

**Texas Forensic Science Commission
Minutes from June 12, 2020 Meeting in Austin, Texas**

The Texas Forensic Science Commission met virtually via GoToWebinar at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, June 12, 2020 as authorized under Government Code section 551.125 pursuant to Governor Greg Abbott's March 13, 2020 proclamation of a state of disaster affecting all counties in Texas due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) and the Governor's March 16, 2020 suspension of certain provisions of the Texas Open Meetings Act.

Members of the Commission were present as follows:

Members Present: Barnard (Presiding Officer), Budowle, Buzzini, Daniel, Downing, Drake, Kerrigan, Johnson, Parsons

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Lynn Garcia, General Counsel
Leigh Savage, Associate General Counsel
Robert Smith, Senior Staff Attorney
Kathryn Adams, Commission Coordinator

1. Call meeting to order. Roll call for members.

The Commission's virtual meeting convened via live broadcast on GoToWebinar at 9:05 a.m. Commission Presiding Officer Barnard called roll and all commissioners were present.

2. Instructions for public participation and meeting process.

Savage gave instructions for stakeholders joining the webinar to engage with commissioners and staff during the meeting. Participants had the ability to "raise their hands" virtually and ask questions and also had access to the chat feature for questions throughout the meeting.

3. Review and adopt minutes from January 31, 2020 Forensic Science Commission Quarterly meeting.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Parsons moved to adopt the meeting minutes draft. Kerrigan seconded the motion. The FSC unanimously adopted the motion.*

4. Office administrative update (FY2020 budget status report second quarter; introduction of Robert Smith, Senior Staff Attorney).

Garcia reported on the Commission's budget status and budget reductions as requested by the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Speaker of the House. The Governor has asked state agencies to reduce their budgets by 5% for the remaining quarter left in fiscal year 2020 through fiscal year 2021. Garcia is working with the Office of Court Administration's Chief Financial Officer on budget reductions for the Commission and will circulate the final copy of the reduced budget when

available. Garcia reported all staff are primarily working from home pursuant to the Office of Court Administration's direction on staff work and travel policies during the COVID-19 pandemic. Garcia updated commissioners on the status of the ransomware attack on the court system in Texas and the network interruptions at the Commission office associated with the attack. She reported the Commission was not impacted as heavily as other OCA divisions because Commission data had already been transferred to cloud-based systems.

5. Moment of silence for Dr. Cliff Spiegelman; discuss possibilities for statistics coursework offerings.

Commissioners observed a moment of silence for Dr. Cliff Spiegelman. Barnard gave the following statement:

“Dr. Spiegelman was a distinguished professor of statistics at Texas A&M, and a senior advisor to our Commission. He assisted with the development of the statistics portion of the Texas general forensic exam. He also developed a statistics course for forensic licensees. Dr. Spiegelman was recently presented with the Regents Award, the highest honor bestowed on a faculty member by the Texas A&M System. The award acknowledged his prolific career across many critical fields, including forensic science. He was among the first in the international statistics community to recognize that the intervention of statisticians could assist the courts in attaching real meaning to the weight of the forensic evidence and establish what was actually known about the accuracy and reliability of a forensic test through a statistical evaluation of the research. As the Innocence Project noted on its website recently, Dr. Spiegelman will be greatly missed, and we can say that with 100% certainty.”

Dr. Spiegelman was a partner to the Commission on many statistics-related issues.

Garcia discussed the status of the statistics program Dr. Spiegelman was administering for students in fulfillment of the statistics requirement for forensic analyst licensure. Several students finished the course and are waiting to take the exam. Garcia is working with Texas A&M to determine how to support students who had enrolled in the course before Dr. Spiegelman's passing. Kerrigan asked staff to make a list of other qualifying statistics course options for students now that this course is no longer available. For example, Sam Houston State University offers a qualifying statistics course during the summer session taught by Buzzini. Staff will work on a list of courses and instructions for publishing on the Commission's licensing page.

6. Discuss and consider pending complaints and laboratory self-disclosures as well as new complaints and self-disclosures received through May 29, 2020.

Disclosures Pending from January 31, 2020

1. No. 19.26; Department of Public Safety Austin (Toxicology)

A self-disclosure by DPS Austin laboratory reporting an incident in the laboratory's toxicology section where two calibrators for morphine did not meet acceptance criteria in a batch, and subsequent investigation revealed five additional batches impacted by the same issues totaling approximately 50 affected cases.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Parsons moved to take no further action on the self-disclosure given the receipt of the final quality incident report describing corrective actions taken by the laboratory, including a review of all affected batches, amended reports, notification to affected counties and/or district attorneys, and a final description of the risk evaluation and root cause analysis. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion*

*Commissioner Johnson recused from discussion and vote on this item.

Disclosures Received as of May 29, 2020

2. No. 20.03; Harris County Institute of Forensic Sciences (Toxicology)

A self-disclosure by the Harris County Institute of Forensic Sciences reporting the malfunction of an off-site storage refrigerator used for long-term storage of tested blood vials. The entire contents of the refrigerator froze, resulting in 347 broken blood vials affecting 298 total cases.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to take no further action on the self-disclosure given the root cause and corrective actions by the laboratory, including notification to the district attorney's office, changes to the laboratory's standard operating procedures to address actions to be taken in the event of a refrigerator malfunction at an off-site facility, the addition of a toxicology designee/contact for refrigerator alarms, and a long-term plan to bring storage refrigerators on-site. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

3. No. 20.11; NMS Labs Winston-Salem (Blood Alcohol)

A self-disclosure by NMS Labs Winston-Salem reporting a failed Blood Alcohol Concentration proficiency test ("PT"). The data indicate the failure occurred due to evaporative loss from previous testing and shipping of the sample from another NMS location. Subsequent re-testing of the PT samples PT by the Winston-Salem laboratory (again) and then at NMS Labs – Horsham, PA revealed consistent results. However, during the process of evaluating the incident, NMS observed inconsistencies in uncertainty of measurement across the laboratories.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to take no further action on self-disclosure in light of the root cause analysis and corrective action taken by the laboratory. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

NMS Labs Quality Director, Aliece Watts, briefly addressed the Commission to answer Commissioner's questions about the laboratory's efforts to establish a common uncertainty of measurement across different laboratory locations.

4. No. 20.13; Signature Science, LLC (Forensic Biology/DNA)

A self-disclosure by Signature Science, LLC reporting professional misconduct by an evidence technician where the technician misrepresented that she opened a sexual assault kit to check for blood evidence and further revised chain-of-custody documentation. The analyst took steps to make it appear as if she had opened the kit by re-taping the evidence, providing her initials on the tape and back-dating the initials.

Members discussed the letter response and explanation from the analyst citing the toxic work environment at the laboratory that led to her actions in back-dating the kit. Members will request an interview with the analyst as part of the investigation.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Parsons moved to investigate the self-disclosure for purposes of determining whether the laboratory's conclusion regarding professional misconduct is supported. Buzzini seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to establish an investigative panel consisting of commissioners Johnson, Daniel and Drake. Parsons seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

5. No. 20.14; Fort Worth Police Department Crime Laboratory (Seized Drugs)

A self-disclosure by the Fort Worth Police Department Crime Laboratory reporting an incident in the laboratory's seized drugs section where an annual review of Val-Pro quality control data revealed a loss of data in 124 drug cases. The loss occurred during transfer of the data from the original computer to the network server.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to take no further action on the self-disclosure given the corrective actions by the laboratory, including re-analysis of all affected cases, notification to the district attorney's office, and changes to the laboratory's chemistry SOP. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

6. No. 20.15; Department of Public Safety Austin (Toxicology)

A self-disclosure by the DPS Austin laboratory disclosing an incident in its toxicology section where a routine audit of evidence in LIMS showed a DPS blood kit never left the possession of the receiving evidence technician and was never located.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to take no further action on the self-disclosure given the explanation by the laboratory, the efforts to increase the evidence receiving workspace, removal of the trash cans in the receiving area, and notification to affected parties. Parsons seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

*Commissioner Johnson recused from discussion and vote on this item.

7. No. 20.17; Jefferson County Regional Crime Laboratory (Seized Drugs)

A self-disclosure by Jefferson County Regional Crime Laboratory reporting ten (10) seized drugs

reports identifying the synthetic cannabinoid MDMB-4en-PINACA included the incorrect disclaimer “Isomer Not Determined” in the note section of the report.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to take no further action on the self-disclosure given the corrective actions by the laboratory, including changes to the laboratory’s SOPs to address the identification of new synthetic cannabinoids, removal of the “isomer not determined” data entry field, case review and notification to the district attorney’s offices and law enforcement agencies affected. Johnson seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

8. No. 20.18; NMS Labs Horsham, PA (Toxicology)

A self-disclosure by NMS Labs Horsham, PA reporting an incident where incorrect numbers were mistakenly used in the uncertainty of measurement calculations for cannabinoid tests leading to inaccurate, wider measurement uncertainty intervals being reported in 495 cases, including 13 Texas cases.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to take no further action on the self-disclosure given the root cause analysis and corrective actions by the laboratory. Johnson seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

9. No. 20.25; Jefferson County Regional Crime Laboratory (Seized Drugs)

A self-disclosure by the Jefferson County Regional Crime Laboratory reporting an incident where an analyst incorrectly reported “no controlled substance or dangerous drug identified” in a case sample that in fact had a potential synthetic cannabinoid detected and the error was not caught on technical review. Drake provided an explanation of how the incident likely occurred and suggested the laboratory include a history of all analytical methods performed in their reports.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to take no further action on the self-disclosure given the corrective actions taken by the laboratory, including remedial training for the analyst, review of the analyst’s cases from the previous six months with no issues identified, and changes made to the seized drugs technical review policy to include review of raw data for any case that will be reported as “no controlled substance or dangerous drug identified”. Parsons seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

Complaints Received as of May 29, 2020

10. No. 20.25; Cochran, Antonio (Southwestern Institute of Forensic Sciences; Forensic Biology/DNA, Serology)

A complaint by defendant Antonio Cochran against Southwestern Institute of Forensic Sciences alleging analysts did not follow laboratory quality control protocols when collecting and processing evidence, and that the serology analysts conspired with prosecutors by fabricating evidence and giving false court testimony in an effort to frame him for murder.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to dismiss the complaint because a review of the case record does not support the numerous generalized allegations made by the defendant. The*

defendant was identified as the suspect based on a CODIS hit (both a hit at the state level and at the national level to an Arkansas case). This hit was substantiated with a known reference sample and the analysis of the knife used to kill the victim yielded a strong random match probability. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.

*Commissioner Barnard recused from discussion and vote on this item.

11. No. 20.10; Rangel, Jerry (Bryan Police Department, Texas Department of Public Safety Austin; Bloodstain Pattern Analysis, Forensic Biology/DNA)

A complaint by defendant Jerry Rangel against the Bryan Police Department and DPS Austin alleging results of DNA testing performed in his case for sexual assault of a child were “suspicious” since DNA has been “discredited,” and that the blood spatter analysis testified to at trial by Bryan police officer was “strikingly similar” to another analysis performed by a different investigator, and was based on “false science.”

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to dismiss the two complaints because the DNA mixture complaint has been addressed by the statewide mixture review team, and the bloodstain pattern analysis complaint does not merit an investigation for the purposes of issuing best practices or other recommendations. Downing seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

*Commissioners Parsons and Johnson recused from discussion and vote on this item.

12. No. 20.24; Schmucker, Margaret (Tom Green County Prosecutors; Bloodstain Pattern Analysis)

A complaint by attorney Margaret Schmucker on behalf of defendant Isidro Delacruz against Tom Green County prosecutors for ignoring results of a bloodstain pattern analysis performed by independent analyst Christine Ramirez that was favorable to the defendant, and subsequently utilizing the San Angelo crime scene technician as the only crime scene witness.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to dismiss the complaint because the Commission has no jurisdiction over the witness-sponsoring decisions of prosecutors in Tom Green County. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to direct staff to work with the crime scene reconstruction working group to form a multidisciplinary subcommittee for the purpose of issuing guidance regarding the limitations of DNA analysis (especially mixtures) as a tool in scene reconstruction. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

13. No. 20.26; Gonzales, Joe (SANE Cynthia Garcia, Bexar County Criminal Investigation Laboratory; Trial Testimony, Forensic Biology)

A complaint by defendant Joe Gonzales against SANE Christine Garcia for allegedly providing unscientific trial testimony, and Bexar County Criminal Investigation Laboratory for providing “ambiguous” DNA results and for refusal to perform any Y-STR or mitochondrial DNA testing.

Downing explained that pediatric sexual assault examinations are often performed by non-experts and suggested draft recommendations and standards for these examinations. Garcia will work with Downing regarding possibilities for implementation.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to dismiss the complaint because the SANE examination and testimony were consistent with the evidence and literature at the time of trial and are consistent with current guidelines. Additionally, the complainant does not allege negligence or misconduct by the Bexar County Criminal Investigation Laboratory with respect to the DNA analysis, but rather complains that the laboratory did not perform enough test methods, citing Y-STRs and mtDNA as examples. Parsons seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

14. No. 20.28; Therrell, John (DPS Houston; Blood Alcohol)

A complaint by defendant John Therrell against the Department of Public Safety Houston, alleging results of blood alcohol and drug testing were never disclosed to him, and alleging the possibility that contaminated blood vials were used for testing in his case.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to dismiss the complaint because there is no evidence of negligence or misconduct related to the forensic analysis in the case. Further, the Becton-Dickinson blood tube recall did not affect this defendant's case as alleged in his complaint as his blood was drawn before the issue arose. Parsons seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

*Commissioner Johnson recused from discussion and vote on this item.

15. No. 20.29; Tawater, Royce W. (Department of Public Safety Garland; Forensic Biology/DNA; Southwestern Institute of Forensic Science (SWIFS); Forensic Biology/GSR)

A complaint by defendant Royce Tawater alleging a CODIS hit against the Missouri state offender database directly contradicted the State of Texas's theory of the case therefore calling into question his murder conviction. The original DNA work in the case was performed at DPS Garland. The complainant states none of his fingerprints or DNA were found on the alleged murder weapon, a firearm. The CODIS hit to DNA from the firearm allegedly owned by complainant and recovered from near the crime scene was a match for a different Missouri offender.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to dismiss the complaint as there is no indication of negligence or misconduct related to the forensic analysis in the case, and the question of materiality of the CODIS hit in light of the type of evidence in question (gun swab) should be addressed by the court system. Commissioners further directed staff to send a letter to SWIFS with suggestions regarding testimony seeking speculation about GSR and the passage of time, as well as discussion of ways to more clearly flag the presence of weak mixture data in the STRmix working group. Drake seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

Garcia will work with the STRmix working group to form a subcommittee of the group to address ways to better flag the presence of weak mixture data. Timothy Sliter, Chief of Physical Evidence at SWIFS, volunteered to be on the subcommittee.

*Commissioners Barnard and Johnson recused from discussion and vote on this item.

In addition to the above cases, Daniel reported fifteen complaints dismissed by commission staff as follows:

- two complaints were dismissed because the laboratories with case records indicated the analyses were never requested and therefore were not performed;
- six complaints were dismissed because claims in their complaints involved legal matters (such as law enforcement forcing defendants to submit to DNA testing, requests for disclosure of test results, a request for us to provide an expert witness, and procedural problems with arrests and indictments) and are out of the scope of TFSC's jurisdiction;
- four were dismissed for failure to state a credible complaint of negligence or misconduct against a forensic laboratory or analyst. These complaints contained very general, sweeping allegations such as overall misconduct, lack of oversight, and issues involving discovery and the conduct of law enforcement and prosecutors without any facts regarding the case.
- one complaint was dismissed because it made no allegations concerning a forensic analysis, only that results came in after his trial and may have affected the jury's understanding of defendant's proximity to the victim in a murder case;
- one was dismissed because the same defendant filed a similar complaint in 2017 that was dismissed and referred to the Tarrant County Conviction Integrity Unit; the CIU declined to take further action.

Two additional cases were referred to Bob Wicoff and the statewide DNA mixture review project.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Daniel moved to accept commission staff's actions on all 15 complaints discussed above. Parsons seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

7. Update on collaboration with the Standards Coordination Office at the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) regarding pathways for improving accreditation for forensic science service providers in Texas.

Garcia reported on her conversations with Warren Merkel, Chief of the Standards Services Group at NIST to discuss enhancing accreditation for Texas laboratories. The Commission has made observations in various cases where members were concerned that the accreditation system had not identified significant issues in the laboratory.

An outline provided to Commissioners by Merkel and NIST proposes working with the major accrediting bodies to give assessors an opportunity to answer more broad-based questions in assessing laboratories. This should assist the labs and lab directors with mitigating and managing

risk earlier in the process. NIST would gather the info from these questions and work with the accrediting bodies to implement this. At the end of a 2-year period, NIST would gather the data to determine whether it can be turned into an enhanced accreditation requirement for Texas.

One suggestion by NIST is that commissioners and staff participate in assessments over the course of a two-year period so they may observe firsthand what is done during an assessment.

Budowle and other commissioners expressed concern with auditors making comments without clear guidance against which to measure a laboratory's compliance. Garcia indicated that the goal is to develop a more specific document that describes what information an auditor may be looking for, including specific gaps the Commission has observed in other situations where perhaps if assessors were allowed to comment, they could have recognized the issues of concern sooner. Staff will work with NIST to develop a more detailed document addressing issues raised by commissioners.

8. Review outstanding general rulemakings and proposed rule concepts for approval, including procedure for appeal of final investigative reports by the Commission pursuant to its investigative authority.

MOTION AND VOTE: *Kerrigan moved to adopt the procedure for appeal of final investigative reports by the Commission pursuant to its investigative authority. Buzzini seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

9. Discuss status of crime laboratory accreditation program, including:

a. Accreditation non-conformances received since January 31, 2020 quarterly meeting;

Savage described accreditation reports and non-conformances received since the January 31, 2020 meeting. Accreditation activities, including on-site assessments, have slowed due to the COVID-19 pandemic resulting in the extension of accreditation period end dates for some Texas laboratories until on-site assessments can begin again.

b. Review outstanding accreditation rules and proposed rule concepts for approval, including:

- i. Procedure regarding revocation of accreditation and appeal of accreditation actions and findings; and**
- ii. Correction to definition of "crime scene reconstruction" in accreditation rule exemptions to remove the terms "bloodstain pattern and trajectory" to match exam eligibility for unaccredited discipline licensing rule changes.**

MOTION AND VOTE: *Kerrigan moved to adopt the procedure regarding revocation of accreditation and appeal of final accreditation actions and findings and the correction to the definition of "crime scene reconstruction" as proposed by staff. Daniel seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

10. Discuss Licensing Advisory Committee, including:

a. Update on licenses issued;

Savage provided an update on licenses issued. There are currently 1,326 forensic analyst and technician licensees in Texas. Staff will renew approximately 1022 forensic analyst licenses before December 31, 2020.

b. Review outstanding licensing rules and proposed rule concepts for approval, including:

- i. Clarifying language re: scope of expectations for analysts under Code of Professional Responsibility; and**
- ii. *De minimis* blanket rule revisions, including rule on blanket transfers.**

MOTION AND VOTE: *Parsons moved to adopt the clarifying language regarding the scope of expectations under the forensic analyst Code of Professional Responsibility and the de minimis blanket rule revisions. Daniel seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously adopted the motion.*

11. Update on development of licensee-required Mandatory Legal and Professional Responsibility Training.

Garcia and Smith reported on the development of the legal and professional responsibility course being developed in collaboration with Sam Houston State University. The substance of the training has been developed, SHSU course designers have provided a mockup of the course and staff is working to finalize content.

12. Update on statewide validation of qualitative method to distinguish hemp from marihuana.

Kerrigan provided an update on statewide efforts to validate a qualitative method (with a quantitative cutoff) for distinguishing hemp from marihuana. The participating laboratories (DPS, Harris County Institute of Forensic Sciences, and Houston Forensic Science Center) are just a few weeks away from completing their validations. A significant challenge to the team was securing authentic substances from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (“NIDA”) drug supply program. Kerrigan reported that NIST is developing a new project where they will have known liquid and plant materials available and suggested laboratories might want to include these materials as part of their method validations. Kerrigan stated that requests for the materials should be made by the Texas Association of Crime Laboratory Directors (TACLD).

Stout indicated the laboratories participating in the validation study hope to launch the services on the same day and distribute notice and instructions regarding the same to TDCAA and other stakeholders.

Kerrigan cited one issue with the delay of validation studies is that many laboratories are unable to use adjudicated case samples for research and validation. Parsons and Garcia discussed reaching out to TDCAA to request permission from district attorneys in the state to procure unused or adjudicated samples for research and validation. Parsons will present the issue at the June TDCAA board meeting and report back.

Brady Mills, DPS Deputy Director of Crime Laboratory Services, reported that DPS is unable to use adjudicated samples without a court order giving permission for use.

Peter Stout, CEO and Director of the Houston Forensic Science Center, indicated that he has been able to use samples from some adjudicated toxicology cases that the Houston Police Department has available.

The Commission will work with law enforcement and other district attorney partners to facilitate the use of adjudicated samples for research and validation throughout the state.

13. Update regarding NMS Labs-Grand Prairie (Seized Drugs) disclosure #19.46 investigative panel.

Garcia and panel members Kerrigan, Johnson, and Daniel reported on the status of the investigation of professional misconduct by forensic analyst, Jessica Almond, for her actions in inappropriately manipulating data during a competency test on a new quantitative procedure. Staff has sent a formal letter to the analyst requesting an interview and has received no response to date. On May 29, 2020, the panel interviewed the NMS supervisor and chemistry technical lead involved in the incident.

The panel will meet again before the Commission's July 24, 2020 quarterly meeting and hopes to have a recommendation in the matter at the July 24 meeting.

14. Update regarding Collins, Robert (DPS Houston; Forensic Biology) complaint #19.04 investigative panel.

Brady Mills provided an update on the status of the laboratory review. DPS's approach has been to split the quality incident from the Fred Lee criminal case analyzed by the DPS Houston laboratory into one incident and address separately the preventative action for the rest of the system. DPS's focus has been on cases using STRmix in the inconclusive range. In Houston, the review targeted 69 cases. Vanessa Nelson completed the review and identified 39 that needed additional discussion. Nelson then identified 10 cases among the 39 that required amended reports. The process for amending the reports is in progress now. DPS should be able to provide the quality incident to the Commission before the July 24 meeting.

With regard to the systemwide preventative action, DPS is evaluating all laboratories doing DNA casework and identifying cases for review. Thus far, in Waco, there were 23 cases reviewed and 2 needed further review; amended reports were issued in these cases. In Weslaco, 24 were reviewed with 1 amended report. In Laredo, the issue with using the inconclusive range was not a concern in either one of two cases reviewed, but DPS amended 1 of the reports for a separate issue. DPS will report back on the status of the preventative action at the Commission's July meeting.

Garcia will begin drafting the final investigative report in the matter narrowly tailored to the complaint regarding DPS Houston and the corrective actions regarding DPS Houston for the July 24 quarterly meeting. DPS will provide additional quality documents to the Commission as they continue their work in the other regional labs.

15. Update on Quattrone Report regarding Austin Police Department DNA Lab.

Garcia reported the Quattrone Center is working in collaboration with the City of Austin, the Austin defense bar and other stakeholders to finalize the report in the Austin Police Department DNA Lab matter. Garcia hopes to have a copy of the report by the Commission's July 24, 2020 quarterly meeting.

16. Update on collaborative work groups to discuss impending OSAC Registry standards, including implementation:

Peter Stout addressed the Commission regarding the collaborative workgroups being established by TACLD to evaluate published standards and decide whether the Commission should recommend adoption of the standards. Activity by the groups has been delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The first group assembled will address the toxicology standards. Stout explained the current published standards should not be an issue for implementation; however, there are some in the pipeline that will need to be addressed by the groups. Stout should have an update at the July 24 meeting.

Budowle reviewed the two new DNA standards and cited issues with the standards that are not completely clear or readily addressed in the text of the standards. The groups can address these issues as part of the process and work with the OSAC committee as well.

17. Consider proposed agenda items for next quarterly meeting.

Staff will include all discussed items on the next quarterly meeting agenda and circulate the proposed agenda for additions.

18. Schedule and location of future panel and quarterly meetings, including July 24, 2020 quarterly meeting.

The Commission will meet for its next quarterly meetings July 24, 2020 and October 23, 2020.

19. Hear public comment.

No further public comments were given other than those noted throughout the agenda above.

20. Adjourn.