MINUTES

REDISTRICTING ADVISORY GROUP

November 12, 1999
Room 123-S—Statehouse

Members Present

Senator Janice Hardenburger, Chairperson
Representative John Ballou (via phone)
Representative Troy Findley
Representative Mike O'Neal

Members Absent

Senator Anthony Hensley
Senator Pat Ranson

Other Selection Committee Members Present

Sue Krische, representing Senate Republican Caucus
Jeremy Anderson, representing Senate Democrat Caucus
Duane Simpson, representing House Republican Caucus
Brad Bryant, representing Secretary of State

Other Selection Committee Member Absent

Stephen Martino, representing House Democrat Caucus

Staff Present

Mary Torrence, Revisor of Statutes Office
Mary Galligan, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Kenneth Hughes, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Robert Chapman, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Dave Larson, Legislative Administrative Services

Others Present

John Potter, Speaker Pro-Tem's Office
Martin Hawver, *Hawver's Capitol Report*

Chairperson Hardenburger called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. The Committee reviewed provisions of Redistricting Support RFP regarding selection criteria and software demonstration (<u>Attachment 1</u>). The Committee also reviewed the results of scoring the proposals derived from members' individual evaluations (<u>Attachment 2</u>). The Committee briefly discussed the appropriate architecture for the redistricting system.

The Selection Committee reached consensus on the following:

- Invite for software demonstrations Election Data Services, Digital Engineering Corporation, and Public Systems Associates. The demonstrations will begin at 8:00 a.m., on November 23. All demonstrations will be on the same day and conducted in accordance with the description in the RFP. Staff is to develop the technical guidelines for the demonstrations and discuss them with the invited vendors.

- Staff and the Secretary of State's office should follow up with vendors on any questions regarding legislative population database preparation.

- The redistricting project budget should include dedicated computer hardware for all redistricting work areas including laptops and projectors for each caucus.

- Staff should explore caucus work area needs and identify appropriate work spaces in the Statehouse.

- Planning for the redistricting system should include a central data server configuration pending analysis of the impact on the network of that arrangement.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Prepared by Mary Galligan

Approved by Committee on:

__December 9, 1999__
(Date)

Representation of dates and times." (State of Kansas Information Technology Executive Council Information Technology Policy #2412 rev. 0)

C. Legal Requirements

Any contract entered into for provision of goods or services will include the Contractual Provisions Attachment which is Attachment 2 of this document.

D. Contract

The LCC reserves the right to negotiate any and all contract provisions for services described in this RFP. Any such negotiations may include, but not be limited to, prices, scope of services, payment schedules, penalties, and means of providing the services. The contract may include this RFP, the respondent's proposal, and all matters agreed to by the LCC and the respondent. Negotiated contract provisions will prevail in the event of conflicting provisions in the other documents.

Any state provided services, support, data, information or work space will be subject to negotiation and addressed in any contract that results from this RFP.

III. Instructions to Respondents

A. Proposal Submission

1. **Open Records.** All proposals and supporting documentation submitted by respondents become the property of KLRD and pursuant to state law will be open to public review after contract signing or rejection of all proposals. Any documentation accompanying the proposal that the respondent considers proprietary or confidential must be clearly marked as such.

2. **Cover Sheet.** All proposals must include a completed copy of the Proposal Cover Sheet which is the first page of this solicitation. All information requested on that form must be provided and the form must be signed by an authorized representative of the responding organization.

B. Costs Related to Preparing Proposal

Costs directly or indirectly related to preparation of a response to this solicitation, including any required demonstration, are entirely the responsibility of the respondent and are not chargeable, in any manner, to the State of Kansas.

C. Evaluation Criteria

1. **Experience.** Persons or entities with pervious, verifiable experience and acceptable performance records as providers of legislative and congressional redistricting support services will be given preference in the selection process.

2. **Knowledge.** Proposals will be evaluated overall for the respondent's apparent knowledge about and understanding of the redistricting task as a technical, political, and legal undertaking.

3. **Required Elements.** For purposes of evaluating proposals, each element of this solicitation is weighted from 1 to 4, with 4 being most important. Each member of the Selection Committee will assess each proposal and assign a point value to each element based on the

Special Comm. on Redistricting Advisory Group 11-12-99 Attachment 1

member's professional judgement of the adequacy of the response. The weighted values will be computed and a composite score will be developed for each proposal by each reviewer. If any element is to be isolated for separate procurement, for example, geocoding services or database development services, that element will be identified following individual ranking of proposals. Vendor selection and contract negotiation of any such isolated element will proceed separately and the resultant contract finalized independently of negotiation and contracting for other elements. Once all proposals are evaluated individually, the Committee will develop composite score for each proposal. A copy of the evaluation rating matrix that will be used by the Committee is Attachment 3.

4. **Demonstration.** The evaluation process of redistricting software offered by a respondent may include a demonstration of that software. The Selection Committee may invite up to three respondents who offer redistricting software to present an on-site demonstration of that software in the Statehouse in Topeka. Evaluation of the demonstration will be based on the Committee's assessment of the software's adequacy to perform the tasks required and ease with which legislators and staff will be able to use the system. The Committee will collectively develop evaluations of the software demonstrated. Functions that will be assessed during the demonstration are enumerated in Attachment 4. However, any required functions may be tested during the demonstration.

An overall evaluation of each proposal will be prepared by the Committee after the software demonstration and those evaluations will be submitted to the LCC with recommendations. The LCC is not bound to follow the recommendations of the Selection Committee. The final choice of vendor(s) will be made by the LCC which will negotiate the service contract.

D. Demonstration of Redistricting Software

At the time potential vendors are invited to demonstrate redistricting software, the Committee will issue specific guidelines for the demonstration. At a minimum those guidelines will include performance of required functions using graphic and statistical databases equivalent in size and complexity to those that will be in use during Kansas' redistricting effort. Potential vendors will be provided an opportunity to demonstrate features of their software not specifically addressed in the guidelines, but those features need not be considered by the Committee during its evaluation. Demonstrations will be performed on hardware specified by KLRD. Failure to demonstrate the proposed software may result in exclusion from further consideration.

A crucial element in the selection of the redistricting software is the speed at which it performs the required graphic and statistical manipulations and produces hard-copy maps and reports. Another important element is ease of operation for those who do not have extensive experience with similar software. Each vendor must be prepared to conduct a short tutorial and to allow at least one member of the Selection Committee to utilize the full complement of plan building tools during the demonstration.

IV. State Background Information

A. Timetable of Key State Redistricting Events

April 2001   Receipt of PL data and TIGER® files from U.S. Census Bureau

2001 Legislature Adjourns

1-2

Attachment 4
Functions To Be Evaluated During the Software Demonstration

The following functions, among others, will be assessed during the demonstration to make judgements about redistricting software:

1. Speed of retrieval of data from storage media and presentation on screen.

2. Speed of assignment of geographic units to districts, recalculation of statistical data, and development of district boundaries.

3. Speed of screen redraw or refresh when shifting from making district assignments at one level o geography to another, *e.g.*, from county to voting district or from voting district to block. In addition to speed, the operation of switching from one assignment level to another will be judged on the appropriateness of the attributes added to or removed from the display and the ease wit which the change is accomplished from the user's perspective.

4. Speed of screen redraw or refresh when zooming and panning. Inclusion of appropriate attributes for the zoom level also will be assessed.

5. Speed of writing plan data to storage media.

6. Speed of generating and printing reports, plots, and screen prints.

7. Ease and speed of moving from plan building to report and hard copy map preparation.

8. Ease of selecting standard reports from a menu or toolbar.

9. Availability of standard hard copy map templates or set formats for easy map preparation and layout.

10. Intuitive icon symbols and menu organization.

11. Efficient use of local and servers processing and storage if the software is for a client-serve system.

Tentative RFP Issuance and Proposal Review Schedule

September 10-14

> Advisory Group, IS Team, Revisor assigned to the Advisory Group, and Review Team, Legislative CITO, review RFP and recommend changes. Advisory Group approves for issuance.

September 15

> Issue RFP

September 16

> Notice of issuance published in *Kansas Register*

November 1

> Proposals due

November 2-10

> Selection Committee review of proposals, individual members make assessment, staff checks references, and any proposals that must be rejected are identified.

November 10

> Compilation of Committee individual assessment scores

November 11 or 12

> Selection Committee conference call to discuss results of initial review and decide which respondents to invite for a demonstration if more than one respondent appears suitable.

November 13

> Issue invitations for software demonstration

November 20-24

> Demonstration—all potential vendors on the same day

Day of Demonstration

> Selection Committee meets to discuss whether any additional information is required from vendors who demonstrated software. Committee may make decision on vendor to recommend to Legislative Coordinating Council (LCC).

December 6

> Selection Committee decision regarding recommendation to the LCC if not already made.

December LCC Meeting

> Presentation of Selection Committee recommendation to LCC; presentation of overall project budget estimate based on proposal; LCC identifies specific

negotiating instructions and authorizes appropriate staff to negotiate contract on the LCC's behalf.

Early January
LCC approves contract.

Comment: This seems like fast track, but it provides some latitude in case the negotiation takes a long time or there is trouble getting the demonstrations scheduled. The objective here is to get the SOS geocoding portion of the work settled upon as fast as possible so that process isn't delayed, and to have a solid number for the appropriations process as early as possible. If the timing looks like its not going to work out, the LCC has the option of splitting the geocoding project off and contracting for it separately.

1-5

Representation of dates and times." (State of Kansas Information Technology Executive Council Information Technology Policy #2412 rev. 0)

C. Legal Requirements

Any contract entered into for provision of goods or services will include the Contractual Provisions Attachment which is Attachment 2 of this document.

D. Contract

The LCC reserves the right to negotiate any and all contract provisions for services described in this RFP. Any such negotiations may include, but not be limited to, prices, scope of services, payment schedules, penalties, and means of providing the services. The contract may include this RFP, the respondent's proposal, and all matters agreed to by the LCC and the respondent. Negotiated contract provisions will prevail in the event of conflicting provisions in the other documents.

Any state provided services, support, data, information or work space will be subject to negotiation and addressed in any contract that results from this RFP.

III. Instructions to Respondents

A. Proposal Submission

1. **Open Records.** All proposals and supporting documentation submitted by respondents become the property of KLRD and pursuant to state law will be open to public review after contract signing or rejection of all proposals. Any documentation accompanying the proposal that the respondent considers proprietary or confidential must be clearly marked as such.

2. **Cover Sheet.** All proposals must include a completed copy of the Proposal Cover Sheet which is the first page of this solicitation. All information requested on that form must be provided and the form must be signed by an authorized representative of the responding organization.

B. Costs Related to Preparing Proposal

Costs directly or indirectly related to preparation of a response to this solicitation, including any required demonstration, are entirely the responsibility of the respondent and are not chargeable, in any manner, to the State of Kansas.

C. Evaluation Criteria

1. **Experience.** Persons or entities with pervious, verifiable experience and acceptable performance records as providers of legislative and congressional redistricting support services will be given preference in the selection process.

2. **Knowledge.** Proposals will be evaluated overall for the respondent's apparent knowledge about and understanding of the redistricting task as a technical, political, and legal undertaking.

3. **Required Elements.** For purposes of evaluating proposals, each element of this solicitation is weighted from 1 to 4, with 4 being most important. Each member of the Selection Committee will assess each proposal and assign a point value to each element based on the

member's professional judgement of the adequacy of the response. The weighted values will be computed and a composite score will be developed for each proposal by each reviewer. If any element is to be isolated for separate procurement, for example, geocoding services or database development services, that element will be identified following individual ranking of proposals. Vendor selection and contract negotiation of any such isolated element will proceed separately and the resultant contract finalized independently of negotiation and contracting for other elements. Once all proposals are evaluated individually, the Committee will develop composite score for each proposal. A copy of the evaluation rating matrix that will be used by the Committee is Attachment 3.

4. **Demonstration.** The evaluation process of redistricting software offered by a respondent may include a demonstration of that software. The Selection Committee may invite up to three respondents who offer redistricting software to present an on-site demonstration of that software in the Statehouse in Topeka. Evaluation of the demonstration will be based on the Committee's assessment of the software's adequacy to perform the tasks required and ease with which legislators and staff will be able to use the system. The Committee will collectively develop evaluations of the software demonstrated. Functions that will be assessed during the demonstration are enumerated in Attachment 4. However, any required functions may be tested during the demonstration.

An overall evaluation of each proposal will be prepared by the Committee after the software demonstration and those evaluations will be submitted to the LCC with recommendations. The LCC is not bound to follow the recommendations of the Selection Committee. The final choice of vendor(s) will be made by the LCC which will negotiate the service contract.

D. Demonstration of Redistricting Software

At the time potential vendors are invited to demonstrate redistricting software, the Committee will issue specific guidelines for the demonstration. At a minimum those guidelines will include performance of required functions using graphic and statistical databases equivalent in size and complexity to those that will be in use during Kansas' redistricting effort. Potential vendors will be provided an opportunity to demonstrate features of their software not specifically addressed in the guidelines, but those features need not be considered by the Committee during its evaluation. Demonstrations will be performed on hardware specified by KLRD. Failure to demonstrate the proposed software may result in exclusion from further consideration.

A crucial element in the selection of the redistricting software is the speed at which it performs the required graphic and statistical manipulations and produces hard-copy maps and reports. Another important element is ease of operation for those who do not have extensive experience with similar software. Each vendor must be prepared to conduct a short tutorial and to allow at least one member of the Selection Committee to utilize the full complement of plan building tools during the demonstration.

IV. State Background Information

A. Timetable of Key State Redistricting Events

April 2001   Receipt of PL data and TIGER® files from U.S. Census Bureau

2001 Legislature Adjourns

Attachment 4
Functions To Be Evaluated During the Software Demonstration

The following functions, among others, will be assessed during the demonstration to make judgements about redistricting software:

1. Speed of retrieval of data from storage media and presentation on screen.

2. Speed of assignment of geographic units to districts, recalculation of statistical data, and development of district boundaries.

3. Speed of screen redraw or refresh when shifting from making district assignments at one level o geography to another, *e.g.*, from county to voting district or from voting district to block. In addition to speed, the operation of switching from one assignment level to another will be judged on the appropriateness of the attributes added to or removed from the display and the ease wit which the change is accomplished from the user's perspective.

4. Speed of screen redraw or refresh when zooming and panning. Inclusion of appropriate attributes for the zoom level also will be assessed.

5. Speed of writing plan data to storage media.

6. Speed of generating and printing reports, plots, and screen prints.

7. Ease and speed of moving from plan building to report and hard copy map preparation.

8. Ease of selecting standard reports from a menu or toolbar.

9. Availability of standard hard copy map templates or set formats for easy map preparation and layout.

10. Intuitive icon symbols and menu organization.

11. Efficient use of local and servers processing and storage if the software is for a client-serve system.

1-8

KLRD   12-Nov-1999
Tally of Proposal Evaluation Sheets

Vendor	Avg. Score	Perfect score	% of perf
Caliper	232	572	40.6%
DEC	438	776	56.5%
EDS	497	776	64.0%
PSA	575	776	74.1%

Redistricting Advisory Group

Special Committee on
Redistricting Advisory Group
11-12-99
Attachment 2