

1 IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF KING COUNTY FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

2 EAST DIVISION, REDMOND COURTHOUSE

3
4 STATE OF WASHINGTON,

5 Plaintiff,

6 vs.

7 AHMACH, SANAFIM, ET AL.

8 Defendants
9

) Case No. C00627921, ET AL.

) ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
) MOTION TO SUPPRESS

10
11
12 Each of the Defendants joined in this motion ask that this three judge panel of the King
13 County District Court suppress the Defendants' breath test readings, arguing that the Washington
14 State Toxicology Laboratory (WSTL) engaged in practices which were both fraudulent and
15 scientifically unacceptable. The State, while agreeing that many of the activities of the WSTL
16 were unacceptable, argues that suppression is not the appropriate remedy, both because none of
17 the Defendants' tests were directly affected at any critical point and because the issues raised by
18 the Defendants could be raised before each trier of fact and given their appropriate weight.

19 For the reasons stated in this Order, the breath tests in each of the Defendants' cases are
20 suppressed.
21

22 **Findings of Fact**

23
24 Each of the Defendants herein were arrested for an alcohol related traffic offense, and
25 each submitted to a test of his or her breath at the request of the arresting officer. These tests

1 were performed on the Datamaster or Datamaster CDM machines located throughout King
2 County and Washington.

3 These instruments operate under the principal of comparing the unknown (the breath of
4 the arrestee) to a known standard of alcohol to measure the amount of alcohol in the breath.

5 There are multiple checks performed by the instrument to ascertain the accuracy of the result.

6 One of the checks is the external standard, which measures the headspace alcohol vapor content
7 of an external simulator solution (field solution). This solution is a mixture of ethanol and water
8 in a known quantity prepared by the WSTL.

9 These instruments are periodically checked, calibrated and maintained by the Washington
10 State Patrol Breath Test Section (breath test section). For this purpose they also use solutions of
11 ethanol and water prepared to known standards by the WSTL (QAP solutions).

12
13 The procedure for preparation of QAP and field simulator solutions is set forth in
14 protocols created and/or promulgated by the State Toxicologist, Dr. Barry Logan. An analyst
15 mixes the solutions according to the protocol, and then each of 16 analysts test the solutions by
16 preparing vials of the mixture and submitting them to headspace gas chromatography along with
17 control vials and blank vials. The results are recorded for each analyst, and ultimately published
18 to the web for access by the public. The analysts then "certify" that they have performed the
19 tests, and that the results as published are correct. These certifications are intended to be used in
20 court in lieu of live testimony by the toxicologists.

21
22 This three judge panel has found many irregularities in the preparation, use and
23 documentation of these solutions and tests, as set forth below:
24
25

1 **False Certifications**

- 2 1. Ann Marie Gordon (AMG) became lab manager at WSTL by appointment of Dr.
3 Logan.
- 4 2. AMG informed Dr. Logan that her predecessor as lab manager had engaged in a
5 practice of having other toxicologists prepare and test simulator solutions for him and
6 yet certify that he had prepared and tested the simulator solutions.
- 7 3. AMG told Dr. Logan that she did not approve of this procedure and was then also
8 informed by Dr. Logan that it was not acceptable for a toxicologist to engage in this
9 practice.
- 10 4. Nonetheless, AMG did engage in this practice beginning in 2003. Ed Formoso was a
11 lab supervisor; he prepared and tested simulator solutions for AMG from 2003 to
12 2007. This involved 56 simulator solution tests.
- 13 5. Each test was accompanied by a CrRLJ 6.13 certification that AMG had performed
14 the test and that the test was accurate and correct.
- 15 6. Melissa Pemberton was the quality control manager at the WSTL during a part of this
16 time, and knew that AMG was not performing tests but was certifying them.
- 17 7. This deception was uncovered after two anonymous tips received by the Chief of the
18 Washington State Patrol.
- 19 8. The first was received on March 15, 2007. Dr. Logan was directed by Assistant Chief
20 Beckley to investigate this complaint.
- 21 9. Dr. Logan directed AMG and Formoso to investigate the complaint.
- 22 10. AMG and Formoso discussed the procedure and agreed that Formoso would no
23 longer perform tests on behalf of AMG.
24
25

1 11. AMG informed Dr. Logan that she did not perform the tests of the solutions but that
2 she signed the forms indicating that she did.

3 12. AMG and Formoso prepared a report stating that there was no problem with the
4 certifications and that no solution had left the lab with an incorrect solution in 20
5 years.

6 13. Dr. Logan, AMG and Formoso knew, or should have known, that this report was
7 incorrect and misleading, but took no steps to correct it or provide for another
8 investigation.

9 14. Melissa Pemberton had run vials prepared for AMG by Formoso through the gas
10 chromatograph along with her own samples, knowing that these were to be attributed
11 to AMG, and that AMG would sign certificates alleging that she did the tests.

12 15. Dr. Logan was aware of this, by August of 2007.

13 16. DR. Logan and Pemberton both testified under oath that no one other than Formoso
14 ever ran tests for AMG.
15

16 **Defective and Erroneous Certification Procedures**

17 17. The software used to perform calculations for simulator solution worksheets was
18 defective from its inception in that it omitted the fourth data entry from the fourth
19 toxicologist who performed the tests.

20 18. Beginning in August 2005 a change in the software resulted in a failure to include
21 data from 4 of the 16 toxicologists performing tests in calculations to establish
22 accuracy.
23

24 19. Lab protocols require the inclusion of all analysts' data in these calculations.
25

1 20. No one checked the software program to ascertain accuracy and compliance with
2 protocols. There was no procedure or protocol propounded to check or verify
3 software used by the WSTL.

4 21. Analysts were not trained or directed to check the calculations performed by the
5 software.

6 22. Analysts regularly signed declarations which stated the mean concentration of alcohol
7 in the solutions. These declarations were prepared by support staff, and were not
8 checked for accuracy by the analysts before signing. In at least six instances these
9 declarations were in error. At least one analyst signed them a second time still
10 reflecting the errors.
11

12 **Software Failure, Human Error, Equipment Malfunction and Violation of Protocols**

13 23. The software used for calculations to determine the acceptability of simulator
14 solutions was developed by computer programmer(s) within the Washington State
15 patrol and was not subject to rigorous testing and/or checking such that substantial
16 errors resulted and significant data was deleted from calculations.

17 24. No procedure or protocol within the WSTL required this software to be validated for
18 accuracy or fitness for purpose, and no Lab personnel conducted such testing at
19 anytime, nor verified that the data produced was correct.

20 25. Errors based on software miscalculations existed within almost all field simulator
21 solution certifications issued between August 2005 and August 2007. At least one
22 QAP solution was similarly affected.

23 26. When analysts conducted gas chromatograph tests, the machine printed results
24 automatically. These were maintained in the test files. Thereafter (sometimes weeks
25

1 after), worksheets were prepared by support personnel detailing the testing results for
2 each toxicologist. Thereafter analysts signed the worksheets to acknowledge their
3 correctness. These worksheets were not checked against the original chromatographs
4 to determine if they were accurate before signing, and incorrect data was in fact
5 inserted into some worksheets. These worksheets were posted to the web and relied
6 upon in determining the accuracy and precision of the breath testing machines in the
7 field.

8 27. Declarations by toxicologists for certification of the solutions are prepared by support
9 personnel and then given to analysts to sign, sometimes weeks after the actual testing.
10 These were not checked against chromatographs or worksheets to insure accuracy.

11 There were at least 150 instances of similar non-software related errors committed by
12 analysts and revealed in the record. These include:

- 13 a. Entering incorrect data into certification spreadsheets for use in calculations to
14 determine mean solution values and compliance with protocols.
- 15 b. Entering incorrect test values for controls.
- 16 c. Entering data for the wrong solutions into certification spreadsheets.
- 17 d. Signing declarations indicating testing of the solution prior to the solution even being
18 prepared.
- 19 e. Signing declarations indicating that a solution had been tested before the testing had
20 taken place.
- 21 f. Incorrect dates for testing and/or signing of declarations.
- 22

23 28. The WSTL was equipped with several gas chromatograph machines for use by the
24 analysts. A machine that malfunctioned was not repaired or maintained adequately
25

1 and this resulted in different operational and measurement characteristics and
2 abnormal variations in readings. The machine remained on line for some time even
3 though individual toxicologists knew that it was not functioning properly. Once
4 repaired this abnormality disappeared.

5 **Improper Evidentiary Procedures**

6 29. In 2004 the Washington State Patrol conducted an internal audit of the WSTL. The
7 report included the following conclusions:

- 8 a. The WSTL was noncompliant with policies and procedures in 8 major categories.
9 b. The simulator solution logbooks were not properly kept.
10 c. The required self audits were not performed.
11 d. AMG indicated that she did not have time to follow WSP policies and would not do
12 so.
13 e. “WSP policies and required procedures appear to be of secondary concern to Lab
14 personnel....Accurate recordkeeping and quarterly auditing as required by patrol
15 Policies and CALEA standards is severely deficient.”
16

17 30. In 2007 another internal audit was conducted by the Washington State Patrol. The
18 report included the following conclusions:

- 19 a. “The department is unnecessarily exposed to litigation due to insufficient
20 documentation and disregard for evidence handling policies and procedures.”
21 b. “Mandatory audits are not being completed.... Non-standard evidence handling
22 procedures and insufficient documentation to ensure the same...and failure to perform
23 required audits jeopardizes operational performance as well as CALEA accreditation.
24

25 “

Inadequate and Erroneous Protocols and Training

1
2 31. The accuracy of breath alcohol measurements is determined by the use of simulator
3 solutions. These must be accurately prepared and certified as such to gain the trust
4 and confidence of the courts and public.

5 32. Accuracy of these solutions is assured by the adherence to proper protocols for their
6 preparation and use.

7 33. Contrary to protocol requirements, toxicologists were trained to discard data
8 generated by the tests if any single data entry lay outside the range for the mean value
9 of the solution as dictated by the protocol. This tended to create a testing system that
10 would not fail a solution as every value outside the range was discarded and only
11 those that were within the accepted range were included in the calculations of
12 accuracy.

13 34. Discarding of data is appropriate in some circumstances where identifiable reasons
14 exist or where there is appropriate statistical justification (outliers). However, a
15 decision to discard data must be governed by appropriate protocols and must be
16 properly documented so that these decisions can be reviewed. Such a protocol was
17 not promulgated until this legal proceeding was well underway, and documentation
18 was not required or provided.

19 35. Several toxicologists discarded data without identifiable or statistical reasons for
20 doing so. Inadequate or no documentation was provided, so that in those situations
21 this Court cannot determine why data was discarded.
22
23
24
25

1 36. At least one toxicologist was not taught that testing of simulator solutions followed
2 different procedures than testing of other materials, and conducted multiple tests,
3 discarding the results of at least one test.

4 37. Protocols for solution preparation and machine testing were contradictory or
5 inconsistent, resulting in field solutions being used for QAP testing in some cases.

6 **Impact on Tests Conducted In the Field**

7
8 38. Field solution #2018 was never properly certified due to errors committed by the
9 analyst. This solution was used as the external standard in 2,018 tests.

10 39. Field solution #2019 was never properly certified due to similar errors committed by
11 the same analyst. These two batch errors were likely caused when the analyst
12 switched data. This solution was used as the basis for QAP's performed on at least 39
13 breath test machines. There were approximately 7,928 tests conducted on the affected
14 machines.

15 40. QAP batch solution #06028 was certified after data was discarded improperly. QAP
16 procedures were performed on 32 Datamaster machines using this solution. This had
17 an impact on 3,445 tests.

18 41. Field solution #05008 was used as a QAP solution to test and calibrate the
19 Datamaster. Though, perhaps, not a violation of protocol since the protocols were in
20 conflict, Dr. Logan conceded that field solutions were never intended to be used for
21 the QAP process. This solution was improperly certified by AMG. If the data from
22 her tests were removed, the solution has a mean alcohol concentration of .1022,
23 outside the acceptable range for QAP solutions. The tests conducted using machines
24 tested and calibrated with this solution number 1,679.
25

1 42. Field solution batch #06003 was used as a QAP solution. This solution had a mean
2 alcohol concentration of .1024, outside the range deemed acceptable for QAP
3 solutions. Two machines were tested using this solution, affecting 392 individual
4 tests.

5 43. Field solution #06048 was qualified using software which provided incorrect results.
6 When correct figures are computed, it was determined that the solution would not
7 have qualified as a QAP solution. At least one Datamaster QAP was performed with
8 this solution, affecting 21 individual tests.

9 44. This same solution was also used as a field solution, but when proper calculations are
10 made, it is apparent that it would have affected all tests conducted using this machine.
11 However, the number of tests affected has not been determined.

12 45. QAP solution #06037 was certified using software that incorrectly calculated the
13 equivalent vapor concentration. The machines calibrated using this solution affected
14 2,691 individual breath tests.

15 46. Field solution #06043 was tested by one analyst using a defective gas chromatograph.
16 The test should have been repeated to determine accuracy. The number of individual
17 test impacted by this has not been ascertained.

18 47. Not all (or possibly any) of the defective solutions noted above would have resulted
19 in substantial changes in every test result. Some test results would be of greater
20 importance than others if they are at or near the absolute standards for violations
21 created by statues, ie. .02, .04, .08, and .15. However, every test conducted with an
22 improperly certified or defective solution is affected in some way.
23
24

25 **Nondisclosure of Machine Bias**

- 1 48. All measuring machines have some bias, and Datamaster breath test machines have
2 bias which is identified in the QAP process.
- 3 49. This bias is not determinable without testing; sometimes creating readings lower than
4 actual and sometimes higher.
- 5 50. The bias of any particular machine can be determined from the information created
6 during the QAP process by applying mathematical formulas and calculations. This
7 information is not readily available to the public, though it is published on the web.
8 Due to the complexity of the calculations and formula involved, few in the legal
9 community are aware of this bias. The Breath Test Section of the Washington State
10 Patrol does, however, provide this information to attorneys and defendants when
11 requested.
- 12 51. The machine bias information could be easily made available to the defendants,
13 attorneys and public by the State Toxicologist.
14

16 Analysis

18 **BAC Admissibility Post Jensen**

19 The Washington legislature conveyed its “frustration with the inadequacy of previous
20 attempts to curtail the incidence of (Driving Under the Influence) DUI” with the adoption of
21 SHB 3055¹ in 2004. City of Fircrest v. Jensen, 158 Wn.2d 384, 388 (2006). Central to SHB
22

23 ¹ In part, the legislature indicated its intent in the adoption of SHB 3055 as follows:
24 “The legislature finds that previous attempts to curtail the incidence of driving while intoxicated have been
25 inadequate. The legislature further finds that property loss, injury, and death caused by drinking drivers continue at
unacceptable levels. This act is intended to convey the seriousness with which the legislature views this problem. To
that end the legislature seeks to ensure swift and certain consequences for those who drink and drive.

To accomplish this goal, the legislature adopts standards governing the admissibility of tests of a person's blood
or breath. These standards will provide a degree of uniformity that is currently lacking, and will reduce the delays

1 3055 were amendments to RCW 46.61.506, by which the legislature sought to curtail pretrial
2 motions seeking the suppression of breath tests in DUI cases. As amended, RCW 46.61.506
3 required that trial courts assume the ‘truth of the prosecution’s... evidence and all reasonable
4 inferences from it in a light most favorable to the prosecution.’ RCW 46.61.506(4)(b). While
5 the amendments would still allow defendants to challenge the reliability or accuracy of breath
6 tests, those challenges would “not preclude the admissibility of the test once the prosecution ...
7 has made a prima facie showing” of each of eight basic admissibility requirements set forth in
8 the statute. RCW 46.61.506(4)(a). Ultimately then, SHB 3055 constituted a legislative attempt
9 to eliminate the trial court’s role as the gatekeeper² for a critical piece of evidence in DUI
10 prosecutions.

11 Thus, when the Washington Supreme Court considered this issue in Jensen, supra, the
12 court could have found that the legislation violated the inherent right of the judicial branch to
13 control its own court procedures, i.e., a violation of the Separation of Powers doctrine. Instead,
14 the Court determined that it could harmonize RCW 46.61.506, as amended, with the rules of
15 evidence and give effect to both. Jensen, 158 Wn.2d at 399. The court held that, once the
16 prosecution had met its prima facie burden under RCW 46.61.506(4), the breath test thereafter
17 became “admissible,” meaning that the court could still serve in its role as the gatekeeper under
18 the applicable rules of evidence. *Id.* By analogy, the Jensen court referenced DNA testing:

19
20
21 caused by challenges to various breath test instrument components and maintenance procedures. Such challenges,
22 while allowed, will no longer go to admissibility of test results. Instead, such challenges are to be considered by the
finder of fact in deciding what weight to place upon an admitted blood or breath test result.”
Laws of 2004, ch. 68.

23 ² A trial court is said to be the “gatekeeper” for the admissibility of evidence under both the Frye test (Frye v. United
24 States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923)) and under the standard articulated in Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals,
25 Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993); State v. Copeland, 130 Wn.2d 244, 259-260 (1996). “In Daubert, the Supreme Court held
that a trial judge should act as a “gatekeeper” to ensure that all scientific evidence admitted is both relevant and
reliable.” Reese v. Stroh, 74 Wn. App. 550, 559 (1994). The court also acts as the gatekeeper when it rules on
motions to suppress scientific evidence under ER 403 or ER 702.

1 In the DNA analogy, DNA admissibility has been accepted under Frye³; however,
2 challenges to the weight of the DNA evidence, including laboratory error; the size,
3 quality, and randomness of Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) databases, and the
4 methodology and practices of the FBI in declaring a DNA match, are subject to ER 702
5 admissibility as determined by the trial court.

6
7 Jensen, 158 Wn.2d at 397. Continuing this analogy to the cases herein, the trial court's
8 determination that the prosecution had, prima facie, met the requirements of RCW 46.61.506(4),
9 would be comparable to acceptance under Frye, meaning that the court would then move on to
10 consideration of any rules of evidence that might be applicable.

11 12 **ER 702 and Laboratory Evidence**

13 A breath test reading is not admissible absent expert testimony, either in person or by
14 affidavit as allowed by CrRLJ 6.13(c)⁴. Pursuant to ER 702, however, an expert may only testify
15 "if scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand
16 the evidence or to determine a fact in issue." In a criminal prosecution, a post Frye analysis of
17 the admissibility of expert testimony under ER 702 is a consequential activity with independent
18 force and effect. "In this state ER 702 has a significant role to play in admissibility of scientific
19 evidence aside from Frye." State v. Copeland, 130 Wn.2d 244, 259-260 (1996).

20
21 ³ Frye requires that the court determine whether (1) the scientific theory has general acceptance in the scientific
22 community, (2) the techniques and experiments that currently exist can produce reliable results and are
23 generally accepted by the scientific community, and (3) the laboratory performed the accepted scientific techniques
24 in the particular case. Frye v. United States, Supra.

25 ⁴ A breath test technician must testify that the BAC Verifier Datamaster or Datamaster CDM was tested, certified
and working properly on the date of the test, and a state toxicologist must testify that the simulator solution was
properly prepared and tested. Both would also have to testify that each activity was performed in conformance with
the rules established by the Washington State Toxicologist. RCW 46.61.506(3); CrRLJ 6.13(c).

The Defendants here have sought suppression of their breath tests based upon the failure of the WSTL to properly
prepare, test and certify simulator solutions. The Defendants have not raised any issues relating to the Washington
State Patrol Breath Test Section or Breath Test Technicians.

1 Under Jensen, therefore, after the prosecution has met its prima facie burden for the
2 admission of a BAC reading, a trial court must engage in a meaningful review of the
3 admissibility of the BAC evidence involving, under ER 702, a two part test. State v. Cauthron,
4 120 Wn.2d 879, 890 (1993). As in Copland, supra, the Cauthron court was concerned with the
5 admissibility of DNA evidence:

6
7 The 2-part test to be applied under ER 702 is whether: (1) the witness qualifies as
8 an expert and (2) the expert testimony would be helpful to the trier of fact. Part 2 of this
9 standard should be applied by the trial court to determine if the particularities of the DNA
10 typing in a given case warrant closer scrutiny. If there is a precise problem identified by
11 the defense which would render the test unreliable, then the testimony might not meet the
12 requirements of ER 702 because it would not be helpful to the trier of fact.

13
14 Cauthron, 120 Wn.2d at 890. In each of the following cases, the Supreme Court engaged in both
15 a Frye analysis and an ER 702 review of challenged forensic laboratory conclusions. In each case
16 discussed, the court began with the proposition that the “determination of whether expert
17 testimony is admissible is within the discretion of the trial court. Unless there has been an abuse
18 of discretion, this court will not disturb the trial court's decision.” Cauthron, 120 Wn.2d at 890.
19 In each case the trial court admitted the scientific evidence and none of the ER 702 challenges to
20 the trial court decisions were overruled, both for the factual reasons noted for each below, and
21 because in each case the court was upholding a discretionary ruling of the trial court.

- 22
23 • In State v. Cauthron, supra, the court noted that the defense had only presented
24 “potential problems” with the DNA evidence. Moreover, the court noted that “the
25 defense presented its own experts to rebut the State's conclusions. Dr. Ford and

1 Dr. Libby both testified that they found the autorads in this case inconclusive, and
2 discussed their reasons at length. In addition, they each pointed out the possible
3 pitfalls of DNA testing, such as degradation, starrng, cross contamination, etc.,
4 and the lack of controls employed in the testing procedure. The jury was
5 presented with a balanced picture of the DNA evidence⁵.” Cauthron, 120 Wn.2d
6 at 899.

- 7
- 8 • In State v. Kalakosky, 121 Wn.2d 525 (1993), the court quickly dealt with the two
9 errors cited by the defense. (1) “The defense asserts that semen samples taken
10 from the C.F. crime scene were spilled in ‘close working proximity to samples of
11 defendant's blood’. The record does not support this”. Kalakosky, 121 Wn.2d at
12 540. (2) “The defense also alleges that there was evidence of a mislabeled
13 autoradiograph which compromised the reliability of the DNA testing. This also is
14 unsupported by the record.” *Id.*
 - 15
 - 16 • In Copeland, *supra*, the court considered the admissibility of lab results which had
17 been challenged for a lack of external testing of lab procedures and for allegedly
18 simplistic proficiency testing procedures. In dismissing these challenges, the
19 court noted that “while a completely independent audit may be ideal, there was no
20 evidence that the FBI procedures compromised the test results in this case.”
21 Copeland, 130 Wn.2d at 271. The court concluded that the “issues of laboratory
22 error and lack of proficiency testing can be and were the subject of cross-

23

24 ⁵ The Cauthron court ultimately reversed the trial court, not for lab error, but because a critical underlying
25 assumption for the admissibility of DNA testing was absent. “Testimony of a match in DNA samples, without the
statistical background or probability estimates, is neither based on a generally accepted scientific theory nor helpful
to the trier of fact.” Cauthron, 120 Wn.2d at 907.

1 examination and defense expert testimony at Copeland's trial. Id.; See also, State
2 v. Cannon, 130 Wn.2d 313 (1996).

3
4 Thus, in each of the above cases dealing with potential lab errors and poor lab
5 procedures, the errors and poor procedures were relatively insignificant. Moreover, the Supreme
6 Court stressed the importance of a trial court's role in evaluating lab evidence under the
7 mandates of ER 702.

8 In Kalakosky, while the court noted that alleged infirmities in the performance of a test
9 will usually go to the weight of the evidence, not its admissibility, it also stated that:

10
11 If the testimony before the trial court shows that a given testing procedure was so
12 flawed as to be unreliable then the results might be excluded because they are not
13 "helpful to the trier of fact". The issue of human error in the forensic laboratory is
14 analyzed under ER 702 and is not a part of the Frye test....

15
16 Kalakosky, 121 Wn.2d at 541. See also, Cannon, 130 Wn.2d at 325; and Copeland, 130 Wn.2d
17 at 270. That this is still the standard in DUI cases post Jensen is reflected in Justice Madsen's
18 concurrence in City of Seattle v. Ludvigsen, 2007 Wash. LEXIS 953 (2007):

19
20 When deviations from additional testing procedures or machine maintenance protocols
21 are so serious as to render test results unreliable, a court has discretion to exclude them in
22 accordance with the rules of evidence.

23 Ludvigsen, at page 35.

24
25 The State argues a violation of protocols by the WSTL could not provide any basis for

1 suppression of breath tests, citing State v. Mee Hui Kim, 134 Wn. App. 27 (2006). Kim,
2 however, does not stand for the proposition that a breath or blood test may never be suppressed
3 for a violation of WSTL protocols under ER 702. The defendant in Kim did not contend that the
4 WSTL failed to comply with a protocol; rather the defendant in Kim argued that the State had
5 failed to *show* compliance with a protocol:

6
7 Specifically, Kim points to the State's failure to show that preparation of the volatile
8 standards in the "Alcohol Standard Logbook" met the requirements in the Head Space
9 GC Protocol.

10
11 Kim, 134 Wn. App. at 35-36. Ann Marie Gordon, testifying at the Kim motion hearing, stated
12 that the protocol had been complied with and that the logbook was available at the lab for
13 defense review. Upon these facts the trial court held that the State had shown compliance with
14 the WAC and that the defense could (when, after the motion hearing they had been able to
15 review the logbook) renew their motion to suppress. Kim, 134 Wn. App. at 36-37. Thus, trial
16 courts are still able to weigh the failure of the WSTL to follow its own protocols in a motion to
17 suppress under ER 702.

18
19 In each of the Defendants' cases herein, the defense cannot point to specific errors
20 directly compromising the breath test results at critical BAC levels. For this reason the State
21 argues that this court should decline to suppress the results of the breath tests and should instead
22 admit the evidence at trial and allow the trier of fact to weigh each of the issues raised. While
23 the State's position is generally preferable when disputes arise relating to the quality of scientific
24 evidence, it is not always the last word on the subject. Indeed, if the court were always to admit
25

1 questionable evidence at trial, ER 702 would serve little purpose. Here we find, for the reasons
2 documented in this court's findings of fact and more fully explained below, that the decision to
3 suppress or admit tips considerably in favor of suppression.

4 Under the current statutory scheme, a charge of DUI is most commonly proven by two
5 different means; proving that an individual drove a motor vehicle while under the influence of or
6 affected by intoxicating liquor, or by proof that the person had, within two hours after driving, an
7 alcohol concentration of 0.08 or higher as shown by analysis of the person's breath⁶. RCW
8 46.61.502 (1). Proof of DUI via analysis of the persons breath is considered a per se violation,
9 i.e., the state is not required to show that the defendant was affected by the alcohol, merely that
10 the level of alcohol in the defendants breath was at or above 0.08. Thus, a crime which carries a
11 potential sentence of one year in jail; carries a mandatory minimum of some amount of jail time,
12 and which will result in the mandatory loss of the privilege to drive a motor vehicle, may be
13 proved by evidence from an instrument alone.

14
15 The 0.08 BAC level is not the only critical level for breath alcohol which has been set by
16 the legislature. The first critical level is 0.02, the level at which a person under the age of 21
17 may be convicted of Driving or Being in Physical Control of a Motor Vehicle After Consuming
18 Alcohol. RCW 46.61.503. The next critical breath alcohol level is 0.04, the level at which a
19 commercial driver will lose his or her commercial drivers license (CDL) for one year. RCW
20 46.25.090; RCW 46.25.120. Finally, in a DUI prosecution, in addition to the 0.08 breath alcohol
21 level, the 0.15 level is also critical. A breath alcohol level of 0.15 or above carries greater
22 mandatory minimum sentencing requirements. RCW 46.61.5055. Moreover, for breath tests
23

24
25 ⁶ The state may also prove the charge of DUI by proof that the defendant was under the combined influence of
liquor and any drug or by proof that the defendant's blood alcohol concentration was 0.08 or higher. RCW
46.61.502 (1).

1 registering above 0.02, 0.04 and 0.08, an individual may lose his or her privilege to drive without
2 the benefit of a prior hearing⁷. RCW 46.20.3101; RCW 46.25.120.

3 Thus, even errors in the range of 1 or 2% can have a profound effect on a breath test
4 reading. Nonetheless, each expert witness who offered testimony⁸ stated that there was not a
5 process or a machine that would not insert some amount of inherent error in any result. That is
6 also the case with the Datamaster and Datamaster CDM. In the process of breath test instrument
7 calibration, the protocols indicate that breath test instrument is still functioning properly if it is
8 accurate to within +/- 5%, and if the precision of the readings stand at +/- 3%⁹. Rod Gullberg
9 testified that the lack of accuracy in a breath test machine is referred to as "bias." A breath test
10 machine normally has a bias of 1-2%, with the smaller fraction of the machines registering a bias
11 of 5% or less¹⁰. The breath test program is not, however, set up to account for any of the
12 potential bias inherent in a breath test machine¹¹. Thus, a process that already allows potential
13 bias in each reading only underscores the importance of ensuring that the WSTL eliminates all
14 other possible sources of error.
15

16 Throughout Washington State, over 40,000 breath tests are administered annually. In
17 light of the importance of each one of these tests for the state and for individual defendants, it is
18 vital that each aspect of the breath test program operate effectively. As stated in the findings, the
19 WSTL prepares and tests both field simulator solutions and quality assurance procedure
20

21
22 ⁷ In the case of a 0.04 reading, a CDL is lost. In each situation the defendant may request a hearing prior to
revocation.

23 ⁸ The court heard testimony from the following expert witnesses: Rod Gullberg, Dr. Barry Logan, Dr. Ashley Emery
and Dr. Nayak Pollisar.

24 ⁹ The WAC defines accuracy and precision as follows: "accuracy" means the proximity of a measured value to a
reference value; "precision" means the ability of a technique to perform a measurement in a reproducible manner.
WAC 449-16-030 (1) & (10).

25 ¹⁰ The bias allowed in the protocols, however, does not include improper procedures or mistakes.

¹¹ For instance, readings are not adjusted at any of the critical levels to account for actual or potential bias, nor
are defendants informed of the potential bias before or during trial.

1 simulator solutions. These solutions serve as a critical check on breath test instruments to ensure
2 that each will provide accurate and precise breath alcohol readings. The CrRLJ 6.13 certificates,
3 or a toxicologist's in-court testimony, allow a breath test technician to "close the loop" and
4 testify that the breath test reading was correct.

6 **A Culture of Compromise**

7 The Cauthron, Kalakosky and Copeland cases, discussed above, generally dealt with
8 questions of lab mistakes and process errors. While many of our findings concern lab mistakes
9 and process errors, the remaining findings indicate that the problems in the WSTL are much
10 more pervasive.

11 Generally, our concerns regarding the WSTL fall into three general categories:

- 13 1. The failure to pursue the ethical standard which should reasonably be expected of an
14 agency that operates as an integral part of the criminal justice system;
- 15 2. The failure to establish procedures to catch and correct human, and software and machine
16 errors within the lab; and
- 17 3. The failure to pursue the rigorous scientific standards which should be reasonably
18 expected of an agency that contributes a key component of critical evidence that may,
19 almost standing alone, result in a criminal conviction.

21 **Ethical Compromises**

22 Ann Marie Gordon falsely signed CrRLJ 6.13 certifications under penalty of perjury
23 indicating that she prepared and tested field simulator solutions and that the solutions were found
24 to conform to the standards established by the State Toxicologist. This and other ethical
25 compromises documented in the findings adopted in this order may at the same time be viewed

