Illinois Forensic Science Commission
Technology Subcommittee
Open Meeting-Via Web Ex
Wednesday, August 20, 2025, 11:00 a.m.

Meeting Minutes

I. Call to Order
1. 11:00 a.m. by Subcommittee Chairperson Mr. Buford.

II. Roll-call
1. Jeffrey Buford, Commission Member, Subcommittee Chairperson
2. Jillian Baker, Commission Member, Subcommittee Member
3. Jeanne Richeal, Commission Member, Subcommittee Member*
4. Caryn Tucker, Commission Member, Subcommittee Member
5. Amy Watroba, Executive Director-Illinois Forensic Science Commission
6. Adrienne Bickel, ISP
7. Casey Craven, ISP
8. Kevin Gillespie, ISP
9. Gina Havlik, NIRCL
10. Megan Neff Salasek, ISP
11. Cassandra Richards, ISP
12. Larry Shelton, ISP
13. Bryan Tomac, ISP

(*denotes individual who joined meeting after roll call)

III. Review of Minutes/Adoption

1. The minutes from the April 23, 2025 and May 21, 2025 subcommittee meetings were approved.

IV. Chairperson Report

1. Mr. Buford provided a brief summary of the information he provided about the subcommittee's work to the Commission at the Commission's June meeting, which was held at the Forensic Science Center-Chicago.

V. Discussion- AI Applications in Forensic Science

1. Summary of RTI International/NIST Harnessing AI for Forensics Symposium
   a. Ms. Watroba attended the two-day Symposium in-person in July and there were representatives from many stakeholder groups present. There also were a large number of on-line attendees. Ms. Watroba provided a link to subcommittee members to watch the recorded sessions from the symposium and indicated that NIST plans to issue a report based on the work done at the symposium. Ms. Watroba summarized some key takeaways which streamlined with the subcommittee's previous discussions on AI applications related to

forensic science. There was general consensus among in-person attendees that AI systems should be deployed first to non-casework tasks, such as quality or administrative applications. Casework adjacent applications such as library searches for toxicology or drug chemistry also were discussed as possible early AI applications to forensic science. Some interesting applications for administrative or quality included possible uses of AI for managing workflow and efficiency, including managing case work assignments in real time and predicting workflows. Another key takeaway was that AI can never replace humans in the forensic science space because the criminal justice system is the end user of the work done in forensic labs. Discussions focused on how AI can best support human analysts. Procurement was identified as a first line of defense to ensure that AI applications are fit for purpose. Additionally, the need for appropriate infrastructure and technology to support AI systems was stressed. Given the nature of some types of AI applications, it was noted that labs should consider the long-term needs of maintaining continuous AI systems, including infrastructure, technology, and long-term funding needs.

b. Ms. Watroba summarized how each of the 2 days of the symposium was structured and how participants were assigned to break-out groups to work through use case cards. One concern noted in all contexts was the risk that as AI becomes more commonly used, there could be an over-reliance on AI which could result in skill degradation. Each breakout group that worked with use case cards during the symposium considered, among other things, balancing the risks of a particular AI application against the value added. The closing panel was interesting and focused on the path forward for AI in forensics. One point made during the panel was that lab directors are critical at the front lines of this new frontier and stressed the importance of lab directors articulating their actual needs.
c. Finally, Ms. Watroba summarized the panel she participated in during the symposium and stressed the importance of considering criminal justice end users when deciding where and how to implement AI systems in laboratories.
d. Mr. Buford observed that the key takeaways from symposium aligned with the subcommittee's discussions of possible AI applications in different disciplines.

2. Continued Discussion of AI Applications in Forensic Science
   a. Mr. Buford noted the extensive discussions the subcommittee has had on the topic of AI applications. Each discipline reviewed the topic as applied to their processes. The subcommittee decided by consensus that the subcommittee has adequately covered the topic of AI for each discipline and that the topic of AI can be tabled at this time. The subcommittee can revisit the issue of AI as more specific applications are developed.

3. Open Discussion of Next Steps for Subcommittee
   a. Ms. Baker reported that the LIMS working group had no updates to report since the last meeting.
   b. Subcommittee members suggested the future topic of how the subcommittee can assist with lab procurement efforts for emerging technologies. Mr. Buford shared how the subcommittee's work on Phase I (current technologies) and Phase II (emerging technologies) and the sharing of that information with the full Commission has served as a

resource for management within agencies to support requests for the procurement of emerging technologies.

c. Subcommittee members suggested that the subcommittee discuss the possibility of agreements between lab systems to share/use present equipment that is available at some labs and how lab systems might coordinate or consult on validations and verifications.
d. The topic of if/how the Commission could be involved in supporting grant applications was suggested as a future topic for the subcommittee to explore.
e. Subcommittee members were encouraged to email Mr. Buford or Ms. Watroba with suggestions after the meeting.

VI. Public Comment

1. No public comment offered.

VII. Next Meeting/ Adjournment

1. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 29, 2025 at 11 a.m.
2. Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:00 p.m.