

Subject: Citizens Redistricting Commission: Technical Consultant Invitation For Bid
From: Tony Quinn [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, Mar 10, 2011 at 5:37 PM
Subject: Written Question on IFB
To: daniel.claypool@crc.ca.gov

I am submitting the following written question to you in your role as Project Manager on the CRC IFB.

Question on the IFB:

California has a population of 37 million people. In the original and revised IFB, bidders were required to provide “customer experience references” showing redistricting experience in areas equal to California Metropolitan Statistical Areas, with populations from roughly 2.1 million people to 12.8 million people. Now the IFB has been changed and bidders only need show experience in cities ranging in population from less than 500,000 to 4.1 million.

Why is the population reference level lowered from a population the size of an MSA to the much smaller population the size of a city, given the need to show the ability to redistrict a state of 37 million people?

MSAs represent the full urbanized community whereas cities are merely incorporated entities. Given the “community of interest” criteria in the law, why were MSAs dropped for much less relevant incorporated cities?

Your addendum was filed on March 9, the last day to submit intent to bid. Does this timing not discriminate against potential bidders who received inadequate notice of your change in the bid standards?

Does not your failure to provide adequate notice invalidate your IFB addendum?

I will await your answers to these questions.

Thank you.

Tony Quinn

Tony Quinn
New E-Mail: [REDACTED]
New Home Page:
<http://www.tonyquinnhomepage.com>

Good morning Mr Quinn,

In a post-release review of the Invitation For Bid (IFB) immediately following its release, we determined that our Customer Experience requirement might be too restrictive. We moved the criteria from Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) to specific cities in order to expand the pool of potential bidders for this project.

We do not believe the change was problematic for any potential bidder, for two reasons. First, the intention to bid is not binding on bidders and bidders can submit bids even though they haven't registered an intention to bid. The process is very flexible. Second, no bidder questioned the use of the MSAs as the basis for the "Customer Experience References" and no bidder has presented a question or a protest at the change to using cities instead of MSAs.

Finally, we believe that we have given bidders adequate notice to adjust to this change and we believe this is reflected in that fact that no bidder or potential bidder has registered a question or a complaint over the timing or conditions of the amendment since we posted it two days ago.

Thank you for expressing your concerns.

Daniel M. Claypool
Executive Director
Citizens Redistricting Commission
Tel: 916.322.3770

From: **Tony Quinn** [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, Mar 11, 2011 at 3:10 PM
Subject: RE: Citizens Redistricting Commission: Technical Consultant Invitation For Bid
To: "Claypool, Daniel" <daniel.claypool@crc.ca.gov>
Cc: Kirk Miller <kirk.miller@crc.ca.gov>, Rob Wilcox <rob.wilcox@crc.ca.gov>

Dear Mr. Claypool:

Thank you for your prompt responses to my questions. They raise further questions:

- Did the Commission approve the changes in the IFB? My recollection is that the Commission voted to approve the IFB in February with the MSA standard.
- You say "the intention to bid is not binding on bidders." I am sorry but in my world words mean what they say, and the IFB lists " Key action dates and time by which action must be taken or completed," and "Last day to submit an intention to bid: 3/09/2011." Would not the reasonable bidder assume that March 9 is the final day to make a decision to bid?

- You say that “no bidder questioned the use of the MSAs.” Well, how did you then determine that the original standard was too restrictive if no one questioned it?
- Finally, you say the reason you made the change, absent request from a bidder, is to “expand the pool of potential bidders,” to which I must ask, why? There are plenty of potential bidders throughout the country who have done redistricting at the state or MSA level. Further, your new standard would accept as an experience level of redistricting an area the size of the city of Riverside, which is smaller than a congressional, senate or assembly district. How could that level of experience be sufficient to redistrict a state of 37 million people?

Thank you for this opportunity to respond, and would you kindly post these responses with my original questions.

Tony Quinn