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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Forensic Applications Consulting Technologies, Inc. (FACTs) is a private S-Corporation in the State of Colorado offering classical Industrial Hygiene services to its clients.

FACTs is performing a series of regulatory audits on public domain documents. This document has been prepared by Forensic Applications Consulting Technologies, Inc. in response to actions by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), and pursuant to the provisions of C.R.S. 18-8-115 Duty to report a crime - liability for disclosure.

This review pertains to the document identified as:

Screening Level Assessment
For the Buildings Located at:
4190 W. 97th Court
Westminster, CO 80031
Weecycle Job Number: 15-11303
Performed On: February 18, 2015
Prepared For:
Lauren Crawford
C/O Buyer Resource Real Estate
Russ Murray
6900 E. Bellview (sic) Ave, Suite 101
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

The purpose of this review is to document regulatory violations associated with regulatory work regarding the assessment of methamphetamine affected properties (6 CCR 1014-3). The level of scrutiny and detail employed in this review is that which has been established by the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

For this regulatory audit of work performed at 4190 W. 97th Court, Westminster, CO 80031 (the subject property), FACTs has identified no fewer than 126 (one hundred and twenty six) regulatory violations.

The purpose of this review is to document regulatory violations associated with regulatory work regarding the sampling of methamphetamine affected properties. The consultant in question, Judith E Sawitsky with Weecycle Environmental Consulting (WEC), has an extensive history of regulatory violations.1,2,3,4

1 See for example: 1170 Garrison Street, Lakewood, CO: http://www.forensic-applications.com/meth/Censored_Weecycle_review.pdf


3 See for example: 3282 E 103rd Dr. Unit 1601, Thornton, CO 80229 (272 regulatory violations): http://forensic-applications.com/meth/WEC_103_PA_Clearance_RA.docx.pdf
As of the date of this audit (December 30, 2015), FACTs has identified no fewer than 838 (eight hundred and thirty eight) regulatory violations in work performed by this consultant in just three reports in just the first six months of the regulations becoming effective (December 15, 2014).

FACTs obtained a copy of the Public Domain report under review through the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA) directly from the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE).

REVIEW OF THE SCREENING LEVEL ASSESSMENT

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment (for methamphetamine) of a property, the Consultant is required by regulations to perform specific mandatory tasks and provide specific mandatory documentation.

In reviewing the Screening Assessment report by Ms. Sawitsky for this subject property, the following regulatory violations have been identified:

**Failure to Provide Qualified Personnel**

Violation of Section 3.0

According to regulations, the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, can only be performed by certain personnel.

**PART 2: TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

3.0 Interim Authorization

3.1 Persons who, as of the effective date of this Part 2 of these regulations, are performing assessment or decontamination activities subject to these regulations may continue to perform such activities, as long as they comply with the requirements of this section 3.

There is no evidence that Ms. Sawitsky, prior to the date of the work at 4190 W. 97th Court, Westminster, CO 80031, has ever been “…performing assessment or decontamination activities subject to these regulations…”

**Violation of 6 CCR 1014-3 General Provisions Failure to Provide Authorized Personnel**

One of the mandatory provisions, pursuant to state regulations promulgated by the Colorado State Board of Health and designated as “6 CCR 1014-3, REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE CLEANUP OF METHAMPHETAMINE-AFFECTED PROPERTIES” states that assessments of properties within the scope of the regulation can only be performed by an Industrial Hygienists meeting the definition of Section 24-30-1402 of the Colorado Revised Statutes.

---

4 See for example 101 S Clarkson Street, Denver, CO (440 regulatory violations)

http://forensic-applications.com/meth/WEC_Clarkson_PA_Clearance_RA.pdf
Over the last several years, a serious problem has been created by consultants (such as WEC) who have fraudulently claimed to be Industrial Hygienists and, under that assumed title, have been performing invalid assessments of illegal drug laboratories. Since local governments were not receiving support in compliance, many local jurisdictions did not enforce any aspect of the regulations.

**Certified Mould Inspectors**

Until recently, Ms. Sawitsky has not even pretended to be an “Industrial Hygienist” and instead Ms. Sawitsky has identified herself as “Judith E Sawitsky, CMC.”

The designation “CMC” is a make-believe “certification” that is not recognized as carrying weight or validity in the legitimate field of microbiology or Industrial Hygiene. The term “CMC” usually indicates some kind of “certified” mould (mold) inspector and often means “Certified Mould Contractor” or “Certified Microbial Contractor,” or other meaningless “certification” in mould related issues.

Colorado, like virtually every other State, does not recognize the credentials of a “certified mould inspector” since there is no State Regulatory Board which oversees such “certification.” This “certification” does not carry any indication of proficiency in any field of practice. Typically, “certified” mould inspectors are self-“certified” and generally lack any legitimate training in indoor moulds or in any science related field.

None of the various “certifications” used by Weecycle in their report, are recognized in Colorado; essentially a child of 12 years old could sit down at their computer and print out a “certificate” identifying themselves as a “CMC” or claim they are a “Certified Meth Lab Decontaminator,” and run around collecting samples. However, that does not make them an Industrial Hygienist, and such a person will not meet the statutory definition of an Industrial Hygienist and, therefore, none of their assessments in illegal drug laboratories will be valid in the state of Colorado.

In fact, similar to most “certified” mould inspectors Ms. Sawitsky is not even knowledgeable in indoor moulds, but rather practices fear-based, junk science, pretending to perform Industrial Hygiene work. FACTs has been involved in reviewing other reports from WEC involving indoor mould issues wherein WEC cooperated with a “toxic mould” remediation contractor and relied on junk-science, and nonsensical sampling to frighten an homeowner into expensive, fear-based “mould remediation.” (See for example: [http://www.forensic-applications.com/moulds/elizcensoredcritical.pdf](http://www.forensic-applications.com/moulds/elizcensoredcritical.pdf). As demonstrated in that report, WEC clearly has no legitimate experience or training in indoor moulds, basic science, air monitoring protocols or Industrial Hygiene.

**CRS Title 24 Article 30 – Industrial Hygienist**

In their report, Ms. Sawitsky claims to be an Industrial Hygienist by virtue of having “...AT LEAST 5 years of experience in Industrial Hygiene prior to the July 1, 1997 date as set out in DEFINITION II.”
However, there is no such provision in Colorado State statutes under which an individual may claim to be an Industrial Hygienist. The Colorado Revised Statutes actually require something completely different than the provision claimed by WEC; the statutes actually read:

CRS 24-30-1402 (c)(2)(II) Any individual who has practiced within the scope of the meaning of industrial hygiene for a period of not less than five years immediately prior to July 1, 1997, is exempt from the degree requirements set forth in this subsection (2.2).

As it is, according to the public domain report, in the five years prior to July 1, 1997, there is no documentation to indicate Ms. Sawitsky was practicing as an Industrial Hygienist; rather Ms. Sawitsky describes her experience as working at “…an environmental consulting firm located in Denver, CO as an intern and then as an Environmental Biotechnologist staff member from 1990 through 1994.” Being an “intern” with an environmental firm is not practicing Industrial Hygiene and there is no definition of an “Environmental Biotechnologist” and, therefore, a janitor at a school legitimately can claim to be an “Environmental Biotechnologist.”

According to Colorado statutes:

24-30-1402. Definitions.
(2.2) “Industrial hygienist” means an individual who has obtained a baccalaureate or graduate degree in industrial hygiene, biology, chemistry, engineering, physics, or a closely related physical or biological science from an accredited college or university. The special studies and training of such individual shall be sufficient in the cognate sciences to provide the ability and competency to:

(a) Anticipate and recognize the environmental factors and stresses associated with work and work operations and to understand their effects on individuals and their well-being;

(b) Evaluate on the basis of training and experience and with the aid of quantitative measurement techniques the magnitude of such environmental factors and stresses in terms of their ability to impair human health and well-being;

(c) (I) Prescribe methods to prevent, eliminate, control, or reduce such factors and stresses and their effects.

The author of this review (Caoimhín P. Connell) was the legislative technical advisor for the promulgation of CRS 24-30-1402, and crafted some of the legislative language. The intent of the legislation was to recognize those Industrial Hygienists who were already practicing Industrial Hygiene for five years prior to July 1, 1997. WEC has not provided any documentation indicating that Ms. Sawitsky was a practicing Industrial Hygienist five years prior to July 1, 1997.

AIHA Industrial Hygienist Core Capabilities
In 2012, the American Industrial Hygiene Association, in conjunction with the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, and the American Board

---

5 I am a member of the AIHA and currently sit on the Clandestine Drug Laboratory Working Group
of Industrial Hygiene, published a document called “Core Competencies for the Practice of Industrial /Occupational Hygiene” The document identified those core competencies as:

- Air Sampling and Instrumental analysis
- Basic Science
- Biohazards
- Biostatistics and Epidemiology
- Chemical Hazards
- Community Exposures
- Engineering Control and ventilation
- Ergonomics
- Health Risk Analysis and Hazard Communication
- Ionizing radiation
- Management
- Noise and Hearing loss prevention
- Non engineering controls
- Non ionizing radiation
- Thermal stressors
- Toxicology
- Work Environments and Industrial Processes

There is no documentation that would suggest that Ms. Sawitsky has ever received any training or experience or knowledge in ANY of the above listed core capabilities. Furthermore, previous work by WEC clearly demonstrates gross incompetence in several of these areas, such as toxicology, biohazards and air sampling.

A part-time FACTs field Technician, was a supervisor at a heavy industry steel manufacturing facility. In November 2013, FACTs asked our technician to contact WEC, and identifying himself and identify his role in heavy industry and to inform WEC he was asked to contact WEC regarding their capabilities to provide Industrial Hygiene services. Specifically, our technician was asked to inquire as to the capabilities of WEC to perform the following Industrial Hygiene services:

- Air Sampling and Instrumental analysis
- Biohazards
- Chemical Hazards
- Engineering Control and ventilation
- Ergonomics
- Health Risk Analysis and Haz Comm
- Ionizing radiation
- Noise and Hearing loss prevention
- Non ionizing radiation
- Toxicology
- Work Environments and Industrial Processes

Our technician was informed by WEC, that they were not able of providing ANY of the above listed Industrial Hygiene services. Therefore, out of the 17 core capabilities that

---

6 Of which I am a member
constitute Industrial Hygiene, WEC was incapable of providing at least 11 of those services.

**TIG and Arc Welding Operations**
Specifically, WEC was asked about their capabilities to provide air monitoring exposures assessment for TIG and stick arc welding operations which incorporates the following industrial Hygiene aspects:

- Air Sampling and Instrumental analysis
- Chemical Hazards
- Health Risk Analysis and Haz Comm
- Ionizing radiation
- Non ionizing radiation
- Toxicology
- Work Environments and Industrial Processes

WEC informed him they were not able to perform this basic Industrial Hygiene function.

**Biohazards**
Specifically, WEC was asked about their capabilities to provide an assessment of biohazards related with the Mycobacteria associated with metal cutting fluids which incorporates the following industrial Hygiene aspects:

- Air Sampling and Instrumental analysis
- Basic Science
- Biohazards
- Engineering Control and ventilation
- Health Risk Analysis and Haz Comm
- Non engineering controls
- Toxicology
- Work Environments and Industrial Processes

WEC informed him they were not able to perform this basic Industrial Hygiene function.

**Ergonomics**
Specifically, WEC was asked about their capabilities to provide an ergonomic assessment for grinders and buffers which incorporates the following industrial Hygiene aspects:

- Basic Science
- Biohazards
- Ergonomics
- Health Risk Analysis and Haz Comm
- Non engineering controls
- Work Environments and Industrial Processes

WEC informed him they were not able to perform this basic Industrial Hygiene function.

**Industrial Ventilation**
Specifically, WEC was asked about their capabilities to provide design criteria for industrial ventilation which incorporates the following industrial Hygiene aspects:
WEC informed him they were not able to perform this basic Industrial Hygiene function.

**Noise and Hearing Loss Prevention**
Specifically, WEC was asked about their capabilities to provide sound and noise monitoring services for a factory floor wherein steel fabrication occurs, which incorporates the following industrial Hygiene aspects:

Basic Science
Engineering Control and ventilation
Health Risk Analysis and Haz Comm
Noise and Hearing Loss prevention
Non engineering controls
Work Environments and Industrial Processes

WEC informed him they were not able to perform this basic Industrial Hygiene function.

**Ionizing radiation**
Specifically, WEC was asked about their capabilities to provide ionizing radiation assessments for sealed source devices, which incorporates the following industrial hygiene aspects:

Basic Science
Community Exposures
Engineering Control and ventilation
Health Risk Analysis and Haz Comm
Ionizing radiation
Management
Non engineering controls
Work Environments and Industrial Processes

WEC informed him they were not able to perform this basic Industrial Hygiene function.

There is no documentation to suggest WEC is an Industrial Hygiene firm. WEC was not able to provide any of the above, basic Industrial Hygiene services since WEC is not an Industrial Hygiene firm and apparently does not employ any Industrial Hygienists.

There is no documentation suggesting that Ms. Sawitsky has any special training or studies in the core cognate sciences that constitute Industrial Hygiene, or that speak to the ability and competency to anticipate and recognize the environmental factors and stresses associated with work and work operations and to understand their effects on individuals.
and their well-being. In fact, as already referenced, FACTs has demonstrated that WEC entirely rejects known air sampling and instrumental analysis techniques, and rejects basic science in evaluating biohazards, and rejects basic science of toxicology and rejects basic science in biostatistics and rejects the science of biohazards and therefore, rejects basic science.

Furthermore, there is no indication that Ms. Sawitsky has any knowledge of the assessment of illegal drug laboratories, and there is no documentation in the WEC report that would indicate that Ms. Sawitsky has any experience or training that would equip her to perform an assessment of an illegal drug laboratory.

**Fraudulent and Misleading Certifications**

**Colorado Methlab Certification**
In the past, WEC has explicitly claimed to be Certified by the State of Colorado to perform illegal drug laboratory assessment work. However, during that time-frame, there was no such certifications in Colorado, and there never had been any such certification in Colorado.

As of November 9, 2013, on their website, WEC made the patently fraudulent claim that they were explicitly **certified** in the State of Colorado for performing testing in clandestine drug laboratories. On their web site, WEC falsely claimed:

![Clandestine Labs Testing](https://example.com/certi.png)

**Figure 1**
**Language from the Weecycle Internet Site**

At that time, there was no such certification, and in fact, Ms. Sawitsky was prohibited by regulation from performing regulatory testing for methamphetamine in Colorado.

**Mysterious State of Colorado Consultant Registration**
In earlier reports, WEC has also claims they hold

\[
\text{State of Colorado Consultant Registration, Reg. #5417}
\]

---

7 Copyright Weecycle 2013, used here without permission under the “fair use” doctrine as described in US Code, Title 17 Section 107 “criticism,” “teaching,” “reporting,” and “scholarship.”
FACTs is entirely unaware of this “registration” or how it may be alluding to this project. FACTs searched the Official State of Colorado Registry and found there is only exclusively one listing for “Judith Sawitsky,” who is exclusively certified to collect asbestos air samples. We could find no reference to a Consultant Registration or Consultant Registration Number 5417.

**Meth Lab Clean-up Company**

On the WEC internet page, WEC claims to have a certification in “Clandestine Drug Lab Decontamination Training,” and they falsely claimed they were certified for performing clandestine drug laboratory assessments in Colorado.

WEC claimed the certification was from a meth-lab cleanup company who is similarly known for multiple violations of State regulations.8,9

**Montana Cleaning License**

We have seen in other reports where WEC claimed to be a Montana Certified Methamphetamine Cleanup Supervisor (MCP11-0039-S) – On November 9, 2013, FACTs went to the following internet page:

http://www.deq.mt.gov/Meth/MethContractors.mcppx

![Figure 2](image-url)

**Language from the State of Montana Internet Site**

Nowhere in the roster of Certified Meth Lab Cleanup Contractors did the State of Montana recognize or list the name of “Sawitsky” (or Judith or Judy) and nowhere on that roster did they list WEC as being certified in any way whatsoever.

---

8 See for example 9210 Race Street, Thornton, CO 80229 [http://forensic-applications.com/meth/Critical_review_Race.pdf](http://forensic-applications.com/meth/Critical_review_Race.pdf)

Inability to Comply with Paragraph 3.3

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the consultant is required to perform specific duties and provide specific information, including:

3.3 The Consultant shall document any observed signs that the subject property is a methamphetamine-affected property. If any signs of a methamphetamine-affected property are observed, then the Screening Assessment requirements of Section 4 and Section 6 of this Part 1 apply in lieu of this section.

As already addressed, Ms. Sawitsky lacks any documented training in the assessment of illegal drug laboratories, and, not being an Industrial Hygienist, and having an established history of failing to recognize chemical storage areas, waste disposal areas, cooking areas, and/or use areas, there is no way Ms. Sawitsky would possess the necessary skill set to comply with this provision.

Failure to Comply with Paragraph 3.3

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the consultant is required to perform specific duties and provide specific information, including:

3.5 The Consultant shall conduct limited composite wipe sampling of the structure(s) for methamphetamine (including fixtures, as appropriate), in accordance with Section 6 of this Part 1.

As described below, Ms. Sawitsky failed to perform sampling as required by Section 6, and none of the samples collected at this property were valid.

Violation of Section 3.7.2 (Ten violations)

During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to provide specific documentation including:

3.7.2 Description of structural features in all buildings comprising the subject property, such as attics, false ceilings, crawl spaces, and basements including identification of structural features connected to adjacent units or common areas.

Based on the available documentation, the structure has at least one attic, and possibly two attics. Ms. Sawitsky failed to address the presence of an attic or attics.

Similarly, Ms. Sawitsky seems to have employed boiler plate language in her report from another property to describe this five bedroom, four bathroom residence:

The residence was built in 1990 of frame masonry veneer construction and has eight (8) rooms including four (4) bedrooms and three (3) bathrooms. No detached structures were noted as present on the property.

Yet, in her report, Ms. Sawitsky identified no fewer than five bedrooms and four bathrooms. It would appear, according to information provided in the WEC report for this subject property, that there are actually no fewer than 19 rooms as follows:
• Bathroom 1
• Bathroom 2
• Bathroom 3
• Bathroom 4
• Bedroom 1
• Bedroom 2
• Bedroom 3
• Bedroom 4
• Bedroom 5
• Dining Room
• Family room
• Garage
• Kitchen
• Laundry
• Living room
• Master living room
• Office
• Utility room
• Workout room

Violation of Section 3.7.5 (21 violations)

During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to provide specific documentation including:

3.7.5 Photographic documentation of property conditions.

Ms. Sawitsky entirely failed to comply with this requirement. According to her report there are at least 19 rooms in the structure, therefore, at a minimum, there should be photographs showing site conditions for those rooms. As it is, the report contains numerous close-up photographs of sample templates, but photographs showing site conditions are missing from the following:

1. Attic
2. Bathroom 1
3. Bathroom 2
4. Bathroom 3
5. Bathroom 4
6. Bedroom 1
7. Bedroom 2
8. Bedroom 3
9. Bedroom 4
10. Bedroom 5
11. Dining Room
12. Exterior grounds
13. Family room
14. Garage
15. Kitchen
16. Laundry  
17. Living room  
18. Master living room  
19. Office  
20. Utility room  
21. Workout room

**Violation of Section 3.7.6.1 (4 Violations)**

During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to provide specific documentation including:

3.7.6 Documentation of screening level sampling shall include:

3.7.6.1 a description of the sampling procedures used, including sample collection, handling, and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC);

In her report, Ms. Sawitsky stated

_Weecycle collected wipe samples following 6 CCR 1014-3, part 1 § 6.2. Using 2x2 inch gauze wipes and isopropanol,..._

However, ad delineated later in this discussion, it would have been physically impossible for Ms. Sawitsky to have collected samples pursuant to §6.2. Therefore, we presume Ms. Sawitsky has simply fabricated the false information in her report (a trait already demonstrable for Ms. Sawitsky).

1. Nowhere in the report do we find any description of the sampling procedures used  
2. Nowhere in the report do we find any description of the sample collection  
3. Nowhere in the report do we find any description of the sample handling  

**Violation of Section 3.7.6.3**

During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to provide specific documentation including:

3.7.6 Documentation of screening level sampling shall include:

3.7.6.3 results of sampling, including a description of sample locations and a computer generated figure illustrating the layout of the building(s) and sample locations ...

Nowhere in the report is there a computer generated figure depicting the location of Sample 2.4.

**Violation of Section 6**

During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to perform specific activities pursuant to Section 6:
6.1.3 The following sample collection procedures shall be followed for screening level sampling, Screening Assessment sampling and clearance sampling, except as provided in Section 6.8.2 of this Part 1.

Inability to comply with Paragraph 6.1.3.2
During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to perform specific activities pursuant to Section 6, including:

6.1.3.2 Wipe sampling shall be used to determine the extent of lead contamination on all surfaces at properties whenever the preliminary assessment indicates the phenyl-2-propanone (P2P) method of methamphetamine manufacture was used on the property.

As already established, Ms. Sawitsky has no documented training that would permit her to determine if the P2P method was used. Therefore, it would have been impossible for Ms. Sawitsky to comply with this provision.

Inability to comply with Paragraph 6.1.3.3
During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to perform specific activities pursuant to Section 6, including:

6.1.3.3 Wipe sampling shall be used to determine the extent of iodine contamination whenever there is visible evidence of iodine staining on surfaces that will not be removed.

As already established, Ms. Sawitsky has no documented training that would permit her to determine if an iodine process was used, and in the past, Ms. Sawitsky has entirely overlooked profound iodine staining, and therefore, it would have been impossible for Ms. Sawitsky to comply with this provision.

Inability to comply with Paragraph 6.1.3.5
During a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required to perform specific activities pursuant to Section 6, including:

6.1.3.5 Vapor sampling shall be used to determine the extent of mercury contamination whenever the Screening Assessment indicates the P2P method of methamphetamine manufacture was used on the property.

As already established, Ms. Sawitsky has no documented training that would permit her to determine if the P2P method was used. Therefore, it would have been impossible for Ms. Sawitsky to comply with this provision.

Violation of Section 6.2.2 (4 Violations – Failure to collect 100cm2)
During the performance of a Screening Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to follow specific sampling protocols including:

6.1.3 The following sample collection procedures shall be followed for screening level sampling, Screening Assessment sampling and clearance sampling, except as provided in Section 6.8.2 of this Part 1.
6.2.2 Delineate a 100 cm² area on the surface to be sampled, either by attaching a physical template to the surface (being careful not to touch the area within the template), or by an equivalently reliable and accurate method. The area within the template (i.e., the sample area) shall be 100 cm².

Historically Ms. Sawitsky has never performed a site assessment wherein she has complied with this provision to the extent that to our knowledge, at every project, Ms. Sawitsky has failed to collect the required area for at least one sample. In several photographs in the current report, Ms. Sawitsky documents that she failed to collect samples from areas that were 100 cm². In several locations, due to her lack of understanding of sampling, Ms. Sawitsky merely placed a 100 cm² template over an item, but in several samples, the area contains empty space. For example:

WEC PHOTOGRAPHS

Violation of Section 6.2.3
During the performance of a Screening Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to follow specific sampling protocols including:

6.2.3 Prepare a rough sketch of the area(s) to be sampled and indicate sample location(s).
There is no sketch or drawing indicating the location of Sample 6.3

**Violation of Section 6.2.7 (24 Violations)**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to follow specific sampling protocols including:

6.2.7 Wipe the surface using one of the following methods:

6.2.7.1 Square method: Start at the outside edge and progress toward the center of the surface area by wiping in concentric squares of decreasing size.

6.2.7.2 "S" method: Wipe horizontally from side-to-side in an overlapping "S"-like pattern as necessary to completely cover the entire wipe area.

6.2.8 Without allowing the sample media to come into contact with any other surface, fold the sample media with the sampled side in.

6.2.9 Use the same sample media to repeat the sampling of the same area using the same method. If using the “S” method, the second pass shall be sampled by wiping with overlapping “S”-like motions in a top-to-bottom direction.

6.2.10 Fold sampled side in. Using the same sample media, sample the same area a third time. The third pass shall be sampled by wiping using the method not previously used (i.e., use the square method if the “S” method was originally used).

Nowhere in the report, do we see where Ms. Sawitsky documented where she used this protocol. As already mentioned, in violation of Section 3.7.6.1, Ms. Sawitsky failed to provide a description of her sampling procedures.

However, historically, Ms. Sawitsky has never complied with this provision, and, all other evidence notwithstanding, there is nothing to suggest she complied with this provision for this property.

In any event, Ms. Sawitsky has documented surface areas wherein it would have been impossible to simultaneously use the mandatory method and/or collect 100 cm² as required. Examples include:

**WEC PHOTOGRAPHS**
Violation of Section 6.2.12.1
During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to follow specific sampling protocols including:

6.2.12.1 To collect a field blank, remove a wipe from the wrapper with a new glove, shake the wipe open, refold in the same manner as during the sampling procedure, and then insert the wipe into the sample container.

In the chain-of-custody, Ms. Sawitsky identifies that the blank was for a 100cm², surface area, therefore, somewhere, Ms. Sawitsky used the blank to wipe some surface, in violation of the regulations. Otherwise, nowhere in the report, do we see where Ms. Sawitsky documented where she used this protocol. As already mentioned, in violation of Section 3.7.6.1, Ms. Sawitsky failed to provide a description of her sampling procedures.

Violation of Section 6.2.12.5
During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to follow specific sampling protocols including:

6.2.12.5 Field blanks shall be representative of the majority of samples collected for every sample group (i.e., discrete or composite).

The majority (83%) of the samples collected on site were four part composites; 12.5% of the samples were three part composites, and one sample was a discrete. Therefore, Ms. Sawitsky was required to submit a four part composite. However, as already described above, Ms. Sawitsky submitted a single wipe material.

Violation of Section 6.2.14
During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to provide specific information and documentation including:

6.2.14 Maintain a Chain-of-Custody Record covering the time of sample collection through final disposition. … At a minimum, the Chain-of-Custody Record shall include the following:

Violation of Section 6.2.14.5 (3 Violations)
During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to provide specific information on the chain-of-custody, including:

6.2.14.5 sample area;

As discussed above, Ms. Sawitsky failed to collect 100cm² for at least four aliquots from the following sample suites

Sample suite 2
Sample suite 3
Sample suite 4
Therefore, the surface area thus reported to the laboratory could not have been 400cm² as claimed.

**Violation of Section 6.2.14.8 (23 Violations – Collection Time)**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to provide specific information on the chain-of-custody, including:

- 6.2.14.8 sample collection time …

Nowhere on the chain-of-custody is the sample collection time provided. Ms. Sawitsky has identified all of the samples as being collected at “3:00.” Whereas it is possible that one of aliquots may have been collected at 3:00, it would have been a physical impossibility for all 24 aliquots to have been collected at 3:00. Therefore, at least 23 of the aliquots had to have been collected at a different time.

**Violation of Section 6.2.14.9 (8 violations)**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to provide specific information on the chain-of-custody, including:

- 6.2.14.9 sample matrix;

Nowhere on the chain-of-custody is the matrix identified. (the term “matrix” as used by the laboratory is different from the term “matrix” as used in the regulations). Since there are five submissions, there are five violations.

**Violation of Section 6.2.14.11**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to provide specific information on the chain-of-custody, including:

- 6.2.14.11 sample preservatives, if applicable; and

Nowhere on the chain-of-custody is the sample preservative addressed.

**Violation of Section 6.2.15**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to provide specific information and documentation including:

- 6.2.15 Painted-over surfaces. Estimate the concentration of methamphetamine present below a painted-over surface (as defined in Section 2 of this Part 1) by one of the following methods:

Nowhere in the Screening Level report is this information provided and nowhere in the report does Ms. Sawitsky even address the issue of painted-over surfaces. Since Ms. Sawitsky failed to provide the mandatory photographic documentation, there is no way to know the site conditions regarding painted-over surfaces.
**Violation of Section 6.3.6 (4 Violations)**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to perform specific duties pursuant to specific protocols, including:

6.3.6 Collect all individual aliquots from 100 cm² sampling areas.

As already addressed above, Ms. Sawitsky documented that she failed to collect at least four aliquots from areas that were 100 cm².

**Violation of Section 6.7.1.1**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to perform specific duties pursuant to specific protocols, including:

6.7.1.1 A minimum of two (2) 4-aliquot composite samples must be collected, with at least one aliquot being collected from each room.

There is no documentation that a sample was collected from the separate Living Room in the Master Bedroom.

**Violation of Section 6.7.1.2 (6 Violations)**

During the performance of a Screening Level Assessment, the Consultant is required by regulations to perform specific duties pursuant to specific protocols, including:

6.7 Screening level sampling protocols for buildings.

6.7.1.2 All exhaust fans (including, but not limited to, kitchen, bathrooms, attic vent fans, or whole house exhaust fans) must also be sampled. Exhaust fan samples shall be collected from inside the fan compartment, the fan blade, or the back side of the fan grill.

...  

1. Ms. Sawitsky failed to collect a sample inside the fan compartment in the kitchen grille 
2. Ms. Sawitsky failed to collect a sample from the vent fan in the attic

**Colorado Criminal Code – Fraud; Offering a false instrument for recording**

According to Colorado Revised Statute §18-5-114 (Offering a false instrument for recording), a person commits a class 5 felony when offering a false instrument for recording in the first degree if, knowing that a written instrument relating to or affecting real or personal property or directly affecting contractual relationships contains a material false statement or material false information, and with intent to defraud, he presents or offers it to a public office or a public employee, with the knowledge or belief that it will be registered, filed, or recorded or become a part of the records of that public office or public employee.
One of two mental states necessarily must have been present in the performance of the WEC work at the subject property: 1) Either Ms. Sawitsky knew that the work she was performing was grossly incompetent and not in compliance with State Regulations (as demonstrated above) or, 2) Ms. Sawitsky was unaware of the fact that her work was deviating from mandatory State requirements.

If Ms. Sawitsky did not know that her work was deviating from mandatory State requirements, then that is sufficient to surmise that she lacked the technical competency and therefore authority to perform the work in the first place since it was her professional obligation to conform to those regulations and perform work pursuant to those regulations.

However, since Ms. Sawitsky has specifically referenced 6 CCR 1014-3 and explicitly stated elsewhere that she was aware of those requirements and since FACTs has identified hundreds of similar regulatory violations in the past regarding Ms. Sawitsky’s work, one must conclude that Ms. Sawitsky knowingly and willfully performed work that deviated from mandatory State requirements.

Pursuant to State statute and state regulations, the “Screening Level Assessment” must be filed with the State of Colorado (indeed the report we reviewed was obtained from the State of Colorado through the Colorado Open Records Act) Therefore, we believe the facts objectively establish that Ms. Sawitsky was aware of such recording and was aware of the false statements she made therein.

**Colorado Criminal Code CRS 18-5-113. Criminal impersonation**

Ms. Sawitsky has repeatedly held herself out to be an Industrial Hygienist. As documented in this review (and in other historical documents referenced in this review) there is nothing in the present documentation that would indicate that Ms. Sawitsky is, in fact, an Industrial Hygienist meeting the State definition.

The incompetence demonstrated in the WEC report should be sufficient to demonstrate that Ms. Sawitsky is not an Industrial Hygienist and is not competent to perform the work and may be falsely representing herself as an Industrial Hygienist (interim authorization notwithstanding).

Colorado Case law defines criminal impersonation as knowingly assuming a false or fictitious identity or capacity, and in that identity or capacity, doing any act with intent to unlawfully gain a benefit or injure or defraud another (*People v. Brown*, 193 Colo. 120, 562 P.2d 754 (1977); *People v. Borrego*, 738 P.2d 59 (Colo. App. 1987)). To falsely impersonate means to pretend to be a particular person without lawful authority (*People v. Horkans*, 109 Colo. 177, 123 P.2d 824 (1942); and to perform an act in assumed character for benefit. It is an offense under the code to falsely impersonate another, and in such assumed character to do any act whereby any benefit might accrue to the offender or to another person. (*People v. Horkans*, 109 Colo. 177, 123 P.2d 824 (1942)). Venue is not an element of the crime of criminal impersonation (*People v. Perez*, 129 P.3d 1090.}
Although the code does not require two overt acts to be committed, (rather the code requires assuming a false identity and doing an act with the intent to gain a benefit (People v. Johnson, 30 P.3d 718 (Colo. App. 2000)), Ms. Sawitsky has repeatedly performed these acts. The requisite intent to gain a benefit may be inferred from the accused's knowing use of a false identity and the acknowledged intent to secure some advantage from the impersonation (People v. Borrego, 738 P.2d 59 (Colo. App. 1987)). The common meaning of "assumes a false or fictitious identity" is not to hold oneself out as someone that she or she is not; it requires the assumption of the identity of another person, whether that other person is real or fictitious (People v. Jones, 841 P.2d 372 (Colo. App. 1992)). For example, an attorney with a suspended license who continues to practice law is guilty of criminal impersonation for practicing law. The courts have held that “continuing to represent himself as an attorney and performing legal work when she was aware that she had no valid license to do so amounts to the assumption of a false or fictitious capacity for purposes of the criminal impersonation statute." (People v. Bauer, 80 P.3d 896 (Colo. App. 2003)).

Colorado Consumer Protection Act

In Colorado, consumers are protected against deceptive trade practices as delineated in the Colorado Consumer Protection Act, CRS Title 6, Article 1. According to those statutes, a person engages in a deceptive trade practice when, in the course of such person's business or occupation, that person knowingly makes a false representation as to the certification of their services, and/or knowingly makes a false representation as to the characteristics of their services and/or represents their services are of a particular standard, quality, or grade if he knows or should know that they are not as specified.

According to the Colorado Department Of Regulatory Agencies, Office Of Policy And Research, Industrial Hygienists, And Safety Professionals 2001 Sunrise Review (October 15, 2001) Mr. M. Michael Cooke, Executive Director stated:

Another avenue of redress is the Colorado Consumer Protection Act. This law prohibits individuals from misrepresenting their certification, abilities, and associations, and making false or misleading statements concerning the price of goods, services, or property. In addition, §6-1-707(1)(a)(l), C.R.S., prohibits an individual from claiming “either orally or in writing, to possess either an academic degree or an honorary degree of the title associated with said degree, unless the person has, in fact, been awarded said degree.” While this Act does not prevent individuals from performing industrial hygiene work, it does prohibit individuals from claiming that they have education or background that they do not possess. An individual who misrepresents her or her qualifications may be in violation of this Act.18 § 6-1-105(1)(b), (c), (e) and (l), C.R.S.

The State regulations were revised in 2014 to counter the serious problem created by fraudulent and incompetent consultants who were falsely claiming to be “Industrial Hygienists” and who were performing invalid assessments under the false presentation of being an “Industrial Hygienist.”

Forensic Applications Consulting Technologies, Inc. (the author of this review), helped the State Legislature write the statutory language that eventually became codified and required the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) to
revised the regulations. Unfortunately, the task for the revision was given to the CDPHE regulator who, in violation of Colorado’s criminal statutes, had helped create the problem associated with fraudulent consultants performing assessments of methamphetamine affected properties.\textsuperscript{10}

The regulations required the CDPHE to restrict Interim Authorization (for the period of time between December 15, 2014 and June 15, 2015) for performing assessments under the regulations exclusively to those consultants who were A) \textit{bona fide} Industrial Hygienists, and B) had an history of performing valid assessments under the old regulations, which had been in effect since 2005. Instead, Ms. Coleen Brisnehan with the CDPHE gave \textit{carte blanche} Interim Authorization to anyone who applied and paid the mandatory fee, including the fraudulent consultants who had created the serious problems in the first place.

Although Ms. Brisnehan granted automatic State Interim Authorization, Ms. Sawitsky has, in the past, never claimed to be an Industrial Hygienist until recently (she has always identified herself as a some kind of a “certified” mould inspector) and has never been able to provide any documentation indicating that she has received any training in illegal drug laboratories or their assessment. As such, there is no expectations that the consultant would possess the necessary skills or knowledge to fulfill the regulatory requirements.

Finally, the consultant in question has never documented any training or experience that would permit her to identify herself as an Industrial Hygienist pursuant to State statutes CRS Statute §24-30-1402.

In the past, Ms. Sawitsky has made several claims regarding her credentials and experience\textsuperscript{11} that upon scrutiny, have been found to be unsupported.

\textbf{CONCLUSION}

For this regulatory audit, FACTs has identified no fewer than 126 regulatory violations committed by Ms. Sawitsky (WEC) in hers Screening Level Assessment for the property located at 4190 W. 97th Court, Westminster, CO 80031.

\textsuperscript{10} See for example, the discussion here: \url{http://www.forensic-applications.com/meth/Addendum_7_Woellner_11767_Grant.pdf}

\textsuperscript{11} See for example, the discussion here: \url{http://www.forensic-applications.com/meth/Addendum_7_Woellner_11767_Grant.pdf}
Appendix A

Reviewer’s Statement of Qualifications
Caoimhín P. Connell, has been involved in clandestine drug lab investigations and assessments since 2002 and meets the Colorado Revised Statute §24-30-1402 definition of an “Industrial Hygienist.” He has been a practicing Industrial Hygienist since 1987. Mr. Connell is a recognized authority in drug-lab operations and is a Certified Instructor in Meth-Lab Safety through the Colorado Regional Community Policing Institute, CRCPI (Colorado Division of Criminal Justice) and was the lead instructor for the CRCPI through the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, providing over 260 hours of meth lab training for over 45 Colorado Law Enforcement Agencies, federal agents, probation and parole officers throughout Colorado judicial districts. He has provided meth-lab lectures to the US Interagency Board, US Air Force, the National Safety Council, and the American Industrial Hygiene Association (of which he is a member and served on the Clandestine Drug Lab Work Group and for whom he conducted the May, 2010, Clandestine Drug Lab Course, and is a coauthor of the AIHA meth lab assessment publication.)

Mr. Connell is a member of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, the Occupational Hygiene Society of Ireland, the Colorado Drug Investigators Association, an appointed Member of the National Fire Protection Association, and the ASTM International Forensic Sciences Committee. (where he was the sole sponsor of the draft ASTM E50 Standard for the Assessment of Suspected Clandestine Drug Laboratories).

From 2009, Mr. Connell served as the Industrial Hygiene Subject Matter Expert on the Federally funded Interagency Board (Health, Medical, and Responder Safety SubGroup), and was elected full member of the IAB-HMRS in 2011 where he now serves. He is the only private consulting Industrial Hygienist in Colorado certified by the Office of National Drug Control Policy High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Clandestine Drug Lab Safety Program, and P.O.S.T certified by the Colorado Department of Law.

He has received over 194 hours of highly specialized law-enforcement sensitive training in drug lab operation, and under supervision of the US DEA, he has manufactured methamphetamine using a variety of street methods. He has received highly specialized drug lab assessment training through the Iowa National Guard, Midwest Counterdrug Training Center and the Florida National Guard Multijurisdictional Counterdrug Task Force, St. Petersburg College, Rocky Mountain HIDTA, as well as through the US NHTSA, and the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance (US Dept. of Justice) and he is currently ARIDE Certified.

Mr. Connell is a current sworn law enforcement officer who has conducted clandestine laboratory investigations and performed risk, contamination, hazard and exposure assessments from both the law enforcement (criminal) perspective, and from the civil perspective in residences, apartments, motor vehicles, and condominia. Mr. Connell has conducted over 611 assessments of illegal drug labs in CO, SD, NE, OK, and collected over 5,527 samples during assessments (a partial detailed list of drug lab experience is available on the web at): http://forensic-applications.com/meth/DrugLabExperience2.pdf

He has extensive experience performing assessments pursuant to the Colorado meth-lab regulation, 6 CCR 1014-3, and was an original team member on two of the legislative working-groups which wrote the original regulations for the State of Colorado and he was the primary author of Appendix A (Sampling Methods And Procedures) and Attachment to Appendix A (Sampling Methods and Procedures Sampling Theory) of the original Colorado regulations. Mr. Connell strongly objected to the unscientific, unfounded and inappropriate amendments now found in regulation.

Recommended by the US NIOSH as Peer Review Expert for the NIOSH 9109 Method, Methamphetamine, he has been admitted as a drug lab expert in Colorado, and an Industrial Hygiene Expert in Colorado in both civil and criminal courts as well as Federal Court in Pennsylvania. He has provided expert testimony in several criminal cases including Grand Jury testimony and testimony for US Bureau ATF and he testified before the Colorado Board of Health and Colorado Legislature Judicial Committee regarding meth lab issues. Mr. Connell has provided services to private consumers, Indian Nations, Sate Investigators, and Federal Investigators, and provided testimony regarding criminal activities of staff members at the Colorado Department of Public Health Environment..
Multijurisdictional Counterdrug
Task Force Training

This is to certify that
Caoimhin P. Connell

Has satisfactorily completed the following 24 hour MCTFT training course held at
DIVIDE, CO
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A partnership between The Florida National Guard and St. Petersburg College

President
St. Petersburg College

Eileen Lehane
MCTFT Director

Midwest Counterdrug Training Center
MCTC

Certificate of Training
This certifies that
Caoimhin Connell

Has successfully completed the
Clandestine Laboratory Certification

Cheyenne, WY
40 Training Hours
2-6 August 2004

Network Environmental Systems, Inc.

LTC Timothy E. Orr
Commandant
THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT

Caoimhin P. Connell

HAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED 20 HOURS OF TRAINING IN

METHAMPHETAMINE INVESTIGATION MANAGEMENT

MARCH 20-22, 2006
DENVER, COLORADO

[Signature]

Training coordinated by the
Institute for Intergovernmental
Research® on behalf of BJA

State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT

Caoimhin P. Connell

HAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED AN 8-HOUR
STATE AND LOCAL ANTI-TERRORISM TRAINING PROGRAM
NARCOTICS TASK FORCE ANTI-TERRORISM BRIEFING

June 1, 2006
Denver, Colorado

[Signature]
Rocky Mountain
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area

Certifies that

Caoimhin Connell

has attended

4 hours of
Hash Oil Extraction: The Scene and The Patient
Aurora, CO
July 25, 2014

Training Manager, Rocky Mountain HIDTA

Director, Rocky Mountain HIDTA
This certifies that

Caoimhin P Connell

Has met the requirements for the online course

Expert Testimony Training for the Prosecutor and Scientist

RTI International

11-07-2012
Certificate Number: 1109778763

For more information please visit http://www.rti.org/forensic

Park County Sheriff's Office
Certificate of Completion

Caoimhin Connell

has completed an 8 hour course in:

Crime-scene Approach and Evidence Collection

Completed this 29th day of April, 2009

[Signatures]

Instructor

Sheriff
Rocky Mountain
High Intensity Drug Trafficking
Area
Certifies that

Caoimhín P. Connell

has attended
2 hours of
Hash Oil Explosions
Woodland Park, CO
May 31, 2014

Certificate of Completion
This Will Certify That

Caoimhín P. Connell

Successfully Completed
Prescription Drug Crimes
7 Hours Completed

At: CO Law Enforcement Officers Assn
On: September 30, 2010
Greeley, Colorado

P. Ritch Wagner
Instructor

Director, Law Enforcement Cadet & Education
Certificate of Training

This is to certify that

CAOIMHIN CONNELL

(Name)

Park County Sheriff's Office

(Agency)

If the bearer of this document possesses a 40 Hour certificate pursuant to 29 CFR §1910.120, this certifies the above named has met the refresher training requirements of 29 CFR §1910.120(o)(8) and is hereby RECERTIFIED in Clandestine Laboratory Safety / HazWoper

Sponsored by
Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area
Colorado Regional Community Policing Institute

[Signature]
Inspector/Date

Colorado Law Enforcement
Officers’ Association

This is to certify that

CAOIMHIN CONNELL

Completed ARIDE (Advanced Roadside Impaired Driving Enforcement

hosted by Loveland Police Department

on February 28 – March 1, 2011

[Signature]
Tony Binelle, CLEOA President

[Signature]
ARIDE Instructor
State of Colorado

THE BOARD ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING
HEREBY AWARDS THIS CERTIFICATE
AS INSPECTOR OF VEHICLE IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS TO
CAOIMHIN PADRAIG CONNELL

August 27, 2008

For fulfilling the prescribed requirements as an Inspector of Vehicle Identification Numbers and as a peace officer in Colorado, pursuant to Title 42, Article 5, Section 206 Colorado Revised Statutes.

Bill Ritter Jr.
Governor

John Suthers
Attorney General, Board Chairperson

Certificate of Completion
Intoxilyzer 9000 Operator Certification Course

The Evidential Breath Alcohol Testing Program of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment certifies that

Caomhín P. Connell
User ID: 841645

has successfully completed the “Intoxilyzer 9000 Operator Certification Course” to determine the alcohol concentration in breath specimens pursuant to the State Board of Health Rules Pertaining to Testing for Alcohol and Other Drugs (5 CCR 1005-2)

Training was provided by the Evidential Breath Alcohol Testing Program of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

February 21, 2013

Certificate Data

Jeffrey A. Goff, Program Manager
Evidential Breath Alcohol Testing Program

David A. Butcher, Director
Laboratory Services Division
Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment

Certification expires 180 days from certificate date. Recertification must be per 5 CCR 1005-2.
Certificate of Achievement

awarded to:

Caoimhin P. Connell

Has successfully completed Methamphetamine Lab Cleanup Management and Supervision training in accordance with 29 CFR 1910.120 and State Regulations Pertaining to the Cleanup of Methamphetamine Laboratories (8Hrs.)

June 1st, 2005

Signed

HAZMAT Plans & Programs, Inc. 30 S. Havana St. Suite 304F Aurora, Colorado 80012 (303) 360-9801

"Safety Plans, Programs and Training Tailored To The Needs Of Your Business"

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION

COLORADO LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSOCIATIONS TRAINING PROJECT

This Certifies That

Caoimhin Connell

Has Attended the

CLEAT 40-HOUR

Train the Trainer Course

Hosted by Breckenridge Police Department
August 14-18, 2006

Karen M. Rosawh, CAE
Executive Director
Colorado Association of Chiefs of Police

John L. Kammerzell
Executive Director
Police Officer Standard & Training

Donald E. Christensen
Executive Director
County Sheriffs of Colorado
CAOIMHIN PADRAIG CONNELL

May 6, 2004

For fulfilling the prescribed requirements for certification. This certificate expires three years from date of issuance unless the certificate holder meets the requirements for continued certification as established by law and the P.O.S.T. Board.

Bill Owens
Governor

Ken Salazar
Attorney General, Board Chairperson
Rocky Mountain
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area
Certifies that

Caoimhín Connell
has attended
16 hours of
MCTC / RMHIDTA Indoor Marijuana Grows
Centennial, CO
August 28-29, 2014

Training Manager, Rocky Mountain HIDTA
Director, Rocky Mountain HIDTA

CERTIFICATE OF TRAINING

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT

Caoimhín Connell
Has completed 4 hours of successful training for
The Hazards of Hash Oil Extraction
Held at IRIS Fire Investigations in Englewood, CO
on this 7th day of November, 2014

Robert K. Toth
IRIS Fire Investigations, President
December 30, 2014

Caoimhin Connell
Forensic Applications Consulting Technologies Inc
185 Bounty Hunter Ln
Bailey, CO 80421

Consultant Interim Authorization Approval

Dear Caoimhin Connell:

The Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (the Department) has reviewed the application for Consultant Interim Authorization and has determined the application to be complete and in compliance with 6 CCR 1014-3, Regulations Pertaining to the Cleanup of Methamphetamine-Affected Properties (the Regulations).

The Department approves the application for Consultant Interim Authorization. This interim authorization approval shall expire on June 15, 2015.

Assessment and sampling of methamphetamine-affected properties may only be conducted by Consultant Firms that have received interim authorization under Part 2, Section 3.2.4 of the Regulations. Therefore, this interim authorization may only be used to conduct assessment and sampling of methamphetamine-affected properties for a Consultant Firm that has received interim authorization approval from the Department.

Approved By: ______________________________ Date: 12/30/2014
December 30, 2014

Forensic Applications Consulting Technologies Inc
185 Bounty Hunters Ln
Bailey, CO 80421

Consultant Firm Interim Authorization Approval

Dear Forensic Applications Consulting Technologies Inc:

The Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (the Department) has reviewed the application for Consultant Firm Interim Authorization and has determined the application to be complete and in compliance with 6 CCR 1014-3, Regulations Pertaining to the Cleanup of Methamphetamine-Affected Properties (the Regulations).

The Department approves the application for Consultant Firm Interim Authorization. The firm shall only utilize individuals who have received interim authorization under Part 2, Section 3.2.1 of the Regulations to conduct assessment and sampling of methamphetamine-affected properties. This interim authorization approval shall expire on June 15, 2015.

The Regulations require submittal of electronic copies of reports to the Department. Electronic copies of reports should be submitted via email to cdphe_methlabdocuments@state.co.us. The words “report” or “report submittal” should be included in the email subject line, and the property address should be included in the body of the email.

Alternatively, compact disks with electronic copies of reports may be mailed to:

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
Hazardous Material and Waste Management Division
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South
Denver, CO 80246-1530
Attn: Colleen Brisnehan or Richard Mruz

Packages may also be hand delivered to the Department’s mail room located in the northwest corner of Building B (700 South Ash Street).

Approved By: ___________________________ Date: 12/30/2014