



## **Request for Proposals**

# **Technical Energy Project Development Action Guide for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) and Other Hazard Mitigation Programs**

**Solicitation Number: NASEO-2022-RFP-006**

Released: May 23, 2022

Responses Due: June 7, 2022

**(Late proposals will not be accepted)**

National Association of State Energy Officials  
1300 17th Street North, Suite 1275  
Arlington, Virginia, 22209

Note on applicants' eligibility: All applicants must meet the generic [DOE Mandatory Requirements and Standard Provisions](#).

## I. Introduction

NASEO seeks a *Consultant* to develop a technical energy project development action guide for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) and other similar hazard mitigation programs, as applicable. NASEO will guide the development of this resource to help State Energy Offices, State Emergency Management Agencies, key local officials, and private sector entities working together to identify solutions to mitigate hazards to the energy sector; and support project eligibility, application, funding, implementation, and closeout for said projects.

FEMA BRIC makes federal funds available to states, U.S territories, federally recognized tribal governments, and local communities for hazard mitigation activities.<sup>1</sup> For the energy sector, BRIC represents a significant opportunity to leverage public and private resources together to mitigate hazards that affect public-serving energy infrastructure, energy sources and supply chains serving critical facilities, and energy dependent [FEMA Community Lifelines](#).

Because of the volume of BRIC project applications sent to FEMA, and the competitive nature of most of BRIC's funding, it is critical for potential BRIC applicants interested in applying for funds for energy resilience to develop targeted, eligible, project applications of the highest quality that stand out in a saturated application pool. This requires involvement of hazard mitigation and energy subject matter experts in project development, buy-in and support from state emergency management partners, and deliberate engagement with local entities and private partners.

The combination of **State Energy Offices, State Emergency Management Agencies**, and relevant **energy industry partners** are best suited to jointly apply for and leverage BRIC funds to support local energy resilience. This coalition archetype can, with proper guidance, develop and submit project applications that are competitive within FEMA's qualitative and quantitative metrics.

NASEO has been a vocal proponent of BRIC and its authorizing legislation, the Disaster Recovery and Reform Act (DRRA). The following links are NASEO's public and formal comments on FEMA's BRIC program:

- [NASEO Comments on FEMA Hazard Mitigation Assistance: Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities \(BRIC\) \(May 2020\)](#)
- [NASEO Letter to Acting Administrator Gaynor Regarding BRIC \(2019\)](#)
- [NASEO Comments on FEMA BRIC Program \(2019\)](#)

In support of this work to date, NASEO has completed a number of activities including hosting a "Community Energy Resilience through FEMA BRIC" workshop; interviewing State Energy Offices, State Hazard Mitigation Offices, private sector entities, and federal partners; and conducting extensive research.

## II. Statement of Work and Timeline

This activity is a continuation of NASEO's support of FEMA's innovative and proactive measures to

support broad community resilience, and advocacy to recognize energy as a fundamental lifeline and enable more accurate evaluation of energy resilience.

To that end, the *Consultant*, with input from NASEO, the National Emergency Management Association (NEMA), and their members, will develop actionable, instructive guidance for states to follow in pursuit of hazard mitigation program funding for energy projects, with an emphasis on BRIC. The guidance will consist of contextual information on hazard mitigation for the energy sector; clarified, sequential, and user-friendly application instructions; peer tips and recommendations; and resources on a variety of subjects including cost-share, benefit-cost analysis, and project eligibility.

It is important to note that BRIC is not the only resilience funding mechanism that exists, nor is it always the most appropriate funding mechanism given its stringent requirements and administrative burdens. NASEO expects that practices and approaches with broader applicability to other funding mechanisms and their evaluation metrics (e.g., HMGP, HUD CDBG, HUD CDBG-MIT, IJA etc.) will be explicitly identified.

It is anticipated that the *Consultant's* services will be initiated in June 2022 and conclude no later than September 2022. Prior to the commencement of any formal tasks, NASEO will host a kickoff meeting with the contractor to clarify the approach and timeline of the project, answer any questions, set expectations regarding frequency and nature of NASEO member engagement, and resolve other specific details for the program.

The *Consultant* will be responsible for the following tasks:

#### **Task 1.0 Adding to Action Guide Outline**

NASEO will provide the *Consultant* with an initial draft outline to refer to, build upon, or supplement, after the execution of the contract. That outline may serve as a starting point for the Action Guide; the Contractor will be encouraged to develop additional sections as necessary based on their unique expertise and guidance. The outline should be drafted with energy lifeline/sector projects in mind and used as examples.

The final outline will be provided to NASEO, NEMA, and the U.S. Department of Energy for approval before any work on Task 3 may begin. Interviews for Task 2 may inform approved sections of Task 1.

#### **DRAFT OUTLINE with Recommended Page Limits per Section**

##### **I. Background and Context**

- A. Importance of Energy Resilience and Pre-disaster Hazard Mitigation **(1 page)**
- B. Intended Audience: State and Territory Energy Offices interested in pursuing BRIC grants for energy resilience **(1 page)**
- C. Actor/Partner Overview Table (roles/what each entity brings to the table) **(1 page)**
- D. BRIC application process overview **(2 pages)**
- E. FEMA Lifeline Concept Overview **(1 page)**

##### **II. Pre-planning:**

- A. Prerequisites Overview. Will seek to answer the questions:
  - a) Which funding source is right for you?

- b) What groundwork, scoping, feasibility assessments, etc. need to be conducted prior to an application?
- c) Does your project proposal support resilience for Projects Supporting Disadvantaged and High/Frequent Impact Communities?

**III. Planning**

- A. Seeks to answer the questions:
  - a) What does a successful energy-resilience BRIC application look like?
  - b) How will the application meet FEMA's qualitative and quantitative evaluation criteria?
  - c) What are the key elements?
- B. Eligibility Determination and Project Scoping
- C. Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration
- D. Hazard-Based Risk Assessments
- E. Cost-share and Funding
- F. Benefit Cost Analysis

**IV. Special Topic Annexes/Supplements:**

- A. Navigating Advanced Assistance Grants from FEMA
- B. Building Energy Code Project Annex
- C. Others as Requested

**Task 2.0 Conduct Literature Review, Research, Interviews**

Following approval of the expanded Action Guide Outline (Task 1), the *Consultant* will conduct research of relevant publications and interviews with relevant stakeholders (e.g., State Energy Officials, State Hazard Mitigation Officers, energy industry stakeholders, local representatives, and others) to gather unique content in support of the technical guide for energy projects. The *Consultant* will be expected to develop lists of questions to ask specific stakeholders in the development of particular sections. The *Consultant* will be required to provide NASEO and NEMA with a list of questions and interviewees prior to any interview. NASEO will have the discretion to supplement or amend the interviewee list and questions list.

In support of this activity, NASEO and NEMA will connect the *Consultant* with members, affiliates, and industry partners to interview and provide state specific context, examples, successes, challenges, and insight; as well as summaries of past workshops. NASEO and NEMA will, to the extent possible and practical, provide the Consultant, with materials and resources from previous hazard mitigation grant applications and sub applications. The Contractor will include NASEO staff on all interviews.

**Task 3.0 Drafting of Technical Energy Project Development Action Guide for FEMA BRIC Funding**

Following the literature review, background research, and conduct of relevant interviews, the *Consultant* will begin writing the draft action guide. Given the sequential structure of the outline, it will be acceptable for the *Consultant* to conduct elements of Task 2 and Task 3 concurrently.

The *Consultant* shall not have the right to reproduce, utilize portions of, or publish any physical or digital deliverable or webinar without NASEO's express written permission.

**Task 4.0 Iterative Review**

The *Contractor*, upon completion of the initial draft of the Action Guide, will engage in an iterative review process with NASEO, NEMA, their members, and the U.S. Department of Energy.

**Task 5.0 Host Technical Rollout/Walkthrough Webinar**

Following NASEO’s and DOE’s approval of the final draft of the action guide, the *Consultant* will host a rollout webinar to socialize the Action Guide and explain how it can be most effectively used. The *Consultant* will record the webinar for NASEO to redistribute, post on its website, and further socialize.

Prior to hosting the webinar, the *Consultant* will share the draft slide deck or presentation with NASEO for review and approval. The webinar should be no shorter than one (1) hour and no longer than two (3) hours in duration.

It is envisioned that this project will be initiated in June 2022 and will conclude by September 20, 2022. The *Consultant* will be responsible for the following tasks and deliverables:

**Project Schedule (Estimated)**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Estimated Deliverable Date*</b>
<b>Kickoff Meeting w/ NASEO and DOE</b>	Week of June 13-17, 2022
<b>Task 1: Action Guide Outline Complete</b>	July 1, 2022
<b>Task 2: Literature Review, Research, Stakeholder Interviews</b>	July 15, 2022
<b>Task 3: Draft Action Guide Due</b>	August 26, 2022
<b>Task 4.a: Iterative Review/Revisions</b>	August 29 – September 9, 2022
<b>Task 4.b: Final Action Guide Due</b>	September 16, 2022
<b>Task 5: Host Technical Rollout Webinar</b>	September 23, 2022

\* The deliverable timeline may change depending on timeliness of internal and external reviews, data acquisition and interviews and other challenges. Final document review by DOE may also delay final deliverable date.

**III. Period of Performance**

This project is estimated to last from June 2022 to September 2022.

**IV. Project Budget**

The proposed project budget should reflect a times and materials consulting agreement. This is a competitively bid project; costs should be feasible and prudent. NASEO has instituted a \$70,000 ceiling for this award. The *Consultant* must submit cost proposals by task for the entire Statement of Work using the DOE EERE budget justification spreadsheet which is a separate file available for download [from DOE’s website](#). NASEO may request changes to the proposal if the proposed scope exceeds the available budget.

NASEO may request changes to the proposal if the proposed scope exceeds the available budget.

**Compensation:** The *Consultant* shall invoice monthly for actual work completed. NASEO shall reimburse the *Consultant* for actual milestones achieved and hours spent in the execution of the work (not to exceed the total approved task budget shown in the final contract agreement) once NASEO has received payment from DOE. The *Consultant* will submit a monthly invoice and progress report by the tenth of each month of the agreement.

#### **Rejection of Proposals and Incurred Costs**

This Request for Proposals (RFP) does not obligate NASEO to award an agreement. All costs incurred in response to this RFP are the respondent's responsibility.

NASEO reserves the right to reject any or all submitted proposals not in conformance with this RFP or for other causes. NASEO reserves the right to request new proposals or to cancel all or part of this solicitation.

#### **V. Contract Requirements**

The funds for this work have been provided through a cooperative agreement between NASEO and the U.S. Department of Energy. The underlying terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement between DOE and NASEO will be provided to the *Contractor* and incorporated in the awarded subcontract. All requirements of the DOE contract shall be controlling, including, but not limited to, federal reporting and the propriety and form of expenses and costs. The contract shall be issued following approval from DOE and will become effective when signed and dated by NASEO and the *Consultant*.

#### **VI. Responding to the RFP**

Please submit responses to the RFP to Campbell Delahoyde by e-mail at [cdelahoyde@naseo.org](mailto:cdelahoyde@naseo.org). **RFP responses are due no later than 5:00 pm ET on June 7, 2022.** Responses need to include the following items:

- Cover letter
- Resumes
- Description of relevant experience, including supporting hazard mitigation application development, including familiarity with the FEMA energy lifeline concept, familiarity with traditional energy resilience projects, experience with State Energy Offices, and interview experience
- Proposed approach and treatment of the tasks and sub-tasks with a view toward expected deliverables
- Proposed Budget by Task Deliverables  
The budget should be completed using the [DOE EERE budget justification spreadsheet](#). Please note that there is no cost-share requirement, applicants can use either the 3-year or 5-year budget justification and add all costs for their proposal under Budget Period 1.

Please limit the cover letter, the description of relevant experience, and the narrative that addresses the proposed approach and development of the project tasks and proposed budget to **6 pages in 11-point font**. Resumes and the proposed budget do not count toward the page limit.

**Note: Late proposals will not be accepted.**

## VII. Subcontractor Selection and Required Qualifications

NASEO will select a *Consultant* through a competitive selection, which will include consideration of the following:

- Relevant experience supporting hazard mitigation application development, including familiarity with the FEMA energy lifeline concept, familiarity with traditional energy resilience projects (e.g., backup generation, infrastructure hardening and protection, etc.), familiarity with non-traditional energy resilience projects (e.g., experience with resilient clean energy technologies, such as microgrids, energy efficiency upgrades, building energy codes, etc.)
- Familiarity with energy security, resilience, and reliability concepts.
- Experience working with State Energy Offices, and other relevant state agencies.
- Competitive rate.
- Quality of academic and professional experience in relevant field.

The NASEO Evaluation Team will use the following criteria in assessing all responses to this RFP:

### **Technical Experience and Applicant Qualifications (30% of total score)**

1. Relevant experience in proposed topics in the energy sector, particularly working with State Energy Offices and other state agencies.
2. Adequate level of technical knowledge to meet the demands of the project.
3. Quality of academic and professional experience in relevant field.

### **Proposed Approach for Implementation (40% of total score)**

1. Proposal responds to the outlined topics in the RFP.
2. Existing availability to meet needs of flexible deployment.
3. Overall quality and professionalism of the proposal (well written, structured and organized) and materials are provided in the format requested.

### **Budget (30% of total score)**

1. Given the scope, is the estimated cost of the proposal appropriate?
2. Does overall cost reflect an efficient value for the level of effort?
3. Is the level of effort for each task appropriate?