
**CITY OF COLUMBUS - BID WAIVER INFORMATION FORM
TO ACCOMPANY LEGISLATION WHICH WAIVES ANY PROVISIONS OF
COLUMBUS CITY CODES CHAPTER 329
(PLEASE LIMIT YOUR RESPONSE TO THIS SHEET)**

1. In accordance with section 329.27 of the Columbus City Code, City Council may determine that the City's best interest is served by waiving the City Code Formal Bid procedures for the following reason(s): (Note that these reasons are all based on time. Currently, formal bid average completion time is 160 calendar days.)

- ☐ An unanticipated breakdown created an unplanned, emergency need.
- ☐ The item to be purchased is of a perishable nature, the price or availability will perish before the formal bid process can be completed.
- ☐ Need to extend an existing contract for one year or more where no provision for extension was included in the original bid/contract.
- ☐ Need to increase a contract for additional supplies/services, although the original contract obligations have been fulfilled.
- ☐ A new law or regulation requires immediate compliance; there is insufficient time to accomplish formal competitive bidding and satisfy the needs in order to comply.
- ☒ Other: There is not enough time to obtain formally advertised, competitive sealed bids to satisfy the needs because: The contract for services has expired and the Division of Police wishes to continue services with the existing vendor, LexisNexis (LN). Prior to the execution of the most recent contract (March 2008-February 2012) with the Division of Police, LN had acquired 2 (of 3) of their closest competitors; Accurint and Choicepoint. Both vendors had previously been used by the Division of Police for their respective and different, proprietary products. Entersect, another vendor used by the Division in the past, continues to provide limited features and is no longer comparable to LexisNexis, largely due to the acquisition (by LN) of its competitors.

2. Informal bid procedure used: ☒ Yes ☐ No Explain:

Division personnel received one demo from Thomson Reuter. Entersect level of service and features were reviewed on-line. Additional searches for comparable vendors were unsuccessful.

3. Informal bids received and prices for each:

A local provider (Thomson Reuter) completed a demo for Division personnel (January 2012). The demo was not well-presented and it was unclear whether the product was equal to our existing services. Thomson Reuter has not responded to our inquiry regarding their ability to include on-site, monthly training for our 24 hour operations with their service. Cost could not be determined due to the poor quality of demo and the lack of response to our training inquiry.

Entersect had given the Division temporary access to their web-based product for review by the Division personnel with the highest Accurint usage in 2008. As of 2012, the Division personnel re-evaluated the Entersect product and reported that it was still not comparable to the LexisNexis Accurint database, since Entersect does not provide the same extensive search parameters and features currently received by the Division.

4. If lowest bid was not accepted, Explain:

The Division wishes to maintain the current level of services received by LN at the lowest cost and in the most cost effective manner. To this end, the Division acknowledges that LN has acquired comparable competitors; provides dedicated personnel for on-site database training to Division investigative personnel during all shifts and it would be cost prohibitive to re-train Division personnel on a brand new system; is utilized by surrounding law enforcement jurisdictions; and therefore, it is deemed to be in the best interest of the Division of Police to continue vital services with this vendor.

Ordinance No.:0358-2012

Approved By: Authorized Approval on Corresponding Legislative File
