

From: [Kamendulis, Lisa M.](#)
To: [Method, Peter](#)
Date: Tuesday, May 11, 2004 11:02:59 AM

Pete,

Nati mentioned to me that there was a problem with drug screen testing of blood and urine samples in the forensic laboratory. Apparently, the drug screens that were performed by Dana dating from February through the beginning of May were performed incorrectly (not according to the operating procedures), and results were apparently reported on these samples. I am not sure how many samples this affected. Nati was advised to inform you of the situation and to provide you details on the breadth of the problem. Although I have not been involved with the laboratory since January of this year (when Nati was hired as the supervisor of the forensic laboratory), I feel the obligation to ensure that you have been apprised of this situation.

Lisa M. Kamendulis, Ph.D.
Division of Toxicology
Indiana University School of Medicine
635 Barnhill Drive, MS 550
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317-274-7824

From: Method, Peter
To: Dumaul, Natividad G
Subject: BDS
Date: Monday, May 17, 2004 4:11:42 PM

I had asked that you send me a daily update of what's going on. I haven't gotten anything yet. I MUST get this information, even if no testing was done on that day.

After thinking about the condition of the P-Lab, as described in the notes you sent me, I believe that we need to at least survey all tests done over the three months. How can we be sure that the results obtained were correct without checking? Contamination in the instrument may have caused some problems that would not be detectable in looking at the data we have. Please schedule retests of all BDS done in the three months.

I don't know whether I'll be in tomorrow, or any other day this week, because of the jury duty. Please send the daily emails. If I am in, I'll call you. If not, I'll check the email each evening, and respond as I can.

Thanks.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.
Acting Director

Indiana State Department of Toxicology
950 North Meridian Street, Suite 960
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Phone: (317) 274-7825
FAX: (317) 278-2836

From: [Method, Peter](#)
To: [Dumaul, Natividad G](#)
Subject: Papers you sent
Date: Friday, May 21, 2004 4:20:36 PM
Attachments: [blood_drug_screens_discrepancy_5.13.04_PFM_reformat.xls](#)

I don't understand why you sent the papers you did. I got all the results from 5/12. What I will need are the other ones. The spreadsheet you sent me earlier today had only the initial retests. It didn't include the ones done since 5/12. Those are what I need.

I have reworked the spreadsheet you sent over with the initial 103 results. The revised sheet is attached. It shows that there were 18 of that initial set that were discrepant, rather than the 16 you initially concluded.

I have a question. You identified with an asterisk the discrepancies (actually, all but 2), and you had a note saying that the ones with the asterisk had already been confirmed to be negative by GC/MS. I assume this includes the ones that were positive initially, but were found to be negative on BDS retest. The ones that were negative initially would not have been run by GC/MS. Is this correct?

I will plan to come over on Monday morning to go over this with you. It's difficult to communicate by email. I'll be over about 9:30.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.
Acting Director

Indiana State Department of Toxicology
950 North Meridian Street, Suite 960
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Phone: (317) 274-7825
FAX: (317) 278-2836

BLOOD DRUG SCREEN DISCREPANCIES

5/13/2004

* confirmed negative by GC/MS

Initial Test Date	Drug	CASE #	Initial Result	Date retested	Retest result	Pos to Neg	Neg to Pos	Overall		
2/10/2004	Cocaine	176 /04*	negative	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	TRUE	1	-1
2/10/2004	Cocaine	210/04*	negative	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	TRUE	1	-1
3/10/2004	Cocaine	485/04 *	negative	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	TRUE	1	-1
3/31/2004	Cocaine	313/04	negative	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	TRUE	1	-1
3/31/2004	Cocaine	627 /04	negative	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	TRUE	1	-1
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	226/04*	negative	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	TRUE	1	-1
2/4/2004	Cocaine	187/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/4/2004	Cocaine	2575/03	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/4/2004	Cocaine	194 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/4/2004	Cocaine	195 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	177 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	216/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	219 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	229/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	235 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	239 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	209 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	217 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	224 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	227 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	230 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	231 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	232 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	233 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	236 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	237 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/10/2004	Cocaine	238 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/23/2004	Cocaine	259 04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/23/2004	Cocaine	261 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/23/2004	Cocaine	262 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/23/2004	Cocaine	272/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/24/2004	Cocaine	281 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/24/2004	Cocaine	289/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/25/2004	Cocaine	317/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
2/25/2004	Cocaine	320 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
3/5/2004	Cocaine	391/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
3/5/2004	Cocaine	401 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0
3/5/2004	Cocaine	407 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0

BLOOD DRUG SCREEN DISCREPANCIES

5/13/2004

* confirmed negative by GC/MS

Initial Test Date	Drug	CASE #	Initial Result	Date retested	Retest result	Pos to Neg	Neg to Pos	Overall
3/5/2004	Cocaine	411 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/5/2004	Cocaine	412 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/10/2004	Cocaine	466/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/11/2004	Cocaine	463 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/11/2004	Cocaine	476 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/11/2004	Cocaine	477 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/19/2004	Cocaine	585 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/19/2004	Cocaine	587/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/22/2004	Cocaine	506 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/22/2004	Cocaine	513 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/22/2004	Cocaine	514/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/22/2004	Cocaine	539/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/22/2004	Cocaine	504 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/22/2004	Cocaine	551/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/24/2004	Cocaine	554/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/24/2004	Cocaine	586/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/26/2004	Cocaine	359 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/26/2004	Cocaine	601 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/26/2004	Cocaine	612 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/26/2004	Cocaine	606 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/26/2004	Cocaine	611 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/26/2004	Cocaine	600 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	354 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	355 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	372 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	624 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	507 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	630 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	634 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	635/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
3/31/2004	Cocaine	646/ .04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/5/2004	Cocaine	652 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/5/2004	Cocaine	668 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/5/2004	Cocaine	670/04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/15/2004	Cocaine	679 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/15/2004	Cocaine	369 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/15/2004	Cocaine	695 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/15/2004	Cocaine	689 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0

BLOOD DRUG SCREEN DISCREPANCIES

5/13/2004

* confirmed negative by GC/MS

Initial Test Date	Drug	CASE #	Initial Result	Date retested	Retest result	Pos to Neg	Neg to Pos	Overall
4/23/2004	Cocaine	731 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
4/23/2004	Cocaine	734/04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	177 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	216 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	219 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	220 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	229 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	215 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	218 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	224 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	227 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	228 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	237 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	238 /04	positive	5/12/2004	positive	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/10/2004	Cannabinoids	240 /04	negative	5/12/2004	negative	FALSE 0	FALSE 0	0
2/4/2004	Cocaine	188/04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
2/4/2004	Cocaine	199 /04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
2/10/2004	Cocaine	240 /04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
2/23/2004	Cocaine	244/04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
3/26/2004	Cocaine	396/04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
4/15/2004	Cocaine	1282/03*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
4/15/2004	Cocaine	682 /04 *	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
4/15/2004	Cocaine	687/02*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
4/15/2004	Cocaine	688/04 *	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
4/15/2004	Cocaine	685/04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
4/15/2004	Cocaine	694/04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
4/15/2004	Cocaine	705/04*	positive	5/12/2004	negative	TRUE 1	FALSE 0	1
Total cases		103		Total discrepancies	18	Wrong Positives	Wrong Negatives	
				Percent	17.5	12	6	
						11.7	5.8	

From: [Method, Peter](#)
To: [Brackett, Gary K](#)
Subject: Revised BDS letter
Date: Monday, May 24, 2004 1:04:42 PM
Attachments: [BDS_rechecks_5.24.04.doc](#)

Here is the letter I want to print. You have the list of Toxicology Case numbers. Use the date of May 25, 2004 for the letters. Print one for each case number. I might have up to six more later this afternoon.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.
Acting Director

Indiana State Department of Toxicology
950 North Meridian Street, Suite 960
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Phone: (317) 274-7825
FAX: (317) 278-2836

(Date)

Re: Retest results on Toxicology Case Number (Tox case)

During an internal laboratory review, we discovered that an Analyst who recently left the lab did not perform blood drug screen tests properly during the period February through April, 2004. We have repeated screen testing for all samples from this time period. Most results were unchanged. However, some tests gave different results from those reported earlier. The enclosed results for blood drug screens only are to supercede the ones recorded in the earlier report. These changes do not affect any confirmatory testing results.

Procedures are in place to prevent such a situation from recurring. In addition, we are scheduling an external review of our entire lab operation to ensure that our procedures and training are complete.

If the initial screen test resulted in "Negative", and the retest resulted in "Presumptive Positive", we will be performing a confirmation test on the sample for further verification. Those results will be sent as soon as they are available.

Please note that drug screen tests are not conclusive, and that they require confirmation testing to verify.

We apologize for any inconvenience the earlier results may have caused.

Please call me at 317-274-7825 or the Lab Supervisor, Nati Dumauai at 317-278-2443 if you have any questions.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.
Acting Director

From: [Method, Peter](#)
To: [Dumauual, Natividad G](#)
Subject: RE: BDS retests
Date: Monday, May 24, 2004 5:16:28 PM

I got your phone message. 210/04 will not need a letter. However the other five listed below do need one, even though for some the confirmation results have been sent. Our records must be complete.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dumauual, Natividad G
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2004 2:57 PM
To: Method, Peter
Subject: RE: BDS retests

Sorry, missed your 244/04. You did not put any case number like you did with the rest.. The 210/04 all along was positive and confirmed positive by GCMS. Was reported by February as positive. No, it was never reported as negative like I told you. When I was transferring the results in my worksheet I put it as negative because it was indertiminate.. my mistake it should have been positive. I did cross it out and put pos on top of my neg but failed to see the line over my neg.. That's why original report to you was negative. Anyway it was done right in the first place..

-----Original Message-----

From: Method, Peter [mailto:pmethod@iupui.edu]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2004 3:01 PM
To: Dumauual, Natividad G
Subject: RE: BDS retests

That last item – did you mean 244/04? This is the one that tested negative initially, but was reported positive.

Now, I'm concerned about this other matter. How did the report get sent out with the wrong result? Could this have happened with other samples?

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dumauual, Natividad G
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2004 12:46 PM
To: Method, Peter
Subject: RE: BDS retests

DR. M

Okay here they are:

Previous results
reported
Results that are already in the hands of the
Agency

RETESTS

176/04
negative
positive
210 /04

Indianapolis, IN 46204

Phone: (317) 274-7825

FAX: (317) 278-2836

From: [Method, Peter](#)
To: [Dumauual, Natividad G](#)
Subject: RE:
Date: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 3:56:38 PM

Internally, I don't care what you call it. DO NOT use that or any similar term in talking to anyone from outside the Department. Using disparaging terms could lead to test results being excluded from court. All we need is for a defense attorney to quote that description when you are testifying. No amount of other testimony could erase the impression that would give.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dumauual, Natividad G
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 2:33 PM
To: Method, Peter
Subject: RE:

Oh Yeah !!! The GC/MS works so good that I call it the SINKING MACHINE. She never let me down, and it always work for me during this times, so I thought that that's the best name for it . THE STINKING MACHINE. If people have a problem with that then I'm sorry I won't change the name, and I will always call her THE STINKING MACHINE..

Nati

From: Method, Peter [mailto:pmethod@iupui.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2005 11:52 AM
To: Dumauual, Natividad G
Subject: FW:

I got this request yesterday, and have answered the questions. However, I'm not pleased with the phrase in red below. If that is reasonably accurate, it is not an appropriate way to discuss our problems with clients, and it is inaccurate. There are many instruments (not machines) in our lab, though only one GC/MS. Of greater concern is the way it is worded. If the description "stinking machine" was used, that can imply that the instrument is not a good one (though I realize that wasn't intended).

The comment, if accurate, was probably due to frustration. However, everyone in the lab needs to be civil and direct in answering such inquiries. For instance "With limited resources and fixed funding, our turn-around times have increased." If that doesn't satisfy them, refer them to me.

Thanks.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.

-----Original Message-----

From: McClure, Rebecca [mailto:bmccclure@pac.IN.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2005 3:27 PM
To: Method, Peter
Subject:

Hi Pete.

A prosecutor called our office last week and raised some questions concerning your lab that I hope you can answer for us.

It seems this prosecutor's office submitted a blood sample to your lab for testing. They received from your lab a preliminary/screening report saying that the sample contained meth. The prosecutor's office requested confirmatory testing on June 14. Last week the prosecutor called your lab to ascertain when they could anticipate the final report on the testing of this sample. She was told that it would be 6 months before a final report would be issued. She was told that there was "only one stinking machine" in your lab and that the government would not give the lab more money for additional equipment.

Here are the questions that the prosecutor poses:

1. Are drug samples run in lots (by the kind of drug the analyst anticipates he/she will find in the sample)?
2. Is there a timetable – as to when particular drug screens are run?
3. How is it determined when a particular sample will be tested?
4. Will your lab do a confirmatory test on a sample without first running a screening test?

I will look forward to hearing from you and will plan to forward your responses to the prosecutor who called.

Thanks, Becky McClure

From: [Method, Peter](#)
To: [Vasko, Michael R.](#)
Subject: IPAC letter
Date: Friday, October 14, 2005 4:54:37 PM
Attachments: [Meeting with IPAC 9.26.05 - follow-up letter.doc](#)

Here is the letter I have prepared for IPAC. Do you have any recommendations for wording? (I haven't checked yet for typos.)

When I get back from Nashville, I will decide what we can do with available funds. I should also know whether there is a surplus GC/MS available; Jason Barclay, Mitch Daniels' Legal Counsel, is getting that information.

Concerning the Advisory Panel, I got a call fro Steve Johnson. He suggests that someone on the Governor's Council should select the panel. That may be a sticking point. We'll see.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.
Acting Director

Indiana State Department of Toxicology
950 North Meridian Street, Suite 960
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Phone: (317) 274-7825
FAX: (317) 278-2836

From: [Method, Peter](#)
To: [Vasko, Michael R.](#)
Subject: IPAC letter revision
Date: Friday, October 28, 2005 10:48:49 AM
Attachments: [Meeting with IPAC 9.26.05 - follow-up letter.doc](#)

How does this one feel?

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.
Acting Director

Indiana State Department of Toxicology
950 North Meridian Street, Suite 960
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Phone: (317) 274-7825
FAX: (317) 278-2836

(date)

Mr. Steve Johnson
Indiana Prosecuting Attorneys' Council
302 West Washington Street
Room E205
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This is a follow-up to our meeting on September 26.

First of all, thanks to you, Becky and Joel for the excellent information you provided about your concerns regarding our current operation. Here are some ways in which we are addressing the six concerns we discussed.

1. There were two samples from Warren County for which initial negative Cannabinoids results were erroneously reported as negative. Though these are only two results out of thousands of tests performed by our department, the errors are not acceptable to us. Upon investigation of these two samples, Toxicology Case Numbers 1681/05 and 1744/05, we have found the cause, and have implemented changes to prevent this type of error from reoccurring.
2. Our confirmation turn-around times are greater than everyone would like them to be, including us. We are obtaining a second instrument (Gas chromatograph with Mass Selective detector – GC/MS), which will allow for more testing to be performed, though availability of analysts might limit the improvement. Any information that you could provide about closed cases would assist in this process.
3. Prioritization of confirmation testing is needed. The addition of a second GC/MS will help with this. We will also be requesting some guidance from submitting officers or prosecutors on the order in which confirmation testing is performed in those cases in which there are multiple drug classes that are Presumptive Positive on screen tests. It may be that confirming one or two classes would provide all the information needed for a particular case. Since confirmation of each class takes a significant amount of time, prioritizing this testing could significantly decrease the time to obtain needed results; it could also assist in improving overall turn-around time for confirmations.
4. We are also making changes to improve turn-around time on drug and alcohol screen tests. With the recent hiring of a technician to replace

the one that left during the Summer, and with another technician now able to perform tests after her wrist surgery, the turn-around should improve. We are also hiring a person to handle paperwork now done by Technicians, which will allow them to spend their time doing testing.

5. My availability for testimony is limited, as we all know. We discussed the possibility of using faculty members of the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology for assistance. I am presently evaluating how this could be done, and should have a detailed plan by early November.
6. An Advisory Panel for the State Department of Toxicology is a good idea. I am planning to implement this before the end of the year.

With these changes, we should see improved turn-around for laboratory samples and more availability for testimony over the next few months.

I trust that this information will assist you in discussions with your Board and other Prosecutors about our Department. I will keep you informed about progress on each of these items. Do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions, comments, or suggestions.

Thank you again for your important input.

Sincerely,

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.
Acting Director

From: [Dumauual, Natividad G](#)
To: [Method, Peter](#)
Subject: RE: Anthony Sibley
Date: Monday, July 24, 2006 2:26:37 PM

Dr Method,

Our report shows positive for cocaine and opiates. The order was blood drug screen and alcohol.

On 6/7 the blood alcohol was tested none detected and reported as none detected. The problem that we have in our data base is when you hit none detected on our panel blood drug screen which includes alcohol, everything will report as none detected. In other words we were not careful and did not detect that everything went out as none detected on June 23.

On June 29 according to our chain of custody, we did the blood drug screen by Randox and reported as presumptive positive for cocaine and opiates and that is the July 7 report that they received.

I send an e-mail to Attorney Zych already explaining the problem. Everybody was advised in the lab about this problem and hopefully aware of the consequences.

Nati

-----Original Message-----

From: Method, Peter [<mailto:pmethod@iupui.edu>]
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2006 9:36 AM
To: Dumauual, Natividad G
Subject: FW: Anthony Sibley

I talked with NMS. Their test code 1866 is a screen for about 200 drugs - both therapeutic and abuse. Cost is \$89. Please send a quote to Mr. Zych, at the Marion County Prosecutor's Office.

Thanks.

Peter F. Method, Ph.D.

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward Zych [<mailto:EZYCH@Indygov.org>]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 6:29 PM
To: Method, Peter
Subject: Anthony Sibley

We sent a sample of his blood to be tested at your lab. The results came back negative on all screens.
1666/06

However, all parties who came into contact with him felt that he was impaired on some sort of drug.

He was driving at least 80mph in a 35mph zone, he hit one car in the road, was going across all lanes of traffic, hit another car then hit my victims car at 80mph and killed him.

He was paranoid, kept saying people were after him, he had the "1000 yard stare", he could not sit still and when told that he killed someone

he laughed.

I know your lab does not test for all substances. We think he might be on PCP or a hallucinogenic drug.

Can you recommend a lab we can send our blood to for further testing for substances you dont normally test for?

I would like a lab that tests for as broad a sample of drugs as possible.

Ed

Deputy Prosecutor Edward Zych
Marion County Prosecutor's Office
OVWI Fatality Prosecutor
Suite 160
251 E. Ohio St.
Indianapolis, IN 46204

From: [Dumauai, Natividad G](#)
To: [Method, Peter](#)
Subject: Incident
Date: Wednesday, October 11, 2006 7:12:30 AM
Attachments: [incident report- Cheryl 101006.doc](#)

We made a mistake on one of the alcohol analysis. I sent out an explanation to submitting officer and Prosecutors office. People are stressed out in this laboratory, Dr. Method and there will be more mistakes made if nothing has been done on techs.. they are overworked. I won't be surprised if they start quitting because of stress.

Nati Dumauai
Supervisor / Laboratory Manager
Indiana State Department of Toxicology
635 Barnhill Dr.
Rm MS 553
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317)-278-2440 (office)
(317)-278-2443 (lab)

10/10/06

Officer B.C Messick
Fort Wayne PD
1320 E Creighton Ave
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46803

cc: Karen Richards
Allen Co. Prosecutor Office
3rd Floor Keystone Bldg
602 S Calhoun St
Fort Wayne, Ind 46802-1715

Subject: Wills, Robert A
Case # 06F141703
Toxicology # 3200/06

Dear Sir/Madam:

A human error was made during the analysis of the specimen of the above subject. The error was immediately discovered after the report of **none detected** on the Blood ethanol was mailed to the above submitting officer and Prosecutor. After repeating the analysis it was found out that the true value was 307 mg/dL(0.30%).

We regret so much making a significant error and I immediately counseled the Technician who performed the analysis. After this incident some minor procedural changes are being made such as checking the label of the specimen when you take out from the refrigerator, when you put it in the rack and when your start pipetting the blood specimen into the vials and when you load the vial into the instrument sampler..

We do hope that this error will not happen again.

Sincerely,

Natividad G. Dumauual

Supervisor
Depratment of Toxicology

From: Dumauai, Natividad_G
To: Method, Peter
Subject: More Errors!!
Date: Monday, November 20, 2006 11:00:49 AM
Attachments: [Incident #3 112006.doc](#)
[Incident #4 112006.doc](#)
[Incident #5 112006.doc](#)

More corrected reports.

nati

Nati Dumauai
Supervisor / Laboratory Manager
Indiana State Department of Toxicology
635 Barnhill Dr.
Rm MS 553
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317)-278-2440 (office)
(317)-278-2443 (lab)

Officer Eric Harden
Trafalgar Police Dept
P.O Box 7
Trafalgar, In 46181

Lance D. Hamner
Johnson Co. Prosecutor Office
Oren Wright Bldg
80 S.Jackson St
Franklin, IN 46131

Subject: Coleman, Joseph
Tox case # 3241/06

Dear Sir:

On October 20th, 2006 we send out a Drug Screen report of **None Detected** for the above subject .

A technical error was made in loading samples in our instrument. After repeating the whole batch of analysis, Cannabinoids was **detected**.

We are sorry for the inconvenience and I made some necessary changes in our Standard Operating Procedures, to check more than 3 times the names and number of subject before loading onto the instrument and to make recommendations to use **barcodes** on all our samples.

Sincerely,

Nati G. Dumauual
Supervisor, State Toxicology

Officer Timothy Byrne
Carmel PD
3 Civic Square
Suite 134
Carmel, Ind 46032

Sonia J. Leerkamp
Hamilton Co Prosecutor Office
One Hamilton Co. SQ
Noblesville, In 46060-2330

Subject: Edmunds, Elizabeth
Tox case # 3338/06

Dear Sir:

On October 20th, 2006 we send out a Drug Screen report of **None Detected** for the above subject .

A technical error was made in loading samples in our instrument. After repeating the whole batch of analysis, Cannabinoids and Benzodiazepines were **detected**.

We are sorry for the inconvenience and I made some necessary changes in our Standard Operating Procedures, to check more than 3 times the names and number of subject before loading onto the instrument and to make recommendations to use barcodes on all our samples.

Sincerely,

Nati G. Dumaul
Supervisor, State Toxicology

Officer: Brian Swisher

Lance Hamner

Greenwood PD
186 Surina Way
Greenwood, IN

Johnson Co. Prosecutor Office
Oren Wright Building
80 S. Jackson St
Franklin, IN 46131

Subject: Edmunds, Elizabeth
Tox case # 3237/06

Dear Sir:

On October 20th, 2006 we send out a Drug Screen report of **None Detected** for the above subject .

A technical error was made in loading samples in our instrument. After repeating the whole batch of analysis, Cannabinoids and Benzodiazepines and Methadone were **detected**.

We are sorry for the inconvenience and I made some necessary changes in our Standard Operating Procedures, to check more than 3 times the names and number of subject before loading onto the instrument and to make recommendations to use **barcodes** on all our samples.

Sincerely,

Nati G. Dumauual
Supervisor, State Toxicology

From: [Dumauual, Natividad G](#)
To: [Method, Peter](#)
Cc: [Vasko, Michael R.](#)
Subject: Errors in the lab (2X)
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2006 9:20:37 AM
Attachments: [incident report-cheryl 111106.doc](#)

This occurred again when Viola was out due to injury. Cheryl has to do Blood volatiles and Drug screens. I guess it was too much to do two tasks at the same time, result? Made an error. It's about time for us to examine our priorities. Instruments?/ Technicians? Or Both.

Vacations/sick/injury is all unavoidable. No matter how I tell our Techs to be careful if we are overwhelmed by samples/deadlines to meet etc, we are bound to make mistakes. I guess if this is acceptable to you and the Department then I don't have to worry.

I have been a Toxicology Supervisor in other Laboratories and I never had this thing happened, error after error. The difference? Because I have enough Tech's to distribute the job and do it accurately and efficiently.

I want that the Toxicology lab have a good reputation, but if I don't have enough Techs' to do the job accurately and efficiently and less pressure then I guess I can't do anything. I just want you to know that if an error occurs again in the future I won't bother you anymore. You will not hear anything from me again. I will just keep on trying to explain to Government agencies and do the best I can.

Nati

Nati Dumauual
Supervisor / Laboratory Manager
Indiana State Department of Toxicology
635 Barnhill Dr.
Rm MS 553
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317)-278-2440 (office)
(317)-278-2443 (lab)

11/15/06

Officer Jeremy S. King
Evansville PD
Office
15 N.W Martin Luther King Blvd.
Room 108 Evansville, IN 47708
Martin Luther King Blvd.

cc: Stanley M. Levco
Vanderburgh Co Prosecutor
Administration Building,
1 NW
Evansville, Indiana 47708

Subject: Gonzales, Gabino
Case # 06-24575
Toxicology # 3470/06

Dear Sir/Madam:

After I received your e-mail, I immediately investigated the case and found out that a human error was made during the analysis of the specimen of the above subject. The error was a report of **none detected** on the Blood ethanol was mailed to the above submitting officer and Prosecutor. We immediately repeated the analysis and found out that the true value was **282 mg/dL(0.28%)**.

We regret so much making a significant error and I immediately counseled the Technician who performed the analysis. After this incident some minor procedural changes are being made such as checking the label of the specimen when you take out from the refrigerator, when you put it in the rack, when you start pipetting the blood specimen into the vials and when you load the vial into the instrument sampler..

We do hope that this error will not happen again.

Sincerely,

Natividad G. Dumauual

Supervisor
Department of Toxicology