

Request for Proposals

South Central Pennsylvania Metropolitan Planning Organizations Environmental Justice Benefits and Burdens Process Development

1. Purpose

The MPOs of PennDOT District 8-0 seek a unified, collaboratively and iteratively developed process and methodology for evaluating the benefits and burdens of transportation projects on environmental justice communities in the study area.

2. Background Information

During their most recent review by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), three Transportation Management Areas (TMA) in the study area received comments concerning environmental justice (EJ) work. The FHWA and FTA also provided a finding in the 2017-2020 Pennsylvania Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) findings letter concerning the state's EJ work.

Subsequently, all Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in PennDOT's Engineering District 8-0 expressed concern over the lack of direction they receive for EJ efforts to conduct benefits and burdens analyses. In addition, all District 8-0 MPOs expressed concern about the amount of time they spend re-evaluating their EJ efforts each time they update a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) without the background necessary to make the decisions that are best for the community.

The selected team will facilitate discussions of relevant stakeholders to determine an appropriate process to evaluate benefits and burdens of transportation projects on EJ populations. The selected team will then perform an evaluation following this process to conclude whether there is an equitable distribution of positive and negative impacts on EJ populations. At the conclusion of the work, each MPO in the study area will have a document evaluating the impacts within their specific area and a process by which to conduct future benefits and burdens analyses.

Key stakeholders to this process will be FHWA and PennDOT in order to ensure the decisions on the process are the best available method to measure equity. Also, the process will develop a template that other areas may choose to use in the analysis of their own programs.

The intention of this Benefits and Burdens Analysis effort should not be confused with a Public Participation Plan (PPP). Any outreach conducted by the consultant and planning partners in each MPO will follow each MPO's PPP. However, due to outreach with EJ communities during this process, new techniques for engaging EJ communities may be identified and added to future updates of their PPPs.

3. General Guidelines and Considerations

The study will be completed by June 30, 2018. Over this time frame the consultant is expected to work and communicate regularly with the members of the workgroup described below.

4. Scope of Services

The following generally outlines the information necessary to complete the requested study.

Who will be involved

The development of a unified evaluation process will include a workgroup coordinated by the consultant to include representatives of FHWA, FTA, PennDOT Central Office, PennDOT Engineering District 8-0, each MPO in the study area, transit agencies in the study area, and representatives from EJ communities.

What will be produced

The consultant will facilitate discussions between the various stakeholders listed above. These discussions will cover the questions listed to the right and any other relevant questions that may arise in the course of discussion. Appendix A includes discussion notes from MPO workgroups while developing this scope. A successful technical proposal will reflect the depth and breadth of these notes in proposed work tasks, timelines, budgets, etc. The format for these discussions (electronic, in-person, real-time, asynchronous messaging, etc.) will be determined by the consultant. A proposed format/process for these discussions should be included in the technical proposal.

The stakeholders and consultant will collaboratively brainstorm alternatives to these questions using current practices, national best practices, and other relevant experience. For each proposed alternative to a question, the consultant will:

- Assess the real-world implications of selecting the alternative, based on actual data for the study area
- Evaluate the feasibility of the alternative based on national, state, and other legislative mandates, rulemaking, etc.
- Determine relevance to the EJ community

The format for these evaluations will be determined by the consultant but may include in-person presentations, webinars, and/or technical memos/white papers.

This process is expected to be iterative until a consensus is reached among the stakeholders about the best possible alternative for each question. The final outcome will be a unified process and methodology for evaluating the benefits and burdens of transportation projects on EJ communities.

Initial Discussion Questions

- What defines an Environmental Justice community?
- What geographic scale should MPOs use for analysis?
- Should MPOs use the concept of Degrees of Disadvantage or should each EJ population be analyzed separately?
- What are the different travel patterns for EJ communities in the study area?
- What benefits should MPOs measure and why?
- What burdens should MPOs measure and why?
- Should MPOs evaluate benefits and burdens per-project or per-TIP/STIP/LRTP?
- What time period should MPOs use to calculate benefits and burdens?
- When should MPOs conduct a benefits and burdens analysis?
- How should MPOs calculate future projections and locations for EJ populations?
- How should MPOs resolve any identified disproportionate impacts?

Using the resulting process and methodology, the consultant will then conduct a benefits and burdens analysis for each of the MPOs in PennDOT Engineering District 8-0 and provide documentation according to which each MPO can conduct future benefits and burdens analyses.

Additional scope-related information

The resulting products will be consistent with all relevant Federal and State legislation and rulemaking and should reflect the practices outlined in ***PennDOT Publication 737; Every Voice Counts*** and ***NCHRP Report 532; Effective Methods for Environmental Justice Assessment***.

The resulting products will be scalable to different staffing capabilities at each MPO across the state. Staff from MPOs in Pennsylvania that are not in the study area will be invited but not required to participate in the discussions. Their input will be valuable to achieve this scalability requirement.

The resulting products should be easily explainable to the public without complicated formulas or explanations.

All sources of data and methodologies that were used in the study must be properly referenced and documented.

5. Format and Content of Proposals

The evaluation process will follow PennDOT's guidance for competitive sealed proposals. As such, the submission should include the following:

1. Letter of transmittal
2. A title page including the title of the proposal; name and address of proposing organization; name, title, address, phone number, and email address of the principal individual responsible for conducting the project; name and title of the organization's contracting officer
3. Technical proposal, the purpose of which is to outline and describe the consultant's overall understanding of and ability to accomplish the study. The technical proposal must clearly indicate and include the following items at a minimum:
 - a. A statement and discussion of the project requirements and objectives as perceived by the proposal consultant
 - b. A statement of interpretations, qualifications, or assumptions pertinent to or inherent in the technical proposal
 - c. Identification of all personnel who will likely be assigned to the project including a summary of their qualifications, as well as a discussion of the extent of availability of key personnel
 - d. A project schedule indicating the activities, major tasks and their duration, and milestones necessary to keep the project on schedule
 - e. References that are to be persons who can advise the selection committee as to the quality of the consultant's performance on similar projects proposed herein
4. Total estimated price of the proposed services with a breakdown of the costs and expected hours for each task. Included should be a listing of various labor rates by personnel category and an identification of the type and amounts of costs that are anticipated (such as travel, hotel, etc.) to be added to labor and other costs for the completion of the project. Future invoices will

be required to relate specifically to these cost breakdowns. *This document should be sealed separately.*

6. Basis for Evaluation

A consultant selection committee comprised of representatives of each of the MPOs in PennDOT Engineering District 8-0 will evaluate the proposals received in response to this RFP. The selection committee will rank the consultants based on the criteria listed below.

1. Understand of the needs, objectives, and nature of the scope of work
2. Experience of the consultant in similar projects
3. Qualifications and apparent ability to meet the terms of the RFP
4. Availability of staff throughout the study and ability to meet the deadline
5. Personal qualifications for individuals assigned to the project as specified in the proposal
6. Soundness of the approach to the study in terms of techniques for conducting the analysis and relationship of major steps in the project's overall process
7. Management methods and adequate response to the RFP specifications and overall study objectives

If deemed necessary by the selection committee, its members may create a short-list of the most qualified firms to invite to make a presentation to the selection committee and then re-rank the firms on the short-list, but this is not a required part of the process.

After ranking all submissions, the selection committee will first open the sealed cost proposal of the highest-ranked firm. If the cost is at or under what is available, this firm will be selected. If the cost is not, negotiations will occur to reduce the price. If that is not successful, the selection committee will repeat this process with the second-highest-ranked firm, and then the third-highest, etc. until a firm is selected.

The selection committee will present their recommendation to PennDOT. PennDOT will authorize the final selection prior to notification of the consultant.

7. Budget, Start, and Completion Date of the Project

The budget for this project is not to exceed \$100,000, available over FY 2017. Any proposed change in the scope of services as described above must be clearly noted and justification provided for the change.

The study is authorized to begin upon award of the contract with completion required no later than June 30, 2018.

8. Contact Information

Firms wishing to be considered should submit **an original and 5 copies** of their proposal by **October 20, 2017** to:

Ms. Felicia Dell, AICP, Executive Director
York County Planning Commission
28 E Market St, 3rd Floor
York, PA 17403

All other questions regarding the RFP, proposals, background information and requests for additional information about this project may be directed to Mike Pritchard, Senior Transportation Planner, York County Planning Commission at mpritchard@ycpc.org or (717) 771-9870.

Appendix A – MPO Scope Development Notes

1. What Geographic Scale should the threshold be calculated for?
 - Block
 - Block Group
 - TAZ
 - Census Tract
 - School District
 - County
 - Urbanized Area
 - Zip Codes
 - State House Districts
 - State Senate Districts
 - MPO
2. What defines an Environmental Justice Community (Define Threshold)?
 - Thresholds or Graduated Scale
 - % EJ population of a Geographic area to the total population
 - % EJ population within a subset Geographic area to the EJ population of the entire Geographic area
 - Density of EJ population within a Geographic Area
 - EJ Population with a Geographic Area
3. Should we utilize the concept of Degrees of Disadvantaged or look at each population separately?
4. What are the different travel patterns for EJ communities in South Central PA
 - Mode of travel to work for EJ communities
 - Public Outreach
5. What benefits should we measure? Should the measurements be for project based or program based? Are Benefits measured only as individual measurements or is there an index that should be developed to review all benefits together?
 - Number of Projects (TIP-UPWP-Supplemental)
 - Financial Investment (Programmed or Actual Cost?)
 - Average Commuter Time
 - IRI
 - Sufficiency Rating
 - Crashes
 - Employment Rate
 - Bus Ridership
 - Transit connectivity
 - Travel time to health care
 - Travel time to post-secondary education
 - Transportation and housing cost
 - Air Quality

- Human Health
 - Environmental
6. What burdens should we measure? Should the measurements be for project based or program based?
 - Number of Projects considered, but not selected
 - Right of way impact
 - Tax base
 7. What is the time period to calculate benefits?
 - Every Current 4 Year TIP
 - Historic 10 Years (Static or Rolling) of Data (Cumulative)
 8. How to calculate future projections and locations for EJ populations?
 - Identify historic changes in locations or thresholds being met from one data set to the next.
 9. When should a benefits and burdens analysis be conducted?
 - Beginning of TIP update on the previous TIP
 - After a draft TIP developed
 - In conjunction with LRTP updates
 10. How should identified disproportionate impacts be resolved? (If any are identified)
 - Develop a plan to balance the investment in EJ and Non-EJ populations.