1	Minutes (Draft)
2	Scientific Advisory Committee
3	Subcommittee on Breath Alcohol
4	August 4, 2008 at 9:20 a.m.
5	DFS Biotech 8, Conference Room
6	Di 5 Dioteen 0, comercine Room
7	
8	Subcommittee Members Present:
9	Subcommutee Members Present.
10	Dale Carpenter, Ph.D
11	Alphonse Poklis, Ph.D
12	
12	Scientific Advisory Committee Members Present:
14	Scientific Havisory Committee Memocro Present.
15	Barry Fisher, Chairman
16	
17	Staff Members Present:
18	
19	Ms. Alka Lohmann, Breath Alcohol Section Chief
20	Ms. Carisa Onorato, Administrative Specialist
21	David Barron, Ph.D Director of Technical Services
22	Ronald Layne, Director of Administration and Finance
23	Guinevere Cassidy, Legal Assistant
24 25	Call to Order:
26	
27	Carisa Onorato called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m. Carpenter, Ph.D (Carpenter) was
28	designated Chairperson for the Breath Alcohol subcommittee meeting.
29	
30	Overview of the Protocols for the New Breath Alcohol Instrumentation:
31	
32	Carpenter and Poklis, Ph.D (Poklis) accepted the agenda. Carpenter opened the discussion to
33	Ms. Lohmann to present the Breath Alcohol procedures manual. Ms. Lohmann gave a brief
34	overview of the breath alcohol protocols. The protocols for the breath alcohol procedures for the
35	new instrument have been put into the final format. Ms. Lohmann advised that the changes to
36	the protocols were highlighted in yellow from the previous copy that the subcommittee members
37	received. An overview was given to the subcommittee on the training progress of the
38	Commonwealth's Breath Alcohol Operators. Ms. Lohmann presented the new training manual
39	to the subcommittee members. Ms. Lohmann discussed that the testing protocol for running a
40	breath test has not been changed from the Intoxilyzer 5000, and then she went into an
41	explanation of those protocols. Ms. Lohmann next went into the explanation of the calibration
42	and certification procedures for the breath alcohol instruments and the certificates of accuracy.
43	-
44	Carpenter inquired about the four different points in the certification procedure. Ms. Lohmann
45	responded with all the values for the four points (.02, .08, .15, and .25), and that they are being
46	done with the dry gas cylinders for the new instruments.

- 47
- 48 Carpenter inquired what the highest reportable value for a subject would be on the new
- 49 instrument. Ms. Lohmann responded that the highest reportable value would be a .50 and went
- 50 into explanation.
- 51
- 52 Carpenter inquired to whether the acceptance of a new firmware version is instrument specific or
- 53 for that firmware. Ms. Lohmann responded that acceptance testing is for that firmware version.
- 54 She then went into an explanation of the testing protocols of the acceptance of new firmware.
- 55
- 56 Carpenter made a point for clarification on the worksheet, about the difference for the firmware 57 version and the software version. He asked if there was a different designation for both the 58 firmware and software version. Ms. Lohmann clarified that yes that there are two numbers and 59 went into an explanation of the software versus the firmware.
- 59 60
- 61 Carpenter asked Ms. Lohmann to speak on the big picture of the process for the new instruments 62 being received by the Department of Forensic Science (DFS), being put into the field, and how
- 63 they will be maintained. Ms. Lohmann went into an explanation on how the instruments are
- 64 currently maintained and how the new instruments will continue to be maintained.
- 65
- 66 Carpenter inquired how many instruments DFS owned. Ms. Lohmann answered that DFS will67 own 220, 20 of which will be for training.
- 68
- 69 Carpenter inquired if that means there will be 440 site visits per year. Ms. Lohmann clarified that
- 70 actually approximately 400 site visits, because 20 instruments are on-site training instruments.
- 71 Ms. Lohmann then discussed that 200 instruments in the field is an increase to what is currently
- in the Commonwealth, and that the new sites have yet to be determined.
- 73
- 74 Poklis inquired as to what the biggest anticipated technical problem will be with the new
- instruments, will it be dry gas? Ms. Lohmann answered that the majority of the inquiries will
- come in will be about the dry gas because it is new. Ms. Lohmann went into an explanation of
- the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) traceability and certification process
- 78 of the instruments.79
- 80 Poklis inquired about how DFS is going to handle testimony about the dry gas. Ms. Lohmann
- 81 gave detail about how she has already spoken with the new judges, to the Commonwealth's
- 82 Attorney's Association, and the plan for doing regional training for judges and Commonwealth
- 83 Attorney's. Operators will not be expected to testify about dry gas.
- 84
- Poklis inquired as to what the classic challenges and what are defense experts going to bring up
  about dry gas. Ms. Lohmann explained that she's received no information from other states that
  are currently using the instrument on classic defenses and believes the science is simple enough
  to explain.
- 88 to e 89
- 90 Discussion ensued about defense experts and dry gas, and Ms. Lohmann went into how it would
- 91 be explained in the courtroom.
- 92

93	There discussion on the use of dry gas verifications and the use of wet bath simulators. An
94	explanation was given on how these would be used in both the field and the lab.
95	
96	The subcommittee recessed at 9:34 a.m.
97	
98	The subcommittee reconvened at 9:38 a.m.
99	
100	Carpenter and Poklis recommended that Ms. Lohmann read through each of the protocols in
101	each section and give an explanation.
102	
103	Ms. Lohmann read over and gave explanations for each section of the Breath Alcohol Procedures
104	manual. The subcommittee members fully discussed these sections with Ms. Lohmann.
105	Discussion also ensued on the current process for breath alcohol operator training.
106	
107	The subcommittee recessed at 10:30 a.m.
108	
109	The subcommittee reconvened at 10:56 a.m.
110	
111	At the subcommittee's request Ms. Lohmann gave a tour of the Breath Alcohol Lab.
112	The the succommuted is request (11). Dominant gave a total of the Dream Theorier Luci
112	The tour was completed at 11:12 a.m.
114	The total was completed at 11.12 a.m.
115	The subcommittee recessed at 11:15 a.m.
116	
117	The subcommittee reconvened at 11:15 a.m.
118	
119	Barry Fisher, Chair of the SAC and David Barron, Ph.D DFS Technical Director joined the
120	meeting at that time.
121	
122	Carpenter gave a brief summary on the work completed during the subcommittee meeting and
123	the recommendation that will be given to the full scientific advisory committee. Poklis
124	concurred with the summary and recommendations.
125	concurred with the summary and recommendations.
126	Poklis then discussed the recommendations that the subcommittee would like Ms. Lohmann and
127	the Breath Alcohol Section to consider.
128	
129	
130	Recommendation for the SAC and FSB:
131	
132	Fisher: "Dale could I ask that you make a motion at tomorrow's meeting recommending the
133	adoption of these procedures. I don't know that you need to go into these other things because
134	they're not germane specifically to the procedures but you've talked to the staff and you're just
135	raising these issues so they don't have to deal them later on in a courtroom situation, when some
136	defense expert or Al comes out"
137	
138	Poklis: "I don't easily show up in criminal cases in the Commonwealth."
	- childer - control of the second cubes in the control would here

- 139
- 140 Carpenter: "I guess we will make that motion that the Committee approve the procedures as
- 141 written knowing they are living documents that will become more thorough with time and it
- 142 gives all of the elements of a solid breath testing program are in place."
- 143
- 144 Poklis: "I think most of our recommendations are just in fact to give themselves credit for a
- bunch of work that they've done that they make sure it is documented."
- 146
- Fisher: "Well, if you want to say something nice to the staff, I don't know why you'd want to,but if a thought crossed your mind."
- 149
- 150 Poklis: "We want to keep them on their toes."151
- 152 There was discussion on the status of the other Scientific Advisory subcommittees.
- 153154 There were no other questions or comments from the members of the subcommittee or the155 Scientific Advisory Committee.
- 156
- 157 <u>Public Comment:</u>
- 158
- 159 There were no members of the public in attendance; therefore there was no public comment.
- 160
- 161 <u>Adjourn:</u>
- 162
- 163 The meeting was adjourned at 11:24 a.m.