

Recovery Plan RFP Questions and Answers – All Sources
5-7-2013

1. What is the history of how this project was conceived?

Recovery planning has been an area that we have wanted to develop beyond Emergency Support Function 14 of the Seattle Disaster Response and Recovery Plan. In 2012 the City Council appropriated some funding to get us started which led to the development of the Phase 1, The Post-Disaster Recovery Plan Framework. Phase 1 provides concepts and sets the scene for future work. For fiscal years 2013-2014, the City Council provided additional funding to develop a Disaster Recovery Plan for the City of Seattle using the whole community concept of planning.

2. Do any of the jurisdictions identified as having recovery plans in the Phase 1 effort have a plan that you feel could be translated to the City of Seattle.

There are different components of some of the plans from other cities that we like, but none of them could be considered meeting all of our needs or desires. We want to be sure to engage the whole community and we recognized that developing processes for policy decision making will be a key element in our plan.

3. If you are looking for broader community input beyond Seattle, consensus can be difficult. Do you have an idea in mind for your approach?

We understand that there will be many competing interests and our focus needs to be on building processes that will make decisions on contentious issues possible. We will certainly need to integrate different opinions or options to consider.

4. Are there some decisions that you believe will require more resources or time than others?

We believe that land use will be one area that will take some time. Others will likely surface early in the process.

5. Seattle appears to have strong neighborhood identifies. Is that a consideration?

Yes, neighborhoods will need to be a part of the planning process as well as business, non-profits and other organizations. We have links into some of the various groups that are strong and others that will need additional development as we move forward in this planning effort. Links to the business community needs to be strengthened for one. We want to improve our bounce back capacity.

6. What are the desired characteristics of team members?

We are looking for good facilitation skills, consensus building and writing in a way that is logical and useful to those who read the plan.

7. How happy were you with the Phase 1 Plan? Are you locked into concepts identified in it?

We liked the link to resilience and several concepts described. We want to build on the foundation of the report but we are not locked into all concepts identified in Phase 1. One thing that we would like to see is the creation (or it could be an existing groups or groups) of a steering committee or task force that will be formed and used in the development of the Recovery Plan that will continue to meet and discuss difficult recovery issues after the plan is complete. We expect to train to and exercise this plan after the performance period of this contract.

8. P. 3 of the RFP indicates that “no Federal funding is used for this contract. Can you provide the funding source?

Seattle City Council.

9. Did the Phase I consulting team assist in development of this RFP?

The RFP draws from the suggested scope of work for Phase 2, but it was developed by Emergency Management staff without input from the Phase 1 consulting team.

10. Is the consulting team utilized in Phase I eligible to submit for Phase II?

Yes.

11. Related to Task 2, do we understand correctly that you would you like to use, but expand upon, the same Planning Team that was used for Phase 1?

Phase 1 involved some stakeholder identification, but did not involve the development of a planning team beyond key staff overseeing the consultants’ work. This would be a new, and we hope, sustainable team.

12. Related to Task 3, how do you envision design charrettes being used during development of the Recovery Plan?

We see the design charrette as a potentially useful tool to step through the recovery process using a particular neighborhood as the context. For example, we could assume a damage scenario for an area we know to be vulnerable to earthquake damage, and then use it to work through recovery options and policy decisions to inform the planning process.

13. As a follow up to the above question related to the design charrettes if they will be desktop type exercises rather than workshop type planning meetings will HSEEP concepts need to be employed?

This could be a paper exercise or a community workshop event. This would be decided between the consulting team awarded the contract and the City. It would not be necessary to use the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) guidelines, but the consulting team is free to propose their use in an RFP.

14. Under Task 4 the bullets primarily are referencing public assistance (PA) type activities, will the plan also include individual assistance (IA) activities?

The plan will address both FEMA PA and IA activities, but the plan is meant to embrace a wide range of recovery issues and resources relevant to community-wide recovery well beyond FEMA-funding programs.

15. Under “plan maintenance” on p. 5 the forth bullet indicates “Identity strategies for effective recovery and disaster resilience.” Does this mean that Hazard Mitigation will be included as part of the Recovery Plan?

The bulleted list on page 5 is not meant to be interpreted as sub-parts of “Plan Maintenance”, but rather sub-task within the plan as a whole. The City does have a stand-alone Hazard Mitigation Plan, but we would like to see the integration of mitigation with recovery planning, as we see them as interconnected.

16. P.11, 3. Are you asking for one page **for each** minimum qualification or one page **that includes all six** minimum qualifications?

The intention was to cover all of the minimum qualifications on one page, but you should feel free to use more space as needed as long as answers are concise.

17. Does the city have a disaster recovery software application they use to build plans?

No

18. Other than Phase I, has the city ever had a disaster recovery program, plans or strategy?

Yes, there are recovery concepts identified in the Seattle Disaster Response and Recovery Plan, Emergency Support Function 14.

19. On page 4, in Task 3 – B: what is ‘design charrettes’?

In planning, the charrette has become a technique for consulting with all stakeholders. We see the design charrette as a potentially useful tool to step through the recovery process using a particular neighborhood as the context. For example, we could assume a damage scenario for an area we know to be vulnerable to earthquake damage, and then use it to work through recovery options and policy decisions to inform the planning process.

20. Are the Co-Leads looking for one person for a length of time? Or a team of people who have different expertise for the different deliverables?

We are open to all proposals and are not locked in to any one model.