

Request for Proposals

Technical Writer for the Development of a Private Well Guidance



www.aphl.org

8515 Georgia Ave, Suite 700
Silver Spring, MD 20910

March 28, 2019

Request for Proposals: Technical Writer for the Development of a Private Well Guidance

[Application Due Date: April 5, 2019](#)

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.

Private Wells

Roughly, 13 million households in the US rely on private wells for their drinking water. These households are responsible for ensuring that their own water is safe enough to drink. APHL seeks a technical writer to create an overview of testing requirements national for private wells; including but not limited to recommendations on testing frequency, analytes, sampling, and a guidance on interpreting results for private well owners.

Eligibility

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 April 5, 2019. APHL anticipates the following schedule for the entire competitive bidding process:

March 28, 2019	APHL Issues RFP
April 5, 2019	Complete proposals due to eh@aphl.org by 5:00 pm EST
April 6, 2019	Proposal Review

April 12, 2019

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 April 5, 2019. 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 brianna.carey@aphl.org to confirm receipt.

Scope of Work

The selected applicant will be expected to do the following:

1. Plan and develop new Private Well guidance materials;
2. Research and consult with APHL staff and subject matter experts to become familiar with private well testing, member laboratory activities and APHL style guidelines;
3. Select diagrams, charts and photographs to enhance Private Well guidance materials;
4. Maintain records and files of work and revisions.

Proposal Requirements

The proposal should be kept to a maximum of 15 pages. Any documents included as an appendix are not included in the 15-page count. The applicant must include the following in their response:

1. A company profile or individual credentials;
2. A description of the applicant's experience in producing materials that include highly technical or scientific content;
3. A description of two (2) past projects that best reflect the applicant's work and relevancy to this project (examples of materials may be included as an appendix);
4. Reference information from two (2) former or current clients. Include company name, contact person's name, contact person's phone number and/or email address, and a description of product delivered;
5. A description of the team that will be assigned to this project, including each person's role (resume's or CVs should be included as an appendix);

6. A description of the applicant’s project management and product development process.

Project Term and Award

APHL will email a notice of award to the selected applicant. The selected applicant will receive funding through a contract agreement with APHL for a maximum of \$15,000. APHL will expect that the selected applicant complete all project components and submit a final product by no later than June 30, 2019. APHL will not grant extensions.

Evaluation

Initial Review

APHL staff members will conduct an initial review of all proposals for completeness. APHL will not consider any applications that are not complete by the proposal due date specified in the *Anticipated RFP Schedule* section above. Incomplete proposals will not receive a formal evaluation.

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

An evaluation team will be assembled to evaluate competitive proposals and then assess their relative qualities based on the *Evaluation Criteria* outlined below. The evaluation team will consist of four members; two will be selected from CDC/National Center for Environmental Health (NCEH) and the remaining two will be 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 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.
- Technical Writer Expertise – The applicant shows knowledge of the subject by demonstrating successful experience with projects of similar technical and scientific standards.
- Organizational Capacity – The applicant company has the appropriate staff to devote to the project within the timeframe needed.
- Project Management and Development Process – The applicant has the project management experience and development process needed to complete a project of this magnitude.

Each member of the evaluation team will evaluate proposals against the 9 questions or criteria found in *Appendix A: Technical Writer RFP 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 proposed approach neither meets the baseline requirements set out in this RFP nor demonstrates more than a minimal understanding of the subject matter.
- *Fair* (1 point) – The respondent’s proposed approach does not meet the baseline requirements set out in this RFP but does demonstrate a baseline understanding of the subject matter.
- *Good* (2 points) – The respondent’s proposed approach meets the baseline requirements set out in this RFP and demonstrates the necessary understanding of the subject matter.
- *Excellent* (3 points) - The respondent’s proposed approach exceeds the baseline requirements set out in this RFP and demonstrates a deep understanding of the subject matter.
- *Outstanding* (4 points) - The respondent’s proposed approach greatly exceeds the baseline requirements set out in this RFP and demonstrates a thorough and comprehensive understanding of, or an expertise in the subject matter.

Post-Evaluation Procedures

APHL staff will notify the selected applicant within ten (10) business days of the completion of the evaluation, and the name of the recipient will be posted to APHL’s procurement website, 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 Brianna Carey at brianna.carey@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

Senior Specialist, Environmental Health

240.485.3829

jennifer.liebreich@aphl.org

Brianna Carey, MPH

Associate Specialist, Environmental Health

240.485.3848

brianna.carey@aphl.org

Appendix A: Technical Writer RFP Scorecard

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

Category:	Criteria:	Score:	Reviewer Comments:
Proposal Sufficiency Does the proposal include all of the necessary elements and demonstrate an understanding of project needs?	Does the proposal meet the overall objectives of the project?		
	Did the applicant follow the proposal requirements, i.e. page count and include required information?		
	Is the information in the proposal presented in a way that is clear and well organized?		
	Section Total:		
Technical Writer Expertise Does the applicant's proposal demonstrate sufficient expertise in technical writing?	Does the applicant describe two past projects that demonstrate their best work and relevancy to this project, and are they at the level of quality that APHL seeks?		
	Does the applicant's past work demonstrate an ability to produce materials for projects that are highly technical and scientific in nature?		
	Section Total:		
Organizational Capacity Does the applicant have the appropriate staff to develop the materials in the necessary time frame?	Does the applicant have the organizational capacity to produce materials in the given time frame?		
	Did the applicant outline an appropriate team to work on this project?		
	Section Total:		
Project Management and Development Process Does the applicant have experience in project management and a sufficient development process?	Does the applicant demonstrate the project management experience to successfully complete a project of this magnitude?		
	Does the applicant have a development process in place to achieve the project goals according to schedule?		
	Section Total:		