On-Site Drug Testing RFP Clarification page continued:

10. Pg. 6, Testing Methods 2.4- Would the Court consider removing the, "second EIA" as one of the available methods to confirm a presumptive positive result? Yes, as second EIA is not considered to be legally defensible, per SAMHSA and CAP. A Sample must be both screened and confirmed positive by a second aliquot using separate testing methodology. The confirmation test must use a physical chemical method (such as GC-MS or LC-MS/MS) distinctly different from the screening method. This test should be more sensitive and specific compared to the screening methods. A second screening test does not meet the requirements for a legally defensible confirmation test. A positive screening result is considered a presumptive positive and a second screening test would still be a "presumptive positive," not a confirmed positive. Screening methodologies are prone to both false positive and false negative results and cannot differentiate drugs within a drug class. For example, Sudafed would cross react with the amphetamines drug class and would react positive on both screens, leading to incorrect and consequential conclusions.

Because all testing services provided by a vendor selected from this RFP are for Court programs, it is necessary that all test results be legally defensible.

11. Page 6, Testing Materials 2.5- What are the Court's requirements for a customized e-coc? The Court requires that "Test Request & Chain of Custody Document" include the following information:

* Program Name and collection site address
* Donor Name and Signature O
* Other donor identifier (DOB or unique identification #)
* Date and time specimen is ordered
* Collector Signature
* Medications (including expiration dates)
* Specific test ordered (w/wo adulterants)
* Validation that specimen collection was observed
* Temperature validation
* Specimen seal (includes donor initials and date)
* Donor receipt

12. Must a bidder be SAMHSA accredited? Yes.