Request for Proposals: Funding to Initiate or Sustain an Existing Biomonitoring Project

Application Due Date: March 9, 2020

Background

APHL is a non-profit membership organization that works to safeguard the public’s health by strengthening laboratory systems in the United States and globally. APHL is organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with its headquarters office in Silver Spring, MD. APHL’s members include state and local laboratories, state environmental and agricultural laboratories, and other governmental laboratories that conduct public health testing. APHL is recognized as tax exempt in the United States under Section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code. Its work on behalf of public health laboratories spans more than 60 years.

APHL, with funding support from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) is pleased to offer funds to one or more state, local or territorial laboratories to initiate or sustain an existing Biomonitoring project in the selected applicant’s jurisdiction.

Eligibility

State, local, or territorial laboratories are eligible to submit proposals. Preference will be given to those laboratories that are members of the National Biomonitoring Network. Interested parties must submit a proposal to APHL that provides all of the information specified in the Proposal Requirements section below. In order to be considered, complete proposals must be submitted no later than the Proposed Due Date specified in the Anticipated RFP Schedule section below. Applicants will find proposal submission information in the Response Submittal section below.

Anticipated RFP Schedule

Applications are due to eh@aphl.org by 5:00 pm Eastern Standard Time (EST) on March 9, 2020. APHL anticipates the following schedule for the entire competitive bidding process:

- February 20, 2020: APHL Issues RFP
- March 9, 2020: Complete proposals due to eh@aphl.org by 5:00 pm EST
- March 10, 2020: Proposal Review
- March 18, 2020: APHL posts names of the selected applicant(s) to procurement site, www.aphl.org/rfp.
If APHL makes any modification to this anticipated schedule, it will post the change to APHL’s procurement site, www.aphl.org/rfp.

Response Submittal
APHL must receive a complete proposal by no later than 5:00 pm EST on Monday, March 9, 2020. Applicants must send proposals via email to eh@aphl.org.

APHL will send an email acknowledging the receipt of your proposal. If you do not receive an acknowledgement within 72 hours, please email erin.morin@aphl.org to confirm receipt.

Project Award
APHL will distribute a one-time award of $101,360 to one applicant, or an award of $50,680 each to two applicants. APHL will notify awardee via email and the awardees will receive funding through a contractual agreement with APHL.

Scope of Work
The selected applicant(s) are expected to initiate or sustain an existing biomonitoring project in their jurisdiction. Award funding can be used for initiatives to begin or enhance a program, including but not limited to:

- Equipment, reagents, proficiency test challenges and/or certified reference materials
- Partial payment towards an analytical instrument
- Instrument service agreement
- Instrument interface to laboratory information management system (LIMS)
- Communication materials

Proposal Requirements
Applicants should limit the proposal to a maximum of five pages. Any documents included as an appendix are not included in the five-page count. The applicant must include the following in their response:

1. A description of the laboratory’s need for this funding
2. A description of the laboratory’s current biomonitoring project(s) (if applicable)
3. A description of the proposed biomonitoring project
   a. Include a description of the appropriate staff and their role in program development and implementation
4. Budget and justification
   a. APHL will award one laboratory an award of $101,360 or two laboratories an award of $50,680 each. Please create a detailed budget and justification for each item requested in the proposal.
Evaluation

Initial Review
APHL staff members will conduct an initial review of all proposals for completeness. APHL will not consider any incomplete applications received by the proposal due date specified in the Anticipated RFP Schedule section above.

Evaluation Process
APHL will conduct reviews via a combination of teleconference and email communications between the evaluation team described below. APHL’s Director of Environmental Health will coordinate the review process and evaluation sessions.

The reviewers may request follow-up interviews with all or some of the applicants, and following these interviews, may request supplemental information on an applicant’s proposal. These interviews and any supplemental information will clarify an applicant’s capacity or experience in one or more of the evaluation criteria, or will help to explain other information contained in an applicant’s proposal.

Evaluation Team
APHL will assemble an evaluation team to evaluate competitive proposals and assess their relative qualities based on the Evaluation Criteria outlined below. The evaluation team will consist of four members: two members from CDC/National Center for Environmental Health (NCEH) and two members of APHL staff. Once potential reviewers are identified, APHL’s Director, Environmental Health will have final approval over the review team’s composition.

Conflict of Interest
APHL will ask all potential reviewers to complete and sign APHL’s Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement in order to disclose any real or perceived conflict of interest prior to the start of the evaluation process. Reviewers will have to affirm that they have no conflict of interest that would preclude an unbiased and objective review of the proposals received. APHL will not select reviewers with a perceived or potential conflict of interest.

Evaluation Criteria
The evaluation team will use the following criteria as a general overall framework in which to evaluate proposals:

- Proposal Sufficiency – The proposed solution meets the needs and criteria set forth in the RFP, including all proposal requirements.
- Budget and Justification – The proposed budget is reasonable and realistic and gives clear justification for all budget line items, including in-kind support.

Each member of the evaluation team will evaluate proposals against the nine questions or criteria found in Appendix A: Proposal Scorecard. Reviewers will assign a numeric score from zero (0) (indicating a ‘poor’ response) to four (4) (indicating an ‘outstanding’ response) to reflect that reviewer’s assessment of the responsiveness of a proposal to each question or criterion. The evaluators will assign score using the following
categorizations:

- **Poor** (0 points) – The respondent’s proposal neither provides a reasonable proposed approach and/or budget justification nor meets the baseline requirements set out in this RFP.
- **Fair** (1 point) – The respondent’s proposal does not provide a reasonable proposed approach and/or budget justification but meets the baseline requirements set out in this RFP.
- **Good** (2 points) – The respondent’s proposal provides a reasonable proposed approach and/or budget justification and meets the baseline requirements set out in this RFP.
- **Excellent** (3 points) - The respondent’s proposal provides a very good proposed approach and/or budget justification and meets the baseline requirements set out in this RFP.
- **Outstanding** (4 points) - The respondent’s proposal provides an exceptional proposed approach and/or budget justification and greatly meets the baseline requirements set out in this RFP.

**Post-Evaluation Procedures**

APHL staff will notify the selected applicant within ten (10) business days of the completion of the evaluation, and will post the name of the recipient to APHL’s procurement website, [www.aphl.org/rfp](http://www.aphl.org/rfp) on the same day. Unsuccessful applicants will receive notification of these results by email within 30 days of the date the name of the winning applicant is posted.

All applicants will be entitled to utilize APHL’s RFP Appeals Process to formulate a protest regarding alleged irregularities or improprieties during the procurement process. Specific details of this policy are located on the procurement website.

**Conditions of Award Acceptance**

The eligible applicant must be able to contract directly with APHL or have an existing relationship with a third party organization that can contract directly with APHL on behalf of the applicant.

**General Considerations**

This RFP is neither an agreement nor an offer to enter into an agreement with any respondent. Once application evaluation is complete, APHL may choose to enter into a definitive contract with the selected applicant or may decline to do so.

APHL must ensure that the selected respondent is neither suspended nor barred from receiving federal funds and that the respondent meets any other funding eligibility requirement imposed by the Cooperative Agreement. APHL’s determination of whether the respondent is eligible to receive Cooperative Agreement funding will be definitive and may not be appealed. In the event that APHL determines that the selected respondent is ineligible to receive Cooperative Agreement funding, APHL will nullify the contract or will cease negotiation of contract terms.

Each respondent will bear its own costs associated with or relating to the preparation and submission of its application. These costs and expenses will remain with the respondent, and APHL will not be liable for these or for any other costs or other expenses incurred by a respondent in preparation or
submission of its application, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the response period or the selection process.

Questions
Please direct all questions regarding this RFP or its requirements via email to Erin Morin at erin.morin@aphl.org, with a copy to Julianne Nassif at julianne.nassif@aphl.org.

CONTACT INFORMATION
Julianne Nassif, MS
Director, Environmental Health
240.485.2737
julianne.nassif@aphl.org

Jennifer Liebreich, MPH
Manager, Environmental Health
240.485.3829
jennifer.liebreich@aphl.org

Erin Morin, MHS
Associate Specialist, Environmental Health
240.485.3830
erin.morin@aphl.org
### Appendix A: Proposal Scorecard

Scoring: Poor = 0, Fair = 1, Good = 2, Excellent = 3, Outstanding = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Reviewer Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal Sufficiency</strong></td>
<td>Does the proposal include all of the necessary elements and demonstrate an understanding of project needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the proposal meet the overall objectives of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the applicant follow the proposal requirements, i.e. page count and include required information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the information in the proposal presented in a way that is clear and well organized?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget and Justification</strong></td>
<td>Does the applicant’s proposal demonstrate a reasonable budget and justification?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the proposal include budget justification for all line items, including any in-kind support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the applicant’s budget and justification reasonable and realistic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Capacity</strong></td>
<td>Does the applicant have the appropriate staff to implement the proposed program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did the applicant outline an appropriate team to work on this project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the applicant’s laboratory have the organizational capacity to complete this project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the applicant have a development process in place to achieve the project goals according to schedule?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>