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Toxicology - over the last 10 years

- 2004 – NHTSA and the National Safety Council’s Committee on Alcohol & Other Drugs* held a meeting of toxicologists, DRE’s, and prosecutors

- “Priorities and strategies for improving the investigation, use of toxicology results, and prosecution of drug-impaired driving cases”

- Following: A Survey of labs supporting DRE programs
Toxicology - over the last 10 years

  - Proposed scope of testing and cut-offs for blood and urine
- 2012 - Resurvey of Labs
- 2013 - updated publication: “Recommendations for Toxicological Investigation of Drug Impaired Driving and Motor Vehicle Fatalities”
Why was 2007 a Failure?

Survey of DUI Tox Labs (2012)

- 96 respondents: state 45%, county 16%, private 13%, regional 11%, hospital 6%, municipal 5%, university 4%
- Survey included staffing levels, caseload, turnaround time, training, and testimony
- Labs were asked to compare their current testing protocols to the 2007 recommendations
Reasons for not meeting the recommendations

- (multiple reasons allowed, 57 responded)
- Lack staffing 40%
- Lack appropriate instrument technology 37%
- Lack instrument capacity 33%
- Do not agree with recommendations 30%
- Methods are not validated 28%
- Other 37% - state statutes, do not quantitate, etc
### Top Priorities for additional resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Instruments</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening Instruments</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility / Upgrade or new</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overcoming these hurdles

- Forensic Toxicology Community
  - Education & Training
  - *Practical, efficient workflows*
  - *Method Sharing*
  - Continued research and data collection on drug effects and driving
  - Engaging Traffic Safety Partners
  - *Forging partnerships outside of our community*
Hurdles Specific to OSHP

Reasons for not meeting the recommendations

- Lack appropriate instrument technology
- Lack staffing
- Lack instrument capacity
- State statutes – per se values
Our Goals - OSHP

• Expansion of our testing menu and capabilities.
• Streamline our processes
• To not throw more people at the problem
  • Do more with Less
Building for the Future

• What does it take to expand your testing menu?
  • Knowledge of the need to expand
  • Development (1 week – several months)
  • Validation (6-8 weeks)
  • Training of staff (?)
  • Considerable financial commitment from stakeholders
  • Instrumentation concerns
Our Goals

- PinPoint Testing, LLC brought on as a consultant in January 2015.
- Established method and testing expansion
- Validation Phase began April 2015
- Continued partnership continues to expand the lab capabilities and service to state of Ohio.
Benefits

- People problem = eliminated
- Testing brought online faster than ever before
- The value of different perspectives/strategies
- Support from outside your walls
- Established partnership has brought several labs together for a common goal.
Lessons Learned

- Important to pitch this correctly to your stakeholders
  - Cost/Savings analysis
- Select the **right** partner
- Understand **your** strengths and weaknesses
- Be prepared for bumps along the way
- Communicate frequently
- Embrace technology in your lab
Joseph O. Jones  
Crime Lab Director - Drug Toxicology  
Ohio State Highway Patrol Crime Lab  
(614)466-4790  
jojones@dps.state.oh.us