



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
TASK FORCE ON FORENSIC SCIENCE
LANSING

CHIEF JUSTICE BRIDGET M. McCORMACK
COL. JOSEPH GASPER
CO-CHAIRS

Task Force on Forensic Science
March 8, 2022
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Meeting Minutes

Voting Members	Representing
Col. Joe Gasper, Director	Michigan Department of State Police
Chief Justice Bridget M. McCormack	The Michigan Supreme Court
Mr. Jeff Nye, Director	Michigan Department of State Police, Forensic Science Division
Mr. Jonathan Sacks	Public defenders or criminal defense attorneys
Mr. Matthew J. Wiese	Prosecuting attorneys
Dr. Jeffrey M. Jentzen, M.D., Ph.D.	Board-certified pathologists with experience in forensic pathology
Mr. Kent Gardner, Director	Oakland County Sheriff's Department Forensic Laboratory
Mr. Christopher R. Bommarito	Forensic science practitioners with at least five years of experience in the field
Mr. Brandon N. Giroux	Forensic science practitioners with at least five years of experience in the field
Hon. (ret.) Dr. Donald Shelton, Ph.D.	Individuals from the private sector or from a university in this state who have earned a doctoral degree in a distinct field relevant to forensic science and who have published scholarship related to the field in a peer-reviewed journal
Dr. Ruth Smith, Ph.D.	Individuals from the private sector or from a university in this state who have earned a doctoral degree in a distinct field relevant to forensic science and who have published scholarship related to the field in a peer-reviewed journal
Dr. Barbara O'Brien, Ph.D.	Individuals from the private sector or from a university in this state who has published scholarship related to cognitive bias
Judge Paul J. Denenfeld	The 17th Circuit Court of Kent County, designated by the Chief Justice
Ms. Lori Montgomery, Attorney General Dana Nessel's designee	The Michigan Attorney General's Office
Non-Voting Members	
Senator John Bizon	The Michigan Senate, designated by the Senate Majority Leader
Senator Stephanie Chang	The Michigan Senate, designated by the Senate Minority Leader
Representative Robert Bezotte	The Michigan House of Representatives, designated by the Speaker of the House
Representative Laurie Pohutsky	The Michigan House of Representative, designated by the House Minority Leader.

I. Call to Order

- Chief Justice Bridget M. McCormack called the Task Force on Forensic Science meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.
- All were advised the meeting was being recorded.

II. Roll Call

- Roll call was taken, and a quorum was present.

Attendance Roll Call	Present Yes	Present No	Location, City, County, & State
Voting Members			
Col. Joe Gasper, Co-Chair	X		Virtual via Zoom
Chief Justice Bridget M. McCormack, Co-Chair	X		Virtual via Zoom
Mr. Jeff Nye	X		Virtual via Zoom
Mr. Jonathan Sacks	X		Virtual via Zoom
Mr. Matthew J. Wiese	X		Virtual via Zoom
Dr. Jeffrey M. Jentzen, M.D., Ph.D	X		Virtual via Zoom
Mr. Kent Gardner	X		Virtual via Zoom
Mr. Christopher R. Bommarito	X		Virtual via Zoom
Mr. Brandon N. Giroux	X		Virtual via Zoom
Hon. (ret.) Dr. Donald Shelton, Ph.D.	X		Virtual via Zoom
Dr. Ruth Smith, Ph.D.	X		Virtual via Zoom
Dr. Barbara O'Brien, Ph.D.	X		Virtual via Zoom
Judge Paul J. Denenfeld		X	
Ms. Lori Montgomery, Attorney General designee	X		Virtual via Zoom
Non-Voting Members			
Senator John Bizon	X		Virtual via Zoom
Senator Stephanie Chang	X		Virtual via Zoom
Representative Robert Bezotte		X	
Representative Laurie Pohutsky	X		Virtual via Zoom

III. Approval Vote of the January 25, 2022 Meeting Minutes

- A motion to approve the January 25, 2022 meeting minutes was given by the Hon. (ret.) Dr. Donald Shelton and seconded by Dr. Barbara O'Brien.
- With no discussion, the January 25, 2022 meeting minutes were approved with 13 Yeas, 0 Nays, and 0 Abstained.

IV. Discussion: Task Force Goals and Proposed Subcommittee Reorganization

Speakers: Mr. Jeffrey Nye, Mr. Jonathan Sacks

- Chief Justice McCormack commented prior to the presentation and discussion: We have had multiple requests to try and figure out a way to not duplicate the efforts that several subcommittees were experiencing.
 - Chief Justice McCormack and Col. Gasper asked Mr. Nye and Mr. Sacks to try and figure out a plan for reorganizing the work of the Task Force to avoid the duplication of efforts and make sure we're respectful of all of Task Force members' time and also be able to product the best product we can.
 - Mr. Nye commented: Chief Justice McCormack did an excellent job describing what the objectives were for this discussion.
- Presentation:
 - Mr. Nye: Task Force Goals from Executive Order 2021-4 signed by the Governor
 - Improve practice, delivery, and use of forensic science in Michigan.
 - Strength forensic science methodologies and practices that are out there.
 - Create statewide protocols for disclosure of negligence or misconduct.
 - Create a process for allowing members of the public to report alleged professional negligence or misconduct.
 - Adopt best practices for those working in the area of forensic science.
 - Create procedures for updating stakeholders on developments.
 - Create a post-conviction notification system.

- Mr. Sacks: Highlighted accomplishments in research that has been done already
 - The State of Forensic Science in Michigan subcommittee has a survey that's ready to go that will allow us to get our heads around where things are right now.
 - The Improving Practices subcommittee has the survey of lab analysts that will give us really good insight from the lab analyst's perspective as to where things are.
 - The Commission's Review subcommittee has laid out, to some extent, the duties of the Forensic Science body.
 - The Credentialing subcommittee has had a few sessions and are doing work in the area of credentials and accreditation.
 - Practices: The Task Force has talked about *Daubert* hearings and the limitation there. The issues with exonerations, and the rules of evidence and testimony.

- Mr. Sacks: Potential recommendations.
 - Permanent Forensic Science Body: The Commission subcommittee has previously discussed establishment of a forensic science entity, statewide.
 - Education and Training: The Education subcommittee has come up with a training framework for prosecutors, defense attorneys, and the judiciary.
 - Access: Access for defense attorneys and all stakeholders to forensic science evidence and experts.
 - Culture of Reporting: Culture of reporting is an issue that came up from the Negligence subcommittee.
 - Quality Control Measures and Elimination of Bias: This has been worked on by the Improving Practices subcommittee and has been discussed in larger Task Force sessions.

- Mr. Sacks: Final Task Force Report and Recommendations
 - Statutory Framework: Independent Statewide Body
 - What would a proposed independent statewide body look like such as the governing group, staffing levels, agency housing the body, and duties and responsibilities.
 - Statutory Framework: Greater Independence and Resources – Forensic Science Practices
 - To accomplish some of the Task Force goals and resolve some of the problems we've looked at.
 - Greater independence that's necessary for forensic science bodies.
 - The resources for those bodies and the statutory framework there that might be separate from the independent statewide body.
 - Non-Statutory Recommendations for:
 - Defense Attorneys
 - The Prosecutors Association
 - The Michigan Indigent Defense Commission
 - The Michigan Judges Institute
 - Along with a variety of other stakeholders

- Mr. Nye: Proposed Subcommittee Consolidation to eliminate overlap that has naturally happened within the subcommittees originally set up. Proposing either three or four subcommittees.
 - Structure (Subcommittee 1a, possibly combine with 1b)
 - This committee would be looking at the structure of any statewide body.
 - What would the organization look like and what would the staffing needs be.
 - Mr. Sacks: If recommending there should be a permanent forensic science body in Michigan, need to determine out of where it should best operate. There are advantages and disadvantages to whether it should be in the executive branch, and if in the executive branch would it be part of the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs (LARA). Would it be part of the Michigan State Police, or should it be in the judicial branch as a quasi-independent agency like the State Appellate Defender Office (SADO), or the Judicial Tenure Commission? Or, should it be in the Legislative Branch, such as Legislative Corrections Ombudsman?

- Mr. Sacks: Within what agency this body would exist, is the question of independent governance and how would that work, how much independence would it have? Examples would be SADO, the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission, and Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards (MCOLES) within the Michigan State Police. There are a lot of good independent governance examples we can look at and figure out the best framework.
- Mr. Sacks: Responsibilities and Objectives (Subcommittee 1b, possibly combine with 1a)
 - If we have a statewide body, what their responsibilities might be.
 - Disclosure and complaints and how those would work, the response to those disclosures, ranging from major forensic science issues to smaller scale responses.
 - Minimum standards, and best practices, with grants to comply.
 - Quality controls measures ranging from cognitive bias to blind control testing.
 - Post-Conviction notifications resources (Under a framework for a Culture of Disclosure)
 - Credentials, accreditation, and registration.
 - Who would need to register or be accredited? Agencies that do testing, but some might just review evidence and wouldn't necessarily need accreditation. And then there's the distinction between public accredited forensic science service providers and independent forensic science service providers. What about the chilling effect if every single defense expert had to be accredited?
 - Review of new technologies and methods that different labs may take on.
 - Minimum Standards and Best Practices / Michigan Indigent Defense Commission Model
 - Independent body recommends standards and best practices
 - Comment period and feedback
 - Final Standards to ultimately adopt
 - Compliance Plans to comply with those standards
 - Grants to comply with those standards. This would be very different in that it's a constitutional requirement for MIDC and a budget guarantee to make sure standards that labs may have to comply with, such as blind testing, quality control, and bias control can be funded. Independence and access could be through statewide grants.
- Mr. Nye: Forensic Science Practice (Subcommittee 2)
 - This subcommittee would be looking at the forensic science practice and any recommendations around the practice of forensic science.
 - Factfinding: State of Forensic Science Survey and the Survey of Lab Analysts are very close to being ready to go out.
 - Independence within Law Enforcement Agencies; much work has been done already by Commission Subcommittee.
 - Mr. Sacks: There are different, good models all of which could be successful. We've heard about the nonprofit model, where there was a shift to a nonprofit lab. That was the Houston Lab; The independent state agency in Virginia, which has a separate and independent government agency for forensic science that is not a part of the state police; Independent governance withing an existing agency. Examples would be MCOLES within the State Police, the legislative Ombudsman; SADO within the judicial branch, and the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission within the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs.
 - Access – Contact with experts, clearinghouse process: Might look at experts within the state from different stakeholders and some sort of a clearinghouse process for how that access might occur.
 - Practices for Quality Control and Compartmentalization: A sort of sequential unmasking of evidence to help minimize and mitigate bias and add to our quality control systems.
 - Disclosure of Negligence / Misconduct: There has already been quite a bit of discussion.
 - Training Requirements: Training requirements for forensic scientists.
 - Resources Needed: Look at resource needs that laboratories, or those that are practicing forensic science in the state might need to improve things like capacity and quality, and turnaround time, etc.

- Mr. Sacks: Forensic Science Use by Criminal Legal System Stakeholders (Subcommittee 3)
 - This subcommittee would look at things like *Daubert* hearings, access, training, etc.
 - Education and Training Requirements
 - This would be building on the work that has already been done by the Education Subcommittee, which would be the education and training requirements for prosecutors, defense attorneys, and judges.
 - Rules of Evidence and Discovery
 - To ensure defense has proper access to forensic science evidence and to make sure the courts can, as well as possible, analyze and evaluate the evidence.
 - Testimony / Uniform Language and Jury Instructions
 - Testimony and uniform language on how to address forensic science evidence in front of a jury and jury instructions.
- Mr. Sacks Recap: This brings us back to what our final Task Force report and recommendations might look like now that we've talked about the framework of the new subcommittees. If we shift to this committee model, we can have a series of recommendations that will get us there with combining and building off all the work that has already been done.
- Mr. Sacks thanked the chairs for giving he and Mr. Nye the opportunity to present this way for the next steps, commenting with him as the Director of the State Appellate Defender Office and Mr. Nye as the head of the Michigan State Police Forensic Science Division, they come from very, very different places in this discussion, but have come to agreement on what is presented.
- Chief Justice McCormack thanked Mr. Sacks and Mr. Nye for the work they put into the presentation.
- Chief Justice asked for comments and if Subcommittee (1a) and (1b) should be combined or kept separate.
 - Hon. (ret.) Dr. Donald Shelton: Feels the subcommittees 1a and 1b should be one because the work is so interrelated.
 - Mr. Christopher Bommarito: Questions if subcommittees were still needed at this point, perhaps we could just survey the Task Force members and see where everybody's at and then discuss those issues as a Task Force.
 - Chief Justice McCormack: There is still a lot of significant, if not medium, heavy lifting that has to be done to get these recommendations into draft form and trying to do that as a committee of the whole feels unwieldy.
 - Mr. Jeff Nye: Agrees there is still a lot of heavy lifting to do. He and Mr. Sacks are both supportive of everything presented to provide some organization for what the subcommittees might discuss. From an efficiency standpoint, it wouldn't be very effective discussing things as a whole Task Force as it would be breaking it down and then bringing some overall concepts to the Task Force for any further discussion or voting.
 - Dr. Jeffrey Jentzen: Agrees the two subcommittees should be merged into one.
 - Mr. Jonathan Sacks: The reason for potentially two groups was because one group might have too much work but agrees to combining them into one group if there are people willing to take on the responsibilities.
 - Mr. Nye: The subcommittees are sort of interrelated so they could breakdown into subcommittees but still interact, so they are staying in step with each other and not getting too far disjointed. Another concern was, given the broad scope of that subcommittee and the amount of work that would need to be done and the need to assign a fair number of Task Force members to it. Another concern is Robert's Rules and whether there would be a quorum since a majority of Task Force members could potentially be on a single subcommittee. Whether we have one large subcommittee or two smaller subcommittees that are very closely aligned with each other and communicating amongst the various subcommittees is important because you can't do one without the other.
 - Chief Justice McCormack: Mr. Wiese and someone from the public, in the meeting chat, asked for a copy of the presentation and commented we will be building out the Task Force website and we will make sure as much information as possible is on that website.
 - Chief Justice McCormack advised we will take a vote later in the meeting to determine if Subcommittee (1a) and (1b) will be combined into one, or if they will remain separate.

V. Public Comments

- There were no public comments expressed

VI. State of Forensic Science Survey Review

Speaker: Mr. Jeffrey Nye

- The survey is designed to assess the status of forensic science in the State of Michigan. The Task Force seems to have a consensus around using a very broad definition to include a variety of disciplines in the scope of the survey.
- Mr. Nye provided the introduction and details of the survey and asked for feedback from the Task Force regarding areas that don't necessarily need to be included within the survey, or area of interest that might have been missed as it relates to the status of forensic science of Michigan.
- Mr. Nye expressed the need to be aware of the time frame we have for the Task Force, trying to make sure it will allow enough time for participants to respond to the survey, and for the subcommittee to evaluate the survey responses.
- Areas covered in the survey:
 - Baseline Information
 - Transparency
 - Independence
 - Analysts Interaction with Law Enforcement/Prosecution
 - Participation in the Selection of Standards and Methods
 - Proficiency Tests
 - Quality Control Processes
 - Education Opportunities
 - Capacity
 - Technologies or Methods
- Comments and questions following the survey review
 - Mr. Brandon Giroux: Having taken a lot of these surveys in the past, the answers you get back sometimes have you second guessing whether or not they're answering the question you're trying to ask. Maybe adding an "I don't know" checkbox might help. Words matter. When asking if you are a certified examiner, does that mean qualified by your laboratory, were you qualified from a previous state, local, or federal lab you were working at? Or does that mean external certification? A little more clarity would be worthwhile. There's the question about licensing. In firearms identification, there is not a license that you can get and that may not necessarily apply to firearms examiners, but when you look at medical examiners, obviously that would be different.
 - Mr. Nye's response: Our intention was that you're certified or licensed by an external body, not necessarily you're certified as meaning you've been accepted as an expert in court. This can be clarified.
 - Mr. Giroux: The question as to what disciplines are you accredited under or do you perform, you mentioned gunshot residue. Keep in mind there are two different versions, one is chemical testing for muzzle to target, and the other is scanning electron microscopy looking at particles on people's hands that would indicate they fired a weapon.
 - Mr. Giroux: Under accreditation standards, not mentioned is ISO 17043, proficiency testing for forensic science. Not sure if that is outside of the scope of what you are trying to accomplish with the survey, but definitely one that is within the state.
 - Hon. (ret.) Dr. Donald Shelton: Questioned if the survey is to determine the state of forensic science in the state, of the state of forensic science laboratories in the state. If we're talking about the state of forensic science, there's a lot more involved. We have to talk about wrongful conviction numbers among other things than just how are labs operated, which matters for who receives the survey and, as a practical matter, you and the Oakland County Lab could fill it out and that'd be about it. Not sure many other providers will fill it out.
 - Mr. Nye's response: The Executive Order says the Task Force must act in an advisory capacity and must do the following review: Review the state of forensic science in the State of Michigan. Mr. Nye took it more to just be the area of the state of forensic science practice and not sure we can survey what Dr. Shelton is asking, which is what is the state of forensic science and how it's used or what is the state of forensic science from an impact point. But we can rely on other areas of data that might exist on that. We're going to send the survey out to hundreds of providers, but there's no carrot or stick to incentivize responses.

- Dr. Shelton comment: Maybe the survey goes on to be renamed the State of Forensic Science Laboratories because that's really what it is and there's other data that we ought to be relying on to talk about the state of forensic science, including wrongful convictions and things of that nature.
 - Mr. Nye's response: In preparation of the previous presentation, Mr. Nye and Mr. Sacks had a lot of discussion about laboratory versus practice because when we use the words Forensic Science Laboratory, there's a very, very small number of laboratories in the state. Noted renaming to "State of Forensic Science Practice."
- Dr. Shelton comment: Understanding the Executive Order uses the phrase physical evidence; he's concerned that it excluded behavioral science evidence when we are talking about the state of forensic science. A substantial number of wrongful convictions result from eyewitness testimony or from false confessions, and there's expert testimony offered, forensic science testimony, about those areas. Psychological evidence gets submitted about eyewitnesses, or confessions, or even the various syndromes that behavioral science experts attempt to testify about, and that's reflected in the disciplines that you list in the survey – nothing currently there encompasses it. Concerning about us focusing just basically on pattern evidence instead of the broader area.
 - Mr. Nye's response: Behavioral sciences are something that weren't really considered during the committee work. Mr. Nye would be interested in any other comments related to behavioral science and whether we want to include that in the broader forensic science. There has been some discussion previously about physical evidence and whether that includes digital evidence and things like that and focused on if you're receiving evidence, analyzing, offering a report, and coming to an expert opinion about something, that's really where forensic science was focused on. But behavioral science might just be another aspect of all of that.
 - Chief Justice McCormack: Judge Shelton has a set of helpful questions. It is relevant to our larger mission to think about behavioral science, especially behavioral expert testimony. Not sure it necessarily applies to the survey, but we may need to have a larger discussion about how we handle that kind of evidence in our report and in our investigation.
 - Dr. Jeffrey Jentzen comments: Thought the survey covered a lot of the issues related to medical examiners and that information is readily available in their accreditation work packets and would be easily recovered. As they are not functioning laboratories in most cases, I think in a lot of the yes and no questions, maybe an NA would be appropriate so there is more information about whether that's actually being performed or part of their duties.
 - Mr. Kent Gardner comments: There are at least 19 kinds of independent or not independent combinations of county and city labs that he contacted that know the survey is coming and they do forensic work. So, once you send the survey, he'll make sure they respond.
 - Chief Justice McCormack: We need to figure out whether to return to this (behavioral science topic) at a future agenda of if there's more discussion we can have this morning.

VII. Break

VIII. Returning to Evaluating State of Forensic Science in Michigan

- Chief Justice McCormack: Dr. Shelton's questions are good questions. The survey Mr. Nye has been working on is really about the practice of forensic science in labs and lab like places. And we may only get 18 responses as we learned from Mr. Gardner, at least that'll tell us something. How to think about the behavioral science expertise that plays a big role in criminal trials and is pretty confusing. It is something we should continue to think about, whether it has a place in the report for recommendation for further study. Not sure what the answer is but welcomes any further comments.
 - Mr. Nye's comments: Maybe there's a call within the report that this is something that was discussed within the Task Force but may be viewed outside of the scope of the Task Force but may need further discussion and study.
 - Dr. Shelton's comments: Hope it is not beyond the scope of the Task Force if we're looking at forensic science testimony and how it impacts the criminal justice system. There is quite a history about the role of behavioral science as it relates to criminal

- cases. Dr. Shelton would be happy to at least prepare a paper with a history and the history in Michigan and would hope to at least talk about it in our Task Force Report.
- Chief Justice McCormack's comments: Dr. Shelton's report would be helpful and let's set aside some time on maybe the next agenda to talk about what he knows and what to do with that in the report.
 - Dr. Jeffrey Jentzen comments: It seems behavioral experts would also come under areas of accreditation and certification and other forms of documentation. So, it would be included in the survey, it's a matter of finding those experts and identifying who they actually are.
 - Mr. Nye's response: He is more than happy to include whatever the Task Force wants, but he would need more information about who the participants would be that would respond to the survey and what are some of the standard, certifications, and things like that so we can include that information in the survey.
 - Chief Justice McCormack: Let's have a larger discussion at the next meeting about what to do with the behavioral science, especially expert testimony.
 - Judge Shelton comments that many behavioral science experts do not testify regularly and he does not believe there are accreditation standards that would apply in particular but could categorize the qualifications they need.
 - Mr. Wiese concurs with Judge Shelton and further adds that they often rely on such experts frequently in domestic violence cases to talk about the dynamics of domestic violence. Believes it would be difficult to survey.
 - Ms. Lori Montgomery question: Is there a way for us to get a list of who we currently have for the survey just to make sure that people who've been used in the past are on the list?
 - Mr. Nye's response: Mr. Nye has tabled the process of the list of potential survey participants because we, The Michigan State Police Forensic Science Division, have within our accreditation documentation a statement saying we have to ask permission to share information about our customers or those that request service from us. This is something that hasn't been thought over or dealt with yet. This is going to have to be rectified pretty soon as to whether we can make our customer list a public document.
 - Chief Justice's comment: We will circle back to Ms. Montgomery's question.

IX. Subcommittee Report-out and Discussion

- State of Forensic Science in Michigan – Chair: Mr. Jeff Nye
 - Survey presentation provided and discussed
- Commissions Review – Chair: Mr. Christopher Bommarito (Ms. Lori Montgomery reporting)
 - Since the subcommittee has done a lot of work in the past and have come to consensus on quite a few areas, they created a survey for the Task Force members that will hopefully go out at the end of this week. This is just a survey and not a vote to simply get what the Task Force feels regarding the various issues, so they can pass the information on to the new reorganization subcommittee, so they'll have a better idea and a roadmap of where they can go and the things they have to spend time on versus the things already agreed to.
 - Ms. Montgomery advised: If there are any other subcommittees that would like questions posed to the whole Task Force, to email her by Friday so they can be added to the survey.
- Improving Practices – Chair: Dr. Ruth Smith
 - The subcommittee has been meeting every couple of weeks and the last few meetings have been focused on working on the survey for lab analysts to get a better idea of challenges lab analysts and various disciplines are facing. The subcommittee has been working with Mr. Dan Churchman from the State Police to put the survey together and the survey is at the point of final review. When the

subcommittee meets again on Friday, they have to start thinking about how they're going to get the survey out and who they will be sending it to.

- Credentialing – Chair: Dr. Jeffrey Jentzen
 - Subcommittee has not met since their last meeting. Pointed to the minutes from the last meeting to see where they are at. The subcommittee has arrived at a basic consensus on mandatory testing and that current accreditation mechanisms are sufficient. But it's the independent practitioners that are not part of a public organization where there is an area of concern.
- Education and Application of Forensic Science – Chair: Hon. (ret.) Dr. Donald Shelton
 - The subcommittee has not met. Currently looking at a couple of states that have adopted, or about to adopt, jury instructions relating to expert forensic science testimony. Information is being gathered and will be distributed.
- Reporting, Testimony, and Rules of Evidence – Chair: Mr. Matthew Wiese
 - The subcommittee has not met. Referred Task Force members to the previous meeting minutes. Mr. Wiese expressed his support of merging with the education subcommittee in the restructure and of Judge Shelton's comments about jury instructions and also uniform language, testimony, education, and training. Looks forward to being a part of that subcommittee and the work going forward.
- Negligence, Misconduct, and Misapplication Reporting – Chair: Senator Stephanie Chang (Caitlin Stadler reporting)
 - The subcommittee has not met since the last Task Force meeting, but they were discussing the grievance procedure and complaints. The subcommittee had not reached consensus yet, but the last Task Force meeting gave a lot of insight into how other Task Force members felt, thought about the grievance system, and the importance of it. The subcommittee is looking at working on that in the new subcommittee.
- Post-Conviction Notifications – Chair: Ms. Lori Montgomery (AG's Office)
 - The subcommittee has not met because they are waiting on the survey. The subcommittee has three questions in the survey in regard to how people notify people post-conviction. They have a road map on what they want but are stuck on what's currently happening until the survey comes back.

X. Subcommittee Restructure

- Chief Justice McCormack comments: Some Task Force may have already figured out where they may fit, where they work fits pretty naturally while others might assume they fit in more than one place, and some probably might be interested in serving on one of the subcommittees that might not necessarily fit with what you do or what you've done so far. That is all okay. Task Force members were asked to either let them know in the meeting chat right now if they already know what you want to do and where you want to serve, or you can let us know by email sooner rather than later, hopefully by sometime tomorrow. Otherwise, members will be divided up in the way that makes sense. Of course, this can be reconsidered as none of this has to be decided permanently by tomorrow.
- Motion to approve the subcommittee reorganization as proposed with the addendum that (1a) and (1b) be combined into one subcommittee was given by Hon. (ret.) Dr. Donald Shelton and seconded by Mr. Matthew Wiese.
- With no discussion, the subcommittee reorganization was approved with 13 Yeas, 0 Nays, and 0 Abstained.
- Colonel Gasper thanked Jeff and Jonathan in particular for all of their work to present the reorganization.

XI. Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 – 9:30 a.m.

- This meeting will be in-person with a remote option

XII. Adjournment

- Meeting was adjourned by Chief Justice Bridget M. McCormack at 11:13 a.m.