

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

RFP # 9XX

INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS OF ANN ARBOR POLICE DEPARTMENT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PRACTICES

City of Ann Arbor
City Administrator's Office



Due Date: December 9, 2016 by 2:00 PM EST

Issued By:

City of Ann Arbor

Procurement Unit

301 E. Huron Street

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION | 3 |
| SECTION II: SCOPE OF SERVICES..... | 10 |
| SECTION III: MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED | 15 |
| SECTION IV: ATTACHMENTS | 21 |

DRAFT

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

A. OBJECTIVE

The City of Ann Arbor (hereafter “the City”) is seeking proposals from individuals, firms, teams, or consultants (hereafter “Consultant”) to provide a review of the techniques the Ann Arbor Police Department (AAPD) employs to effectively and equitably deliver law enforcement services to all members of the community (hereafter “the Project”) and to gage the appropriate level of civilian review. Under the direction of the City Administrator, the City’s intent is to undergo a process that openly and objectively examines the means and methods the Ann Arbor Police Department (AAPD) employs and should adopt to support and sustain a safe and inclusive community and explores how those means and methods are perceived by the community. The ultimate purpose is to receive and adopt recommendations to enhance the AAPD’s service to and relationship with the community, which is a critical part of the exceptional quality of life we strive to provide to all of Ann Arbor’s residents, visitors, businesses, and institutions.

B. QUESTIONS ABOUT AND CLARIFICATIONS OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

All questions regarding this Request for Proposal (RFP) shall be submitted via e-mail. Questions will be accepted and answered in accordance with the terms and conditions of this RFP. **All questions shall be submitted on or before November 1, 2016 at 10:00 AM.**, and should be addressed as follows:

Scope of Work/Proposal Content questions shall be e-mailed to Sara Higgins, City Administrator’s Office, shiggins@a2gov.org.

RFP Process and Compliance questions shall be e-mailed to Colin Spencer, Buyer - cspencer@a2gov.org.

Should any prospective Consultant be in doubt as to the true meaning of any portion of this RFP, or should the consultant find any ambiguity, inconsistency, or omission therein, the Consultant shall make a written request for an official interpretation or correction by the due date got questions above.

All interpretations, corrections, or additions to this RFP will be made only as an official addendum that will be posted to a2gov.org and MITN.info and it shall be the Consultant’s responsibility to ensure they have received all addenda before submitting a proposal. Any addendum issued by the City shall become part of the RFP, and must be incorporated in the proposal where applicable.

If it becomes necessary to revise any part of the RFP, notice of the addendum will be posted to Michigan Inter-governmental Trade Network (MITN) www.mitn.info and/or the City of Ann Arbor web site www.A2gov.org for all parties to download.

Each consultant must acknowledge in its proposal all addenda it has received. The failure of a Consultant to receive or acknowledge receipt of any addenda shall not relieve the consultant of the responsibility for complying with the terms thereof. The City will not be bound by oral responses to inquiries or written responses other than official written addenda.

C. PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING

There will be no pre-proposal meeting.

D. PROPOSAL FORMAT

To be considered, each firm must submit a response to this RFP using the format provided in Section III. No other distribution of proposals is to be made by the consultant. An official authorized to bind the Consultant to its provisions must sign the proposal in ink. Each proposal must remain valid for at least ninety days from the due date of this RFP.

Proposals should be prepared simply and economically providing a straightforward, concise description of the Consultant's ability to meet the requirements of the RFP. No erasures are permitted. Mistakes may be crossed out and corrected and must be initialed and dated in ink by the person signing the proposal.

E. EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE

The selected vendor should have team members with extensive experience and expertise in the following areas:

- best practices in police practices and the related laws, including policy review, community policing, problem-oriented policing, use of force policy and training, de-escalation training, policing of people with mental health or substance abuse issues, diversion (including pre-arrest), reducing racially disparate impacts in policing outcomes, racial equity impact analysis, and restorative justice (including community-based restorative justice models not involving the criminal justice system);
- police accountability systems and civilian police review boards; and
- uses of social science methodology including surveys, statistical analysis, observations and interviews.

No one working for (or as a subcontractor to) the City of Ann Arbor is eligible to win this RFP.

F. SELECTION CRITERIA

Responses to this RFP will be evaluated using a point system as shown in Section III. A selection committee comprised of staff from the City will complete the evaluation.

The fee proposals will not be reviewed at the initial evaluation. After initial evaluation, the City will determine top consultants, and open only those fee proposals. The City will then determine which, if any, firms will be interviewed. During the interviews (if required), the selected firms will be given the opportunity to discuss their proposals, qualifications, past experience, and fee proposals in more detail. The City further reserves the right to interview the key personnel assigned by the selected Consultant to this project. If the City chooses to interview any respondents, the interviews will be tentatively held the **week of January 13, 2017**. Consultants must be available on these dates.

All proposals submitted may be subject to clarifications and further negotiation. All agreements resulting from negotiations that differ from what is represented within the RFP or in the Consultant's response shall be documented and included as part of the final contract.

G. SEALED PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

All proposals are due and must be delivered to the City Procurement Unit on, or before, December 2, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. (local time). Proposals submitted late or via oral, telephonic, telegraphic, electronic mail or facsimile will not be considered or accepted.

Each respondent must submit in a sealed envelope

- One (1) original proposal
- Three (3) additional proposal copies
- One (1) digital copy of the proposal on a flash drive as one file in PDF format

Each respondent must submit in a single separate sealed envelope marked Fee Proposal with the following:

- Two (2) copies of the fee proposal

The fee proposal and all costs must be separate from the rest of the proposal.

Proposals submitted must be clearly marked: "RFP No. 9XX – "Independent Analysis of Ann Arbor Police Department Community Engagement Practices" and list the consultant's name and address.

Proposals must be addressed and delivered to:

City of Ann Arbor
c/o Customer Service
301 East Huron Street
P.O. Box 8647
Ann Arbor, MI 48107

All proposals received on or before the due date will be publicly opened and recorded on the due date. No immediate decisions will be rendered.

Hand delivered proposals must be date/time stamped by the Customer Service Department at the address above in order to be considered. Delivery hours are 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding Holidays.

The City will not be liable to any Consultant for any unforeseen circumstances, delivery, or postal delays. Postmarking on the due date will not substitute for receipt of the proposal. Consultants are responsible for submission of their proposal. Additional time will not be granted to a single Consultant. However, additional time may be granted to all consultants at the discretion of the City.

A proposal will be disqualified if:

- 1) The fee proposal is not contained within a separate sealed envelope.
- 2) The fee proposal is submitted as part of the digital copy. Provide fee proposal in hard copy only.
- 3) The forms provided as Attachment C - City of Ann Arbor Non-Discrimination Declaration of Compliance, Attachment D - City of Ann Arbor Living Wage Declaration of Compliance, Attachment E - Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form of the RFP Document must be included in submitted proposals.

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

H. DISCLOSURES

Under the Freedom of Information Act (Public Act 442), the City is obligated to permit review of its files, if requested by others. All information in a consultant's proposal is subject to disclosure under this provision. This act also provides for a complete disclosure of contracts and attachments thereto.

I. TYPE OF CONTRACT

A sample of the Professional Services Agreement is included as Attachment A. Those who wish to submit a proposal to the City are required to review this sample agreement carefully. **The City will not entertain changes to its Professional Services Agreement.**

The City reserves the right to award the total proposal, to reject any or all proposals in whole or in part, and to waive any informality or technical defects if, in the City's sole judgment, the best interests of the City will be so served.

This RFP and the selected consultant's response thereto, shall constitute the basis of the scope of services in the contract by reference.

J. MEASUREMENT AND PAYMENT.

The City will make progress payments upon receipt of the deliverables specified in the work plan. Payments will be made upon receipt of a draft (50%) and final (50%) work product for each task.

K. PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING.

While the City expects interested Consultants may seek to contact stakeholders within the community to gain a greater understanding of the environment, it requests that potential offerors refrain from lobbying or making contact with City Officials other than the City's designated points of contact (POC). This restriction includes contact with the Mayor and Members of the City Council, City staff other than the POC, the Ann Arbor Police Department, and citizen members of the City's Human Rights Commission. Any

violation of this condition may lead to an offeror being disqualified at the sole and final discretion of the City Administrator consistent with City codes, ordinances, and practices.

L. HUMAN RIGHTS REQUIREMENTS

All Consultants proposing to do business with the City shall satisfy the contract compliance administrative policy adopted by the City Administrator in accordance with the Section 9:158 of the Ann Arbor City Code. Breach of the obligation not to discriminate as outlined in Attachment B shall be a material breach of the contract. Consultants are required to post a copy of Ann Arbor's Non-Discrimination Ordinance attached at all work locations where its employees provide services under a contract with the City.

M. WAGE REQUIREMENTS

The Attachments provided herein outline the requirements for payment of prevailing wages or of a "living wage" to employees providing service to the City under this contract. The successful Consultant must comply with all applicable requirements and provide documentary proof of compliance when requested.

N. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE

The City of Ann Arbor Purchasing Policy requires that the Consultant complete a Conflict of Interest Disclosure form. A contract may not be awarded to the selected consultant unless and until the Procurement Unit and the City Administrator have reviewed the Disclosure form and determined that no conflict exists under applicable federal, state, or local law or administrative regulation. Not every relationship or situation disclosed on the Disclosure Form may be a disqualifying conflict. Depending on applicable law and regulations, some contracts may be awarded on the recommendation of the City Administrator after full disclosure, where such action is allowed by law, if demonstrated competitive pricing exists and/or it is determined the award is in the best interest of the City. A copy of the Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form is attached.

O. COST LIABILITY

The City of Ann Arbor assumes no responsibility or liability for costs incurred by the Consultant prior to the execution of a Professional Services Agreement. The liability of the City is limited to the terms and conditions outlined in the Agreement. By submitting a proposal, Consultant agrees to bear all costs incurred or related to the preparation, submission, and selection process for the proposal.

P. DEBARMENT

Submission of a proposal in response to this RFP is certification that the Respondent is not currently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, and declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any State or Federal departments or agency. Submission is also agreement that the City will be notified of any changes in this status.

Q. PROPOSAL PROTEST

All proposal protests must be in writing and filed with the Purchasing Manager within five (5) business days of the award action. The Consultant must clearly state the reasons for the protest. If a Consultant contacts a City Service Area/Unit and indicates a desire to protest an award, the Service Area/Unit shall refer the consultant to the Purchasing Manager. The Purchasing Manager will provide the consultant with the appropriate instructions for filing the protest. The protest shall be reviewed by the City Administrator or designee, whose decision shall be final.

R. SCHEDULE

The proposals submitted should define an appropriate schedule in accordance with the requirements of the Proposed Work Plan in Section III.

The following is the schedule for this RFP process.

| Activity/Event | Anticipated Date |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| RFP Issued | November 4, 2016 |
| RFP Questions Due (if any) | November 18, 2016 |
| RFP Questions Answered | December 2, 2016 |
| Proposals Due | December 9, 2016 |
| Finalist Notification | December 23, 2016 |
| Finalist Interviews (if required) | January 13, 2017 |
| Consultant Selection | January 20, 2017 |
| Contract Award | February 6, 2017 |
| Report Due | August 7, 2017 |

The above schedule is for information purposes only and is subject to change at the City’s discretion.

S. IRS FORM W-9

The selected Consultant will be required to provide the City of Ann Arbor a completed IRS form W-9.

T. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

1. The City reserves the right in its sole and absolute discretion to accept or reject any or all proposals, or alternative proposals, in whole or in part, with or without cause.
2. The City reserves the right to waive, or not waive, informalities or irregularities in terms or conditions of any proposal if determined by the City to be in its best interest.
3. The City reserves the right to request additional information from any or all consultants.
4. The City reserves the right to reject any proposal that it determines to be unresponsive and deficient in any of the information requested within RFP.

5. The City reserves the right to determine whether the scope of the project will be entirely as described in the RFP, a portion of the scope, or a revised scope be implemented.
6. The City reserves the right to select one or more consultants to perform services.
7. The City reserves the right to retain all proposals submitted and to use any ideas in a proposal regardless of whether that proposal is selected. Submission of a proposal indicates acceptance by the firm of the conditions contained in this RFP, unless clearly and specifically noted in the proposal submitted.
8. The City reserves the right to disqualify proposals that fail to respond to any requirements outlined in the RFP, or failure to enclose copies of the required documents outlined within RFP.

DRAFT

SECTION II - SCOPE OF SERVICES

A. BACKGROUND

In November 2015, the Ann Arbor Human Rights Commission (HRC) published its report addressing concerns over the practices the AAPD employs in policing our community. The report mentioned “incidents of apparent police misconduct nationwide – and by the shooting of Aura Rosser locally” as the trigger for its review, and cited calls from the community, implicit racial bias, and the lack of police transparency and external review, among other reasons, as the basis for it. At the conclusion of report, the HRC provided the following recommendations to “strengthen the critical community-police relationship”:

1. Engage the services of a police auditor-consultant on a temporary basis.
2. Create and maintain a civilian police review board.
3. Implement alternative dispute resolution methods.
4. Implement the use of crisis intervention teams and community policing more fully.

In its review of the HRC Report, AAPD agreed with the first recommendation, but deferred its support of the remaining recommendations until an audit was completed. The rationale for the AAPD response is that the second through the fourth recommendations should be viewed as outcomes of the audit, and the actual implementation of best practices should be applied in the context of the audit findings. Concurrent with and independent of the audit, AAPD is pursuing accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA).

In its statement on the AAPD Response, the HRC argued that the decision to create a civilian police review board should not be deferred until the completion of the audit and should turn on the City’s vision of police-community partnership. The Commission urged City Officials to express their commitment now to establish that board and task the auditor with helping to create an effective one.

Further background information on the City of Ann Arbor, the Human Rights Commission, and the AAPD are provided in the paragraphs below. The following relevant documents are provided as **Attachment A**:

- Civilian Police Review: Recommendations for Strengthening the Police-Community Relations in Ann Arbor, prepared by The Human Rights Commission, November 4, 2015 (hereafter, “the HRC Report”).
- Police Department Response to Human Rights Commission Report, dated June 6, 2016 (hereafter “the Police Response”).
- Ann Arbor Human Rights Commission Statement on Responses to Its Civilian Police Review Report and Recommendations, undated (hereafter “the HRC Response”).

City of Ann Arbor¹

Ann Arbor is located in Washtenaw County, MI within the Detroit-Ann Arbor-Flint Combined Statistical Area of southeastern Michigan. The City has the reputation of being a small, friendly town with big-city sophistication. It has a world-class educational and high-tech research center nestled in a quintessential college town; a close-knit community of charming neighborhoods with a rich mix of cultures. During the 1960s and 1970s, the city gained a reputation as a center for left-wing politics. Ann Arbor became a focal point for political activism and anti-Vietnam War movement, as well as various student movements.

Ann Arbor is home to the University of Michigan, one of the foremost research universities in the United States. The university shapes Ann Arbor's economy significantly as it employs about 30,000 workers, including about 12,000 in the University's medical center. The city's economy is also centered on high technology, with several companies drawn to the area by the University's research and development money, and by its graduates.

Ann Arbor has a council-manager form of government. The City Council has 11 voting members: the Mayor and 10 City Council members. The Mayor and City Council Members serve two-year terms: the Mayor is elected every even-numbered year, while half of the City Council Members are up for election annually (five in even-numbered and five in odd-numbered years). Two council members are elected from each of the city's five wards. The Mayor is elected citywide. The Mayor is the presiding officer of the City Council and has the power to appoint all Council Committee Members as well as board and commission members, with the approval of the City Council. Day-to-day city operations are managed by a City Administrator chosen by the city council.

As of the 2010 U.S. Census, there were 113,394 people, 45,634 households, and 21,704 families residing in the city. The population density was 4,270.33 people per square mile (2653.47/km²). There were 49,982 housing units at an average density of 1,748.0 per square mile (675.0/km²), making it less densely populated than inner-ring Detroit suburbs like Oak Park and Ferndale (and Detroit proper), but more densely populated than outer-ring suburbs like Livonia or Troy. The racial makeup of the city was 73.0% White (70.4% non-Hispanic White), 14.4% Asian, 7.7% Black or African-American, 0.3% Native American, 1.0% from other races, and 3.6% from two or more races. Hispanic or Latino residents of any race were 4.1% of the population. In 2013, Ann Arbor had the second-largest community of Japanese citizens in the state of Michigan, numbering 1,541; this figure trailed only that of Novi, which had 2,666 Japanese nationals. In addition, Ann Arbor has a population of Arab Americans, including residents of Lebanese and Palestinians backgrounds.

In 2000, out of 45,693 households, 23.0% had children under the age of 18 living with them, 37.8% were married couples living together, 7.5% had a female householder with no husband present, and 52.5% were non-families. 35.5% of households were made up of individuals and 6.6% had someone living alone who was 65 years of age or older. The average household size was 2.22 and the average family size was 2.90. The age distribution was 16.8% under 18, 26.8% from 18 to 24, 31.2% from 25 to 44, 17.3% from 45 to 64, and 7.9% were 65 or older. The median age was 28 years. For every 100 females there were 97.7 males; while for every 100 females age 18 and over, there were 96.4 males.

¹ Information combined from several sources, including City information, Visit Ann Arbor, Wikipedia, and MLive.

The median income for a household in the city was \$46,299, and the median income for a family was \$71,293 (these figures had risen to \$51,232 and \$82,293 respectively as of a 2007 estimate). Males had a median income of \$48,880 versus \$36,561 for females. The per capita income for the city was \$26,419. About 4.6% of families and 16.6% of the population were below the poverty line, including 7.3% of those under age 18 and 5.1% of those age 65 or over.

Ann Arbor's crime rate was below the national average in 2000. The violent crime rate was further below the national average than the property crime rate; the two rates were 48% and 11% lower than the U.S. average, respectively. However, public perceptions of police engagement with the community and sensitivity to use of force considerations were raised subsequent to the police shooting of Ms. Aura Rosser in November 2014.

The Human Rights Commission²

The Human Rights Commission (HRC) of Ann Arbor was established in 1957 as the Human Relations Commission to investigate and deal with issues of racial discrimination in housing and employment. The name of the agency was changed in 1970 to the Human Rights Commission. Its primary function is to help ensure compliance with the city's non-discrimination ordinance.

Ann Arbor's non-discrimination ordinance prohibits discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations. No person may be denied *his or her civil or political rights or be discriminated against because of actual or perceived age, arrest record, color, disability, educational association, familial status, family responsibilities, gender expression, gender identity, genetic information, height, HIV status, marital status, national origin, political beliefs, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, source of income, veteran status, victim of domestic violence or stalking, or weight.* (City of Ann Arbor Code, Chapter 112, Section 9:150; Ord. No.14-25, Sec. 1, 10-20-14).

The responsibilities of the HRC, which consists of nine members appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council, are to:

- (a) Receive and review complaints from individuals alleging violations of Ann Arbor's human rights ordinance, [Chapter 112](#) Non-Discrimination, and take appropriate action, including but not limited to referral of complaints to appropriate agencies or to the City Attorney, mediation of complaints, or dismissal of complaints;
- (b) Report annually to City Council regarding complaints received and actions taken;
- (c) With city staff, develop procedures to (1) enforce and (2) provide notice of non-compliance with nondiscrimination provisions of [Chapter 112](#) Non-Discrimination applicable to city contractors;
- (d) With city staff, provide an annual report to City Council regarding compliance of city contractors with nondiscrimination provisions of [Chapter 112](#) Non-Discrimination;
- (e) Investigate, study, hold hearings and make recommendations to City Council regarding complaints from any class or group protected under the human rights ordinance;

² Information from City sources.

(f) Make periodic public reports and recommendations to the City Council and City Administrator on ways to improve city government programs and ordinances designed to eliminate discrimination or to remove the effects of past discrimination;

(g) Communicate with federal and state agencies regarding human rights and affirmative action programs for the purpose of making recommendations to City Council;

(h) Provide education and programs about the human rights ordinance, other commission initiatives, and/or to discourage and eliminate racial tensions, prejudice, and/or discrimination.

(Ord. No. 68-69, 1-19-70; Ord. No. 28-78, 6-19-78; Ord. No. 15-20, § 2, 9-8-15)

The Ann Arbor Police Department³

The Ann Arbor Police Department is located in the Ann Arbor Justice Center at 301 E. Huron St. in downtown Ann Arbor. There are 122 sworn police officers included in the overall staff of 149. The AAPD is a full-service department with many services and units. These include a detective section, traffic services unit, K9, motorcycle and bicycle patrols, as well as a neighborhood watch and crime prevention unit. The AAPD road patrol is committed to a community-oriented policing philosophy and strives for a high level of community engagement.

Mission Statement: To provide protection and service to all.

Vision Statement: All Ann Arbor police personnel are partners with the public and city administration to help the community successfully fulfill its desired destiny.

Key Staff

Chief of Police Jim Baird has been with the AAPD since 1993, when he was hired as a patrol officer. He was promoted to sergeant in 1999, lieutenant in 2012 and deputy chief of the operations division in May 2013, and has held assignments in patrol, professional standards and SWAT. Chief Baird was appointed to his current position of Chief in February 2016. He has a bachelor's degree from Michigan State University in criminal justice. He is also a graduate of the Eastern Michigan University School of Police Staff and Command. As chief of the department he is responsible for ensuring that daily operations of the department are effective and efficient.

Deputy Chief Robert Pfannes has been with the AAPD since 1998, when he was hired as a patrol officer. Before coming to the AAPD he served with the Detroit and Garden City police departments. He came with experience in patrol, major crimes, narcotics and patrol supervision. He was promoted to AAPD Sergeant in 2004 and has held various supervisory assignments including road patrol, Communications, Professional Standards and the Detective Section. In 2012 he was promoted to Detective Lieutenant and served as the commander of the Detective Section. He was promoted to Deputy Chief in 2016. Deputy Chief Pfannes has a bachelor's degree in Legal Studies from Madonna University and is a graduate of the EMU School of Police Staff and Command and EMU Basic and Advanced SWAT training. He has taught at the Western Wayne Regional Police Academy for the last 23 years. As Deputy

³ Information from City sources.

Chief, he is responsible for the patrol, detective, special services, administrative services and professional standards sections, which includes training, hiring and recruiting, and community standards.

Command Staff

The Ann Arbor police command staff is comprised of six lieutenants and eighteen sergeants. Each lieutenant is responsible for a specific section of the department. The sergeants are responsible for the direct supervision of the officers and/or civilian employees.

Community Engagement

Interaction with residents and businesses is important to the Ann Arbor Police Department to regularly address concerns and to maintain general public safety. In addition to informal or impromptu interactions, AAPD participates in outreach through community presentations and special programs.

B. PROJECT SCOPE

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is for a contract of limited duration, and will be awarded and delivered in phases. ***Phase 1 – Community Review and Early Action Deliverables, is estimated at three (3) – six (6) months (January – March 2017)*** duration and will be initiated upon notification to proceed. During Phase 1, the Consultant will work with the City to determine the scopes for ***Phase 2 - Policy and Practice Review***, and ***Phase 3 – Follow-Up and Sustainment***. The City, at its sole discretion, will provide additional direction to the Consultant on which Phase 2 and 3 tasks will be pursued.

The City requests the Consultant to propose an approach that will best address the goals of the Project based upon its expertise, proven best practices, and progressive trends in law enforcement. The successful offeror will provide a work plan that addresses the following requirements and criteria:

- ***OBJECTIVE 1: Build acceptance and trust of the process.*** The Consultant will propose mechanisms for evaluating public acceptance and trust. These may include querying community and AAPD members directly and will also involve quantifying the degree of public engagement; conducting a “before and after” survey; the use of the periodic and recurring ICMA Citizen Survey to survey the public at large; and other methods as appropriate. The Consultant will identify the level of effort required, proposed costs, schedule for completion, and the deliverables to be provided.
- ***OBJECTIVE 2: Assess the effectiveness of the methods AAPD employs to engage with the community.*** The assessment will include a peer city (including similarly-sized “town and gown” communities) comparison, data/statistical analyses, the participation of peer city police agency representatives, community input, and recommendations for training and process improvement. The Consultant will identify the tasks required and associated level of effort, proposed costs, schedule for completion, and the deliverables to be provided.
- ***OBJECTIVE 3: Provide for periodic assessment and adjustment.*** The audit report will include a proposed plan for implementation of recommendations (including schedules, resources, cost estimates, and measures of success); a progress review at the 18-month anniversary of the audit’s

completion; and the mechanisms for recurring assessment of performance and review and integration of best practices. The Consultant will identify the tasks required and associated level of effort, proposed costs, schedule for completion, and the deliverables to be provided.

C. PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The City is requesting that proposals present the work to be performed be in the following three phases:

Phase 1 – Community Review and Early Action Deliverables (January – March 2017)

During Phase 1, the Consultant will address the following requirements:

- The Consultant will interview members of the community, elected officials, the City administrators, and members of the AAPD to determine the need for, structure of, and best practices model for a formal civilian board/commission to review police matters. The Consultant will also elect to conduct field observations of police operations.
- The Consultant will review the adequacy of existing processes for citizen reporting and filing of complaints, including an evaluation of community desires for alternative and redundant processes outside of AAPD control for filing complaints.
- The Consultant will review AAPD’s progress toward achieving CALEA accreditation and the alignment of that process with best practices and innovative approaches, including but not limited to practices contained within the Report of the *President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing* and consistency of AAPD’s *Use of Force* policies with best practices.
- The Consultant will review AAPD’s personnel management practices, including hiring, promotion, and disciplinary practices and provide recommendations on how those processes support recruitment and retention of a diverse workforce.
- The Consultant will focus on the current AAPD training practices on community engagement, with emphasis on the applicability of these practices to the interaction with the diverse members of the community and the human rights values of Ann Arbor, and make recommendations for changes to the training curricula, methods of delivery, and frequency of training. Particular attention should be paid to training surrounding the use of control and force, de-escalation, handling and processing of detainees and the mechanisms for determining when a person is “endangering the life of the officer or bystanders,” implicit bias, cultural sensitivity, mental health, alcohol/drug abuse, and other forms of training for working with people from vulnerable or marginalized communities.
- The Consultant will provide a report containing, at a minimum, recommendations on areas requiring additional and/or more detailed review and the estimated cost and schedule parameters for each recommendation. The City will work with the Consultant to prioritize the recommendations and determine which measures will be incorporated into the City’s FY18 budget request. The report will also provide a preliminary assessment on the culture and organizational climate within AAPD, including areas of high performance and areas of potential improvement. The Consultant will present its findings and recommendations to the Human Rights Commission and the City Council at public meetings.

The City believes gathering community input will provide critical information for both the Consultant and the greater Ann Arbor community and will also be pivotal in achieving the RFP's first objective, ***Building acceptance and trust of the process***. The techniques the Consultant employs should address potential difficulties might arise in the following areas:

- Providing confidentiality for people giving feedback if they want it (or perhaps even to everyone). They believe that many people, particularly the most vulnerable members of the community, are likely to feel great hesitation about giving any feedback to the police.
- Getting the word out to a broad representative group of people, including the City's youth, who want to provide this feedback.
- Giving people a variety of options about how they can provide this feedback (small focus groups, town hall meeting, email, one-on-ones in people's homes, questionnaires, opportunities facilitated by church groups, opportunities for low income housing occupants, etc.).
- Collecting the right information – not only about the big incidents, but also those that happen in day-to-day interactions and feel disrespectful, but have become normalized.

This issue is important enough to the community that RFP respondents must include a plan to gather this information accurately and efficiently. The Consultant may propose training civilian volunteers from Ann Arbor to help carry out this task to make it more cost efficient. The Consultant's plan should also describe what will happen to the individually-submitted information and how it will be reported so that the community can be certain it understands the strengths and problem areas in the City's police-community relations, while taking care to protect those who provided the information.

Phase 2 - Policy and Practice Review

The City will work with the Consultant to determine which recommendations will be pursued for further study and investigation. Phase 2 will provide a more detailed and assessment of Policy and Practice Review, and may address the following components:

- A review of police data to determine, insofar as possible, if disparities exist in interactions with discernable subsets of the community (including race, ethnicity, gender (including the LGBT population), mental health, alcohol and/or substance abuse, and age/educational status). Data may include records of citations, arrests, use of force, traffic stops, injuries and fatalities, training records, and other reasonably available sources. The review may also include an assessment of the reliability and efficiencies of the technology employed in the data collection and records management systems, and their uses and applications.
- Follow-up on specific instances and/or complaints to determine if there are procedural, practical or other barriers that serve to suppress or discourage the reporting of complaints.
- Follow-up on the status of CALEA accreditation and focused review of procedures, codes, and practices where the accreditation process may not be sufficient to address community values.

- Assess the adequacy of the current staffing status and equipment requirements, and make recommendations based upon best practices and peer city models.
- A review of demographics and comparison of incident data from “peer” cities, particularly “town and gown” communities of similar size, to understand how Ann Arbor compares and possibly identify causes, influencing factors, or communities that may offer learning opportunities.

In developing the recommendations for Phase 2, the Consultant will focus the assessment techniques to be used in exploring how police behave when interacting with the public and how AAPD policies are implemented in practice. In addition to interviews with AAPD officers and reviewing documents and audio and video records, the Consultant should seek to obtain community input on additional areas of investigation.

Phase 3 – Follow-Up and Sustainment

The audit report will include a proposed plan for implementation of recommendations (including schedules, resources, cost estimates, and measures of success); a progress review at the 18-month anniversary of the audit’s completion; and the mechanisms for recurring assessment of performance and review and integration of best practices. The Consultant will identify the tasks required and associated level of effort, proposed costs, schedule for completion, and the deliverables to be provided.

D. EXPERIENCE, PAST PERFORMANCE, AND ABILITY TO PERFORM THE WORK

The City is seeking a broad and fair perspective on the issues facing the Ann Arbor community. In addition to providing examples of its experience and past performance on efforts of similar size, scope, and complexity (including project descriptions), the successful Offeror will also demonstrate how it has provided balanced and unbiased approaches to its review. Teams consisting of personnel with both community policing and citizen-based backgrounds are desired.

The resumes of key individuals proposed to be involved will be provided, along with a matrix cross-referencing the individual experience to the examples of past performance provided. The Consultant will provide assurances of the availability of the key personnel to be dedicated to the Project.

SECTION III - MINIMUM INFORMATION REQUIRED

A. PROPOSAL FORMAT

Proposals will be provided in both hard copy and digital format. Hard copies will be printed on recycled paper. Digital copies will be provided as PDF documents. Documents will be delivered in a sealed envelope. Consultants will submit their proposals in the form of a work plan. While the City is not providing a standard format or imposing a page limitation on the proposal, it will view the overall presentation as an indicator of the Consultant's ability to communicate in a clear, concise, and effective manner and must address the following:

- Professional Qualifications
- Past Performance on Projects of Similar Size, Scope, and Complexity
- Proposed Work Plan
- Fee Proposal (included in a separate sealed envelope clearly marked "Fee Proposal")
- Names of the Authorized Negotiator
- Required Attachments

The City expects that the work plan will include a background section and objective statement; provide examples of past experience and identify key staff; and provide a scope and schedule of deliverables for each task.

The overall fee proposal will also be presented in a separate schedule of values that will facilitate payment. Costs will include level of effort, direct and indirect (overhead rates), and other direct costs (travel, materials, sub-consultants, et al) detailed by task.

Offerors must clearly identify items that they consider to be confidential business information and exempt from disclosure under the applicable sections of the Michigan Freedom of Information Act and other relevant laws.

Each person signing the proposal certifies that he or she is the person in the consultant's firm/organization responsible for the decision as to the fees being offered in the Proposal and has not and will not participate in any action contrary to the terms of this provision. Proposals will include the name, phone number, and e-mail address of persons(s) in your organization authorized to negotiate the agreement with the City

The Legal Status of Consultant, Conflict of Interest Form, Living Wage Compliance Form, and the Non-Discrimination Form must be completed and returned with the proposal. These elements should be included as attachments to the proposal submission.

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Written proposals will be evaluated on a "best qualified" basis in accordance with the following weighted factors:

- Past Performance and Experience of Key Personnel (30%)
- Understanding of the Community and Audit Objectives (30%)
- Effectiveness of the Work Plan in Addressing Community Concerns (30%)
- Cost and Schedule (10%)

The City may request interview sessions with the most qualified Offerors, including presentations and question-and-answer sessions with the Human Rights Commission. The City will reimburse direct costs for travel up to \$1,500 should an on-site interview be required. Reimbursement will be made in accordance with City standards for business travel.

C. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The selection committee will evaluate each proposal by the above-described criteria and point system (A through C) to select a short-list of firms for further consideration. The City reserves the right to reject any proposal that it determines to be unresponsive and deficient in any of the information requested for evaluation. A proposal with all the requested information does not guarantee the proposing firm to be a candidate for an interview. The committee may contact references to verify material submitted by the consultants.

The committee then will schedule interviews with the selected firms if necessary. The selected firms will be given the opportunity to discuss in more detail their qualifications, past experience, proposed work plan and fee proposal.

The interview must include the project team members expected to complete a majority of work on the project. The interview shall consist of a presentation of up to thirty minutes (or the length provided by the committee) by the consultant, including the person who will be the project manager on this contract, followed by approximately thirty minutes of questions and answers. Audiovisual aids may be used during the oral interviews. The committee may record the oral interviews.

The firms interviewed will then be re-evaluated by the above criteria (A through C), and adjustments to scoring will be made as appropriate. After evaluation of the proposals, further negotiation with the selected firm may be pursued leading to the award of a contract by City Council, if suitable proposals are received.

The City reserves the right to waive the interview process and evaluate the consultants based on their proposals and fee schedules alone and open fee schedules before or prior to interviews.

The City will determine whether the final scope of the project to be negotiated will be entirely as described in this RFP, a portion of the scope, or a revised scope.

Work to be done under this contract is generally described through the detailed specifications and must be completed fully in accordance with the contract documents.

Any proposal that does not conform fully to these instructions may be rejected.

SECTION IV - ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Relevant Documents

Attachment B - Legal Status of Respondent

Attachment C – Non-Discrimination Ordinance Declaration of Compliance Form

Attachment D – Living Wage Declaration of Compliance Form

Attachment E – Vendor Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form

Attachment F – Non-Discrimination Ordinance Poster

Attachment G – Living Wage Ordinance Poster

DRAFT