

Illinois Forensic Science Commission

Meeting Minutes

12 March 2025

I. **Call to order**

Because Chairperson Brendan Kelly was present via Web Ex, Illinois State Police Director Designee Robin Woolery and Executive Director Amy Watroba called to order the meeting of the Illinois Forensic Science Commission at approximately 10:00 a.m. on March 20, 2025. The meeting was held in-person at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Carl R. Woese Institute for Genomic Biology, Room 1619. The meeting also was available via Web Ex.

II. **Roll-call**

1. The following Forensic Science Commission members and staff were present:

1. Brendan Kelly, Chairperson (via Web Ex)
2. Dr. Ponni Arunkumar, Member
3. Jillian Baker, Member
4. Jeff Buford, Member
5. Claire Dragovich, Vice Chairperson
6. Katherine Drummond, Member (via Web Ex)
7. John Hanlon, Member
8. Judge Art Hill (ret.), Member (via Web Ex)
9. Dr. Cris Hughes, Member
10. Jeanne Richeal, Member
11. Caryn Tucker, Member
12. Carrie Ward, Member
13. Amy Watroba, Executive Director
14. Robin Woolery, Director Designee

2. Quorum confirmed.

3. The following members of the public were present in-person:

1. Timothy Ruppel
2. Sarah Ware

4. The following members of the public were present via Web Ex:

1. Declan Binninger*
2. Maya Dukmasova
3. Mike Harte
4. Gina Havlik
5. Brendan Heffron
6. Philip Kinsey
7. Joanne Liu*
8. Jennifer Maples*
9. Kevin McMahon
10. Amy Miles

11. Dale Rush
12. Lindsay Simpson
13. Peter St. Andre
14. Dagmara Wojtas

*Denotes individual who joined meeting via Web Ex after roll call.

III. **Review/Adoption of the Minutes of December 16, 2024.**

The motion to adopt the Meeting Minutes from the December 16, 2024, Commission meeting was unanimously approved.

IV. **Executive Director Summary**

1. General: ED Watroba welcomed new NIRCL Lab Director Peter St. Andre, who will be applying for appointment to the Commission. ED Watroba thanked Phil Kinsey for his decades of service to the forensic science community and his three years of service to the Commission and wished him well in his retirement.
2. Legal/Legislative Update: ED Watroba explained that she created a bill tracking document at Ms. Baker's suggestion, which is available on the Commission's shared drive. Commission members can access the document to view the bills ED Watroba is tracking and they can add additional bills as they are introduced during the current legislative session. ED Watroba highlighted HB 2586 which proposes adding language to the Commission's enabling statute providing that the Governor will designate a Commission Chairperson for two-year terms beginning on January 1, 2026. If the bill passes and is signed into law, the Commission can then decide whether any provisions of the Bylaws or Commission procedures previously discussed need to be amended to push forward recommendations to the Governor regarding designation of a Commission Chairperson.
3. Education/Outreach: ED Watroba reported that she attended the American Academy of Forensic Sciences (AAFS) annual conference in Baltimore from February 19-21, 2025. She attended presentations in the Jurisprudence, Criminalistics, and Anthropology sections. ED Watroba will provide information gleaned at the conference relevant to the work of the subcommittees at the subcommittee level. ED Watroba summarized general categories and topics covered during the presentations she attended. ED Watroba noted that one presentation included a brief discussion of state level boards and commissions. Based on this presentation, ED Watroba predicted that there will be more presentations related to boards and commissions at the 2026 AAFS conference. Dr. Hughes presented at the conference and Dr. Arunkumar also was in attendance.

ED Watroba also attended a two-hour webinar presented by Ted Hunt of the FBI on February 14, 2025, regarding the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in

Smith v. Arizona. The slides from that presentation were shared with webinar participants and are posted on the Commission's shared drive as a resource for Commission members.

ED Watroba continues to engage with the National Association of Forensic Science Boards (NAFSB) by attending monthly NAFSB Executive Committee meetings and serving on the membership committee. The NAFSB is in the process of planning the next annual conference and is tentatively looking to hold that conference in January of 2026.

V. Subcommittee Reports

1. Quality Systems Subcommittee: Claire Dragovich, subcommittee chairperson, shared that the subcommittee met on January 23rd and February 27th to start the process of preparing the 2024 report of significant non-conformities. The subcommittee began by reviewing the statutory language related to state and local publicly funded ISO 17025 accredited labs providing reports to the Commission which summarize the labs' significant non-conformities from 2024. The subcommittee used publicly available websites to identify state and local labs meeting the statutory criteria. At the direction of the subcommittee, letters explaining the statute and requesting a response were sent to the labs identified by the subcommittee: Analytical Forensic Testing Laboratory (AFTL), Cook County Medical Examiner's Office (CCMEO), DuPage County Forensic Science Center, Illinois State Police Forensic Sciences Command, and Northeastern Illinois Regional Crime Laboratory (NIRCL). The subcommittee has received responses from 4 of the 5 laboratories. AFTL requested a one-month extension due to a current external investigation related to human testing. Given AFTL's commitment to provide a report, the extension request was granted and the subcommittee expects AFTL's response by April 3rd. The subcommittee reviewed and discussed the responses from the CCMEO and NIRCL at the February 27th meeting and plans to review the responses from the remaining three laboratories at the next subcommittee meeting(s) and then move forward to prepare a summary report for the Commission. DD Woolery inquired about the timetable for the report. Ms. Dragovich explained that the subcommittee will finalize the report and provide the report to the Commission for approval before the next Commission meeting. ED Watroba noted that the 2023 report was presented and approved at the June 2024 Commission meeting.
2. Training and Career Development Subcommittee: Caryn Tucker, subcommittee chairperson, summarized current subcommittee projects. The first two training videos for core disciplines are in production for Latent Prints and Drug Chemistry. The Latent Print training materials have been submitted to the subcommittee for review. The Drug Chemistry materials are almost complete and will be submitted to the subcommittee soon for review. ED Watroba and Ms. Tucker are working on an introductory video that can be included at the beginning of each discipline's training video. The video will include stock footage from multiple stakeholders. ED Watroba also is working

on the legal disclaimer for the videos. The subcommittee's goal is to have the Latent Print and Drug Chemistry training videos complete for the Commission to review prior to the June Commission meeting. Once these videos are complete, the subcommittee will begin work on the remaining core disciplines. ED Watroba thanked the subcommittee members and contributors to the project for the time and work they have dedicated to creating the videos.

3. Public Policy Subcommittee: John Hanlon, subcommittee chairperson, reported that the subcommittee met twice since the last Commission meeting to discuss topics that the subcommittee will address in 2025. The subcommittee is focusing on two topics at this time which were brought forward by Ms. Baker and Dr. Hughes.

Ms. Baker provided background information related to topic she proposed for consideration before the subcommittee. Ms. Baker explained that drugs are controlled under the Illinois Controlled Substances Act either by name or by class. When a lab identifies a controlled substance it identifies the substance in a lab report and if it falls under a controlled class labs may provide additional information explaining that the substance falls within a controlled class. Recently, labs have seen several new novel psychoactive substances in casework and the subcommittee is going to explore whether there could be a mechanism for Illinois lab systems to review these compounds and collectively decide if they belong in a controlled chemical class. Benefits to this approach include ensuring consistency in reporting across state lab systems and the ability to identify trends in casework. If abused substances are identified that do not fall into a current controlled chemical class, legislative recommendations could be made. Information about trends in novel substances identified in labs could also be shared with law enforcement, medical examiner/coroners' offices, and public health agencies.

Dr. Hughes provided background information related to the topic she brought before the subcommittee, which relates to the Illinois Missing Persons Act and possible legislative changes that may be proposed by law enforcement agencies and medical examiners/coroners to fill a gap in funding that exists for medical examiners and coroners to conduct DNA testing to identify unidentified human remains (UHR). When the Act was originally conceived, NamUs had federal funding to supply those services to medical examiners and coroners, but there was a shift in the funding landscape approximately five years ago. Dr. Hughes explained that she and Dr. Arunkumar are engaging with the Illinois Coroner and Medical Examiner's Association (ICMEA) and other stakeholders to examine possible updates to address this issue. They will report back to the subcommittee when the issue is ripe for possible subcommittee action.

4. Technology Subcommittee: Jeff Buford, subcommittee chairperson, reported that the subcommittee has met twice since the last Commission meeting. The subcommittee is currently examining three topics. First, the subcommittee has had live table discussions on Artificial Intelligence (AI) and its possible

applications to forensic science. The subcommittee has shared articles and resources related to AI and subject matter experts have shared insight on how AI might impact each discipline as well as possible administrative applications of AI. The subcommittee sought external insight on the topic of AI and has invited a guest speaker to its next meeting. Second, the subcommittee recommended that the lab systems created a LIMS working group. The LIMS working group has met once and will continue to meet as needed and report back to the subcommittee. Third, the subcommittee followed up on its Phase 2 work related to emerging technologies to see how labs are progressing with purchasing or researching new technologies or equipment. For example, NIRCL has purchased a virtual comparison microscope for its firearms section and ISP has completed a layered study of virtual comparison microscopes and is primed to purchase that equipment. ISP also is looking into high resolution screening for toxicology.

5. Forensic Investigative Genetic Genealogy (FIGG) Subcommittee: Subcommittee chairperson Cris Hughes reported that the subcommittee continues to consult with and invite experts from across the country to provide information about developments related to FIGG and the use of FIGG by different agencies. Joanna Johnson from the Indiana State Police recently presented to the subcommittee about their process of onboarding FIGG internally. Dr. Hughes explained that there are several systems and approaches that agencies have taken to utilizing FIGG, including bringing parts of the FIGG process (such as tree building) in-house. Ms. Johnson provided valuable information about the systems they are using to bring FIGG fully in-house including the type of cases they are working with FIGG, the genealogy team and training they are building, unit composition, instrumentation choices and approaches, and funding strategies for their unit. Wendy McLean, a genealogist from the University of North Texas Center for Human Identification will present at the next subcommittee meeting to discuss considerations for the genealogy aspect of FIGG.

VI. Issues for Discussion

1. Discussion and possible action- addition of link to Florida International University (FIU) Research Forensic Library on Commission's webpage:

ED Watroba introduced the topic of providing a link to the FIU Research Forensic Library on the Commission's webpage. ED Watroba explained that she and Judge Hill met the lead librarian at the NAFSB Annual Conference where they discussed the idea of adding a link on the Commission's website. The FIU Research Forensic Library is the first-of-its-kind on-line public library which contains over 7500 articles, including recent and historical publications. Publications are available at no cost and the library offers a daily digest email. ED Watroba shared an example of a daily digest email. ED Watroba proposed the addition of a "resources" tab on the Commission's webpage to house the link and future resource materials such as the fundamentals of forensic science training videos. Mr. Buford commented that

the FIU Research Forensic Library is a rich resource and noted that providing a link to help facilitate people accessing the content it provides would be consistent with the Commission's commitment to transparency and serving as a resource for the public, criminal justice stakeholders, and forensic science stakeholders. Ms. Hoos indicated support for adding the "resources" tab to the Commission's webpage as a good place to house links and future Commission materials. Mr. Hanlon inquired as to whether the FIU Research Forensic Library includes a search feature and ED Watroba indicated that it does and that the webpage is user-friendly from a navigation standpoint.

A motion to approve adding a "resources" tab to the Commission's webpage and adding a link to the FIU Research Forensic Library passed unanimously.

2. Discussion and possible action- SB 1889 proposed changes to DUI-Cannabis statutes (625 ILCS 5/11-501 and 625 ILCS 5/11-501.2):

ED Watroba summarized SB 1889, which was introduced this session by Senator Morrison and which proposes changes to two sections of Illinois Vehicle Code related to DUI-Cannabis. ED Watroba shared slides of the proposed legislation and outlined the proposed changes, which include 1) re-defining delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol as "free" or "parent" delta-9 THC in several sections of the statutes; and 2) excluding urine from "other bodily substance" in several sections of the statutes.

ED Watroba also shared the Commission's previous recommendation related to clarifying the delta-9 THC language in the statutes as well as the findings in the Commission's statement related to the 2-hour collection window in the DUI-Cannabis statute. ED Watroba indicated that the proposed language in SB 1889 appears consistent with both Commission documents related to DUI-Cannabis from last year. As such, the Commission discussed whether to support SB 1889 in its current form and whether to empower ED Watroba to take steps to communicate the Commission's support of the bill by taking actions such as entering a witness slip on behalf of the Commission.

Ms. Hoos raised the issue of amendments that may be made to the bill. Ms. Ward explained that when a witness slip is filed it relates to the version of the bill for which it is entered and it does not indicate support of a subsequent amendment to a bill. Ms. Ward suggested that if the Commission empowers ED Watroba to act in support of the current version of SB 1889 that it also give her latitude to take action consistent with the Commission's position without having to bring the issue back to the Commission.

Ms. Dragovich commented that the addition of the definition of delta-9 THC to subsection (a)(7) of the DUI statute is a positive improvement because readers do not have to look to section 501.2 for the definition. She also supports the clarification regarding "free" delta-9 THC.

Ms. Ward moved that the Commission support SB 1889 in its current form and authorize ED Watroba to pursue passage of the bill in alignment with the Commission's position in its current and any future amended form. The motion passed following a roll call vote with 11 votes in favor of the motion and two Commission members abstaining from the vote (Ms. Hoos and Ms. Drummond).

3. Discussion and possible action- THC Testing at UIC Analytical Forensic Testing Laboratory (AFTL):

ED Watroba provided background information on this discussion topic. She noted that Ms. Dragovich touched on the topic of AFTL when discussing the work that the Quality Systems Subcommittee is doing as part of their annual process of reviewing significant non-conformities for 2024 and that AFTL is one of the laboratories that is engaging in that process. ED Watroba observed that the Commission is non-regulatory and non-investigatory, but that the Commission's enabling statute outlines the Commission's scope and duties as a forum for stakeholders to discuss issues related to forensic science and to act in an advisory capacity. As such, the item is on the agenda to enable the full Commission to discuss how it might address the developing situation related to THC testing that took place at AFTL.

DD Woolery suggested that the discussion begin with background information about THC testing at AFTL. ED Watroba then summarized information gleaned from news reports and a recent press release, explaining that during a 2024 quality assurance review an issue with toxicology methodology at AFTL was discovered which revealed that the methodology used may not have been separating out the delta-8 THC and delta-9 THC isomers, presumably in DUI cases. AFTL sent a notification to prosecutors' offices presumably as part of a corrective action process. AFTL is no longer conducting human toxicological testing. ED Watroba further explained that the issue with AFTL's methodology has had a downstream impact because one State's Attorney's Office (DuPage County) noted in a press release that they did a case review based on the AFTL notification and made decisions with respect to charges in impacted cases.

Judge Hill commented that, based on his reading of the Commission's statute, the Commission can examine anything that impacts public perception or trust in forensic science and that the Commission has a duty to examine any such issues both for the sake of ensuring the integrity of forensic science and to ensure public confidence in forensic science/forensic scientists. Judge Hill mentioned that he previously worked as the Chief Deputy and First Assistant State's Attorney in the Cook County State's Attorney's Office and that, while not related to a science or lab issue, when there were allegations of wrongdoing or mistakes from a police department, for example related to drug arrests and convictions, the office did what Mr. Berlin did in DuPage County, which was to look at any cases that might be impacted in light of the alleged irregularities or issues. He explained that this review process sometimes resulted in action by the prosecutor's office, such as dismissing pending cases

or taking steps to reopen or bring back cases where there had already been a conviction/sentence. From a prosecutor's standpoint, such situations are very impactful, and Judge Hill indicated that he was not surprised that prosecutors' offices would be taking such action in direct response to the notification of possible irregularities with methodology at AFTL. Judge Hill indicated that the Commission should monitor the issue and any additional downstream impact on criminal cases.

Mr. Hanlon inquired about the impact on defendants, whether any impacted defendants are still incarcerated, and whether any defense organizations were notified. ED Watroba responded that a news report from ABC-7 Chicago suggested that there is one incarcerated person with a case in Boone County who is represented by counsel with a post-conviction petition pending related to testing at AFTL, but that she is unaware of the status of those proceedings. ED Watroba shared that, as a former prosecutor like Judge Hill, she also knows that whenever there is an issue with methodology brought to the attention of a prosecutor's office, the office does a case-by-case evaluation of the issue and facts of cases to decide how any cases may have been impacted. In response to Mr. Hanlon's question, Ms. Hoos likewise shared that there is a general process which unfolds when a laboratory notifies a prosecutor's office of an issue or irregularity. Ms. Hoos is not aware of the facts related to the notifications in this particular instance, but generally a prosecutor's office has a duty to review impacted cases and notify the defense.

ED Watroba suggested that enough information may not be available to the Commission at this time to assess possible next steps. ED Watroba indicated that she is not aware of who AFTL contacted as part of their corrective action. She suggested that the Commission might be in a better position to decide how to proceed once the UIC's independent investigation of the issue at AFTL is complete and more information is available. ED Watroba observed that, since AFTL is no longer conducting human testing and continued testing therefore is presumably not an issue, the Commission might consider taking a similar approach to how it handled the issue related to the use of victim DNA in databases. In that instance, the Commission examined the DNA issue that arose at an out-of-state lab, conducted a survey to determine if the practice at issue was taking place at any Illinois labs, and then decided what action to take as a Commission. ED Watroba observed that the Commission is not an investigatory or regulatory commission, but that it was important for the Commission to start discussing the topic of the methodology used at AFTL since it is an issue that is currently impacting forensic science stakeholders in Illinois.

DD Woolery and Ms. Richeal noted that part of how the Commission handled the victim DNA issue was to draft a statement explaining that Illinois labs were not using victim DNA in the same manner as the out-of-state lab in question. The Commission could consider drafting a similar statement making clear that none of the ISO 17025 accredited laboratories in Illinois that are doing toxicology testing are currently doing the type of testing that was an issue at

AFTL and/or explaining what testing is done at these labs. Ms. Hoos expressed support for such a statement but noted that the statement should focus on what other labs are doing rather than what AFTL did, since the Commission does not have enough information at this time to fully understand the methodology issue that occurred at AFTL. Commission members expressed support for this idea.

Ms. Dragovich expressed support for a letter explaining what other Illinois labs are doing. She also explained that, when a lab has a non-conformity, other labs can learn from what happened at that lab. From an external perspective, understanding what was reported to customers, understanding what was testified to in cases, understanding that there could still be impacted cases pending in other jurisdictions, and understanding that not every entity that received a notification may handle it in the same manner or interpret the notification in the same way are issues to consider. Ms. Dragovich noted that having a Commission comprised of members from varying backgrounds brings value to an assessment of what happened at AFTL, if the corrective action process pursued worked effectively and efficiently with notified stakeholders, and whether the notification information was shared with defense stakeholders in a meaningful way. Ms. Dragovich indicated that there is a lot that Illinois labs can learn from the non-conformity that occurred at AFTL. ED Watroba agreed and suggested that downstream stakeholders could also learn about topics such as corrective actions from the Commission's examination of what occurred at AFTL once more information is available about the non-conformity and the corrective actions taken in response.

Commission members discussed how the pending investigation will impact next steps and whether the Commission will need the results or report of the investigation to decide how to move forward. Ms. Dragovich explained that she was contacted by counsel from UIC to request an extension for providing AFTL's 2024 summary report of significant non-conformities to the Quality Systems Subcommittee based on the pending investigation, but that she is not sure what the investigation entails or what form the report will take. Since the lab is no longer conducting human testing, the investigation is not being conducted by the lab itself.

Dr. Arunkumar asked for clarification on how AFTL was reporting THC results. Ms. Dragovich suggested the need for a comprehensive examination of how results were reported over several years because labs often change reporting language based on changes in legislation or laboratory communication. She indicated that she had only seen some AFTL reports which reported out total THC with no free cannabinoids detected, but did not report out an amount of "free" delta-9 THC. Ms. Dragovich explained that a lot of things need to be examined to understand how the non-conforming event impacted the criminal justice system. For example, methodologies would have to be examined to understand what happened. It would be important to know if the lab was previously able to distinguish between the delta-8 and delta-9 THC isomers prior to something going wrong or changing with their methodology in 2024

versus a scenario where the lab's methodology was never able to distinguish between the delta-8 and delta-9 THC isomers. It would also be important to look at how forensic scientists testified about their test results after the notification of the non-conformity was sent to customers. Ms. Dragovich circled back to Judge Hill's earlier comments regarding the importance of the Commission taking steps to maintain confidence in the community regarding the forensic services provided in the state.

Commission members discussed whether a general process or best practice document could be put in place to address similar issues that may arise in the future, regardless of the outcome of the investigation related to the THC testing non-conformity at AFTL, and possible general limitations the Commission would have to work within. It was noted that AFTL was an ISO 17025 accredited laboratory affiliated with UIC that was paid by law enforcement agencies to conduct toxicology testing in DUI cases. Dr. Arunkumar noted that agencies also contract with private laboratories for different lab services.

Since AFTL was ISO 17025 accredited, AFTL already had best practices it had to follow. AFTL had to follow a non-conforming work approach, which means notifying clients of testing issues and sending out supplemental or remedial reports to clarify the issue. Ms. Dragovich observed that AFTL did at least part of that because a letter did go out according to the DuPage County State's Attorney's Office's press release. Open questions include how effective the letter was and how effectively the lab handled the non-conformity. Since the lab closed after the notification letter was sent, there are open questions about what checks and balances were in place related to previously issued lab reports after the lab closed. Discussion ensued about how the Commission could obtain the results of the completed investigation, including requesting the results directly from UIC and/or submitting a FOIA request for the investigation results.

Because the Commission meets quarterly, ED Watroba presented the procedural option of having a subcommittee monitor the AFTL situation so that they can address any developments more expeditiously. Commission members discussed advantages to pushing the issue to a subcommittee, including the ability to invite subject matter experts as guests and to solicit speakers to educate subcommittee members on topics such as accreditation and quality assurance. Ms. Hoos noted that if the Commission decides to develop some type of best practices document or model that extends beyond the toxicology issue at AFTL, moving the issue to a subcommittee would be a good idea. Discussion ensued about whether an existing subcommittee could take on the issue and reached a consensus that the Quality Systems Subcommittee would be a logical choice, especially since that subcommittee is currently working on the 2024 report summarizing significant non-conformities at ISO 17025 accredited labs, including AFTL. Ms. Dragovich, chairperson of the Quality Systems Subcommittee, indicated that the subcommittee could take on the issue and explained that decisions about next

steps would likely be decided after the subcommittee reviews what information is included in AFTL's forthcoming submission for the annual report. Ms. Dragovich noted that the members of the subcommittee have backgrounds in quality systems and that subject matter experts in other areas could be invited to engage with the subcommittee as needed. Dr. Hughes asked Ms. Dragovich for her thoughts on the idea of a broader best practices document not specific to the AFTL situation, and Ms. Dragovich observed that the idea should be considered in light of other existing guardrails and requirements in place to address non-conforming work, such as ISO 17025 requirements and Brady disclosure rules. Ms. Dragovich expressed an interest in examining whether the types of communications already in place are effective, for example trying to assess if the end users of notifications (often lawyers) understand what a notification (often written by scientists) actually means and what the case implications are. Clarity of communication between scientists and lawyers is a broader recognized challenge. The subcommittee could also discuss what happens when a lab closes during a corrective action. Discussion ensued about possible ways to try to assess the effectiveness of communication and perform a type of "gap analysis" of the mechanisms already in place both in general and with respect to particular issues, while being mindful of staying within the Commission's scope.

[Approximately 76 minutes into the Commission meeting, technical difficulties occurred at the location of the in-person meeting, during which audio communication could not be heard between the meeting room and the individuals joining the meeting via Web Ex. Substantive discussion was suspended in the meeting room while tech support from the University of Illinois was contacted and worked to address the audio issue. The issue was resolved approximately twelve minutes later and substantive discussion resumed.]

When the discussion resumed, Commission members discussed looking at the notification aspect of corrective actions in general, even if the Commission is not able to ascertain exactly what happened at AFTL. Ms. Tucker suggested a possible two-pronged approach: 1) draft a statement outlining what Illinois labs currently do for THC testing, similar to the approach the Commission took to the victim DNA issue; and 2) examine as much information as possible related to the AFTL methodology issue and draft suggestions for best practices based on what is learned.

Ms. Dragovich summarized her previous comments about how labs can learn from examining how other laboratories handle non-conforming work, including how the non-conformity was addressed, how the non-conformity was communicated to clients and stakeholders, and what accreditation requirements were triggered by the event. ED Watroba summarized the Commission's discussions of possible things to look at related to THC testing at AFTL and possible approaches within the scope of the Commission's statute. Next steps will include having the Quality Systems Subcommittee monitor the issue in tandem with and in addition to their work on the 2024 summary report for ISO 17025 accredited laboratories. As more information becomes

available, the subcommittee may begin work on a statement related to what other labs do for THC testing, invite subject matter experts or other relevant parties to speak to the subcommittee, and ED Watroba may submit a FOIA request for the results of the pending investigation when it is complete. The subcommittee will report back to the Commission on the status of what they are learning and doing and any action items that the Commission may wish to consider in the future.

VII. Housekeeping Items

ED Watroba noted that the June Commission meeting will be hosted by ISP at the Forensic Science Center-Chicago. DD Woolery reminded Commission members to submit travel reimbursements for the March and June meetings before the end of the fiscal year, which is June 30th.

VIII. Public Comment

No public comment was offered from individuals who were present in-person at the meeting.

Public comment was offered via Web Ex by Amy Miles. Ms. Miles manages the regional toxicology liaisons. Ms. Miles offered suggestions on how to support SB 1889. Ms. Miles also raised the issue of the amounts of delta-9 THC in the per se provision of the DUI-Cannabis statute and offered possible national resources to assist the Commission if the Commission re-visits the topic of the per se limits.

Public comment was offered via Web Ex by Maya Dukmasova. Ms. Dukmasova asked that the individuals who joined the meeting following roll call be identified. ED Watroba noted the three individuals present who were not present at roll call and indicated that the meeting minutes will reflect all individuals who were present for the meeting regardless of what time they joined.

IX. Meeting Schedule

The next meeting is scheduled at 10:00 a.m., on Wednesday, June 11, 2025, at the Illinois State Police Forensic Science Center-Chicago, 1941 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, IL.

X. Adjournment

Director Designee Woolery and ED Watroba adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:43 a.m. on March 12, 2025.