



DFS Evidence Submission Advisory Committee Meeting

Video Conference- Microsoft Teams

MEETING: 11/4/2025, 1:00PM

ATTENDEES

Angela Richards	X	Jennifer Naugle	X
Bridget Krause	N/A	Jennifer Greene	X
Carlton Cowie	X	Jeremy Perri	N/A
Chris Botsch	X	Kathy Mahnke	X
Corey Stephan	X	Keith Alexander	N/Z
Dan Campbell	X	Monica Hall	X
Dan Flaherty	N/A	Nikki Roehm *Facilitator	X
David Poteat	X	Rachel Berg	N/A
Eva King	X	Sandy Koresch	X
Katie Hoffmeyer	X	Xia Xiong	X

Notice is hereby given that there will be a virtual meeting of the Division of Forensic Sciences Advisory Committee on Tuesday, November 4 at 1:00pm to conduct the following business:

1. **Welcome (Nikki Roehm)**

Nikki welcomed everyone to meeting.

2. **Meeting Announcement and agenda published on DOA Public Meeting website:**

As a reminder, this meeting is open to the public and subject to open meetings laws. The meeting minutes will be posted to the website following the meeting.

3. **DNA Guidelines (Kathy Mahnke)**

We have one change that we want to run past the committee. We are having trouble getting our reporting out in a timely manner, especially with the number of speedy trial demands we are handling. We have met all deadlines, but we have very limited resources. Nikki shared that we asked for more staff (in the biennial budget request) but were not granted any new positions. Due to that, we need to adjust on our end. The change we are suggesting is to extend the turnaround time to a three-month time frame from a two-month time frame. The workload is not changing, and we have limited resources.

DA Hall asked: Is there an exception if there is (genuine) speedy trial demand for DNA testing? Yes, there are always exceptions that can be made and there is bold print following the change that acknowledges that test results might need to be quicker for the court.

Nikki shared that there are always exceptions. These are just guidelines.

Kathy shared that if you have a speedy trial, just stay in communication with us. It is noted in the guidelines. (*section above mentions rush requests or speedy trial demands to reach out to the forensic case manager*)

DA Hall requested to provide more clarity around speedy trials or move the noted exception to the "evidence acceptance" area or bold the text to make it stand out.

Nikki shared that on a side note, we have been gathering information on how other states handle this. Testing takes a long time. There are some states that allow 6 months. Testing takes a long time and with the volume we are getting, we can see the breaking point.

The only other change was that our email domain has changed.

Action Item: Kathy will make the updates as discussed here and then she will re-circulate the documents for the committee to review.

4. Firearms & Toolmarks Guidelines Update (Kathy Mahnke and Xai Xong)

Overall, we revamped the guidelines to make it more user friendly by adding a table instead of a long paragraph. The table should be easier to access and follow.

Kathy reviewed the packaging requirements and opened up for questions. There were questions about what we do with packaging, so hopefully this provides clarity.

Next, Kathy reviewed the services that require approval. She did not read through everything but did provide some examples of why clarity was needed for submitters.

Kathy called out the services that we have historically done but are not doing much of anymore and want to know the value it adds to your case.

Xai provided an example of trigger pull testing. Historically, we have provided trigger pull estimating on every firearm (without a request). We have rarely seen this service requested in testimony. The Crime Lab is still planning to provide this service but are asking that you request it by letting us know how you would use it on your case.

Another example: Magazine capacity and functionality determination. Request to determine if a magazine works.

Serial number restorations- we have performed hundreds of them but haven't seen how the information is used, so we are looking for more information. We are still happy to provide this service if it is needed.

We now have a functioning firearms unit in Wausau. This makes for two firearms units in the State of Wisconsin: Milwaukee and Wausau. This will be very helpful when we move into our new Milwaukee Lab so that we can continue to provide services during the move. The additional firearms unit is noted in the guidelines. Milwaukee will continue to handle firearms destruction.

5. Discovery Packet Requests Guidelines (Jen Naugle)

This is a new guideline we put into place to address the increase in open records requests from those seeking discovery packets.

Awareness: We have a new LIMS system that we were hoping could auto generate discovery packets, but we are not there yet.

Our new LIMS is online, and we are becoming more comfortable with the data it pulls (and format) and what will be included in reporting. We are not taking any information away; it will just look different and might have more information.

The portal that will be used to access reports and discovery- we are looking to start the pilot group in Q1 2026. We would like to be able to roll this out at the end of 2026 pending the new Milwaukee Crime lab move and accreditation.

6. Follow-Up Items

Touched DNA (Kathy Mahnke)

Kathy walked through the flowcharts that were prepared. These were shared with the group ahead of time for review. The first example was burglary with knob swabs. These are not a part of the DNA guidelines, but we can publish them to the website.

Are there any questions or concerns or feedback?

Nikki asked if the committee thinks the visual is helpful?

DA Hall said it is helpful and explanatory but asked if we can include how to gain approval from the lab and add Kathy's contact information to the top instead of the bottom of the flowchart.

Action Item: Kathy will update the flowcharts and re-circulate to this group before publishing

Bail Jumping (Katie Hoffmeyer)

In our last meeting, there was an article out of Madison about the use of bail jumping charges. A lot of people on this call were surprised to hear that the crime lab was involved with testing, so we went back and pulled data. Nikki handed it over to Katie to present the data:

Taking a snapshot of the bail jumping cases we worked in our toxicology unit for one year (August 1, 2024- July 31, 2025), this accounted for 13% of our case load. Higher than anticipated.

Looking at our case load and percentage and misdemeanor vs felony, about 30% are tied to misdemeanor bail jumping charges.

For clarification and to provide an example, this could be a person who was charged with OWI and now they are suspected of drinking at the bar and so another sample is taken and analyzed. The sample is collected because they are not meeting the conditions of their bond. This is not a drunk driver who has another open case, and we are analyzing the blood for the drunk driving and there just happens to be a misdemeanor bail jumping on the same case.

Recap:

What type of requests are we getting as it relates to bail jumping?

- 13% of toxicology cases from 8/1/2024 through 7/31/2025.
- Samples are collected because they are not meeting the conditions of their bond.

Is this coming from a certain selection of counties? There are some counties that request more than others.

Katie asked if the committee thinks we need to set boundaries.

DA Hall shared she has never sent a sample to a lab for bail jump and agreed that the numbers are high and agreed guidelines would be appropriate.

Does the State Lab of Hygiene accept these? They used to, but we all came together to draw lines based on funding sources. It's a little outside of the scope they are resourced for. They focus on ME requests, coroners, traffic offences, etc.

Action Item: We will go back to our toxicology team and work on editing the tox guidelines for the next meeting and consider some parameters around bail jumping.

DFSA Kit vs OWI Kit

Captain Poteat brought up a great question around evidence submitted for drug facilitated sexual assault cases. He shared that a few years ago he came across guidance that if you have a non-traffic related crime that you are drawing blood from that you need to use the DSFA kit and not the OWI kit. In the last year or so we have had pushback from hospitals saying that you can only use the DSFA kit for sexual assaults. Everything else is OWI. Where is this written down? What is the right answer? Can kit usage be added to the toxicology guidelines?

Dan Campbell shared some background on why the DFSA was created and that it was designed specially for sexual assault evidence collections. SANE nurses are very familiar with this specific kit.

Captain Poteat brought up the concern of where to get kits and the expiration of the kits. Nikki shared that the cost to manufacture the kits jumped dramatically. Crime Labs are paying for it out of appropriations that are funding us. DOJ pays for the kits because hospitals were buying them for a low amount (\$15) from the state and then charging higher costs (\$100+). Now that DOJ provides them for free, hospitals cannot legally charge for them.

Dan asked Captain Poteat approximately how many kits they use in Brown County. His guess was between 6-8 per year.

Nikki opened the floor for any additional questions or topics:

Question from DA Hall: Recently I saw a chart from law enforcement that showed her a chart that showed what the hygiene lab takes vs the crime lab takes. Jefferson county has always submitted felony level OWI's to the crime lab. Any misdemeanors go to the hygiene lab. The chart shows that the hygiene lab is now taking everything including felonies. Is this true and if yes, when did that change happen?

Nikki shared that she is only aware that they have always taken felony level vehicle homicide/traffic related (non-OWI). Nothing has changed. The Crime Lab still takes OWI felony.

Captain Poteat noted that Brown County sends felonies to the Crime Lab. The Crime Lab provides tracking and when you send kits to the hygiene lab, you will not get them back. In felony cases you are more likely to need re-testing.

7. Closing remarks

Thank you to everyone for this valuable discussion and for the recommendations on messaging. If no one is opposed, we plan to have our next meeting on Tuesday, March 3, 2026, at 1:00pm. A calendar invite will be sent out this month.