



ADDENDUM #1
Sheriff Operations – Office of Emergency Management
Hazard Mitigation Plan
RFP # 7256-21

September 28, 2021

The attached addendum supersedes the original Information and Specifications regarding RFP # 7256-21 where it adds to, deletes from, clarifies, or otherwise modifies. All other conditions and any previous addendums shall remain unchanged.

Please note: Due to COVID-19, BIDS will only be accepted electronically by emailing purchasing@bouldercounty.org.

1. Question: Can the county provide copies of any plan review comments provided by the state and/or FEMA?

ANSWER: We can provide comments made by the State Hazard Mitigation Office once the contract is awarded.

2. Question: The RFP indicates that Boulder County began this HMP update in 2019 and submitted a draft to DHSEM for review in March of 2021. Is a copy of the Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool with DHSEM comments available for review?

ANSWER: Yes, the tool is being provided for potential vendors to review.

3. Question: Would Boulder County please provide the Plan Review Tool and any other documentation received from DHSEM and FEMA following their plan review(s)? This document would outline the exact changes needed in order for the plan to receive FEMA approval.

ANSWER: Yes, see question #2. There is no FEMA review at this time.

4. Question: Can you confirm if the maximum fee to be paid to the winning

contractor is \$25,000 or \$27,000?

ANSWER: The amount is \$27,000 for the vendor contract.

5. Question: To better understand the scope of work and the amount of work that will be required to complete the plan update, is it possible to review what has been completed so far, or to discuss with OEM what work has already been completed in house? At a minimum, some kind of itemization of what work has been completed for each of the sub-tasks on pages 12-15 would be necessary for us to estimate a cost to complete.

ANSWER: The work that needs to be completed is within the annexes for each participating municipality or organization. The annexes have been completed but need work to make them acceptable for State and Federal review. If the consultant has previous experience with multi-agency Hazard Mitigation Plans the structure for each community is identical. The content is what will need to be collected and integrated into the plan. The communities need to improve their HVA locally and generate better projects for their community. Refer to the state HMP review tool for more detail. The base plan has improvements that need to be made but OEM staff is responsible for the completion of the recommended changes. Also, all community meetings and peer county review will be completed by the Director of OEM for Boulder. Any further discussion can be made through conversations with the Director of Boulder OEM.

6. Question: How many hours of work were the estimate costs based on for each task? Are there any provisions for if it turns out the hours needed to complete the project exceed the hours estimated by the County?

ANSWER: The cost estimate was based on the State Hazard Mitigation Officer's estimate of remaining work to complete the plan.

7. Question: Are any additional meetings needed or anticipated?

ANSWER: Meetings with local municipalities and organizations completing their annex is where the consultant will be focusing their effort. All additional community meetings and neighboring counties will be conducted by Boulder OEM.

8. Question: Have all jurisdictions met participation requirements and provided all necessary information? If not, will the County be assisting in jurisdictional coordination and collection of any outstanding information?

ANSWER: The participating jurisdictions have made requirements for participation in the base plan's development. OEM will assist with

jurisdictional coordination as we have all contact and relationships in place. There will be information and data collection required from the consulting firm with the local jurisdictions.

9. Question: Page 15 implies that Task 5 (Grant Management) will be completed entirely by County and jurisdiction staff without contractor assistance. However, on page 17, there is \$795 budgeted for contractor expenses under Task 5. Can you clarify what will be expected of the contractor under Task 5?

ANSWER: We are seeking \$2,000 of in-kind cost recovery. This would require the contractor to record attendance of jurisdictional personnel to document time, name, department, hourly rate for calculating in kind costs.

10. Question: Is there any flexibility with the schedule dates proposed on page 15?

ANSWER: No.

11. Question: Is the proposed budget of \$27,000 the proposed budget only for the successful offeror on this RFP?

ANSWER: Yes.

If not, please provide a breakdown of how Boulder County anticipates the money will be allocated.

ANSWER: N/A.

Is this a firm upper limit for this work?

ANSWER: Yes.

12. Question: The RFP Scope of Work (SOW), Item 1.C on page 11 indicates that a draft HMP was created and submitted to the Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management (DHSEM) in March of 2021. Regarding that draft HMP: Can Boulder County please provide offerors with the name of the contractor who completed the initial draft?

ANSWER: Boulder Office of Emergency Management submitted the draft as a locally developed plan. In 2016 this was a local plan but due to COVID and other factors assistance to complete is now being sought by a contractor.

To what extent will that contractor be involved in the completion of the HMP?

ANSWER: All adoption actions by local jurisdictions will be conducted by Boulder OEM. Involvement of the contractor is directly related to the completion of jurisdictional annexes.

Will offerors be expected to bring the previous contractor on as a subcontractor to complete the HMP update?

ANSWER: There is no other contractor, local plan development is the status.

If so, how much of the \$27,000 budget (RFP page 10) is allocated for that contractor?

ANSWER: N/A.

13. Question: Regarding the *FEMA Addendum, Bonding requirements (2 C.F.R. § 200.326)*, on page 43, will offerors be required to provide a bid bond with proposal submissions?

ANSWER: Not at the time of submission but upon acceptance bid bond will need to be executed before the contract is awarded.

Submittal Instructions:

Submittals are due at the email box only, listed below, for time and date recording on or before **10:00 a.m. Mountain Time on October 5, 2021.**

Please note that email responses to this solicitation are limited to a maximum of 50MB capacity.

NO ZIP FILES OR LINKS TO EXTERNAL SITES WILL BE ACCEPTED. THIS INCLUDES GOOGLE DOCS AND SIMILAR SITES. ALL SUBMITTALS MUST BE RECEIVED AS AN ATTACHMENT (E.G. PDF, WORD, EXCEL).

Electronic submittals must be received in the email box listed below. Submittals sent to any other box will NOT be forwarded or accepted. This email box is only accessed on the due date of your questions or proposals. Please use the Delivery Receipt option to verify receipt of your email. It is the sole responsibility of the proposer to ensure their documents are received before the deadline specified above. Boulder County does not accept responsibility under any circumstance for delayed or failed email or mailed submittals.

Email purchasing@bouldercounty.org; identified as RFP # 7256-21 in the subject line.

All proposals must be received, and time and date recorded at the purchasing email by the above due date and time. Sole responsibility rests with the Offeror to see that their bid is received on time at the stated location(s). Any bid received after due date and time will be returned to the bidder. No exceptions will be made.

The Board of County Commissioners reserve the right to reject all bids, to waive any informalities or irregularities therein, and to accept the bid that, in the opinion of the Board, is in the best interest of the Board and of the County of Boulder, State of Colorado.



**RECEIPT OF LETTER
ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

September 28, 2021

Dear Vendor:

This is an acknowledgment of receipt of Addendum #1 for RFP #7256-21, Hazard Mitigation Plan.

In an effort to keep you informed, we would appreciate your acknowledgment of receipt of the preceding addendum. Please sign this acknowledgment and email it back to purchasing@bouldercounty.org as soon as possible. If you have any questions, or problems with transmittal, please call us at 303-441-3525. This is also an acknowledgement that the vendor understands that **due to COVID-19, BIDS will only be accepted electronically by emailing purchasing@bouldercounty.org.**

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. This information is time and date sensitive; an immediate response is requested.

Sincerely,

Boulder County Purchasing

Signed by: _____ **Date:** _____

Name of Company _____

End of Document

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL

The *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool* demonstrates how the Local Mitigation Plan meets the regulation in 44 CFR §201.6 and offers States and FEMA Mitigation Planners an opportunity to provide feedback to the community.

- The Regulation Checklist provides a summary of FEMA’s evaluation of whether the Plan has addressed all requirements.
- The Plan Assessment identifies the plan’s strengths as well as documents areas for future improvement.
- The Multi-jurisdiction Summary Sheet is an optional worksheet that can be used to document how each jurisdiction met the requirements of the each Element of the Plan (Planning Process; Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment; Mitigation Strategy; Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation; and Plan Adoption).

The FEMA Mitigation Planner must reference this *Local Mitigation Plan Review Guide* when completing the *Local Mitigation Plan Review Tool*.

Jurisdiction: Boulder County	Title of Plan: 2021-2026 Boulder Hazard Mitigation Plan	Date of Plan: 3/5/21
Local Point of Contact: Mike Chard	Address: 3280 Airport Rd Boulder, CO 80301	E-Mail: mchard@bouldercounty.org
Title: Boulder County Director of Emergency Management		
Agency: Boulder County Office of Emergency Management		
Phone Number: 303-441-3653		

State Reviewer: Patricia L. Gavelda Mark W. Thompson	Title: DHSEM Local Hazard Mitigation Planning Program Manager; Mitigation Planning Specialist	Date: 3/24/2021
---	---	---------------------------

FEMA Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII		
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption		
Plan Approved		

**SECTION 1:
MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET**

MULTI-JURISDICTION SUMMARY SHEET									
#	Jurisdiction Name	Jurisdiction Type	Jurisdiction Contact	Email	Requirements Met (Y/N)				
					A. Planning Process	B. HIRA	C. Mitigation Strategy	D. Update Rqmts.	E. Adoption Resolution
1	Boulder County	County	Mike Chard	mchard@bouldercounty.org					
2	City of Boulder	Home Rule Municipality							
3	Town of Jamestown	Statutory Town							
4	City of Lafayette	Home Rule Municipality							
5	City of Longmont	Home Rule Municipality							
6	City of Louisville	Home Rule Municipality							
7	Town of Erie	Statutory Town							
8	Town of Lyons	Statutory Town							
9	Town of Nederland	Statutory Town							
10	Town of Superior	Statutory Town							
11	Four Mile FPD	Special District							

**SECTION 2:
REGULATION CHECKLIST**

REGULATION CHECKLIST	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)			
ELEMENT A. PLANNING PROCESS			
A1. Does the Plan document the planning process, including how it was prepared and who was involved in the process for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(1))	Section 3, pg 25-38		X
A2. Does the Plan document an opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, agencies that have the authority to regulate development as well as other interests to be involved in the planning process? (Requirement §201.6(b)(2))	Section 3, pg 25-38		X
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))	Section 3, pg 30-35	X	
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))			X
A5. Is there discussion of how the community(ies) will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii))	Section 7.2.4, pg 265-268	X	
A6. Is there a description of the method and schedule for keeping the plan current (monitoring, evaluating and updating the mitigation plan within a 5-year cycle)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i))	Sections 7.1, 7.2.1-7.2.2, pg 261-264	X	
ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS			
<p>A1a. Some of the information about this process appears to be unchanged from the last HMP. Please see my comment on page 25.</p> <p>A1b. The table on page 26 needs to include the Four Mile FPD with a named point of contact.</p> <p>A1c. There are special districts listed as participants on page 27 that don't meet the requirements as participating jurisdictions and should be listed as stakeholders. Also, consider changing the language about the City of Boulder. See my comments on page 27.</p> <p>A2a. I didn't see discussion in Section 3 about opportunities for neighboring jurisdictions and relevant agencies. Minimum requirements for communities are adjacent counties (Grand, Larimer, Weld, Broomfield, Jefferson, and Gilpin). Relevant agencies should include (not inclusive): public (state/federal) landowners, CDOT, CGS, DFPC, CWCB, Dam Safety, CDPHE, and others.</p> <p>A2b. I recommend replacing all current and future uses of Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD) with Mile High Flood District (HMFD). Keeping UDFCD references for past events would be appropriate.</p> <p>A4. There is good discussion in the base plan about these references being incorporated at the County level but it's incomplete from the other jurisdictions' annexes.</p>			
ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT			

REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
B1. Does the Plan include a description of the type, location, and extent of all natural hazards that can affect each jurisdiction(s)? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Section 4, pg 38-240;			
B2. Does the Plan include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i))	Section 4, pg 38-165;			X
B3. Is there a description of each identified hazard’s impact on the community as well as an overall summary of the community’s vulnerability for each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Section 4.4, pg 165-240			X
B4. Does the Plan address NFIP insured structures within the jurisdiction that have been repetitively damaged by floods? (Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii))	Section 4, pg 220-221			X
ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS				
<p>B1. Although Section 4.4, Vulnerability Assessment, does a nice job providing a “10,000 foot view” of vulnerability and impacts across the County, the jurisdictions need more information in their annexes to differentiate theirs from the County as a whole. This can be done descriptively, with a map, or both. Using flood as an example, the paragraphs on pages 209-210 between tables 4.23 and 4.24 start to narrow in on individual jurisdictional vulnerabilities. The Community Impacts section on pages 220-221 add to this. However, they don’t help a reader to fully understand where a given jurisdiction is most vulnerable and why. This needs to be done for <u>all jurisdictions and for each hazard with a probable geographic location(s)</u>, such as: flood, dam failure, geological hazards, and wildfire. Four Mile FPD can be an exception. It can choose to focus on wildfire and threats to its own facilities because the other hazards within its footprint are already covered by the County and/or municipalities.</p> <p>B2a. The avalanche fatality info on page 58 is out of date. Please see my comment on that page.</p> <p>B2b. The date range for extreme temperatures on page 93 is out of date. Please see my comment on that page.</p> <p>B2c. The flood probability is incomplete. Please see my comment on page 110.</p> <p>B2d. The tornado occurrence data is out of date. Please see my comment on page 139.</p> <p>B2e. The municipal and FPD annexes don’t describe each jurisdiction’s hazard occurrences and future probabilities where they differ from the County’s as a whole.</p> <p>B3. General & related to my comment for B1. Excluding the County, the annexes need to describe each jurisdiction’s vulnerabilities to each hazard. Vulnerabilities are more than assets exposed and potential losses- they are the key issues or problems that a hazard can or will create within that community.</p> <p>B3a. (County) The Dam/Levee potential losses are described adequately; estimating actual numbers in the inundation areas will make this section stronger. See comment on page 195.</p> <p>B3b. (County) The potential loss info for earthquakes is out of date. See my recommended solution on page 197.</p> <p>B3c. (County) You have likely met this requirement for flood loss. The flood loss estimates would be stronger if you used the 100-150% content values for commercial & industrial properties (pg 203).</p> <p>B3d. My comment for B1 above identifies what’s needed for this requirement from the jurisdictions as well.</p> <p>B3e. Louisville Assessor data on page 430 is out of date.</p> <p>B4a. The County’s annex says there are two repetitive loss properties in the County (pg 274) but pg 221 says there are none in the County. Please reconcile these differences and include the correct statement.</p> <p>B4b. The City of Boulder’s annex doesn’t address RL/SRL properties.</p> <p>B4c. The Louisville annex doesn’t address RL/SRL properties.</p> <p>B4d. The Nederland annex doesn’t address RL/SRL properties.</p> <p>B4e. The Superior annex doesn’t address RL/SRL properties.</p>				

REGULATION CHECKLIST	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)			
ELEMENT C. MITIGATION STRATEGY			
C1. Does the plan document each jurisdiction’s existing authorities, policies, programs and resources and its ability to expand on and improve these existing policies and programs? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3))	Jurisdictional Annexes		X
C2. Does the Plan address each jurisdiction’s participation in the NFIP and continued compliance with NFIP requirements, as appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	Jurisdictional Annexes		X
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	Section 5.1, pg 241-243	X	
C4. Does the Plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each jurisdiction being considered to reduce the effects of hazards, with emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii))	Jurisdictional annexes		X
C5. Does the Plan contain an action plan that describes how the actions identified will be prioritized (including cost benefit review), implemented, and administered by each jurisdiction? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv)); (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iii))	Section 5.4, pg 244;	X	
C6. Does the Plan describe a process by which local governments will integrate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms, such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate? (Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii))	Section 7.2.3, pg 264-265		X

REGULATION CHECKLIST	Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS			
C1a. There are several capabilities that were generally not addressed in the annexes. Please see the attached Excel file for details. Missing capabilities are highlighted in yellow boxes.			
C1b. Louisville reports no floodplain manager in Table F.10 but someone has to fill that role.			
C1c. Erie is also in the Weld County plan, which is on a very similar timeline to this one. There were several capabilities where Erie gave a different response between the two plans. Please have them confirm which is correct and update as appropriate.			
C2a. The Louisville annex doesn't describe <u>how</u> the City will continue to comply with the NFIP.			
C2b. The Nederland annex doesn't describe <u>how</u> the City will continue to comply with the NFIP.			
C4a. The County's annex does not include any new mitigation actions in its strategy. The strategy portion of the annex appears to be identical to the one from 2016, except for an additional landslide warning action worksheet. Please see my comments throughout the mitigation strategy in v2 and page 270 in v4 for specific comments.			
C4b. The City of Boulder only has one new action in its annex (#1) and copied 9 of the 25 actions from its 2018 plan. A city that size needs to have more than one new action or it needs to explain why it wants to continue to focus on detailed, significant, and impactful actions remaining from its previous plan. 2018 actions 12, 14, 16, 18, and maybe one of the wildfire actions (if it had more detail) could fill this role.			
C4c. Jamestown doesn't have any new actions and needs at least one. Otherwise, see my comments in City of Boulder (above) or Longmont (below) on why and which ongoing actions it will focus on.			
C4d. There aren't any new actions for Lafayette.			
C4e. Longmont only has two new actions in its annex (Tree Canopy, Vulnerability Assessment). A city that size needs to have more than two new actions or it needs to explain why it wants to continue to focus on detailed, significant, and impactful actions remaining from its previous plan. Many of the remaining flood actions and the fire action could fill this role.			
C4f. Louisville doesn't have any new actions but does need some.			
C4g. Superior only has one new action, which isn't enough for a town that size. Consider additional actions to mitigate its high or medium hazards.			
C6. There aren't any integrations for Jamestown included in the plan.			
ELEMENT D. PLAN REVIEW, EVALUATION, AND IMPLEMENTATION (applicable to plan updates only)			
D1. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in development? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 2, pg 22-24; Section 4, hazard profiles; Section 4.4, future development		X
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 5.4; Appendices E-G		X
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	Section 5	X	

REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
<u>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
D1. There are many instances where information is out of date. See my comments throughout the annexes.				
D2a. There is no update to the Lyons McConnell Park action.				
D2b. The status comments in Table 5.2 (pg 249) don't provide any information. Where possible, replace "In progress" with a brief statement of what has occurred. The exception is the County, which is covered in Appendices E-G.				
D2c. I also added some comments related to HMGP, PDM, and FMA grants received that may be tied to some of the actions.				
D2d. The City of Boulder's annex contains 10 actions. Nine of them were copied from the City's 2018 HMP. The City had 25 actions in its plan that all need to be addressed- table 5.2 is a good starting place.				
ELEMENT E. PLAN ADOPTION				
E1. Does the Plan include documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	NA			
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	Appendix F (pending)	TBD		
<u>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISION</u>				
OPTIONAL: HIGH HAZARD POTENTIAL DAM RISKS				
HHPD1. Did Element A4 (planning process) describe the incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information for high hazard potential dams?	Section 4.3.4, pg 65-71; Section 4.5.2, pg 195	X		
HHPD2. Did Element B3 (risk assessment) address HHPDs?	Section 4.3.4, pg 65-71; Section 4.5.2, pg 195	X		
HHPD3. Did Element C3 (mitigation goals) include mitigation goals to reduce long-term vulnerabilities from high hazard potential dams that pose an unacceptable risk to the public?	Section 5.1, pg 241-243	X		
HHPD4. Did Element C4-C5 (mitigation actions) address HHPDs prioritize mitigation actions to reduce vulnerabilities from high hazard potential dams that pose an unacceptable risk to the public?				X
<u>REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
HHPD2. This would be stronger with more specific loss estimates. See my comment for B3a.				
HHPD4. This is an optional element of the review and will not impact plan approval. It will prevent any high hazard dams in Weld County from being eligible for FEMA's High Hazard Potential Dam Rehabilitation Grant Program.				
ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)				

REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
F1.				
F2.				
<u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

**SECTION 3:
PLAN ASSESSMENT**

A. Plan Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement

This section provides a discussion of the strengths of the plan document and identifies areas where these could be improved beyond minimum requirements.

Element A: Planning Process

Strength. This plan contains excellent integration of considerations from Climate Change as well as the Social, Ecological, Technological (SETS) Framework in Section 1.5. This section succinctly describes past, present, and future conditions to take a holistic approach towards hazard mitigation. It also reflects a deeper community perspective than exists in many HMPs.

Opportunity. TBD.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Strength. The HIRA portion of the base plan is very good at giving a County-level perspective on risk. Including the SETS and Climate Change considerations was also excellent and will hopefully become a best practice.

Opportunity. TBD.

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Strength. TBD.

Opportunity. TBD.

Element D: Plan Review, Evaluation, and Implementation (Plan Updates Only)