ADDENDUM ONE

DATE: September 25, 2013

TO: All Vendors

FROM: Pete Kroll, Buyer
State Purchasing Bureau

RE: Questions and Answers for RFP Number 4509Z1
to be opened October 8, 2013 2:00 p.m. Central Time

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above mentioned Request For Proposal. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the Request For Proposal.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1. Page 36, Item 1 – the chart listing several elements and their respective counts. These values we believe are from Agilent's specifications and their instrument. This is a value that is not attainable on our system. Also, counts per second (cps) are not an indication of detection limits as many perceive them to be. It is really signal to noise that counts. If you have several counts of background (noise) then your detection limit goes down. On our system we have very, very low backgrounds therefore we have very low and comparable detection limits. We feel like this spec needs to be lowered or removed for it to be a competitive bid.	NPHEL reviewed several public ICPMS specs when composing this section. The specification of background noise at < 1 c/s prevents the sensitivity specification to be measured at artificially elevated noise levels, which would limit detection limits. The oxide ion specification at <2% prevents the sensitivity specification to be performed at abnormally high sample uptake rates that would significantly increase interferences. The CeO/Ce ratio is traditionally used as an indicator for those interference levels. All of the conditions stated in the bid specifications (Sensitivity, background, CeO/Ce ratio, short term precision) contribute to the detection capability of the ICP-MS system. By specifying all of these to be met simultaneously under one set of operating conditions, the ultimate detection capability of a particular ICP-MS system can simply be compared to others by evaluating the sensitivity performance across the mass range.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
2. Page 39, Item 1 – statement that says "RF generator should be of solid state design to reduce heat output……..." We believe this is also an Agilent specification and our system **does** use a RF power tube. Our design is one that is proven over time and is a free running RF generator. I understand the State of Nebraska not wanting to pay for the expensive power tubes but we will cover their cost under the service contract on the system so this will not be an additional expense. If you can change the spec to state that a free running design utilizing a RF power tube is acceptable that would make us as well as others more competitive.	The RFP states that it 'should' be of solid state design to eliminate replacement of RF power tubes. The RFP does not state that it 'must'. Therefore, please state in the appropriate section of Form C that your design uses RF power tubes but that their cost is covered in your service contract.