

## ACRP 02-42 [RFP]

### Understanding Air Quality and Public Health Studies Related to Airports

Posted Date: 11/22/2011

Project Data	
Funds:	\$200,000
Contract Time:	12 months (includes 1 month for ACRP review and approval of the interim report and 3 months for ACRP review and for contractor revision of the final report)
Authorization to Begin Work:	4/30/2012 -- estimated
Staff Responsibility:	Joseph D. Navarrete Phone: 202/334-1649 Email: jnavarrete@nas.edu
RFP Close Date:	1/18/2012
Fiscal Year:	2012

### BACKGROUND

The communities surrounding airports have become increasingly aware of potential impacts to air quality and public health from airport operations. A number of airport air quality and health studies have been completed or are underway in North America (e.g., Los Angeles International, Boston Logan, T.F. Green, and Santa Monica) and Europe. Most of these studies have been required by regulatory agencies or legislated in response to airport improvement projects or to the public health concerns from local government or citizen groups. These studies, which vary greatly in method, scope and duration, include air sampling, modeling, and health assessment. There is a need to compile and assess relevant information on airport air quality and public health studies to provide an understanding of how these studies can be useful for airport operators.

### OBJECTIVE

The objective of this research is to assess the current body of knowledge regarding the impact of airport operations (e.g., aircraft, ground service equipment, ground transportation, and stationary sources) on air quality and public health to aid airport operators in responding to concerns about air quality in the vicinity of airports.

The research should include:

1. A review and summary of publicly available relevant airport emissions, air quality (modeling and monitoring), and public health studies conducted in North America and Europe, including those undertaken for civil and military facilities. The summary should include, but not be limited to, describing each study's purpose, research protocol, peer review status, airport specifics, airport activities and sources studied, airborne pollutants studied, available mitigation measures, health outcomes included, and study results;
2. A matrix or table encapsulating the review including, at a minimum, the criteria identified above, to assist readers in identifying studies of interest; and
3. A synthesis and critique of the current body of knowledge, including lessons learned, based on the reviewed studies, addressing research methods, conclusions, and limitations.

### RESEARCH PLAN

*The ACRP is seeking the insights of proposers on how best to achieve the research objective. Proposers are asked to develop and include a detailed research plan for accomplishing the research objective. Proposers are expected to describe research plans that can realistically be accomplished within the constraints of available funds and contract time. Proposals must present the proposers' current thinking in sufficient detail to demonstrate their understanding of the issues and the soundness of their approach to meeting the research objective. The work proposed must be divided into tasks, and proposers must describe the work proposed in each task in detail.*

The research plan should include, at a minimum, the following interim deliverables: (1) initial list of relevant studies; (2) draft matrix/table format; and (3) interim report that describes work done in early tasks, an updated work plan for remaining tasks, and proposed criteria with which to undertake the synthesis and critique of the current body of knowledge. The research plan should include, at a minimum, the following checkpoints with the ACRP panel: (1) a kick-off web meeting to be held within 1 month of contract execution and (2) an interim meeting to review the results of the interim report.

*Note: Following receipt of the interim report, there should be 4 months for ACRP member comments and for the interim meeting.*

*Note: Following receipt of the interim report, there should be 1 month for ACRP review and comments and for the interim meeting.*

The final deliverable will be a report that includes a brief introduction to airport air quality/public health studies and issues, the research findings, a description of the research process, and a glossary. The report should be written in plain language and geared for a non-technical airport audience.

*Note: Following receipt of the draft final report, there should be 3 months for ACRP review and comments and for contractor preparation of the final report. For budgeting purposes, proposers should assume that ACRP will provide access to web-enabled teleconference services. ACRP will pay panel members' travel costs for the meeting. Proposers should assume that the meeting will be held in Washington, DC.*

## SPECIAL NOTES

A. Proposers should describe in their work plan how relevant completed and ongoing ACRP research will be considered in their research.

B. After delivery and acceptance of the revised final report, the successful contractor will be expected to respond to queries from the ACRP editorial staff related to clarification and formatting.

C. Proposals should include a task-by-task breakdown of labor hours for each staff member as show in Figure 4 of the brochure, "Information and Instructions for Preparing Proposals" (<http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/crp/docs/ProposalPrep.pdf>). Proposals also should include a breakdown of all costs (e.g., wages, indirect costs, travel, materials, and total) for each task using Figures 5 and 6 in the brochure.

D. ACRP projects are intended to produce results that will be applied in practice, and proposals and the project final report must contain implementation plans for moving the results of the research into practice. Item 4(c), "Anticipated Research Results," in each proposal must include an Implementation Plan that describes activities to promote application of the product of this research. It is expected that the implementation plan will evolve during the project; however, proposals must describe, as a minimum, the following: (a) the "product" expected from the research, (b) the audience or "market" for this product, (c) a realistic assessment of impediments to successful implementation, (d) the institutions and individuals who might take leadership in applying the research product, (e) the activities necessary for successful implementation, and (f) the criteria for judging the progress and consequences of implementation.

E. Item 5 in the proposal, "Qualifications of the Research Team," must include a section labeled "Disclosure." Information relevant to the ACRP's need to ensure objectivity and to be aware of possible sources of significant financial or organizational conflict of interest in conducting the research must be presented in this section of the proposal. For example, under certain conditions, ownership of the proposing agency, other organizational relationships, or proprietary rights and interests could be perceived as jeopardizing an objective approach to the research effort, and proposers are asked to disclose any such circumstances and to explain how they will be accounted for in this study. If there are no issues related to objectivity, this should be stated.

F. Proposals are evaluated by the ACRP staff and project panels consisting of individuals collectively very knowledgeable in the problem area. Selection of an agency is made by the project panel considering the following factors: (1) the proposer's demonstrated understanding of the problem; (2) the merit of the proposed research approach and experiment design; (3) the experience, qualifications, and objectivity of the research team in the same or closely related problem area; (4) the plan for ensuring application of results; (5) the proposer's plan for participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises—small firms owned and controlled by minorities or women; and (6) the adequacy of the facilities.

**Note: The proposer's plan for participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises should be incorporated in Item 12 of the proposal.**

---

**Proposals (20 single-bound copies) are due not later than 4:30 p.m. on 1/18/2012.**

This is a firm deadline, and extensions simply are not granted. In order to be considered, all 20 copies of the agency's proposal accompanied by the executed, unmodified Liability Statement must be in our offices not later than the deadline shown, or they will be rejected.

### Delivery Address:

PROPOSAL-ACRP  
ATTN: Christopher W. Jenks  
Director, Cooperative Research Programs  
Transportation Research Board  
500 Fifth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001

### Liability Statement

The signature of an authorized representative of the proposing agency is required on the unaltered statement in order for the ACRP to accept the agency's proposal for consideration. **Proposals submitted without this executed and unaltered statement by the proposal deadline will be summarily rejected.** An executed, unaltered statement indicates the agency's intent and ability to execute a contract that includes the provisions in the statement.

### General Notes

1. According to the provisions of Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 21, which relates to nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs, all parties are hereby notified that the contract entered into pursuant to this announcement will be awarded without discrimination on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or disability.
2. The essential features required in a proposal for research are detailed in the current brochure entitled **"Information and Instructions for Preparing Proposals"** (updated November 2010). **Proposals must be prepared according to this document, and attention is directed specifically to Section V for mandatory requirements. Proposals that do not conform with these requirements will be rejected. This brochure is available here.**
3. The total funds available are made known in the project statement, and line items of the budget are examined to determine the reasonableness of the allocation of funds to the various tasks. If the proposed total cost exceeds the funds available, the proposal is rejected.
4. All proposals become the property of the Transportation Research Board. Final disposition will be made according to the policies thereof, including the right to reject all proposals.
5. Potential proposers should understand that follow-on activities for this project may be carried out through either a contract amendment modifying the scope of work with additional time and funds, or through a new contract (via sole source, full, or restrictive competition).

To create a link to this page, use this URL: <http://apps.trb.org/cmsfeed/TRBNetProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=3247>

Transportation Research Board, 500 Fifth St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20001  
Copyright © 2011. National Academy of Sciences. All Rights Reserved.

