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I Executive Summary – Background and Goals

On August 27, 2004 Senate Bill 1623 was approved by the Governor of California. The bill, which goes into effect January 1st 2005, removes the Department of Health Services (DHS) regulatory authority to license forensic alcohol laboratories engaged in traffic-related casework for law enforcement agencies. CAT members engaged in this type of forensic testing will be affected by SB 1623. CAT was approached by members who felt that the organization should provide guidance to members on some of these changes.

On November 16, 2004 representatives of the Board, Committee Chairs and CAT members who had indicated a keen interest in SB1623 related issues met at short notice. The purpose was to discuss some of the issues concerning SB 1623, to attempt to identify practical solutions and guidance for members, and to determine how CAT could facilitate an exchange of information among the entire membership. Delegates from both private and public laboratories met to share their experiences and discuss the anticipated impact of the bill. Representatives from the DHS were also in attendance. The meeting was chaired by Janet Anderson-Seaquist.

The purpose and discussions at the November meeting were limited in scope: Many technical and logistical aspects relating to SB 1623 are still unknown. DHS itself is still in the process of determining the exact nature of its responsibilities in light of SB 1623. These issues will become clearer in coming months. Nevertheless, the association felt it necessary to communicate the current state of knowledge to members prior to the law going into effect, and to encourage participation in a member-wide discussion of the proposed changes to Title 17.

Currently the California Department of Health Services’ Food and Drug Laboratory Branch's Forensic Alcohol Program (FAP) licenses and regulates over 40 forensic alcohol laboratories. Four areas were identified for preliminary discussion: Laboratory Licensing, Individual Certification, Title 17 Regulations and Updates, Proficiency Testing and Review Panel Formation. Specific issues and suggestions are presented for each of these topics, together with a number of proposed CAT activities, with the specific intention of capturing feedback from the entire membership. A special forum on SB 1623 issues is tentatively scheduled for Thursday March 10, 2004 in Sacramento.
II Introduction

Sections A, B and C list the bill (as passed), a synopsis of the existing and new law, and common misconceptions concerning SB 1623, respectively.

A. Senate Bill No. 1623
CHAPTER 337

An act to amend Section 100425 of, to add Sections 100701, 100702, and 100703 to, to repeal Sections 100710, 100715, 100720, 100730, 100735, 100740, 100745, 100750, 100755, 100760, 100765, and 100770 of, and to repeal and add Section 100700 of, the Health and Safety Code, relating to laboratories.

[Approved by Governor August 27, 2004. Filed with Secretary of State August 30, 2004.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

SB 1623, Johnson. Laboratories: licensing and accreditation.

Existing law requires the State Department of Health Services to adopt and publish regulations to be used in approving and governing the operation of laboratories engaged in the performance of tests by or for law enforcement of blood, urine, tissue, or breath samples for the purposes of determining the concentration of ethyl alcohol in the blood of persons involved in traffic accidents or in traffic violations, including the qualifications of the employees who perform the tests, that the department determines are reasonably necessary to ensure the competence of the laboratories and employees to prepare, analyze, and report the results of the tests.

Existing law requires each laboratory in the state that performs those tests to be licensed by the Director of Health Services. Existing law requires the department to periodically inspect every approved and licensed laboratory. If the director orders the suspension or revocation of a laboratory’s license, the licensee is required to surrender the license to the director upon the effective date of that order. Existing law authorizes the director, after suspension of the license, to reinstate the license under prescribed conditions.

This bill would repeal all of the above provisions. The bill would instead require laboratories engaging in the performance of forensic alcohol analysis tests by or for law enforcement agencies on blood, urine, tissue, or breath for the purposes of determining the concentration of ethyl alcohol in persons involved in traffic accidents or in traffic violations to comply with various existing department regulations regarding inspection of laboratories, collection and handling of samples, methods of analysis, and laboratory records. The bill would prohibit the department from requiring laboratories to be licensed. The bill would require each laboratory to ensure that breath alcohol instruments and calibrating devices used in testing are listed in the conforming products list in the Federal Register by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the United States Department of Transportation and would require all laboratories to follow the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board guidelines for proficiency testing, and to meet other proficiency test requirements.

The bill would require the department, on or before July 1, 2005, to establish a review committee that would be required to meet at least once in each 5-year period thereafter, or within 60 days of receipt of a request by the department or a member of the review committee, to evaluate and determine revisions to relevant department regulations. The bill would require the review committee to submit a summary of those revisions to the California Health and Human Services Agency. The bill would authorize the agency to disapprove one or more of the revisions within 90 days of receiving
them. The bill would require the department to adopt regulations to incorporate the revisions determined by the review committee, except for those revisions that the agency disapproves. The bill would make additional conforming changes to existing law.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 100425 of the Health and Safety Code is amended to read:

100425. (a) The fees or charges for the issuance or renewal of any permit, license, registration, or document pursuant to Sections 1639.5, 1676, 1677, 2202, 2805, 11887, 100860, 106700, 106890, 106925, 107080, 107090, 107095, 107160, 110210, 110470, 111130, 111140, 111630, 112405, 112510, 112750, 112755, 113060, 113065, 113845, 114056, 114065, paragraph (2), of subdivision (c) of Section 114090, 114140, subdivision (b) of Section 114290, 114367, 115035, 115065, 115080, 116205, 117923, 117995, 118045, 118210, and 118245 shall be adjusted annually by the percentage change printed in the Budget Act for those items appropriating funds to the state department. After the first annual adjustment of fees or charges pursuant to this section, the fees or charges subject to subsequent adjustment shall be the fees or charges for the prior calendar year. The percentage change shall be determined by the Department of Finance, and shall include at least the total percentage change in salaries and operating expenses of the state department. However, the total increase in amounts collected under this section shall not exceed the total increased cost of the program or service provided.

(b) The state department shall publish annually a list of the actual numerical fee charges for each permit, license, certification, or registration governed by this section. This adjustment of fees and publication of the fee list shall not be subject to the requirements of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

SEC. 2. Section 100700 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 100700 is added to the Health and Safety Code, to read:

100700. (a) Laboratories engaged in the performance of forensic alcohol analysis tests by or for law enforcement agencies on blood, urine, tissue, or breath for the purposes of determining the concentration of ethyl alcohol in persons involved in traffic accidents or in traffic violations shall comply with Group 8 (commencing with Section 1215) of Subchapter 1 of Chapter 2 of Division 1 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations, as they exist on December 31, 2004, until the time when those regulations are revised pursuant to Section 100703.

(b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the department shall not require laboratories to be licensed.

SEC. 4. Section 100701 is added to the Health and Safety Code, to read:

100701. All laboratories that are subject to the requirements of Section 100700 shall ensure that breath alcohol instruments and calibrating devices used in testing are listed in the conforming products list in the Federal Register by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the United States Department of Transportation.

SEC. 5. Section 100702 is added to the Health and Safety Code, to read:

100702. (a) All laboratories that are subject to the requirements of Section 100700 shall follow the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) guidelines for proficiency testing. The required proficiency test must be obtained from any ASCLD/LAB approved test provider.

(b) Each laboratory shall participate annually in an external proficiency test for alcohol analysis.
(c) Each examiner shall successfully complete at least one proficiency test annually.
(d) Each laboratory shall have a procedure in writing that describes a review of proficiency test results, and, if applicable, the corrective action taken when proficiency test results are inconsistent with expected test results.

SEC. 6. Section 100703 is added to the Health and Safety Code, to read:

100703. (a) On or before July 1, 2005, the department shall establish a review committee.
(b) The review committee shall have eight members, including one person representing each of the following:
(1) Prosecuting attorneys.
(2) Law enforcement agencies.
(3) Defense attorneys.
(4) Coroners, pathologists, or medical examiners.
(5) Criminalists.
(6) Toxicologists.
(7) Crime laboratory directors.
(8) The State Department of Health Services.

(c) The review committee shall meet at least once in each five-year period after its initial meeting, or within 60 days of receipt of a request by the department or a member of the review committee.

(d) The review committee shall evaluate Group 8 (commencing with Section 1215) of Subchapter 1 of Chapter 2 of Division 1 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations and determine revisions that will limit those regulations to those that the review committee determines are reasonably necessary to ensure the competence of the laboratories and employees to prepare, analyze, and report the results of the tests and comply with applicable laws. The review committee shall submit a summary of revisions to the California Health and Human Services Agency.

(e) Within 90 days of receiving the review committee’s revisions, the California Health and Human Services Agency may disapprove of one or more of the revisions.

(f) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the department shall adopt regulations pursuant to this section that shall incorporate the review committee’s revisions. Nothing in this section shall be construed as exempting the regulations from the requirements of Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

(2) The department shall not adopt regulations to incorporate any review committee revisions that were disapproved under subdivision.

SEC. 7. Section 100710 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 8. Section 100715 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 10. Section 100730 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 11. Section 100735 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 12. Section 100740 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 13. Section 100745 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 15. Section 100755 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 16. Section 100760 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 17. Section 100765 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.
SEC. 18. Section 100770 of the Health and Safety Code is repealed.

B. Synopsis of New and Existing Law

Existing Law:

1) Requires forensic alcohol analysis to be performed only by a law enforcement laboratory approved and licensed by DHS.

2) Requires DHS to: a) license forensic alcohol laboratories; b) adopt and publish regulations governing the laboratories; c) inspect laboratories; and, d) suspend, revoke or deny licenses or take any disciplinary action on the laboratories, as specified.

New Law:

1) Prohibits DHS from requiring laboratories that conduct forensic alcohol analysis to be licensed.
2) Requires laboratories to ensure that breath alcohol instruments and calibrating devices used in testing are listed in the conforming products list in the Federal Register by the National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration of the United States Department of Transportation.

3) Requires all laboratories to follow the American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) guidelines for proficiency testing. The required proficiency test must be obtained from any ACSLD/LAB approved test provider. Also requires each laboratory to participate annually in an external proficiency test for alcohol analysis; each examiner to successfully complete at least one proficiency test annually; each laboratory to have a procedure in writing that describes a review of proficiency test results, and, if applicable, the corrective action taken when proficiency test results are inconsistent with expected results.

4) Requires DHS to establish a review committee on or before July 1, 2005, as specified, to evaluate the regulations and determine revisions that will limit those regulations to those that the committee determines as reasonably necessary to ensure the competence of laboratories and employees. Requires DHS to adopt the review committee’s revisions upon approval of the revisions by the Health and Human Services Agency (HHS).

5) Requires that the review committee consist of eight members, with one representative from each of the following: prosecuting attorneys, law enforcement agencies, defense attorneys, coroners, pathologists, or medical examiners, criminalists, toxicologists, crime laboratory directors, and DHS.

6) Requires the review committee to submit a summary of revisions to the California Health and Human Services Agency. Allows HHS to disapprove one or more of the revisions within 90 days of receiving the revisions.

7) Requires laboratories performing forensic alcohol analysis to comply with regulations governing forensic alcohol analysis as they exist on December 31, 2004, and until such regulations are revised and adopted by DHS pursuant to the review committee’s evaluation.

C. Misconceptions

The law:

- **Does not** require applicable laboratories to be ASCLD/LAB accredited.

  Rather, it requires them to follow ASCLD/LAB guidelines for proficiency testing.

- **Does not** require that each examiner perform an external proficiency test annually.

  The source of the annual proficiency test for each individual examiner is not specified. It can be internal or external.

- Forensic Alcohol Analyst Trainee (FAAT), Forensic Alcohol Analyst (FAA) and Forensic Alcohol Supervisor (FAS) will no longer apply after Jan 1, 2005.

  In fact, the FAP plans to continue to certify these individuals; note also that the Department of Motor Vehicles may require these designations to continue to appear on reports as part of the DMV hearing process.
III Laboratory Licensing

Issue

- Laboratories will no longer be licensed by DHS after Dec 31, 2004.

Comments, Ideas, Solutions

- Perception is that this may impact private labs to a greater extent than public labs; public laboratories are largely accredited by other organizations, e.g. ASCLD/LAB.

- All laboratories, regardless of their domain need to be prepared to address the lack of licensure. Training, policies, procedures and good laboratory practices that were in place under the regulatory authority of DHS will remain intact. Laboratory personnel should be prepared to testify to the specifics of the quality system that is in place in their laboratory, rather than the license itself; SB 1623 does not dictate changes in the procedural operation of the laboratory; if these remain intact, the laboratory activities should not be subject to increased scrutiny or question.

- Be prepared to answer additional questions regarding the quality system in place in your laboratory; prepare witnesses and conduct additional training if needed.

- Proficiency testing requirements set forth in SB 1623 are perceived by some to be more stringent than those currently required by DHS (see Section VI).

- If not already accredited by an outside agency, consider laboratory accreditation to increase confidence in the quality of the work product and introduce a measure of external accountability that will increase the credibility of the laboratory. Both ABFT\(^1\) and ASCLD/LAB\(^2\) offer laboratory accreditation programs which are applicable to forensic alcohol analysis.

IV Individual Certification

Issue

- Forensic Alcohol Analyst Trainee (FAAT), Forensic Alcohol Analyst (FAA) and Forensic Alcohol Supervisor (FAS) may no longer be valid designations.

Comments, Ideas, Solutions

- In fact, until Title 17 has been revised, the FAAT, FAA/FAS designations are still valid.

- A preliminary legal assessment by DHS attorneys indicates that the Forensic Alcohol Program (FAP) will continue to certify individuals as FAAT, FAA and FAS. DHS anticipates that the assessment of personnel qualifications and examinations will continue. However, they do not anticipate that they will continue to provide a list of qualified persons (see Section V).

---

\(^1\) ABFT (American Board of Forensic Toxicology, Inc.): The Forensic Toxicology Guidelines can be downloaded from the Society of Forensic Toxicologists website at http://www.soft-tox.org/Guidelines/default.asp

\(^2\) ASCLD/LAB (American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors / Laboratory Accreditation Board) guidelines can be purchased from their website at http://www.ascldlab.org
• DMV requests that these certifications are listed on the report for the purpose of hearings.

• Certifications should continue to be listed on reports and other applicable documentation.

**Issue**

• Witness credibility

**Comments, Ideas, Solutions**

• Consider seeking alternative certifications in forensic toxicology or criminalistics to demonstrate competency in the field. For example, American Board of Criminalists (ABC)³ or the American Board of Forensic Toxicologists (ABFT)⁴.

• Witnesses should always be prepared to answer questions regarding their training, competency, credentials, proficiency and court experience. SB 1623 does not change the fact that forensic analysts must be properly qualified, independent of their status as either a Forensic Alcohol Analyst or Forensic Alcohol Supervisor.

• Ensure that attorneys are prepared to ask the appropriate questions of the witness during *voir dire*.

• Managers and supervisors should be especially mindful of who they send to testify to ensure that witnesses have the necessary training and experience.

• Additional weight may be given to internal laboratory training records and demonstration of competency. Laboratories should be prepared for this and ensure that documentation is available for review when necessary.

• Seek appropriate training for staff wherever necessary.

**V Title 17 Regulations and Updates**

**Issue**

• Specifically what changes are needed to Title 17? How should these ideas be solicited and what is the role of CAT?

**Comments, Ideas, Solutions**

• Various organizations including the California Association of Crime Laboratory Directors (CACLĐ)⁵ and the California Association of Criminalists (CAC)⁶ are in the process of drafting Title 17 changes for DHS review.

• The specific recommendations were beyond the scope of the November 16th meeting. However, CAT will propose a full-day meeting to address this. CAT recommends this meeting takes place

---

⁵ http://www.geocities.com/cacld/
⁶ http://www.cacnews.org/
the day before the scheduled March CAT Scientific Meeting in Sacramento. The meeting will be chaired by the Association’s toxicologist nominee for the DHS review committee (see Section VII). The meeting could be used as an opportunity to discuss these issues in more detail and review recommended changes to Title 17.

- CAT should solicit recommendations for Title 17 changes from the membership. This could be accomplished via a downloadable PDF file from the CAT website. These could be assembled by the Board of Directors and forwarded to DHS, together with a summary of key points, consensus statements (if applicable) and minority opinions.

**Issue**

- DHS will no longer provide a qualified persons list.

**Comments, Ideas, Solutions**

- Analysts must make clear that they are still qualified under Title 17.

- Laboratories should consider providing an internal list of qualified persons. The laboratory director can then sign the document and certify that the persons on the list are qualified. Some laboratories already do this.

**VI Proficiency Testing**

**Issue**

- Lack of proficiency tests supplied by DHS and possible increased cost to laboratories.

**Comments, Ideas, Solutions**

- Based upon preliminary legal assessments, the FAP plans to continue to provide proficiency tests, including the initial qualification samples required for FAAT, FAA certification, and the three tests per year for each laboratory.

- To date, the following proficiency test providers are approved by ASCLD/LAB for alcohol determination: College of American Pathologists (CAP)\(^7\), Collaborative Testing Services (CTS)\(^8\), and Quality Forensics\(^9\). More vendors are in the process of application and approval. For an updated list of approved vendors, contact ASCLD.

- If not already doing so, subscribe to at least one ASCLD/LAB approved external proficiency test. Significant increases in cost will only apply if the laboratory chooses to purchase external proficiency tests for each analyst. This will be a matter of laboratory policy, as it is not required by law. The law requires only one external approved proficiency test per laboratory.

---

\(^7\) CAP offers a blood alcohol proficiency test consisting of three shipments, each containing five challenges..AACC/CAP Alcohol/Volatiles (AL1). Details are available on the CAP website at http://www.cap.org

\(^8\) CTS offers two blood alcohol proficiency tests, each containing four challenges: 564, 565. Details are available on their website at http://collaborativetesting.com

\(^9\) Quality Forensics offers two blood alcohol proficiency tests, each containing four challenges: QF-TXA-04A and QF-TXA-04B. Details are available on their website at http://www.qualityforensics.com
• Annual proficiency tests required for each examiner can be internal, or other more cost-effective alternatives as deemed necessary by the individual agency.

• Blind proficiency testing should be considered wherever possible.

**Issue**

• Written procedures to evaluate proficiency test results and take corrective action when necessary.

**Comments, Ideas, Solutions**

• Public laboratories that are already accredited by ASCLD/LAB or ABFT should already have this in place. This will have the most impact in private laboratories and non-accredited public laboratories.

• If laboratories do not already have these guidelines in place, they should do so immediately.

• Possible resources for developing these guidelines include colleagues in accredited laboratories. The FAP also has a document entitled: “Determining Acceptable Performance For Forensic Alcohol Proficiency Tests”.

**Issue**

• Provision of breath alcohol proficiency tests.

**Comments, Ideas, Solutions**

• These are not required under Title 17.

• DHS does not plan to provide these now or in the future.

• Some agencies (for example, Orange County Sheriff’s Department) are informally providing breath alcohol proficiency test samples to other agencies.

• CTS are currently working on an ASCLD/LAB approved breath alcohol proficiency test.

• Trends in the use of dry gas calibrant may influence the need for aqueous proficiency tests for wet bath simulators.

**Issue**

• Stringency of ASCLD/LAB proficiency test requirement compared with the DHS proficiency test program.

**Comments, Ideas, Solutions**

• Each approach has its own merit and strengths. Whereas many ASCLD/LAB accredited laboratories consider their requirements more stringent, DHS suggests otherwise.
Title 17 currently requires laboratories to complete three proficiency tests each year in addition to the initial qualification (competency) samples and examination required for FAA certification.

ASCLD/LAB requires only one external proficiency test per laboratory but recommends that each examiner is proficiency tested at least once annually. As practical matter, proficiency test programs in ASCLD/LAB accredited laboratories are rigorously enforced and require a minimum number of acceptable proficiency test results per year for each specified analyst. Under Title 17, although the laboratory must undergo annual proficiency tests, an individual examiner may not be tested for several years.

Many laboratories already subscribe to more than one external forensic alcohol proficiency test. In addition to ASCLD/LAB approved proficiency tests, there are a number of excellent surveys available elsewhere (e.g. NHTSA). These alternative surveys should also be considered for annual proficiency testing of individual examiners.

VII Review Committee Formation

Issue

How will the panel be selected?

Comments, Ideas, Solutions

The new law dictates the composition of the panel to include one criminalist, one toxicologist, and one crime laboratory director.

DHS has not yet determined how the panel will be selected. Typically they would solicit single nominations from recognized organizations, such as CAT.

The panel members are expected to attend the necessary meetings and volunteer their time on the panel without reimbursement for expenses. Meetings are likely to be held in the Sacramento area.

Issue

Should CAT nominate a toxicologist for the panel? If so, how should CAT accomplish this?

Comments, Ideas, Solutions

General consensus was that CAT should assist in the identifications of a qualified candidate.

There are no “specifications” as outlined in the bill or elsewhere.

CAT could solicit applications for persons wishing to volunteer themselves. This could be accomplished using a nomination form posted on the CAT website or via a mass mailing to all members. The CAT Board of Directors could then propose a short list of nominees (six) for a membership vote. The nominee with the greatest number of votes would be forwarded to DHS for their consideration.

The CAT nomination would need to be solicited from members in the near future in order to be considered by DHS.
Update

- On November 27th CAT received a letter from DHS dated November 22nd inviting us to suggest a qualified member to serve as representative on the Forensic Alcohol Review Committee before December 30th 2004. Because of the very short timeline, CAT was unable to solicit nominations and votes on a member-wide basis.

- On November 28th nominations were solicited from the Board, Committee Chairs, and other CAT members identified by these groups to have a keen interest in SB-1623 related issues. A solicitation for nominees was also placed on the CAT website. However, as many members do not regularly visit the website, this approach had only limited impact. This reinforces the need for CAT to continue efforts to develop the member-wide email distribution list. Although efforts to create this member-wide list started several months ago, they are ongoing and have been thwarted by out-of-date email and membership information for many members. We hope to have a viable membership list in time for the March meeting. **To facilitate this, we ask that members interested in receiving timely information through this forum please go to the website at http://www.cal-tox.org and use the CONTACT CAT link to update your e-mail address.**

- By popular vote, Paul Sedgwick was nominated by CAT to serve on the Forensic Alcohol Review Committee.

Paul Sedgwick received his Bachelor's degree from Earlham College, Richmond, IN in 1967. He did graduate work in physiological psychology and psychopharmacology at Indiana University in Bloomington, IN. He worked as a Graduate Laboratory Technician at the Indiana State Toxicology Laboratory in Indianapolis until 1970 when he came to the Orange County Sheriff-Coroner's Laboratory in Santa Ana, CA. He is a Charter member of the CAT, is Meetings and Short Courses Editor of the Journal of Analytical Toxicology, and has served as C.A.T. President, as well as other offices. His publications and presentations include alcohol analysis, postmortem alcohol formation, benzodiazepine screening techniques, interpretation of digoxin concentrations and case reports on MDA and amoxapine, among others. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, a Diplomate of the American Board of Forensic Toxicology, a Diplomate of the American Board of Criminalistics and is presently employed as a Senior Forensic Scientist at the Orange County Sheriff-Coroner's Office. He has been a College of American Pathologists (CAP) Forensic Urine Drug Testing inspector and is presently an ASCLD-LAB inspector specializing in Forensic Alcohol and Toxicology. As an ASCLD-LAB inspector since 1995 he has inspected approximately 15-20 laboratories or laboratory systems. He has written and maintained DOH accepted methods and ASCLD-LAB methods. He presently works in a DOH, Title 17 licensed laboratory, is currently certified as a Forensic Alcohol Supervisor, and is intimately involved in the day to day operations of forensic blood, urine and breath alcohol testing.

- **CAT has tentatively scheduled a special one-day forum on SB-1623 issues to be held in Sacramento on Thursday March 10, 2004.** The forum will take place the day before the regularly scheduled CAT Scientific Meeting (March 11-12th) in Sacramento, CA. **Details on the SB 1623 Forum will be posted on the CAT website in January. The forum will be chaired by Paul Sedgwick.**
VIII Appendix

CAT would like to acknowledge the meeting participants and their contributions to the report, in particular Janet Anderson-Seaquist who volunteered to chair the meeting.

CAT Forensic Alcohol Working Group: Board Representatives, Committee Chairs and Other Members:


Non-CAT Attendees:

Paul Kimsey, Jon Knapp, Clay Larson.

Observers:

Gail Heuer, Shana Meldrum, Danielle Roberts, Jeremy Zerbe.

Mark your calendars
Thursday March 10th for the
Special CAT Forum on SB 1623 Issues

Meeting details will be posted on the CAT website in January
http://www.cal-tox.org

Update your e-mail address by visiting the CAT website at
http://www.cal-tox.org

Use the “CONTACT CAT” link to update your e-mail address for timely notification on CAT-related issues