



1130 K Street, Suite 101 \ Sacramento, CA 95814 \ Tel (866) 356-5217 | Fax (916) 322-0904 | www.WeDrawTheLines.ca.gov

Invitation for Bid # 001
for
Redistricting Services

EVALUATION TEAM RESULTS:

ROSE INSTITUTE

Citizens Redistricting Commission
1130 K Street, Suite 101
Sacramento, California 95814

Citizens Redistricting Commission
Redistricting Services IFB #001

C. THE EVALUATION TEAM

Late bids cannot be considered.

The Team members initially receiving and logging the bids shall record the date and time received and whether the bid was received in the mail, or delivered via UPS, etc.

1. The Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team consists of Commission Staff Members and the Commissioners

Commission Staff Members consist of:

Team Chairperson: Daniel Claypool, Executive Director / Project Manager
Raul Villanueva
Marian Johnston

Commissioners shall consist of:

Gabino Aguirre
Angelo Ancheta
Maria Blanco
Vincent Barabba
Cynthia Dai
Michelle DiGuilio
Jodie Filkins Webber
Stanley Forbes
Connie Galambos Malloy
Gil Ontai
M. Andre Parvenu
Jeanne Raya
Michael Ward
Peter Yao

ATTACHMENT A - BID REVIEW LOG

The Chairperson shall distribute bid volumes, or portions thereof, to appropriate Team members for evaluation. This attachment will be used to record who reviewed which bid documents and the date of review.

Team Member Name	Bid Review Document / Date
1. <u>Danieel Claypool</u>	<u>Bid Opening (3/16/2011)</u>
2. <u>Raul Villanueva</u>	<u>Review and Evaluation: 3/16/2011</u>
3. <u>Marian Johnston</u>	<u>Review and Evaluation: 3/16/2011</u>
4. <u>Raul Villanueva</u>	<u>Review and Evaluation: 3/17/2011</u>
5. <u>Marian Johnston</u>	<u>Review and Evaluation: 3/17/2011</u>
6. _____	_____
7. _____	_____
8. _____	_____
9. _____	_____
10. _____	_____
11. _____	_____
12. _____	_____
13. _____	_____
14. _____	_____
15. _____	_____
16. _____	_____
17. _____	_____
18. _____	_____
19. _____	_____
20. _____	_____
21. _____	_____
22. _____	_____
23. _____	_____
24. _____	_____

ATTACHMENT B – BID PACKAGE CHECKLIST

The Team member shall inspect each bid and verify that delivery requirements were met, checking for general conformance to the format and content requirements of the IFB.

Cost data shall remain sealed until the evaluation of other bid requirements is completed and opened only for compliant bidders.

YES If the bid response is compliant to the bid requirement, indicate YES.

NO If the bid response contains a deviation to the requirement, indicate NO and explain on Attachment D- Deviation Work Sheet.

Bidder Rose Institute Date March 16, 2011

Team Member Name Raul Villanueva, Marian M. Johnston

BID SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

1. Original Signatures YES/NO NO

One copy of all bid documents requiring a signature must bear an original signature of a person authorized to bind the bidding firm, except each of the four copies of the contract requires original signatures.

No signature on Bidder Declaration, Form GSPD 05-1-5

2. Number of Copies YES/NO YES

The requirements portion of the bid and the cost portions of the bid must be submitted separately as follows:

- one (1) original and twenty (20) copies (hard copy) of each, except only four (4) signed (original) copies of the contract are required (Volume IV – Contract);
- one (1) electronic copy of the requirements portion of the bid (only) in PDF format on a CD; and
- one (1) electronic copy of the cost portion of the bid (only) in PDF format on a separate CD. The hard copies and CDs must be clearly labeled as either “Bid: Requirements” or “Bid: Costs.”

3. Binder Format YES/NO NO

Bid responses shall be printed double sided, submitted on 8-1/2” x 11” paper, with easy to read font size and style.

Yes

Pages shall be numbered, tabbed, and bound (spiral / comb / three-ring binder).

(Not numbered consecutively and not tabbed)

Tabbed dividers should separate and identify the response items. **(Not done)**

4. Table of Contents YES/NO YES

The Bidder shall insert a comprehensive Table of Contents denoting separate sections for each section and subsection of the bid response.

5. Sealed Cover and Plainly Marked YES/NO YES

All bids must be submitted under sealed cover and sent to the Project Manager identified in SECTION I by the Submission of Final Bid due date and time shown in SECTION I, Key Action Dates. The sealed cover must be plainly marked with the bid number and bid title, must show your firm name and address, and must be marked with "DO NOT OPEN", as shown below:

Bid Number
Bid Title/Name
Contractor Name and Address
DO NOT OPEN

6. Contract Terms and Conditions YES/NO YES

The bidder must provide four (4) signed copies of the Contract Terms and Conditions (STD 213 with GTC 610). Alternate contract language is not acceptable. A bid with such language will be considered a counterproposal and will be rejected. The Commission's General Terms and Conditions (GTC) are not negotiable.

7. Bidder Cost Work Sheet YES/NO _____

The bidder must complete and return the BIDDER COST WORK SHEET, ATTACHMENT 9, in Volume V of the Final Bid. Volume V must be a separate, sealed, and clearly identified document. **Not verified yet.**

SECTION III - ATTACHMENTS - GENERAL REQUIREMENTS (Volume I)

A. Cover Letter - Attachment 1 YES/NO YES

A principal of the firm authorized to legally bind the firm shall sign the Cover Letter and include the following information:

- Company Name
- Contact Person for purposes of responding to the bid
- Mailing Address
- Telephone Number and Facsimile Number
- Email Address

B. Payee Data Record (STD 204) - Attachment 2 YES/NO YES

Bidder must list their Taxpayer Identification Number.

C. Bidder Declaration Form GSPD-05-105 - Attachment 3 YES/NO YES and NO

Bidder must identify all subcontractors proposed for participation in the contract.

Not signed and no subcontractors identified although Lisa Handley appears to be subcontractor.

D. Conflict and Impartiality Statement - Attachment 4 YES/NO YES and NO

–

Bidder must complete and return.

Statement included but appears to be inaccurate as no conflicts are identified and yet several conflicts appear to exist from review of resumes. – Levitt, Handley, Cotton, Pollack, and Stone.

E. TACPA/EZA/LAMBRA - Attachment 5 YES/NO N/A

If the bidder is claiming preference, the Team member shall complete ATTACHMENT F - COMPUTING EZA, TACPA AND LAMBRA.

F. Bid/Bidder Certification Sheet - Attachment 6 YES/NO YES

Bidder must submit this certification along with Attachments 1 - 8 as an entire package with original signatures.

G. Small Business Preference YES/NO N/A

If the bidder is claiming a small business preference (see Contractor Certification Clauses (CCC) (Attachment 8)), the Team member shall complete ATTACHMENT G - COMPUTING SMALL BUSINESS PREFERENCE.

H. Required Attachment Check List - Attachment 7 YES/NO YES

Bidder must submit this check list along with Attachments 1 - 8 as an entire package with original signatures. Place a check mark or “X” next to each item being submitted.

I. Contractor Certification Clauses (CCC-307) - Attachment 8 YES/NO YES

Bidder must complete, sign and return.

J. Format

YES/NO YES

Bidder's submission is required to follow the IFB format, as is, unchanged (requirements are not to be retyped). The required format for responding to the bid requirements has been replicated in Attachment C below.

K. Secretary of State

YES/NO YES and NO

Both domestic and foreign corporations (those incorporated outside of California) must be in good standing in order to be qualified to do business in California. The Commission will determine whether a corporation is in good standing by contacting the Office of the Secretary of State.

<http://kepler.ss.ca.gov/>

Rose Institute is not registered, but Claremont McKenna College is.

L. Contractor Evaluation

YES/NO YES

The Commission shall verify with the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services, whether a negative STD. 4, Contractor Evaluation, has been filed.

ATTACHMENT C – BID REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST

Each Team member shall check for responsiveness to the following requirements of the IFB. Deviations will be recorded on Attachment D- Deviation Work Sheet.

YES If the bid response is compliant to the bid requirement, indicate YES.

NO If the bid response contains a deviation to the requirement, indicate NO and explain on Attachment D- Deviation Work Sheet.

Bidder Rose Institute Date March 16, 2011

Team Member Name Raul Villanueva, Marian M. Johnston

SECTION IV - ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS (Volume II)

A. Legal Assistance YES/NO YES

At the sole discretion of the Commission, Contractor may be required to provide technical assistance to the Commission in the event any legal action arises relating to the redistricting plans developed with Contractor’s assistance. Contractor shall provide technical support for any lawsuits resulting from this contract in state and federal court, as deemed necessary by the Commission.

B. Commission Participation YES/NO YES

A Commission Project Manager/Coordinator will be assigned to this project and, along with other key Commission personnel, will be working with the Contractor as active participants to provide project continuity at the operating level. This assignment is to foster support for the project and enhance its chances for success.

C. In Process Review YES/NO YES

The Commission may, at its sole discretion, assign an individual, individuals, or entity, to provide an independent evaluation of any map and/or report being submitted to the Commission for its consideration and approval. The individual, individuals, or entity will be considered a separate consultant to the Commission and must be provided unfettered access to any completed map and/or report and the supporting documentation for either of those documents during any phase of the redistricting process. This includes any and all data at any level being used by the "line drawing" Contractor to construct a district boundary.

D. Progress Report/Schedule YES/NO YES

The Contractor shall provide progress reports on an as needed basis as determined by the Commission or the Executive Director. This may be in the form of a progress schedule or reports, meetings on a regular basis, and/or a Final Summary Report once the project is completed. Any request for a written or verbal report must be addressed within twenty-four (24) hours of notification.

SECTION V - SCOPE OF WORK (Volume III)

Bidder response to subsection I, Customer Experience References, and J, Resumes, below, may include attachments. The references and resumes will be validated by the Team members who initially open the Final Bids and the results recorded on Attachment E – Reference and Evaluation Summary. A completed Attachment E will be provided to the Commissioners when the public evaluations commence,

A. Software Capability **YES/NO YES**

The software employed by the Contractor must be able to automatically show the results of any proposed change in a district by retabulating and presenting on-screen the resulting map and the corresponding changes in total population and population sub-groups associated with the proposed change to a district.

B. Final Map Report **YES/NO YES**

Contractor must issue a report for each of the four (4) final maps that explains the basis for the decisions for achieving compliance with the criteria required by the initiatives (Proposition 11 and 20), and by applicable state and federal laws and requirements.

C. Information Security **YES/NO NO**

Bidder must employ Information Security Measures conversant with industry standards (ISO/IEC 27002 and CALIFORNIA State Administrative Manual (SAM) Chapter 5300, for example) that will be maintained throughout the course of the contract, in critical areas, such as, but not limited to, the following:

1. Secure data transmission
2. Data monitoring and verification
3. Data storage and back-up
4. Confidentiality practices regarding staff and data handling

No showing that contractor is conversant with industry standards.

D. Staff Support **YES/NO YES**

Contractor shall provide overall staff support to the Commission’s redistricting effort necessary to meet project goals and objectives.

E. Work Plan **YES/NO YES**

The Contractor must possess the following Technical Skills to develop Work Plans with specific deliverables and timelines as directed by the Commission. These Work Plans will be required throughout the contract service period and will be developed in collaboration between the Contractor and the Commission. The deliverables are required to be provided as mutually agreed upon.

Technical Skills

In conjunction with their knowledge and expertise in redistricting, the Contractor will use computerized geographical information systems (GIS) software and a redistricting database containing population data and digitized maps to assist the Commission in the following:

1. Evaluating the movement of census geography units into and out of proposed election districts, and
2. Producing the maps that reflect proposed districts and the final districts, as determined by the Commission.

The Contractor will have sole responsibility for the following:

- a. All necessary computerized equipment necessary to house and utilize the redistricting database;
- b. Assembling the redistricting database as specified below;
- c. Development and oversight of the coding of public testimony such that it can be aggregated and collated to corresponding maps; and
- d. Any and all equipment required to produce, digitally store, project on screen (for audience viewing), and print all maps desired by the Commission.

F. Redistricting Database

YES/NO YES

The Contractor's database must consist of the certified population data from the 2010 US Census for the State of California, including the population subgroups of California as enumerated by the 2010 US Census data. The 2010 Census Data used shall be that of the California Statewide Database located at the University of California, Berkeley Law, Center for Research.

The population data will consist of the certified 2010 US Census data for the State of California, including the population subgroups of California as enumerated by the 2010 US Census data. In addition, the Commission may also use adjusted 2010 census data for analysis. The geographic data will include digitized maps showing the boundaries of the census geographic units for which the population statistics are available (i.e., census block through county level), as well as the physical geography and relevant built environment (city boundaries, streets and highways, etc.) throughout California. Voting and elections data associated with the district(s) will be included in the database so it is available if required by the Commission to demonstrate compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Commission may either: (1) provide for a separate contractor to provide the precinct level voting data and elections data associated with the district(s) to assist in performing any required studies (racially polarized voting analysis, for example), or (2) request the Contractor to perform the analysis.

G. Fixed Cost Public Input Hearings Pre- and Post-map (includes travel expenses) **YES/NO YES**

Contractor shall work in conjunction with and at the direction of the Commission during the Public Input Hearings. Commission staff and Contractor will jointly facilitate interaction with the public.

The Contractor and/or Contractor's staff must attend Pre-and Post-map Public Input Hearings. There will be a minimum of 18 Public Input Hearings (Pre-and Post-map combined). The total cost for these 18 hearings will be provided as a Fixed Cost that includes all associated travel expenses. See HEARINGS/GENERAL TIME FRAME TABLE and HEARINGS DESTINATION TABLE below. This cost will be included in ATTACHMENT 9 – Bidder's Cost Work Sheet.

Not verified yet.

It is also anticipated that there may be 3-4 occasions (included in the 18) where simultaneous meetings will be occurring at different locations around the State. Contractor must have the capacity to accommodate simultaneous meetings. The Contractor will be responsible for:

- Providing all equipment necessary to draw the maps reflecting the stated concerns and interests of the public participants;
- Providing the coding for each corresponding map either submitted by the public, or developed during the hearing to describe the stated concerns and interests of the public participants;
- Providing the coding for all public testimony related to redistricting so it can be later aggregated and collated to the specific district(s) in question; and
- Producing, digitally storing, projecting on-screen (for audience viewing) and later printing all maps as required by the Commission.

HEARINGS/GENERAL TIME FRAME TABLE

Event	General Time Frame	Key Activity
Public Input Hearings (pre-maps)	April to early May 2011	Gathering public input throughout California; minimum 9 meetings
Release of Initial Maps	Late May 2011	Release of preliminary maps
Public Input Hearings (post-maps)	June to early July 2011	Gathering public input about preliminary maps; minimum 9 meetings
Finalize maps and reports	Mid-July to early August 2011	Prepare final maps submission by for Aug. 15

Optional Public Input Hearings Pre-and Post map

The Contractor is required to provide a per meeting cost for optional Public Input Hearings (Pre-and-Post map). These optional meetings will be scheduled at the discretion of the Commission. The cost will be included in the evaluation for award.

Travel Expenses

Contractor's travel expenses for the 18 Public Input Hearings should be based on travel from the Contractor's primary work place in California (out-of-state travel is not reimbursable) to each of the cities identified in the table below, once for each of the nine (9) Public Input Hearings Per-map and once for each of the nine (9) Public Input Hearings Post-map. For example, one trip to Region 1, San Diego, during the Public Input Hearings (Pre-map) and one more trip to Region 1, San Diego, during the Public Input Hearings (Post-map). **Hotel accommodations and travel per diem costs shall be limited to rates published by the Department of Personnel Administration (DPA).**

HEARINGS DESTINATION TABLE

Area	City
Region 1	San Diego
Region 2	San Bernardino
Region 3	Anaheim
Region 4	Central Los Angeles
Region 5	Santa Barbara
Region 6	Fresno
Region 7	Salinas
Region 8	San Francisco
Region 9	Redding

H. Fixed Cost for Commission Meetings (includes travel, expenses) **YES/NO YES**

The Contractor must attend and participate in a minimum of ten (10) days of Commission meetings (Post-Map). The total cost for these 10 meetings will be provided as a Fixed Cost that includes all associated travel expenses. This cost will be included in ATTACHMENT 9, Bidder's Cost Work Sheet. The Contractor will be responsible for:

- a. Present a summary of testimony from groups of citizens self-identifying as a "community of interest" and any related maps provided by them;
- b. Present relevant criteria to be used in evaluating the maps under discussion;
- c. Produce, digitally store, project on screen (for audience viewing), and print all maps desired by the Commission.

The Contractor is required to provide the cost for 10 meetings with the Commission including travel expenses. Contractor must provide travel costs based on travel from Contractor's primary work place in California (out-of-state travel is not reimbursable) to Sacramento.
Not verified yet.

Optional Commission Meetings Cost (includes travel expenses)

The Contractor must provide a cost per meeting day for optional Commission meetings including travel expenses (as described above). These optional meetings will be scheduled at the discretion of the Commission. The cost will be included in the evaluation for award.
Not verified yet.

ATTACHMENT D – DEVIATION WORK SHEET

The individual Team members shall complete this attachment when any deviation to the requirement is found in the bid response. After all individual evaluations have been completed, the Team members will review the deviations and make a final determination if the deviation is material and warrants rejection of the bid.

If the intent of the bid is not clearly established by the complete bid submittal, the Original (Master) Copy has priority over the copies, the bid narrative has priority over the contract and the contract has priority over the cost sheets.

A deviation from a requirement is material if the deficient response is:

- Not in substantial accord with the IFB requirements,
- Provides an advantage to one bidder over other bidders, or
- Has a potentially significant effect on the delivery, quantity, or quality of items bid, amount paid to the Contractor, or on the cost to the Commission.

Requirement Reference	Bid/Proposal Reference	Deviation, Error or other
3 (c)		No signed Bidder Declaration, GSPO 05-105, and indication that there are no subcontracts appears to be inaccurate as Handley appears to be employed by a different employer
9		Pages not consecutively numbered and no tabs.
5 (i)(3)		No phone number for one reference, so reference eliminated as required by DGS
Attachment 4		Conflict and Impartiality Statement inaccurate as resumes of 5 staff members reveal conflict.
5(i)		No information provided in designated space for litigation. Some information provided at p. 27.
5(i)		Population diversity for Project #1 below 15% cut-off for African Americans and Asians
Attachment E		Project information provided was performed by different contractor, National Demographics Corp., and not Rose Institute, although Doug Johnson and maybe others appear to be on both staffs. Start and stop dates of projects not provided.

--	--	--

ATTACHMENT E: REFERENCE AND RESUME EVALUATION SUMMARY

Bidder supplied references and resumes shall be contacted and reviewed during the evaluation. This attachment will be used to record findings.

Bidder Rose Institute Date March 16-17, 2011

Team Member Name Raul Villanueva, Marian M. Johnston

I. Customer Experience References

1. Reference Projects

YES/NO YES and NO

Bidders must provide the name, location and start and end dates for two (2) "reference" redistricting projects with districts and/or agencies that the Contractor has successfully performed services for over the past twenty (20) years.

No start or end dates provided, and projects were completed by different entity,

Project1:

Name of Agency	Location	Start Date	End Date	Within 20 Years?
State of Arizona	State of Arizona			
Population of Location: 6,595,778				
Diversity of Location: Hisp. 30.8%, White 57.1%, Black 3.6%, Asian 2.5%				

Project2:

Name of Agency	Location	Start Date	End Date	Within 20 Years?
San Diego Unified School District	San Diego			
Population of Location: 1,027,189				
Diversity of Location: Hisp. 24.0%, White 47.9%, Black 7.3%, Asian 13.9%				

Note: Third project not considered as contact information not provided (per DGS).

The references must be for projects that are of a similar size, scope and complexity as those found in California's most populous cities, for example (with Jan 2010 population figures from California Department of Finance):

City	Population of City	15% Above Population Value	15% Below Population Value
Riverside	304,051	349,659	258,443
Sacramento	486,189	559,117	413,261
San Francisco	856,095	984,509	727,681
San Diego	1,376,173	1,582,599	1,169,747
Los Angeles	4,094,764	4,708,979	3,480,549

The table below describes the racial/ethnic diversity of the Cities based on 2006-2009 ACS data from the U.S. Census:

	% Hispanic or Latino	% Not Hispanic or Latino	% Not Hispanic or Latino: White	% Not Hispanic or Latino: Black	% Not Hispanic or Latino: Asian
Los Angeles	41%	59%	42%	8%	9%
San Francisco	13%	87%	51%	6%	30%
Riverside	39%	61%	50%	6%	5%
San Diego	24%	76%	58%	67%	13%
Sacramento	23%	77%	47%	13%	17%

	% Hispanic or Latino	% Not Hispanic or Latino	% Not Hispanic or Latino: White	% Not Hispanic or Latino: Black	% Not Hispanic or Latino: Asian
Los Angeles	35-47%	50-68%	36-48%	7-9	8-10%
San Francisco	11-15%	74-100%	43-59%	5-7%	26-35%
Riverside	33-45%	52-70%	43-58%	5-7%	4-6%
San Diego	20-28%	65-85%	49-67%	57-77%	11-15%
Sacramento	20-26%	65-89%	40-54%	11-15%	14-20%

To be deemed comparable, the bidder's redistricting projects must consist of the following for each of the project references (based on the time the redistricting services were provided):

- a. Population within **15%** of any of the cities noted above; and
- b. Racial and ethnic diversity of the population within 15% of the values for the racial/ethnic groups who make-up any of the cities noted above.

Project1:

Population within 15% ?	YES / NO YES	Comment:
Diversity within 15% ?	YES / NO No	Comment: Not comparable for Black or Asian percentages.

Project2:

Population within 15%?	YES / NO YES	Comment:
Diversity within 15%?	YES / NO YES	Comment:

2. Description of Contractor's Role

The Contractor must provide a description of how the above two factors (1. a-b) were addressed when lines were being drawn and the Contractor's contribution to resolving any issues resulting from the prospective lines, including whether VRA section 2 or 5 criteria impacted the line drawing and if so, the involvement of the Contractor in determining where the line should be drawn.

Project1:

Did Contractor describe how population and population diversity were addressed when lines were being drawn?:	YES / NO No
Did Contractor describe own contribution to resolving issues resulting from prospective lines?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor indicate whether VRA Sect.2 impacted line drawing?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor describe own involvement in determining where VRA sect. 2 lines should be drawn?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor indicate whether VRA Sect.5 impacted line drawing?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor describe own involvement in determining where VRA sect. 5 lines should be drawn?	YES / NO No

Note: The entire State of Arizona is subject to Sec. 5

Project2:

Did Contractor describe how population and population diversity were addressed when lines were being drawn?:	YES / NO No
Did Contractor describe own contribution to resolving issues resulting from prospective lines?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor indicate whether VRA Sect.2 impacted line drawing?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor describe own involvement in determining where VRA sect. 2 lines should be drawn?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor indicate whether VRA Sect.5 impacted line drawing?	YES / NO No
Did Contractor describe own involvement in determining where VRA sect. 5 lines should be drawn?	YES / NO No

3. Contact Person for Reference

For the reference projects, provide a “contact name”, “address” and “phone number” for a principal member of the reference project. The contact person must be an individual in a senior capacity who was directly involved in drawing the lines and must be available by phone for two days after Final Bid opening.

Project 1:

Contact Name: Steve Lynn

Address: 1 S. Church Ave., Tucson, AZ 85701

Phone #: 520 884-3629

Agency (during redistricting project): Az. Redistricting Commission

Position/Title (during redistricting project): Chair

Did Contact verify agency, location and start/end dates for project? **YES/NO** YES

Comment: AZ contracted with National Demographics Corp. (NDC) not Rose Institute. Primary staff were D. Johnson, M. Adams, Leoni (?), and MacDonald. Lisa Handley was part of the project as a separate contractor.

Did Contact verify Bidder’s description of how population and population diversity were addressed when lines were being drawn? **YES/NO** YES

Comment: Mr. Lynn verified use of “participant kit”. Kits were used by public in drawing own maps or for providing narrative testimony. Modus operandi focused on Commission providing direction to NDC for changes to AZ “grid map.” Public addressed Commission not NDC. Commission conducted the public hearings. NDC compiled public testimony and developed preliminary maps to “test” the effects of lines based on testimony.

Did Contact verify Bidder’s description of Bidder’s contribution to resolving issues resulting from prospective lines? **YES/NO** YES

Comment: Mr. Lynn stated NDC was provided direction for what maps / alternative maps to draw and produced them indicating the criteria the maps addressed. NDC produced whatever maps desired by the Commission.

Did Contact verify whether VRA Sect.2 impacted line drawing? **YES/NO NO**

Comment: Bid did not mention VRA Sect. 2 impact. NDC's participation is not known.

Mr. Lynn indicated that Lisa Handley was asked to conduct several analyses of voting and potential voting dilution as possible majority minority districts were considered by the Commission.

Did Contact verify Bidder's description of Bidder's involvement in determining where VRA sect. 2 lines should be drawn? **YES/NO NO**

Comment: Bid did not mention VRA Sect. 2 impact. NDC's participation is not known.

Mr. Lynn indicated that Lisa Handley was asked to conduct several analyses of voting and potential voting dilution as possible majority minority districts were considered by the Commission.

Did Contact verify whether VRA Sect.5 impacted line drawing? **YES/NO YES & NO**

Comment: Bid noted sect. 5 preclearance was required, but not the extent of sect. 5 involvement.

Mr. Lynn confirmed that the entire state of Arizona is under VRA Sect. 5 pre-clearance requirements. This was a major factor in the Commission's view.

Did Contact verify Bidder's description of Bidder's involvement in determining where VRA sect. 5 lines should be drawn? **YES/NO YES & NO**

Comment: Bid noted a coalition opposed the preclearance causing DOJ to deny the initial request for preclearance. Further that the Commission "rapidly changed the plan to the numbers needed for preclearance."

Mr. Lynn indicated that the Coalition was made up of several groups including then-current political incumbents and officials. There were (over 5 years) two lawsuits, two appeals and then a State Supreme Court case which resulted in the Court appointing a 3 judge panel who appointed a Special Master to review the NDC data & maps . A 3rd party was brought in by the Special Master who found areas in the maps requiring correction. The 3 Judge panel approved the changes to the NDC maps.

Contact's description of Bidder and Bidder's staff's comportment when interacting with the public, agency staff, and agency's other contractors. (Sect. II, G)

Comment:

Mr. Lynn indicated that NDC always acted in a very professional manner. Produced whatever maps the Commission needed and made whatever changes the Commission required. NDC never went beyond the Commission's direction or interjected their personal views.

Contact's description of Bidder and Bidder's staff's comportment when interacting with Diverse members of the public. (Sect. II, G)

Comment:

Mr. Lynn indicated that Bidder's interactions with the public were professional.

Contact's description of Bidder and Bidder's staff in regards to respectful and collaborative working relationships with Agency and agency staff and contractors. (Sect. II, G)

Comment:

Mr. Lynn affirmed that Bidder and Bidder's staff were very professional in all of their relationships and dealings with the Commission.

Did Bidder handle redistricting/project data in a secure and confidential manner? **Y/N YES**
(Sect. V, C)

Was the Bidder's database complete to meet the redistricting project's needs? **Y/N YES**
(Sect. V, F)

For the reference projects, provide a “contact name”, “address” and “phone number” for a principal member of the reference project. The contact person must be an individual in a senior capacity who was directly involved in drawing the lines and must be available by phone for two days after Final Bid opening.

Project 2:

Contact Name: Ricardo Soto

Address: 400 Maryland Ave. SW Washington DC 20202

Phone #: 800 421-3481

Agency (during redistricting project): San Diego Unified School District

Position/Title (during redistricting project): in house counsel

Did Contact verify agency, location and start/end dates for project? **YES/NO** **YES**

Comment:

Mr. Soto confirmed the above information. This was also an NDC contract (not Rose Institute). Principles were Mr. Douglas and Dr. Adams.

Did Contact verify Bidder’s description of how population and population diversity were addressed when lines were being drawn? **YES/NO** **YES**

Comment:

Mr. Soto confirmed that NDC provided educational materials and presentations for the public (groups of 15-25); facilitated the public input meetings, and processed the public input for the Committee members. NDC identified population groups of interest and where they were located.

Did Contact verify Bidder’s description of Bidder’s contribution to resolving issues resulting from prospective lines? **YES/NO** **YES**

Comment: Bidder only stated they “performed an analysis of the District’s potential exposure under the new CA VRA”.

Mr. Soto recalled a vote dilution analysis.

Did Contact verify whether VRA Sect.2 impacted line drawing? **YES/NO YES**

Comment:

No VRA sect. 2 issues noted by Bidder. Mr. Soto noted only the vote dilution analysis.

Did Contact verify Bidder's description of Bidder's involvement in determining where VRA sect. 2 lines should be drawn? **YES/NO N/A**

Comment:

Did Contact verify whether VRA Sect.5 impacted line drawing? **YES/NO N/A**

Comment:

Did Contact verify Bidder's description of Bidder's involvement in determining where VRA sect. 5 lines should be drawn? **YES/NO N/A**

Comment:

Contact's description of Bidder and Bidder's staff's comportment when interacting with the public, agency staff, and agency's other contractors. (Sect. II, G)

Comment:

Always professional; very helpful

Contact's description of Bidder and Bidder's staff's comportment when interacting with Diverse members of the public. (Sect. II, G)

Comment:

Always professional; very helpful

Contact's description of Bidder and Bidder's staff in regards to respectful and collaborative working relationships with Agency and agency staff and contractors.
(Sect. II, G)

Comment:

Always professional; very helpful

Did Bidder handle redistricting/project data in a secure and confidential manner? **Y/N YES**
(Sect. V, C)

Was the Bidder's database complete to meet the redistricting project's needs? **Y/N YES**
(Sect. V, F)

J. Resumes

YES/NO YES

1. Key Personnel

The bidder must provide detailed resumes for all management, supervisory and key personnel to be assigned to the contract.

2. Relevance of Contribution

Resumes must substantiate prior experience with redistricting projects of comparable population and racial/ethnic diversity to those required by this bid. Resumes must include:

- Project start and end dates.
- The individual's primary responsibilities relevant to successfully completing the project(s), and
- A description of litigation for any project referenced and the outcome of that litigation.

3. Knowledge and Expertise in Redistricting

Resumes must specify project experience illustrating that the Contractor, Contractor's staff and/or Contractor's sub-contractor (if any) have knowledge and/or expertise in the following areas:

- a. The Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965;
- b. California Constitution, Article 21, Section 2;
- c. The Geography of California as related to redistricting;
- d. The population diversity of California as related to redistricting;
- f. Census data as related to redistricting;
- g. The application of GIS-related databases to the problems of redistricting; and
- h. Applicable provisions of the California Elections Code.

BIDDER RESUMES

Knowledge / Experience Area	Knowledge and/or Experience?
The Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965	YES / NO YES
California Constitution, Article 21, Section 2	YES / NO YES
The Geography of California as related to redistricting	YES / NO No
The population diversity of California as related to redistricting	YES / NO YES
Census data as related to redistricting	YES / NO YES
The application of GIS-related databases to the problems of redistricting	YES / NO YES
Applicable provisions of the California Elections Code	YES / NO YES

Resume Work Sheet

Bidder Rose Institute Date March 16, 2011

Team Member Name Raul Villanueva, Marian M. Johnston

Name: Doug Johnson		Current Title / Position: Project Leader	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N <u>yes</u>	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N <u>yes as to 1 project</u>
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: Chief technical consultant to AZ Commission, assisted with redistricting over 30 public entities, half of which are in CA No other specific information provided			
Litigation? Not Provided		Results of Litigation? Not Provided	

Name: Dr. Andrew Busch		Current Title / Position: Institute Director	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Not Provided	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Not Provided
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: Management and Strategic Project (sic) No other specific information provided			
Litigation? Not Provided		Results of Litigation? Not Provided	

Name: Dr. Kenneth Miller		Current Title / Position: Rose Institute Assoc. Director	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date N/A	End Date N/A	Location: N/A	
Primary Responsibilities: Management and Strategic Project (sic) No other specific information provided			
Litigation? N/A		Results of Litigation? N/A	

Name: Dr. Florence Adams		Current Title / Position: Associate Director (retired)	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N YES	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N Not Provided
Start Date Not Provided	End Date Not Provided	Location: Multiple	
Primary Responsibilities: Not provided. Lists over 30 CA public entities she has consulted with for redistricting. No specific information apart from the names of the entities.			
Litigation? Not Provided		Results of Litigation? Not Provided	

Name: Bipasa Nadon		Current Title / Position: Assistant to the Director	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date N/A	End Date N/A	Location: N/A	
Primary Responsibilities: Management and strategic project			

Name: Dr. Lisa Handley		Current Title / Position: Racially Polarized Voting Expert	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N YES	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N Not Provided
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
<p>Primary Responsibilities: Advisor (?) role not delineated; not clear if she is being brought in as a contractor or as a staffperson.</p> <p>Experience as a VRA expert witness, line drawing.</p> <p>Note: within the last 10 years: Worked as a consultant for Democratic Party of Ohio and Pennsylvania</p>			
Litigation? YES – role not described		Results of Litigation? Not Provided	

Name: Justin Levett		Current Title / Position: Fellow	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N YES	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N Not Provided
Start Date	End Date	Location: Not Provided	
<p>Primary Responsibilities: Role not identified.</p> <p>NOTE: Worked for Assembly Republican Caucus in Sacramento 2006-2007 (“analyzing bills and supporting the floor team”)</p>			

Name: Jacinth Sohi		Current Title / Position: Manager	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
<p>Primary Responsibilities: role not identified</p>			

Name: David Meyer		Current Title / Position: GIS Director	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities :role not delineated, mapping experience			

Name: Ryan Boone		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: Role not delineated.			

Name: Chloe Cotton		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities::Role not delineated.			
Note: Summer intern for Democratic Senator of Alaska			

Name: Nathan Folk		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: Role not delineated.			

Name: Emily McNab		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: Role not delineated.			
Name: Aditya Pai		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: Role not delineated.			
Name: Helen Pollock		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: Role not delineated.			
NOTE: Intern for Republic Assembly Office of Policy in Sacramento			
Name: Samuel Stone		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	
Primary Responsibilities: :Role not delineated.			
Note: Intern with Democratic Senator from California			

Name: Kathryn Yao		Current Title / Position: Associate	
Prior redistricting Experience?	Y/N NO	Comparable Pop/Diversity	Y/N N/A
Start Date	End Date	Location:	