
1.0 SCOPE AND CLASSIFICATION

- 1.1 **Scope:** The City of Columbus, Department of Finance and Management, is seeking proposals to provide the City with a contract for consulting services to perform a Public Safety Review which will entail an operations review of the Columbus Division of Police (“Division”), as well as select Division policies, procedures, training, and recruitment. The review will address these issues through the lens of community and problem-oriented law enforcement services.

The consultant, who will work directly with an assigned City of Columbus liaison and project team, will also support the research needs of the Columbus Community Safety Advisory Commission (“Commission”). This time-limited Commission, appointed by Mayor Andrew J. Ginther, has been tasked as follows:

“The Columbus Community Safety Advisory Commission will openly and thoroughly review existing research and recommendations of respected law enforcement and social justice experts. In particular, they will draw on the experience and advice of similar groups – like President Obama’s Taskforce on 21st Century Policing and the Ohio Task Force on Community-Police Relations – to identify data-driven, evidence-based best practices that work for Columbus.

“This Commission will focus on areas such as de-escalation, crisis intervention, and implicit bias training; use of force policies; diversity recruitment and retention; and early intervention and officer wellness programs.

“In each area, the Commission will assess what we need to do differently to provide public safety services that are transparent, accountable, and responsive for every person in every neighborhood.”

This review will be further informed by Mayor Andrew J. Ginther’s Comprehensive Neighborhood Safety Strategy and prior third party assessments of the Division of Police.

The City of Columbus (City) is the capital and largest city in the State of Ohio. It is the 14th largest city in the United States with a population of 860,090. It is the core city of the Columbus, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which encompasses a ten-county area.

The City of Columbus is a home-rule municipality under the Ohio Constitution and state law. The executive functions of the City are governed by an elected mayor, with directors managing the day-to-day operations of city departments. The Office of the Mayor is led by a chief of staff and includes three initiatives led by executive

directors. The City manages six collective bargaining contracts for unionized employees, as well as a management compensation plan for non-union employees.

The Columbus Division of Police has a complement of approximately 1,900 officers and 300 civilian employees. With the exception of the Chief of Police and six Deputy Chiefs, all officers fall under the purview of the collective bargaining agreement with the Fraternal Order of Police, Capital City Lodge #9.

The Director of the Department of Public Safety is appointed by the mayor and oversees the chief of police and the chief of fire, both of which divisions report up to the mayor through the department.

The Division covers 20 precincts across the greater Columbus metropolitan area. In 2017, the Division of Police received approximately 1.25 million calls for service of which approximately 633,510 were emergency 911 calls. With respect to the 2018 budget for the Division of Police the following are close approximations: general fund for personnel costs and general expenses \$330,812,000; capital fund for facility renovations of \$1,680,000; and vehicle purchase fund of \$5,568,237.

The Division regularly undergoes accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc. (“CALEA”).

This project will review operations in the Division of Police to identify opportunities to deliver high-quality, cost-effective services for Columbus residents in the following five categories:

I. Personnel

In general, determining the benchmarks for staffing, including deployment models, staffing levels, field services structure, and alignment with community and problem-oriented policing.

1. Whether the number of officers is optimum given the City of Columbus population, square miles, crime rate, calls for service and workload, as benchmarked against national data-driven, evidence-based best practices and peer cities?
2. Whether the number of civilians is optimum given the City of Columbus population, square miles, crime rate, calls for service and workload, as benchmarked against national data-driven, evidence-based best practices and peer cities?
3. Whether the ratio between officers and civilians is optimum given the City of Columbus population, square miles, crime rate, calls for service

and workload, as benchmarked against national data-driven, evidence-based best practices and peer cities?

4. Whether the Division deployment models is optimum, as benchmarked against national data-driven, evidence-based best practices and peer cities?
5. Whether the number and type of non-patrol officers is optimum for case load and solve rate given the City of Columbus population, square miles, crime rate and workload, as benchmarked against national data-driven, evidence-based best practices and peer cities?
6. Whether the organizational structure is the best framework for delivering effective and efficient safety services. This analysis shall include, but is not limited to, a review of:
 - a. The table of organization
 - b. Span of supervision, especially at the patrol level
 - c. The number and ratio of generalist vs specialist
 - d. Availability to conduct proactive policing and community engagement
7. Whether greater efficiencies could be obtained by the use of technology, alternative process flows, or alternative administrative service models not currently being implemented?
8. Whether current diversity recruitment and retention efforts are optimum when benchmarked against national data-driven, evidence-based best practices and peer cities, with a specific focus on consultant reports and marketing plans presently created for or on behalf of the Division?
9. Whether greater diversity in the sworn ranks could be achieved by national data-driven, evidence-based best practice programs not currently being implemented?
10. Whether current Civil Service testing, rules and procedures, current Fraternal Order of Police Capital City Lodge #9 collective bargaining agreement, and associated work rules properly provide for recruiting, graduating and retaining diversity within the ranks of the Division.

II. Community and Problem Oriented Policing

After developing a common understanding of community and problem-oriented policing, determine how those concepts can and should be embedded in the operational culture of the Division.

1. How can we best define community and problem-oriented policing for the city of Columbus?
2. What is the data-driven, evidence-based best practice time available for community and problem-oriented policing on the part of field patrol personnel; how does the Division measure in that regard; and

what changes in personnel may be necessary to achieve the benchmarked standards?

3. What structures and coordination efforts would maximize delivery of proactive field patrol services in a community policing environment?
4. Whether the current programs (see attached: "Community Engagement and Outreach Initiatives") utilized by the Division are effective and/or national data-driven, evidence-based best practice models?
5. What additional national data-driven, evidence-based best practice programs should be implemented to facilitate community policing and engagement?
6. What is the current level of support for and understanding of community and problem-oriented policing within the Division?

III. Policies and Practices

Determine how Division policies and practices align with and support community and problem-oriented policing.

1. Whether the policies and practices of the Columbus Division of Police (see: www.columbus.gov/police-divisiondirectives/) are comprised of national data-driven, evidence-based best practices? A more detailed focus should be applied to policies which address the following topics:
 - a. Use of Force
 - b. Use of Force Investigations (especially officer involved shootings)
 - c. Crisis intervention
 - d. De-escalation
 - e. Protest and Crowd Control
 - f. Search and Seizure
 - g. Body Camera Utilization
 - h. Implicit bias, explicit bias, and cultural competency
2. Whether recommended policies and practices are in line or in conflict with CALEA accreditation, and, if in conflict, the fact basis for the recommendation?

IV. Training

Examine and benchmark training curriculum and implementation with a focus on outcomes that support community and problem-oriented policing.

-
1. Whether national data-driven, evidence-based best practices are being utilized to train Division of Police cadets and officers (see attached Columbus Division of Police Training Summary for a brief overview). The analysis should include a benchmark of both program content, as well as the relative amount of time dedicated to a given subject and the ability to embed key policing philosophies, such as community and problem-oriented policing in training process. A more detailed analysis should be applied to training in the following areas:
 - a. Interacting with a diverse metropolitan population
 - b. Interacting with people in crisis
 - c. De-escalation tactics
 - d. Crowd control and protests
 - e. Use of Force, especially with firearms
 - f. Constitutional policing

V. Transparency and Accountability

Identify data-driven, evidence-based best practices to support officers and the community by building trust through transparency and accountability for the Division.

1. Whether the current system in place to review officer misconduct comports with national data-driven, evidence-based best practices?
2. What collective bargaining sections hinder optimum transparency and accountability in regards to investigating alleged officer misconduct?
3. What additional communication practices could be implemented to promote greater transparency and accountability?
4. What officer wellness and early intervention systems might better support officer performance?

1.2 **Classification:** Offerors are encouraged to submit proposals that demonstrate their competence, ability, past performance, quality and feasibility, cost, and environmental impact as defined in this request. The City may contract with one or more Offerors chosen through this RFP process. The City welcomes partnerships between firms as part of this process.

2.0 APPLICABLE STANDARDS AND PUBLICATIONS

2.1 N/A

3.0 SPECIFICATIONS

3.1 **General Information:**

3.1.1 **Term:** The contract term shall be negotiated. The City will negotiate a term with the selected vendor for one (1) year and potential modifications of up to two (2) additional years. However, it is anticipated that the primary work will be completed in FY2018

3.1.2 **Budget Estimate:** The Request for Proposal (RFP) must contain sufficient information to allow the City to perform a basic analysis of the cost of the scope of work. This information shall include the amounts of the basic elements of the proposed cost. These elements will include, as applicable, direct labor, travel, materials, subcontracts, indirect costs, fee, profit, etc. It should be noted that the evaluation committee will only score the proposals based on the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 4.0.

3.1.3 **Non-disclosure:** The contractor agrees that no information will be disclosed to third parties or published in case studies, advertisements, white papers, customer testimonials, etc. without the written consent of the City.

3.2 **RFP Overview:** The Offeror's response to this RFP should be a clear and concise description of the Offeror's capabilities and proposed service offerings. The RFP will be evaluated using (1) the competence of the offeror to perform the required service as indicated by the technical training, education and experience of the Offeror's personnel who would be assigned to perform the work; (2) the quality and feasibility of the Offeror's technical proposal; (3) the ability of the offeror to perform the required service competently and expeditiously as indicated by the Offeror's workload and the availability of necessary personnel, equipment and facilities; and (4) past performance of the Offeror as reflected by evaluations of the city agency, other city agencies and other previous clients of the offeror with respect to such factors as quality of work, success in controlling costs, and success in meeting deadlines.

3.2.1 **Process Summary:** The City will appoint an evaluation committee to evaluate proposals received. The Committee will include City of Columbus staff and at least one member of the Columbus Community Safety Advisory Commission. The committee will evaluate all Offerors and proposals received and rank the offerors based upon the evaluation criteria specified in the RFP. The committee may then select two (2) or more of the highest qualified Offerors with which to hold additional discussions. The discussions may include, but are not limited to, presentations by the Offerors to the committee to elaborate upon their qualifications, proposals, and/or other pertinent information. Based upon the content of

the proposals received including any revisions thereto, and upon any additional discussions with the Offerors the committee shall rank the remaining offerors based upon the evaluation criteria specified in the RFP. The committee shall submit its ranking of the Offerors along with a written explanation to the Finance and Management Director. The Finance and Management Director shall select the Offeror(s) with which to enter into contract negotiations. If negotiations fail, negotiations with these offeror(s) shall be terminated, and the city agency may enter into contract negotiations with another.

3.2.2 RFP Sequence of Events: The following RFP sequence of events represents the City's best estimate of the schedule that will be followed. Exact times for questions / answers (in Section 3.2.2.1) and due date (on the RFP cover page) are noted in this document and will be published on Vendor Services and in the City Bulletin:

- RFP Issued
- Deadline for written questions: approximately 14 days after RFP issued
- City response to questions: approximately 3 days after question deadline
- RFP Due: approximately 14 days after question responses published
- Notification of finalists: approximately 15 days after RFP received
- Presentations to City: approximately 15 days after notifications sent
- Negotiations begin: approximately 10 days after presentations
- Contract completed: approximately 30 days after completed negotiations
- Contract Commencement: July 2018 (target date)

3.2.2.1 Specification Questions: Questions regarding this solicitation, including any exceptions and/or suggested changes to the requirements, must be submitted on the portal by 11 a.m. Eastern Standard Time on **xx xx, 2018**". Responses will be posted as an addendum to this bid on the City's website (vendorservices.columbus.gov) no later than 5:00 p.m. (local time) on **<insert month> xx, 2018**. Offerors whom have not registered and received a login and password from the City's vendorservices.columbus.gov web site are strongly encouraged to do so. Notice of any notes and addenda will only be sent to Offerors whom have registered at the site. Include the Solicitation Number in the subject line of your e-mail.

3.2.2.2 Communications: During the bidding and evaluation process, Offerors are strictly prohibited from communicating with any City

employees or officers regarding this solicitation except through the method stated immediately above during the Question & Answer Period. Any communication from the vendor to the City after the Question & Answer period should be limited to only what is necessary. Necessary communication required by the City will be communicated clearly to Offerors. If any Offeror has a need to communicate with the City, the communication should come only to the Chair of the Committee. If a City employee attempts to communicate with an Offeror contrary to this provision, the Offeror shall report said incident to the Chair of the Committee. The Chair is Bryan Clark, Chief Policy Advisor to Mayor Andrew J. Ginther. He can be reached at bmclark@columbus.gov or 614-645-6992. A violation of this section on the part of the Offeror will lead to disqualification.

4.0 RFP EVALUATION CRITERIA

Section One – Competence (15 points): The competence of the Offeror to perform the required service as indicated by the technical training, education and experience of the Offeror's personnel who would be assigned to perform the work.

Section Two – Quality and Feasibility (55 points): The quality and feasibility of the Offeror's proposal. The committee will give points to Offerors who clearly demonstrate their compliance with the needs defined in the specifications.

Section Three – Ability (10 points): The ability of the Offeror to perform the required service competently and expeditiously as indicated by the Offeror's workload and the availability of necessary personnel, equipment and facilities.

Section Four – Past Performance (20 points): The past performance of the Offeror as reflected by evaluations of the city agency, other city agencies and other previous clients of the Offeror with respect to such factors as quality of work, success in controlling costs, and success in meeting deadlines.

4.1 **Section One – Competence (15 points):**

4.1.1 Provide sufficient information in a clear, concise manner to the City to evaluate the competence of Offeror to perform the requested services. Information in Section One should be limited to no more than 7 pages and should include:

-
- the technical training of staff assigned to perform on this project
 - experience of staff assigned to perform on this project
 - experience of lead project manager assigned to oversee this project

4.2 Section Two – Quality and Feasibility (55 points):

4.2.1 Provide detailed information in a clear, concise manner addressing the scope as defined in Section 1.1. Information in this section will not have a page limit. To assess the quality and feasibility of the firm’s work, please provide electronic links to three (3) reports similar in nature to the current request and completed by the firm in the previous five (5) years.

4.2.2 To assess your ability to deliver this analysis, please address the following:

1. Describe your review process, as well as projected timeline to complete the review and your first step(s) after selection.
2. What are your expectations of City of Columbus departments and the internal Safety Review Committee during the study process?
3. What is your experience working with citizen-led commissions; and what is your approach to providing timely responses to research or information requests from such groups?
4. What information and recommendations will be included in the Safety Review Report?
5. On an as-needed basis during the course of the contract and at the conclusion of the study process, how will you share with us your findings to the best of your ability?
6. Please provide the City with a complete client list.
7. Are you presently doing any work in the Columbus metropolitan area? If so, with whom and where? In order to avoid conflicts-of-interest with competing studies would you agree to give us the “right of approval” over any clients you might work with in our geographic area (if we retain your services)?
8. What makes your firm “right” for us, and better than other firms/individuals we could select?

4.2.3 The audiences of the Safety Review are the members of the Columbus Community Safety Advisory Commission and liaisons thereto; the residents of the City of Columbus; the senior leadership teams for the Office of the Mayor, Department of Public Safety and Columbus Division of Police; and the Mayor of the City of Columbus.

As part of the program interview process, the consulting team may meet with the Mayor Andrew J. Ginther. The team will be expected to devote appropriate time engaging with senior leadership of the Department of Public Safety and the Division of Police, as well as patrol and non-patrol supervisors and personnel in the Division. In addition, the team will be expected to meet with and support members of the Columbus Community Safety Advisory Commission.

After conducting this analysis, the consulting team will be expected to provide recommendations to address the scope as defined in 1.1, in addition to any information jointly agreed to as part of the project. These recommends should include quantitative and qualitative information to assist the City in determining anticipated costs/benefits of each recommendation; reasonably anticipated legal or contractual barriers to implementation; annotations to national best practices; and examples of similar, successful operations in other departments.

In addition to a final report, the selected firm must develop and provide a PowerPoint presentation to the Safety Review Committee for use during presentations and meeting with stakeholders.

4.3 Section Three – Ability (10 points):

4.3.1 The ability of the Offeror to perform the required service competently and expeditiously as indicated by the Offeror's workload and the availability of necessary personnel, equipment and facilities. Information in Section Three should be limited to no more than 5 pages and should include

Indicate clearly:

- current workload
- availability of necessary personnel
- availability of necessary equipment
- availability of necessary facilities

4.4 Section Four – Past Performance (10 points):

4.4.1 Offeror shall include in the proposal three of the following questionnaires as completed by customers of Offeror. The Offeror may not ask the City of Columbus to complete this form.

PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

To:
(Name of person completing survey)

Phone: Fax:

Subject: Past Performance Survey of:
(Name of Company)

(Name of individuals)

City of Columbus (the City) is implementing a process that collects past performance information on firms and their key personnel. The information will be used to assist the City in the selection of firms, to perform various projects. The contractor listed above identified you as someone for whom the contractor either currently provides a service or for whom the contractor has provided this service in the past. Please take a moment to tell us about this contractor’s performance.

HOW SATISFIED. Rate each of the criteria on a scale of 1 to 10, with a 10 representing highly satisfied and a 1 representing highly dissatisfied. Use a number in between to show different degrees of satisfaction. Please rate each of these criteria to the best of your knowledge. If you have no knowledge of past performance in a particular area, leave it blank.

NO	CRITERIA	UNIT	YOUR SCORE
1	Ability to meet customer expectations	(1-10)	
2	Ability to financially perform in the best interest of the client and citizens	(1-10)	
3	Ability to maintain schedules and meet deadlines	(1-10)	
4	Ability to increase value	(1-10)	
5	Quality of service	(1-10)	
6	Ability to identify and minimize the users risk	(1-10)	
7	Leadership ability (minimize the need of owner/client direction)	(1-10)	
8	Your comfort level in hiring the firm/individual again based on performance	(1-10)	

_____ Printed Name (of Evaluator)
 _____ Signature (of Evaluator)

Thank you for your time and effort in assisting us in this important endeavor. Please fax survey back to (Vendor enter your fax number here).