

July 17, 2026

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN UPDATE

The following questions were submitted to Brendon Dukett, Director of Regional Planning & Municipal Services via the purchasing@scrcog.org email address between June 18th, 2026, and July 10th, 2026. Please see the answers below to each question.

- 1. Can SCRCOG provide a copy of the completed FEMA Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Review Tool from the 2023 HMP review? If not, will SCRCOG please provide any key comments or recommendations from DEMHS or FEMA that it would like consultants to address as part of this HMP update approach?**

Please find a copy of the FEMA Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Review Tool from the 2023 HMP review attached at the end of this question document.

- 2. Will SCRCOG provide available GIS data, mapping files from the 2023 HMP, municipal contact information, and other relevant datasets to support the update effort?**

Yes. SCRCOG will provide available GIS data, mapping files, municipal contact information, and other relevant information and datasets that are available and applicable to support the update effort.

- 3. Does SCRCOG have specific expectations for community and stakeholder engagement, including the anticipated number of public meetings, workshops, surveys, stakeholder interviews, or other outreach activities to be conducted as part of the planning process?**

SCRCOG does not have a prescribed number of meetings, workshops, surveys, or other outreach activities. Proposers should recommend an engagement approach that they believe is appropriate to satisfy the scope of work and FEMA planning requirements.

- 4. Given that SCRCOG is concurrently updating its regional Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), does SCRCOG have specific expectations regarding coordination between these two planning processes?**

SCRCOG expects a reasonable level of coordination between the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan Update and the Regional POCD update to ensure consistency

where appropriate. However, the two efforts are separate planning processes with independent scopes of work and deliverables.

5. Does page count include cover, table of contents, or dividers?

Yes, those are included in the total page count.

6. Does the 2-page Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form count towards the proposal's 30-page limit?

No, the Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form does not count towards the page limit.

7. Can you please confirm whether the 10-page interview slide deck referenced in Section 4, Submission of Responses, is required at the time of proposal submission rather than upon receipt of an interview invitation? If the slide deck is required with the proposal submission, should it be included in both the electronic and physical submission package?

The interview slide deck will be required at the time of proposal submission. This slide deck should be included in the electronic submission package. If it is not included, SCRCOG will follow-up accordingly with respondents who are missing those materials.

8. For firms invited to interview, will there be an opportunity to update or tailor the PowerPoint presentation prior to the interview, or should the presentation submitted with the proposal be considered final?

There will not be an opportunity to update or tailor the PowerPoint presentation prior to the interview, and the presentation submitted with the proposal is considered final.

9. Will SCRCOG make the following prior-plan datasets available to the selected Consultant at Notice to Proceed: (a) GIS layers used in the prior plan's risk assessment, (b) critical facility inventories, (c) repetitive loss and severe repetitive loss data, and (d) municipality capability assessment source data?

Yes, to the extent possible, SCRCOG will provide the selected consultant with prior-plan datasets available.

10. Please clarify the minimum expected number and format (in-person, virtual, or hybrid) for the following engagement components: (a) Regional Advisory or Steering Committee meetings, (b) individual municipal kickoff and working meetings for each of the 15 jurisdictions, (c) public workshops or open houses, (d) coordination meetings

with FEMA Region 1, DEMHS, CIRCA, and utility providers, and (e) municipal adoption support meetings

SCRCOG has not prescribed a minimum number of meetings for each engagement component. Respondents should propose an engagement strategy they believe is necessary to complete a FEMA-compliance Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan update and satisfy the requirements outlined in Section 2.0 of the RFP. SCRCOG anticipates that the selected consultant will conduct an appropriate level of coordination with necessary stakeholders and participants. SCRCOG reserves the right to refine the meeting schedule and engagement approach with the selected consultant during project initiation.

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW TOOL – Final

Jurisdiction Name & State: South Central Regional Council of Governments, CT

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 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: South Central Regional Council of Governments (SCRCOG), CT	Title of Plan: 2023 SCRCOG Hazard Mitigation Plan Update	Date of Plan: January 2023
Single or Multi-jurisdiction plan? Multi-Jurisdiction	New Plan or Plan Update? Update	
Regional Point of Contact: Rebecca Andreucci Title: Senior Transportation Planner Agency/Address: SCRCOG 127 Washington Avenue 4 th Floor West North Haven, CT 06473 Phone Number: 203-466-8601 E-Mail: randreucci@scrcog.org jamie@jamiecaplan.com	Local Point of Contact: Refer to Section 3, Multi-Jurisdiction Contact List Title: Agency/Address: Phone Number: E-Mail:	
State Reviewer:	Title:	Date:
FEMA Reviewer: Sean Loughlin	Title: Community Planner	Date: 3/27/23 – 3/31/23; 4/3/23; 4/18/23
Date Received in FEMA Region I	3/27/23	
Plan Not Approved	3/31/23 Required Revisions	
Plan Approvable Pending Adoption	4/3/23	
Plan Adopted by Jurisdiction	Bethany 4/3/23; Guilford 4/3/23; Milford 4/3/23; North Haven 4/6/23; Orange 4/12/23; West Haven 4/10/23; Remaining Community Adoption Dates TBD	
Plan Approved	4/4/23	

SECTION 1:
REGULATION CHECKLIST

INSTRUCTIONS: The Regulation Checklist must be completed by FEMA. The purpose of the Checklist is to identify the location of relevant or applicable content in the Plan by Element/sub-element and to determine if each requirement has been ‘Met’ or ‘Not Met.’ The ‘Required Revisions’ summary at the bottom of each Element must be completed by FEMA to provide a clear explanation of the revisions that are required for plan approval. Required revisions must be explained for each plan sub-element that is ‘Not Met.’ Sub-elements should be referenced in each summary by using the appropriate numbers (A1, B3, etc.), where applicable. Requirements for each Element and sub-element are described in detail in this *Plan Review Guide* in Section 4, Regulation Checklist.

1. 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))	p. 3-5, p. 45-48, p. 76-100, Appendix A	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))	p. 79-100, Appendix A	X		
A3. Does the Plan document how the public was involved in the planning process during the drafting stage? (Requirement §201.6(b)(1))	p. 88-100, Appendix A	X		
A4. Does the Plan describe the review and incorporation of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information? (Requirement §201.6(b)(3))	p. 253- 275, and Municipal Annexes	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))	p. 303-304	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))	p. 303-307	X		
<u>ELEMENT A: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
ELEMENT B. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT				
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))	p. 101-185, and Municipal Annexes	X		
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))	p. 101-251, and Municipal Annexes	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))	p. 186-251, Appendix C, Municipal Annexes	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))	p. 141-147, 225, Municipal Annexes	X		
ELEMENT B: REQUIRED REVISIONS				
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))	p. 252-286, and Municipal 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))	p. 278-286, and Municipal Annexes	X		
C3. Does the Plan include goals to reduce/avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i))	p. 46-47, p. 287- 289	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))	p. 292-293, and Municipal 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))	p. 293 – 295, and Municipal Annexes	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))	p. 298-299	X		
ELEMENT C: REQUIRED REVISIONS				

1. REGULATION CHECKLIST		Location in Plan (section and/or page number)	Met	Not Met
Regulation (44 CFR 201.6 Local Mitigation Plans)				
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))	p. 48-50, Municipal Annexes	X		
D2. Was the plan revised to reflect progress in local mitigation efforts? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	p. 50, p. 289-291 and Municipal Annexes	X		
D3. Was the plan revised to reflect changes in priorities? (Requirement §201.6(d)(3))	p. 51, Appendix B, and Municipal Annexes	X		
<u>ELEMENT D: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
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))	N/A			
E2. For multi-jurisdictional plans, has each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan documented formal plan adoption? (Requirement §201.6(c)(5))	p. 6-35 Signed resolutions on file	X		
<u>ELEMENT E: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				
ELEMENT F. ADDITIONAL STATE REQUIREMENTS (OPTIONAL FOR STATE REVIEWERS ONLY; NOT TO BE COMPLETED BY FEMA)				
F1.				
F2.				
<u>ELEMENT F: REQUIRED REVISIONS</u>				

SECTION 2: 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.

Recommended Corrections:

- **Meriden Annex:** P. 2, Table 4 in Table of Contents refers to Woodbridge. Update to Meriden.
- **Meriden Annex:** P. 18, Table 4 refers to Woodbridge. Update to Meriden.
- **Milford Annex:** Change to City throughout the Annex where it is referred to as a Town. The Annex says both City and Town throughout.
- **West Haven Annex:** Title page refers to the community as a Town on the top and City on the bottom. Change to City throughout the Annex where it is referred to as a Town. The Annex says both City and Town throughout.
- **Woodbridge Annex:** P. 29, Table 20, has City of West Haven in the title. Update to Town of Woodbridge.
- **Woodbridge Annex:** P. 3, Table of Contents, Table 20, has City of West Haven in the title. Update to Town of Woodbridge.

Element A: Planning Process

Strengths:

- The planning process is well documented and includes a detailed schedule of the events and meetings that contributed to the development of the plan. This included the development of a Public Outreach Strategy, four Advisory Committee meetings, 15 municipality meetings and two Public Workshops.
- The planning process is well detailed. The inclusion of meeting materials will help guide future updates.
- The outreach strategy was comprehensive, with a variety of opportunities for the public to participate. Feedback was incorporated into the plan. The public survey on the SCRCOG web site was provided in both English and Spanish.
- For the first time, all 15 municipalities in the SCRCOG region participated in the plan. Meriden joined the planning process this year.
- Community officials were effectively engaged in the planning process. Their feedback shaped the content of the plan.
- A range of existing studies, reports and plans were reviewed and incorporated, resulting in a plan that is comprehensive and current.
- The plan includes a nice regional profile that includes demographic information, including environmental justice populations.
- Stakeholder engagement included meetings with three organizations that made important contributions to the plan development: Connecticut Institute for Resilience and Climate Adaptation (CIRCA), Greater New Haven Water Pollution Control Authority (GNHWPCA), and The Nature Conservancy. Good job!

Opportunities for Improvement:

- For the next plan update, be sure to read through all of the requirements associated with the [Local Mitigation Planning Policy Guide](#), that becomes effective April 19, 2023.
- Consider incorporating specific mitigation measure evaluation criteria into the plan monitoring procedures so that progress can be better quantified.
- A suggestion is to write out the full name of the SCRCOG somewhere within the draft adoption resolutions, to minimize any confusion with other COG acronyms within the State of Connecticut.

Element B: Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment

Strengths:

- Fifteen (15) hazard profiles are well defined with detailed information about the context of the hazards and the risks they present to the community.
- The plan includes profiles of the communities, including demographic information, development trends and landscape features. This makes community assets and vulnerabilities clear.
- The Risk Analysis, Chapter 5, includes some excellent data sources to quantify exposure and loss estimates for the hazards identified within the plan, such as: HAZUS, FEMA PA, National Center for Environmental Information (NCEI) and the Resilient Connecticut vulnerability assessment report. Good job utilizing various data sources to enhance the risk assessment.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- The hazard profiles in Chapter 4 contain probability information, as does Chapter 5 (Table 87, Priority Risk Index (PRI) and Table 89, PRI Summary). Consider verifying that the probability terminologies used in the hazard profiles is consistent with the PRI tables to minimize confusion and for consistency. For example, the probability term used for Earthquake and Tornado in Chapter 4 was “Occasional”, but “Rare” and “Moderate” were used for probability in Chapter 5’s PRI tables.

Element C: Mitigation Strategy

Strengths:

- The plan provides a comprehensive, detailed description of each community's existing programs, plans, policies, and capabilities that support mitigation.
- The plan includes a variety of different types of actions (local plans and regulations, structures and infrastructure projects, natural systems protections, and education and awareness programs).
- While the previous plan considered climate change and resilience, this plan names climate change in the updated mission statement: Reduce or eliminate risk to people and property from natural hazards and climate change.
- In the previous plan, only the City of Milford and the City of New Haven were active participants in the Community Rating System (CRS). Now that the Town of Guilford has joined the program, this plan update includes three communities that participate in the CRS and receive a discount for NFIP policy holders.
- The plan includes a section on potential FEMA funding sources for mitigation activities and Table 107 contains many hyperlinks to non-FEMA funding sources as well. Good job!
- The community annex includes problem statements, which are designed to briefly summarize the key hazard risks and vulnerabilities to the municipality based on potential impacts and losses from future events.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- The information provided for the C6, Plan Integration element appears to meet the intent of the mitigation planning requirements, such as the mitigation plan being integrated into some regional plans that all the communities participate in- and plans it may be integrated into in the future. Continue to show how the mitigation plan has and will be integrated into other community efforts - further “baking” mitigation into other community planning mechanisms.

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

Strengths:

- Progress on mitigation actions is clear and comprehensive.
- Priorities in the plan recognize current conditions. They are reflective of the planning process, risk assessment and the mitigation strategy.

Opportunities for Improvement:

- Including a discussion of lessons learned about implementing mitigation actions would strengthen the plan, as would a short narrative on some “success stories” about their implementation. Further showcase the mitigation successes and grant funding received. This will further demonstrate the importance of this plan and enhance the plan’s visibility among decision makers of the SCRCOG jurisdictions.

B. Resources for Implementing Your Approved Plan

Refer to the [State Hazard Mitigation Plan](#) to learn about hazards relevant to Connecticut and the state's action plan.

Technical Assistance:

FEMA

- [FEMA Climate Change](#): Provides resources that address climate change.
- [FEMA Library](#): FEMA publications can be downloaded from the library website. These resources may be especially useful in public information and outreach programs. Topics include building and construction techniques, NFIP policies, and integrating historic preservation and cultural resource protection with mitigation.
- [FEMA RiskMAP](#): Technical assistance is available through RiskMAP to assist communities in identifying, selecting, and implementing activities to support mitigation planning and risk reduction. Attend RiskMAP discovery meetings that may be scheduled in the state, especially any in neighboring communities with shared watersheds boundaries.

Other Federal

- [EPA Resilience and Adaptation in New England \(RAINE\)](#): A collection of vulnerability, resilience and adaptation reports, plans, and webpages at the state, regional, and community levels. Communities can use the RAINE database to learn from nearby communities about building resiliency and adapting to climate change.
- [EPA Soak Up the Rain](#): Soak Up the Rain is a public outreach campaign focused on stormwater quality and flooding. The website contains helpful resources for public outreach and easy implementation projects for individuals and communities.
- [NOAA C-CAP Land Cover Atlas](#): This interactive mapping tool allows communities to see their land uses, how they have changed over time, and what impact those changes may be having on resilience.
- [NOAA Sea Grant](#): Sea Grant's mission is to provide integrated research, communication, education, extension and legal programs to coastal communities that lead to the responsible use of the nation's ocean, coastal and Great Lakes resources through informed personal, policy and management decisions. Examples of the resources available help communities plan, adapt, and recovery are the Community Resilience Map of Projects and the National Sea Grant Resilience Toolkit
- [NOAA Sea Level Rise Viewer](#) and [Union for Concerned Scientists Inundation Mapper](#): These interactive mapping tools help coastal communities understand how their hazard risks may be changing. The "Preparing for Impacts" section of the inundation mapper addresses policy responses to protect communities.
- [NOAA U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit](#): This resource provides scientific tools, information, and expertise to help manage climate-related risks and improve resilience to extreme events. The "[Steps to Resilience](#)" tool may be especially helpful in mitigation planning and implementation.

State

- [Connecticut Department of Emergency Services & Public Protection](#): The Connecticut State Hazard Mitigation Officer (SHMO) and State Mitigation Planner(s) can provide guidance regarding grants, technical assistance, available publications, and training opportunities.

- Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection [Natural Resources](#) and [Environmental Quality](#) can provide technical assistance and resources to communities seeking to implement their hazard mitigation plans.
[CT Mapping Portal](#): Environmental GIS data available to download.

Not for Profit

- [Kresge Foundation Online Library](#): Reports and documents on increasing urban resilience, among other topics.
- [Naturally Resilient Communities](#): A collaboration of organizations put together this guide to nature-based solutions and case studies so that communities can learn which nature-based solutions can work for them.
- [Rockefeller Foundation Resilient Cities](#): Helping cities, organizations, and communities better prepare for, respond to, and transform from disruption.

Funding Sources:

- [Connecticut Department of Emergency Services](#): Assists in applying for FEMA Hazard Mitigation Grant Program funds.
- [Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Services](#) offers clean water grants that can be used for river restoration or other kinds of hazard mitigation implementation projects.
- [Connecticut Institute for Resilience and Climate Adaptation](#) provides funding for Municipal Resilience projects
- [Grants.gov](#): Lists of grant opportunities from federal agencies (HUD, DOT/FHWA, EPA, etc.) to support rural development, sustainable communities and smart growth, climate change and adaptation, historic preservation, risk analyses, wildfire mitigation, conservation, Federal Highways pilot projects, etc.
- [FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance](#) (HMA): FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance provides funding for projects under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), Pre-Disaster Mitigation (PDM), and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA). States, federally recognized tribes, local governments, and some not for profit organizations are eligible applicants.
- [GrantWatch](#): The website posts current foundation, local, state, and federal grants on one website, making it easy to consider a variety of sources for grants, guidance, and partnerships. Grants listed include The Partnership for Resilient Communities, the Institute for Sustainable Communities, the Rockefeller Foundation Resilience, The Nature Conservancy, The Kresge Climate-Resilient Initiative, the Threshold Foundation's Thriving Resilient Communities funding, the RAND Corporation, and ICLEI Local Governments for Sustainability.
- USDA [Natural Resource Conservation Service](#) (NRCS) and [Rural Development Grants](#): NRCS provides conservation technical assistance, financial assistance, and conservation innovation grants. USDA Rural Development operates over fifty financial assistance programs for a variety of rural applications.