

-----Original Message-----

From: Faulkner, Brian [mailto:btfaulkner@alcoholtest.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2006 7:23 AM
To: Pulju, Pat; Gilbreath, Glen; Collins, Bill; Schofield, Bill; Lewis, Tony
Cc: Weatherson, Harold; Edin, David; Hardin, Glenn; Kierzek, Karin; Hall, Toby
Subject: RE: Intoxilyzer software v43/37 & 62/240

Thank you Pat. We will discuss and get back with you.

Regards,
 Brian Faulkner

From: Pulju, Pat [mailto:Pat.Pulju@state.mn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, September 27, 2006 13:13
To: Gilbreath, Glen; Faulkner, Brian; Collins, Bill; Schofield, Bill; Lewis, Tony
Cc: Weatherson, Harold; Edin, David; Hardin, Glenn; Kierzek, Karin; Pulju, Pat
Subject: Intoxilyzer software v43/37 & 62/240

Here is the skinny on the testing we performed with live drinkers:

The acceptance of samples blown into the instrument is dependent on which version of software the instrument is running. Acceptance is also dependent on how the subject provides the sample. i.e. soft through very hard

We performed a variety of tests under different conditions using each version and the results were not the same. The statements below compare one version of software to the other using the same instrument.

When blowing soft there is a slight increase in the volume needed to accept a sample.
 Ex. (43/37) 1.50L @ .053 to (62/240) 1.60L @ .053

When blowing moderate to hard there is an increase in the volume needed to accept a sample.
 Ex. (43/37) 2.00L @ .053 to (62/240) 2.70L @ .053

When blowing hard to eye popping hard there is a large increase in the volume needed to accept a sample, if it will accept it at all.
 Ex. (43/37) 2.80L @ .053 to (62/240) 4.10L @ .053

When blowing multiple attempts there are false invalid samples.
 Ex. (43/37) none to (62/240) two

This seems to occur more frequently as the alcohol concentrations rise.
 Ex. Infrequently @ .010 to common @ .250

Another oddity that was noticed occurs with the puff counter. It seems that an attempt that is not accepted that is larger than 1.1 liter counts as two while an attempt that is less than 1.1 liter counts as one. This is not related as it occurs in both versions.

Also on occasion the volume and alcohol that were last seen on the display are not the same as when printed out. (62/240)

If you could discuss this and get back to us with any theories or questions, it would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks

Patrick Pulju

Pulju, Pat

From: Weatherson, Harold
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2005 3:51 PM
To: Pulju, Pat
Subject: FW: collective suggestion

-----Original Message-----

From: Wfcollinscmi@aol.com [mailto:Wfcollinscmi@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2005 3:48 PM
To: "Weatherson, Harold"
Subject: Re: collective suggestion

Harold:

Sorry I did not get back to you today.....bunch of meetings, blah, blah, blah. I did talk to Bill Schofield & Brian Faulkner & we will definitely call about mid morning tomorrow to catch up with you. Bill mentioned the options of desensitizing the software or taking out the negative slope check.....but we will discuss it firther tomorrow.

I am forwarding your email to Bill & Brian for consideration & will call tomorrow.

--

Bill Collins
Technical Sales Manager
CMI, Inc.
402-289-5635 (office)
402-699-5087 (cellular)
270-685-6466 (Owensboro)
402-289-5645 (Fax)