

**PORTSMOUTH POLICE COMMISSION
STEERING COMMITTEE – INDEPENDENT STUDY OF THE PD**

**MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1ST, 2010 MEETING
8:00 A.M. – WM. MORTIMER CONFERENCE ROOM**

I. CALL TO ORDER: The chairman called the November 1st, 2010 meeting of the steering committee to order at 8:06 a.m. in the Wm. Mortimer Conference of the Portsmouth Police Department

Present at the Meeting: Committee Chair John Golumb, and committee members Deputy Police Chief Stephen DuBois, Doug Bates, Lisa DeStefano, Chris Dwyer, Jerry Hejtmanek, and Renee Riedel-Plummer. Dan Hartrey from the City's Community Development Office also attended. Executive Assistant Kathleen Levesque took the minutes.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION: There was no public comment.

III. APPROVE AND ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON: October 18th, 2010

Action: Lisa DeStefano moved to accept the minutes of the October 18th meeting.

Seconded by Renee Riedel-Plummer.

On a Roll Call Vote: The committee voted unanimously to accept the minutes of the October 18th meeting and place them on file.

IV. MEETING DISCUSSION:

Dan Hartrey - reviewed the draft RFQ with the committee (invitation, intent of the study, selection process, etc.). He said since the committee may want to interview applicants, it should factor in the time needed to do this. He explained that since we are looking for qualifications and not proposals, this is a more basic document.

Renee Riedel-Plummer – raised the possibility that we may find the perfect company, but their price tag may not be \$50,000, it may be \$80,000. What will our response be?

Dan Hartrey – explained the committee would negotiate with them. He gave an example, referencing a similar situation the city had just experienced. He said the firm came in high on the price, the city responded back with a counter figure and proposal and subsequent negotiations resulted in an agreement.

Chris Dwyer – wanted to know if it turned out there was only one qualified company, could the committee sole-source the project without being in violation of the city’s purchasing directives.

Lisa DeStefano – echoed Chris’ question, asking if only one company really shines, would the committee then have to go out and somehow secure the stipulated three bids?

Some discussion ensued on the legal aspects of this.

Doug Bates – felt he would like to have Ms. Woodland let us know what the committee’s liability was if we picked a company right away in an abbreviated process.

Dan Hartrey – referring back to the draft, said the RFQ states the committee *may* conduct interviews, so he believed these was ‘wiggle room’ on this issue.

John Golumb – felt it would be worthwhile to check with Suzanne (Woodland) to be sure on this.

Doug Bates – said he didn’t want the outcome to be tainted because we as a committee neglected to do something, or did something improperly.

Steve DuBois – asked Dan Hartrey if he wanted input from the committee at this point on corrections to the draft. Dan indicated he did.

Steve, referring to the appropriate page and heading, asked if there was a way the document could show Portsmouth’s day/night population fluctuations, since they are considerable.

Chris Dwyer – indicated Nancy Carmer would have that number.

Some discussion ensued about the difficulty of getting a concrete population number.

Doug Bates – explained that we (the city/Chamber) don't have access to the room and meals tax information.

Steve DuBois – said the only other correction he had was the language regarding negotiated contracts, which should be amended as follows, "...and practices are negotiated with the police commission and approved by the city council."

Chris Dwyer – referred to, "Intent, III"; she read the statement and commented that we want to narrow it somewhat, since we're really not trying to have them look at everything.

There was discussion re: language that would indicated this is not a comprehensive study.

Steve DuBois – said that at the end of the last fiscal year when the chief and his command staff were talking about setting money aside to conduct such a study, he did ask some of his professional contacts for round cost numbers for a study such as this, and they came back with the \$30,000 to \$40,000 range.

Doug Bates – observed that sometimes the number a responding company puts into their proposal is a strategy in itself. They may put a high number in with the intention of negotiating downward if necessary.

Renee Riedel-Plummer – felt it would be interesting to find a company that has done a police department study in say, the last two years. We would then be in a position to visit that department to see what impact the study results have had on the department.

Lisa DeStefano – asked how the committee would follow up after reading the RFQs, to verify they are as advertised.

Renee Riedel-Plummer – agreed that it would be easy for a company to advertise themselves as just what we're looking for, but how would we know.

Dan Hartrey – said the committee could also ask firms to provide evidence that they have follow-up mechanisms in place. He referred to reporting mechanisms that would show the effectiveness of studies in past client departments where their recommendations have been implemented.

Lisa DeStefano – brought up establishing a timeline.

Chris Dwyer – said that since this is just an RFQ, and not a proposal, perhaps we could move the timeline up. If we agree on the RFQ draft this week, how quickly could we put it out?

Dan Hartrey - felt it could go out the end of this week. We would then get it back the end of November, or the first of December. He suggested the 24th of November, just before Thanksgiving.

Steve DuBois – asked about the sequence of events, from the review, to the interview, to price negotiation, if any, to the final decision.

There was a brief discussion of the sequence of reviewing the RFQ responses, narrowing the field and making selections, and conducting interviews.

Jerry Hejtmanek – asked at what point would a firm name their price.

Lisa DeStefano – indicated it would be after the interview. She said that when her firm receives an RFQ from a municipality, they look into the respective city's budget to see which department has budgeted for the services. This helps them formulate their response.

There was a brief discussion of pricing strategies.

Chris Dwyer – said the committee should indicate in the RFQ when it expected to conduct interviews so companies could plan availability.

Dan Hartrey – suggested the date of December 6th.

Discussion ensued as to when the RFP would go out, and when the committee expected to be ready for the interview step.

Renee Riedel-Plummer – didn't feel the 6th allowed enough time.

Dan Hartrey – recapped changes in wording regarding dates and timeline.

Lisa DeStefano – said that some of the responders may be national firms, and asked if such firms would have enough time to respond.

Chris Dwyer - said that the RFQ is essentially in place in that firms have a template for them. Their references and qualifications are already in the template. They just have to tweak this template for the particulars of the bid request, and decide if they're going to respond.

There was some discussion elaborating on this.

Jerry Hejtmanek – asked if there was an existing list of RFQ recipients.

Dan Hartrey - responded that the city does have a list they put RFQs out to, and he would add whatever input he gets from Steve DuBois.

Chris Dwyer – said that in addition to those firms that conduct police-specific studies, we should also reach out to groups that do broader municipal reviews. She felt it was important to the credibility of the study.

Dan Hartrey – described how the purchasing department puts out RFQ notices.

There was some discussion on where and how the committee would put out the RFQ notices, and on how to provide for the possibility they may receive a large number of responses.

Lisa DeStefano and **Doug Bates** – asked if there was some type of matrix the committee could put the responses through to screen them.

Lisa DeStefano – thought that section two of the draft might provide for that.

Steve DuBois – felt that experience with police departments should be part of that screen.

Chris Dwyer – said that section one would be the place to insert a limit on the number of pages the responders could submit.

Lisa DeStefano – felt that might be hard to do.

Chris Dwyer – explained how the structure of the RFQ frames the responders document and will make it easy to review, because it enumerates content, appendices, etc.

A brief discussion followed on how to word those stipulations. The committee agreed to wording that responding firms must have completed a similar project in the last five years.

Chris Dwyer – felt they should cut the time frame down to three years.

Doug Bates – said this was a good way to winnow things quickly.

Chris Dwyer – suggested the group may need a subcommittee to sort through the initial responses. This would speed up the review process.

Lisa DeStefano – said that in formulating the interview questions, she felt the committee should make sure enough time has lapsed from the completion of past projects to be able to see results in the departments provided as references.

Chris Dwyer – said sizing up the detail of a company's study recommendations is important. It is possible that the firm did a good study and made recommendations, but the client department elected not to implement them. This shouldn't reflect badly on the consultant company.

Lisa DeStefano – said we should have wording that ensures the responding firm is not entangled in legal issues.

Doug Bates – felt there were ways the committee could check on that.

Lisa DeStefano – said that once the committee selects a firm, who would that firm be reporting to? Who would they be working for?

Steve DuBois – said technically, they are working for the police commission. The police commission has empaneled the committee with John Golumb as chair, so they would be reporting to John.

This prompted a discussion on the extent of the steering committee's responsibility and timeline for involvement in the study.

Lisa DeStefano – summed up the discussion by her statement that the steering committee's involvement ends when the results of the study have been reviewed and recommendations have been selected and presented to the police commission for their action.

John Golumb – agreed, and said it was his understanding that the committee would review everything (resulting report of the study), and make recommendations about what parts of the study should be implemented.

Everyone was in agreement with John's understanding of the role of the steering committee. This led to a discussion about the committee getting some education about the police department before the results of the study come back.

Steve DuBois – said he could arrange for a tour prior to the start of the interview process of the RFQ respondents.

Doug Bates – said that he has been associated with the police department for a long time, and felt a great deal could be learned by going on a ride along.

Committee discussion returned to establishing a timeline for receipt and review of the RFQs in light of the impending holidays.

Dan Hartrey – said it was important that the RFP that goes out is exactly what the committee wants. He said the group could get started putting the RFP together by working on it electronically. He recommended the committee meet according to the following timeline:

Tuesday, November 16th @ 9:00 a.m. to finalize the RFP.

Tuesday, December 7th @ 9:00 a.m. to review the RFQs received and select the RFP recipients.

This schedule was agreeable to everyone. (Chris Dwyer had already left the meeting to catch a plane.)

It was decided the December 7th meeting needed to be a non-public session because of the content of the agenda.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Action: Lisa DeStefano moved the November 1st meeting be adjourned.

Seconded by Renee Riedel-Plummer.

On a Roll Call Vote: The committee voted unanimously to adjourn the November 1st meeting at 9:20 a.m.

END OF MEETING

NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, November 16th, at 9:00 a.m. in the Wm. Mortimer Conference Room of the Portsmouth Police Department.