



**CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF CLERKS
AND ELECTION OFFICIALS**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

**ELECTION COST ANALYSIS AND
CONSULTING SERVICES**

RFP No. 2014-01-CACEO

**PROPOSALS MUST BE RECEIVED BY APRIL 30, 2014,
3:00 PM, PACIFIC STANDARD TIME**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

COVER PAGE

The California Association of Clerks and Election Officials, (CACEO) Board of Directors is pleased to announce its acceptance by the James Irvine Foundation as a grant recipient to develop an elections cost database to inform policies and practices and to collect and disseminate best practices. The James Irvine Foundation is committed to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of California's election system and we are honored to be a part of that process.

The CACEO is soliciting proposals from qualified firms (Responder) to provide election cost analysis services. Responder must meet the minimum qualifications and requirements and must be capable of providing all core services in Attachment A, Scope of Work. The awarded contract (Contract) will be a fixed fee contract between CACEO and selected Responder(s).

This RFP is in the following format:

- SECTION I Introduction and Instructions to Responder
- SECTION II Proposal Response Requirements

PROPOSALS ARE DUE DATE APRIL 30, 2014, BY 3:00 PM Pacific Standard Time (PST).

Responders must direct questions and inquiries related to this RFP to CACEO's designated contact, Neal Kelley, CACEO Vice President via email at neal.kelley@rov.ocgov.com. Other CACEO staff will not answer questions concerning this RFP.

Mr. Kelley will provide all official communications and any supplemental information in writing. CACEO bears no responsibility for responses to or regarding this RFP from anyone other than Mr. Kelley.

Responders must submit questions or requests for interpretations or clarifications concerning this RFP no later than April 1, 2014, 3:00 PM, PST. Include in the inquiry the RFP number, the Responder's company name, contact person, phone number, and email address.

I HAVE READ, UNDERSTOOD AND AGREE TO ALL STATEMENTS IN THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) AND TO THE TERMS, CONDITIONS, AND ATTACHMENTS.		
_____ Company Name (as it appears on your invoice and W9)		_____ Fed TAX ID#
_____ Address		
_____ Authorized Signature (Sign all copies)	_____ Title	_____ Date
_____ Contact Person	_____ Phone Number	_____ Email Address

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
COVER PAGE	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS TO RESPONDER	4
Introduction and Tentative Time Schedule	5
Instructions for Submission	6
Evaluation Process and Criteria	7
Selection and Award Process.....	8
SECTION II: PROPOSAL RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS	10
Minimum Qualifications	10
<u>Part 1</u>	
Cover Page, Validity of Proposal, Certificate of Understanding.....	11
Minimum Qualifications Statement, Certificate of Insurance, Conflict of Interest.....	12
Signature Requirements	13
<u>Part 2</u>	
Company Profile.....	14
Proposal Description, Company Background, Statement of Qualification	15
Financials, Operational Requirements.....	16
Personnel Requirements	17
<u>Part 3</u>	
Responder’s Cost Proposal, Fixed Fee	18
<u>Attachments</u>	
Attachment A – Scope of Work	19
Attachment B – Compensation/Payment.....	27
Attachment C– Staffing Plan.....	29

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

AND

INSTRUCTIONS TO RESPONDER

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS TO RESPONDER

A. INTRODUCTION

CACEO is requesting proposals for an election cost analysis and consulting. This RFP is an opportunity to allow qualified vendors to present proposals that will assist CACEO in determining which Responder(s) best meets the Scope of Work requirements in Attachment A.

B. TENTATIVE TIME SCHEDULE

Date	Action
February 10, 2014	Release of RFP
April 1, 2014	Written questions from Responders due by 3 PM, PST
April 7, 2014	CACEO will issue an official addendum to the RFP if necessary
April 30, 2014, 3PM, PST	Deadline to submit Proposals
May 9, 2014	Evaluation of Proposals and negotiation phase
May 16, 2014	Awarding the contract and notification to the selectee
May 21, 2014	Submission for approval by CACEO Board of Directors
June 1, 2014	Contract start date

C. INSTRUCTIONS TO RESPONDER FOR SUBMISSION

1. Proposals are due by April 30, 2014, no later than **3:00 pm** and must be delivered in a sealed package addressed as follows:

RE: RFP No. 2014-01-CACEO

California Association of Clerks and Election Officials
Attn: Neal Kelley, Vice President
1300 S. Grand Avenue, Building C
Santa Ana, CA 92705

2. It is the Responder's sole responsibility to ensure that Mr. Kelley receives the Proposal at the address above by the deadline. Late proposals will not be accepted.
3. CACEO has provided all of the information available about the RFP. It is the responsibility of each Responder to review, evaluate, and request any clarification prior to submission of a Proposal. If the Responder is in doubt as to the true meaning of any part of this RFP or finds discrepancies in the specifications, the Responder may submit a written request for clarification to Mr. Kelley no later than April 1, 2014.
4. Responder agrees that its Proposal is valid for a period of one year from the deadline.
5. Responders may not withdraw their Proposals after submission.
6. Responder must provide a total of three paper copies of the Proposal and one electronic copy. One paper original and two paper copies must contain original, wet signatures. The electronic copy must be a scanned version of the signed original and be submitted via USB flash drive or on a CD. The Responder must mark the original hard copy Proposal as the original on the outside cover.
7. Responders understand that Proposals are not confidential or proprietary and must not be marked as such. Proposals submitted in response to this RFP may become subject to public disclosure per the requirements of the California Public Records Act, Government Code Section 6250 et seq. CACEO shall not be liable in any way for disclosure of any such records. CACEO may refuse to consider any proposal so marked.
8. Upon receipt by Mr. Kelley, Proposals become the property of CACEO. CACEO reserves the right to make use of any information or ideas contained in the proposals.
9. Responder must complete the Minimum Qualification Statement contained in this RFP. By submitting a Proposal, the Responder represents that it has thoroughly examined CACEO's requirements and Scope of Work and is capable of providing the services to achieve the RFP's objectives.
10. CACEO reserves the right to negotiate modifications with any Responder as necessary to serve the best interests of CACEO and the grant. Proposals may be rejected as non-responsive if it is conditional, incomplete, or deviates from the specifications in this RFP. CACEO reserves the right to waive, at its discretion, any procedural irregularity or immaterial defect which CACEO deems reasonably correctable or not warranting rejection. Waivers will not excuse a Responder from full compliance with all other sections of the RFP.
11. Pre-contractual expenses are not to be included as part of the compensation. Pre-contractual expenses include, but are not limited to costs incurred by the Responder in preparation and submission of its Proposal, negotiations with CACEO; and any other expenses incurred by the Responder prior to the date of award and execution, if any, of the Contract.

12. CACEO makes no representation that any Contract will be awarded to any Responder responding to this RFP. CACEO reserves the right to a) negotiate the final Contract with any Responder(s) to serve the best interests of CACEO and the grant; b) withdraw this RFP, in whole or in part, at any time without prior notice; c) make an award to one Responder or to apportion the award to two or more Responders; and d) reject any Proposal of it is conditional, incomplete, or deviates from the services requested in this RFP. Furthermore, CACEO may or may not engage in negotiations with a Responder; therefore, the Responder's Proposal should contain the **most favorable terms and conditions**, since CACEO may award without discussion with the Responder.
13. Where two or more Responders desire to submit a single proposal in response to this RFP, they must do so on a main contractor – subcontractor basis. CACEO will award to a single firm or multiple firms but not with multiple firms doing business as one joint venture.

D. EVALUATION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

CACEO evaluation panel (Panel) will only evaluate those Proposals meeting the minimum qualifications stated under Section II, Minimum Qualifications. The evaluation criteria are as follows and are not in order of importance:

- Demonstration of understanding of meeting the requirements of the RFP;
- Ability to meet the deadlines and deliverables dates required in all phases of the process. This includes Responder's reasonable suggestions to modify the Scope of Work to meet the required deadlines;
- Technical experience of the firm and past experience with CACEO;
- Detailed implementation plan and quality control plan;
- Expertise of key personnel;
- Responder References as submitted under Part 2, Company Profile, Section A.

Financial information as submitted under Part 2, Company Profile, Section B. Cost proposal as submitted under Part 3, Cost Proposal. Please note that the while the costs are an evaluation element, CACEO is not required to select the Proposal with the lowest costs.

The Panel will score the Proposals based on the above criteria, which are weighed and assigned points that measure the responsiveness to each element. The Panel totals the number of earned points for each Proposal and the Proposals are ranked according to point total.

At the sole discretion of CACEO, the Panel may invite the top three ranked Proposals to make an oral presentation, either in person or by phone, to CACEO Board of Directors members. Invitees have three calendar days after notification to prepare for this presentation. Responders are prohibited from altering their original Proposal using this process. The oral presentation is worth up to an additional 25 percent on top of the final score. CACEO will notify the successful the top three ranked Responders and provide an agenda for the oral presentation.

E. SELECTION/AWARD PROCESS

The Panel will present a recommendation to the CACEO Board of Directors upon completion of the evaluation process and will issue a Notice of Intent to Award Contract.

SECTION II

PROPOSAL RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

SECTION II: PROPOSAL RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

CACEO suggests that Proposals be prepared in a clear and concise manner with adequate descriptions of capabilities to satisfy the requirements of this RFP. Emphasis should be on completeness to allow for accurate evaluation and comparative analysis.

Proposals must include three tabbed sections: Part 1, Part 2, and Part 3. Each part must be indexed in the order outlined below. List the questions and your responses and attachments as listed within each part.

Minimum Qualifications

Responder must meet all of the following minimum requirements:

1. A demonstrated ability to perform work of this scope and complexity in a public arena.
2. A minimum of five (5) years experience in similar types of consulting.
3. A minimum of five (5) customers with at least one (1) being a government entity.

PART 1:

This is the first tabbed section. This section is comprised of:

- Cover Page
- Validity of Proposal
- Certification of Understanding
- Minimum Qualification Statement
- Certificate of Insurance
- Conflict of Interest
- Statement of Compliance

1. **Cover Page**

All Proposals must be accompanied by a cover letter of introduction and executive summary of the Proposal. The cover letter must be signed by person(s) with authority to bind the Responder to the terms of this RFP and any resulting Contract. See the Signature Requirements on page 12. An unsigned Proposal or failure to comply with the signature requirements is grounds for disqualification from participation in this RFP process.

2. **Validity of Proposal**

CACEO requires that all Proposals be valid for at least one year from this RFP's closing date. Proposals that are not valid for one year from the RFP's closing date will be rejected. Please state below how long this Proposal will be valid for.

Responder hereby certifies that Responder's Proposal is valid for at least one year from the RFP closing date.

_____ (Signature required)
State how long Proposal is valid

3. **Certification of Understanding**

CACEO assumes no responsibility for any understanding of the Responder or representation made by any of CACEO's officers, employees or agents prior to or during the execution of any Contract resulting from this RFP unless:

- A. Such understanding or representations are expressly stated in the Contract; and
- B. The Contract expressly provides that CACEO assume the responsibility.

By signing below, Responder certifies that such understanding has been considered in this Proposal.

_____ (Signature required)

4. **Minimum Qualifications Statement**

Responder certifies that it meets all minimum qualifications and requirements as set forth in this RFP.

(Signature required)

5. **Certificate of Insurance**

Responder hereby certifies Responder's willingness and ability to provide the required insurance coverage and certificates in the form of a performance bond equal to or in excess of the amount of the contract and a general liability policy that includes workers compensation coverage. See Section 8, Statement of Compliance below on how to make a request for an exception.

(Signature required)

6. **Conflict of Interest**

Responder hereby certifies that: (I) Responder has provided CACEO with the disclosures required in (A) and (B) below as part of its Proposal, or (II) that no relationships as outlined in (A) and (B) exist.

- A. Disclose any financial, business or other relationship with CACEO, any other entity that is a member of or purchases good or services from CACEO, or any CACEO Board member, officer or employee, which may have an impact, effect, or influence on the outcome of the services you propose to provide. Provide a list of current clients, employees, principals or shareholders (including family members) who may have a financial interest in the services you propose to provide.
- B. Disclose any financial, business or other relationship within the last three (3) years with any firm or member of any firm who may have a financial interest in the work.

I. _____
(Signature required)

Or

II. No relationships as specified in A or B exist

(Signature required)

Signature Requirements

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. | Corporations | Corporations Code § 313 |
| | Nonprofit Public Benefit Corp. | Corporations Code §§ 5214, 5141 |
| | Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corp. | Corporations Code § 7214, 7141 |
| | Nonprofit Religious Corp. | Corporations Code §§ 9214, 9141 |

You must have one signature from each category listed in a and b:

- a. Chairman of the Board, President, or any Vice President;
 - b. Secretary, any Assistant Secretary, Chief Financial Officer or any Assistant Treasurer;
 - c. Total of 2 signatures required.
 - d. Unless Board authorized or ratified to bind the corporation for the Contract regardless of whether executed wholly or in part executory.
 - e. May delegate signature authority by corporate resolution.
-
- | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2. | Limited Liability Companies | Corporations Code § 17157 |
|----|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
- a. Two managers, unless articles of organization state that it is managed by only one manager;
 - b. Total of 2 signatures required.
-
- | | | |
|----|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 3. | Partnerships | Corporations Code § 16301 |
|----|---------------------|---------------------------|
- a. Generally requires a Partner signature for contracts in the ordinary course of business.
 - b. Exception: Partner for ordinary course of business, unless the partner had no authority to act for the partnership in the particular matter and the person with whom the partner was dealing knew or had received a notification that the partner lacked authority.
 - c. Only 1 signature required.
-
- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 4. | Limited Liability Partnership | Corporations Code §§ 16111 & 16301 |
|----|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
- a. See above. Same as Partnership.

PART 2: COMPANY PROFILE

This is the second tabbed section.

Company Legal Name: _____

Company Legal Status (corporation, partnership, etc.): _____

Business Address: _____

Telephone Number: (____) _____ Facsimile Number: (____) _____

Website Address: _____ Email Address: _____

Length of time the firm has been in business: _____ Length of time at current location: _____

Is your firm a sole proprietorship? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, sole proprietor's social security number: _____

Is your firm a sole proprietorship doing business under a different name? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, please indicate sole proprietor's name and the name you are doing business under: _____

Is your firm incorporated: _____ Yes _____ No If yes, State of Incorporation: _____

Federal Taxpayer ID Number _____

Regular business hours: _____

Regular holidays and hours when business is closed: _____

Contact person in reference to this RFP: _____

Telephone Number: (____) _____ Facsimile Number: (____) _____

Email Address: _____

Contact person for accounts payable: _____

Telephone Number: (____) _____ Facsimile Number: (____) _____

Email Address: _____

Name of project manager: _____

Telephone Number: (____) _____ Facsimile Number: (____) _____

Email Address: _____

In the event of an emergency or declared disaster, the following information is required:

Name of contact during non-business hours: _____

Telephone Number: (____) _____ Facsimile Number: (____) _____

Email Address: _____ Cell or Pager Number: _____

Proposal Description:

Please provide a brief synopsis of the Responders' understanding of CACEO's needs and how the Responder plans to meet these needs. This should provide a broad understanding of the Responder's entire Proposal. It should also include a statement that the Responder will provide all of the services included in Section III, Attachment A, "Scope of Work."

Company Background and Information:

1. Provide information regarding your organization, including a short description of your services, length of time in business and company size.
2. Identify your business structure and whether it is a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, etc. and number of years of operation under this structure.
3. For any business structure, provide history of acquisition, buy-outs, or mergers with other entities for the past ten years.
4. If you are planning to use sub-contractors, provide specific plans and information regarding the subcontractor's organization.
5. Number of years of experience your firm have in the United States providing similar types of consulting services. Provide name and address if prior business name is not the same as Responder.

Statement of Qualifications:

A. References:

1. Responder(s) must demonstrate successful prior performance of comparable services in the public sector arena and provide a minimum of three (3) recommendations from clients that are comparable to CACEO or a similar organization, for which similar consulting services have been performed within the past five (5) years. Each reference listed should include all of the following information:
 - a) Client name, title, address and telephone number that may be contacted as a reference;
 - b) Type of services provided;
 - c) Date and length of services provided; and
 - d) All reference requirements as listed in the Evaluation Criteria section, page 7.
2. Responder(s) must provide a complete list of California public entities that discontinued the use of their services within the last three (3) years, and must state the reason and circumstances of such discontinuance.

B. Financial:

1. **Financial Information:** Responder shall submit balance sheets for the three most recent fiscal years. Financial balance sheets shall be prepared in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.
2. **Bankruptcy Information:** Responder shall indicate whether Responder, its principals, directors, or majority shareholder(s), or any company Responder has held a controlling interest in, or which has held a controlling interest in Responder, has ever filed for, has been involuntarily put into bankruptcy, or has been declared bankrupt. If yes, attach a statement indicating the bankruptcy date, court jurisdiction, trustee's name and telephone number, amount of liabilities, amount of assets and current status of bankruptcy.

No bankruptcy pending No prior bankruptcy Information provided

3. **Current / Past Litigation:** Responder shall provide detailed information regarding litigation (court and case number), liens or claims involving Responder, or any company Responder holds a controlling interest in, or any company that holds an interest in Responder, or any of the principal officers of the Responder's firm in the past 5 years.

No action pending No prior action Information provided

C. Operational Requirements:

Responder(s) shall submit responses to the following:

- Provide a project organization chart to delineate reporting relationships among assigned staff. Include resumes of key personnel assigned to CACEO's account which includes: Education, Experience/Qualifications, and Professional Credentials (where applicable).
- Describe the ability to respond efficiently and timely to request for services
- Describe the firm's technical experience in a similar project. List the customer, date, value, a description of each related project's scope and methodology, and the project's outcome.
- Describe any unique services they can provide CACEO that will distinguish their firm from other potential firms
- Describe the proposed methodology, including any equipment and software used, for this RFP and Scope of Work. Identify and list any requirements for CACEO-furnished equipment, materials, facilities or any other CACEO support that will be necessary to implement and complete this project. CACEO reserves the right to accept or reject any and all requests for CACEO-furnished items and assistance.
- Provide a project plan and schedule, including a quality control plan. At a minimum, the Responder's plan and project schedule shall include a general description of the Responder's proposed methodologies from project initiation through deliverables as outlined in the Scope of Work. Please include a description of any ongoing quality improvement activities.

D. Personnel Requirements:

- Assigned staff must have a minimum of five (5) years of expertise and experience with emphasis on the public sector with depth and breadth of services available.
- Substitution or addition of Contractor's key personnel in any given category or classification shall be allowed only with prior written approval of CACEO's Project Manager.
- The Contractor may reserve the right to involve other personnel, as their services are required. The specific individuals will be assigned based on the need and timing of the service/class required.
- Assignment of additional key personnel shall be subject to CACEO approval in writing.

PART 3: COST PROPOSAL

This is the third tabbed section.

I. FIXED FEE

Responder(s) must identify proposed fees; provide pricing detail at a fixed rate for the term of the Contract. The annual fixed rate shall include all costs and expenses directly related to meet the requirements set forth in the Scope of Work. Mileage, parking, telephone/fax expenses, food, postage, and incidental photocopies are not billable and will not be allowed.

ATTACHMENT A

SCOPE OF WORK ELECTION COST ANALYSIS AND CONSULTING SERVICES

This Scope of Work details consultation requirements for election cost analysis and consulting services by CACEO.

► BACKGROUND:

CACEO (CACEO) is a professional organization comprised of the chief election official from each of the 58 counties in California. Established in 1908, CACEO is a non-profit, nonpartisan organization created to analyze and develop strategies to effectively implement legislation, as well as advise policy makers by taking positions on legislation that effect our profession. These positions are guided by the following principles:

- To promote high standards of administration in office
- To promote efficiency through legislation
- To promote the welfare of members and the counties they represent
- To promote uniformity of practices and procedures in the application of the laws

► GOALS

Over the past two decades, elections have undergone tremendous changes based on significant federal and state legislative actions. Those rapid changes have challenged election officials to continue to provide consistent services which are the most efficient and effective practices possible. Without consistent and reliable cost analysis from county election officials, policy makers cannot accurately estimate or evaluate the costs associated with their actions or proposed legislation. To address this, our organization proposes to:

- Inform policy makers, stakeholders, the media, election officials and the public on the costs associated with election activities and how those costs are tied to particular election variables so that all parties can make informed decisions
- Help election officials operate in a more consistent, efficient and effective manner.

► OBJECTIVES

Our organization sees this process as primarily one of data collection and analysis. The first phase examines election accounting and expenses. The second, shorter phase will wrap up phase one and begin planning for a best practices documentation program. CACEO has set the following objectives to help us reach our goals.

First twelve months –

- Develop a baseline collection tool for election cost and billing
- Create an online database for the data set which will reside on the FOCE web site
- Target counties that need extra assistance in gathering data to fill in missing areas
- Create “apples to apples” analysis to determine comparable metrics for costs statewide
- Analyze specific variables to determine their effects on costs

Last six months –

- Promote the existence of the database to interested parties
- Develop continuity strategy to ensure the consistent updating of the cost collection database
- Survey election officials on existing best practices in four broad areas and analyze submissions, begin to categorize them into more specific subcategories
- Develop documented plan for best practices program administered by CACEO

► **EXPECTED OUTCOMES:**

By the end of the eighteen month grant period, our organization will have:

- Created a sustainable database of historic election costs over a broad base of election variables
- Created a sustainable “apples to apples” cost analysis tools for election officials
- Analyzed a variety of ancillary variables to allow for effects on election costs
- Developed a preliminary methodology for future best practices collection and distribution
- Strengthened partnerships and increased understanding with FOCE, Irvine Foundation, other interested elections stakeholders, the public, the media, etc.

SPECIFICATIONS

The first twelve months will focus on the following activities and deliverables:

- Develop a baseline collection tool for election cost and billing.
- Create an online database for the data set to reside on the FOCE web site.
- Target counties that need extra assistance in gathering and evaluating data to fill in missing areas.
- Create “apples to apples” analysis to identify metrics for costs across state/counties.
- Analyze specific variables to determine their effects on costs.
- Determine five areas of focus and develop in depth data sets in those areas.
- Promote the existence of the database to interested parties.
- Establish database ownership and updating responsibilities going forward.

Project Description and Rationale

California is an incredibly diverse state with counties that range from less than a thousand voters (Alpine) to more than 4.7 million voters (Los Angeles), with geographies ranging from as small as 46.9 sq. miles (San Francisco) to as many as 20,105 sq. miles (San Bernardino), and from elevations of 282 ft. below sea level (Inyo) to 14,505 ft. (Inyo/Tulare). Election materials are provided in up to 12 mandated languages with a half dozen additional languages covered at the discretion of local jurisdictions.

Over the last two decades, tremendous changes have occurred at the state and federal levels with new laws being enacted that dramatically impacted the elections landscape. These challenges have included the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), and the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment Act (MOVE) at the Federal level, significant modifications to the way we conduct primaries at nearly every primary election in the last decade and a half, changes to the

certification and approval of voting systems, as well as dozens of other state laws implementing their own changes. Additionally, several factors, including the aging-out of baby boomers and budget cuts, have led to the loss of veteran election personnel and the historic knowledge that they inherently maintain.

Counties have also faced the loss of state funding to reimburse counties for state-mandated programs. CACEO budgets have faced their own cuts resulting from the drop in tax revenue stemming from the housing crisis and recession, and elections departments have experienced multiple special vacancy elections, for which there is no state funding provided, further exacerbating the situation. The complexity and uncertainty of this landscape poses tremendous challenges in implementing statewide procedures that fit the needs of all 58 counties while being efficient, effective, and consistent.

To encourage consistent procedures and processes, CACEO (CACEO) is proposing an eighteen month endeavor that would document through a collaborative data collection model the costs of administering elections, and begin to develop a program to help election officials employ and share more efficient, effective and consistent practices. This would allow interested parties, including policy makers and the media, to compare and analyze existing and historic costs and inform stakeholders about how proposed changes might impact future costs.

Documenting election costs in California has the potential to inform contemplated policy and legislative changes before they are enacted and to provide an additional level of transparency to how elections are administered in California. Currently when CACEO and county officials are asked for costs, those costs are collected on the fly and anecdotally as new legislation is proposed or changes are made to programs. CACEO polls its members, often under very tight turn around times, for individual county costs.

The level of participation in those polls varies greatly by topic, complexity of the requested estimates and how quickly the information is needed. Because each county tracks costs in their own manner, the information that is obtained and then passed along to the requesting parties is, at best, an extrapolated estimate. By gathering the proposed information in a central database, creating more consistent billing and surveying categories for counties to use, and including the information in a flexible web environment based on uniform information from a broad base of counties, future estimates will be more accurate and quickly attained.

By also making that database public, any interested party can begin to understand what costs are involved in elections and how changes to them, either through circumstance (like county population) or action (like changes in law) will impact the cost of the work we do. Our organization has been a partner with the Irvine Foundation through the Future of California Elections (FOCE) collaborative since its founding (2011).

The FOCE collaborative includes participants with different perspectives in the election world including election officials; election advocacy groups; civil, minority, language and disability rights groups; outreach organizations and election security advocates. The collaborative produced a Roadmap of 10 principles to find common ground to inform the future of voting in California. The Roadmap puts forth several challenges that we as election officials have chosen to champion. This proposal details our initial efforts to rise to those challenges and take dramatic and meaningful first steps toward meeting these ideals. The following tables set forth a rough timeline and general activity descriptors that are detailed further in this proposal.

First Twelve Months – Cost Collection Analysis

Timeline*	Participants	Activities
Upon funding	CACEO Board of Directors (BOD)	Form a Grant Oversight Committee (GOC) to supervise grant, issue RFP, and award contract
Month 1	CACEO GOC	Hire consultant
Month 1	CACEO GOC/Consultant	Develop baseline data collection tool in consultation with FOCE and partnering groups
Months 1-2	CACEO/Consultant/ FOCE partners	Determine technical needs for online database for this data set to live; piggy back on larger FOCE web site project
Month 3	CACEO/Consultant	Survey Kickoff – Collect Data
Month 4	Consultant	Determine where data is spotty/missing
Months 4-6	CACEO/Consultant	Target counties that need extended data collection assistance: site visits, phone conferences
Months 7-9	Consultant	Complete data set analysis: getting to an “apples to apples” format identify metrics for costs across state/counties
Month 10	CACEO GOC/Consultant	Distribution of initial analysis to CACEO GOC/FOCE/Irvine group – launch of database online on FOCE website
Months 11-12	Consultant	Deeper analysis of data set. Study effects of ancillary variables affecting cost differences – voting technology used, county size, voting methods, % of vote-by-mail, language complexity, etc.
Month 12	Consultant	Final report to Irvine, CACEO GOC and larger FOCE group.

Last Six Months – Cost Analysis Wrap Up and Begin Best Practices Documentation

Timeline*	Participants	Activities
Month 1	CACEO GOC/ Consultant	Develop sustainability plan to keep the election costs database updated
Month 1-6	Consultant	Continue to promote the existence of the database to interested parties
Month 1	CACEO GOC	Make determination about consultant staffing, adjust as needed
Month 1-3	CACEO GOC/Consultant	Develop program parameters for ongoing best practices program through and for CACEO
Month 3	CACEO BOD and GOC/FOCE/Consultant	Develop survey of counties with input from larger FOCE group, create evaluation process for best practices submissions
Month 4-5	CACEO/Consultant	Survey BOD, stakeholders and counties, compile results
Month 5	CACEO GOC/Consultant	Develop survey results (consultation between Consultant and FOCE, partner organizations)
Month 6	Consultant	Presentation of preliminary program design at special CACEO meeting in conjunction with Legislative Com. meeting in Sacramento
Month 6	Consultant	Provide grant overview evaluation and best practices program parameters to CACEO’s GOC and BOD, deliver final report to Irvine

**Timelines are approximate*

As outlined above, this project is a two phase process, with the bulk of the work in the first twelve months, but with the intention to extend both tasks into a longer lasting partnership between CACEO and FOCE (partner organizations). The first phase, or first twelve months, examines election accounting and expenses over a broad range of areas. The second phase, or last six months, entails wrapping up the cost analysis project, preparing for ongoing maintenance of that database, and developing program parameters for documenting and sharing the best practices of election officials. Under both phases, the goal is to have all 58 counties participate, with a minimum threshold of 51 counties represented in the data collected and reported.

First Twelve Months

The first twelve months will begin by hiring a full time consultant or firm of consultants with a demonstrated ability to perform work of this scope and complexity, in the public arena. At the discretion of CACEO Grant Oversight Committee (GOC), an additional consultant/firm may be brought on to continue the efforts into the last six months to transition to the next series of projects as a different skill set may be needed for those programs.

The consultant will work closely with CACEO Grant Oversight Committee, along with input from members of FOCE, to develop a cost collection tool, using the FOCE Roadmap as a guiding document. Number nine of the Guiding Principles of the Roadmap addresses election costs, and we believe that “holding election officials accountable for efficient and effective use of those funds,” can only be achieved by establishing data with which to evaluate election related expenditures and individual county fiscal policies and practices.

During the first month, the consultant will work closely with CACEO Grant Oversight Committee and FOCE to assess what data should be collected to allow for an “apples to apples” comparison of costs in elections, respective of not only the common threads between all counties, but also the types of variables that impact costs such as voting systems, regional variations, size of jurisdictions, variances in county fiscal policies and practices, etc.

The collection tool will be very clear and comprehensive so that it can capture not only the costs that are billed to districts, but also those that are billed to the Secretary of State via reimbursement claims and to the State through past and potential future SB90 claims (currently not funded). In addition, the collection tool needs to address charges to candidates, campaigns, members of the public and other interested parties for services that departments provide such as voter lists, maps, recounts, and all other items that are part of the election expense landscape.

While the collection tool will be able to gather data across the election spectrum, CACEO Grant Oversight Committee and the participating FOCE members will choose five specific areas where at least a third of the grant’s attention will be focused, which might include recounts, petitions, vote-by-mail programs, multilingual services, or voter registration (for example, comparing costs of voter registrations processed on paper, online, at the DMV or other NVRA agencies). The areas chosen will harvest specific data elements in order to ascertain the real costs associated with those tasks.

For example, should provisional voting be chosen, the questions could address items such as: printing envelopes and receipts, cost to issue a provisional ballot on paper, cost to issue a provisional ballot on the accessible voting unit, cost to receive and organize the provisional ballots on Election Night and during the Official Canvass, processing provisional ballots in the election management system, duplicating ballots cast on the wrong party/ballot type to the correct ballot type/contests, tally costs associated with paper and accessible provisional ballots, cost to register or update voters who voted provisionally who had some issue with their voter record, outreach to voters associated with provisional ballots that need to

register, need to update their signature on file, or need additional assistance, and other costs not captured above (being specific).

CACEO Grant Oversight Committee may choose to pursue only one topic at a time or assess all areas and all questions at the same time. In addition to specific costs, historical and demographic information about each county, that has an impact on overall costs, will be collected, such as voting system in use during each election, registration, number of districts consolidated with election that appeared on the ballot, number of districts that had candidates appointed in lieu of election, number and types of languages the ballot is produced in, languages posted at the polls, bilingual election officers needed, variance in county fiscal policies and practices, etc.

Finally, to illustrate how certain types of changes affect expenses, a searchable, quick-reference index of election code changes and changes in Federal or State processes for each year will be established. The search feature will be structured to be able to locate information in a number of different ways. For example, Proposition 14 Top Two Candidates Open Primary Act in 2010 took effect on January 1, 2011. Interested parties will be able to locate this information by name, the year it passed, the effective date, or effect of the law.

After the data collection tool is created, the consultant will work with the group handling the FOCE website to determine the technical needs for the online database and how this data can be integrated. The results of the collaboration will dictate the way in which the data is collected and eventually stored.

The survey will be deployed statewide. The consultant will review incoming responses to ensure the completeness of the data being reported, and follow up with counties for more information. Where necessary, the consultant will target counties that may need more individualized help and will give them additional support via site visits and/or phone conferences.

While Election Cost Allocation and Recovery survey responses are being received, consultant will use interaction opportunities to solicit Best Practices documentation on selected topics from each county as time permits.

After a majority of responses have been collected (target is forty counties responding initially), the consultant will begin the data set analysis to establish the “apples to apples” comparison standards for how election cost data is tracked and, therefore, what is available for comparison. It is anticipated that not all data will be reported in the same format, or even the same units. Different counties may report different tasks together by area instead of breaking down time spent on component parts of the same task. Some work will be required to allow for uniform comparison.

The consultant will help tease out the source information to provide highly accurate comparisons of these (newly) uniform data sets.

The benefits of these new uniform statistics are multi-fold. The user will be able to:

- Isolate particular variables or sets of variables and how they impact costs.
- Identify particular types of jurisdictions to see how costs compare/differ and perhaps why.
- Create a baseline that can be used when estimating future costs based on current practices.
- Create a baseline that policy makers can use to identify the fiscal impacts of proposed changes.
- Evaluate whether election program costs are in line with comparable programs in other counties and if not, perhaps why.
- Research irregularities in costs to spur research into better practices/legislation.
- Give the media and public an opportunity to understand the costs and complexities of elections on a local, regional, or statewide basis.

The “apples to apples” approach allows for the creation of a budgeting tool that accurately estimates election expenses based on historical and current information and can be applied to a single county or multiple jurisdictions. This tool will allow individual variables to be manipulated so that the impact of particular changes to an election may be researched.

Currently, each election official tracks their costs and bills those costs out in their own way and according to individual county fiscal policies and practices. This causes a number of challenges for effective estimations that can be applied across the board to all counties. The new tool will be useful for election planners when planning a statewide election, for media to be able to talk about an election, or for researchers to be able to compare two similar elections where they manipulate just one variable such as statewide policy changes.

For example, this could be done on a county by county basis, a statewide basis, or by selecting certain jurisdictions to include (i.e. all counties that produce materials in Japanese). As additional information is available, it will be worked into the analysis. In addition to analyzing the information, the consultant will also create a database of historic election costs. These costs will allow interested parties to see the impacts of past legislative changes and have a better understanding of how future changes may affect costs.

The initial findings will be reported to CACEO Grant Oversight Committee, FOCE, Irvine Foundation, and the database will be posted to the FOCE website. The consultant will work with CACEO Grant Oversight Committee and FOCE, CSAC, Pew, the Department of Finance, and other key partners to promote the new database and the initial findings to interested stakeholders such as policy makers, social/advocacy stakeholders, the media, researchers, election officials, and the public.

The GOC will collaborate with FOCE to distribute press releases and introductions to view the newly available database to member contacts throughout California. Additionally, CACEO may present documentation of the database to national professional organizations for consideration in their annual best practices recognition awards (for example, the Election Center, the National Association of CACEO Recorders, Election Officials and Clerks (NACRC), the International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers (IACREOT), and the National Association of Counties (NACO)). CACEO’s Legislative Committee has regular working relationships with the Elections Policy Committees in both houses of the Legislature that should facilitate introduction of the database to legislators and legislative staff.

The final phase of data analysis will be to add sections specific to the variables that causes divergence in costs. These will, at a minimum, include cost differences between voting technology used, election management systems used, language requirements for ballots/precinct postings/election officer staffing, county size, voting methods, percent of voters voting by mail, turnout, department organization, geography, and population dynamics such as total population and urban/rural centers. As these analyses are completed, the new data sets will be added to the website. The final results will be compiled into a report to be distributed to Irvine, CACEO Board of Directors, CACEO Grant Oversight Committee and FOCE. Another round of outreach will be performed to interested parties to highlight the fine-tuned data that will be available on the website and in the final report. Since the database will take time to fully mature, partnering groups may request that certain variables be added into the database earlier than others to strengthen the work they do and to help CACEO in the work it does.

Last Six Months

The first task in this phase will be for the consultant to work with CACEO to create a maintenance schedule to assure that the cost analysis database continues to grow as new data is available and future election costs become realized. Since the database will take time to fully mature, partnering groups may request that certain variables be added into the database earlier than others to strengthen the work they do and to help CACEO in the work it does. During this time the consultant will also continue to promote the existence of the database on the website to parties who can benefit from it.

Additionally, the consultant will host at least one training opportunity for partnering agencies, interested legislators and legislative staff to learn about the database, how it works and how it may be of use to them.

Consultant will work with the GOC and CACEO generally to develop program parameters for a Best Practices Documentation and Sharing Program. Additionally, details such as how this program will be staffed, how CACEO’s capacity to do this work can be expanded, and how it will be managed in the future will be determined by the GOC in collaboration with CACEO’s BOD and FOCE. One task will be the drafting of a survey covering four broad areas of election administration with up to 25 more specific subcategories to collect existing Best Practices documentation from all counties.

Based on the way the fiscal database is designed, county election officials will need a fiscal manual to help them track their costs in a manner that allows the database to be updated in the future. The consultant will draft an Election Cost Allocation and Recovery best practices manual for this purpose which will serve as a first best practice manual under the new documentation and sharing program.

Deliverables

The table below illustrates the planned deliverables. However, the final deliverables may change based on complexity and other relevant factors of the final topics chosen.

Phase	Product(s)	Technical Assistance	Trainings
First Twelve Months	Election Cost Database with 5 fully tracked election focus areas; Index of historical changes to the election law	Base metrics established; variables that impact costs identified	Hosted demonstrations of data sets to stakeholders (CACEO and FOCE, etc)
Last Six Months	Database Promotion activities; Fiscal Best Practices Manual; Best Practices Program parameters and goals	Work with specific counties to gather missing data and finalize Fiscal Best Practices	Training for partnering agencies and interested legislators on use of the new database.

ATTACHMENT B

Compensation / Payment

1. COMPENSATION:

This is a fixed fee price Contract between CACEO and the Contractor for analysis and consulting services as provided in Attachment A, Scope of Work. The Contractor agrees to accept the specified compensation as set forth in this Contract as full remuneration for performing all services and furnishing all staffing and materials required, for any reasonably unforeseen difficulties which may arise or be encountered in the execution of the services until acceptance, for risks connected with the services, and for performance by the Contractor of all its duties and obligations hereunder. CACEO shall have no obligation to pay any sum in excess of total Contract amount specified unless authorized by an amendment to the contract with CACEO.

2. FIRM DISCOUNT AND PRICING STRUCTURE:

Contractor guarantees that prices quoted are equal to or less than prices quoted to any other local, State or Federal government entity for services of equal or lesser scope. Contractor agrees that no price increases will be passed along to CACEO during the initial term of this Contract not otherwise specified and provided for within this Contract.

3. PAYMENT TERMS:

Payment shall be made after completion of each phase of the project/to be negotiated with successful Responder upon acceptance of the services as required in the Contract, as determined by CACEO's Project Manager in accordance with the terms and conditions herein. An invoice for the fixed cost of the services shall be submitted to the address specified below upon the completion of the services and approval of CACEO Project Manager. Payment will be net 30 days after receipt of an invoice in a format acceptable to CACEO and verified and approved by the Registrar of Voters and subject to routine processing requirements of CACEO. The responsibility for providing an acceptable invoice rests with the Contractor.

Billing shall cover services not previously invoiced. The Contractor shall reimburse CACEO for any monies paid to the Contractor for services not provided or when services do not meet the Contract requirements.

Payments made by CACEO shall not preclude the right of CACEO from thereafter disputing any items or services involved or billed under this Contract and shall not be construed as acceptance of any part of the services.

Invoice(s) are to be sent to:

California Association of Clerks and Election Officials
Attn: Neal Kelley, Vice President
1300 S. Grand Avenue, Building C
Santa Ana, CA 92705

4. INVOICING INSTRUCTIONS:

The Contractor will provide an invoice on Contractor's letterhead for services rendered. Each invoice will have a number and will include the following information:

1. Contractor's name and address
2. Contractor's remittance address (if different from 1 above)
3. CACEO Contract number
4. Date of Order
5. Rate
6. Deliverables / Service description (in accordance with Attachment C)
7. Contractor's Federal I. D. number
8. Total

Incomplete invoices are not acceptable and will be returned to the Contractor for correction. CACEO's Project Manager, or designee, is responsible for approval of invoices and subsequent submittal of invoices to the Finance department for processing of payment.

ATTACHMENT C

STAFFING PLAN

1. Primary Staff /Key Personnel to perform Contract duties.

Name	Classification/Designation

2. Alternate staff/ Key Personnel (for use only if primary staff is not available).

Name	Classification

Substitution or addition of Contractor’s key personnel in any given category or classification shall be allowed only with prior written approval of CACEO’s Project Manager.

The Contractor may reserve the right to involve other personnel, as their services are required. The specific individuals will be assigned based on the need and timing of the service/class required. Assignment of additional key personnel shall be subject to CACEO approval in writing. CACEO expressly retains the right to prohibit any of the Contractor personnel from performing services to CACEO under this Contract. CACEO shall notify the Contractor in writing of the specific personnel to be prohibited from providing services to CACEO under this Contract.

Contractor shall effectuate the removal of the specified Contractor personnel within 3 business days of notification by Project Manager. CACEO is not required to provide any reason, rationale or factual information if it elects to request any specific Contractor personnel be prohibited from performing services under this Contract. Contractor’s failure to comply with CACEO Project Manager’s decision and remove the specified personnel will be deemed a material breach of this Contract and CACEO may immediately terminate the Contract without penalty.