

**PAMELA J. MARCUM
FORENSIC SCIENTIST
1003 STRAWBERRY LANE
BOISE, ID 83712
208 384 1715**

Date: April 21, 2009
To: Dr. Greg Hampikian, Idaho Innocence Project
From: Pamela J. Marcum, Forensic Scientist
Subject: Alfonzo Hubanks File

Following are my findings from reading the reports and bench notes you forwarded to me on the above case:

- No mention whether analyst Ripp screened for invisible stains with an Ultraviolet light (Wood's Light) on the clothing or car seat. The only mention of the use of UV was by the hospital on V's right thigh. It was best practices at that time to look for stains visually and with a UV light in the forensic laboratory. Possible exonerative stains may have been missed.
- No description of type of stain used to examine microscopic pellet for sperm—common practice to use the "Christmas Tree Stain"—very sensitive for observing spermatozoa. Using other less specific stains may cause the analyst to miss important sperm.
- No indication of how many spermatozoa observed—general procedure is to at least say—"numerous" or "rare" sperm observed.
- PGM gel photocopies—can't see if any controls were used. Confusing and not obvious to me. Copies blurred as to the order of samples.
- This is probably minor-but details are important: Use of Red top tubes (clot) for known blood samples are not recommended-now or then. Purple top tubes are preferred. Analyst's comments in bench notes states both Trunnel and Wells' blood tubes were lysed. This can have an impact on the fragile red cell enzymes we are trying to discern as the knowns. May compromise results.
- Pep A was tested on the known bloods—note that both Wells and Hubanks were inconclusive—due to lysed blood and inappropriate blood tubes??? Not getting a result on a known blood handled under a controlled environment is puzzling.
- Sloppy crossed out mistakes on bench notes on Lewis typing results-makes you wonder if all the work was rushed and sloppy
- Hospital did not collect anal swabs-standard practice to collect oral, anal and vaginal swabs, regardless of V's version of events. May have missed exonerative evidence.
- PGM subtyping—Can't tell if appropriate controls were used, i.e., reagent blanks, all four subtypes. Not apparent on photocopies. FBI classes taught all forensic serologists in those days to use appropriate controls at all time. Order of samples difficult to tell on photocopies
- No population frequencies mentioned in report-no sense of significance for the reader. Importance of PGM results could have been inaccurately conveyed at trial.