



COLORADO

Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management

Department of Public Safety

DHSEM Announces Hazard Mitigation Grant Opportunities for 2021-2022

Colorado communities have a unique opportunity to reduce their long-term risks from natural hazards with assistance from FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance (HMA) programs: Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP), Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC), and Flood Mitigation Assistance (FMA).

FEMA recently released the annual Notices of Funding Opportunity for BRIC & FMA 2021 and also announced that Colorado will receive approximately \$58.6M from HMGP to fund mitigation projects. These are in addition to the three existing HMGP's related to last year's large wildfires. There are differences between programs so here's a summary of each. HMGP mitigates all natural hazards, has an allocation for projects with difficult to verify cost-effectiveness, and is solely for eligible jurisdictions and projects in Colorado. BRIC also mitigates all natural hazards, focuses on transformative infrastructure and community-level projects, has a state allocation of \$1M, and is primarily competitive with other projects across the nation (except for the state allocations). FMA is intended to reduce or eliminate the risk of repetitive flood damage to buildings and structures insured under the National Flood Insurance Program. The funding available in these programs offers us the chance to tackle big mitigation projects with large benefits to our communities- so think big!

More information about the programs is available from the DHSEM Mitigation Section and at <https://www.fema.gov/grants/mitigation>. All three programs have a 75% federal cost share for each awarded project. Economically Disadvantaged Rural Communities may receive a 90% federal cost share for awarded projects.

Our priorities for these programs are:

- Prioritize projects that help underserved populations.
- Oversubscribe all HMGP programs.
- Apply for and spend the entire \$1M BRIC 2021 state allocation.
- Identify and fund projects larger in scale and size than we have with previous grants.
- Use available state funds to wholly or partially meet the non-federal share for projects. (Depending on the hazard being mitigated.)



COLORADO

Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management

Department of Public Safety

Our pledge is to make this process as seamless and transparent for you as possible by using an integrated approach. Let's discuss projects instead of grant programs. If you're interested in applying, please complete the attached Notice of Interest (NOI) for our review. Once we work to resolve any questions or concerns with you we'll forward the NOI to FEMA Region VIII for their initial review and feedback on project eligibility. Then we'll work with you to get access, if necessary, into our EM Grants system at <https://co.emgrants.com/> to complete your sub-application. Finally, we'll determine which program(s) to apply to. If it's HMGP we'll submit your application into a FEMA system. If we decide to submit your sub-application for BRIC or FMA then you'll copy and paste your application from EM Grants into FEMA's Grant Outcomes system.

- **Sub-applications for HMGP 5334 are due to DHSEM by: 12/1/2021***
- **Sub-applications for HMGP 5378 are due to DHSEM by: 12/14/2021**
- **Sub-applications for HMGP 4581 are due to DHSEM by: 12/14/2021**
- **Sub-applications for HMGP 4498 and BRIC/FMA 2021 are due to DHSEM by: 12/14/2021**
- **Final sub-applications for HMGP 5378 are due to DHSEM by: 3/1/2022**
- **Final sub-applications for HMGP 4498 are due to DHSEM by: 7/7/2022**

*- assumes an extension from FEMA, the current deadline to FEMA is 9/30/2021

We will submit low-cost "shovel ready" projects to FEMA for HMGP 5334 and 5378 as soon as we receive them from you.

DHSEM and other state agencies that form the State Hazard Mitigation Team will score and prioritize all projects for BRIC using the attached Colorado Resiliency Framework Criteria and the two sets of BRIC criteria in the attached BRIC Scoring Rubric. We'll score and prioritize FMA projects with the Colorado Resiliency Framework and the appropriate attached FMA Scoring Rubric, depending on the project type. Finally, we'll score and prioritize HMGP 4498 and 4581 projects using the Colorado Resiliency Framework and the applicable BRIC or FMA criteria.

Communities and Special Districts must have a currently approved local Hazard Mitigation Plan to apply for BRIC or FMA and to receive funds from all three programs. Additionally, requested projects must be included in that jurisdiction's mitigation strategy in the HMP. Jurisdictions that are not in an HMP may find a project sponsor who is or they may ask to be added to the appropriate HMP by following the enclosed DHSEM Additions to HMPs checklist. Communities



COLORADO

Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management

Department of Public Safety

and special districts can also add projects to their mitigation strategy if they're not already included.

DHSEM's Mitigation Section is committed to helping the people and communities of Colorado identify and reduce risk from natural hazards. Please contact Mark Thompson at markw.thompson@state.co.us for any questions related to hazard mitigation plans (including adding actions and/or jurisdictions) and Matt Arsenault at matt.arsenault@state.co.us with any questions about projects or BRIC Capability and Capacity Building (C&CB) activities. We stand ready to assist you with the application process to enable each community to reduce its long-term risks from natural hazards.

Encls

1. DHSEM Notice of Interest
2. Colorado Resiliency Framework Criteria
3. BRIC Scoring Rubric
4. FMA Scoring Rubric
5. DHSEM Additions to HMPs Checklist

NOTICE OF INTENT - PRE-APPLICATION ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET

FOR THE FEMA BUILDING RESILIENT INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES (BRIC), HAZARD MITIGATION GRANT PROGRAM (HMGP) AND
FLOOD MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE (FMA) GRANT PROGRAMS

MITIGATION **PROJECT** PROPOSALS

(Refer to FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance Guidance for Eligible Projects)

Applicant/Organization: _____

Proposed Activity Title: _____

Applicant Type: ☐ State Agency ☐ Tribal Government ☐ Local Government ☐ Special District

Primary Contact: _____

Primary Contact Title: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ County: _____ Zip: _____

Phone #: _____

FAX # _____

Email Address: _____

Alternate Contact: _____

Alternate Contact Title: _____

Phone #: _____

Email Address: _____

If a Tribal or local government is the proposed applicant, does the Tribal or local government have a current FEMA approved, locally adopted multi-hazard mitigation plan (HMP) OR if a state agency or private nonprofit organization is the proposed applicant, is the proposed project located totally within a jurisdiction with a FEMA approved, locally adopted hazard mitigation plan? ☐ No ☐ Yes
If unsure, please check with the County or City Emergency Manager. If yes, name of plan:

Current expiration date of the HMP: _____

If no, is the local jurisdiction developing or updating a local hazard mitigation plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable

Proposed Project: ☐ Acquisition ☐ Elevation ☐ Relocation ☐ Mitigation Reconstruction ☐ Retrofit ☐ Floodproofing ☐ Saferoom/Shelter
☐ Stabilization and Restoration ☐ Utility and Infrastructure Protection ☐ Flood Control ☐ Codes and Standards ☐ Warning Systems
☐ Wildlife Mitigation ☐ Education and Awareness ☐ Feasibility, Engineering, and Design Studies ☐ Microgrid ☐ Generator
☐ Landslide Mitigation ☐ Planning Related Activities ☐ Other C&CB Activities ☐ Partnerships ☐ Evacuation ☐ Windstorm
☐ Other _____

Primary Hazard: ☐ Avalanche ☐ Debris Flow ☐ Earthquake ☐ Erosion ☐ Flood ☐ Landslide
☐ Lightning ☐ Wildfire ☐ Wind ☐ Winter Weather ☐ Other: _____

Secondary Hazard: ☐ Avalanche ☐ Debris Flow ☐ Earthquake ☐ Erosion ☐ Flood ☐ Landslide
☐ Lightning ☐ Wildfire ☐ Wind ☐ Winter Weather ☐ Other: _____

Brief Description of the Proposed Project:

Location:

Briefly describe who this project will benefit and/or impact of the project in terms of lives saved and property damage avoided:

Briefly describe how the project will be implemented:

Describe the residences or other buildings directly affected by the proposed hazard. Include quantities in the description.

Does this project mitigate the risk to one or more of the FEMA Community Lifelines? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please explain which one(s) and how the project will enhance their protection.

☐ Safety and security ☐ Food, water, and shelter ☐ Health and medical ☐ Energy ☐ Communications ☐ Transportation ☐ Hazardous material

Estimated Total Project Cost: _____ Federal Share: _____

Non-Federal Share: _____

Proposed Sources of funds for the Non-Federal Share:

Cost effectiveness. Please provide a preliminary benefit cost ratio estimate: _____

Fill in the below two evaluations for BRIC projects only.

Technical Evaluation Criteria

As set forth in the table below, FEMA will score sub-applications using technical evaluation criteria. The technical evaluation criteria offer incentives for elements valued by FEMA. In order to ensure transparency and efficiency in competition project selection, technical evaluation criteria are binary point awards (with the exception of the tiered building codes criterion for FY21). Projects either receive the full points allotted or zero points for each criterion. Please provide an estimate of the points you expect your project to earn after the # sign.

Technical Evaluation Criteria for the National Competition	
Criteria	Potential Total Points / Project Estimate
Infrastructure project	# /20
Mitigating risk to one or more lifelines	# /15
Incorporation of nature-based solutions	# /10
Applicant (State) has mandatory tribal-, territory-, or state-wide building code adoption requirement (2015 version of International Building Code and International Residential Code) OR Applicant has mandatory building code adoption requirement (2015 or 2018 versions of International Building Code and International Residential Code)	# /10 # /20
Sub-applicant has Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (BCEGS) Rating of 1 to 5	# /20
Application generated from a previous FEMA HMA Advance Assistance award, Capability and Capacity Building (C&CB) projects, or the sub-applicant is a past recipient of BRIC non-financial Direct Technical Assistance	# /10
A non-federal cost share of at least 30% (or, for Economically Disadvantaged Rural Communities as referenced in 42 U.S.C. § 5133(a) as small impoverished communities, a non-federal cost share of at least 12%).	# /5
Designation as a small, impoverished community (as referenced in 42 U.S.C. § 5133(a)) and defined in the BRIC Policy	# /15

Qualitative Evaluation Criteria

In order to increase transparency in decision-making while building capability and partnerships, FEMA will convene a National Review Panel to score sub-applications based on qualitative evaluation criteria. The qualitative criteria are narrative submissions to allow sub-applicants the flexibility to fully explain the strengths of the proposed project. Qualitative evaluation criteria have graded scales of point scoring. Please provide an estimate of the points you expect your project to earn after the # sign.

Qualitative Evaluation Criteria for the National Competition		
Topic	Criteria	Potential Total Points
Risk Reduction/Resiliency Effectiveness	The sub-application details how the project will effectively reduce risk and increase resilience (including the benefits quantified in the BCA), realize ancillary benefits, and leverage innovation. Ancillary benefits could include how this project will address inequities and provide the greatest support to those with greatest need.	# /35
Climate Change and Other Future Conditions	The sub-application describes how the project will enhance climate adaptation and resilience, details how the project is being responsive to the effects of climate change ⁴ (such as sea level rise ⁵) and/or other future conditions (population/demographic/land use, etc.), and cites data sources, assumptions, and models.	# /20
Implementation Measures	The sub-application adequately describes how the costs and schedule will be managed, how the project will be successfully implemented, and how innovative techniques to facilitate implementation will be incorporated. The project's scope of work identifies sufficient technical and managerial staff and resources to successfully implement this project.	# /15
Population Impacted	The project sub-application demonstrates community-wide benefits and identifies the proportion of the population that will be impacted, including a description of the disadvantaged communities as referenced in EO 14008. The sub-application also describes how the project was selected and designed to maximize positive impacts and minimize negative impacts to any disadvantaged populations. The sub-application demonstrates how disadvantaged communities as referenced in EO 14008 are benefited.	# /25
Outreach Activities	The sub-application describes outreach strategy and supporting activities appropriate to the project and the community that advance mitigation. The sub-application also outlines the types of community planning processes leveraged and describes how input from a diverse range of stakeholders was gathered and incorporated into project conception and design.	# /5

Leveraging Partners	The project sub-application incorporates partnerships (e.g., state, tribal, private, local community, etc.) that will ensure the project meets community needs, including those of disadvantaged populations, and show the outcome of those partnerships (e.g., leveraging resources such as financial, material, and educational resources, coordinating multi-jurisdictional projects, heightened focus on equity related issues, etc.)	# /15
---------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Technical Evaluation Score: _____

Qualitative Evaluation Score: _____

Upon completion, please e-mail your NOI to:
Matt Arsenault at: matt.arsenault@state.co.us with a copy to
Julie Beyers at: Julie.beyers@state.co.us
Debbie Goerlitz at: debbie.goerlitz@state.co.us

2021 CRO Framework Scoring Instructions (from 2020 Framework Update) for HMGP, BRIC, and FMA.

Resiliency Definition:

The ability of communities to rebound, positively adapt to, or thrive amidst changing conditions or challenges – including human-caused and natural disasters – and to maintain quality of life, healthy growth, durable systems, economic vitality, and conservation of resources for present and future generations. - *Colorado House Bill 18-1394*

Six Sectors and Missions:

- Community- *Build community capabilities and resources that coordinate and integrate resiliency, equity, and disaster recovery planning efforts and facilitate social connectivity and empowerment, especially focusing on marginalized populations.*
- Economic- *Address Colorado's toughest challenges through regionally diverse, coordinated education and capacity-building that generates a skilled workforce and overall innovation economy that is adaptive and agile.*
- Health and Social- *Dismantle structural inequities and integrate efforts across health and social service networks to empower communities, expand access, and improve health outcomes and wellness for all Colorado residents.*
- Housing- *Implement a collaborative strategy to create sustainable affordable housing solutions that address the needs of the whole community while preparing for and responding to changing environmental, social, and economic conditions.*
- Infrastructure- *Improve the resiliency and sustainability of infrastructure in Colorado by prioritizing resilience and integrating social equity, investment, planning, mitigation and recovery efforts across jurisdictions.*
- Watersheds and Natural Resources- *Protect, enhance, and restore Colorado's watersheds and natural resources, consistent with scientific understanding, community priorities, and environmental laws.*

Four Themes: Climate Change, Risks from Natural and Other Hazards, Social Equity and Unique Community Needs, Economic Diversity and Vibrancy.

Resiliency Prioritization Criteria: (DRAFT FOR 2021)

1. Co-Benefits: Provide solutions that address problems across multiple sectors [the six plus emergency management for BRIC/FMA] to create maximum benefit.
 - a. Weighting: 2

- b. Scale:
 - i. Four or more sectors- 10 points
 - ii. Three sectors- 5 points
 - iii. Two sectors- 3 points
 - iv. One sector- 1 point
- 2. Innovation: Advance creative approaches and techniques that provide new solutions and encourage continual improvement and advancement of best practices – serving as models for others in Colorado and beyond.
 - a. Weighting: 2
 - b. Scale: *Project incorporates an innovative project implementation approach while demonstrating effectiveness. Examples include: nature-based solutions (flood), new treatment methodologies (wildfire), low impact development, Climate Resilient Mitigation Activity.*
 - i. Yes- 5 points
 - ii. No- 0 points
- 3. High Risk and Vulnerability: Ensure that strategies identify risk and vulnerability, and directly address the reduction of risk to human well-being, physical infrastructure, and natural systems. Strategies should consider impact to those who most experience marginalizing.
 - a. Weighting: 3
 - b. Scale:
 - i. Proposed project is at the nexus of high risk and vulnerability – 7-10 points
 - ii. Proposed project moderately addresses risk and vulnerability – 3-6 points
 - iii. Proposed project does not or fails to adequately address risk and/or vulnerability – 0-3 points
- 4. Adaptive Capacity: Include flexible and adaptable measures that consider future unknowns of changing climate, and economic and social conditions.
 - a. Weighting: 3
 - b. Scale:
 - i. Proposed project considers and addresses both changing climate and evolving risk due to development in its community and project is intentionally designed to address those concerns – 7-10 points
 - ii. Proposed project considers and addresses either climate change or evolving risk to its community – 4-6 points
 - iii. Proposed project fails to consider either climate change or evolving risk – 0-3 points

5. Economic Benefit-Cost: Make financial investments that can sustain changes and have the potential for economic benefits to the investor and the broader community – through both direct and indirect returns. DHSEM uses FEMA's Benefit Cost Analysis tool for this.
 - a. Weighting: 1
 - b. Scale: (*AA, BB, CC, DD to be determined based on the range of BCAs in submitted applications*)
 - i. Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of 1:CC – 1:DD - 10 points
 - ii. BCR of 1:BB – 1:CC - 7 points
 - iii. BCR of 1:AA – 1:BB - 4 points
 - iv. BCR of 1:1 – 1:AA - 1 point

6. Harmonize with Existing Activity: Expand, enhance, or leverage work being done to build on existing efforts. Engage relevant stakeholders to maximize these efforts and reduce potential conflicts.
 - a. Weighting: 2
 - b. Scale:
 - i. Proposed project compliments and leverages previous or ongoing work of this nature in the community-10 points
 - ii. Proposed project is intended to be the first of ongoing efforts within the community, a “starter” project- 5 points
 - iii. Proposed project fails to evaluate or consider previous efforts in the community and is a stand-alone activity- 0 points

7. Social Equity: Provide solutions that are inclusive, with consideration to populations that are often most impacted by disruptions. Address inequities, remove barriers, and benefit populations by providing access or meeting functional needs. Equitably distribute economic benefits.
 - a. Weighting: 3
 - b. Scale:
 - i. Proposed project accounts for potential impacts to fragile and vulnerable populations and proposes a project solution which positively impacts the community-10 points
 - ii. Proposed project accounts for potential impacts to fragile and vulnerable populations and takes appropriate steps to mitigate known impacts- 5 points

iii. Proposed project does not address social equity considerations- 0 points

8. Long-Term and Lasting Impact: Create long-term gains to the community with solutions that are replicable and sustainable, creating benefits for present and future generations.

a. Weighting: 1

b. Scale:

- i. Proposed project has a Project Useful Life >50 years- 7 points
- ii. Proposed project has a Project Useful Life of 50 years- 6 points
- iii. Proposed project has a Project Useful Life of 40 years- 5 points
- iv. Proposed project has a Project Useful Life of 30 years- 4 points
- v. Proposed project has a Project Useful Life of 20 years- 3 points
- vi. Proposed project has a Project Useful Life of 10 years- 2 points
- vii. Proposed project has a Project Useful Life <10 years- 1 point

9. Technical Soundness: Identify solutions that reflect best practices that have been tested and proven to work in similar regional context. Identify measurable indicators to assess performance and success.

a. Weighting: 1

b. Scale:

- i. Sub-applicant has proposed a leading or best practice as a solution to reduce risks and/or has previously implemented similar projects with success-10 points
- ii. Sub-applicant has proposed a project approach which demonstrates adequate knowledge and expertise of its proposed project and its technical soundness to reduce or alleviate hazard impacts- 5 points
- iii. Sub-applicant has proposed a project with indeterminate or unknown impacts to reduce its hazard risks- 0 points

BRIC Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
Eligibility Review					
Eligibility of subapplicant	The sub applicant is an eligible local government entity, including state agencies, cities, townships, counties, special district governments, and Indian tribal governments	- Private Non-Profits (PNP) are not eligible for BRIC	Y/N		NO
Eligibility of proposed activities	Mitigation project must be in alignment with the current HMA Guidance and Addendum (2015).	- Is the proposed project one of the following eiligible activities? - Capability and Capacity Building (C&CB) Activities: - Building Codes, Partnerships, Project Scoping, and Planning - Property Acquisition or Relocation for Open Space - Property Elevation - Wildfire Mitigation (defensible space, structure protection, or hazardous fuels reduction) - Safe Room - Mitigation Reconstruction Projects - Dry Floodproofing - Generator - Flood Risk Reduction - Soil Stabilization	Y/N		NO
Cost-Effectiveness	Project has a well documented and replicable BCA with a BCR equal to or over 1.0.	- Was cost-effectiveness determined for this project using the following methods? - FEMA Version 6.0 Toolkit - Pre-calculated benefits - Substantial damage in special hazard area - Other BCA methodology approved by FEMA in writing - Is there documentation to verify - the project useful life - maintenance cost - the methodology used to determine damage - the frequency and damage relationship as modeled, historical or professional estimated damages - that the cost estimate supports cost reasonableness - standard benefits - Were social benefits added to the project benefits?	Y/N		NO
EHP compliance	Project is in conformance with all applicable EHP laws, regulations, executive orders, and agency policies "Refer to EHP Triage"	- Does your project affect or is in close proximity to any buildings or structure 50 years or more in age? If so, is the following documentation provided? - Property Appraisal or equivalent documentation that identifies the construction date and address - Minimum of two photos - USGS 1:24,000 scale topographic map - historic properties in proximity listed in the National Register - Consideration of how the project design will minimize adverse effects on known or potential historic buildings or structures - Does your project involve ground disturbance? If so, is the following documentation provided? - Description and dimension of ground disturbance - Are Federally listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat present in the area affected by the project? If so or not known, is the following documentation provided? - Outreach to United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), NMFS or State Wildlife Agency - List of potential endangered species located in the project location or area - If vegetation removal, provide a map and description and photos - Is the project in, near (within 200 feet) or likely to affect any type of waterway or body of water? - Information about the type of water body - Outreach to USFWS and/or State Wildlife Agency concerning any potential impacts - Is there a reason to suspect there are contaminants from a current or past use on the property associated with the proposed project?	Y/N		NO
Engineering feasibility	Mitigation projects must be both feasible and effective at mitigating the risks of the hazard for which the projects were designed. The feasibility of a project is demonstrated through conformance with accepted engineering practices, established codes, standards, modeling techniques, or best practices	- Does the scope note what the project is doing and how it will effectively mitigate the risk and hazard? - Does the project comply with best practices, engineering practices, codes, regulations, etc.?	Y/N		NO
Alignment with approved mitigation plan	Must have a FEMA-approved Local or Tribal Hazard Mitigation Plan in accordance with 44 CFR Part 201 by the application deadline and at the time of obligation of grant funds for mitigation projects	- Does the sub applicant meet this criteria? - Does the sub-application refer to the specific goals, objectives, and mitigation action in the sub-applicant's portion of the mitigation plan?	Y/N		NO
No Duplication of Benefits (DOB)	Must have no assistance from more than one source is used for the same purpose or activity	- Is there no DOB or if there is an outside source used to leverage funds for the project, is there documentation or description verifying no DOB?	Y/N		NO
Local Match	Local Match identified	- Is there a Local Match Letter or combination of Match Letters?	Y/N		NO

BRIC Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
Completeness of subapplication	The subapplication is complete and demonstrates an: eligible sub applicant, eligible mitigation activity, cost-effective project, technically feasible, available non-federal cost share, and alignment with approved HM Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Verify that the subapplication components are all completed and well documented.– The subapplicant, in coordination with the applicant, must identify at least one or more Go/No-Go milestones in the work schedule for mitigation projects submitted to the national competition that FEMA will review and approve.- Does the sub-application directly address all of the technical and qualitative criteria?	Y/N		NO
Competitiveness		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Does the project have planning studies or feasibility reports?- Does the project have design documents?- Does the project conform with the latest published building codes?- Does the scope highlight the use of a nature-based solution?- Does the scope seem to indicate that the project impacts a significant portion of a community or neighborhood (large scale/high impact project)?- Does the scope describe an infrastructure project (infrastructure is critical physical structures, facilities and systems that provide support a community, its population, and economy)?- Does the project have a documented history of significant damages, loss of service/function, or other losses/disruption?- Does the project have data or studies documenting the extent, severity and/or current risk of the hazard?- Does the project include additional cost share (local match) taken on by private organizations/businesses emphasizing community participation, collaboration, and A12	Y/N		NO
Technical (all or nothing scoring)					
Infrastructure project	Infrastructure is critical physical structures, facilities, and systems that provide support to a community, its population, and economy. What is critical can be defined by the community. The sub application must describe how the project protects infrastructure that is important to the function of the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Sub application must explain how the project mitigates natural hazard risk to critical physical structures, facilities, and systems that provide support to a community, its population and its economy- Attached document or source to verify benefit area and population served- Example: proposed nature based solution that will reduce risk from high-intensity rainfall events, and enhance protection at a waste water treatment plant, which supplies fresh water to 30K people- This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section in FEMA GO	20		0
Mitigating risk to one or more lifelines	<p>A lifeline enables the continuous operation of critical government and business functions and is essential to human health and safety or economic security. The project must reduce lifeline vulnerability through mitigation activities and BRIC mitigation grants can go toward projects which mitigate these structures, facilities, and systems, https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/practitioners/lifelines</p> <p>The project must describe how it reduces risk and vulnerability for multiple lifelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Safety/Security2. Food, water, shelter3. Health and medical4. Energy (power and fuel)5. Communications6. Transportation7. Hazardous Material	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Sub application must indicate that the project will mitigate risk to at least one of the seven community lifelines (enable continuous operation of critical gov't/essential business functions)– Refer to the Mitigation Action Portfolio (MAP) for more information, https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/2020-08/fema_mitigation-action-portfolio-support-document_08-01-2020_0.pdf– This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section and Cost Effectiveness in FEMA GO	15		0
Incorporation of nature-based solutions	<p>Project types can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">– Land conservation– Greenways– Wetland restoration– Stormwater parks– Floodplain restoration– Rain gardens– Vegetated swales– Green roofs– Rainwater harvesting– Permeable pavement– Tree canopy– Tree trenches– Green streets– Waterfront parks– Living shorelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Supplication must indicate and describe how the project incorporates one or more nature-based solutions, which are sustainable environmental management practices that restore, mimic, and/or enhance nature and natural systems– The sub application should note how these solutions provide economic, environmental, and social resilience– This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section and Cost Effectiveness in FEMA GO	10		0

BRIC Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
Applicant (State) has mandatory tribal-, territory-, or state-wide building code adoption requirement (2015 version of International Building Code and International Residential Code)	No statewide code.	- Must provide the year of the building code & building code -This information should be included in the Evaluation section of FEMA GO	10		0
Applicant (State) has adopted 2018 or 2021 International Building Code (IBC)	No statewide code.	- Must provide the year of the building code & building code -This information should be included in the Evaluation section of FEMA GO	20		0
Sub applicant has Building Code Effectiveness Grading Scale (BCEGS) Rating of 1 to 5	BCEGS rating is an independent assessment of a community’s building code adoption and enforcement activities, resulting in a score of 1 (best) to 5, https://www.isomitigation.com/bcegs/ and https://www.verisk.com/siteassets/media/downloads/underwriting/location/2019-bcegs-schedule.pdf (CO is page 57) The sub application must clearly demonstrate the current BCEGS rating	- Sub application must denote a BCEGS rating (score) between 1 to 5 to receive points for this category. Building Code Effectiveness Grading Schedule (2019 Edition) - Questions can be emailed to BCEGS_Info@verisk.com. Sub applicants that do not have a BCEGS rating can complete a survey and request a score be obtained at no cost (takes 2-4 months) - This information should be included in the Evaluation section of FEMA GO	20		0
Application generated from a previous FEMA HMA Advance Assistance or Project Scoping award, High Hazard Potential Dams (HHPD) award, or DHS Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency’s (CISA) Regional Resiliency Assessment Program (RRAP), or the subapplicant is a past recipient of BRIC non-financial Direct Technical Assistance	The mitigation project used a previous AA grant to scope, design, and/or develop the proposed project. The sub application should note the name and/or project number	- Sub application must indicate the current project was generated from a previous FEMA HMA award and that award is directly related to the current proposal - This information should be included in the Evaluation section of FEMA GO	10		0
A non-federal cost share of at least 30% (or, for Economically Disadvantaged Rural Communities as referenced in 42 U.S.C. § 5133(a) as small impoverished communities, a non-federal cost share of at least 12%). To receive the full points, the federal share requested can be no more than 70% (or 88% for qualified EDRCs).	Additional cost share may be taken on by private organizations/businesses emphasizing community participation, collaboration, and investment	- Sub application must indicate the non-federal cost share exceeds 25% - This information should be included in the Budget section of FEMA GO	5		0
Designation as an Economically Disadvantaged Rural Community (as referenced in 42 U.S.C. § 5133(a) as a small impoverished community)	Sub applicant meets 42 U.S.C 5133 (a) A community of 3,000 or fewer individuals identified by the Applicant that is economically disadvantaged, with residents having an average per capita annual income not exceeding 80% of the national per capita income, based on best available data	- Population information can be found at the U.S. Census website - National income information can be found at http://www.bea.gov - This information should be included in the Budget section of FEMA GO and attach required support documentation	15		0
Qualitative Scoring (gradient scoring: not at all, minimally, partially, mostly, entirely, and exceeds) Visit this link for scoring breakdown https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/2020-08/fema_bric-qualitative-criteria_support_document_08-2020.pdf					
Risk reduction/resiliency effectiveness	The subapplication details how the project will effectively reduce risk and increase resilience (including the benefits quantified in the BCA), realize ancillary benefits, and leverage innovation. Ancillary benefits could include how this project will address inequities and provide the greatest support to those with greatest need.	- Scoring is in increments of 7 (0 to 35) - Resilience refers to the ability to prepare for anticipated hazards, adapt to changing conditions, and withstand and recover rapidly from disruption - How will the proposed project improve resilience (Ability to prepare for anticipated hazards, Adapt to changing conditions, Recover rapidly from disruption)? How will the proposed project reduce risk(s) and to what level? - Ancillary benefits refer to benefits other than the project’s primary risk reduction objective which may be identified in the Hazard Mitigation Plan, SOW, and BCA (water/air quality, habitat creation, energy efficiency, economic opportunity, reduced social vulnerability, cultural resources, public health, mental health, etc.) - What ancillary benefits (Water/Air Quality, Habitat Creation, Energy Efficiency, Economic Opportunity, Reduced Social Vulnerability, Cultural Resources, Public Health, Mental Health) will the project provide and how? Does the project consider multiple hazards (e.g., wind/storm surge, wildfire/mudslides) to address risks beyond the proposal’s primary risk reduction objective? - Innovation in one community can look very different from innovation in another community - How does the project leverage or demonstrate innovation for your community? What new ideas or approaches is the project incorporating? - This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section in FEMA GO	35		0

BRIC Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
Climate Change and Other Future Conditions	The subapplication describes how the project will enhance climate adaptation and resilience, details how the project is being responsive to the effects of climate change ⁴ (such as sea level rise ⁵) and/or other future conditions (population/demographic/land use, etc.), and cites data sources, assumptions, and models.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Scoring is in increments of 5 (0 to 20)– What anticipated future conditions are relevant for the project? Examples of future conditions include, but are not limited to, the following: expected population growth or shrinkage, land use and development shifts, aging population, shifts in income or employment, changes in housing needs, sea level rise, more intense rainfall events, increasing storm frequency, etc.– What tools or models were used to assess future conditions and climate change?– How is the project responsive to any identified anticipated changes? Does the project integrate the consideration of future conditions into design, planning, and operations workflows?– How was the project informed by, or connected to, plans and planning efforts and their assessment of future conditions? Relevant plans may include Hazard Mitigation Plans, Comprehensive Plans, Climate Adaptation Plans, Long-Range Transportation Plans, Small Area Plans, etc.– What data sources, tools, and assumptions are used to guide the project? Did the sub-applicant use the Future Avoided Cost Explorer (FACE:Hazards) available at https://cwcbl.colorado.gov/FACE?– This information should be included in the Evaluation section of FEMA GO	20		0
Implementation measures	The subapplication adequately describes how the costs and schedule will be managed, how the project will be successfully implemented, and how innovative techniques to facilitate implementation will be incorporated. The project’s scope of work identifies sufficient technical and managerial staff and resources to successfully implement this project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Scoring is in increments of 3 (0 to 15)– Does the application inspire confidence that the project can be completed successfully as designed, given the stated implementation measures?– What potential implementation challenges and obstacles are identified (e.g., technical, political, financial, public support) and what innovative implementation solutions are proposed?– Are the proposed project costs and schedule realistic? How do project cost estimates and the schedule identify and properly address potential challenges and obstacles?– What pre- and post-implementation monitoring strategies are proposed for the project? What specific evaluation elements are proposed to measure progress and ensure the project is executed as designed?– What technical and managerial staff and resources are available to successfully implement the project? How will anticipated staff and resource gaps be filled?– Are examples of successfully completed projects included to demonstrate effective implementation measures?– This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section in FEMA GO	15		0
Population impacted	The project subapplication demonstrates community-wide benefits and identifies the proportion of the population that will be impacted, including a description of the disadvantaged communities as referenced in EO 14008. The subapplication also describes how the project was selected and designed to maximize positive impacts and minimize negative impacts to any disadvantaged populations. The subapplication demonstrates how disadvantaged communities as referenced in EO 14008 are benefited.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Scoring is in increments of 5 (0 to 25)– Community size, scale, and definition can look very different in different local contexts. What does “community-wide” mean in the context of the proposed project?– What percent of the population will directly benefit from the project (i.e., experience direct community-wide benefits)? How is this estimate calculated?– What is the extent of the project’s expected direct and indirect impacts? How will the project reduce cascading impacts to Community Lifelines, residents, businesses, public services, infrastructure, and natural systems?– Who are the most vulnerable members of the community where the project is proposed? How will the project negatively impact vulnerable members of the community? How will the project positively impact vulnerable members of the community?– Impacts can be directly related to the risk reduction activity or indirectly related, such as with ancillary impacts (i.e., social, environmental, economic impacts)– Describe how the sub-applicant is assessing the project's impacts on socially vulnerable populations. What tools or models were used. For example, did the sub-applicant use information from the CDC’s social vulnerability index at https://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/placeandhealth/svi/index.html?– This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section in FEMA GO	25		0
Outreach activities	The subapplication describes outreach strategy and supporting activities appropriate to the project and the community that advance mitigation. The subapplication also outlines the types of community planning processes leveraged and describes how input from a diverse range of stakeholders was gathered and incorporated into project conception and design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">– Scoring is in increments of 1 (0 to 5)– To what extent did stakeholders and/or stakeholder groups contribute to this project?– What planning processes were leveraged during the development of the project proposal to advance mitigation? How did the project planning process ensure that the most vulnerable members of the community were involved in the planning and decision-making processes?– What information (e.g., resiliency goals and outcomes, partnership opportunities, project implementation progress) will be shared with the public? What public outreach and engagement strategies will be used to disseminate project information to and gather feedback from stakeholders and members of the community?– What support or conflicts emerged through the project planning process? How will conflicts be resolved as the project is implemented?– What are the linkages between your hazard mitigation plan and local land use requirements and how does the linkage make your community more resilient?– This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section in FEMA GO	5		0

BRIC Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
Leveraging partners	The project subapplication incorporates partnerships (e.g., state, tribal, private, local community, etc.) that will ensure the project meets community needs, including those of disadvantaged populations, and show the outcome of those partnerships (e.g., leveraging resources such as financial, material, and educational resources, coordinating multi-jurisdictional projects, heightened focus on equity related issues, etc.)	<p>– Scoring is in increments of 3 (0 to 15)</p> <p>– Partnerships can take many different forms. For example, partners may contribute financially, support and promote the proposed project, help generate community-wide awareness of the risks the proposal is designed to address, etc.</p> <p>– What partners were involved in the project design? How did partners contribute to the application? What partners will contribute to the implementation of the project?</p> <p>– To what extent were non-governmental organizations, universities, private organizations, or other government entities consulted for advice or assistance? How has collaboration with surrounding jurisdictions supported project development?</p> <p>– To what extent have other federal programs or funding sources been leveraged for the project? To what extent have partners provided funding that increases the non-federal cost share?</p> <p>– How have partnerships been used to increase community resiliency? What potential exists for partnerships to continue beyond implementation of the project?</p> <p>– This information should be included in the Evaluation section of FEMA GO</p>	15		0
Total			240		0

FMA Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
Eligibility Review					
Eligibility of subapplicant	The sub applicant is an eligible local government entity, including state agencies, cities, townships, counties, special district governments, and Indian tribal governments. Certain political subdivisions (i.e., regional flood control districts or county governments) may apply and act as subapplicants if they are part of a community participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) where the political subdivision provides zoning and building code enforcement or planning and community development professional services for that community.	- Private Non-Profits (PNP) are not eligible for FMA	Y/N		NO
Performance Measures	Mitigation project must be in alignment with the current HMA Guidance and Addendum (2015).	FMA aims to implement projects that reduce flood risks posed to repetitively flooded properties insured under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), by funding priority projects and activities. To achieve these goals, for FY 2021 FMA is prioritizing the following types of projects: Project Scoping, Community Flood Mitigation (aka localized flood control) projects, Flood Mitigation Plans, Technical Assistance, and Individual Property Mitigation that mitigate flood risks to NFIP participating communities and active policyholders. FEMA will evaluate input and output indicators of each federal award by measuring the total properties mitigated that carry a Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) and Repetitive Loss (RL) definition pursuant to 42 U.S. Code § 4104.h(2) and (3), and are included in a final mitigation action. FEMA will also evaluate each award output by measuring project capability to positively influence the government’s goal of mitigating SRL and RL designated properties and thereby the reduction of future losses to the NFIP under this award.	Y/N		NO
Cost-Effectiveness	Project has a well documented and replicable BCA with a BCR equal to or over 1.0.	- Was cost-effectiveness determined for this project using the following methods? <ul style="list-style-type: none">- FEMA Version 6.0 Toolkit- Pre-calculated benefits- Substantial damage in special hazard area- Other BCA methodology approved by FEMA in writing - Is there documentation to verify <ul style="list-style-type: none">- the project useful life- maintenance cost- the methodology used to determine damage- the frequency and damage relationship as modeled, historical or professional estimated damages- that the cost estimate supports cost reasonableness- standard benefits	Y/N		NO
EHP compliance	Project is in conformance with all applicable EHP laws, regulations, executive orders, and agency policies "Refer to EHP Triage"	- Does your project affect or is in close proximity to any buildings or structure 50 years or more in age? If so, is the following documentation provided? <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Property Appraisal or equivalent documentation that identifies the construction date and address- Minimum of two photos- USGS 1:24,000 scale topographic map- historic properties in proximity listed in the National Register- Consideration of how the project design will minimize adverse effects on known or potential historic buildings or structures - Does your project involve ground disturbance? If so, is the following documentation provided? <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Description and dimension of ground disturbance - Are Federally listed threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat present in the area affected by the project? If so or not known, is the following documentation provided? <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Outreach to United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), NMFS or State Wildlife Agency- List of potential endangered species located in the project location or area- If vegetation removal, provide a map and description and photos - Is the project in, near (within 200 feet) or likely to affect any type of waterway or body of water? <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Information about the type of water body- Outreach to USFWS and/or State Wildlife Agency concerning any potential impacts - Is there a reason to suspect there are contaminants from a current or past use on the property associated with the proposed project?	Y/N		NO
Engineering feasibility	Mitigation projects must be both feasible and effective at mitigating the risks of the hazard for which the projects were designed. The feasibility of a project is demonstrated through conformance with accepted engineering practices, established codes, standards, modeling techniques, or best practices.	- Does the scope note what the project is doing and how it will effectively mitigate the risk and hazard? - Does the project comply with best practices, engineering practices, codes, regulations, etc.?	Y/N		NO
Alignment with approved mitigation plan	Must have a FEMA-approved Local or Tribal Hazard Mitigation Plan in accordance with 44 CFR Part 201 by the application deadline and at the time of obligation of grant funds for mitigation projects.	- Does the sub applicant meet this criteria?	Y/N		NO
No Duplication of Benefits (DOB)	Must have no assistance from more than one source is used for the same purpose or activity	- Is there no DOB or if there is an outside source used to leverage funds for the project, is there documentation or description verifying no DOB?	Y/N		NO
Local Match	Local Match identified	- Is there a Local Match Letter?	Y/N		NO

FMA Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
Completeness of subapplication	The subapplication is complete and demonstrates an: eligible sub applicant, eligible mitigation activity, cost-effective project, technically feasible, available non-federal cost share, and alignment with approved HM Plan.	- Verify that the subapplication components are all completed and well documented.	Y/N		NO
Competitiveness	The subapplication must be reviewed for completeness.	- Does the project have planning studies or feasibility reports? - Does the project have design documents? - Does the project conform with the latest published building codes? - Does the scope highlight the use of a nature-based solution? - Does the scope seem to indicate that the project impacts a significant portion of a community or neighborhood (large scale/high impact project)? - Does the scope describe an infrastructure project (infrastructure is critical physical structures, facilities and systems that provide support a community, its population, and economy)? - Does the project have a documented history of significant damages, loss of service/function, or other losses/disruption? - Does the project have data or studies documenting the extent, severity and/or current risk of the hazard? - Does the project include additional cost share (local match) taken on by private organizations/businesses emphasizing community participation, collaboration, and A12	Y/N		NO
Final Priority Scoring Criteria for Project Scoping					
Eligible Project Scoping activities must benefit NFIP insured properties. Examples include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting meetings, outreach and coordination with subapplicants and community residents • Developing or conducting engineering, environmental feasibility and/or benefit-cost analyses • Undertaking activities that lead to development of project applications • Evaluating facilities to identify mitigation actions • Using staff or resources to develop cost share strategies 					
NFIP Insured Multiple Loss Communities	Jurisdictions with 50 or more Repetitive Loss (RL) or Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) structures and has received an Individual Assistance declaration for flood in the past 10 years.		200		0
Private-Partnership Cost Share	Cost share contributed on by private organizations. Points will be assigned based on percentage of private cost share invested of the non-federal match, up to 150% of the non-federal match. For example, if a private organization provides 50% of the non-federal cost match the subapplicant would receive 50 points. If the organization provides 100% of the non-federal match, then the project would receive 100 points.		Up to 150		0
Community Rating System (CRS) Participation	The CRS recognizes and encourages community floodplain-management activities that exceed the minimum National Flood Insurance Program standards. Depending on the level of participation, flood insurance premium rates for policyholders can be reduced up to 45%. Highest weight will be assigned to class 1 and descending through lower classes. (Graded Scale: 1 = 100, 2 = 90, 3 = 80, 4 = 70, 5 = 60, 6 = 50, 7 = 40, 8 = 30, 9 = 20, 10 = 10)		10-100		0
Cooperating Technical Partners Program (CTP) Participation	The CTP is a qualified partnership program in which communities commit to collaborate in maintaining up-to-date flood hazard maps and other flood hazard information. Points will be assigned to CTP participating communities.		30		0
CDC Social Vulnerability Index	Projects that benefit area(s) with an overall Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) score of 0.7501 or greater per CDC’s Social Vulnerability Index will eligible for this point priority. The Benefiting Area map will be used to determine which census tracts will be considered for assessment of these points. In the event multiple census tracts are included in an area benefiting from the project, FEMA will consider the highest SVI score.		200		0
Final Priority Scoring Criteria for Community Flood Mitigation Projects					
Eligible activities must benefit NFIP insured properties. Examples include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localized flood control • Floodwater storage and diversion • Floodplain and stream restoration • Stormwater management • Wetland restoration/creation 					
NFIP Insured Multiple Loss Communities	Communities with 50 or more Repetitive Loss (RL) or Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) structures and have received NFIP claims in a county that has received an Individual Assistance declaration for flood in the past 10 years.		200		0

FMA Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
NFIP Policy Holder	Points will be assessed for every NFIP policy that is active as of the FMA application start date (Section D, Application and Submission Information, Key Dates and Times) and is verified within the benefitting area of the project. (2 per NFIP Policy).		2 x each NFIP Policy		0
Severe Repetitive Loss (SRL) and Repetitive Loss (RL) Properties	Points will be assessed for SRL or RL structure that is verified within the benefitting area of the project (5 per RL and 10 per SRL property).		5 x each RL 10 x each SRL		0
Private-Partnership Cost Share	Cost share contributed by private organizations/businesses. Points will be assigned based on percentage of private cost share invested in the non-federal match, up to 150% of the non-federal match. For example, if a private organization provides 50% of the non-federal cost match the subapplicant would receive 50 points. If the organization provides 100% of the non-federal match, then the project would receive 100 points.		Up to 150		0
Community Rating System (CRS) Participation	The CRS recognizes and encourages community floodplain-management activities that exceed the minimum National Flood Insurance Program standards. Depending on the level of participation, flood insurance premium rates for policyholders can be reduced up to 45%. Highest weight will be assigned to class 1 and descending through lower classes. (Graded Scale: 1 = 100, 2 = 90, 3 = 80, 4 = 70, 5 = 60, 6 = 50, 7 = 40, 8 = 30, 9 = 20, 10 = 10)		10-100		0
Advance Assistance Generated Project (Projects Only)	Application generated from a previous FEMA HMA Advance Assistance award.	– Sub application must indicate the current project was generated from a previous FEMA HMA award and that award is directly related to the current proposal – This information should be included in the Evaluation section of FEMA GO	20		0
Cooperating Technical Partners Program (CTP) Participation	The CTP is a qualified partnership program in which communities commit to collaborate in maintaining up-to-date flood hazard maps and other flood hazard information. Points will be assigned to CTP participating communities.		30		
CDC Social Vulnerability Index	Projects that benefit area(s) with an overall Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) score of 0.7501 or greater per CDC’s Social Vulnerability Index will eligible for this point priority. The Benefiting Area map will be used to determine which census tracts will be considered for assessment of these points. In the event multiple census tracts are included in an area benefiting from the project, FEMA will consider the highest SVI score.		200		
Consideration of climate change and other future conditions OR Incorporation of Nature-based solutions	Projects that describe how the project will enhance climate adaptation and resilience, detail how the project is being responsive to the effects of climate change (such as sea level rise, increased rainfall, increased likelihood of flash flood due to wildfire, etc.) and/or other future conditions (population/demographic/land use, etc.), and cites data sources, assumptions, and models. OR Incorporation of nature-based solutions. (For more information on potential nature-based solutions, please reference Building Community Resilience with Nature-Based Solutions: A guide for local communities.)	– Supplication must indicate and describe how the project incorporates one or more nature-based solutions, which are sustainable environmental management practices that restore, mimic, and/or enhance nature and natural systems – The sub application should note how these solutions provide economic, environmental, and social resilience – This should be included in the Scope of Work (SOW) section and Cost Effectiveness in FEMA GO	200		
Final Priority Scoring Criteria for Individual Flood Mitigation Projects					
Eligible activities must benefit NFIP insured properties. Examples include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localized flood control • Floodwater storage and diversion • Floodplain and stream restoration • Stormwater management • Wetland restoration/creation 					
SRL/RL property	If greater than 35% of properties in the subapplication are SRL or RL, then 40 points will be assigned. OR If 25-35% of properties in the subapplication are SRL or RL, then 10 points will be assigned.		40 OR 10		0
Substantial Damage	The subapplication includes structures that were determined Substantially Damaged by the community within two (2) years of the Application Submission Deadline and a verification letter is included in the subapplication.		10 x each SD structure		0
Not Secondary Dwelling Units	Less than 25% of structures included in the subapplication are Secondary Dwelling Units pursuant to the active NFIP Policy.		10		0

FMA Project Eligibility, Technical and Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Screening					
Priority	Description	Script Questions/Details for Scoring (Competitiveness)	Total Points	Current Subapplication	Likely Points
CDC Social Vulnerability Index	Each subapplication will be assigned a weighted score relative to its social vulnerability score per CDC’s Social Vulnerability Index (SVI). The average SVI score per subapplication will be calculated by averaging the overall SVI scores of the census tract in which each property is located, based on validated address(es) provided in the subapplication. A subapplication average SVI score of 0 would receive 0 points and a subapplication average SVI score of 1 would receive the full 40 points.		0-40		0



COLORADO

Division of Homeland Security & Emergency Management

Department of Public Safety

POST-APPROVAL ADDITIONS TO LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLANS

This checklist applies to jurisdictions (municipalities and special districts) that request to join an existing local Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) after FEMA approval. It combines existing FEMA guidance and new DHSEM guidance. The entire checklist applies if the jurisdiction did not participate in the HMP development process. Jurisdictions that partially participated in the HMP's development must coordinate with the lead jurisdiction and DHSEM Mitigation to identify the applicable portions of this checklist.

The jurisdiction(s) must recreate key portions of the planning process described in FEMA's 2013 *Local Mitigation Planning Handbook*, which is available at https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1910-25045-9160/fema_local_mitigation_handbook.pdf.

Jurisdiction requesting addition to an existing approved HMP.	
Name of the existing HMP the jurisdiction requests to join.	
Lead jurisdiction of the existing HMP.	
Existing HMP's expiration date.	

Lead Jurisdiction Responsibilities	Yes	No	Comments
Does the lead jurisdiction agree that the requesting jurisdiction is within or adjacent to the HMP's planning area?			
Does the lead jurisdiction agree to add the requesting jurisdiction to its existing Hazard Mitigation Plan once the requesting jurisdiction meets all planning requirements?			
Does the lead jurisdiction agree that the hazards that could impact the requesting jurisdiction are profiled in the existing plan's Hazard Identification and Risk Assessment (HIRA)?			

Does the lead jurisdiction prefer to add the requesting jurisdiction in a new annex/appendix, OR,			
Does the lead jurisdiction prefer to revise and update the existing plan?			

Signature of Lead Jurisdiction Representative

Date

Name and Title of Lead Jurisdiction Representative

Requesting Jurisdiction Planning Responsibilities.	Yes	No	Comments
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to document its planning process?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to create its own annex to the existing HMP?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to conduct public outreach, which must be more than a public review of the annex only?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to invite involvement and participation from all communities within and adjacent to the jurisdiction's boundaries, as well as relevant agencies that are involved in hazard mitigation?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to review the existing HMP's hazards and describe its own unique exposure and vulnerabilities to those hazards?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to describe additional relevant hazards and its own exposure and vulnerability to them?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to review of, and agreement with, the HMP's Mitigation Goals and Objectives?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to create additional Mitigation Goals and Objectives if necessary?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to create new mitigation actions specific to itself?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to complete the DHSEM Mitigation Capabilities Tracker for itself?			

Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to agree to participate in the lead jurisdiction's Implementation and Maintenance Strategy?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to provide the public an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the draft annex?			

Signature of Requesting Jurisdiction Representative

Date

Name and Title of Requesting Jurisdiction Representative

Requesting Jurisdiction Plan Review, Adoption, and Approval Responsibilities.	Yes	No	Comments
Does the requesting jurisdiction agree to submit the annex and completed local HMP Review Tool through the lead jurisdiction and DHSEM to FEMA for review?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction commit to formally adopt the existing HMP, with the new annex, as its Hazard Mitigation Plan and submit its adoption through DHSEM to FEMA?			
Does the requesting jurisdiction acknowledge that approval of the new HMP annex only provides the jurisdiction eligibility for FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Assistance grant programs through the current expiration date?			

Signature of Requesting Jurisdiction Representative

Date

Name and Title of Requesting Jurisdiction Representative