

ST. LOUIS BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS
 Purchasing Agent - Budget & Finance Division
 Request for Qualification (RFQ) for Hearing Officers for
 Commissioned Officer Disciplinary Hearings

SOLICITATION NO.:	RFQ #FY2026-1250-0001
SOLICITATION ISSUED ON BEHALF OF:	Internal Affairs
ISSUE DATE:	March 20, 2026
REQUISITION NO.:	

**QUALIFICATIONS DUE NO LATER THAN:
 April 20, 2026 AT 12:00 PM CENTRAL TIME**

Responses must be delivered to Lt. Colin Tully, 1915 Olive, St. Louis, Missouri 63103 or emailed to catully@slmpd.org with the subject line including: "RFQ #FY2026-1250-0001" with a copy to the Board of Police Commissioners General Counsel's office at bpc@generalcounselstl.com
 Mailed or faxed qualification responses will not be accepted.

RFQ CONTACT INFORMATION:

BUYER: Lt. Colin Tully
PHONE NO.: (314) 309-4391
EMAIL: catully@slmpd.org with a copy to bpc@generalcounselstl.com

ATTENTION:

1. After reviewing the Request for Qualifications (RFQ), the vendor must complete and return **Exhibit A, Response Signature Page and all other necessary exhibits**

RFQ Organization:

RFQ Sections	Section 1	Introduction and Background Information Section
	Section 2	Scope of Work Section
	Section 3	Submission and Evaluation Information Section
RFQ Vendor Response Exhibits	Exhibit A	Response Signature Page
	Exhibit B	Response Submittal Checklist
	Exhibit C	Experience of Attorney and Past Performance

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION SECTION

1.1 Introduction:

- 1.1.1 Purpose: This document constitutes a request for qualifications for the provision of hearing officer services for disciplinary hearings of commissioned (sworn) officers of the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department (the “SLMPD”). The St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners (the “BOPC”) may delegate the power and duty for hearing officers to hear and decide certain types of disciplinary matters arising within the SLMPD. Services may include pre-hearing matters with SLMPD employees, conducting disciplinary hearings, and issuing written findings.
- 1.1.2 Compliance Requirements: All hearing officer services must be provided in compliance with SLMPD and Board policies and procedures, the Collective Bargaining Agreements in place with the recognized bargaining units of the SLMPD, and relevant state statutes including, but not limited to, Missouri Revised Statutes Chapter 536 and Missouri Revised Statutes § 590.502.
- 1.1.3 Titles: Titles of paragraphs used herein are for the purpose of facilitating reference only and shall not be construed to infer a contractual construction of language.

1.2 Background Information:

- 1.2.1 The BOPC may delegate to a hearing officer its authority to hear and decide disciplinary matters for commissioned officers. The BOPC currently has a backlog of pending disciplinary appeals for commissioned officers, many of which require hearing officer services. The BOPC intends to hire at least five hearing officers to be part of a pool of hearing officers for use on pending disciplinary matters. Selection of the hearing officer on individual pending disciplinary matters will be made pursuant to the BOPC’s policies and procedures.
- 1.2.2 Once selected from the pool of hearing officers, the hearing officer will have authority regarding pre-hearing motions, discovery disputes, and other controversies arising within the scope of the disciplinary matter being decided by the hearing officer. The BOPC’s secretary will serve as the clerk on all pending commissioned officer disciplinary matters and can assist the hearing officer with receiving filings, scheduling, and routine correspondence related to disciplinary matter.

1.3 Statement of Needs:

- 1.3.1 The BOPC requires knowledgeable, experienced, and efficient hearing officers to provide the BOPC with hearing officer services for its docket of pending disciplinary matters. The relevant BOPC policies and procedures, as well as the Missouri Revised Statutes Chapter 84 and Missouri Revised Statutes § 590.502, allow the BOPC to utilize hearing officers for disciplinary appeals.

1.4 Current Contract Information:

- 1.4.1 A current contract does not exist for the services being obtained via this RFQ.

******END OF INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION SECTION******

2. SCOPE OF WORK SECTION

2.1 General Requirements:

- 2.1.1 All hearing officers must be licensed to practice law in the State of Missouri.
- 2.1.2 All hearing officers must not have any ethical conflicts with the BOPC and the SLMPD.

2.2 Qualification Information:

- 2.2.1 Those submitting their qualifications to the BOPC for consideration must provide information on:
 - a. The specialized experience and technical competence of the attorney with respect to the provision of hearing officer services.
 - b. The capacity and capability of the attorney to perform the work in question.
 - c. The past experience of the attorney in providing hearing officer services or other judicial or quasi-judicial experience.
- 2.2.2 Law firms wishing to submit qualifications for multiple attorneys with the firm to provide hearing officer services may do so, however, the foregoing qualifications must be provided with respect to each individual attorney seeking to provide hearing officer services.

******END OF INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION SECTION******

3. SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION INFORMATION SECTION

3.1 Response Submission Overview:

- 3.1.1 Attorneys seeking to provide hearing officer services must examine the entire RFQ carefully.
- 3.1.2 Attorneys seeking to provide hearing officer services must direct all of their questions or comments regarding the RFQ, the evaluation, etc., to the buyer of record indicated on the first page of this RFQ. It is preferred that questions be emailed to the buyer with a copy to the BOPC's General Counsel at bpc@generalcounselstl.com.
- 3.1.3 It is the attorney's responsibility to ask questions, request changes or clarifications, or otherwise advise the Purchasing Agent if the attorney believes that any RFQ provisions are: (1) ambiguous, (2) contradictory or arbitrary, (3) violate any state or federal law or regulation, (4) restrict or limit the requirements to a single source, or (5) restrict or limit the attorney's ability to submit qualifications.
- 3.1.4 All responses must (1) be submitted by a duly authorized representative of the attorney or the attorney seeking to provide hearing officer services, and (2) contain all information required by the RFQ.

3.1.5 The Purchasing Agent reserves the right to officially amend or cancel an RFQ after issuance.

3.2 Preparation of Response:

3.2.1 RFQ Response Exhibits: The attorney must submit properly completed RFQ Response Exhibits with their qualifications. If the attorney submits any additional materials, the attorney is instructed to identify to which Exhibit an/or RFQ provision the material corresponds. Each exhibit includes instructions outlining the information to be provided in response to the exhibit.

- a. Exhibit A, Response Signature Page should be completed and placed at the beginning of the qualifications. The remaining exhibits should be placed in sequential order after the Exhibit A, Response Signature Page.
- b. Attorneys do not need to return the RFQ Sections or RFQ Attachments contained herein with their proposal.

3.2.2 Response Preparation Costs: Any and all costs incurred by the attorney in preparing or submitting the response and qualifications shall be the attorney's sole responsibility whether or not any contract results from this RFQ. The SLMPD nor the BOPC shall reimburse such costs.

3.2.3 Response Page Numbering: The response should be page numbered.

3.2.4 Response Font: The response should be easily readable and legible fonts, 12 point or above, should be used. For graphics or illustrations within the response, the font size may be smaller than 12 point.

3.2.5 Embedded Files, Hyperlinks, and Video Clips: The attorney should not include embedded files, hyperlinks, or video clips within their response to the RFQ. In the event the attorney provides embedded files, hyperlinks, or video clips, the attorney shall understand the SLMPD is not obligated to consider such information in the evaluation of the attorney's response.

3.2.6 Completeness of Response: It is the attorney's sole responsibility to submit complete and clear information in their response and qualifications. The SLMPD is under no obligation to solicit such information if it is not included in the attorney's response. The attorney's failure to submit such information may cause an adverse impact on the evaluation of their qualifications. Information not relevant to the requirements herein should be excluded from the attorney's response.

3.3 Compliance with Requirements, Terms and Conditions:

3.3.1 Any response submitted that does not meet the general requirements shall be deemed ineligible for further consideration.

3.3.2 Responses which do not comply with the requirements and specifications of this RFQ are subject to rejection without clarification.

3.4 Confidentiality and Proprietary Materials:

- 3.4.1 Missouri Sunshine Law: The SLMPD is a governmental body under the Missouri Sunshine Law (chapter 610, RSMo). Section 610.011, RSMo, requires that all provisions be "liberally construed and their exceptions strictly construed" to promote the public policy that records are open unless otherwise provided by law.
- 3.4.2 Qualifications and Response Confidentiality: Regardless of any claim by an attorney as to material being proprietary and not subject to copying or distribution, or how an attorney characterizes any information provided in its qualifications, all material submitted by the attorney in conjunction with the RFQ is subject to release in relation to a request for public records under the Missouri Sunshine Law (see Chapter 610, RSMo). Only information expressly permitted to be closed pursuant to the strictly construed provisions of Missouri's Sunshine Law will be treated as a closed record by the SLMPD and withheld from any public request submitted to the SLMPD. The attorney should presume information provided to the Purchasing Agent in a qualifications will be public. The attorney's sole remedy for the SLMPD's denial of any confidentiality request shall be limited to withdrawal of their qualifications in its entirety. Except for information the SLMPD deems confidential, the attorney is advised not to include any information in the proposal that the attorney does not want to be viewed by the public, including personal identifying information such as social security numbers. Therefore, attorneys should NOT include confidential material with their response.

3.5 Qualification Review:

- 3.5.1 Responses will be opened on the response end date, indicated on the first page of this RFQ, and the opening time specified on the RFQ document.
- 3.5.2 Late Responses: Responses which are not received prior to the official response end date and time shall be considered late, regardless of the degree of lateness, and normally will not be opened. Late responses may only be opened and considered under extraordinary circumstances.

3.6 Evaluation Process:

- 3.6.1 The SLMPD will follow the evaluation process identified herein.
- 3.6.2 Evaluation Committee and Subject Matter Expert(s): The attorney is advised that an evaluation committee and possibly subject-matter experts will be used to review and assess the responses.
- 3.6.3 Compliance Review: Each proposal submitted in response to the RFQ will be reviewed for compliance with the mandatory requirements of the RFQ. The attorney shall understand the SLMPD will not award a contract to an attorney with a non-responsive (non-compliant) response.
- a. A response which contains non-responsiveness issues which could never be expected to be brought into compliance, even if given an opportunity for competitive negotiations, shall be considered unacceptable and eliminated from further consideration in the evaluation.

- b. Response with non-responsiveness issues which could be corrected during competitive negotiations, if conducted, shall be considered potentially acceptable and remain in the evaluation process until a decision is made in regard to competitive negotiations. Responses that remain non-responsive at the conclusion of the evaluation process, whether competitive negotiations were or were not conducted, shall be considered non-responsive and therefore ineligible for award.
- c. The Purchasing Agent reserves the right to reject any and all responses.

3.6.4 Competitive Negotiation of Responses: Once the BOPC selects the most qualified attorneys to provide hearing officer services, an agreement will be negotiated. The BOPC currently uses form Special Counsel agreements for those providing services to the SLMPD.

3.6.5 Evaluation Criteria: After determining that a response satisfies the mandatory requirements stated in the RFQ, the evaluator(s) shall use both objective analysis and subjective judgment in conducting an assessment of the proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated below. Each response will receive a score for each element of the evaluation criteria, and the table below identifies the maximum point totals available for each evaluation element, the rating available for each evaluation element, and the available score for each rating.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Element					Maximum Points
QUALIFICATIONS						200 points
Experience and Past Performance Evaluation Criteria						100
	Experience of Attorney					100 points
	<u>Distinctive</u> 100	<u>Superior</u> 85	<u>Satisfactory</u> 70	<u>Marginal</u> 40	<u>Unsatisfactory</u> 10	
Qualification Evaluation Criteria						100 points
	Attorney Qualifications					100 points
	<u>Distinctive</u> 100	<u>Superior</u> 85	<u>Satisfactory</u> 70	<u>Marginal</u> 40	<u>Unsatisfactory</u> 10	
TOTAL						200 points
Details for each of the evaluation categories, evaluation criteria, and evaluation elements outlined above are further defined in the following sections.						

3.6.6 Any information submitted with the response, regardless of the format or placement of such information, may be considered in making decisions related to the responsiveness and merit of a response and the award of a contract.

3.7 Qualifications Evaluation:

3.7.1 Evaluation of Experience and Past Performance: The evaluation of Experience and Past Performance shall be subjectively based on fact. Information provided by the attorney in response to the Exhibit C, Experience and Past Performance and Qualifications will be used in the Experience and Past Performance evaluation.

- a. Scoring of Experience of Organization and Past Performance - The attorney’s Experience and Past Performance will be rated by the SLMPD using the rating system as defined below:

Experience of Organization and Past Performance Rating System	
Rating	Definition
Distinctive	Experience of attorney and past performance involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in this RFQ and was recent. Attorney’s experience of organization and past performance provided the evaluation committee with high confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Superior	Experience of attorney and past performance involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the RFQ and was recent. Attorney’s experience and past performance provided the evaluation committee with confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Satisfactory	Experience and past performance <u>either</u> involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the RFQ and was relatively recent, <u>or</u> was of similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the RFQ, but was not recent. Attorney’s experience of organization and past performance provided the evaluation committee with adequate confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Marginal	Experience and past performance did not involve similar scope and magnitude of effort or complexity required in the RFQ. Attorney’s experience and past performance provided the evaluation committee with limited confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Unsatisfactory	Experience and past performance was not relevant to the requirements in the RFQ. Attorney’s experience and past performance provided the evaluation committee with little or no confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.

- 1) The rating for the specific elements of the Experience and Past Performance will have the point values as shown in the table in paragraph 3.6. above.

3.7.2 Evaluation of Qualifications: The evaluation of the Qualifications shall be subjectively based on fact. Information provided by the vendor in response to the Exhibit C, Experience and Past Performance and Qualifications will be used in the Qualifications evaluation.

- a. Scoring of Qualifications - The attorney’s Qualifications will be rated by the SLMPD using the rating system as defined below:

Team Qualifications Rating System	
Rating	Definition
Distinctive	Qualifications include experience and demonstrated expertise involving essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the RFQ. Qualifications provided the evaluation committee with high confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Superior	Qualifications include experience and demonstrated expertise involving similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the RFQ with no measurable weaknesses. Qualifications provided the evaluation committee with confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Satisfactory	Qualifications include experience and demonstrated expertise involving some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities required in the RFQ with no significant

Team Qualifications Rating System	
Rating	Definition
	weaknesses. Qualifications provided the evaluation committee with adequate confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Marginal	Qualifications include experience and demonstrated expertise not similar in scope and magnitude of effort or complexity required in the RFQ, and one or more significant weaknesses exist. Qualifications provided the evaluation committee with limited confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.
Unsatisfactory	Qualifications include experience and demonstrated expertise not relevant to the requirements in the RFQ, and significant weaknesses exist. Qualifications provided the evaluation committee with little or no confidence in the attorney’s capability to perform the requirements of the RFQ.

- 1) The rating for the specific elements of the Qualifications will have the point values as shown in the table in paragraph 3.6.5 above.

******END OF VENDOR SUBMISSION, EVALUATION, AND AWARD INFORMATION SECTION******

**EXHIBIT A
RESPONSE SIGNATURE PAGE**

**ST. LOUIS BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS
BUDGET & FINANCE DIVISION
PURCHASING AGENT
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)**

**RFQ #FY2026-1250-0001
Hearing Officers for Commissioned Officer Disciplinary Hearings**

Attorney's Organization Name:			
Point of Contact:			
Phone Number:		Email Address:	
Mailing Address:			
City/State/Zip:			
Vendor Tax Filing Type with IRS (check one):	<input type="checkbox"/> Corporation <input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> State/Local Government <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership <input type="checkbox"/> Sole Proprietor <input type="checkbox"/> IRS Tax-Exempt		
What date did the vendor's organization begin operation?	Date: / / MM/DD/YYYY		

I am authorized to submit a response to the St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department in response to the RFQ on behalf of my organization, to provide the hearing officer services. The information provided as my organization's response is true and accurate.

Authorized Signature	Date
Printed Name	Title

EXHIBIT B, PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST

The following table is provided to assist the attorney in completing their proposal. It is the attorney's sole responsibility to ensure that all mandatory requirements are met and that their response, including all exhibits, are properly completed and submitted with their response. The attorney may want to check the Task Complete boxes to ensure that each of these items are completed and/or submitted with the response.

No.	Description – While not all documents/items listed below are mandatory in submitting a responsive proposal, failure to provide adequate information to completely address the specified evaluation criteria may at least result in minimal subjective consideration and may result in <u>rejection</u> of the vendor's response.	Task Complete
1.	Complete and sign Exhibit A, Response Signature Page.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Complete Technical Proposal Exhibit C, Experience and Past Performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMINDER: vendors do not need to return RFP Sections 1 through 5 or the RFP attachments, if any, with their proposal response.

**TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EXHIBIT C,
EXPERIENCE OF ATTORNEY AND PAST PERFORMANCE AND QUALIFICATIONS**

Experience of Attorney and Past Performance Submission Instructions: The attorney should provide the information requested below regarding the attorney’s qualifications identified in the RFQ.

EXPERIENCE OF ATTORNEY

The attorney should describe their overall experience relative to the information requested below that demonstrates similar scope and magnitude of effort, including identifying the recentness of that experience.

Specialized experience and technical competence of the attorney with respect to the provision of hearing officer services.	
Past experience of the attorney in providing hearing officer services or other judicial or quasi-judicial experience.	

ATTORNEY BIOGRAPHY

Name: _____
Title: _____

Education, Certifications, and Other Distinctions

Degree, certification, or other distinctions	Institution	Date
Example: BA, Business Administration	Washington University in Saint Louis	
Example: Lean Six Sigma Black Belt	Villanova University (online)	

Employment History

Organization	Role	Dates
<i>Example: Current Company</i>	<i>Partner and leader of organization design practice</i>	<i>2014-present</i>
<i>Example: Company ABC</i>	<i>Director, Strategy and Continuous Improvement</i>	<i>2010-2012</i>

Other Experience or Background Information
