

## Recommendations on Contact Card Analysis RFP

### “Independent Review and Analysis of CPD Contact Card Data and Reporting Practices”

Bid / Project Number [265X901177](#)

#### 1. Extend the RFP Submission Timeline

The RFP was issued June 12, 2026 with a submission deadline of June 22, only 5 business days, the shortest of any RFP since June 2025 in the City’s procurement portal. Assembling a solid proposal for a study of this scope is difficult in one week and is likely to severely limit the pool of qualified respondents.

**Recommendation:** Extend the submission deadline to at least 15 business days from issuance.

#### 2. Make the Full Data from the Review Public

The RFP states the City "may provide additional datasets," leaving data access entirely at the City's discretion. Key datasets such as the full contact card records, officer assignments, and deployment patterns should be explicitly guaranteed.

All data used in the analysis should be publicly accessible, as contact card data is a public resource that should be available for research and civic purposes beyond this single study. The City also holds contact card data predating 2009 that was used in prior RAND studies but has never been made publicly available. Releasing this data would allow others to research and build on the full historical record.

**Recommendations:**

- A. Replace discretionary language with a list of datasets the City commits to providing.
- B. All data used in the analysis, including pre-2009 contact card data, should be made publicly available.

#### 3. Require the Same Study Period as Campaign Zero’s Review

The RFP states that “the Contractor’s review of contact card data shall include a study period proposed by the Contractor and approved by the City”, without criteria for how the City would evaluate or reject a proposed period. The City holds contact card data dating back to 2002 – specifying the study period in advance ensures the scope is comprehensive and established before a contractor is selected.

**Recommendation:** Require the study period to be from 2009-2025, allowing a direct comparison to Campaign Zero's analysis.

#### **4. Include All Stops in the Analysis (Vehicle and Pedestrian)**

No study commissioned under the Collaborative Agreement, from the Eck report in 2003 through all five RAND annual reports (2005–2009), analyzed pedestrian stops. Campaign Zero's 2026 report is the only study to have reviewed both types, finding pedestrian stops have worse racial disparities than vehicle stops. Analyzing all stops is necessary for a complete picture of officer-initiated stops.

**Recommendation:** Require separate analysis of vehicle stops and pedestrian stops, with findings reported independently for each stop type.

#### **5. Include an Individual Officer Analysis**

Every RAND yearly evaluation of the Collaborative Agreement included an individual officer analysis to identify, if any, officers who made a disproportionate number of stops of Black people. Campaign Zero's study also includes individual officer analyses.

**Recommendation:** Require the review to include individual officer analysis with findings for every officer made publicly available.

#### **6. Make All Findings Public**

The Final Report Deliverables section states: "The Contractor shall present findings, conclusions, and supporting analysis to City leadership and other designated stakeholders and provide all underlying data, analyses, and supporting documentation to the City in a format acceptable to the City."

There is no requirement for a public presentation or for the final report to be publicly posted. For a study that directly concerns the civil rights of Cincinnati residents and fulfills an obligation created by a community-driven agreement, limiting the audience to City-designated stakeholders is insufficient.

#### **Recommendations:**

- A. Require the final report to be posted publicly in full within a defined timeframe after delivery.
- B. The contractor should be required to document and disclose any instances where the City directed them to change any aspect of the report, including its methodology.

## 7. Guarantee Equal Access for the Public

The RFP states that "the Contractor shall provide a draft report for City review and comment, and a final report incorporating feedback as appropriate." Only the City is designated as a reviewer, with no mechanism for the public to engage with or ask questions of the researchers while the study is in progress.

For a study connected to the Collaborative Agreement that directly concerns the civil rights of Cincinnati residents, the public should have the same level of participation as the City in the research process to strengthen transparency.

### **Recommendations:**

- A. The RFP should include at least one public session during the research process, held before findings are delivered to the City, where community members can ask questions of the researchers.
- B. The contractor should be required to document and respond to substantive questions raised through that process.
- C. Community leaders should be included in the review sessions alongside City leaders.

## 8. Include Community Organizations in the Selection Committee Composition

The selection committee is entirely City-appointed. Given that the Collaborative Agreement involved significant community participation, including community representation on the selection committee would be consistent with its intent. For example, a member of the Citizens Complaint Authority (CCA) would be a natural fit, given the CCA's independent oversight role.

**Recommendation:** At least one seat on the selection committee should be held by a community organization or civil rights representative with no financial relationship to the City.

## 9. Require Population Benchmarking and Root Cause Analysis

Section D of the RFP requires that the "Contractor shall review, present, and critique benchmarks commonly used in disparity studies." Among the benchmarks applied, population should be required because it measures disparities in terms of outcomes: who is being stopped relative to who lives in a given area.

Population benchmarks allow quantifying the system-level scope of disparities, how broadly communities are affected by officer-initiated stops. This is directly aligned with the principles of the Collaborative Agreement, which states that it is "outcome oriented, putting great emphasis on objective measures of police-citizen relations

and police effectiveness” (¶13). This is especially relevant for pedestrian stops, where the residential and daytime workforce populations are natural benchmarks, given that these stops occur in neighborhoods where people live and work.

Should the contractor opt for the veil-of-darkness (VOD) method as a possible root cause analysis for department-level bias, it should not be the only method applied for two reasons. First, it is not a sufficient measure to measure bias in all types of stops, since it does not apply to pedestrians. Second, VOD is designed to test whether individual officers are more likely to stop a driver based on race, but it does not detect departmental policies or deployment patterns that may contribute to racial disparities. It cannot alone support a comprehensive root cause analysis.

**Recommendation:** Require the study to use population as a benchmark for analysis. Should the “Veil of Darkness” (VOD) benchmark be used, it should not be the only root cause method employed.