

County of Los Angeles Quality and Productivity Commission
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUND PROPOSAL

Department: Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk

Date: October 7, 2009

Project Name: Voting Systems Assessment Project

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (Describe project, e.g., new or replacement equipment, additional staff, etc.)

The County of Los Angeles is currently using an aging voting system that will need to be overhauled or replaced. The Department proposes to establish a participatory process to allow for citizen/public input, to help identify the needs and expectations a new voting system must meet for County voters. The project will conduct a series of focus groups and forums with voters from diverse communities (e.g. ethnic/immigrant, disability, youth), community leaders, election integrity advocates, and city clerks to compile data about the type of voting system that will best serve all voters. In addition the project will hold a series of focused meetings with academics, technology experts, and regulatory agencies to explore and identify possible market-based or public development and/or customization voting system solutions best suited for LA County.

SUMMARY OF BENEFITS TO BE ACHIEVED (i.e., revenue increase, service enhancement, future cost avoidance, cost savings, etc.)

Acquiring and implementing new voting systems carries a high degree of risk if the system does not meet the needs of voters and other stakeholders (e.g. cities that consolidate elections). The following is a summary of the benefits that could be achieved:

- Lead to the development of a customized voting system for Los Angeles County;
- Enhance services to voters by providing a voting system more responsive to their needs. Also expect better system means better performance from poll workers;
- Increase voter confidence in the voting system;
- Potential increases in revenue if more local districts decide to consolidate elections;
- Possible cost avoidance by reducing potential for lawsuits due to an inaccessible or noncompliant voting system.

EVALUATION/PERFORMANCE MEASURES (What is to be achieved and how will the project lead to enhanced quality and/or productivity? What measures will be used to evaluate the attainment of these goals)

The project will allow the RR/CC to collect important data that will inform its recommendations for the acquisition and/or development and implementation of a new voting system. It will also help establish a new participatory process for acquiring and implementing large scale serviced-based systems in Los Angeles County. Specifically the project will produce:

- Focus group, forum, and meeting summary reports ;
- Process summary to serve as a case study for serviced-based systems implementation;
- Report to the Board of Supervisors recommending adoption of a comprehensive strategic process for modernizing our voting systems.

County of Los Angeles Quality and Productivity Commission
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENT FUND PROPOSAL

If this is an Information Technology project, is IT form attached? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	If loan, indicate repayment period (3 year maximum without special approval):	Amount Requested:		
		<u>Loan</u>	<u>Grant</u>	<u>Total</u>
		0.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00

Cost Analysis Summary. Attach detail for A and B, including staff, equipment, supplies, etc.

	<u>Implementation Period</u>	<u>Project Year 1</u>	<u>Project Year 2</u>	<u>Project Year 3</u>
A. Annual Cost Of Current Process:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
B. Estimated Annual Cost Of Proposal:	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
C. Savings (B-A)		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Funds Flow Summary: Indicate the amount of funds needed during the project implementation by period (i.e., quarter, subsequent year(s), etc.): Should funds be made available, funding will be expended during the December 2009 to March 2010 period.

Quarter 1 (December 2009 – February 2010) \$ 42,000.00

Quarter 2 (March 2010 – May 2010) \$ 8,000.00

Productivity Manager (Print and Sign) <i>Ann Smith</i> <i>Ann Smith</i> Telephone Number (562) 462-2665	Project Manager (Print and Sign) Efrain Escobedo <i>[Signature]</i> Telephone Number (562) 462-2721
Department Head (Print and Sign) Dean C. Logan <i>[Signature]</i> Telephone Number (562) 462-2729	Budget/Finance Manager (Print and Sign) <i>Ann Smith</i> <i>Ann Smith</i> Telephone Number (562) 462-2665

1. Has this proposal been submitted before for a Productivity Investment Fund loan or Innovation Grant? Yes No

If so, when (date)?

2. Was this proposal included in the department's current budget request?

Yes No If not, why not? Process is not part of regular

Departmental operations. In addition the project had not been proposed until after budget process was complete.

3. How much of this proposal is for a loan and how much for grant funding?

Loan \$ 0.00 Grant \$ 50,000.00 Total \$ 50,000.00

4. How many years will it take for the loan to be paid back (3 years maximum without special approval)?

5. When will the funds be needed? Please indicate by Fiscal Years and Quarters:

2009-2010 <u> X </u>	2010-2011 <u> <input type="checkbox"/> </u>
2011-2012 <u> <input type="checkbox"/> </u>	2012-2013 <u> <input type="checkbox"/> </u>

6. Where will the funds come from to repay the loan? (N/A)

Hard dollar savings	Cost Avoidance
Revenue generation	Other (please explain below):

7. If this is a grant, does it reduce net County cost? No.

8. Does this proposal provide technology transferability to other departments? No.

9. Does this proposal eliminate a function? No.

10. Does this proposal enhance the County image and/or provide an innovative service?

Yes. The project will significantly increase the transparency of the County's elections process, increase voter confidence, and enhance County's image of responsiveness to needs of its citizens. As a one-of-a-kind election practice the County will likely receive national recognition as a leader in enhancing democracy in the United States with a high degree of transparency and accountability.

11. Does this proposal promote interdepartmental cooperation?

Yes. The replicability of this process will provide a model for other County departments who seek to implement systems that serve the public or other stakeholders. The process will also promote greater cooperation with the Chief Information Technology Office.

12. Has this proposal gone through a pilot?

No.

13. Where did the original idea for this project come from?

The idea was developed as part of the Department's strategic goal to overhaul its aging voting system. The commitment to a participatory process is part of an overall Department philosophy and its positive experiences with its Community Voter Outreach Committee, which has helped to enhance county services to communities of interest (e.g. language minorities and voters with disabilities) for the past ten years.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

KEY MILESTONES	START DATE	FUNDS NEEDED	FUNDS REPAID
(Major steps in the project development)	(Estimated date for each project step)	(Amount and which quarter funds will be needed)	(Amount and which quarter funds will be repaid)
Roundtable with Voting Technology Experts	December 2009	\$2,000.00	\$
Voter focus groups and forums	December 2009	\$30,000.00	
Focus Group and Forum Summary	January 2010	\$10,000.00	
Roundtable on the Regulatory Environment for Voting Systems	February 2010	\$2,000.00	
Process Summary	March 2010	\$6,000.00	
Final report to Board of Supervisors/Executive Office	June 2010	\$0	

LINE ITEM BUDGET DETAIL**Salaries and Employee Benefits**

Salaries/Wages	\$ 0.00
Employee Benefits	\$ 0.00
(a) Total Salaries and Employee Benefits	\$ 0

Services and Supplies

Focus Group Facilities	\$ 30,000
Meals and beverages for meetings/forums	\$2,000
Travel for meetings	\$2,000
Consultant services for summary reports	\$16,000
(b) Total Services and Supplies	\$ 50,000

Other Charges

List all other charges here

(c) Total Other Charges \$

Fixed Assets

List all equipments and other fixed assets here

(d) Total Fixed Assets \$

TOTAL COSTS (a+b+c+d) \$ 50,000

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STATEMENT

*** NOT APPLICABLE TO THE VOTING SYSTEMS ASSESSMENT PROJECT ***

1. Is the technology of the proposed hardware or software compatible with existing and related systems? Specifically, does it conform to the Automated Business Plan?

2. Does the proposal represent current or state-of-the-art technology?

3. How does the technology-based solution you are requesting conform to your department's strategic or automation plan and the County's direction for future use of technology?

4. Do you have existing knowledge in the technology-based solution you are requesting?

5. Will you be able to support the technology-based solution with existing staff?

6. Will staff have to be trained in the new technology and its supporting infrastructure?

7. Will you be hiring a contractor to provide the technology-based solution, or will you be requesting the hiring of dedicated County staff?