SOUTHWEST FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT 2379 BROAD STREET

BROOKSVILLE, FLORIDA 34604-6899

TELEPHONE: 352-505-2970

November 21, 2025



RFP 25-4871 NEW COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANNING (CEMP/COOP) SOFTWARE SOLUTION

ADDENDUM #2 (Acknowledgment is Required)

The Respondent shall acknowledge its review and receipt of this Addendum by signing below and including a signed copy of this Addendum with its bid submittal. Failure to do so could result in disqualification of the bid.

Please note that double underlined information (<u>example</u>) is added wording and stricken information (<u>example</u>) is deleted wording.

I. **CLARIFICATIONS**:

- 1. The Table of Contents is hereby amended as follows:
 - Attachment 1 is replaced in its entirety with <u>Attachment 1-A COST PROPOSAL RESPONSE</u> <u>FORM</u>
 - Attachment 8 Florida Division of Emergency Management Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP) FDEM COOP Checklist has been added.
- 2. Section 1.7.5 Organizational Profile and Qualifications is hereby amended as follows:
 - 1.7.5.4 Documentation showing CEMP implementation and support of at least 25 enterprise-level customers. Equivalent Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) as per CPG 101 are acceptable. Of the supported customers, provide a summary, not to exceed a maximum of five pages, highlighting a minimum of ten that most closely mirror, at least, the District's minimum expectations as outlined in PART III NATURE OF SERVICES REQUIRED. Indicate their longevity as Respondent customers, average support incidents per year, and products supported.
- **3.** Section 1.7.7 Methodology Approach is hereby amended as follows:
 - 1.7.7.2 Onboarding Methodology
 - Onboarding Costs Any costs associated with onboarding activities must be clearly identified and itemized in the <u>proposal and included in in the Year 1 lump sum on</u> <u>Attachment 1, Cost Proposal Response Form.</u>

1.7.7.4 Data Maintenance/Migration

 <u>Data Return Upon Termination</u> - Outline the process for returning all relevant files and documents to the District should the District choose to discontinue services. This should include format, <u>and</u> delivery method, and any associated costs.

- 1.7.7.5 <u>Data Recovery and Business Continuity</u> <u>The proposed system shall be the District's designated system of recovery planning.</u> Describe the Respondent's high-level disaster recovery and business continuity practices, including:
- 1.7.7.10 <u>Document Retention and Audit Requirements. Under Florida Statute 252.905, disaster plans are exempt from Florida Statute 119.07(1) and Section 24(a), Article I of the State Constitution. Therefore, the platform must also support the ability to maintain the confidentiality of these records.</u>

The disaster plan platform must comply with specific legal requirements under Florida law regarding public access, data retention, version control, and auditability. Specifically, the platform must:

- Retain Records in Accordance with State Guidelines
- Follow the general records schedules approved by the Records Management section of the Florida Department of State, Division of Library and Information Services (DLIS), State of Florida General Records Schedule GS1-SI For State and Local Government Agencies (GS!-SL) including:
 - <u>Disaster Preparedness Plans (GS1-SL #210) Retain for five fiscal years after being superseded or becoming obsolete.</u>
 - o <u>Disaster Preparedness Drill Records (GS1-SL #259) Retain for two calendar years, provided that reviews have been conducted.</u>
 - o <u>Implement safeguards to ensure that records are not deleted before the legally mandated retention period has elapsed.</u>
 - Ensure that records remain accessible and readable for the entire retention period, regardless of changes in technology or file formats.
 - o <u>Provide functionality for timely and efficient retrieval of specific records upon request.</u>
 - o <u>Include mechanisms to generate and maintain detailed audit logs that capture user identification, precise timestamps, actions taken, and resources accessed, as required for compliance.</u>
- **4.** Section 1.7.8 Cost is hereby amended as follows:

Respondent must provide an annual rate inclusive of all costs for each year of the anticipated five-year agreement term. This section of the proposal is addressed in ATTACHMENT 1 - Cost Proposal Response Form. Year 1 shall include all onboarding, consulting, training, implementation costs in addition to all software maintenance and subscription cost. Years 2 through 5 shall include all software maintenance and subscription cost.

- 5. Section 3.1.2 Consulting Services is hereby amended to include the following:
 - Updating the current COOP in accordance with the guidelines outlined in Attachment 8 Florida Division of Emergency Management Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP) FDEM COOP Checklist and migrating the existing COOP into the new software solution
- **6.** Section 3.2.3 CEMP Baseline Assessment is hereby replaced in its entirety as follows:

The Consultant shall conduct a comprehensive review of the District's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) in accordance with ATTACHMENT 5, FEMA

Developing and Maintaining Emergency Operations Plans - Comprehensive Preparedness Guide (CPG) 101, and ATTACHMENT 6, Florida Division of Emergency Management (FDEM) Local Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan Compliance Criteria (CEMP-001), or an equivalent recognized doctrine. As part of this task, the Consultant will perform a baseline assessment to determine whether the existing CEMP aligns with FEMA and FDEM standards, as well as the District's specific jurisdictional requirements. Any identified gaps will be documented, and the Consultant shall compile a fully revised, redlined version of the CEMP that incorporates all proposed recommendations (in effect, the Consultant conducts а rewrite of the plan).recommendations into a draft for District review and comment.

Additionally, the COOP must be able to meet FDEM requirements. See the link provided on Attachment 8, FLORIDA DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANNING (COOP) FDEM COOP CHECKLIST, for instructions.

Upon receiving feedback, the Consultant shall finalize the recommendations within ten (10) business days, and submit the final version for the District's review and approval.

- **7.** Section 3.1.1 <u>Software Requirements</u> is hereby amended to include the following:
 - Support tiered access levels.
- **8.** Section 3.4 PERFORMANCE SCHEDULE is hereby amended as follows:

The Consultant shall prepare, submit, and maintain a detailed Performance Schedule using February 1, 2026, as the anticipated start date, to define the start of the Project and June 1, 2026 as the target date for full productive use. This schedule will serve as the primary tool for managing and controlling the Project timeline and will be used as the basis for scheduling all work and determining compensation.

II. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

1. Question: Are you migrating existing COOP or BC plans into the new system? If so, from what system or format (e.g., Word, Excel, SharePoint, homegrown database, or vendor tool)?

Answer: Yes, the District will be migrating the existing COOP into the new system. The current CEMP is in word format and current COOP is in BOLDplanning.

2. Question: How is your continuity program structured — are plans owned and maintained by individual divisions/departments, or centrally administered by Emergency Management?

Answer: The COOP is maintained by bureaus and divisions.

3. Question: Do you have a defined COOP plan print/export format (e.g., FEMA, Florida DEM, or internal template) that must be replicated within the system?

Answer: See clarifications #1 and #5 above.

4. Question: How detailed are current plans? For example, do departments maintain Mission Essential Functions (MEFs), dependencies, or staffing plans at a detailed level, or are they summarized

Answer: The current plans are detailed including dependencies and staffing plans. They are organized by Mission Essential Functions.

5. Question: Do you currently perform Business Impact Analysis (BIA) and Risk Assessments separately from the COOP plan, or are they embedded within each plan? Should the new system handle these as integrated modules?

Yes, the District currently perform Business Impact Analysis and Risk Assessments separately from the COOP plan. If possible, the selected system may handle these as integrated modules.

6. Question: The Scope of Work requires the Consultant to "compile recommendations into a draft for District review and comment." Please clarify the expected format and level of detail for this 'draft.'

Is the intent for the Consultant to deliver:

- 1. A marked up document (i.e., comments) detailing expert recommendations for improvement? OR
- 2. A fully revised, redlined version of the CEMP that incorporates all proposed recommendations (in effect, the Consultant conducts a rewrite of the plan)?

Answer: See clarification #6 above

Answer:

7. Question: Regarding "1.7.5.4 Documentation showing CEMP implementation," must this be specifically CEMP (FEMA CPG 101 plus Florida CEMP-001), or any equivalent Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) as per CPG 101?

Answer: See clarification #2 above.

8. Question: Are there existing systems that the new CEMP/COOP solution needs to integrate with (e.g., GIS, Microsoft Entra ID, internal document repositories, alerting/messaging platforms)?

Answer: The software solution shall support secure integration with Microsoft Entra Single Sign-On (SSO). Please refer to section 3.1.1, **Software Requirements**.

9. Question: Should the system support real-time incident tracking or exercise management, or is the initial focus strictly on planning and compliance?

Answer: Initial focus strictly on planning and compliance. Optional features of the software should be provided in proposal for future consideration but will not be a factor in the evaluation. Please refer to section 3.1.1, **Software Requirements**.

10. Question: Approximately how many users or departments will be managing their own plans, and should the system support tiered access (e.g., editors vs reviewers vs read-only users)?

Answer: Departments will not be managing their own plan(s), but all of the users will need to be able to access their plan to review and sign off. The ten (10) Emergency Operations Center (EOC) staff members and two (2) staff per bureau will be users. We estimate a total of 100 users with various levels of access.

See clarification #7 above for further information.

11. Question: Are there specific document retention, Sunshine Law, or audit requirements that need to be reflected in data access, versioning, or archiving within the platform?

Answer: See clarification #3 above.

12. Question: For Disaster Recovery (DR) and IT dependencies: are you expecting the CEMP/COOP tool to integrate with your ITDR or CMDB systems (e.g., ServiceNow), or will [Consultant] serve as the single system of record for recovery planning?

Answer: Integration with ITDR or CMDB systems is not a requirement. Please refer to clarification #3.

13. Question: Budget scope — Please confirm whether the stated estimated budget of \$65,000 covers Year 1 (software + implementation + training + consulting + MEF workshop) only, or the entire five-year term. If Year 1 only, should subscription/licensing for Years 2–5 be shown as separate annual amounts on Attachment 1?

Answer: Estimated budget of \$65,000 covers Year 1 for software subscription + implementation + training + consulting + MEF workshop only, software maintenance and subscription licensing for Years 2–5 must be shown as separate annual amounts on Attachment 1.

14. Question: Cost form granularity — Should Year 1's lump sum remain a single number on Attachment 1 while we break out software vs. onboarding/consulting in the narrative (permitted as explanation only), keeping Attachment 1 strictly lump-sum by year?

Answer: Yes, Attachment 1 shall be lump sum by year. Please refer to section 1.7, **PROPOSAL FORMAT**. See clarifications #3 and #4 above for further instruction.

15. Question: Annual rate expectation — Please confirm that the District expects an annual, allinclusive rate for each year of the five-year term, as indicated in §1.7.8 Cost (and presented via Attachment 1).

Answer: See clarification #4 above.

16. Question: "Full productive use" acceptance – Please confirm the acceptance criteria you intend to use for go-live/"full productive use." For example: (a) configuration complete, (b) data migration complete, (c) trainings delivered per the Software Training Plan, and (d) District sign-off. Will the District use a formal acceptance document at that point? (Our understanding is that acceptance ties to the Performance Schedule tasks and final deliverables.)

Answer: Please refer to Part III, **NATURE OF SERVICES REQUIRED**. Yes, the District will utilize a formal acceptance document.

- 17. Question: Role-based counts For accurate licensing and training planning, please provide expected headcounts by role and access level:
 - Full/Admin Users staff who will build/update plans, workflows, or run exercises.
 - Occasional Users department leads/planners who review/update data periodically.

- Field/Mobile Users employees/responders who input during activations, drills, incidents.
- Mass Notification Recipients total recipients (internal staff, contractors, external partners).
- Concurrent Users (if known) peak expected simultaneous users (e.g., during activation).
- Expected Administrator Count to train as "super users."
 (This will also help align the Software Training Plan by role and time commitments.)

Answer: The estimated users are listed below:

- Full/Admin users (consisting of EOC support staff): ten (10)
- Occasional users (consisting of bureau and division staff): 100
- Field/Mobile staff: zero (0)
- Mass notifications: zero (0)
- Concurrent users: maximum of 100
- Expected admin count: ten (10)
- 18. Question: District resource requirements Do you have a preferred breakdown of District roles, weekly time commitments, and post-production involvement for implementation? If not, we'll propose one that aligns with §1.7.7 (District Resource Requirements / Deliverables).

Answer: Please refer to section 1.7.7, <u>Methodology Approach</u>, and provide as part of response.

19. Question: Training format & cadence — Any preference for live virtual vs. recorded modules vs. hands-on workshops by role, and any refresher cadence you'd like us to assume in Year 1?

Answer: There is no set cadence the District would like the Respondent to assume in year one.

20. Question: Is partial award an option?

Answer: No.

21. Question: Does the district have preferred consultants to work with?

Answer: No, the District does not have preferred consultants to work with.

22. Question: What is the target date for full productive use?

Answer: See clarification #8.

23. Question: Is the \$65,000 budget allocation for year 1 for both software and consulting, or is the budget total for software and consulting for the three-year term?

Answer: Estimated budget of \$65,000 covers Year 1 for software + implementation + training + consulting + MEF workshop only, software maintenance and licensing for Years 2–5 must be shown as separate annual amounts on Attachment 1.

24. Question: What is the desired number of users and are these users required to not have any limitations on frequency of access?

Answer: The estimated total number of users is approximately 100 and unlimited access

25. Question: If data migration is expected to be provided as part of this contract, please provide additional responses to the following:

- 1. What methods of data export does the system provide? (CSV, XML, API, etc.)?
- 2. Can you provide documentation of the format and examples?
- 3. Can you provide a full data schema of the legacy system?
- 4. Which entities in the schema are expected to be migrated?
- 5. How many records for each entity are to be migrated?
- 6. Are there any files (docs, pdf, etc.) that need to be migrated?
- 7. What is the total size of the data to be migrated?

Answer:

- 1. The current system for the COOP can export to xls and xml. The current CEMP is in doc format.
- 2. The District does not have examples to provide. However, the current system creates draft documents in doc format from data entered into fields.
- 3. The full data schema is not available for the current system at this time.
- 4. All existing entities in the schema are expected to be migrated.
- 5. The District estimates that there are no more than 5,000 records in the current system.
- 6. Yes, existing unstructured data include xls, doc, and pdf files.
- 7. The total size of current data is unknown. The current CEMP system contains data for four CEMP plans and associated documents. The COOP is in doc format.

26. Question: Please confirm if all consultation and training needs will be conducted virtually.

Answer: Please refer to the following sections:

- 1.7.7.3, <u>Software Training Plan</u>. The respondent must provide a training plan which includes the format of the training (e.g. live virtual sessions, recorded modules, hands-on workshops).
- 3.2.1, Project Kick-Off Meeting. The kick-off meeting is virtual.
- 3.2.4 Mission Essential Functions (MEF) Workshop. The MEF workshop is virtual.

27. Question: Would you please advise when the question and answer details will be made available?

Answer: This Addendum (Addendum #2) contains the answers to all questions received prior to the posting of this Addendum.

28. Question: Would it be possible to extend the submission deadline to 11/21?

Answer: The deadline for submissions has been extended to December 9, 2025 at 2:00 pm. See Addendum 1 posted on November 13, 2025 to both www.DemandStar.com and www.watermatters.org.

III. ATTACHMENTS:

- 1. Attachment 1-A Cost Proposal Response Form
- 2. Attachment 8 Florida Division of Emergency Management Continuity of Operations Planning (COOP) FDEM COOP Checklist

Chamanda Burris Procurement Supervisor cc: Project Manager

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDUM #2	
	BY: _
DATE	
(TYPE/PRINT NAME AND TITLE)	
COMPANY NAME	

ATTACHMENT 1-A COST PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORM FOR

RFP 25-4871 NEW COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANNING (CEMP/COOP) SOFTWARE SOLUTION

COST PROPOSAL RESPONSE FORM					
DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	TOTAL ITEM COST (\$)		
Year 1 – Include all onboarding, consulting, training, implementation costs in addition to all software maintenance and subscription costs.	1	Lump Sum	\$		
Year 2 – Include all software maintenance and subscription costs.	1	Lump Sum	\$		
Year 3 – Include all software maintenance and subscription costs.	1	Lump Sum	\$		
Year 4 – Include all software maintenance and subscription costs.	1	Lump Sum	\$		
Year 5 – Include all software maintenance and subscription costs.	1	Lump Sum	\$		

TOTAL PROPOSAL AMOUNT \$				
TOTAL PROPOSAL AMOUNT IN WORDS (Type or Clearly Print):				

SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES			
SERVICE AND DESCRIPTION	ADDITIONAL COST (\$)		
	\$		
	\$		
	\$		

ATTACHMENT 8

FOR

RFP 25-4871 NEW COMPREHENSIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AND CONTINUITY OF **OPERATIONS PLANNING (CEMP/COOP) SOFTWARE SOLUTION**

FLORIDA DIVISION OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLANNING (COOP) FDEM COOP CHECKLIST

This document is available by following the link below or by downloading it from the solicitation page on www.DemandStar.com

https://www.floridadisaster.org/dem/response/planning-section/continuity-of-operations-planning/