

Letter/ Comment Number	Comment	Response
Lisa Flores (October 23, 2020)		
LF-1	Here is my review and comments of the Request For Proposal (RFP) for Consultant Services for a Truck Route Study.	Intro to the comment letter – no response is necessary
LF-2	<u>Table of Contents</u> (1) Exhibits listed A, B and C do not match the exhibits in the back of the document. (2) Exhibit C should be listed as “Disclosure of Conflict of Interest”	Comment noted. Corrections will be made during final formatting.
LF 3	Public Notice First paragraph need to be rewritten - suggested paragraph  The City of Fresno (City) desires to select qualified Respondent(s) to provide professional consulting services for preparation of the Truck Route Study, <i>“in an effort to reduce community exposure to air pollution from local sources. This study will be funded through a cooperative agreement between the City and the San Joaquin Valley Air District acting as the administrators of Assembly Bill 617 funds. The project area is defined as South Central Fresno.”</i>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-4	Page 1 First paragraph, add elements of the specific health data that needs to be add to this truck route study.	
LF-5	Second paragraph, second line should read... <i>“meet and confer requirements with respective bargaining units.”</i>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-6	Background The paragraph needs to add information and or inventory of pedestrian pathways (i.e. sidewalks), bicycle paths (both formal and informal) housing developments and schools.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification

LF-7	Page 2 Second paragraph should read... <i>"The evaluation will form the basis for modification to <del>established and planned</del> truck routes, as shown <del>on</del> in the 2005 City of Fresno Designated Truck Route Map."</i>	No change the study needs to update both the establish and planned routes
LF-8	Page 2, Budget and Timeline The City has budgeted \$250,000, and AB617 has budgeted \$500,000 - so why is this route study only estimated not to exceed \$250.000?	The narrative will be revised accordingly. We need to allocate a portion for the health study and reduce the \$750,000 to reflect that University contract being a separate contract.
LF-9	The RFP should require a quarterly GANTT update, so the AB 617 Community Steering Committee (CSC) and City Council members can receive update in a timely and effective manner.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-10	Page 3, Proposal Content Requirements First paragraph should read, <i>"Provide a brief introduction of the firm, including any experience relevant to the preparation of environmental review documents <del>of</del> in this subject matter."</i>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-11	Under Project Team Experience section should read, <i>"Provide a brief overview of the project treat overall experience, including any experience relevant to the preparation of environmental review documents <del>of</del> in this subject matter."</i> Highlight and add a line space to - "Relevant Projects and References (3 pages max)"	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-12	Highlight and add a line space to - "Relevant Projects and References (3 pages max)"	Comment noted. The language was redundant and deleted
LF-13	Highlight "Project Understanding, Approach and Scope of Services (10 pages max.)"	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-14	Schedule - Add language to include quarterly GNATT charts as a deliverable.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-15	Under Cost section should read, " Provide a summary of costs, <del>as well as,</del> and a detailed breakdown of costs by key staff including sub contractors markups, and	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification

	reimbursements expenses (i.e. cost of travel printing of materials, etc.)	
LF-16	Cost section should include language cost such as public outreach, translation services (in at three languages - English, Spanish, and Hmong) and cost of public notices in bilingual/ethnic community newspapers.	Comment noted. Additional language added to the Outreach & Community Engagement Section
LF-17	Page 4, Proposal Evaluation and Criteria The scoring and ranking methodology needs to include a category for cultural competency, local and or minority-owned business preference.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-18	Page 5, Work Plan, Task 1: Project Management Second paragraph - City staff needs to explain to the AB 617 CSC what are the overlapping studies currently in the works? And what exactly should the AB 617 should be spending their money on?	Comment noted. The Consultant team will be responsible for reviewing all documents listed in the RFP for consistency. If the AB617 CSC wishes to discuss the documents in more detail staff is available.
LF-19	Page 6 In the table shown, do any of these documents have on-going truck route study or data that will be used for this document? Also, this table needs a title.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification. There is discussion truck routes in some of the listed studies. This study should be consistent with any adopted goa
LF-20	Highlight - "Deliverables" Under Deliverables, does this include monthly report and updates to the AB 617 Community Steering Committee.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-21	Deliverables (con't) Review the second, third and fourth for misuse of the word "also"	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-22	Deliverables should include that all materials shall be available in multiple languages formats and translators shall be expected at all public events (as requested)	Comment noted. The Engagement Strategy will define the details of all materials. Additional language was added to the Section F.

LF-23	Page 7 Highlight - General Public Outreach and Engagement	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-24	Highlight - Key Stakeholder Engagement. In the first paragraph should read, " <i>cultural, agricultural, and environmental stakeholders, and community residents</i> "	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-25	In the third paragraph, Is this "Steering Committee" a new one or is it the AB 617 Truck Route Study subcommittee?	This would be a new Steering Committee made up of community members, business owners, and other applicable agencies
LF-26	Deliverables need to be numbered and whom does the Record of Meeting goes to besides the City. Will the AB 617 CSC get to see it.	All meeting documentation will be included in the Final document.
LF-27	<p>Page 8, Task 3: Existing Conditions Reports Under Community impacts from trucking, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Safety issues, <i>such as (but no limited to) including, but not limited to serious crashes and fatalities, pedestrian and bicycle</i></li> <li>○ Air quality issues</li> <li>○ Health impacts (<i>data gathering of disparities rates of diseases, mortality rates, and death attributed to air quality</i>)</li> <li>○ Noise issues</li> <li>○ Road condition</li> <li>○ VMT impacts</li> <li>○ Impacts to local schools within ¼ mile of high volume truck routes</li> <li>○ Impacts to active transportation facilities</li> <li>○ Other (<i>impacts to local schools within ¼ mile of high volume truck routes</i>)</li> <li>● State and local cost of maintaining roads, particularly those supporting high truck volumes.</li> </ul>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification

LF-28	<p>Page 9  First paragraph, last line should read - <i>“Additional classified count data will be provided by the City of Fresno along potential routes proposed through the community engagement process or as requested by the AB 617 Subcommittee on Truck Re-Route Study.”</i></p>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-29	<p>Deliverable  Under Task 4 - add a component to the Best Practices regarding health issues.</p>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-30	<p>Under Tsk 5, sentence should read, <i>“ The plan <del>should also</del> shall identify and consider deficient.”</i></p>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-31	<p>Page 10  Second paragraph should read, <i>“ The document <del>will likely</del> shall include, but not limited to section on:”</i></p>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-32	<p>Bullet points changes are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Recommend policy changes for the local and or state municipalities. City of Fresno, County of Fresno and Caltrans or other <del>pertinent</del> entities to improve routing and demand management.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Recommendations to <del>that</del> address <del>other</del> livability issues <del>and</del> that are consistent with other Plan recommendation for livability/quality of life.</i></li> <li>• <i>“Recommendations <del>Steps</del> for legal action for city, county state to implement ordinance changes.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“<del>A long term scenario may include.</del> Recommendations for further studies of interconnectivity of intermodal facilities in the study area.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“Implementation strategies, including estimated cost descriptions of actions that should be taken within he next five, ten and twenty-face year horizons <del>timeframe</del> to advance recommendations.”</i></li> </ul>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification

LF-33	<p>Page 11, F. Key Assumptions General Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“The City provide in-person translation services for public meetings and/or hearing related to the project. Consultant staff should be bilingual.”</i></li> <li>• <i>“All data,, maps, virtual platforms and all other materials prepared or collected under the contract will become the property of the City of Fresno, and San Joaquin Valley Air District.”</i></li> </ul>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-34	<p>Document Production Assumptions</p> <p>Add a bullet that discuss that the document shall be available for public review at City Hall, libraries, schools, and community centers, as well as, be provide in alternative languages that best represent the community (i.e. Spanish, Hmong).</p>	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
LF-35	<p>Document Review Assumptions</p> <p>“The Consultant should anticipate one (1) round of public review of the Draft Study within each City Council district.”</p>	
LF-36	<p>Meetings and Hearings</p> <p>Regarding the bullet points - “The consultant should anticipate up t twenty (20) one-hour conference calls” How is this broken down? And with whom - City of Fresno, AB 617 Truck Route Study Subcommittee?</p>	The Consultant’s scope of work will provide details.
LF-37	<p>Page 13</p> <p><i>“Violation of the provision by the Respondent and/or their agent may lead to disqualification of the Respondent’s RFP from consideration”</i> Would this include any communication with the San Joaquin Valley Air District or the AB 617 Community Steering Committee?</p>	Yes. During the RFP process there will be an opportunity for all interested responders to ask questions - answers will be made available to all.
LF-38	<p>Page 14, 6. Standard City Consultant Agreement</p> <p><i>“The City will be utilizing a Standard City Consultant Agreement with an initial term of one year and extendable, with a possible extensions at the City’s sole discretion for up to two additional periods of 12 months, for with a maximum them of no more than three years one year extension. The Consultant Agreement is attached as Exhibit C”</i></p>	For discussion with the Subcommittee.
LF-39	<p>Page 15, 6 Standard City Consultant Agreement</p>	

	<p><i>“Any contract exceeding \$50,000 shall be subject to the approval of the City Council in accordance with the Fresno Municipal Code.”</i> The document should update the project funding as listed:</p> <p>City of Fresno \$250,000  (pending final budget approval)  AB 617 \$500,000  Total \$750.000</p>	
LF-40	<p>K. Attachments  Please make sure that all the Exhibits are listed under this section correlate with the Table of Index and the actually Exhibits.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Corrections will be made during final formatting.</p>
LF-41	<p>Finally, the Request For Proposal needs to flush out the health issues that the AB 617 Community Steering Committee wants to see//added into the final document.</p>	<p>The Health Assessment will be a separate document and have a separate scope of work.</p>
Ivanka Saunders (October 25, 2020)		
IS-1	<p>While this draft RFP for the truck reroute study touches on many of the components that the AB617 Community Steering Committee members and the residents of the Southwest Fresno Specific Plan community have asked to be included, the overall narrative does not focus on the fact that this study is occurring due to the community needs and the overdue action for the relocation of truck routes that must be removed from the community.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please propose text to update.</p>
IS-2	<p>We know that land use planning and decisions of the City of Fresno have long failed communities of color by allowing heavy industry and the heavy duty trucks leading to those facilities, to travel through their neighborhoods. To put forth an RFP for a truck reroute study without this acknowledgement does not give the applicant the opportunity to fully understand that this is not just a Reroute Study for the</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please propose text to update.</p>

	<p>purposes of economic feasibility or CEQA guidelines, but that this study is to lead to recommendations of solving the challenges and mitigating these impacts in the community. As currently written, it appears that the City will only be asking for requirements in the RFP that would support reasoning and a legal defense as to why there is NOT a need for rerouting trucks.</p>	
IS-3	<p>1. It should be noted that this is more than a typical Truck Rerouting Study by changing the name from “Truck Rerouting Study” to “Truck Rerouting Study and Community Impact Analysis”. This will allow the consultant to understand that this is not just an engineering/public works contracted service.</p>	<p>Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification</p>
IS-4	<p>2. RFP should include that the chosen consultant team will most likely need to include co-consultants for the expertise of key issues that address the Community Impact Analysis. Consultants will need to demonstrate experience in solutions to alleviating heavy duty industrial burdens in environmental justice communities.</p>	<p>Consultants are aware of the opportunity for and need to subcontract to firms with specific expertise.</p>
IS-5	<p>3. The requirements can be further defined by requesting that the consultant have the ability to assess the needs and challenges of communities impacted as well as bringing forth the health impacts data.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Health Assessment will be a separate document.</p>
IS-6	<p>4. Page 1 Last Paragraph is very concerning in how it is written. The Air District should edit and improve the language of this RFP in accordance with the language of AB617 and the Community Emissions Reduction</p>	<p>Comment noted. This is the language from the CERP.</p>

	Plan. To state that, “ This measure will study whether heavy-duty trucks travelling within the community can be rerouted to reduce emissions exposure of South Central Fresno community residents” .....again, sets this CERP measure up to fail instead of creating improved changes for the community.	
IS-7	5. Community Engagement: This needs to be clearly defined as a requirement and the applicant must show proof of examples of what they consider community engagement, beyond using online approaches. The applicant must be able to confirm that they understand the needs of the communities that they must reach out to.	Comment noted. The selected Consultant/team will need to provide an Engagement Strategy early in the study.
IS-8	6. The work on this project should not only be advised by the listed stakeholders, but the stakeholders must include the community members. There shall be no stakeholder meetings or advisory committees that do not include community members.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
IS-9	I look forward to our conversations with the subcommittee. Thank you	Closing to the comment letter – no response is necessary
Kimberly McCoy (October 28, 2020)		
KM-1	I would like to thank the City Staff for their time developing the RFP, however, I feel that the RFP does not reflect what community members have been asking for to be address for a long period of time within the boundary of the AB 617 and Southwest Fresno residents. On page 84 of the Southwest Specific Plan, it calls for rerouting of existing residential neighborhoods in Southwest Fresno as well in the AB 617 boundary area. Southwest Specific Plan has recommended truck reroutes that are shown in Figure 5-6 just to give an	Comment noted. As stated in the RFP, the Consultant/team will be responsible for reviewing previously prepared documents for recommendations.

	example as well as the other plans that are reference in the other plans that were used to prepare the RFP.	
KM-2	The health impacts that residents experience on a daily basis should be included by outline the type of illnesses that residents have because of all the toxics being release in the air. There are several organizations that have conducted research and have enough data that can be included in the study.	Comment noted. The Health Assessment will be a separate, complimentary document.
KM-3	As I stated in the beginning of this process, there has to be true authentic community engagement during this entire process, that community residents, especially the residents living within the AB 617 boundary area. All documents pertaining to the Truck Reroute Study need to be available in Spanish, Hmong, and any other language to make sure all residents can be aware and involved.	Document has been updated to reflect the requested modification
KM-4	In conclusion, it is time for the City of Fresno to do right by the communities who have been look over when it comes to investing in their communities, due to the way the city zone's the land has to lived by industrials facilities that cause major health impacts to their families and neighborhoods. This RFP needs to support why a Truck Reroute study is needed and is vital to the residents living in these communities.	Closing to the comment letter – no response is necessary