

June 9, 2026

**Addendum #1
RP022-26**

Provision and Implementation of a Laboratory Information Management System on a Multi-Year Contract

Questions & Answers:

Q1. There is a reference to HIPAA in the request for proposal. Will the LIMS the County is seeking be managing, handling, storing PHI and/or need to be HIPAA compliant? Please clarify.

5.7 Personnel & Security Vetting

- Employee Background Checks
- Service providers must perform background checks on employees accessing sensitive County data.
- Must provide evidence of checks upon request.
- Sensitive data includes:
 - Personally Identifiable Information (PII) as defined by Georgia law
 - **Data regulated by PCI, HIPAA, CJIS, or other legal frameworks**

A1. There is no PHI/HIPAA data associated with the LIMS installation. Strike the word "HIPAA" from the referenced bullet under Paragraph 5.7.

Q2. Implementation Timeline: To ensure a realistic project plan, please confirm the expected go-live date relative to contract award and whether phased module roll-outs are acceptable within the one-year window.

A2. The installation should be planned for installation and all associated performance testing to provide a complete and fully functional LIMS system 365 calendar days from the Notice to Proceed. A phased module roll-out will be considered. However, the WRL must have a fully functional LIMS operating throughout the installation period. Any phased roll-out plan must consider and maintain any functionality of the existing LIMS impacted by any module or component that is brought into operation. Further, interim approval of modules or components will not relieve the service provider for full operational functionality of the complete system.

Q3. Data Migration Scope: How many years of historical data (sample results, QC records, instrument metadata) must be migrated into the new LIMS, and in what source formats are these data currently stored?

A3. There is 20 years of historical data (2006-present). The data will be provided as an excel spreadsheet that is compatible with Microsoft Excel 2007.

Q4. Instrument Integration: For each instrument listed in Table 1, please identify the preferred communication protocol (e.g., CSV, HL7, serial) and whether existing vendor drivers/interfaces are currently licensed by the County.

A4. See Revised Table 1 below. The preferred communication protocol would be determined by the manufacturer's drivers as listed for each device. The LIMS provider is responsible for coordinating with the instrument vendors and should specify what methods are available to push or pull information results to the proposed LIMS system. Software and licenses are valid.

Equipment Type	Manufacturer and Model	Software Version
Analytical Balance	Mettler PC2000 balance	3.01
Total Organic Carbon (TOC)	Shimadzu L CSH	TOC-L 1.10
Ion Chromatography	Metrohm 930 Compact IC Flex	MajIC 3.3
Benchtop Nephelometer	Hach TU5200	1.11
Spectrophotometer	Hach 6000 and Hach 3900	1.25 and 1.34
Fluorometer	Turner Designs Trilogy	GUI 2.0.4- Firmware 4.02
Discrete Analyzer	Thermo Fisher Scientific Gallery	Gallery 5.21.234
Biochemical Oxygen Demand	Skalar BOD Model#21088905-01	Skalar Robotics 1.1.66.0
Total Phosphorus Spectrophotometer	Shimadzu UV-2600i UV-Vis	Lab Solutions UV-Vis 1.12
Microscope	Nikon Eclipse Ci	Elements 4.60.011710
Incubator	Walk in unit (Manufacturer and Model unknown)	Left-V1.0.0 PCo5+small and Right-PC01NLn

Revised Table 1: Existing Water Resources Laboratory Instruments

- Q5. API Licensing: Will the County require unrestricted API access for external systems (Hach WIMS, ArcGIS, future tools), and should any per-call or per-seat API pricing be excluded from evaluation?
- A5. API access will need to be available for both scheduled data pulls and for on-demand queries for a minimum of 5 seats. It was anticipated that this API-connectivity would be covered under the user licenses identified in the request for proposal, Section 6.14. If separate API licenses are required for the proposed system, the number of such API licenses and cost per license should be listed specifically in the Total Solution Pricings – Additional Costs section. For consistency among proposers, each such license is to be costed on a per-seat basis. The County reserves the right to take advantage of other licensing methods or plans with the winning proposer if in the best interest of the County.**
- Q6. Reference Acceptability: If the service provider’s proposed solution is delivered via an OEM/partner LIMS with three comparable U.S. utility lab references, will those partner references satisfy the “minimum three installations for three years” requirement when the prime itself is the system integrator?
- A6. The references under Part VIII must be for the service provider the County will be contracting with, not any subcontractor or partner the service provider will utilize. For the information provided under Part II, the “partner references” would be acceptable to satisfy the installation requirement for having the system installed and operated in at least three laboratories comparable to the WRL for at least three years.**
- Q7. The RFP states the County’s minimum expectations for:
- Recover Time Objective (RTO) of 12 hours after declaration of a disaster.
 - Recover Point Objective (RPO) of 4 hours maximum customer data loss.
- If a services provider hosts via AWS and the estimated RTO time frames are: 1 hour per 100GB of restored data plus 1 hour system configuration and if the services provider can include the full disaster recovery plan details in the response, is this acceptable or would it be cause for exclusion.
- A7. At a rate of 100Gb/hr, the recovery available within the 12-hour limit would exceed 1 Terabyte. This value exceeds the expected size of the active database which would be needed for the WRL to resume their duties. Full details of the recovery plan should be included in the proposal. Meeting or not meeting this requirement is not cause for exclusion. Services providers are scored accordingly.**
- Q8. Request for Proposal Section 2 – WRL is currently supported by up to 15 subcontracted specialty laboratories on an as-needed basis. What access, if any, will the 15 subcontracted specialty laboratories used on an as-needed basis need access to the LIMS solution? To what extent?
- A8. The subcontracted labs would not be accessing the LIMS directly. The subcontracted labs would supply data to the WRL in files that would then be uploaded.**

- Q9. Request for proposal Section 3.3 – Please provide an example of the branded bench sheet described. is it proprietary software or in-house template?
- A9. See attached example. These are in-house templates. It is expected that the formatting of reports and documents prepared by the proposed LIMS will include the ability to incorporate similar branding with the County's official branding as the example provided.**
- Q10. Request for proposal Section 5.14 – Please provide an example of the branded bench sheet described. is it proprietary software or in-house template?
- A10. Section 5.14 does not reference bench sheets.**
- Q11. Request for proposal Section 6.5 – Upon contract termination regardless of reason, the service provider must transfer all data including active and archived data to the County in a form and format specified by the County. What format is the County specifying?
- A11. The size and complexity of the database at the time of transfer will potentially impact the method and formatting of data transfer. It is the expectation of the County that the service provider will work cooperatively with the County to ensure an effective and efficient transfer of information. For the purposes of this proposal, it can be assumed that the export format would be in most current version of Excel at that time.**
- Q12. Request for proposal Section 6.9 – The system shall provide seamless interoperability for all the hardware and software components identified in this document (Table 1 Existing Laboratory Equipment). What level of interoperability is needed for each instrument? For example, what is the interoperability for the walk-in incubator (no brand or model provided)?
- A12. See A4.**
- Q13. Request for proposal Section 6.9 – How does the County define data cleanup?
- A13. Upon migration of the data from the existing to the proposed LIMS, the service provider will verify that all data fields have transferred as anticipated and clean up any errors in the data due to the migration. This includes the standardization of data labels without changing the representative numerical results corresponding with those labels.**
- Q14. Request for proposal Section 6.9 – Data migration must include previously archived information from the existing system. How is data structured in the existing system? What kind of access does the County want the new solution to provide to this archived dataset
- A14. Archived data will be provided in the same Excel format as the active data. Archived data will be stored such that it can be accessed as set out in Section 4.2. No routine, operational access is anticipated as necessary for archived data, but occasional data searches will occur in support of research or reporting needs of the Department.**
- Q15. Request for proposal Section 5.6 Security & Compliance Certifications - Service providers must provide a SOC 2 Type II report covering the entire technology stack—excluding inherited reports from infrastructure providers like AWS, Azure, or GCP. This requirement appears to imply that it is mandatory for not only the hosting provider/data center to have an SOC 2 report, but the SaaS Application itself as well. Please confirm.
- A15. Yes, a SOC 2 Type II report is needed for the SaaS application as well. The service provider must demonstrate that the remaining controls such as identity/access management, encryption, logging, vulnerability scanning, incident handling, change management, etc., originate and are managed by the service provider.**

Attachment

- Sample Branded Bench Sheet

Acknowledge receipt of this addendum on Page 39 of the proposal document.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Dana Garland".

Dana Garland, CPPB, FOII, NIGP-CPP
Purchasing Manager



YEAR: 2025

FORMULA:

$$V = \frac{c+d+e}{a+b} \times 100$$

The value "V" in the following formula cannot exceed 5 percent in one month, for any two consecutive months.

WHERE:

- a = number of instances where the residual disinfectant concentration is measured;
- b = number of instances where the residual disinfectant concentration is not measured but heterotrophic bacteria plate count (HPC) is measured;
- c = number of instances where the residual disinfectant concentration is measured but not detected and no HPC is measured;
- d = number of instances where no residual disinfectant concentration is detected and where the HPC is >500/ml; and
- e = number of instances where the residual disinfectant concentration is not measured and HPC is >500/ml.

MONTH	a	b	c	d	e	Results (%)	Comments
January	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
February	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
March	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
April	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
May	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
June	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
July	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
August	305	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
September	306	0	0	1	0	0.33	In Compliance
October	306	0	0	1	0	0.33	In Compliance
November	306	0	0	0	0	0	In Compliance
December						#DIV/0!	

Calculation formula reference: [eCFR:: 40 CFR 141.72--Disinfection.](#)

Water in the distribution system with a heterotrophic bacteria concentration less than or equal to 500/ml, measured as heterotrophic plate count (HPC) as specified in § 141.74(a)(1), is deemed to have a detectable disinfectant residual for purposes of determining compliance with this requirement.