ADDENDUM NO. 1

DATE: **June 19, 2018**
FROM: **City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division**
TO: **All Interested Parties**
RE: **Laboratory Inventory Management System (LIMS) RFI-4518-18-SH**

Firms responding to the above referenced solicitation are hereby instructed that the requirements have been clarified, modified, superseded and supplemented as to this date as hereinafter described.

Please make note of the following:

Question #1: Can you please tell me whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this?
Answer: Yes.

Question #2: Can you please tell me whether we need to come over there for meetings?
Answer: Please see the solicitation document for this information.

Question #3: "Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA?
Answer: You will need to make this determination after reading the solicitation document.

Question #4: We would like to participate in the RFI. One of our concerns about RFI's is that sometimes companies allow vendors that don't participate in the RFI to participate in the subsequent RFP. As a vendor we feel that if we participate in the RFI we should be given extra credit for doing so vs. those that skip the RFI and participate in the RFP. We propose/suggest that only those that participate in the RFI be allowed to participate in the RFP. What is the City of Grand Junction's view on this?
Answer: The City of Grand Junction does not want to limit competition. As a result, we will not be restricting RFP participation.

Question #5: Has any vendor been involved with City of Grand Junction in helping to put the RFI together or does the City of Grand Junction have any relationship with another vendor outside of the current provider ATL?
Answer: No other vendor has been involved with the requirements of this RFI, nor has any other vendor had any relationship with the City.

Question #6: Is ATL being allowed to participate in the RFI or RFP?
Answer: Any vendor may participate. Please see the Answer for Question 4.

Question #7: What features would you change about your current LIMS?
Answer: Improvements in the following areas are desirable:
  a. Improve user friendliness
  b. Less IT intensive

c. Easier report writing
d. Less antiquated platform
e. Ability to talk to all remove locations
f. Field data loggers that function properly
g. Improved QA/control chart features

Question #8: Is there a preference for a specific deployment style (SaaS, Premise)?
Answer: The City is open to evaluating both types of deployment.

Question #9: Is there a preference for a client/server or browser-based solution?
Answer: IT would prefer a browser-based solution, but is open to evaluating client/server solutions.

Question #10: What functionality will the e-Notebooks perform? Are these notebooks currently in use within the laboratory? How many users are/will need to utilize the e-Notebooks? What data will need to be captured?
Answer: Notebooks are not currently used. Bench notebooks are needed for transfer of bench data for instruments that cannot be interfaced. Field notebooks are needed to acquire field testing of pH, turbidity, chlorine, temperature, etc. and possibly field/sample conditions.

Question #11: Will the new LIMS need to support NPDES DMR submission, or is this handled through OPS10?
Answer: The system should support NPDES DMR submission or interfaced from LIMS to OPS10.

Question #12: How many contract (reference) laboratories does the City currently utilize? Will a standard template for importing results support a majority, or will separate import templates be needed for each contract lab?
Answer: There are 4 or 5 outside labs the City uses. The goal is to have one reporting template for all.

Question #13: Will any of the instruments identified in Item 7 need to interface both TO and FROM the LIMS?
Answer: Yes, all of them will need to interface either bi-directionally or uni-directionally.

Question #14: Item 1) K – "Cooler contents list generation" – Is this specific to coolers that are used to transport samples to the laboratory; or relative to storage location, such as refrigerators, contents?
Answer: This refers to tracking of client cooler sample bottles received with demographics; number of bottles, temperature, preservation, etc.

Question #15: Item 6) Q – "Support and provide hand held field and bench data loggers/ELNs that can be downloaded to the system." – Is this functionality for capturing results/conditions/ locations data for field collections and/or logging results at the bench that will synchronize with the LIMS?
Answer: Functionality includes all of the above.

Question #16: Does the City wish to migrate all historical data from the existing LIMS to the new LIMS, or only a specific number of years?
Answer: Data migration is open to discussion. Whether or not to migrate data and the number of years will depend on the solution selected by the City.

Question #17: In addition to OPS10, are there other internal/external software systems the City wishes to interface with the new LIMS, e.g. Accounting, ERP, etc.? If so, will any of these interfaces need to be both TO and FROM the LIMS?
Answer: Ideally, the system will be cost/functionality dependent where invoice generation can be sent to A/P. It is also desirable to have the ability to send reports to Colorado DPHE drinking water portal or other CDHPE portals.

Question #18: Are there custom reports the City will want vendors to deliver with the new LIMS? If so, may we see examples of these reports?
Answer: There could be some custom reporting needed, but the City needs to know the capability of your specific system to make that determination. If multiple reports generation routinely needs IT or vendor assistance or intervention this may not satisfy the requirement for easy user friend report writing.

Question #19: Is there a need for advanced statistical data analysis?
Answer: Perhaps. It is possible the need is there for running medians, percentile calculations, 7 day averages, 30 day averages, etc. The information would come from raw data and may need to incorporate permit reporting rules; ex: "Saturday rule".

Question #20: Does the City desire a web-portal for users (internal/external) to access only results and reports? If so, how many users does the City estimate will require access to the portal?
Answer: A web portal would be preferable, but is dependent on cost and functionality. There are currently five internal and 30 external clients.

Question #21: What is the estimated cost of the Laboratory Inventory Management System (LIMS)?
Answer: The estimated cost is not known, hence the reason for this RFI.

Question #22: Has the Department allocated funding for the LIMS yet? If so, through which source (budget, CIP, state/federal grant etc.)
Answer: Funding will be allocated in the budget based on the outcome of this RFI process.

Question #23: Which vendor provides the incumbent ATL Sample Master application?
Answer: ATL

Question #24: Would it be possible to name the three greatest challenges the Department is having with the current solution?
Answer: See Question 7.

Question #25: Should the Department decide to proceed past the RFI process, has a time frame been established in which an RFP may be issued?
Answer: Not at this point

Question #26: Which other systems will have to integrate or interface with the LIMS, and incumbent vendors for each system?
Answer: See Section 7 under Information Requirements and Questions 11 and 17.

Question #27: Which operating platform is desired for the LIMS?
Answer: Please see the Project Background Section of the RFI document.

Question #28: Can the Department elaborate on any additional drivers behind this acquisition that may not be addressed in the RFI?
Answer: There is no other information available other than the RFI and this Addendum.

Question #29: Who is the technical contact and/or project manager for the LIMS?
Answer: This information is not relevant to this solicitation.

Question #30: Have you had any external assistance preparing this RFI?
Answer: Please see Question 5.

Question #31: Does the Department anticipate any professional or consulting services may be needed to accomplish this effort? (i.e. project planning/oversight, PM, QA, IV&V, staff augmentation, implementation services etc.)?
Answer: No.

Question #32: How is the existing system not meeting lab needs?
Answer: See Question 7.

Question #33: Type and volume of data to migrate into the system?
Answer: Water/Wastewater analytical data. Migration volume has not yet been determined. See Question 16.

Question #34: Given the list of instruments, how many of each instrument will be integrated?
Answer: All of those listed.

Question #35: What is the budget for this project?
Answer: See Questions 21 and 22. Budget limitations will exist but are not yet defined.

Question #36: Are you considering any specific vendors at this time?
Answer: No. See Question 4.

Question #37: Do you have a preference for SaaS vs. On-premises?
Answer: See Question 8.

Question #38: The number of External Users to license?
Answer: See Questions 12 and 20.

Question #39: Although you list 1.5FTEs for the Water Lab and 5FTEs for the Wastewater Lab, what is the total number of Lab Users to license?
Answer: The number rounds up to 7.

Question #40: How many users on the system?
Answer: There are approximately 35 external and 5-6 internal users.

The original solicitation for the project noted above is amended as noted.

All other conditions of subject remain the same.

Respectfully,

Susan Hyatt
City of Grand Junction, Colorado