

TEXAS FORENSIC SCIENCE COMMISSION

Justice Through Science

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT
December 2018–November 2019



TEXAS FORENSIC SCIENCE COMMISSION
EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and Background.....	3
II.	Forensic Science Commission Members and Budget.....	3
	<i>A. Appointments to Date</i>	
	<i>B. Annual Budget</i>	
III.	Summary of Complaints and Disclosures.....	5
	<i>A. Complaint/Disclosure Tally</i>	
	<i>B. Complaint/Disclosure Screening Process</i>	
IV.	Summary of Pending Complaint and Disclosure Investigations and Reports.....	6
V.	Discipline Specific Reviews.....	8
	<i>A. DNA Mixture Interpretation Analysis</i>	
	<i>B. Crime Scene Investigation and Reconstruction</i>	
VI.	Additional Items Required in Annual Report by Statute.....	12
	<i>A. Accreditation Updates</i>	
	<i>B. Forensic Analysis Definition</i>	
	<i>C. Developments in Forensic Science Made or Used in Other State or Federal Investigations and the Activities of the Commission with Respect to Those Developments.</i>	
	<i>D. Other Relevant Information</i>	

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit A	Copy of Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Article 38.01
Exhibit B	FY2020 Budget Plan
Exhibit C	Complaint/Disclosure Spreadsheet

I. Introduction and Background

This report covers Commission activities from December 1, 2018 through November 30, 2019. The Commission is part of the Office of Court Administration which publishes an annual report that includes a section on the Forensic Science Commission. Copies of the Office of Court Administration's annual reports can be found [here](#).

The Texas Legislature created the Commission during the 79th Legislative Session by passing House Bill 1068. HB 1068 amended the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure to add Article 38.01, which describes the composition and authority of the Commission. The Commission is required to investigate allegations of professional negligence or professional misconduct that would substantially affect the integrity of the results of a forensic analysis conducted by a crime laboratory. The Legislature also requires the Commission to develop and implement a reporting system through which accredited crime laboratories report professional negligence or misconduct. During subsequent legislative sessions, the Texas Legislature further amended the Code of Criminal Procedure to clarify and expand the Commission's jurisdictional responsibilities to include oversight of the State's crime laboratory accreditation and forensic analyst licensing programs. The Commission is also actively engaged in various forensic development initiatives and works collaboratively with stakeholders in the criminal justice system to improve education and training in forensic science and the law. For a complete historical perspective on the creation and evolution of the Commission, please see Section II of the Commission's first annual report, which may be obtained on the Commission's website or by emailing Commission staff at info@fsc.texas.gov.

II. Forensic Science Commission Members and Budget

A. Appointments to Date

To date, the FSC has had 33 different Commissioners and currently has 4 full-time staff members. Following is a table providing appointment and expiration dates for current members as of November 30, 2019 as well as the basis for each appointment.

Current Members	Original Appointment	Basis for Appointment	Expiration Date
Jeffrey Barnard, MD <i>Presiding Officer</i>	10/31/2011	UT—Forensic Pathology (Dallas) Art 38.01, Section 3(a)(4)	09/01/2021
Bruce Budowle, Ph.D.	11/28/2016	UNTHSC Director—Missing Persons DNA (Fort Worth) Article 38.01, Section 3(a)(7)	09/01/2020
Patrick Buzzini, Ph.D.	04/04/2019	SHSU Faculty—Materials (Trace) (Huntsville) Article 38.01. Section 3(a)(8)	09/01/2020
Mark Daniel, J.D.	11/28/2016	TCDLA—Defense Counsel (Fort Worth) Article 38.01, Section 3(a)(3)	09/01/2021
Nancy Downing, Ph.D.	11/28/2016	Texas A&M Faculty— Forensic Nursing (College Station) Article 38.01, Section 3(a)(5)	09/01/2020
Jasmine Drake, Ph.D.	11/28/2016	TSU Faculty—Forensic Chemistry (Houston) Article 38.01, Section 3(a)(6)	09/01/2020
Pat Johnson, M.S.	11/28/2016	Forensic Chemistry (Austin) Article 38.01, Section 3(a)(1)	09/01/2021
Sarah Kerrigan, Ph.D.	11/28/2016	Forensic Toxicology (The Woodlands) Article 38.01, Section 3(a)(1)	09/01/2021

Jarvis Parsons, J.D.	11/28/2016	TDCAA--Prosecutor (Brazos) Article 38.01, Section 3(a)(2).	09/01/2021
----------------------	------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	------------

B. Annual Budget

The FSC’s annual budget is \$602,100 plus up to \$120,000 available in collected licensing program fees for fiscal year 2020 and \$563,900 plus up to \$153,000 available in collected licensing program fees for fiscal year 2021. A copy of the FSC’s projected budget for FY2020 is attached as **Exhibit B**. The Commission will dedicate funds to the following critical priorities during FY2020: (1) funding of staff salary and overhead; (2) complaint and disclosure investigative activities; (3) management and administration of the laboratory accreditation program; (4) management and administration of the forensic analyst licensing program; (5) discipline-specific reviews and related training and forensic education initiatives; (6) forensic development including a forensic bench book and licensing oversight; and (7) other collaborative training projects with the Texas Criminal Justice Integrity Unit (“TCJIU”) and other stakeholders. **Exhibit B** provides a breakdown of projected costs in major categories.

III. Summary of Complaints and Disclosures

A. Complaint/Disclosure Tally

Commission staff receives complaints from a range of sources, including but not limited to attorneys (both defense and prosecution), current inmates and their families/friends, national advocacy groups, former laboratory employees, other laboratories and interested members of the public. The Commission relies upon accredited crime laboratories, attorneys and interested members of the public to bring issues of concern to the Commission’s attention. For a complete summary of the Commission’s investigative jurisdiction, please see Section II of the Commission’s seventh annual report.

To date, the Commission has received a total of 264 complaints and 82 self-disclosures, and has disposed of 336 complaints and disclosures, either through dismissal, investigation and release of a report, and/or referral to another agency. Of the 346 complaints and self-disclosures received, 47 were received from December 1, 2018 through November 30, 2019. The Commission currently has 8 open complaints/self-disclosures, including 2 active investigations. A complete spreadsheet detailing the disposition and status of each complaint is provided at **Exhibit C**.

B. Complaint/Disclosure Screening Process

Pursuant to Section 3 of the Commission's Policies and Procedures, the Commission's Complaint and Disclosure Screening Committee conducts an initial review of complaints and disclosures before each meeting as necessary. After discussion, the Committee makes a recommendation on what further action, if any, is merited for each complaint or self-disclosure received. The Committee's opinion is presented to the full Commission for consideration and deliberation during the quarterly meeting.

The Commission may only review allegations of professional negligence or misconduct for those cases involving accredited crime laboratories and accredited forensic disciplines. The Commission receives many complaints falling outside those statutory requirements, and typically will only review cases involving unaccredited disciplines and entities if a majority of the Commission determines the review would be an effective use of public resources and is likely to benefit the criminal justice system in Texas. Many complaints are dismissed because they do not meet these standards. Other complaints are dismissed because they lack fundamental information or simply fail to state an actual complaint regarding forensic analysis as that term is defined in the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure. Finally, the Commission must dismiss any complaint involving the portion of an autopsy conducted by a medical examiner or other forensic pathologist who is a licensed physician. *See* TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. 38.01, § 2(4).

IV. Summary of Pending Complaint and Disclosure Investigations and Final Reports Issued from December 1, 2018 to November 30, 2019.

As of the date of this report, one complaint and one disclosure are pending investigation and release of a final report by the Commission: (1) a complaint by DNA consultant, Dr. Robert Collins, alleging a DPS – Houston DNA analyst falsely reported an inconclusive result that should have clearly been an exclusion in a capital murder trial; and (2) a self-disclosure by Sorenson Forensics describing two incidents of contamination that were not identified prior to case reports being released. These incidents were detected by Sorenson’s client. The Commission is currently in the process of investigating these two incidents and plans to issue final reports addressing the issues in early 2020. Copies of final reports are published on the Commission’s website.

In 2019, the Commission released investigative reports for 1) a self-disclosure by DPS Austin reporting an incident where DNA evidence was excluded during a pre-trial evidentiary hearing due to standard operating procedure violations and related errors that came to light during testimony by the analyst at the hearing; 2) a self-disclosure by the Fort Worth Police Department Crime Laboratory where a licensed DNA analyst intentionally falsified the standard curve metrics in a performance check (PC) after maintenance of the quantification instrument and fabricated the PC plate in the quality check in order to conceal the fact that she did not actually run the PC plate; and 3) a complaint by a toxicology expert for the defense regarding the unsupportable use of duplicate data in blood alcohol cases reported by the DPS regional laboratory in El Paso. Copies of all final investigative reports may be found on the Commission’s website [here](#).

VII. Discipline Specific Reviews

A. DNA Mixture Interpretation Analysis

1. Background/Case Review

In May 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) issued a notification to laboratories around the country stating it had identified certain errors in the database used by laboratories to calculate DNA match statistics in criminal cases. The statistical impact of those errors was minimal as demonstrated through empirical studies at the national and state level. In an abundance of caution, Texas laboratories notified prosecutors they would re-calculate statistics for any case using the corrected data. Some prosecutors requested new reports reflecting the re-calculations, particularly for cases currently scheduled for trial. The reports confirmed the statistical insignificance of the FBI database errors.

However, when the amended reports were issued, some prosecutors noticed a significant difference in statistical results for a few of their cases, such as a change from an inclusion or “cannot be excluded” result with an accompanying population statistic to an inconclusive result, or a major change in a population statistic. When the affected prosecutors asked how this type of change could be possible when the FBI database issues were supposed to be *minimal*, they were informed the changes were attributable not to the FBI database corrections but rather to changes in mixture interpretation protocols over time.

While some variation in laboratory interpretation policies and protocols is acceptable and to be expected, mixture interpretation protocols in years past may not have adequately considered certain important scientific limitations, such as allele dropout, stutter, allele stacking, allele masking and other stochastic effects. To be clear, this is by no means isolated to Texas but rather an issue in laboratories nationwide and it does not impact every laboratory or every case involving DNA analysis. Some cases may have a significantly changed statistic when reviewed, some may have minor and insignificant changes while others may have no changes at all. In light of the Commission’s findings related to mixture interpretation protocols that may not have adequately considered certain important scientific limitations, such as allele dropout, stutter, allele stacking,

allele masking and other stochastic effects, the Commission felt it prudent to initiate a statewide review of DNA mixture interpretation cases.

2. Notification and Screening Process

As part of a recommended notification process, the Commission requested all criminal DNA testing laboratories in the State provide DNA mixture lists of cases analyzed since the inception of STR testing to the affected prosecuting agencies for review and notification where appropriate. With Court of Criminal Appeals Judge Barbara Hervey's assistance, the Commission also published a notice in Texas prison libraries describing the DNA mixture interpretation issues and providing inmates with information on submitting their case for review and/or reanalysis.

3. Case Review Update

With the exception of Tarrant and Travis counties, which chose to manage their own reviews, the statewide DNA mixture interpretation case review is currently managed by Robert Wicoff, Chief of the Appellate Division of the Harris County Public Defender's Office. The work is 100% funded by a grant from the Texas Commission on Indigent Defense. Wicoff and a team of lawyers received approximately 3,072 requests for review and/or re-analysis of cases. Over 2,500 of those cases have been resolved so far. Of the over 2,500 resolved, recalculation was requested and/or completed in about 4% of cases. The group has received recalculated results in at least 50 cases thus far, 44 of which confirmed the original results, 1 in which the results changed from "cannot be excluded" to "excluded", 3 where results changed from "cannot be excluded" to "inconclusive" and 2 cases in which results were confirmed but saw a significant statistical change. As of October 25, 2019, Wicoff is currently waiting on numerous recalculation requests made to laboratories and expects to issue a final report in early 2020.

B. Crime Scene Reconstruction, including Bloodstain Pattern Analysis

1. Background

At its May 26, 2017 meeting, the Commission reviewed a self-disclosure from the Houston Forensic Science Center ("HFSC") describing nonconformities in its Crime Scene Unit including deficiencies in documentation, collection, recovery and preservation of evidence at multiple crime scenes that led to the removal of a crime scene investigator and a technical supervisor. The Commission voted to form an investigative panel consisting of Commissioners Mr. Pat Johnson, Mr. Jarvis Parsons and Dr. Jasmine Drake. The same investigative panel combined its observations about best practices for crime scene investigation made in the HFSC disclosure with recommendations for accreditation of crime scene analysis and reconstruction, including bloodstain pattern analysis made in the Commission's investigation of a complaint filed by Walter Reaves on behalf of defendant Joe Bryan. A copy of the Commission's final investigative report can be found on the Commission's website here.

2. Considerations re: Accreditation and Licensing in Crime Scene Discipline

On January 22, 2018, the panel and Commissioners held a hearing during which invited stakeholders in the area of crime scene analysis and reconstruction provided testimony on their practice and its scientific support and answered questions about whether accreditation should be required for the discipline. At its April 2018 quarterly meeting, Commissioners decided to temporarily exempt the discipline from accreditation requirements to provide an adequate timeframe for the development of an accreditation program for the discipline. In the interim, the Commission and the panel formed a collaborative working group of crime scene investigation practitioners and other interested stakeholders that has met four times since May 2018 to develop standards of practice for crime scene investigation and analysis, including bloodstain pattern analysis. The group began by distinguishing crime scene processing and investigation activities from crime scene reconstruction and analysis activities by defining applicable terms. Over 2,400 law enforcement agencies across Texas engage in crime scene processing activities that are integral

to any case investigation. Only a limited number of practitioners engage in crime scene analysis and reconstruction, including bloodstain pattern analysis. With respect to crime scene processing and recommendations for best practices, the panel and working group members worked closely with the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement to revise the Basic Peace Officer Training Course to include what was previously an intermediate level crime scene investigator course in the basic course and to update instructional material provided for crime scene processing.

3. Voluntary License for Crime Scene Reconstruction Analysts

With respect to crime scene analysis and reconstruction, including bloodstain pattern analysis, the working group, at its July 15, 2019 meeting, changed its recommended oversight approach from accreditation to voluntary licensure of crime scene reconstruction analysts. This change was due in significant part to resource challenges expressed by law enforcement agencies in rural jurisdictions. The group is now working on licensing requirements that will be proposed and evaluated by the Commission's Licensing Advisory Committee and presented to the full Commission for approval and final recommendation. At the Commission's August 16, 2019 quarterly meeting, the Commission approved the approach of voluntary licensure for crime scene reconstructionists in Texas after weighing related costs, necessary levels of oversight and staffing concerns. The Commission expects to have draft requirements for the new voluntary license program sometime in 2020.

V. Additional Items Required in Annual Report by Statute

A. Accreditation Update

As part of its statutory Annual Report requirement, the Commission must describe any forensic method or methodology the Commission designates as part of the accreditation process for crime laboratories.¹ In 2018, the Commission considered whether to exempt or subject crime

¹ TEX. CODE CRIM. PROC. art 38.01 §8(2).

scene reconstruction, including bloodstain pattern analysis and trajectory determination, to accreditation requirements. Previously, the discipline was neither subject to nor exempt from accreditation requirements which resulted in some confusion among experts, attorneys and judges. Effective December 16, 2018, Commissioners exempted the discipline from accreditation requirements. A working group of stakeholders and the Commission's Licensing Advisory Committee is in the process of developing licensing criteria for crime scene reconstruction analysts as described in paragraph **IV. 3.** above.

In April of 2019, the Commission exempted from accreditation requirements confirmatory testing of human specimens in a laboratory certified by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS/CMS) under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA) for the purposes of referring, offering, or making available treatment or monitoring, conducted by or under contract with a community supervision and corrections department, the parole division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, or the Board of Pardons and Paroles, where the results of such testing are subsequently entered into evidence in an action to revise or revoke the terms of an individual's community supervision or parole. The laboratory seeking the exemption primarily performs testing for the purposes of assessing appropriate drug abuse treatment and/or monitoring, and the results are not typically used for purposes of connecting the results to a criminal action. However, in some rare instances, the results of such testing may be entered as evidence in a criminal action to revoke or revise the terms of a person's community supervision or parole. The Commission concluded these infrequent instances did not justify the cost and time necessary for licensing analysts and thus approved the requested exemption.

Effective July 15, 2019, the Commission exempted from accreditation and licensing requirements the forensic discipline of document examination. Currently, only Texas DPS is

accredited by the Commission to perform document examination. Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Article 38.35 excludes evidence in a criminal action where the laboratory conducting the forensic analysis is not accredited by the Commission. Because there is only one accredited entity available for document examination and because that entity typically performs work for the State only, the defense bar has raised concerns that the accreditation requirement in the context of document examination unfairly restricts a defendant's access to experts. Staff also surveyed out-of-state accredited entities that may perform document examination and none of the entities were able to provide services for a defendant in this circumstance.

B. Forensic Analysis Definition

In addition to the explanation of accreditation changes, the Commission's enabling statute also requires a report on recommendations for "best practices concerning the definition of 'forensic analysis' provided by statute or by rule" each year. The Commission has not identified any recommendations regarding the definition of "forensic analysis." The Commission may revise its conclusion on this issue as necessary to ensure the advancement of forensic science in Texas.

C. Developments in Forensic Science Made or Used in Other State or Federal Investigations and the Activities of the Commission with Respect to Those Developments.

Texas is a leader among states seeking to advance the integrity and reliability of forensic science in criminal courts and is often recognized for its successful efforts in forensic reform both nationally and internationally. On September 10, 2019 this year, the Commission's General Counsel, Lynn Garcia, was invited by Chairwoman Eddie Bernice Johnson to speak before the United States House of Representatives Committee on Science, Space, & Technology at the Committee's hearing to provide remarks on how Texas has strengthened forensic science and what challenges remain for our state. The hearing can be accessed at the following link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jrNIUTJK8hl&feature=youtu.be>. The Committee is assessing the

progress in forensic science since the 2009 National Academy of Sciences report and will examine the role of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in the advancement of forensic science research and standards.

At its October 24, 2019 meeting, the Commission voted to adopt a recommendation to encourage Texas-accredited crime laboratories to voluntarily adopt all Organization of Scientific Area Committee (OSAC) registry standards. OSAC is an organization administered by the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) working to strengthen forensic practice through improved standards by 1) facilitating the development of technically sound, science-based standards through a formal standard developing organization (SDO) process; 2) evaluating existing standards published by SDOs for placement on the OSAC Registry; and 3) promoting the use of OSAC Registry approved standards throughout the national forensic science community.

The Commission is also working with the NIST Standards Coordination Office in identifying key laboratory issues in Texas, including assessing gaps between assessment and the accreditation process. The Commission expects to release additional information regarding this assessment by its January 31, 2020 meeting.

D. Other Relevant Information

In 2020, the Commission will release a forensic bench book to assist judges in their gatekeeping role as they encounter forensic issues in casework. The Commission expects the forensic bench book to be continually updated and hopes the book will serve as a reference guide for lawyers, judges and other stakeholders seeking to ensure the effective and fair application of forensic methodologies.

EXHIBIT A

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

TITLE 1. CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

CHAPTER 38. EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL ACTIONS

Art. 38.01. TEXAS FORENSIC SCIENCE COMMISSION

Sec. 1. CREATION. The Texas Forensic Science Commission is created.

Sec. 2. DEFINITIONS. In this article:

(1) "Accredited field of forensic science" means a specific forensic method or methodology validated or approved by the commission under this article.

(2) "Commission" means the Texas Forensic Science Commission.

(3) "Crime laboratory" has the meaning assigned by Article [38.35](#).

(4) "Forensic analysis" means a medical, chemical, toxicologic, ballistic, or other expert examination or test performed on physical evidence, including DNA evidence, for the purpose of determining the connection of the evidence to a criminal action, except that the term does not include the portion of an autopsy conducted by a medical examiner or other forensic pathologist who is a licensed physician.

(5) "Office of capital and forensic writs" means the office of capital and forensic writs established under Subchapter B, Chapter [78](#), Government Code.

(6) "Physical evidence" has the meaning assigned by Article [38.35](#).

Sec. 3. COMPOSITION. (a) The commission is composed of nine members appointed by the governor as follows:

(1) two members who must have expertise in the field of forensic science;

(2) one member who must be a prosecuting attorney that the governor selects from a list of 10 names submitted by the Texas District and County Attorneys Association;

(3) one member who must be a defense attorney that the governor selects from a list of 10 names submitted by the Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association;

(4) one member who must be a faculty member or staff member of The University of Texas who specializes in clinical laboratory medicine that the governor selects from a list of five names submitted by the chancellor of The University of Texas System;

(5) one member who must be a faculty member or staff member of Texas A&M University who specializes in clinical laboratory medicine that the governor selects from a list of five names submitted by the chancellor of The Texas A&M University System;

(6) one member who must be a faculty member or staff member of Texas Southern University that the governor selects from a list of five names submitted by the chancellor of Texas Southern University;

(7) one member who must be a director or division head of the University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth Missing Persons DNA Database; and

(8) one member who must be a faculty or staff member of the Sam Houston State University College of Criminal Justice and have expertise in the field of forensic science or statistical analyses that the governor selects from a list of five names submitted by the chancellor of the Texas State University System.

(b) Each member of the commission serves a two-year term. The terms expire on September 1 of:

(1) each odd-numbered year, for a member appointed under Subsection (a) (1), (2), (3), or (4); and

(2) each even-numbered year, for a member appointed under Subsection (a) (5), (6), (7), or (8).

(c) The governor shall designate a member of the commission to serve as the presiding officer.

Sec. 3-a. RULES. The commission shall adopt rules necessary to implement this article.

Sec. 4. DUTIES. (a) The commission shall:

(1) develop and implement a reporting system through which a crime laboratory may report professional negligence or professional misconduct;

(2) require a crime laboratory that conducts forensic analyses to report professional negligence or professional misconduct to the commission; and

(3) investigate, in a timely manner, any allegation of professional negligence or professional misconduct that would substantially affect the integrity of the results of a forensic analysis conducted by a crime laboratory.

(a-1) The commission may initiate for educational purposes an investigation of a forensic analysis without receiving a complaint, submitted through the reporting system implemented under Subsection (a)(1), that contains an allegation of professional negligence or professional misconduct involving the forensic analysis conducted if the commission determines by a majority vote of a quorum of the members of the commission that an investigation of the forensic analysis would advance the integrity and reliability of forensic science in this state.

(b) If the commission conducts an investigation under Subsection (a)(3) of a crime laboratory that is accredited under this article pursuant to an allegation of professional negligence or professional misconduct involving an accredited field of forensic science, the investigation:

(1) must include the preparation of a written report that identifies and also describes the methods and procedures used to identify:

(A) the alleged negligence or misconduct;

(B) whether negligence or misconduct occurred;

(C) any corrective action required of the laboratory, facility, or entity;

(D) observations of the commission regarding the integrity and reliability of the forensic analysis conducted;

(E) best practices identified by the commission during the course of the investigation; and

(F) other recommendations that are relevant, as determined by the commission; and

(2) may include one or more:

(A) retrospective reexaminations of other forensic analyses conducted by the laboratory, facility, or entity that may involve the same kind of negligence or misconduct; and

(B) follow-up evaluations of the laboratory, facility, or entity to review:

(i) the implementation of any corrective action required under Subdivision (1) (C); or

(ii) the conclusion of any retrospective reexamination under Paragraph (A).

(b-1) If the commission conducts an investigation under Subsection (a) (3) of a crime laboratory that is not accredited under this article or the investigation is conducted pursuant to an allegation involving a forensic method or methodology that is not an accredited field of forensic science, the investigation may include the preparation of a written report that contains:

(1) observations of the commission regarding the integrity and reliability of the forensic analysis conducted;

(2) best practices identified by the commission during the course of the investigation; or

(3) other recommendations that are relevant, as determined by the commission.

(b-2) If the commission conducts an investigation of a forensic analysis under Subsection (a-1), the investigation must include the preparation of a written report that contains:

(1) observations of the commission regarding the integrity and reliability of the forensic analysis conducted;

(2) best practices identified by the commission during the course of the investigation; and

(3) other recommendations that are relevant, as determined by the commission.

(c) The commission by contract may delegate the duties described by Subsections (a) (1) and (3) to any person the commission determines to be qualified to assume those duties.

(d) The commission may require that a crime laboratory investigated under this section pay any costs incurred to ensure compliance with Subsection (b), (b-1), or (b-2).

(e) The commission shall make all investigation reports completed under Subsection (b), (b-1), or (b-2) available to the public. A report completed under Subsection (b), (b-1), or (b-2), in a subsequent civil or criminal proceeding, is not prima facie evidence of the information or findings contained in the report.

(f) The commission may not make a determination of whether professional negligence or professional misconduct occurred or issue a finding on that question in an investigation initiated under Subsection (a-1) or for which an investigation report may be prepared under Subsection (b-1).

(g) The commission may not issue a finding related to the guilt or innocence of a party in an underlying civil or criminal trial involving conduct investigated by the commission under this article.

(h) The commission may review and refer cases that are the subject of an investigation under Subsection (a)(3) or (a-1) to the office of capital and forensic writs in accordance with Section [78.054](#)(b), Government Code.

Sec. 4-a. FORENSIC ANALYST LICENSING. (a) Notwithstanding Section 2, in this section:

(1) "Forensic analysis" has the meaning assigned by Article [38.35](#).

(2) "Forensic analyst" means a person who on behalf of a crime laboratory accredited under this article technically reviews or performs a forensic analysis or draws conclusions from or interprets a forensic analysis for a court or crime laboratory. The term does not include a medical examiner or other forensic pathologist who is a licensed physician.

(b) A person may not act or offer to act as a forensic analyst unless the person holds a forensic analyst license. The commission by rule may establish classifications of forensic analyst licenses if the commission determines that it is necessary

to ensure the availability of properly trained and qualified forensic analysts to perform activities regulated by the commission.

(c) The commission by rule may establish voluntary licensing programs for forensic disciplines that are not subject to accreditation under this article.

(d) The commission by rule shall:

(1) establish the qualifications for a license that include:

(A) successful completion of the education requirements established by the commission;

(B) specific course work and experience, including instruction in courtroom testimony and ethics in a crime laboratory;

(C) successful completion of an examination required or recognized by the commission; and

(D) successful completion of proficiency testing to the extent required for crime laboratory accreditation;

(2) set fees for the issuance and renewal of a license; and

(3) establish the term of a forensic analyst license.

(e) The commission by rule may recognize a certification issued by a national organization in an accredited field of forensic science as satisfying the requirements established under Subsection (d)(1)(C) to the extent the commission determines the content required to receive the certification is substantially equivalent to the content of the requirements under that subsection.

(f) The commission shall issue a license to an applicant who:

(1) submits an application on a form prescribed by the commission;

(2) meets the qualifications established by commission rule; and

(3) pays the required fee.

Sec. 4-b. ADVISORY COMMITTEE. (a) The commission shall establish an advisory committee to advise the commission and make recommendations on matters related to the licensing of forensic analysts under Section 4-a.

(b) The advisory committee consists of nine members as follows:

(1) one prosecuting attorney recommended by the Texas District and County Attorneys Association;

(2) one defense attorney recommended by the Texas Criminal Defense Lawyers Association; and

(3) seven members who are forensic scientists, crime laboratory directors, or crime laboratory quality managers, selected by the commission from a list of 20 names submitted by the Texas Association of Crime Laboratory Directors.

(c) The commission shall ensure that appointments under Subsection (b)(3) include representation from municipal, county, state, and private crime laboratories that are accredited under this article.

(d) The advisory committee members serve staggered two-year terms, with the terms of four or five members, as appropriate, expiring on August 31 of each year. An advisory committee member may not serve more than two consecutive terms. A vacancy on the advisory committee is filled by appointing a member in the same manner as the original appointment to serve for the unexpired portion of the term.

(e) The advisory committee shall elect a presiding officer from among its members to serve a one-year term. A member may serve more than one term as presiding officer.

(f) The advisory committee shall meet annually and at the call of the presiding officer or the commission.

(g) An advisory committee member is not entitled to compensation. A member is entitled to reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred in performing duties as a member of the advisory committee subject to the General Appropriations Act.

(h) Chapter [2110](#), Government Code, does not apply to the advisory committee.

Sec. 4-c. DISCIPLINARY ACTION. (a) On a determination by the commission that a license holder has committed professional misconduct under this article or violated this article or a rule or order of the commission under this article, the commission may:

- (1) revoke or suspend the person's license;
- (2) refuse to renew the person's license; or
- (3) reprimand the license holder.

(b) The commission may place on probation a person whose license is suspended. If a license suspension is probated, the commission may require the license holder to:

- (1) report regularly to the commission on matters that are the basis of the probation; or
- (2) continue or review continuing professional education until the license holder attains a degree of skill satisfactory to the commission in those areas that are the basis of the probation.

(c) The commission shall give written notice by certified mail of a determination described by Subsection (a) to a license holder who is the subject of the determination. The notice must:

- (1) include a brief summary of the alleged misconduct or violation;
- (2) state the disciplinary action taken by the commission; and
- (3) inform the license holder of the license holder's right to a hearing before the Judicial Branch Certification Commission on the occurrence of the misconduct or violation, the imposition of disciplinary action, or both.

(d) Not later than the 20th day after the date the license holder receives the notice under Subsection (c), the license holder may request a hearing by submitting a written request to the Judicial Branch Certification Commission. If the license holder fails to timely submit a request, the commission's disciplinary action becomes final and is not subject to review by the Judicial Branch Certification Commission.

(e) If the license holder requests a hearing, the Judicial Branch Certification Commission shall conduct a hearing to determine whether there is substantial evidence to support the determination under Subsection (a) that the license holder committed professional misconduct or violated this article or a commission rule or order under this article. If the Judicial Branch Certification Commission upholds the determination, the Judicial Branch Certification Commission shall determine the type of disciplinary action to be taken. The Judicial Branch Certification Commission shall conduct the hearing in accordance with the procedures provided by Subchapter B, Chapter [153](#), Government Code, as applicable, and the rules of the Judicial Branch Certification Commission.

Sec. 4-d. CRIME LABORATORY ACCREDITATION PROCESS. (a) Notwithstanding Section 2, in this section "forensic analysis" has the meaning by Article [38.35](#).

(b) The commission by rule:

(1) shall establish an accreditation process for crime laboratories and other entities conducting forensic analyses of physical evidence for use in criminal proceedings; and

(2) may modify or remove a crime laboratory exemption under this section if the commission determines that the underlying reason for the exemption no longer applies.

(b-1) As part of the accreditation process established and implemented under Subsection (b), the commission may:

(1) establish minimum standards that relate to the timely production of a forensic analysis to the agency requesting the analysis and that are consistent with this article and applicable laws;

(2) validate or approve specific forensic methods or methodologies; and

(3) establish procedures, policies, and practices to improve the quality of forensic analyses conducted in this state.

(b-2) The commission may require that a laboratory, facility, or entity required to be accredited under this section

pay any costs incurred to ensure compliance with the accreditation process.

(b-3) A laboratory, facility, or entity that must be accredited under this section shall, as part of the accreditation process, agree to consent to any request for cooperation by the commission that is made as part of the exercise of the commission's duties under this article.

(c) The commission by rule may exempt from the accreditation process established under Subsection (b) a crime laboratory conducting a forensic analysis or a type of analysis, examination, or test if the commission determines that:

(1) independent accreditation is unavailable or inappropriate for the laboratory or the type of analysis, examination, or test performed by the laboratory;

(2) the type of analysis, examination, or test performed by the laboratory is admissible under a well-established rule of evidence or a statute other than Article [38.35](#);

(3) the type of analysis, examination, or test performed by the laboratory is routinely conducted outside of a crime laboratory by a person other than an employee of the crime laboratory; or

(4) the laboratory:

(A) is located outside this state or, if located in this state, is operated by a governmental entity other than the state or a political subdivision of the state; and

(B) was accredited at the time of the analysis under an accreditation process with standards that meet or exceed the relevant standards of the process established under Subsection (b).

(d) The commission may at any reasonable time enter and inspect the premises or audit the records, reports, procedures, or other quality assurance matters of a crime laboratory that is accredited or seeking accreditation under this section.

(e) The commission may collect costs incurred under this section for accrediting, inspecting, or auditing a crime laboratory.

(f) If the commission provides a copy of an audit or other report made under this section, the commission may charge \$6 for the copy, in addition to any other cost permitted under Chapter [552](#), Government Code, or a rule adopted under that chapter.

Sec. 5. REIMBURSEMENT. A member of the commission may not receive compensation but is entitled to reimbursement for the member's travel expenses as provided by Chapter [660](#), Government Code, and the General Appropriations Act.

Sec. 6. ASSISTANCE. The Texas Legislative Council, the Legislative Budget Board, and The University of Texas at Austin shall assist the commission in performing the commission's duties.

Sec. 7. SUBMISSION. The commission shall submit any report received under Section 4(a)(2) and any report prepared under Section 4(b)(1) to the governor, the lieutenant governor, and the speaker of the house of representatives not later than December 1 of each even-numbered year.

Sec. 8. ANNUAL REPORT. Not later than December 1 of each year, the commission shall prepare and publish a report that includes:

(1) a description of each complaint filed with the commission during the preceding 12-month period, the disposition of each complaint, and the status of any complaint still pending on December 31;

(2) a description of any specific forensic method or methodology the commission designates as part of the accreditation process for crime laboratories established by rule under this article;

(3) recommendations for best practices concerning the definition of "forensic analysis" provided by statute or by rule;

(4) developments in forensic science made or used in other state or federal investigations and the activities of the commission, if any, with respect to those developments; and

(5) other information that is relevant to investigations involving forensic science, as determined by the presiding officer of the commission.

Sec. 9. ADMINISTRATIVE ATTACHMENT TO OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION. (a) The commission is administratively attached to the Office of Court Administration of the Texas Judicial System.

(b) The Office of Court Administration of the Texas Judicial System shall provide administrative support to the commission as necessary to enable the commission to carry out the purposes of this article.

(c) Only the commission may exercise the duties of the commission under this article. Except as provided by Subsection (b), the Office of Court Administration of the Texas Judicial System does not have any authority or responsibility with respect to the duties of the commission under this article.

Sec. 10. OPEN RECORDS LIMITATION. Information that is filed as part of an allegation of professional misconduct or professional negligence or that is obtained during an investigation of an allegation of professional misconduct or professional negligence is not subject to release under Chapter [552](#), Government Code, until the conclusion of an investigation by the commission under Section 4.

Sec. 11. REPORT INADMISSIBLE AS EVIDENCE. A written report prepared by the commission under this article is not admissible in a civil or criminal action.

Sec. 12. COLLECTION OF CERTAIN FORENSIC EVIDENCE. The commission shall establish a method for collecting DNA and other forensic evidence related to unidentified bodies located less than 120 miles from the Rio Grande River.

Sec. 13. TEXAS FORENSIC SCIENCE COMMISSION OPERATING ACCOUNT. The Texas Forensic Science Commission operating account is an account in the general revenue fund. The commission shall deposit fees collected under Section 4-a for the issuance or renewal of a forensic analyst license to the credit of the account. Money in the account may be appropriated only to the commission for the administration and enforcement of this article.

Added by Acts 2005, 79th Leg., Ch. 1224 (H.B. [1068](#)), Sec. 1, eff. September 1, 2005.

Amended by:

Acts 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., Ch. 782 (S.B. [1238](#)), Sec. 1, eff. June 14, 2013.

Acts 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., Ch. 782 (S.B. [1238](#)), Sec. 2, eff. June 14, 2013.

Acts 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., Ch. 782 (S.B. [1238](#)), Sec. 3, eff. June 14, 2013.

Acts 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., Ch. 782 (S.B. [1238](#)), Sec. 4, eff. June 14, 2013.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1215 (S.B. [1743](#)), Sec. 8, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1215 (S.B. [1743](#)), Sec. 9, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1276 (S.B. [1287](#)), Sec. 1, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1276 (S.B. [1287](#)), Sec. 2, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1276 (S.B. [1287](#)), Sec. 3, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1276 (S.B. [1287](#)), Sec. 4, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1276 (S.B. [1287](#)), Sec. 5, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1276 (S.B. [1287](#)), Sec. 6, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1276 (S.B. [1287](#)), Sec. 7, eff. September 1, 2015.

Acts 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., Ch. 212 (S.B. [1124](#)), Sec. 1, eff. September 1, 2017.

Acts 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., Ch. 324 (S.B. [1488](#)), Sec. 24.001(4), eff. September 1, 2017.

Acts 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., Ch. 1115 (S.B. [298](#)), Sec. 1, eff. September 1, 2017.

Acts 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., Ch. 574 (S.B. [284](#)), Sec. 1, eff. September 1, 2019.

EXHIBIT B

Budget Forecast FY20

July 25, 2019

Column1	Column2	Column3	Column4	Column5	Column6	Column7	Column8
Category	Description	YTD	Projected	Current Remaining	% Total Budget	% Projected Used	% Projected Remaining
FY19 Expenditures							
Staff salaries							
	<i>All labor costs for 6 full-time employees (includes licensing specialist and longevity, EAP, Bonuses, Payroll Health Contributions and Payroll Retirement Contributions for all 6 employees, including new attorney hire)</i>	-	552,014.25	552,014.25	75.63%	0.00%	100.00%
Travel for Commissioners, Licensing Advisory Committee Members and Staff							
	<i>Travel reimbursements</i>	-	40,000.00	40,000.00	5.48%	0.00%	100.00%
Conference/Training Fees/Membership Fees - 4 Staff							
	<i>All employee conference and professional membership fees</i>	-	3,048.00	3,048.00	0.42%	0.00%	100.00%
Office Supplies							
	<i>Office Supplies (file folders, copy paper, batteries, envelopes, etc.)</i>	-	1,016.56	1,016.56	0.14%	0.00%	100.00%
IT Services FY18							
	<i>Filemaker Database Management and Design</i>	-	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.14%	0.00%	100.00%
	<i>Filemaker Software License Renewal</i>	642.00	642.00	-	0.09%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>WBT Systems - TopClass Licensing Software - Annual Maintenance Fee</i>	9,600.00	9,600.00	-	1.32%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>TopClass Change Orders for CFE</i>	-	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.69%	0.00%	100.00%
	<i>Onboarding Technology for New Attorney</i>	-	6,511.09	6,511.09	0.89%	0.00%	100.00%
General Operating Expenses (copier, phone, internet, other utilities, including \$30K administrative fee to Office of Court Administration) FY18							
	Encumbered Operating Expenses						
	<i>Administrative Fee - OCA</i>	30,000.00	30,000.00	-	4.11%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Xerox</i>	9,934.92	9,934.92	-	1.36%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Xerox Copies/Overages</i>	2,000.00	2,000.00	-	0.27%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Verizon</i>	1,823.52	1,823.52	-	0.25%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>ATT (1-800 numbers and data)</i>	736.66	736.66	-	0.10%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>DIR</i>	7,690.43	7,690.43	-	1.05%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Lexis Research</i>	1,035.60	1,035.60	-	0.14%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Dropbox</i>	211.08	211.08	-	0.03%	100.00%	0.00%

Budget Forecast FY20

July 25, 2019

	<i>GoTo Meeting Annual Software License Fee</i>	588.00	588.00	-	0.08%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>CenturyLink</i>	10.00	10.00	-	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Tex. Code Crim. Proc. Rules</i>	147.00	147.00	-	0.02%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Texas Directory</i>	7.95	7.95	-	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Mailing/Fedex/PO Box							
	<i>Mail Service Costs (including annual PO Box fee)</i>	-	1,500.00	1,500.00	0.21%	0.00%	100.00%
Training and Forensic Development							
	<i>STRMix Travel/Training</i>	-	10,000.00	10,000.00	1.37%	0.00%	100.00%
	<i>NIST/OSAC Subject Matter Groups on Standards Implementation</i>	-	10,000.00	10,000.00	1.37%	0.00%	100.00%
Investigative Costs							
	<i>Investigative activities/subject matter experts</i>	-	15,000.00	15,000.00	2.06%	0.00%	100.00%
Other Initiatives (Bench Book, BPA Case review, Crime Scene)							
	<i>Travel Reimbursements and other Costs for Crime Scene Workgroup</i>	-	10,000.00	10,000.00	1.37%	0.00%	100.00%
	<i>Other</i>	-	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.69%	0.00%	100.00%
Licensing Program							
	<i>ACS Ventures/Psychometric consulting</i>	-	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.69%	0.00%	100.00%
	<i>Public Data - Criminal History Search Subscription</i>	370.00	370.00	-	0.05%	100.00%	0.00%
	<i>Other Operating Costs</i>	-	5,000.00	5,000.00	0.69%	0.00%	100.00%
FY19 Revenue							
	<i>Licensing fee revenues as of 1/21 (first column - actual revenue for FY20, second column - FY18-FY19 revenue minus expended funds)</i>	-	127,787.06				
		\$ 64,797.16	\$ 729,887.06	\$ 670,089.90		8.88%	91.81%
FY20 Budget Totals							
	<i>FY20 Budget Allocation</i>	\$ 602,100.00					
	<i>Licensing Revenue Balance from FY19</i>	\$ 127,787.06					
	Total Expendable Budget FY20	\$ 729,887.06	(Does not include any forecasted licensing revenue for FY20)				
	Projected Ending Budget Balance for FY20	\$ 729,887.06	\$ 729,887.06	\$ -	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%

EXHIBIT C

TFSC CASE LIST 12/1/18-11/30/19

FILE NO.	COMPLAINT	SELF-DISC	DOC DATE	DATE REC'D	COMPLAINANT/LAB	SUBJECT LAB	DISCIPLINE	LAB NOTIFIED	STATUS/DISPOSITION	PANEL MEMBERS	FINAL RPT RELEASED
18.55	X		12/7/18	12/18/18	Jason Hendershott	DPS Corpus Christi	DNA	To Bob on 1/9/19	Dismissed- To DNA team		
18.56		X	12/12/18	12/12/18	DPS Midland		Seized Drugs/Lost Evidence		NFA- Closed		
18.57	X		12/22/18	1/4/19	George O. Brien	HCIFS	Latent Prints	To HFSC/HCIFS 1/11/19	Dismissed		
19.01	X		1/2/19	1/8/19	Robert Tracy Warterfield	SWIFS;Dallas PD	DNA		Dismissed		
19.02	X		1/7/19	1/7/19	Sam Benson	DPS Weslaco	Facilities Maintenance		Dismissed		
19.03		X	1/8/19	1/8/19	DPS Austin		DNA		Accepted	Outside: Boswell, C	8/16/19
REC'D SINCE JAN COMMISSION MTG											
19.04	X		1/24/19	1/24/19	Dr. Robert Collins	DPS Houston/Andrew McWhorter	Forensic Biology (DNA)	to Brady 2/6/19	Accepted	Daniel, Budowle, Buzzini	
19.05		X	1/9/19	1/9/19	SWIFS	SWIFS	Forensic Biology/AP Testing		NFA- Closed		
19.06	X		2/15/19	2/15/19	Irwin Pentland	DPS Austin	Forensic Biology (DNA)	to Brady 2/20/19	Dismissed		
19.07	X		2/25/19	2/15/19	Dr. Robert Collins	Mont. Co. SD/Rossi, Ramirez	CSI	to Rossi 2/28/19	Dismissed		
19.08	X		2/16/19	2/28/19	Allan Latoi Story	SWIFS	Forensic Biology (DNA)		Dismissed		
19.09		X	3/7/19	3/7/19	Bexar Co CIL	Bexar Co CIL	Firearms/Tool Marks		NFA- Closed		
19.10	X		3/23/10	3/27/19	Ryan Peucker	IFL; Analyst Nichole Huddleston	Seized Drugs	to Aliece 3/28/19	Dismissed		
19.11	X		3/25/19	4/8/19	Warren R. Horinek	Tom Bevel/Bevel Gardner	BPA	do not send per LRG	Dismissed- to Tar Co CIU		
19.12		X	4/18/19	4/18/19	Ft. Worth PD	Ft. Worth PD Crime Lab	Serology		Accepted	Lab's findings accepted; analyst resigned	
19.13	X		4/4/19	4/11/19	Domingo Amaro-Solis	HFSC/Jisel Luttrell	DNA	to HFSC 4/15/19	Dismissed	2nd complaint dismissed w/o processing.	
19.14	X		undated	4/11/19	Ronald James Coleman	Baylor All Saints Medical Center	Sexual Assault Exam		Dismissed		
19.15	X		4/4/19	4/11/19	Adam K. Moore	SANE Patty Salazar	Sexual Assault Exam	to Dr. Downing 4/15/19	Dismissed- to BON		
REC'D SINCE MAY COMMISSION MTG											
19.16	X		4/25/19	4/25/19	Nicholas Hughes	HCIFS	Forensic Chemistry/GCMS	to HCIFS 4/26/19	Dismissed		
19.17		X	5/8/19	5/9/19	SWIFS		Seized Drugs		NFA- Closed		
19.18		X	5/8/19	5/13/19	DPS Waco		Seized Drugs		NFA- Closed		
19.19		X	5/16/19	5/16/19	DPS Lubbock		Toxicology		NFA- Closed		
19.20		X	5/28/19	5/28/19	Corpus Christi PD		Latent Prints		NFA- Closed		
19.21	X		6/1/19	6/11/19	Elijah Neighbors	DPS Corpus Christi	DNA		Dismissed		
19.22	X		6/13/19	6/21/19	Rodney D. Gowans, Sr.	DPS Austin	Blood Alcohol	to Brady 7/9/19	Dismissed		
19.23		X			Harris Co IFS		Serology		NFA- Closed		
19.24	X				Charles Lorey Frederick	Orange Co SD	Ballistics/CSI		Dismissed		
19.25	X		6/28/19	7/9/19	Jimmy D. Green	UNTHSC	Touch DNA		Dismissed		
19.26		X	7/15/19	7/15/19	DPS Austin		Toxicology		NFA- Closed		
19.27	X		7/8/19	7/22/19	Frederick Riley Abbott	DPS Waco	DNA/Serology		Dismissed		
19.28	X		8/2/19	8/3/19	IP/Larry Swearingen	DPS Austin	DNA/Serology		Withdrawn		
REC'D SINCE AUG COMMISSION MTG											
19.29	X		7/30/19	8/5/19	Randy Blair	DPS Waco	Seized Drugs	To Brady on 10/1	Dismissed		
19.30		X	7/16/19	7/16/19	Bexar Co CIL		AP Test/Serology		NFA- Closed		
19.31	X		9/7/19		Lee Charles Jones	None specified	Firearms/Tool Marks	To Tarrant Co 9/25	Dismissed		
19.32	X		9/9/19	9/25/19	James Striblin	Bexar CO ME's & CIL	Toxicology; Firearms/Toolmarks	To BCME 9/25	Dismissed		
19.33		X	6/11/18 ??		DPS Laredo		Seized Drugs/Lost Evidence		NFA- Closed		
19.34		X	9/30/19	9/30/19	DPS Austin		Forensic Biology- Trial Testimony		NFA- Closed		
19.35	X		7/30/19	7/30/19	Brandon Greene	Quest Diagnostics	Toxicology		Dismissed		
19.36	X		8/8/19	8/8/19	Misty Flinchum-Wallaca	Texas Alcohol & Drug Testing	Toxicology		Dismissed		
19.37		X	10/4/19	10/4/19	DPS Lubbock		Forensic Biology		NFA- Closed		
19.38	X		9/30/19	10/4/19	HFSC		Firearms/Tool Marks (NIBIN)		NFA- Closed		
19.39		X	10/8/19	10/8/19	HFSC		Toxicology		NFA- Closed		
REC'D SINCE OCT COMMISSION MTG											
19.40	X		9/30/19		Rolando Torres	HCIFS	Blood spatter/DNA	to HCIFS 12/31/19	Open		
19.41	X		9/28/19	10/14/19	Wilburn Ray Whitmill	None specified	Wants DNA testing		Dismissed		
19.42		X	10/9/19	10/11/19	DPS Midland		Seized Drugs		Open		
19.43		X	11/7/19	11/7/19	Bexar Co CIL		Many		Open		
19.44	X		11/1/19	11/12/19	Joseph Pastquinel Scott	DPS Waco	Forensic Biology (DNA)	to Brady 11/13/2019	Open		
19.45		X	11/7/19	11/13/19	DPS Amarillo		Seized Drugs		Open		
19.46		X	10/16/19	10/16/19	NMS (DFW Location)		Seized Drugs		Open		
19.47	X		11/25/19	12/4/19	Charles Lee	Reliagene Technologies	Forensic Biology (DNA)		Open		
19.49	X		11/24/19	12/9/19	James A. Smiley	DPS Capitol	Forensic Biology (DNA)	ask Lynn- case open	Open		
19.52	X		11/26/19	12/23/19	John Henry Jackson	HPD/HFSC	Toxicology	ask Lynn- send to HCICU	Open		