The text in this document is provided for assisting in the preparation of NOEs for court purposes. These templates provide general information that may be covered in testimony by a lab analyst in the listed discipline. For case-specific information, attorneys should contact the analyst to discuss their expected testimony for inclusion in this notice.

The State of Alaska, by and through the undersigned attorney, hereby provides notice in the above-captioned case that the State intends to call [ANALYST NAME], Alaska Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory (ASCDL), 4805 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave., Anchorage, AK, 99507, (907) 269-5740, as an expert witness. Any reports authored by this expert have been or will be provided to the defense pursuant to Criminal Rule 16. Curricula vitae for ASCDL analysts are available on the lab’s website: <https://dps.alaska.gov/Statewide/CrimeLab/Quality-Assurance/SOQ>

The substance of [ANALYST NAME]’s expected testimony in this case is as follows:

Analyst will

1. Describe their education, background, training, qualifications, continuing education, and/or professional organization membership as it relates to performing chemical, physical, and optical techniques to locate, recover, preserve, compare, and identify footwear impressions on evidentiary items.
2. Discuss evidence handling practices and procedures including how evidence is received and securely stored by the laboratory, as well as chain of custody.
3. Describe the different mechanisms by which footwear impressions can be deposited. Discuss detection/development methods, recovery techniques across various surfaces, conditions impacting assessment of the impression (distortion, interference, impression quality).
4. Describe which items of evidence submitted to the Alaska Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory were processed or tested for the presence of footwear impressions.
5. Describe each test method used, scientific principles related to that test method, quality control procedures in place, and any limitations, as well as the comparison methodology followed.
6. Describe general and specific footwear manufacturer techniques that could affect the assessment and articulation of opinions in this case.
7. Discuss the number of distinct outsole designs present and/or direction of travel in the impressions from the crime scenes.
8. Explain the opinions reached and limitations for each item or footwear impression analyzed.
9. Describe the quality assurance measures in place to ensure the integrity and validity of the opinions rendered in this case.
10. Comment on any other relevant matter on which the analyst is qualified to render an opinion.
11. *[Case-specific opinions, and the basis of those opinions, can be added here, after consultation with the assigned analyst]*