

ADDENDUM No. 1

RFP No. 22-28

Community Engagement Services

Due: March 30, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. (local time)

The information contained herein shall take precedence over the original documents and all previous addenda (if any) and is appended thereto. **This Addendum includes three (3) pages.**

The Offeror is to acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1, including all attachments in its Proposal by so indicating in the proposal that the addendum has been received. Proposals submitted without acknowledgement of receipt of this addendum may be considered non-conforming.

The following forms provided within the RFP Document should be included in submitted proposal:

- **Attachment B - Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment C - Living Wage Declaration of Compliance**
- **Attachment D - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form**

Proposals that fail to provide these completed forms listed above upon proposal opening may be rejected as non-responsive and may not be considered for award.

I. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following Questions have been received by the City. Responses are being provided in accordance with the terms of the RFP. Respondents are directed to take note in its review of the documents of the following questions and City responses as they affect work or details in other areas not specifically referenced here.

Question 1: What does the City hope to learn as a result of the community engagement process?

Answer 1: The City is hoping to receive feedback on several important issues related to the final recommendation for the unarmed response program. First, we would like to learn the community's expectations for what type of services an unarmed response program will provide. We can model our program after programs in other cities and approximate what services might be useful to the community, however we feel it is better to understand the specific priorities of residents, employees, students, and members of the wider Ann Arbor community for what their expectations may be.

We also would like to learn if the community has strong feelings about the structure of the unarmed response program. For instance, it is generally considered a best practice to separate an unarmed response program from the police department and manage it separately. We are interested to know if there is also a strong desire to separate the program from non-police city leaders, and if so to what degree that separation should be designed. Should this be a completely separate agency that is not accountable to the City Council? Should it be an independent agency that is guided by a city appointed board much like the Housing Commission or AAATA? Should the relationship be treated more like a vendor that has some operational independence but whose contract is approved by City Council and whose performance is ultimately accountable to the City Administrator. If there is a strong preference in the community, we would like to know.

We would like to understand the community's tolerance for cost of the program. This program could grow into a multi-million dollar annual commitment and we would like to both communicate that reality to the public and understand the tolerance for that kind of financial commitment—the tolerance may be very high and that would be good to know as we make important planning decisions this year.

Finally, there may be other issues that are important the public that we are as yet unaware of, and so we would like there to be open ended opportunities for feedback that we have not yet considered. Other topics may become priorities for us to explore as the engagement campaign comes together.

Question 2: Are there any unarmed response programs/best practices that you would like to use as a model? If so, perhaps it would be useful in guiding this process.

Answer 2: The City conducted a review of what unarmed response program look like in other cities at the end of 2021 and published a memo to the Council. That memo can be viewed here: <http://a2gov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=5365438&GUID=8F62BB3F-47AA-451F-B7AD-F56D00DC67E6>

Question 3: What is the anticipated start/completion timeline for the project?

Answer 3: The City would like to start the engagement campaign as soon as possible, ideally at some point in April. However, we are interested in selecting the right vendor first and would be willing to accommodate scheduling issues in service of hiring the best fit firm.

Question 4: Do you have an established budget for this project?

Answer 4: We are interested in receiving quality responses and judging the value of the proposal relative to the proposed work plan. We are willing to pay for quality, within reason. Beyond that we would prefer not to commit to a specific budget until we are able to review proposals.

Question 5: Will there be representatives (from the areas noted in the RFP) that will make up a Planning Committee to work with the consultant(s)?

Answer 5: The vendor will work at the direction of the City Administrator's Office. We will want to consult with community leaders and subject matter experts to help facilitate small group meetings and community conversations, and that will be done with the advice of staff.

Question 6: What COVID restrictions and policies are in place for in-person group meetings?

Answer 6: It depends on what the state of the pandemic is at the time of the meetings. Currently, the City has lifted its mandatory mask mandate for staff working in City Hall, however we are still requiring masks when staff interact with members of the public without physical barriers like glass windows and stanchions. We still have physical distancing requirements in place, however, for meetings indoors. If case rates start to rise, we may take a more conservative approach with regard to masking Part of the rationale for the timing of this campaign is to conduct it when the weather is nicer, and allow for some of these engagements to occur outside where the need for masking and distancing can be obviated.

Question 7: When was the most recent strategic plan for the City of Ann Arbor conducted? Is this project a new initiative or component of the overall strategic plan for the City?

Answer 7: This program does not appear in the City's strategic planning document as they are outdated at this point. This is a new initiative that has been directed by the Council and that enjoys broad support from the city's leadership.

Question 8: Can you define what success looks like for this project?

Answer 8: Success for this project would include the following deliverables:

1. We are able to successfully articulate answers provided by the public to the questions that we would like to have answered (and as detailed in a previous answer above).
2. Those answers are articulated in a report that is provided back the City.
3. The detail of these answers of such quality that we are able to rely on this community feedback to help construct a proposal for the structure of the city's unarmed response program, and begin defining partnerships and drafting follow-on RFPs for the delivery of crucial services related to the program.

Question 9: What are the expected roles of the City Administrator's Office, Public Engagement Office, Equitable Engagement Working Group, and the Communications Team?

Answer 9: The firm chosen will work at the sole direction of the City Administrator's Office. Employees from the city's public engagement team (including those working on the City's equitable engagement project) and Communications team will advise and collaborate on the project at the direction of the City Administrator's Office.

Question 10: What partnerships exist or can be expected between the City of Ann Arbor and the University of Michigan, Law Enforcement (9-1-1 dispatch), and/or Washtenaw County Community Mental Health regarding the development and implementation of an unarmed response team?

Answer 10: The program being developed will be a program of the City exclusively, and we will partner with outside organization as needed to successfully implement the objective of the program which is to ensure that unarmed professionals from a variety of social and human services backgrounds are responding to crisis calls for service that otherwise may not require an unarmed police officer to be present. It is too early to define the parameters of those partnerships at this point, or to understand what specific partnerships would be required.

Question 11: The RFP seems to include insurance requirements that might be onerous for some firms. What flexibility is there to alter the insurance requirements?

Answer 11: The RFP does not state specific insurance requirements that are required. There is a sample professional service agreement that includes some insurance requirements, but this is only included as an example document for what our standard professional services agreement looks like. Once a firm is selected, we will evaluate the final scope of work and work plan with our insurance advisors and determine the level of insurance coverage that may be required as part of the contract negotiation process. Firms who are interested in completing the work are encouraged to respond to the RFP.

Offerors are responsible for any conclusions that they may draw from the information contained in the Addendum.