

Transcript - From Call to Court: How Technology is Revolutionizing Crime Solving

Welcome, everyone, to the National Criminal Justice Training Center webinar. Our topic today is *From Call to Court-- How Technology is Revolutionizing Crime Solving*. My name is Katie Koleske, and I will be your moderator for today.

Don't miss these upcoming training offerings. To register or view the most current dates and times, please visit ncjtc.org/contracting.

Today's webinar is brought to you by NCJTC and NW3C. The National White Collar Crime Center-- NW3C-- and the National Criminal Justice Training Center of Fox Valley Technical College-- NCJTC-- are pleased to announce their partnership in hosting the *Solving Crimes Through Emerging Technologies Conference*, taking place from January 13th through the 15th, 2026, in Las Vegas, Nevada. Two great organizations coming together with one great mission.

Today's presenters will be part of our *2026 Solving Crimes Emerging Technologies Conference* that will be held in Las Vegas, Nevada, January 13th through the 15th, 2026. Please join us at our conference to learn more. We will bring law enforcement professionals and industry leaders together to explore emerging Internet of Things-- IoT-- technologies, discover investigative methods, and consider how navigating the landscape of the IoT can help solve crimes and make communities safer. To view this conference and other current conference offerings, please visit ncjtc.org/conferences.

Poll questions will be asked during the webinar. Let's try our first poll question. The question is, which of the following best describes your current role or affiliation? Professional support staff and public safety, victim services, victim advocate, court/judicial, sworn active law enforcement, retired, but still supporting the mission, community member or private industry supporting law enforcement, or other?

We have about 45% of people as sworn and active law enforcement, and 17% with professional support in public safety, 9% with victim services and victim advocate, 8% with court/judicial, 5% with retired, but still supporting the mission, and 1% with community member and other supportive services, and 14% is other. Thank you for participating.

We are very pleased to introduce you to our presenters today. With us, we have Detective Paul Kroshus and Major Ed O'Carroll. Thanks for joining us, Paul and Ed. The time is now yours.

Great. Thank you very much, Katie and to the NCJTC team. You all do incredible work in helping the profession, the law enforcement profession, no matter the assignment, the duty, or the responsibility. So Paul and I are very thankful for NCJTC, but also very thankful for all the attendees.

It was really exciting to look at all the assignments and tasks and duties and responsibilities that popped up in that most recent poll. That's terrific. Love seeing victim services, the analyst community, prosecutors, the hard-working detectives, and advocates that are out there or those in private industry supporting the mission. And all the folks that are jumping in on the chat, thanks for sharing where you're from and what brings you to this webinar.

I'm excited to report that we have over 400 attendees registered for the webinar. And I'm sure there's going to be some no shows because the profession that we're in is busy. It's very busy. And I'm sure there's some that signed up, but are called out to serve the community in a violent crime or property crime, or duty or responsibility, or maybe need to be in a courtroom and meet with the victim's family. So there's a lot of distractions.

But I want to take the first slide and talk about your leadership. Thank you for answering the call to join us on this webinar, learn a little bit more about NCJTC, a little bit more about where technology is helping in that crime fight. Because I think the answer is embracing tech to get important answers in those cases. That's what it's all about.

And although, as Katie mentioned in the introduction, I proudly served with the Fairfax County, Virginia Police Department. And I did see Virginia Beach up on the chat. Virginia Beach, welcome. Virgin Islands, Washington state. It's great to see folks from all over.

I'll actually be in Virginia Beach in a couple of weeks, teaching the Virginia Beach Police Department on some genetic genealogy.

And Katie mentioned some of the courses that NCJTC offers. Most notably is next month, I'll be in Texas teaching genetic genealogy. So your leadership, no matter the assignment, the duty, the responsibility, the color of your shield, whether it's silver or gold or pink for Breast Cancer Awareness Month, we're all in this together. We have an awesome responsibility to work for the victims that have entrusted us to get justice for them.

So I'm going to turn back the clock a little bit and jump right into a brief genetic genealogy discussion. So NCJTC supports this training. As I mentioned, we have one coming up in a couple of weeks. I just did two last month in Michigan. I saw Michigan on the list. And here in Colorado, actually, outside the Denver suburbs.

But this screenshot might look familiar, especially the photo on the left. So that's Joseph DeAngelo.

When we talk about historical cases or current cases, it's vitally important for us to get justice for those victims that we work for, not closure. I often bring up in my trainings, that our mission is not about closure. Closure is owned by the victim and the victim's family. Those that are impacted by crime. We may deliver justice, but it's not our term to define. It's up to the family to say whether or not we have delivered closure.

We might do resolution. We might do justice. But we're on a mission to get answers. So this is a case that went unsolved for decades, decades, and decades. And only seven years ago, in 2018, this case changed law enforcement for the better. It gave you crime-fighting tools to solve crime.

Now, Joseph DeAngelo was a monster. He was a killer. He was a rapist. He was a burglar. And he was a police officer-- former police officer that invaded people's homes and committed the most heinous of crimes. And Paul's going to have a pretty extensive case study here in a little bit talking about how technology is changing the answers for us.

Genetic genealogy solved this crime. And that's actually Joseph DeAngelo with a mustache in the lower right-hand corner, some sketches that were done. And we had a sketch artist in my department, very effective back in the day, but it's only as effective as when these tools come in.

So I have a question. We talk about digital evidence, in particular. We talk about the crime fight. We're going to do a poll.

So our next poll question, do you currently have a backlog of digital evidence in your agency? If so, how long is the average delay? No backlog, 2 to 10 days, 11 to 30 days, one to three months, four to six months, more than six months, not applicable, I'm not aware or prefer not to share?

As you can see from the results, we have about 40% not aware, prefer not to share. Coming in second is 2 to 10 days and then following after that, 13% with one to three months.

Thank you, Katie. I appreciate that.

Very important for us to understand where we are in-- where technology may be at times slows us down or bogs us down. Oftentimes, what I've heard in visiting agencies, both large, medium-sized, and small, is that they're drowning in data. So similar to the Golden State Killer case-- the slide that was up a little bit ago with Joseph DeAngelo-- that was a massive investigation. So much data.

And you know what wasn't in there? Was the name Joseph DeAngelo. And oftentimes, we see that in current cases. When we have witness identification or tips coming in through Crime Stoppers or Crime Solvers, they lead us a little bit astray. So the answers are there. Similar to Joseph DeAngelo, Golden State, the DNA was there. Not so much digital obviously back in the '70s when he was on his crime spree, but what we see in today's investigation, there's so much digital data.

I say, and I firmly believe this, every case is solvable. Every case is solvable. That we can further an investigation. The answers are there. So how do we sort through what we have? Because we have a lot.

On these search warrants that you're executing, we're not getting one or two devices. We're getting 12, 14, 31. There's so many Internet of Things, or IoT, connected devices. And it's making our job, in some ways, a little bit more complicated, but it's giving us more investigative leads. So that poll question that Katie went over was an effort for us to get an idea. Are we waiting days or weeks or months to get investigative leads?

And we need them soon. Because the sooner we get them, the sooner we can start moving towards seeking justice, finding those that are responsible, clearing the innocent that are sometimes the focus of an investigation. So digital evidence is a big part of investigations, just like DNA. It's enormous what is out there and how it connects us to the suspect or suspects or the investigative leads.

So with that, we actually just want to come over and go through this quick poll question to get a better idea of some of the challenges. Katie, I'll turn it back over to you.

Yes. What's your biggest challenge when it comes to leveraging technology in investigations? Your choices are, budget constraints, lack of trained personnel, outdated or limited technology, too many data sources, not enough time, or executive support for funding/embracing technology.

From the results, we have 29% lack of trained personnel, following with 26% budget constraints, 19% with too many data sources, not enough time, 18% outdated or limited technology, and 8% executive support for funding/embracing technology.

Thank you, Katie. Looking at those results, but those responses is exactly what I see when I visit enforcement agencies.

But I will tell you, there are grants out there. If you're struggling over a digital challenge that you may have, there is grant money available to agencies, large and small, to help fund training personnel, getting the important equipment. Because one of the things we want to do is increase our solve rates. Every crime is solvable.

Interesting-- and both these slides depict really-- both these graphics depict the same detail is nationally, our homicide solve rate has dropped from the 1960s. Back in '65 or so-- if you look on the chart on the right-- our solve rate nationally was over 90%. And in 2025, we sit at just shy of 60% of a national solve rate. So that means 40% of homicides go unsolved.

But we can do better, and it's not for a lack of trying. Everyone on this webinar, because of your leadership, you're trying. You try hard. That's probably why you signed up is to the points that we just got out of this last poll question, is that we're struggling over training our people. As soon as they get trained, they get promoted or transferred or retire. Getting executives to support us in the crime fight-- how do we seek that support? So we need to increase our solve rates. These cases are so important.

This is one of the homicides when I was Bureau Chief of Major Crimes in Fairfax County, Virginia. A 73-year-old man gunned down at the ATM, 5:20 in the morning by a juvenile. Single shot right to the chest. Robbery gone bad. This case is no different than what we see across the country.

And you have examples in your jurisdiction. This is an important case. Every case is important. And it's tough because we're short staffed. The national trend in my agency when I retired, in 2023-- so just about two years ago-- I was a 205th vacancy on my department. And it's tough to fight crime when you're down 200 hardworking cops. And we had vacancies in our professional staff positions.

And I see the chat with prosecutors. Thanks for being here. I know you're struggling with the cases that we're sending you and discovery and all the things that are so important, so we're fair to the defendant, we exonerate those that are wrongfully accused, and get to those answers. So we're struggling with a staffing crisis in the profession. But where we can help out here and help out in justice is looking at tech.

So a couple of news stories from 2022. They resonate today. There's some surveys out there that law enforcement oftentimes is overwhelmed with digital evidence. There are workflows that are coming to the profession that are here.

I'll give you an example. Metro Nashville, no backlog. Fairfax County, largely cleared our backlog that we can get answers in hours or the next day. A detective walks in and the answers are there. So digital is important.

Everything that we do in a case is important because we're supporting those victims. We're in the crime fight together. Both the analysts, the team, the detectives, all those responsible for pulling the puzzle pieces together and getting these monsters off the street that take advantage of our vulnerabilities as a community. So we do need to leverage limited personnel, oftentimes, and embrace technologies that work.

Because when a case comes to your community-- and you remember this graphic from New York City. when crime happens, we spring into action. We spring into action to get answers for those that are targeted, those that are victims, the families that are impacted.

Now, there are cases that get national attention, and this one did. And law enforcement sprang into action. Look for community support. You look for all the leads on the digital side through the cameras and cell towers and the digital footprint that's left behind and partnerships with the community to get tips in, so our hard-working crime fighters can get answers in the important cases that they're assigned. A door puller tonight is a trigger puller tomorrow. If we have an impact on lower level crime, we're going to have an impact on more serious crime.

So two final comments, and Paul is getting ready to take the microphone.

We can prevent tomorrow's victims by solving today's cases. Today's crime, if it's solvable, will make a positive impact on your solve rates-- I don't like to say closure rates, but solve rates-- but also getting these monsters identified, through the justice system onto the prosecutors that are on this call or your DA, or-- where I hail from-- a commonwealth attorney, get the case to the prosecutor before a judge. The judge or a jury is likely looking for digital evidence and DNA, the CSI effect. They want the validation from the science community in addition to, maybe, witness identification and all the puzzle pieces coming together.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Paul, to take the microphone, go through a very interesting case study. We do have a couple of more poll questions throughout the seminar. Feel free to drop some notes in the chat. And towards the end is when Paul and I are going to put our information up, because we're going to be available. You're not alone on your journey. And with that, Paul.

All right. So I'm going to be talking about a case that's actually a 2021 case. I'd say my journey in the digital evidence side of things has kind of been an evolution since, probably, about 2017-2018 time frame. And it just keeps growing and growing. And obviously, the amount of digital footprints that are out there just keeps expanding, and that gives us a lot of really good stuff that we can go after. Sometimes, it's not just proving who was there, who did what, but it provides that corroborative evidence. because when we get a lot of conflicting statements in a case, which we obviously see quite a bit, the digital side can really put more credit on who's being more truthful.

So this is a case. It was a neighborhood shootout. I'll give you just a real short backdrop before I get into it, so it doesn't get too confusing. But it was a graduation party in our city back in 2021. So it was June, right after school let out.

We've got two opposing groups that come together at this party. There's a fight that breaks out, and then, obviously, the one group wants to escalate things, it turns into a drive-by shooting, and then that drive-by shooting gets escalated and it turns into a neighborhood shootout.

So our case kicks off at about 10:43 PM. We get multiple 911 calls that start coming in. Some of the callers are giving us names of who might be involved. They're telling us about the vehicles that might be involved.

I'm going to play one of the 911 audio. So this is actually from inside the car. We obviously had a deceased person on this. It was a 14-year-old local kid. So this 911 call came from the car where he was in.

911, what's the address of your emergency?

Come here! Come here! Hey! My cousin died! My cousin! My cousin, he's dying out here in the parking lot. My cousin, he just got shot out there. My cousin got shot.

Your car is being-- what is going on with your car?

Just got shot!

Your car got-- what did you-- what's going on?

We gotta [AUDIO OUT]. Come on. Open the fucking door. open the door. Come on. Fucking door! Come on! Come on, come on, come on, come on.

Hello, I need someone to tell me what's going on.

[PANICKED GIBBERISH]

Hello? Hello? I need someone to tell me what's going on.

Help me! Help me! Help me! Help me!

So, I mean, it kind of helps signify some of the chaos that's coming in. Our cops are able to-- through the multiple 911 calls, they get at least a little bit of information. We know that there is multiple vehicles involved. We've got multiple different people involved. Lots of people with guns. There's lots of shooting going on.

Ultimately, we end up discovering, after a vehicle pursuit, that one of our involved people is a 14-year-old, who was shot and killed. I'm going to play a little segment from one of our responding squads, from his squad camera. Just again, you can hear-- I clipped it. It was much too long of a video for a presentation like this, but I clipped it together, just again, to put that visual of some of the chaos that we're all familiar with when we get a scene like this.

Since that truck ended up being going through that area. Several shots heard with vehicle horn. Possibly undercover back. Still on the scene. That's 13 year finger on the last name. He left in a white Tahoe, a white Tahoe.

That's still nothing going.

No signal. Making a right turn.

We have a pass. We have him there.

Go ahead to the car.

Show me your fucking hands! Keep-- we got someone shot in the back. 71.

71-31.

So I clipped some of this stuff together there, but you can see, the officers from Saint Paul PD, our neighboring agency to the west, at the end, they're pulling out our 14-year-old victim. The guy fleeing in this car was actually the stepdad of this young kid. And he was trying to get him to the hospital, which was at least part of the reason related to the pursuit outside of the fact that he was just involved in a drive-by shooting.

So, I mean, we've got the initial chaos of this type of thing. You see that from the 911 calls, that initial response, just kind of setting the stage of what we're looking at here. We've got 30 high school-aged witnesses that are on scene. Not all of them really want to talk to us. We're getting some conflicting information from them.

We've got our involved people that we're starting to identify. We've got our victims that we're starting to identify. We're getting conflicting stories from them.

Ultimately, as we're going through this, we're able to identify that our white Tahoe was actually the initial shooting vehicle. So it was reported that it was creeping through the neighborhood, windows rolled down. It opened, fired, and then that's when the gun battle started. That's when people started dropping to the ground and hiding, running away, and stuff like that.

So we really have a couple different crime scenes that we're looking at with this. We've got that-- obviously, the homicide of this 14-year-old, Demaris. And then we've got this drive-by shooting. And then we've got just some other potential scene chaos that is all unfolding that we're trying to work through.

And again, the statements are great. I know that there's prosecutors that are on this. And we know that when we get statements, that's a really good thing. But when we're able to back that up with some digital forensics and some other things that are a little less in dispute than a person's word, and we can corroborate those witnesses, it really makes a lot more of a case that you can really bring forward when we're looking at the potential for a jury trial. And obviously, you get a homicide involved and there's a pretty high likelihood that this is something that's going to end up in a trial. And we want to have as much as we possibly can.

We don't necessarily need every single bit of digital evidence for every single case that we ever work. I use this stuff on most of the things that I do. I always am trying to look for ways to corroborate my cases above and beyond. But when you do have a homicide, that's when you pull all the stops and you try to get everything and anything that's potentially out there.

So our players involved in this, we got this white Tahoe. In his initial statement-- this is Keith Dawson. He was a stepdad of Demaris, who's our gunshot victim. His initial statement and some of the initial statements from the kids that were involved on the victim side was that they were assaulted at this party, they tried to leave, and then they got shot up as they were leaving the neighborhood.

What we noticed pretty quickly on this car, the front passenger side window is shot out. There's some bullet holes that are in this car. All of those bullet holes that are in this car are bullets that are going out of the car. So they're not bullets that are actually coming back into the car. There's first, I guess, problem number one for this.

As we start seeing some of the inconsistencies, we start piecing all of these different interviews that we're getting together. So we're starting to put all this stuff and see, OK, we've got these different conflicting sides of what's really happening here.

He had obviously had a gun that was involved in that shooting. We were able again on that physical side-- because this is a blending of our physical crime scene, some of the traditional methods, and then enhancing that and adding to that, these corroborative things from our digital crime scene that is kind of around, as well.

So on the ballistics, we're able to later-- we recovered this handgun nearby. It was thrown out the window while he was fleeing. We're DNA testing. We link it back to this. Keith Dawson. We're also able to ballistically prove that this is the weapon that had been fired with recovering rounds, the shell casings, the inside of his car when he was arrested was covered in shell casings. So that initial statement that they were in this car wasn't quite driving up. And that's where we got introduced to hey, there's actually this other car that's involved.

So these two kids that are on the lower left on your screen there, that's Davion and Demaris. The younger one is Demaris. He's our 14-year-old that was ultimately killed. We start figuring out there's five occupants in this car.

Demaris was the back seat, middle passenger. And as we start using the trajectory rods and that type of stuff, when we process this vehicle, we were able to see that the fatal round that was fired into this car went through that license plate and then up through the trunk compartment and then into his body.

On the autopsy side of things, he took one single gunshot. It was in his mid-back. He was leaning forward in the vehicle, ducking down as they were taking rounds coming at them as they were speeding down the street. That caused the bullet to ravage around inside his chest cavity with his heart and lungs. The bullet lodged into his shoulder and no exit wound. And ultimately, he had seconds to live before he died.

So as we start working through these cases and we're saying, OK, we've got this drive-by shooter, we've got these other kids that are involved, we've got a death related on this side, so who are the shooters that ultimately killed Demaris? And that's where we identify these other people.

So Xavier Hudson was very well-known to a lot of people at the party. He was kind of leader of a group. This BSM, he said it was Bad Side Music. His hooded sweatshirt, you might not be able to read it, but it says Bad Side Mafia. He was-- essentially, it kind of boils down to gang conflicts between local gangs of these young kids.

So we've got Xavier Hudson. We've got Enrique Davilla that we ultimately identify later. And then we've got this Jaden Townsend. So at the time of our report, we were told there was three shooters. We had a whole lot of rounds that were found in the neighborhood. Ultimately, as we work through this and figured it out, we figured out that only two of these guys actually discharged weapons and only two that we could prove actually had weapons.

So what actually happened on this whole thing, and why? As we start working through our crime scene, so we got a graduation party. It's an open invitation that's put out there. That time of year. Hey, come over, hang out. We're kind of sending each other off to college or what's next in life.

We've got these two conflicting groups. They show up at the party. Group one is made up of Xavier, Jaden, Enrique, Alexis-- Xavier's girlfriend-- and there's some others that kind of form this group one. Davion, Demaris are brothers and then them and their friends kind of form group two.

We've got Jaden, who ultimately approaches this Davion kid at the party. They were kind of giving each other the eye and whatever during the non-verbal cues of something's about to start and something's about to kick off during the party. So the group two people start making their way to leave because they don't want to deal with it.

This Jaden kid comes up, punches him in the face, tries to rob him. And while this is going on, Enrique pulls out this gun, and it's described by Davion, as a black and tan handgun with a green laser beam on it.

While that's going on, Demaris makes a phone call to his stepdad, which is Keith Dawson. He's our white Tahoe driver. So he says, hey, we need help. He's getting jumped. They got a gun, blah, blah, blah. Group two ultimately leaves after that altercation. And then they go nearby, and they meet in the parking lot with Keith.

So Dawson's driving that white Tahoe. The group two is in this silver Kia. They leave the party, and they end up rallying at a nearby business and parking lot, and they start forming their retaliation. Because their logical next step on, hey, these bad things just happened is to escalate it into more violence.

So our group two, we get Dawson. HE meets with them in the neighborhood. He wants to go back to the party and confront this group, take care of business. He ultimately pulls into the neighborhood, finds group one, who are about to leave, standing next to a Dodge Durango and a little red sedan. And then that's where he opens fire. And he shoots seven rounds off during his drive-by. Speeds off.

According to Keith and his statement, initially, the kids in the Kia, his two stepsons, were only supposed to show him what street to drive down, and he was going to do the rest. They were not supposed to follow him. Whether that's true or not, I don't know.

I think it's pretty obvious that Davion, Demaris, and all of those kids probably knew what Keith was going to do, or at least had a decent idea that this was going to probably turn into a shooting and a drive-by of some sort. Once that shooting occurs, group one, which they already knew was armed, they pull out their guns and it is the shootout off. It's kicked off.

So we've got Xavier, Enrique. Ultimately, they fire over 40 rounds in the direction of Dawson. The problematic part there is this Kia is between the bullets and the guns and the fleeing Tahoe driving down the street. So one of these bullets goes through that Kia. It actually took multiple rounds, but one of them goes through that license plate and ultimately kills Demaris in the back seat. We did eventually prove that it was Davilla, through ballistics, that his weapon was the one that fired that fatal gunshot.

So, Dawson, they get down to the end of the street. They jump into a park. That's where that 911 call happened, as they were transferring Demaris out of the Kia and into Keith Dawson's car. And then that's where he was trying to get him to the hospital.

Group one then flees the scene. We locate Dawson as he's fleeing, and that's where the chase is on. So in our neighborhood, on that physical crime scene side, this blue house with the white tree, that's the party for the graduation. About where that silver vehicle is on the curve of the street, that's where Xavier and his friends had parked their car. That's where they were set up at the time. And that's where the drive-by shooting initially kicked off.

So as we start mapping this stuff out on our physical crime scene, we can say, all right, this is where the initial confrontation would have occurred. This is where the initial drive-by shooting would have occurred. Keith Dawson is rolling by. He's firing out of his vehicle, shoots out his window, puts a couple rounds through his own car as he's shooting in the direction of these guys. His claim was that he only wanted to scare them so that they would stop messing with his kids.

And then as he flees down the street, our Kia goes flying after it. And then that's where Xavier and Enrique pull out their guns, and then they just start blasting until they're pretty much empty. And they were rolling with the extended mag, so they had plenty of ammunition and they threw it all downrange.

Our physical crime scene, as we start looking at, how are we going to process all of this? It was obviously an entire neighborhood. We've got 9 millimeter rounds that are going everywhere. We've got all different kind of ammo brands from the shell casings. So we're trying to identify all the paths of travel. We're documenting all the trees they shot, all the vehicles they shot.

We probably were real close to having a couple additional homicides with bullets going into houses within 2 feet of where a guy was sitting in a recliner watching TV and where a kid was laying in bed at the end of the night. So there's a lot of additional scenes that we're processing on that physical scene side of things.

On our digital crime scene-- so this is something that I didn't really know back then, but we can take those internet modems that are in the house. And what does that give us? Well, it'll tell us, what devices are maybe connected to that home Wi-Fi. Even if the device doesn't connect to the home Wi-Fi, there's still an interaction between a person's cell phone, which everybody carries, right? Or at least most people. There's still an interaction between those electronic devices and the modem, where they might just say hi to each other. The same thing with Bluetooth.

So these are considerations as we keep progressing forward in this digital age that we got to be thinking about as potential evidence. Especially when you have a whodunit, where you don't know who your bad guys are, this is a potential way at least to try to rule stuff out or maybe rule somebody in. We've got Ring cameras everywhere. Our city's got a ton of Ring cameras all over. So we start doing neighborhood canvasses, and it's everywhere. It's expanding through the entire street and any street that we can figure out, these people may or may not have driven down to either rule in or out, as we can start tracking their path of travel.

Where did they go afterwards? When did they come into the neighborhood? What is on the video for that?

State Patrol intersection cameras. We got highway cameras everywhere. So we can start getting access to those and start seeing, what do we see? Are we able to start tracking people and backtrack and say, all right, here's their vehicle at this intersection at this time?

Same thing with nearby businesses. The outside security cameras, if they're up and they're functioning, there might be something that's caught on there that will help us build some of that timeline. And again, the important thing with this case is that timeline is really corroborating the statements that we're getting from both sides of this story, along with our independent witnesses.

You look at cell phone tower dumps. What devices were communicating with those cell towers in the area during the crime? And again, you're going to get a really big list. But if you can start narrowing stuff down that way, it's huge.

Back in this time, Google-- also, we could do GEO Fence warrants. Google claims that they don't store that information. They don't record and document that. I think we all know that that's probably, not true, but Google's not wanting to give us that data anymore.

We also have our OSINT, our open source methods. And these are all our considerations. Anything and everything that we could possibly do digitally that helps us prove the who, what, where, or the when on our case. And it might be different for each case. You might not need every component for everything. You might have so many different independent witnesses that you're really able to say, I don't really need the where, because I know where this occurred. I know when this occurred based on the 911 calls, and all of that. But what occurred and who was involved, maybe that's the important part, or it could be other factors in there.

On the search warrants, obviously, so we're getting these guys identified through our witness statements. We know Xavier is involved and Jaden. Then we got this unknown guy with face tattoos, and the face tattoo part really was helpful for us because we were able to pretty easily and quickly identify at least a potential suspect for Enrique. We do the photo lineup to our witnesses and confirm that that's him.

And again, the ballistics ultimately proved only two guns were fired, but we still got to prove which two of these three And our prosecutors know that. We got three different guys that might be involved in this. Are they going to start changing their story once testimony starts? Everybody says, no, this guy wasn't involved. But then when they get on the stand, everybody points the finger at a guy who's maybe case already got resolved. So we had to be very, very careful as we worked through this as well, with that factor.

Who is Enrique? Well, he's got lots of rap videos that he's posted on YouTube. He's trying to be a rapper-- sorry-- Xavier. All the videos that this kid puts out there is guns everywhere. He is very much known to always be armed. He's got lots of police contacts in our community, so he's a known kid, and he's known to be problematic, and he's known to be violent.

When we look at the search warrant to his house, once his name was thrown out there, the-- Oakdale is a city just to the north of us. They put their cops out on his house. We started getting the SWAT team involved so they could set up and secure the area.

We've got that Durango sitting in the driveway, along with the little red car that had fled the neighborhood. So we got the cars there. So we ended up ultimately doing a search warrant there after we held the house, until we got the warrant signed. We've got the Durango is full of bullet holes. The other car didn't have damage on it, but our suspects are gone.

When we did get inside the house, we recover-- I found a duffel bag in the garage. In that, we've got multiple weapons. And ultimately, we're able to find ballistically, this black and tan gun with the green laser beam that was described by one of our victims. It's got the extended magazine. That's ultimately, what ballistically showed as the murder weapon.

And then we've got the other handgun, which is the one that Xavier had that was fired. So we're lucky that we were able to recover both of these weapons that were used in the crime and have those as part of our evidence.

So when we look at every phase, you get to, what's my objective? What have I got so far? What do I still need to get to put all these pieces of this case together?

So we've got our three suspects that are still outstanding. We do have Keith Dawson in jail. We've got him held on a drive-by shooting. And he was a convicted felon, so he can't have a gun. So we've got those charges related to him. And we're still trying to collect as much evidence as we can possibly get related to our homicide and proving those and corroborating those witness statements, as to who was involved and what else can we potentially prove and verify and validate related to all those statements.

So we start looking at some of the other digital stuff. So what else can we get? Not just for the evidence side of things, but for the apprehension side? We've got three guys that are at large. They're armed, we believe. We believe that there's danger related to the community because of this ongoing gang feud. So we exigent GPS PEN orders, following up with the regular PEN order.

We start going up on social media accounts, identifying their Snapchat, Facebook, Instagram, X, whatever we can find, to start getting search warrants into those. PEN orders into those, if appropriate.

The vehicles that we seized-- so we took this Tahoe. We did seize that. We seized all the cars that were involved. These cars were all older, but in today's day and age, there's a lot of information you can get out of vehicle telematics.

So if we're looking at a newer vehicle that might have some of those GPS functions, what Bluetooth devices are attaching to the car as it's moving around, those are good ways to get other additional evidence that, again, corroborates and supports. Sometimes that evidence might be how you're just proving in general that this person was involved in the crime and other times that might be just additional corroborative evidence. And again, when you're looking at a homicide case, you really want to pull in anything and everything that you possibly can.

So we got our surveillance that might be in the neighborhoods where we're looking at. Ring cameras, any other exterior surveillance cameras and the surrounding areas, trying to compile all of this stuff together. I think it's really important to, especially for our prosecutors that are listening, a lot of this, the presentation here that I'm talking through, this was what I testified to on this case when we went through a jury trial.

So when we start getting into the weeds on some of the digital forensics and what that looks like and how do you explain this to a jury of 12 that doesn't maybe have the same level of training and whatnot, you know, the PowerPoint style, at least in our area, has been really effective. And our county attorneys use it. Our cops use it. Our investigators around our area, a lot of them are going to this kind of approach, as far as putting these more complex cases together, because then I can not just talk about it, but you got a visual representation as you're explaining this to the jury, what does all this stuff mean? The picture equals thousand words, right?

So you can show this and say, hey, here are the cell phone records on this date. And here are all my bad guys and how they are coming together just prior to the shooting. They're kind of rallying at Xavier's house, which is that little blue pin at the top. Our Woodberry house where the shooting occurred is just down to the south of that. And you start building these timelines and showing those associations of when these devices are coming together, when they go apart, and when they and where they travel together during the time frame of when your crime is being committed.

And again, using some surveillance videos to start capturing and corroborating. So we're corroborating these cell phone locations by showing, here's our association of these cars coming into the area matching up with these cell phone records. So we kind of use that digital stuff that's out there to corroborate the other digital stuff that we're getting, which is also corroborating our witness statements. So we get a lot of really good corroboration on all of these things.

So our next poll question, which type of forensic evidence do you believe is currently the most underutilized in your or your agency's investigative strategy? Digital evidence, cartridge casings, DNA, video surveillance, none, we use all available resources effectively?

As you can see, we have 37% of folks, none, we use all available resources effectively, 35% digital evidence, then 12% video surveillance, 9% with DNA, and 7% cartridge casings.

So as we continue on, obviously we know that our cell phones can be huge when it comes to getting our different digital evidence that way. And the cell phone evidence has been around for probably a lot longer than some of the other things. But again, when you start combining all of these things together, when you've got the what do we get out of a phone?

OK, we are able to see in those phone exams, along with our call detail records-- like what I just showed before-- we can see that our one group is at the party. The other group then arrives after them. We can see that the assault occurred against Davion right around 10:15, 10:20, because then we've got the phone call going between Demaris and his stepdad, Keith Dawson, at around 10:20 PM. And then we're able to see that the group two leaves the party between 10:20, 10:25 and then they go meet with Dawson.

So as we start looking through those cell records and the CDR records, and we're tracking all of this stuff and looking at some of the nearby surveillance, we know that they met in a nearby parking lot. So we start getting some of these business surveillance videos and we're able to start tracking this movement of the Kia as it's coming in. And now, we've got the white Tahoe that's coming into the area. So we've got multiple different business security cameras that are able to show where these vehicles are meeting up and corroborate those statements and putting those pieces together.

And then we've got our white SUV right before the shooting. The street that he's on right now loops right down. It makes a curve, and then that is the next street down where the actual shooting occurred itself. And so we're tracking that video and then bam, we get right to the shooting at 10:43 PM.

When we start looking at neighborhood canvas stuff-- and again, this is one of our Ring videos. We got several of these. We're trying to track the movement of things. So right after the shooting occurs, we've got our Tahoe that goes fleeing by this Ring camera followed by the Kia. They get to the end of the road there. Again, that's when that 911 call comes in that I played at the beginning.

This gives us path of travel. It gives us some corroboration of timelines. It helps corroborate those other pieces of digital evidence we get. Now, we've got the Durango that's fleeing the area, along with the little red car that's leaving the area. So we start being able to put these paths of travel together, and it kind of just starts supporting everything else. So the more digital evidence we're able to build and put together, the more it starts to support each other.

And again, we jump back to some of these business cameras and our traffic cameras that are around in the area where we're able to show their paths of travel out. And as these paths of travels are captured on the cameras, we're able to corroborate that through data that we're pulling out of the cell phone, the physical devices itself, and corroborating that to the cell tower data that we're getting from the call detail records. And we're able to kind of-- again, everything is kind of validating itself, which is, again, just of helping provide that extra corroborative evidence in this. Ultimately, up to the point where just shortly after this last image here, where our patrol guys made that initial contact with this fleeing Tahoe, and then that's where that car chase ensued, that I played at the beginning.

So we start looking again, then at our devices, what their movements are, again, their associations, when they come together, when they leave. I do note in here, we got a T-Mobile anomaly. I don't know why, and I called T-Mobile and asked them why, one of my suspect phone's kept perpetually showing me a location that was very far away. The best answer I got was when he first opened that app, he was on a different tower, and there's just some kind of anomaly that goes with it. T-Mobile wouldn't give me anything in writing. I was a little worried about that. And when this goes to court, is it going to be something that is going to be brought up as an issue to try to raise doubt? Will the defense try to raise doubt to the validity of these call records?

So again, we're on the front side of it with our case. We just put it in there, and said, we don't know what this anomaly is, but it would ping off of this tower, and then it would show where the device actually was.

So documenting those things, when you get weird stuff that doesn't make a lot of sense and try to figure it out. If you can't figure it out, it is what it is, right? So, it doesn't invalidate anything.

After the shooting, we're able to see that all these devices are now converging. So these are all our involved people. The other name on there, the Susan name, that's Xavier's mom. She had some after-the-fact involvement in this case. But you see the devices are converging. That corroborates the vehicles that were recovered there. And also is important for the recovery of those handguns that were involved in the shooting, that they had those guns. They were at the shooting. They go to the house. Now, these guns are found at the house.

After the shooting occurred, we get lots of phones that start turning off as we're going up on emergency orders. We ultimately were able to find out that Xavier, his mom, and his girlfriend, they fled the state, crossed the river over into Wisconsin, where they hid out for the night.

I don't know if I mentioned this earlier. Again, this this was just, probably, six months prior to me really getting in to understanding what RTT and timing advance data could do. And so I didn't get any of that data on this case. This image is not from this investigation. I use this all the time now. I mean, the timing advanced records that are out there are so important. They're so valuable. I think even maybe more so than a PEN order. In the 2,000 meter radius, you might get on a PEN order, if you get the timing advanced records that go along with that, especially when you're looking for a missing person or a wanted fugitive, it's engineering records, essentially is what it is.

You get the arc, you get the tower and the direction, so it knows this many distance in feet or meters from this location of the cell tower, along this direction of that antenna on the top of the cell tower. And when you get two different cell towers, they basically form an X, like an X marks the spot on a treasure map. And that is going to be very accurate and close to where that device actually is going to be.

If I had, had this earlier on this, we would have had all three of our-- well, maybe not all three, but at least two of our wanted three people in custody probably within days, instead of it dragging out for a couple of weeks.

So we look at videos, as well. So we'll play this with court exhibits, where you can see the movement over the period of time as to these devices-- how they come together, how they separate, when they get powered off. Everybody decided after the shooting that they were they're powering their phones off. Some of our people ended up dumping their phone all together shortly after the shooting, because they're doing everything they can. They know the law enforcement can track them that way. And some of them are more savvy than others to shut down that technology because they know that we can in some ways use that technology to track them, find them, apprehend them. And there's evidence that's going to be potentially related to that.

So the PEN orders, we're looking at, OK, we're going up on phones. Obviously, we always get our curveballs and sometimes you end up on the wrong phone because you had bad information. That happened on this case. It is what it is. We figured it out. We moved on.

And then we also did one for Xavier's girlfriend. So we were up on the wrong phone for him. We figured it out. And then we also went up on his girlfriend's phone because they were allegedly always together.

On his apprehension, we start tracking him when we did get that right phone number. Of course, as soon as we go up on it and we're able to start tracking it, playing the phone turned on, phone turned off game, he was out of the state and he was mobile. And so we were able to track that he did a 23-hour drive straight out of Minnesota all the way down to Tampa, Florida. So we tracked him down there. We were monitoring. We weren't sure what he was going to do from there.

We started working with Tampa PD to see if they were going to be able to maybe help us find this needle in a haystack down in Florida. But he didn't stay there very long. They literally drove 23 hours down there. They were only there to sleep in a hotel overnight one night. And the next day, he started driving back north.

And so, because they drove all the way straight through down, we were like, well, maybe he'll drive all the way straight through back. Once he committed north of Chicago, we were able to identify he's going to come into the Minneapolis-Saint Paul area through I-94. We started taking our investigative crew, and we just drove east. And we got a couple hours about-- I think I was the furthest east, two hours into Wisconsin.

We tried to time it based on doing math. So I didn't do it. I won't take credit for it. But we had one of our analysts start doing math to say every 15 minutes, we get a phone ping. He's hitting here, here, here. He's doing about this many miles per hour. If we can get to about this area, we should be five minutes behind the ping, meaning that he'll drive past me five minutes or within five minutes of the next ping. So we timed it that way.

It actually worked, which is surprising, because a lot of things don't work that we try, right? But it actually worked where I just beached my car on the side of the road, put my hood up, looked like I was stranded motorist. And once the ping hit, I started looking at all the cars going by. We were a little bit more rural in Wisconsin, where there wasn't a ton, a ton of traffic.

I spotted a white rental car. We ran the plate. We were able to link that back. And then my partners further up the road, we just took turns driving up alongside this car and looking in the windows. Xavier had cut his hair, changed his appearance, but we were able to see his mom and his girlfriend visibly in the car, and we were pretty sure that was him. So we just waited. We followed him all the way back until he crossed the state line into Minnesota, and then we took him into custody.

We did the same approach for Jaden. And again, if I'd have had that RTT data, I would have been able to pinpoint exactly what motel, hotel he was at. But he was hiding out over in the west metro part of Minneapolis-Saint Paul. Our 2,000 meter PEN that we were getting with the phone turning on and off, wasn't helpful for us to really be able to lock him down. We would have had it, I think, a lot sooner if we would have had the RTT.

But he ended up turning himself in the day after we arrested Xavier. So as soon as Xavier got picked up and he was kind of the leader of the group, this kid turned himself in right after.

Enrique was a lot smarter. He was very good at hide and seek. And we kind of went old school. So, I mean, I ended up doing a wanted poster. I mean, I tried everything with going after him. And it's really thinking out of the box and looking at all the different options that you can go at for these types of things.

So he dumped his cell phone within days. We had the CDR warrants. We put our analysts on it, where they went after every phone number, analytics towards his family member's, girlfriend, known associates, to see if we could figure out a new phone number for him. That didn't work. So I ended up doing an IMEI warrant.

So I got this IMEI, which is the device serial number that the phone companies have. He was a prepaid plan. So the thought process is well, if he kept the same device, had a different number, maybe we would be able to track that. And I got records back from T-Mobile on it, so it works. He just didn't put in a new plan, and he didn't have anything active at the time.

We did Snapchat PEN, Instagram PEN, Facebook PEN. We did iCloud warrants on him trying to get the identification of a new device ID. We did Google warrants for location, any new device ID. We went up on his girlfriend's phone. She ended up dumping her device. Same as him.

So ultimately, we just kind of went down the list of everything and anything we could think of to try to find any kind of device we could track and get him into custody. It ended up taking three months. But, our final-- again, it was the old school wanted poster. I looked at his CDR records and said, if this is everywhere he goes, these are his most common places prior to the shooting. And I papered wanted posters up at apartment buildings, bus stops, telephone poles, pretty much anything and everything that was around there that I could stick them up to put the heat on. And ultimately, it led to somebody dimming him out. Saw the poster, knew where he was, and they gave us a tip. We were able to lock him in after that.

When we get to the interview side of this, Jaden again, he turned himself in. He came in with an attorney. His attorney said, nope, he wasn't a shooter. We got no statement other than that.

Enrique did the, wasn't me, wasn't there. Which, again, is great when we look at all of the ways we can prove he was there through the digital evidence.

And then Xavier, he went the route of he admitted amenity was there. Admitted that he shot, admitted that he had a weapon. He did identify Enrique as the second shooter, said Townsend or Jaden didn't have a gun, wasn't a shooter, and then he claimed self-defense. The issue with the self-defense claim is that when he picked his gun up and started shooting, the other shooter was already driving 100 miles an hour away from him and the threat had stopped. And then those actions of aggression down and shooting ended up killing another kid.

The cell phone evidence, I won't get too much into this. We all know how great cell phone evidence is with proving all of the kind of history and stuff related to a person.

But what was really important out of this is really that he was constantly searching his name, constantly searching the case. He was searching for, where is the border the weakest in Mexico, between Mexico and Texas? Looking to flee the country. And then they had-- looked like they were making a reservation for a VRBO at a town-- I can't remember the name of the city-- that was literally right on the border of Mexico in South Texas that came up in one of the Google searches as one of the places where our border was the weakest for people coming into the US. So they were going to go that way to go out of the US. Other than that, lots of evidence of guns-- buying and selling guns, and then he was a local fentanyl dealer.

This was really good too, that came out of a Snapchat warrant and from the phones, putting that gun-- this was the murder weapon itself. This is what our victim Davion described was pointed at him while he was a victim of the initial assault. It's the black and tan Glock with the green laser beam on it. And this was a picture and the device that was taken one day before our shooting.

So again, when we start taking all of this stuff-- and again, this is a very quick overview. We didn't get too much into the weeds. But we're really trying to tie everything together. So we've got our victim statements, our witness statements. There's always the credibility things that come in and out of that for our prosecutors that deal with these things. We've got our suspect statements, all the conflicting information that's coming from that.

Our job as law enforcement, obviously, is the finder of facts and to collect evidence, right? And so we've got our physical crime scene, the ballistics, the DNA, the recovered weapons. We've got all of those things, traditional law enforcement. And then we've got all this digital stuff. And in this case, again, the digital stuff really was just a corroborating factor in everything else. So it was tying everything together.

It did actually give us an additional case against Xavier's mom and his girlfriend for aiding an offender after, because they put so much effort into trying to help him evade law enforcement. And they were going to try to flee the country had we not got to them in time. And that digital evidence just supported everything. It corroborated and it really tied everything together for our prosecution.

So when we look at the outcome on this, you know, ultimately Keith Dawson, he pled guilty, felon in possession of a firearm and the drive-by shooting. He ended up with a seven-year prison sentence for that. And then obviously living with the guilt that his actions started a snowball effect that led to the death of his stepson.

We had a full-blown jury trial with Xavier. It was about a three-week trial, where we went through all of the witnesses, all the evidence. We put it out in front of the jury, and ultimately, they convicted him of second-degree intentional murder in the state of Minnesota, with a sentence of 37 years in prison, which is pretty hefty.

There's a lot of back and forth initially between him and Enrique as to which one was going to go first to trial. They kept pushing it back with defense motions. Xavier ended up going first. Enrique pushed everything back, and then he waited until the sentencing was complete. And once the sentencing was complete and he knew what he was up against, I mean, the expected result was probably going to be the same for him, they ended up doing a plea deal. He took a 20-year prison sentence on a plea.

And then Jaden Townsend, ultimately, he got a three-year prison sentence just on the assault related to that initial altercation that kind of started everything.

And so that kind of wraps up the case study just to put some of that stuff out there. And again, this is-- the conference that we're looking at in January gets a lot more into the specifics of all these things that we're talking about. But this is just a quick overview of a case to really talk and think about, what other evidence is out there that's potentially going to be valuable and help move your case forward and better confirm and lock things in, as far as your evidence and provability in court?

Our last poll question. If in a law enforcement role, how confident are you that your agency is fully leveraging available technology to increase case clearance rates? Your choices are very confident, somewhat confident, not confident, unsure, not applicable to my role or prefer not to share.

43% said somewhat confident, 25% not applicable, 13% very confident, and 14% not confident.

Well, I tell you, that's interesting-- another interesting poll as we put kind of everything in perspective. And, Paul, thanks for going through that, not only the case study for us and for all our followers here on the webinar, but for the work that you and your team did to move that case forward. That's so important. And that was a lot of hard work over a long period of time. And to get justice in the courtroom is very validating.

So just moving on. We've got a few more slides. Thanks for hanging with us. So we'll be wrapping up just here in a little bit. And again, our information will be up at the end. We're going to highlight the January 2026 conference-- *Solving Crime Through Emerging Technologies Conference*-- and then our info.

So in Paul's case study-- oh, Paul, and there was one question that came in. And before it slips by, if you're still near the mic, there was a question that popped up in the chat about NIBIN. I don't know if you have any visibility on the NIBIN work that was done, because actually, it connects to one of my final remarks here in the next couple of slides.

We did. Yeah. I mean, we usually will send all of our stuff into the ATF for NIBIN's, get those reports. I don't believe that either of those weapons were involved in any other crimes. But, you know, pending trial, while this was all starting to play out and people got out of custody with their bail amounts, our main guy, this Xavier kid, ended up in multiple other shootings with a couple-- I think at least one additional attempted second-degree murder charge pending on him for another shoot out while he was on bail. And I know that there was definite NIBIN links that they were able to connect him back when they-- I believe they arrested him, recovered another firearm again, while he's out on bail for a murder, and then ended up charging him with another attempted murder.

NIBIN's is a great tool. I mean it really-- it may take time before that weapon gets brought back in by another agency. But it's a great tool to be able to really link these shooters from one scene to the next.

Yeah. And, Paul, one of the things I got away from your sharing was how all this comes together. The digital evidence, the DNA, the NIBIN, the shell casings, all the returns that come back, the work that your analysts did, you did, your team did, to get these monsters off the street before they hurt and kill and harm others. So again, my highest compliment.

So yeah, I see-- Taylor, I agree, not smart for this fellow to be out doing additional crimes when he's out on bail. But that's what we deal with, right? I mean, it's oftentimes, a small group in the community that are involved in most of our cases. And so many of our cases do get the connection.

But on this slide, I want to just talk about a couple of things as we wrap up. So many of us or all of us are probably intimately familiar when the Idaho quadruple college student murder case happened in 2022. But one of the things I want to point out when we talk about digital evidence, in particular, ties into one of our earlier poll questions, is Bryan Kohberger actually turned off his cell phone and left it at home and didn't bring it on his attack.

So I sometimes get asked, well, how many cases do you think, Ed, there's digital evidence? And my answer is always the same. I say 100% of our cases have a digital nexus. And oftentimes, DNA. The two Ds of solving crimes. It's either going to be solved digitally or DNA or likely both-- back to my point earlier about the CSI effect.

So the fact is that Bryan Kohberger turned off his phone, went dark for those moments early in the morning when he committed that heinous crime is very compelling. To my prosecutors, just imagine when you have-- and of course, with this case, we have DNA. We have genetic genealogy used to solve that crime, which again, will be discussed pretty extensively at our 2026 conference. But you have genetic genealogy. You have the absence of DNA for his cell phone going off for those that period of time. Then you have his DNA at the scene.

And we see that in the Gilgo Beach homicide out in Suffolk County, New York. I think we have got some New York folks dialing in. These cases can come down to the smallest amount of traceable evidence to get answers.

And as we see in Paul's case study, these cases that I'm talking about are very complex. And they require all of us to work together. Our analyst community, our Detective Bureau, our crime scene, and forensics, all super important.

So I just want to highlight this case, again hailing from the national capital region just outside Washington, DC, where I did serve for those 34 years. The last five I oversaw our Major Crimes, Cyber, and Forensics. And one of the cases that my team worked was a serial killer case, Anthony Eugene Robinson. Just recently, a few months ago, convicted by a Harrisonburg, Virginia, jury.

And it took the jury 30 minutes to convict Anthony Robinson of killing two women in Harrisonburg. 30 minutes, the recommendation is four life sentences plus 10 years. Now, he's actually responsible for killing more people. He's got two murders that Fairfax County has identified him in and one even in the Washington, DC, area.

We've talked very publicly about this case in the national capital region because it's not too common in 2022 or this day and age that we have a serial killer. But he was able to kill five women over a period of time. We dubbed him the "shopping cart killer" because in multiple cases of the five, he's on video pushing a shopping cart with a victim in it-- one of the victims. This case is digital. He met his victims online. This case is DNA, because his DNA is left at the motel. So very, very interesting on how these things can all come together.

So as we wrap up just a couple more slides, I do want to point out a couple of things where technology is going. So we talked about NIBIN, the importance in Paul's case about the collection of these spent casings, these fired cartridge casings, these FCCs, and how, oftentimes, we want the process of NIBIN. NIBIN is a great system. I believe in it. My agency, we funded, with the ATF, to bring NIBIN on site. But there's not enough NIBIN sites. Sometimes, they're too far away, and sometimes, we wait too long for investigative leads to come back.

And I want to point, if you're looking at your screens on your computer, on your mobile device, in the upper left-hand corner. I did a training a NCJTC training not too long ago and I asked the students, how long are you waiting for NIBIN returns? Just taking the firearms, the FCCs and asking, for this gun crime intelligence, how long are we waiting in law enforcement? And those are handwritten notes that the students return. Six months, two months, maybe a month, two weeks, two weeks, maybe a month, one to three weeks.

I would say, all of those numbers are way too long. We need investigative leads sooner. So I just want to point out some tech and where it's going on the right-hand side of the screen. You'll hear more about this if you attend the conference in January.

But there's a system out there using breaking technology, where you create your own database and you can get NIBIN-like returns in three to five minutes. You can get it sent off to a certified fire examiner and get it certified by a firearms examiner 24/7 within 20 minutes. And that's where technology is going. It's getting answers sooner.

Similar to our real-time crime center concept, where you can't wait a week when you run a license plate for a stolen return. We need that instantly on registrations and wanted checks. And we need to move more instantly even in the world of firearms. And that's why I mentioned Evidence IQ. Rapid DNA Fairfax, my agency, we went live with our own rapid DNA, where you can get scientific correlations, scientific DNA returns in 90 minutes. Not nine months, not nine weeks, or sometimes, a year. You can get answers within minutes. And that's where we're moving.

And the third picture on the middle-upper part of the page is an M-VAC, where evidence that's been processed by the lab, we're hearing there's no viable offender. You get it through an M-VAC process and we're getting returns. We solved a serial killer on the I-95 corridor in Fairfax County. Victim's name is Amy Baker. That evidence had been looked at by the state lab routinely. No fault of their own, but they weren't using the latest breaking technologies.

We M-VACed it. We got an offender profile. And that monster didn't only kill Amy Baker. He killed another victim down the I-95 corridor. These cases are connected.

These victims deserve our hardest efforts and the latest technology to get answers for their case. Because these monsters, if we don't stop them, they're going to be a repeat offender. And if we're all sitting back waiting for a CODIS match-- remember, you're only in CODIS if you're a violent offender and you've met a strict criteria to be entered into the FBI's CODIS database.

So when we have a CODIS match that tells us it's not his or her first time at victimizing us. He's a repeat offender. And if you don't have a CODIS match, you should be thinking about advanced technologies like genetic genealogy.

So, hey, ladies and gentlemen, here's your life preserver. We're here to help-- Paul and I, the rest of the NCJTC team, all the presenters that are going to be in Las Vegas in January. As we said, we're not going to leave you abandoned. We're actually here to help and support, give some tips and tricks to help out to get those investigative leads even sooner.

So, Katie mentioned it when we started off. Paul made mention of it, as well. So Paul and I will be at the *Solving Crimes Through Emerging Technologies Conference*. We'd love to see you there at Planet Hollywood. I've had a pleasure of being there the past couple of years. Great conversations. Everything about the Internet of Things and how tech is giving us those important answers-- how we can harness technology to serve the community a little bit better and solve more crime, increase our solve rates, get answers sooner, take these monsters off the street, get them in the courtroom, and have them stand for the crimes that they committed, and seek justice for those victims that we work so hard for.

So I'm a realist to say no one can do everything. I'm not expecting my friend, Mary, from Virginia Beach, Michelle from Buena Vista here in Colorado, Kimberly-- I think you're here in Colorado, as well-- thanks for joining. I'm actually retired from the DC area and moved to Colorado, so I'm just doing some shout-outs to my Colorado colleagues. But I haven't forgotten, Culpepper's on the line and so many folks from around the country, which is wonderful.

But no one can do everything. And oftentimes, you can't do it yourself. You need partners. But everyone can do something. And together, we can change the world. And this is a quote from Ronald J. Sider. I usually bring it up in my classes because I recognize that people like ourselves are overwhelmed, but there's still some capacity to bring in technology to get those answers even sooner, even faster.

So as I conclude, this is our information. Paul's information is there. Paul did a super great job. Thank you, Paul, for sharing that very powerful case study.

My information is there, as well. That's my cell phone. If you scan the QR code, I would love for you to follow me on LinkedIn or on social media. If you're interested to have a one-on-one discussion with either myself or Paul-- or Paul and I, feel free to reach out. Be more than happy to support your mission and the important work that you do. So follow us, follow NCJTC, and with that, I will wrap it up. Turn on to the next slide here.

Thank you, Paul and Ed, for an excellent presentation today and sharing your insights and knowledge with us. To hear more on this topic, our presenters today will be at our 2026 *Solving Crimes Through Emerging Technologies Conference* that will be held in Las Vegas, Nevada, January 13th through the 15th, 2026. To view this conference and other current conference offerings, please visit ncjtc.org/conferences.

This concludes our webinar for today. I'd like to thank Paul and Ed again for their time and insight on this important topic. If you are interested in additional training, please visit www.ncjtc.org for listing of upcoming training opportunities or view our on-demand online training. Thank you for joining us today and have a great rest of your day.