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Fire Investigation: Historical Perspective and Recent Developments


ABSTRACT: As a forensic science discipline, fire investigation involves a wide variety of disciplines and thus attracts an equally wide variety of practitioners. These range from fire protection engineers who may only occasionally engage in forensic work to law enforcement officers, laboratory chemists, metallurgists, and materials engineers. This breadth of practice has resulted in a checkered history, which only relatively recently has given science a full-throated embrace. Because of the stakes involved, fires provide a rich source of material for litigation, both civil and criminal. This conceptual review provides a brief history from the standpoint of a practitioner who has witnessed and sometimes precipitated the changes that have taken place since 1974. Highlights include the debunking of many misconceptions about fire behavior and a general (though not always uninterrupted) movement toward making fire investigation more scientifically accurate through the development of best practices.
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INTRODUCTION

As a forensic science discipline, fire investigation is one of the broadest, in that it encompasses so many different academic and investigative fields. Fire investigators, if they are to understand their role properly, need to be conversant in chemistry, physics, fluid dynamics, fire dynamics, developments in data collection and analysis, and the use of science to answer questions of interest to the legal system. To say that fire investigation has undergone dramatic changes in the last few decades would be a major understatement. It becomes difficult to identify a place to start, as change has been stretched out over so many years and seems to be accelerating.

A wide-ranging and richly annotated review of the discipline was released in 2017 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), entitled “Forensic Science Assessments: A Quality and Gap Analysis. Report 1: Fire Investigation” [1]. This gap analysis was intended to be applied to 10 forensic disciplines, but only two have been released so far: fire investigation and latent fingerprint examination. The Fire Investigation Report and its “plain language” summary may be found at: https://www.aaas.org/resources/fire-investigation.

I. FIRE SCENE INVESTIGATION

WENT OFF THE RAILS EARLY ON

To put the changes in fire investigation science into historical perspective, a convenient starting point is the 1977 report by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), the predecessor to the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), entitled “Arson and Arson Investigation: Survey and Assessment” [3]. The 144-page study may be found at: https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/147389NCJRS.pdf.

In that assessment, the authors described several well-known “burn indicators” but stated, “Although burn indicators are widely used to establish the causes of fires, they have received little or no scientific testing.” The study authors recommended “that a program of carefully planned scientific experiments be conducted to establish the reliability of currently used burn indicators” and “a handbook based on the results of the testing program should be prepared for field use by arson investigators”.

Three years later, the handbook called for in the 1977 report was published by the most respected scientific and engineering body on the planet, the US National Bureau of Standards (NBS; National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, since 1988) [4]. Unfortunately, the scientific studies recommended in the survey had not been conducted. The NBS handbook editors were advised by two members of the National Fire Academy staff, and in Chapter 1 they repeated most of the myths that have been used to incorrectly determine that a fire burned faster or hotter than normal. The text refers to “hot” fires and a “rapid buildup of heat”, which were generally interpreted by investigators as indicative of the use of liquid accelerants.

The indicators that could allegedly be used to determine whether a fire was a “slowly developing” one or a “rapidly developing” one were listed as follows [4]:

- **Alligatoring of wood**. Slow fires produce relatively flat alligatoring. Fast fires produced humpback, shiny alligatoring.
- **Spalling of concrete**. An indication of intense high-heat fire.
- **Fire patterns**. A wide-angle or diffuse V pattern generally
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