



PROCUREMENT JUSTIFICATION FORM (PJF)

This form must accompany all contract requests and sole source requisitions (RQS) over \$5,000 submitted to the Division of Procurement Services.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please provide the requested information in the white spaces below. All responses (except signatures) must be typed; no hand-written forms will be accepted. See the guidance document posted with this form on the Division of Procurement Services intranet site (Forms page) for additional instructions.

PART I: OVERVIEW			
Department Office/Division/Program:	Office of the Attorney General		
Department Contract Administrator or Grant Coordinator:	Mark A. Toulouse		
(If applicable) Department Reference #:			
Amount: (Contract/Amendment/Grant)	\$ 35,892.00	Advantage CT / RQS #:	CT 26A 20230816*364
CONTRACT	Proposed Start Date:	9/1/2023	Proposed End Date: 4/30/2024
AMENDMENT	Original Start Date:		Effective Date:
	Previous End Date:		New End Date:
GRANT	Project Start Date:		Grant Start Date:
	Project End Date:		Grant End Date:
Vendor/Provider/Grantee Name, City, State:	University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service, PO Box 9300, Portland, ME 04104-9300		
Brief Description of Goods/Services/Grant:	Data Collection and Analysis Project		

PART II: JUSTIFICATION FOR VENDOR SELECTION			
Check the box below for the justification(s) that applies to this request. (Check all that apply.)			
<input type="checkbox"/>	A. Competitive Process	<input type="checkbox"/>	G. Grant
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. Amendment	<input type="checkbox"/>	H. State Statute/Agency Directed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	C. Single Source/Unique Vendor	<input type="checkbox"/>	I. Federal Agency Directed
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. Proprietary/Copyright/Patents	<input type="checkbox"/>	J. Willing and Qualified
<input type="checkbox"/>	E. Emergency	<input type="checkbox"/>	K. Client Choice
<input type="checkbox"/>	F. University Cooperative Project	<input type="checkbox"/>	L. Other Authorization

Please respond to ALL of the questions in the following sections.

PART III: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. Provide a more detailed description and explain the need for the goods, services or grant to supplement the response in Part I.

In recent years, a growing body of research, media attention, advocacy, and funding initiatives have focused on body worn cameras (BWCs) and their role within a variety of justice processes. Initial research indicated that officers with BWCs were significantly less likely to engage in use of force and have citizen complaints lodged against them. However, more recent studies have revealed mixed findings about the impacts of BWC. The current climate of increased scrutiny and calls for police accountability and transparency impose a sense of urgency to understand Maine’s usage of BWCs. Studying the use of BWCs in Maine can be answered best by broad stakeholder input, analysis of empirical evidence, and a measured approach to implementing statewide legislation and policy. Many potential benefits of BWCs have been reported, such as better transparency, increased civility, quicker case resolution, corroborating evidence, and training opportunities. A 2020 national study found that BWCs were the most widely supported police reform, and an overwhelming bipartisan majority (89%) were in favor of requiring all police departments to have BWCs. However, there are also numerous issues such as cost, training, considerations for victim privacy and confidentiality, evidentiary procedures, the needs of marginalized communities, and the potential misuse of information gathered in BWC footage in other cases – among other considerations. Overall, more research is needed in order to assess the impact of BWCs on policing and justice outcomes, and effective policy implications. In October of 2020, the Attorney General of Maine initiated a study of the current and potential use of body-worn cameras (BWC) by law enforcement officers in Maine. The intent of the study was to gather information about existing policies, costs, and practices, including data storage, video retention, and privacy considerations; and provide a review of nationally recognized research and best practices. The Catherine Cutler Institute at the University of Southern Maine was contracted with to conduct the mixed-methods research project. It was grounded in a researcher-practitioner collaborative approach, and a broadly defined group of stakeholders was invited to share their perspectives. Overall findings and recommendations for policy and/ or legislation were provided in a final report for the Attorney General. In 2023, the Maine Attorney General would like to see how many Maine law enforcement agencies have acquired BWCs since the first study was completed two+ years ago.

2. Provide a brief justification for the selected vendor to supplement the response in Part II. Reference the RFP number, if applicable.

The University of Southern Maine – Muskie School of Public Service - Justice Policy focus area seeks to inform policy development and practice in civil, criminal, and social justice systems in Maine and nationally. Their applied research, training, and technical assistance builds capacity and improves community health and public safety. Their expertise and experience allow them critical and efficient access to data necessary to make informed recommendations on this topic.

3. Explain how the negotiated costs or rates are fair and reasonable; or how the funding was allocated to grantee.

A concise budget of personnel and rates was provided, which is consistent with other University of Maine contracts the Office of the Attorney General currently has in effect.

4. Describe the plan for future competition for the goods or services.

This is a specific project with defined end date. There is no anticipated future need upon receipt of report findings and recommendations.

PART IV: AMERICAN RESCUE PLAN ACT (ARPA) / MAINE JOBS & RECOVERY PLAN (MJRP)

Does this request utilize ARPA/MJRP funds?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes – If Yes, please attach the approved Business Case(s).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No – If No, proceed to Part V.

PART V: APPROVALS

The signatures below indicate approval of this procurement request.

Signature of requesting Department's Commissioner (or designee):	<i>Mark A. Toulouse</i>		
Typed Name:	Mark A. Toulouse	Date:	8/16/2023

Signature of DAFS Procurement Official:	DocuSigned by: <i>Sue H. Garcia</i> <small>E5DB92AC0F8D490...</small>		
Typed Name:	Sue H. Garcia	Date:	10/11/2023