

The examiner will perform an on-screen side by side comparison of the latent impression that was searched to the candidate's known exemplar.

If a TLI/PLI results in a Hit, the examiner will:

- Delete the registered impression(s)
- Print a side-by-side of the latent impression that was searched and the candidate's known exemplar (e.g., Search Confirmation page)
- Document the side-by-side with the words "TLI Hit" or "PLI Hit", initial, date, and note which registered impressions were deleted from the database

All Hits will be forwarded to the unit supervisor for case assignment.

4.3 Known Exemplars

4.3.1 Known exemplars electronically generated

The examiner retrieving electronically generated known exemplars from the San Diego County Document Archive System, the California Department of Justice Automated Archive System, or the Federal Bureau of Investigation's known repository will:

- Stamp each page of the known exemplars using the appropriate stamp (Local, DOJ, or FBI)
- Sign and date the stamp
- Mark multiple page known exemplars as 1 of 4, 2 of 4, etc.
- Be retained in the case notes

Known exemplars printed from archive systems do not need a barcode as they can be repeatedly reproduced electronically.

Receipt of known exemplars received via email or fax will be included in the case notes.

4.3.2 Known exemplars not generated electronically (original evidence)

The examiner will create a barcode label for known exemplars not generated electronically (e.g., inked finger or palm print cards, major case prints, etc.). These known exemplars are considered original evidence.

A copy of all known exemplars used during comparison will be retained in the case notes (e.g., elimination prints, inked prints, major case prints, etc.).

Known exemplars collected by an examiner will include the following on each exemplar sheet:

- Case/incident number
- Examiner's handwritten initials
- Date of collection
- Name of the individual printed
- Page number if multiple exemplars are collected (e.g., 1 of 2, 2 of 2, etc.)
- Barcode label

Known exemplars will be placed in an envelope with an additional barcode label placed on the outside of the envelope. These exemplars will be impounded in the property room.

Morgue prints will routinely be packaged in clear plastic sleeves, sealed, and enclosed within a sealed, manila envelope containing a barcode label.

4.3.3 Known to known comparisons

Known print to known print (K to K) comparisons are conducted when multiple known exemplars are used for the same subject from the following sources:

- Electronically generated known exemplars from different archive systems (Local, DOJ, FBI)
- Major Case Prints
- Elimination Prints
- Inked finger/palm prints

Known to known print comparisons are not required for exemplars generated from the same archive system, if the SID#, FBI#, or MAIN# are the same, the date of birth is the same, and the names are the same or significantly similar as to associate to the same individual.

Known to known comparisons must be verified and will only be conducted in the latent print unit. They will not be performed in a courtroom or in the District Attorney's Office.

If there is no identification, no further documentation is required other than indicating in the case notes that no K to K identification was made.

If there is an identification, the examiner will document the known exemplar in red with "K to K," the identification date, and their initials. The verifier will document the identification in red near the primary examiner's documentation with "K to K," the verification date, and their initials.

4.4 Case Notes

Each page of the case notes will contain the following:

- Case/incident number
- Date
- Examiner's handwritten initials
- Page number

The first page of the case notes will include the date of examination and the technical reviewer's handwritten initials and date of review.

Methods used during the examination will be included in the case notes and only referred to as "methods used." The following will be listed in case notes when applicable:

- Visual analysis performed by the examiner/examiner aide
- Manual comparison performed by the examiner
- Automated Latent Print System (ALPS) computer search
- Dataset computer search
- Digital processing
- Collection of known exemplars using (insert method here) (e.g., black powder and adhesive sheets, ink and a tenprint card, mikrosil, etc.)

A copy of all analyzed latent print evidence will be included in the case notes to include the latent print envelope(s), latent print card(s), and image(s) from disc(s).

A contact sheet of all images will be generated and include the file name for each image (e.g., barcode number, image description, image number). Any images determined to be suitable for further examination will be printed in a larger format and identified with the file name.

Latent print cards taped together will be documented in the case notes (e.g., latent print cards 1 and 2 taped together, latent print cards 1 and 2 are attached, etc.) if not visually represented.

All annotated impressions require a documented analysis which will be included in the case notes. The analysis, at a minimum, will include the features examined. This can be documented in the form of an analysis sheet or a Cogent print out.

All opinions and interpretations must be included in the case notes (e.g., matrix).

Identifications, exclusions, and inconclusive opinions and interpretations will be documented as followed:

Identification:

- Examiners will generate a side-by-side comparison for identifications which will be included in the case notes. This side-by-side will include the work “identification,” corresponding features, and the date the identification was made.
- The examiner verifying an identification will generate a side-by-side comparison which will be included in the case notes. This side-by-side will include the words “verification” and “identification,” corresponding features, and the date the verification was made.

Exclusions:

- The examiner verifying an exclusion will handwrite “I agree with all exclusions” on any note page that includes an exclusion opinion and interpretation (e.g., matrix).

Inconclusive with similarities:

- Examiners will generate a side-by-side comparison for inconclusives with similarities which will be included in the case notes. This side-by-side will include the word “inconclusive” or the reason for the inconclusive (e.g., ICD), the corresponding features, and the date the opinion and interpretation was made.
- The technical reviewer will handwrite “I agree” on the case examiner’s side-by-side comparison for inconclusive opinions and interpretations that contain similarities to a known exemplar.

Inconclusive:

- The examiner will include a reason for inconclusive opinions and interpretations in the case notes.

Records of pertinent communication will be documented in the case notes (e.g., communication log, emails, etc.) Refer to the Quality Assurance Manual Policy on Process Requirements for more details if needed.

The examiner will write the case/incident number on photographs or papers that are not standard letter size and attach them to a standard letter size (8½” x 11”) blank sheet of paper.

The internal chain of custody between the examiner, the verifier, and the technical reviewer will be included in the case notes. The following information will be provided:

- A description or barcode/property tag number of the evidence being transferred
- Condition of the evidence (sealed or unsealed) upon initial receipt
- Individuals transferring and receiving the evidence
- Location the evidence was transferred to (in-person or via in-box)
- Date of the transfer
- Disposition of evidence (e.g., to the Latent Print Unit file or to the Property Room)

4.5 Reports and Notifications

4.5.1 Reports

A latent print unit report is written after the completion of all laboratory activities.

All opinions and interpretations must be included in the report.

Identification and exclusion opinions and interpretations will not be released prior to verification. Additional opinions and interpretations will not be released prior to technical review (e.g., no value, inconclusive, etc.).

If elimination prints are received, the report must reflect that they were received and whether they were compared. Elimination prints shall not be compared without the approval of the Latent Print Unit supervisor unless a work request specifically states to compare the elimination prints.

The examiner will communicate the extent of the Automated Latent Print System computer database search (Local, DOJ, FBI, Dataset) in the report.

Refer to the Laboratory Quality Assurance Manual policy on Reporting Results for the required elements to include in the report. In addition to the Quality Assurance policy, report will include the following unit specific requirements:

- Instances where required information for the header is not available, the words “Not Listed” will be used
- Use a Suspect Header for all manual cases
- Use the Background Report Body Heading for TLI and LPE Aide HIT reports
- Use the Evidence Collected Report Body Heading for Major Case Print reports
- Use the Exemplar Report Body Heading for all cases in which a manual comparison is performed to an exemplar generated from an archive/repository
- Use the following wording under the Methods Used Report Body Heading
 - Visual analysis performed by the examiner or examiner aide
 - Manual comparison performed by the examiner
 - Verification performed by a second examiner
 - Automated Latent Print System (ALPS) computer search
 - Dataset computer search
 - Digital processing
 - Collection of known exemplars using (insert method here) (e.g., black powder and adhesive sheets, ink and a tenprint card, mikrosil, etc.)

Technical and Administrative reviews are performed on all reports prior to issuance.

For report corrections, refer to the Laboratory Quality Assurance Manual policy on Issuing Corrections.

4.5.2 Notifications

Notifications are issued on unconfirmed TLI hits in which no further work is going to be conducted. Reports are issued on confirmed TLI hits.

The side-by-side printout(s) of the unconfirmed TLI is initialed and dated by the Examiner who evaluates the unconfirmed hit.

The notifications are issued via email by the Latent Print Unit supervisor or supervisor OCA.

The Detective is informed that there was an unconfirmed TLI hit and that no further work will be conducted.

The TLI Notification and printouts are scanned into the case file.

4.6 Latent Print Unit Cover Sheet

The Cover Sheet is used by the Latent Print Unit supervisor to gather statistical data and will be retained for monthly statistics and the ALPS Recognition Program.

The coversheet is reviewed during technical review.

The examiner will complete the case coversheet using the following:

- Case or incident number
- Crime Type – Property or Person
- Case Type – Proactive, ALPS (work request), Manual (work request), TLI (Tenprint-to-Latent Inquiry), or Major Case Prints (work request)
- Date completed (report date)
- Prints of value remaining – Yes, no, or not applicable
- Name of the primary examiner
- Evidence analyzed – total number of cards/images/scans
- ALPS – total number of ALPS searches including datasets
- Manual – total number of manual examinations
- Total number of identifications
- Name of the verifier and/or technical reviewer
- Verifications – Total number of verifications and/or exclusions
- Information pertaining to the collection of major case prints to include the number of subjects and if the work was completed on overtime
- Information pertaining to identified subjects including their name and unique identifier (e.g., MAIN#, SID#, FBI#)
- Information pertaining to the lifting officer, detective, or crime scene specialist to include their name and ID number for the ALPS award program.

4.7 Technical and Administrative Reviews

All cases will be technically and administratively reviewed.

When discrepancies in the analysis or conclusion are discovered, the technical reviewer must address corrections or suggestions for change directly with the case examiner. The technical reviewer cannot initial any paperwork until all corrections/changes have been made.

The examiner who performs the technical review does not have to be the verifier on the case.

Refer to the Laboratory Quality Assurance Manual policy on Technical and Administrative Review for elements of the administrative and technical review processes. In addition to the

Quality Assurance policy, while performing technical reviews, refer to the following unit specific procedures:

- The technical reviewer will determine if the conclusions reached were reasonable and are included in the report and case notes
- All identifications and exclusions will be re-compared and verified
- All non-identified latent print evidence will be technically evaluated to assure the original conclusions are reasonable
- The technical reviewer will review all reports, case notes, and evidence for errors and inconsistencies, and will ensure that the documentation of the evidence has been done properly and that unit policy and procedures were followed
- In the event of a disagreement between the primary examiner and reviewer, refer to the Laboratory Quality Assurance policy on Technical and Administrative Review
- If an examiner changes an opinion and interpretation based on the review, keep all original documentation and make the appropriate notations to document the new opinion and interpretation

4.8 Reworking Cases Previously Examined

Additional work may be requested on cases previously examined by examiners unable to continue the work. The Latent Print Unit supervisor will determine what work will be performed prior to assignment and will advise the new examiner.

If the new examiner does not agree with the opinion and interpretation of the previous examiner, they may consult with another examiner which will be included in the case notes. The Latent Print Unit supervisor and QA manager will be notified of the discrepancy.

The numbering and/or lettering system used at the time of the original request will be continued with the exception of the known exemplars. The name of the subject will be used instead of the "K #" (K number refers to known exemplars). In one system, Q #s were used. The "Q" stands for Questioned. The cards were documented as Q1-5, meaning envelope #1, card #5. In another system, the envelopes were numbered sequentially. For example, if more than one envelope was received in a case, the first envelope would be labeled #1 (1-7), the next envelope would be #2 (8-20), etc. If Q #s were used in the original report, refer to Q #s in the current report.

Only the latent print evidence (e.g., latent print cards, photos, known exemplars, etc.) being used for the new examination needs to be initialed and dated. A copy of the evidence used for the examination will be included in the examiner's case notes.

All other latent print evidence (not examined), documents, negatives, etc. included in the latent print envelope will be inventoried and included in the examiner's case notes (e.g., the latent print envelope also contained latent print envelopes Q2 through Q6, miscellaneous documents, and photographs).

Reports and case notes issued by the new examiner will follow current reporting procedures.

5.0 RECOVERY AND RECORDING OF FRICTION RIDGE SKIN

When requested, Latent Print Unit personnel will assist in the identification of unknown decedents and in the recovery of friction ridge skin. This occurs when advanced decomposition prevents the routine collection of known exemplars or when circumstances require expertise from a latent print examiner.

The examiner will record:

- Fingerprints from unknown decedents for identification purposes (John/Jane Does)
- All friction ridge skin (major case prints) from the hands (fingers and palms) for comparison with latent print evidence recovered from crime scenes
- Foot print impressions when the found body was recovered bare foot

Only by request and the Chief's approval will latent print examiners assist in the identification of decedents in major disasters.

Techniques for recovering and recording friction ridge skin may not be limited to just one technique. The examiner will determine which procedure would yield the best results based on the conditions of the fingers/hands/feet before starting with the following recovery technique(s):

- Black Printer's Ink
- Black Powder "Kinderprint" or "Handiprint"
- Silicone ("Mikrosil" or "Accutrans") casting material
- The Boiling Technique
- The Sodium Hydroxide Rehydration Technique
- Metaflow and Restorative Rehydration Technique

Black Printer's Ink

1. Visually examine the friction ridge skin to determine if all fingers and toes are present. The examiner will note any missing digits
2. Carefully remove any loose contaminants that may be present and clean the friction ridge skin with liquid soap and water using either a sponge or gloved finger if needed
3. Dry the hand with a cloth towel. Use Isopropyl Alcohol to dry out the skin further if needed
4. Apply printer's ink to a smooth surface (metal or glass) and spread it out evenly using a roller
5. Either roll the fingers onto the inked surface or apply a thin layer of printer's ink to the friction ridge skin directly using the roller
6. Roll the inked skin onto a finger or palm print card

Use black printer's ink when the friction ridge skin is sloughing off:

7. Remove the friction ridge skin and slip it over your gloved finger/hand
8. Apply printer's ink to a smooth surface (metal or glass) and spread it out evenly using a roller
9. Roll the fingers onto the inked surface
10. Roll the inked skin onto a finger or palm print card

Black Powder “Kinderprint” or “Handprint”:

1. Visually examine the friction ridge skin to determine if all fingers and toes are present. The examiner will note any missing digits
2. Carefully remove any loose contaminants that may be present and clean the friction ridge skin with liquid soap and water using either a sponge or gloved finger if needed
3. Dry the hand with a cloth towel. Use Isopropyl Alcohol to dry out the skin further if needed
4. Powder the friction ridge skin using black fingerprint powder and a fingerprint brush
5. Use adhesive lifts to record the friction ridge detail. Place the adhesive lifts onto a transparency/clear acetate sheet. Using a black sharpie, label the adhesive lifts with the proper hand/finger designation

Silicone (“Mikrosil” or “Accutrans”) casting material:

Silicone is best to use when friction ridge skin is wrinkled, charred, or desiccated (dry).

1. Visually examine the friction ridge skin to determine if all fingers and toes are present. The examiner will note any missing digits
2. Carefully remove any loose contaminants that may be present and clean the friction ridge skin with liquid soap and water using either a sponge or gloved finger if needed
3. Dry the hand with a cloth towel. Use Isopropyl Alcohol to dry out the skin further if needed
4. Powder the friction ridge skin using black fingerprint powder and a fingerprint brush or use black printer’s ink
5. Mix the silicone casting materials per manufacture directions
6. Spread the silicone over the friction skin and allow it to dry
7. Remove silicone lifts and place on card stock with clear lifting tape
8. Ensure the silicon lift is laterally reversed when comparing and/or searching the known exemplar

The Boiling Technique

The boiling technique is best to use when friction ridge skin is macerated (wet) or putrefied (advanced decomposition).

1. Disarticulate the hand(s), finger(s), feet from the body
2. Visually examine the friction ridge skin on the hands to determine what damage has been made. Carefully remove any loose contaminants from the hands that may be present and clean the friction ridge skin with liquid soap and water using either a sponge or gloved finger
3. Fill an electric water kettle with tap water and turn it on. Once the water starts to boil (30 seconds to 1 minute), pour the boiling water into an appropriate size container that can accommodate the whole hand. Fill the container $\frac{3}{4}$ of the way with the boiling water. Make sure the container you are using is safe to hold boiling water
4. Place the hand into the boiling water for 5-10 seconds (first trial)
5. Dry the hand with a cloth towel first, then use the Isopropyl Alcohol to dry the hand out further
6. Powder the hand using black fingerprint powder and fingerprint brush

7. Use the adhesive lifts to record the friction ridge detail. Place the adhesive lifts onto a transparency/clear acetate sheet. Using a black sharpie, label the adhesive lifts with the proper hand/finger/foot designation
8. Dry the hand with Isopropyl Alcohol if needed
9. Obtain a second lift repeating steps #6-#7
10. If needed, place the hand into the boiling water for an additional 5-10 seconds (second trial)
11. Repeat steps #5-#9
12. If needed, place the hand into the boiling water for an additional 5-10 seconds (third and final trial). No more than three trials should be completed. Extended exposure to heat can destroy friction ridge detail
13. Repeat steps #5-#9

The Sodium Hydroxide Rehydration Technique:

The sodium hydroxide rehydration technique is best to use when friction ridge skin is putrefied (advanced decomposition), desiccated (dry), or when hands may be stuck in a clenched position due to rigor mortis.

1. Disarticulate the hand(s), finger(s), feet from the body
2. Visually examine the friction ridge skin on the hands to determine what damage has been made. Carefully remove any loose contaminants from the hands that may be present using care not to disturb any of the friction ridge skin
3. Fill a container with approximately 2 liters of tap water, and under a fume hood, slowly add the sodium hydroxide crystals to the water. Do not add the crystals all at once
4. Let the sodium hydroxide solution cool for approximately 24 hours, uncovered, prior to use
5. After 24 hours, add the hands to the solution. If the hands begin to float, wad up a cloth towel and place it between the lid and the hands to keep them submerged in the solution
6. Allow the hands to soak for approximately 24 hours at room temperature. After 24 hours, remove the hands from the solution. Evaluate them for suppleness and pliability. If the hands are unable to be unclenched or tissue has not softened to the satisfaction of the examiner, return the hands to the solution for an additional 24 hours
7. Since the sodium hydroxide solution is time sensitive, care should be taken to not over soak the hands in the solution. The hands should be closely monitored while soaking in the solution, checking more frequently after the first 24 hours. If left unattended for 72 hours or more, the friction ridge skin could be in danger of dissolving making collection of ridge detail impossible
8. After the hands are removed from the solution, they will be coated with a slick, oily substance. Under running tap water, gently rub this substance off using a sponge or gloved hand. Liquid dish soap may also be used in conjunction with the tap water to attempt to clean off the hands. Be careful not to disturb any friction ridge detail
9. Once the oily substance is removed, dry the hands using a cloth towel first, then Isopropyl Alcohol to dry the hands out further
10. Powder the hands using black fingerprint powder and a fingerprint brush

11. Use the adhesive lifts to record the friction ridge detail. Place the adhesive lifts onto a transparency/clear acetate sheet. Using a black sharpie, label the adhesive lifts with the proper hand/finger/foot designation
12. Dry the hand with Isopropyl Alcohol if needed
13. Obtain a second lift repeating steps #10-#11
14. If quality exemplars are not obtained, place the hands back into the solution and monitor frequently
15. Repeat steps #8-#14 until quality exemplars are obtained

Metaflow and Restorative Dehydration Technique

The Metaflow and Restorative Rehydration Technique is best to use when friction ridge skin is putrefied (advanced decomposition) or desiccated (dry).

1. Disarticulate the hand(s), finger(s), feet from the body
2. Visually examine the friction ridge skin on the hands to determine what damage has been made. Carefully remove any loose contaminants from the hands that may be present using care not to disturb any of the friction ridge skin.
3. Fill a plastic container with equal parts of the Dodge Metaflow and Dodge Restorative chemicals. Ensure there is enough of the solution to submerge the hands. If the hands begin to float, wad up a cloth towel and place it between the lid and the hands to keep them submerged in the solution
4. Allow the hands to soak for approximately 24-72 hours at room temperature. After 24 hours, remove the hands from the solution. Evaluate them for suppleness and pliability. If the hands are unable to be unclenched or tissue has not softened to the satisfaction of the examiner, return the hands to the solution
5. Periodically check on the hands until the friction ridge skin is pliable and/or a white film develops
6. After the hands are removed from the solution, dry the hands using a cloth towel first, then Isopropyl Alcohol to dry the hands out further
7. Powder the hands using black fingerprint powder and a fingerprint brush
8. Use the adhesive lifts to record the friction ridge detail. Place the adhesive lifts onto a transparency/clear acetate sheet. Using a black sharpie, label the adhesive lifts with the proper hand/finger/foot designation
9. Dry the hand with Isopropyl Alcohol if needed
10. Obtain a second lift repeating steps #7-#8 until quality exemplars are obtained

Using the Metaflow and Restorative Rehydration Technique for rehydrating and photographing small sections of friction ridge skin:

11. Remove the skin above the first joint (pattern area) of the finger
12. Place the skin in a plastic container and label
13. Soak the skin in the solution until it looks like living tissue (flesh color)
14. Excess tissue on the underside of the skin may need to be scraped away to allow solution to permeate the skin
15. Clean, dry, and mount the skin by placing it between two glass slides
16. Photograph the slides using transmitted light; friction ridge skin will photograph tonally correct (black ridges)

17. If needed, use black printer's ink or powder the friction ridge skin using black fingerprint powder and a fingerprint brush

General Comments:

1. Receiving disarticulated hand(s), finger(s), feet from the Medical Examiner's Office:
 - a. Sign the chain of custody at the Medical Examiner's Office to receive the evidence and retain a copy to include in the case notes
 - b. Transport the evidence in a secure container
 - c. All processing will take place in the Crime Scene Unit of the Crime Laboratory
 - d. If not immediately processing, store in the Crime Scene Unit refrigerator
 - e. When processing is complete or if the Medical Examiner's Office has requested the return of the hands/fingers/feet, transport back in a secure container
 - f. Sign the chain of custody at the Medical Examiner's Office to return the evidence and retain a copy to include in the case notes
2. Known inked prints of the victim will not always be available for comparison purposes. In this situation, objects from the victim's residence can be processed for latent print evidence

6.0 OUTSIDE EXPERTS

The Latent Print Unit supervisor will give approval prior to an in-house examination by an outside expert. Refer to the Laboratory Quality Assurance Manual policies on Outside Experts in the Lab and Request for Viewing or Release of Evidence, Space, or Equipment. Any request for a copy of the latent print evidence (e.g., latent print cards, discs, etc.) will be provided through the Quality Assurance Manager.

An examiner that has received a request to make the original evidence available for an in-house examination will:

- Retrieve the latent print evidence from the property room
- Perform an inventory of the evidence prior to viewing
- Inventory the evidence at the completion of the examination in the presence of the outside expert
- Ensure an internal chain of custody is documented by the examiner and the outside expert. The existing chain of custody in the case notes can be used or a new chain of custody can be added to the original case notes
- Ensure the chain of custody and any additional note page(s) are technically and administratively reviewed

7.0 LATENT PRINT UNIT EQUIPMENT LIST

The Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)/Automated Latent Print System (ALPS) is used to store, search, and retrieve latent and known finger and palm print files.

A hard copy of the Cogent user's manual is located in the Latent Print Unit and an electronic version is available on each Cogent system as a resource.

The Cogent System is contracted and maintained by the County of San Diego.

- The AFIS/ALPS System is validated when there is a new contracted vendor. Refer to the Validation and Quality Control Log located in the Latent Print Unit
- The contracted vendor through the County of San Diego provides the initial training. Internal training on the AFIS/ALPS System and procedures is provided in the AFIS/ALPS training module
- Maintenance of the Cogent System shall be performed by a certified service or trained professional

A quality control check will be performed when there are software updates or repairs that may affect the searching capabilities in the Cogent database. Refer to the Validation and Quality Control Log located in the Latent Print Unit.

For all other Cogent issues, the following steps will be performed:

- Examiners will advise the Cogent Coordinator of the issue(s)
- The Cogent Coordinator will contact Cogent Support to resolve the issue(s) if available. If unavailable, examiners will call the Cogent Help Desk
 - If a ticket is generated, it will be tracked on the Cogent Issue Log located on the G:/Latent Print/COGENT/Cogent Issue Log
- If the issue cannot be resolved, it will be escalated by the Cogent Coordinator to the CAL-ID Administrator
 - Escalated issues are placed onto the San Diego Open Issue List. Refer to G:/Latent Print/COGENT/San Diego Open Issue Lists
 - The Cogent Coordinator is responsible for tracking all open issues

8.0 PROFICIENCY TEST PROGRAM

Latent Print Examiners who have successfully completed training and are independently working cases will be required to participate in annual external proficiency testing.

Latent Print Examiner Aides who have successfully completed training and are independently working cases will be required to participate in annual intralaboratory testing.

Latent Print Examiners and Latent Print Examiners Aides that have successfully completed a competency test in the same year as the required proficiency or intralaboratory test will be exempt from taking the test for that year.

Proficiency and intralaboratory tests are completed similar to independent casework, following all laboratory and unit policies and procedures.

Test results will be evaluated against published results with consideration to unit policy and procedures. Test results will be reviewed by the Latent Print Unit supervisor.

If an examiner is unable to complete the proficiency or intralaboratory test due to poor quality images, photographs, or scans, the examiner will confer with the Latent Print Unit supervisor and Quality Manager to determine the course of action.

9.0 LATENT PRINT UNIT ABBREVIATION LIST

*	= SEE NOTES
A	= ALPS QUALITY
ALPS	= AUTOMATED LATENT PRINT SYSTEM
AMP	= AMPUTATED FINGER/TOE
BC	= BARCODE
BSI	= BIOMETRIC SET IDENTIFIER
COC - C of C	= CHAIN OF CUSTODY
DEC'D	= DECEASED
DOE	= DATE OF ENTRY
E	= EXCLUSION
EXMR	= EXAMINER
HYP0	= HYPOTHENAR
ICD	= INSUFFICIENT CLARITY AND/OR DETAIL
IMP(S)	= IMPRESSION(S)
K TO K	= KNOWN TO KNOWN
LI	= LEFT INDEX
LL	= LEFT LITTLE
LM	= LEFT MIDDLE
LO	= LIFTING OFFICER
LP	= LATENT PRINT/LEFT PALM
LPC(S)	= LATENT PRINT CARD(S)
LR	= LEFT RING
LS	= LEFT SLANT
LT	= LEFT THUMB
MC-MCP'S	= MAJOR CASE PRINTS
NAF	= NEED ADDITIONAL FINGERS
NAMC	= NEED ADDITIONAL MAJOR CASE PRINTS
NAP	= NEED ADDITIONAL PALMS
NC	= NOT CONSIDERED/NOT COMPARED
NFT	= NEED FINGER TIPS
NSC	= NOT SUITABLE FOR COMPARISON
NSE	= NOT SUITABLE FOR EXCLUSION
NP	= NEED PALM PRINTS
NR	= NO FRICTION RIDGES
OR	= ORIENTATION
O/S	= ORIENTATION/SOURCE AREA
P	= COMPARABLE PALM PRINT

PLI-P/LI	= PALMPRINT/LATENT INQUIRY
PPI	= PIXELS PER INCH
P/P-PP	= PALM PRINT
Q-Q#	= QUESTION (EXHIBIT)
REC'D	= RECEIVED
REG	= REGISTRATION
RI	= RIGHT INDEX
RL	= RIGHT LITTLE
RM	= RIGHT MIDDLE
RP	= RIGHT PALM PRINT
RR	= RIGHT RING
RS	= RIGHT SLANT
RT	= RIGHT THUMB
RU	= RELIABILITY IS UNCERTAIN
SA	= SOURCE AREA
S/A/A	= SAME AS ABOVE
Ⓣ	= TOM WASHINGTON
TLI - T/LI	= TENPRINT/LATENT INQUIRY
UCN	= UNIVERSAL CONTROL NUMBER
ULM	= UNSOLVED LATENT MATCH RESPONSE
UTL	= UNABLE TO LOCATE
X	= COMPARABLE PRINT

10.0 LATENT PRINT UNIT TRAINING PROGRAM

The Latent Print Unit supervisor is responsible for the administration of the training program.

The Latent Print Examiner I training program is approximately one year in duration. The Latent Print Examiner Aide training program is approximately six to eight months in duration. These durations are subject to change based upon the needs of each trainee and the unit.

Training outlines and modules will be used to document the training process. The trainer is responsible for the completion of the training, associated paperwork, and testing (if applicable) for their designated module(s).

Latent Print Examiner Aide and Latent Print Examiner I trainees will receive training modules A-L. The modules can be completed in any order and will be based upon the needs of the unit. The significant variation in training between the Aide and Examiner trainees occurs in the ACE-V module, in which evaluation determinations are expanded to include identification, exclusion, inconclusive, and incomplete opinions and interpretations. These determinations are only required for Examiner trainees.

A formerly trained or experienced trainee may complete the training modules in a more abbreviated form, based upon past training, but will complete a competency test and supervised casework prior to performing independent casework.

The Recommended Reading Lists may be amended with appropriate and more current references.

The examiner will obtain the training outline, module(s), and supporting documents (e.g., practical(s) and applicable testing materials) from the Latent Print Unit supervisor.

The trainer, trainee, and supervisor will initial and date the following:

- The completion of each module
- The completion of each test to include the test score (80% is passing)

Approval from the Quality Manager is needed prior to the start of supervised casework, independent casework, and validations.

REQUIRED READING LIST:

- Ashbaugh, D. (1999, Oct 27), *Quantitative-Qualitative Friction Ridge Analysis: An Introduction to Basic and Advanced Ridgeology*
- Cower, J. (1992, Nov 30), *Friction Ridge Skin: Comparison and Identification of Fingerprints*
- Cummins, H. & Midlo, C. (1976), *Fingerprints, Palms and Soles*
- FBI, *The Science of Fingerprints: Classification and Uses*
- NIJ, *The Fingerprint Source Book*
- NIJ, *Latent Print Examination and Human Factors: Improving the Practice through a Systems Approach*

RECOMMENDED COURSES:

- *Alice White (Maceo): "Analysis of Distortion in Latent Prints,"* Alice Forensics
- *Jamie Bush: "Palm Print Comparison Techniques,"* Ron Smith & Associates
- *Ron Smith and Associates: "Ridgeology"*

MODULE A: GENERAL OVERVIEW AND ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES

OBJECTIVES

- Become familiar with how the unit operates and functions
- Learn and perform the latent print unit administrative duties
- Understand the chain of custody procedures
- Learn the applications utilized to perform latent print unit administrative duties
- Read the Laboratory's Quality Assurance Manual
- Read the Laboratory's Code of Conduct
- Read the Latent Print Unit Policy Manual

LECTURE:

1. Latent Print Unit Functions and Processes
 - a. Proactive versus requests
2. Procedures for Receiving Latent Print Evidence
 - a. Chain of custody
 - b. Retrieving sealed latent print evidence from Property and Evidence
 - c. Barcode and Property Tag procedures
3. Procedures for Releasing Latent Print Evidence
 - a. Returning sealed latent print evidence back to Property and Evidence
 - b. Court evidence receipt for barcodes (via File on Q) vs. Property Tags (via paper court evidence receipt)
4. Priorities for Service: Determined by the Supervisor
 - a. Case management
 - b. Preliminary or Trial date determined
 - c. Person crimes
 - d. Property crimes
 - e. Proactive vs. requests
5. Applications utilized for latent print unit administrative duties
 - a. LabLynx
 - b. CRMS/Net RMS

- c. PD Roster Plus
- d. FileOnQ
- e. Microsoft Outlook
6. Reports
 - a. Scan and file finished latent print reports
 - b. Send completed reports to assigned detectives and officers
7. Quality Assurance
 - a. Technical review
 - b. Administrative review
 - c. Conflict resolution
 - d. Chemical storage, SDS location(s), and their use
 - e. Power DMS

REQUIRED READING

- NAS Report CH. 7, Accreditation
- Quality Assurance Manual
- Laboratory's Code of Conduct
- Latent Print Unit Policy Manual
- Clerical Desk Guide

EXAMINATION: Not Applicable

MODULE B: HISTORY

OBJECTIVES:

- Understand the historical aspects of how fingerprints evolved into being used for identification purposes. Become familiar with fingerprint pioneers who contributed to the science of fingerprints, and the classifications systems and their uses
- Obtain a general understanding of the science of friction ridge identification

LECTURE: The History and Background of Fingerprints

1. Earliest recorded awareness of fingerprints
2. Early anatomical observations
3. Scientific observations and uses leading to modern fingerprint identification
4. Awareness of fingerprint pioneers who contributed to the science of fingerprint comparison
5. Awareness of classification systems and their uses (Henry and Vucetich)

REQUIRED READING

- Chapter 1-The Fingerprint Source Book
- Chapter 2-History, Ashbaugh

EXAMINATION: Written-80% is passing

MODULE C: BIOLOGY – FRICTION RIDGE SKIN FUNDAMENTALS AND FORMATION

OBJECTIVES:

1. Understand the biological basis of uniqueness, persistence, pattern formation, wound healing, aging, and individual ridge characteristics of the skin

LECTURE:

1. Skin Formation: Gain an understanding of the persistence, pattern formation, wound healing, aging, and individual ridge characteristics of the skin
2. Uniqueness: Gain an understanding of the significance and biological basis of uniqueness, including ridge characteristics, ridge flow, creases, and scars

REQUIRED READING

- Chapters 2 & 3-The Fingerprint Source Book

PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT: Various

EXAMINATION: Written-80% is passing

MODULE D: HUMAN FACTORS AND ETHICAL ISSUES

OBJECTIVES:

- Obtain a basic understanding of the human visual system
- Obtain a basic understanding of the nature of visual expertise
- Understand the various types of bias (e.g., contextual vs confirmation)
- Obtain a basic understanding of the sources of human error
- Understand 'error rates' as it applies to the latent print discipline
- Understand ethical issues as they pertain to Forensic Science

LECTURE:

PowerPoint Presentation

REQUIRED READING:

- Chapter 15-The Fingerprint Source Book
- Chapters 1-3-Human Factors Report
- Langenburg, Glenn. A Performance Study of the ACE-V Process: A Pilot Study to Measure the Accuracy, Reproducibility, Repeatability, and Biasability of Conclusions Resulting from the ACE-V Process. JFI 59(2):219-257,2009
- Why Experts Make Errors – Dror
- When Emotions Get the Better of Us: The Effect of Contextual Top- down Processing on Matching Fingerprint – Dror, Charlton, Peron and Hind

EXAMINATION: Written-80% passing

MODULE E: PRINT EXEMPLARS

OBJECTIVES:

- Learn ink and Kinderprint/Handiprint techniques for obtaining exemplars
- Understand the reasoning for exemplar collection

LECTURE:

1. Print Exemplars
 - a. Methods to record fingerprints and palm prints
 - b. Major case prints
2. Recording Prints of a Deceased Individual
 - a. Inked and morgue spoon
 - b. Powder “Kinderprint” or “Handiprint”
 - c. Removing skin from fingers and inking
 - d. Silicone (“Mikrosil” or “Accutrans”) casting material
 - e. Charred or desiccated hands
 - f. Re-hydration technique for mummified fingers
 - g. Processing Human Skin for Latent Prints

REQUIRED READING

Chapter 4-The Fingerprint Source Book

PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT: Various

EXAMINATION: Not Applicable

MODULE F: LATENT PRINT DEVELOPMENT AND PROCESSING

OBJECTIVES:

- Understand the commonly used chemicals and powders used in the Crime Scene Unit (CSU) for latent print development
- Understand how to choose latent print development techniques based on the type of surface examined
- Understand the physiology and chemical composition of sweat and the components of latent prints that are targeted by the various chemical methods
- Understand factors that can affect latent prints. (Transfer conditions, substrate, and environmental)
- Understand the proper sequencing of techniques
- Understand proper evidence handling
- Become familiar with the SDPD laboratory equipment (cameras, scanners, and printers)

LECTURE: PowerPoint Presentation

REQUIRED READING

- Chapter 7-The Fingerprint Source Book
- Latent Print Recovery Conditions-Triplett

PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT: Various

EXAMINATION: Written-80% is passing

MODULE G: FORGERY AND FABRICATION

OBJECTIVES:

- Understand the Forgery and Fabrication of latent prints, the different methods, and how an examiner can detect this unethical activity

LECTURE: PowerPoint Presentation

REQUIRED READING

- Detection of Forged and Fabricated Latent Prints - Wertheim

PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT: Various

EXAMINATION: Written - 80% is passing

MODULE H: DIGITAL PROCESSING/ADOBE PHOTOSHOP

OBJECTIVES:

- Become familiar with basic and advanced functions in Adobe Photoshop
- Understand the policies and procedures for digital capture, storage, retrieval, display, and transmission of latent print images retained as evidence
- Understand how to choose digital processing techniques based on the type of latent print image examined
- Understand the importance of image quality, image integrity, and required casework documentation of latent print images that have been digitally processed in Adobe Photoshop

LECTURE:

1. Original vs Working Images
 - a. Imported images
 - b. Image Size/Resolution/File Format
 - i. Upsizing vs downsizing
 - ii. Resolution & Resolution for AFIS Entry
 - iii. File Formats - TIFF/RAW
2. Calibrating 1:1 Images
3. Using Layers
4. Adjustments
 - a. Rotating
 - b. Cropping
 - c. Contrast (shadow/highlights & levels)
 - d. Black & White
 - e. Color Channels
 - f. Invert
5. Processing Techniques:
 - a. Calculations
 - b. Using Actions (Automated Processing Techniques)
6. Fast Fourier Transform (FET)
 - a. Printing out the Adobe Photoshop History Log
7. Using "ACE-V" in Adobe
 - a. Marking friction ridge detail
 - b. Tracing ridges

- c. “Zoning Out” Distortion
- d. Tile images side-by-side
- e. Note pages using Adobe Photoshop/Power point/Bridge

REQUIRED READING

- Standard for Friction Ridge Impression Digital Imaging – SWGFAST Document #6

PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT:

- Process an image in Adobe Photoshop using various techniques
- Process an image in Adobe Photoshop using Fast Fourier Transform and Actions

EXAMINATION: Written-80% is passing

MODULE I: ACE-V and DOCUMENTATION

OBJECTIVES:

- Understand the philosophy of friction ridge identification
- Learn how to efficiently determine anatomical origin of friction ridge impressions based on shape of the impression, ridge flow, and crease patterns
- Understand the elements of analysis, including first, second and third level detail, threshold for suitability for comparison, exclusion, computer search
- Understand the mechanics of touch and recognizing distortion
- Understand variation in appearance in latent prints from the same source skin
- Understand the comparison process
- Understand the evaluation phase of the process
- Understand how to properly document results and write reports

LECTURE:

Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification of friction ridge skin identification

Analysis:

- Suitability criteria (ALPS, Non-ALPS, No Value)
- Appearance of latent impressions (orientation and ridge flow)
- Levels of detail
- Quantitative/qualitative information
- Distortion Factors
- Effects of processing (distortion, tonal/lateral reversal)

Comparison:

- Search clues
- Target areas
- Focal points
- No minimum number of characteristics
- Incipient ridges

Evaluation:

- Identification

- Exclusion
- Inconclusive
- Incomplete

Verification (Examiner Trainees):

- Different procedures and documentation for each conclusion
- Blind verifications
- Annotating evidence
- Marking of lifts, photographs, images, CDs, and DVDs

DOCUMENTATION, NOTES, AND REPORTS

- Note packets-Required elements
 - Scans/copies of all evidence physically examiner
 - Chain of custody form
 - Reviewer initials – when/where
 - Worksheets
 - Comparison matrix
 - Analysis pages
 - Case management cover sheet
 - Technical and administrative reviews
 - Conflict resolution and documentation
- Reports-Required elements
 - Header information
 - Description of evidence examined
 - Type of examination was performed
 - Conclusions
 - Initials of technical and administrative reviewers

REQUIRED READING

- SWGFAST – Standards for Examining Friction Ridge Impressions and Resulting Conclusions (Latent/Tenprint)
- Chapter 9-The Fingerprint Source Book
- Ulery, Bradford; Hicklin, Austin; Buscaglia, JoAnn; and Roberts, Antonia Maria. Repeatability and reproducibility of decisions by latent fingerprint experts. PloS ONE March 2012 7(3):e32800. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0032800
- Ulery, Bradford; Hicklin, Austin; Buscaglia, JoAnn; and Roberts, Antonia Maria. Accuracy and Reliability of forensic latent fingerprint decisions. PNAS 2011 doi:10.1073/pnas.1018707108

PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT: Various

EXAMINATIONS:

- Exam 1: Suitability Competency for the Latent Print Examiner Aide AND the Latent Print Examiner: 80% is passing
- Exam 2: Competency for determining identifications, exclusions, and inconclusive conclusions for the Latent Print Examiner only: 80% is passing

MODULE J: AFIS/ALPS AND DOCUMENTATION

OBJECTIVES:

- Understand the historical development of AFIS
- Understand the basic operations of AFIS
- Understand the SDPD search criteria for entering latent prints
- Learn how to search latent prints through various AFIS databases (local and FBI)
- Understand how to properly document AFIS cases and write reports

LECTURE:

1. COGENT SYSTEM
 - a. CABIS equipment/history and overview
 - b. Search criteria
 - c. LT/PL enrollment (demographics)
 - d. Transaction queue
 - e. Search options (finger and palm)
 - i. Other: FBI palms / Finger Segments / Side of thumb as a palm
 - f. Retrieve candidates like for LT/PL and FBI Candidates list
 - g. Searching other databases (DOJ and FBI CABIS Searches)
 - h. Exemplar retrieval (local/DOJ/FBI)
 - i. Registration/Deletion
 - j. TLI
 - k. Data Sets
 - i. Create from known exemplars
 - ii. Importing images
 - iii. Create from archives
 - l. Cogent DVD/CD
 - m. Enhancement Tools
 - n. Printouts
 - o. Quality Assurance
2. DOCUMENTATION, NOTES, AND REPORTS
 - a. Note packets (Refer to ACE-V module)
 - b. Cogent/ALPS printouts

REQUIRED READING

- Cogent manual
- Chapter 6-The Fingerprint Source Book

PRACTICAL ASSIGNMENT: Various

EXAMINATION: Written-80% is passing

MODULE K: LEGAL ISSUES AND EXPERT TESTIMONY

OBJECTIVES:

- Understand the Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE)
- Understand the Frye Standard, Frye v. US 1923

- Understand the impact of Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals 1993, General Electric Co. v. Joiner 1997, and Khumo Tire v. Carmichael 1999 on expert testimony
- Understand the basis of criticisms of the latent print discipline and other forensic sciences
- Learn the different court systems in which laboratory employees can testify to (superior, federal, etc...)
- Understand how discovery motions, court orders, and outside experts are handled by the SDPD Crime Laboratory
- Courtroom etiquette
- Courtroom appearance and attire
- Learn how to prepare a demonstrative court exhibit
- Understand Voir dire
- Learn how to present qualifications, present the basis and method of latent print examination, introduce evidence, present conclusions, and articulate the basis for conclusions
- Be able to articulate laboratory accreditation standards and quality assurance policies and procedures
- Be able to articulate general lab policies and procedures

LECTURE

1. PREPARATION FOR COURT TESTIMONY
 - a. Jury's perception
 - b. Research current issues (Daubert, NAS report, error rates)
 - c. Oral preparation prior to court (pre-trial conference)
2. PREPARING COURT EXHIBITS
 - a. Purpose
 - b. Creating a PowerPoint
3. PREPARE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOR EXPERT TESTIMONY
 - a. Voir dire
 - b. Basic scientific principles
 - c. Defense questions
4. DISCUSS AND DEMONSTRATE EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY
 - a. Court room etiquette
 - b. Communication with prosecutors and defense attorneys
 - c. Audio/video recording of testimony
 - d. Discuss and review testimony

REQUIRED READING:

- Vanderkolk, Chapter 1 Objectivity-Subjectivity
- National Academy of Sciences. Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward. National Academies Press 2009

PREPARATION FOR MOOT COURT

EXAMINATION: Moot Court – 80% is passing

MODULE L: SUPERVISED CASEWORK:

OBJECTIVES:

- All supervised casework will be authored by the trainee
- Latent Print Examiner Aide Trainees
 - Demonstrate competency in determining suitability for:
 - No Value
 - Non-ALPS
 - ALPS
- Latent Print Examiner Trainees
 - Demonstrate competency in determining suitability for:
 - No Value
 - Non-ALPS
 - ALPS
 - Demonstrate the ability to perform independent casework to include:
 - Proactive Cases (No Value, Non-ALPS, ALPS)
 - ALPS Requests
 - Demonstrate competency in determining evaluations regarding:
 - Identifications
 - Exclusions
 - Inconclusive
 - Incomplete interpretations
 - Demonstrate the ability to perform independent casework to include:
 - Proactive Case (No Value, Non-ALPS, ALPS)
 - ALPS Requests
 - Manual Requests

ADDITIONAL READING LISTS:

MODULE B: HISTORY

- A fingerprint fable, Will and William West case
- Cummins & Midlo, History
- Faulds, Nature – On the Identification of Habitual Criminals by Finger-prints
- Faulds, Nature – On the skin-furrows of the Hand
- Galton, Nature – Finger Print Evidence
- Galton, Nature – Identification
- Galton, Nature – Method of Indexing Finger Marks
- Galton, Nature – Patterns in Thumb and Finger Marks
- Herschel, Nature – Skin Furrows of the Hand
- Moenssens, CH. 1 Fingerprint Techniques

MODULE C: FRICTION RIDGE SKIN FUNDAMENTALS AND FORMATION

- Ashbaugh, Premises of Friction Ridge Identification, Clarity, and the Identification Process
- Babler, Embryologic Development of Epidermal Ridges and Their Configurations
- Babler, Prenatal Origins of Human Variation in Friction Ridge (Presentation)
- Maceo & Wertheim, Critical Stage of Friction Ridge and Pattern Formation

- Maceo & Wertheim, Friction Ridge and Pattern Formation Presentation
- Maceo, Analysis of Distortion in Latent Prints
- Swofford, Ontogeny of Friction Ridge – Explanation of Epidermal Ridge Development
- Maceo, Alice. Palm Prints. 2013
- Ashbaugh, Palmar Flexion Crease Identification
- Cowger, Palm Prints and Sole Prints
- Johnson, Ridge Flow of the Feet
- Ron Smith and Associate's Palm Print Comparison Technique Class

MODULE D: HUMAN FACTORS AND ETHICAL ISSUES

- Budowle, Bruce; et. al. A perspective on errors, bias, and interpretation in the forensic sciences and direction for continued advancement. JFS July 2009 54(4):798-809
- Busey, Tom and Vanderkolk, John. Behavioral and electrophysiological evidence for configural processing in fingerprint experts. Vision Research 45:431-448, 2005
- Gutowski, Steve. Error rates in fingerprint examination: The view in 2006. The Forensic Bulletin, Autumn 2006:18-19
- U.S. Department of Justice. A review of the FBI's handling of the Brandon Mayfield case. Office of Inspector General, January 2006
- Journal of Forensic Sciences: Letter to the Editor The Bias Snowball and the Bias Cascade Effects: Two Distinct Biases that May Impact Forensic Decision Making – Dror May 2017
- Journal of Forensic Sciences: Human Factors Effecting Forensic Decision Making: Workplace Stress and Well-being-Jeanguenat January 2018 –

MODULE E: PRINT EXEMPLARS

- Cowger, CH. 2 Taking Inked Prints
- Wertheim, Pat. *Inked Major Case Prints, JFI*
- FBI. *Proper procedures for taking Major Case Prints*

MODULE F: LATENT PRINT DEVELOPMENT AND PROCESSING

- Tuthill, Life of a Latent Impression
- Almog, Joseph et al. Fingerprint's Third Dimension: The Depth and Shape of Fingerprints
- British Home Office, Police Scientific Development Branch, Manual of Fingerprint Development Techniques, 2000
- Champod, Christophe et al. Fingerprints and Other Ridge Skin Impressions, CRC, New York 2004. Chapters 3 & 4
- Davis, Phil. Photography. W.C. Brown Company, 1983; Chapters 4- 7
- FBI, Processing Guide For Developing Latent Prints, 2004
- Jasuja, Om et al. Dynamics of latent fingerprints: The effect of physical factors on quality of ninhydrin developed prints – A preliminary study. Science and Justice. 2009 49:8-11
- Langenburg, Glenn. Deposition of Bloody Friction Ridge Impressions, JFI 2008 58(3):355-387

- Lee, H.C. and Gaensselen, R.E. (eds). *Advances in Fingerprint Technology*, CRC Press, New York 2001; Chapter 3 – Composition of Latent Print Residue by Robert Ramotowski, p. 63-104
- Raymond, M.A. et al. *The Physical Properties of Blood – Forensic Considerations*. Science & Justice 1996 Vol. 36 pp. 153-160

MODULE G: FORGERY AND FABRICATION

- Wertheim, Integrity Assurance
- Wertheim, Latent Fingerprint Fabrication

MODULE H: DIGITAL PROCESSING/ADOBE PHOTOSHOP

- SWGFAST Document #6, Standard for Friction Ridge Impression Digital Imaging
- Foray Technologies, “Calibrating Your Images”
- Foray Technologies, “Image Processing Guidelines”
- Adobe, “Image Size and Resolution”
- Photoshop Essentials, “Image Resolution and Print Quality”
- Luminous-Landscape, “Understanding Resolution”
- Reis, George. *Photoshop CS3 for Forensic Professionals*. Wiley Publishing, 2007; Chapters 1 – 8, 10, 15, 19 –22
- Kelby, Scott. *The Photoshop CS2 Book for Digital Photographers (Voices That Matter)*, New Riders Press, 2005; Chapters 1, 3, & 4

MODULE I: ACE-V and DOCUMENTATION

- Ashbaugh Chapters 2, 4-7
- Champod, Christophe – *Fingerprint examination: Toward More Transparency*
- Champod, Christophe – *Edmund Locard – Numerical Standards and “Probable” Identifications*
- Champod, C – *A Probabilistic approach to Fingerprint Evidence*
- Evett & Williams. *Review of the Sixteen Point Standard in England and Wales*
- Galton, Francis – *Fingerprints*
- Neumann, Cedric – *Computation of Likelihood Ratios in Fingerprint Identification for Configurations of Any number of Minutia*
- Wertheim, Kasey; Langenburg, Glenn; Moenssens, Andre. *A report of latent print examiner accuracy during comparison training exercises*. JFI 56(1):55-93, 2006. *Letter to the Editor* JFI 56(4):493-510, 2006
- Wertheim, Detection of Forged and Fabricated Latent Prints
- Wertheim, Integrity Assurance
- Wertheim, Latent Fingerprint Fabrication
- Ashbaugh, Defined Pattern, Overall Pattern, and Unique Pattern
- Ashbaugh, CH. 4 The Identification Process
- Ashbaugh, CH. 5 Poroscopy and Edgeoscopy
- Ashbaugh, Incipient Ridges – Clarity Spectrum
- Ashbaugh, Level 1, 2 and 3 Details
- Black, The Application of ACE-V to Simultaneous Impressions
- Busey & Parada, The Nature of Expertise in Fingerprint Examiners
- Cowger, CH. 7 Comparison Prints

- Huber, IAI Document Seminar – St. Louis
- Langenburg, Glenn. *Pilot Study: A statistical analysis of the ACE-V methodology – Analysis stage*. JFI 45(1):64-79, 2004
- Langenburg, A Performance Study of the ACE-V Process
- Leo, Distortion versus Dissimilarity in Friction Skin Identification
- Leo, Friction Skin Identification a Scientific Approach
- McRoberts, Fingerprints – What they Can and Cannot Do
- McRoberts, Is Friction Ridge Identification a Science
- Okajima, Dermal and Epidermal Structures of the Volar Skin
- Triplett, ACE-V
- Vanderkolk, Forensic Individualization of Images Using Quality-Quantity
- Wertheim, Comparison and Identification of Fingerprint Evidence

MODULE J: LEGAL ISSUES AND EXPERT TESTIMONY

- 1995 CTS Test
- A Year in Review – 40 Significant Fingerprint Events of 2010
- Ashlock, Expert Witness Effective Courtroom Testimony
- Bergeron, Identification versus Individualization
- Budowle, A Perspective on Errors, Bias, and Interpretation in FS and Direction for advancement
- CPLEX, Full Daubert Hearing is Not Always Required to Admit Expert Testimony
- Daubert Card
- Dror & Charlton, Contextual Information Affects Fingerprint Experts
- Edwards, NAS – What it Means for the Bench and Bar
- Gutowski, Error Rates in Fingerprint Examination – The View in 2006
- IAI Resolution, July 2010
- Illsley, Jurors Attitudes Toward Fingerprint Evidence and the Witness
- Lockheed-Martin 50K Study
- NAS Report, Chapter on Friction Ridge Analysis
- Smith, Specific Tactics of Cross-Examination
- Spinney, The Fingerprint
- Srihari & Srinivasan & Fang, Discriminability in Fingerprints of Twins
- Stacey, Report on Erroneous Identification in Madrid Bombing
- Thorton, Letter to the Editor – A Rejection of Working Blind
- Triplett, Admissibility Criteria, Cases, and Critics
- USA v. Mitchell, Post-Daubert Hearing Memo
- Vanderkolk, CH. 1 Objectivity-Subjectivity
- Wertheim, Qualifying as an Expert Fingerprint Witness
- NAS Executive SUMMARY
- Federal Rules of Evidence, 2011
- Moenssens, Andre et al. *Scientific Evidence in Civil and Criminal Cases*. Foundation Press, 2007; Chapters 1 & 10
- Moenssens, Andre and Meagher, Steve. *Friction Ridge Sourcebook*, Chapter 13- *Fingerprints and the Law*
- National Institute of Justice 2011
- PCAST and the PCAST Addendum