

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ELECTRONIC POLLBOOKS

WA19004

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is issued and conducted by the Utah Division of Purchasing (the Division), the State, to seek competitive Proposals for electronic pollbooks, WA19004 (the Project). A complete and responsive Proposal will contain all required elements detailed in this Request for Proposals (“RFP”). This RFP is issued and administered pursuant to authority provided in Utah Code § 63G-6a-Part 7 and the applicable administrative rules. The Contract will be procured using best value as a basis of selection, taking into consideration the price and evaluation criteria identified herein, following the process identified in this RFP.

Following Definitions apply to this solicitation:

- “EPB” – Electronic Pollbook used to check-in voters, send appropriate ballots to printers, and communicate vote history with the state VRDB.
- “VRDB” – Statewide Voter Registration Database that maintains voters’ registration and vote history information.

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The State’s Background

Currently, counties within the State of Utah use a variety of elections equipment and software. The State of Utah currently has contracts with Election Systems & Software (ES&S), [AR2762](#)¹, and Dominion Voting Systems, [AR1910](#)². Counties within Utah are able to use these contracts. There are also counties who have their own contracts for voting solutions from other providers.

To date, most of the counties use a home-grown electronic pollbook solution that interfaces with the VRDB.

This solicitation is being conducted as a State of Utah Cooperative Contract. As such, all public entities in the State of Utah may elect to use the award contract without going through another competitive procurement process.

The State of Utah conducts a minimum of two elections per year and has 29 counties that fall into three tiers:

¹ [Contract AR2762](#) expires on November 19, 2027

² [Contract AR1910](#) expires on December 31, 2020.

	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Registered Voters	904,071	400,337	342,731
Number of Counties	2	3	24
Average Number of EPBs Required per County	200	35	5
Average Number of In-Person Votes per County (presidential election)	135,611	60,051	51,410

Problem Statement

The State does not currently have a viable EPB solution.

Expectations for Deliverables

- Completely interface with State's VRDB system to transmit and receive updated voter history at or near real time. This includes the State's current VRDB and future upgrades or enhancements to the State's VRDB system.
- Maintain functionality and accurate information in the event of network or power outages and be fully recoverable in the event of device failure
- Must be auditable
- Interface with different election vendor solutions used in polling locations
- Current and maintained security for voter information
- Support services for polling location volunteers
- Meet all State of Utah Department of Technology Services requirements

Project Goals

The State seeks to enter into a contract for electronic pollbook solution(s) that will interface with the State's VRDB system to validate voters and create and print ballots with multiple different election vendor solutions used by counties across the State.

II. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Proposal Acceptance

The Proposal shall consist of a Technical Proposal and Price Proposal. The Technical Proposal contents are set forth in Attachments D-1, D-2, and D-3. The Proposal evaluation will be based on both Pass/Fail criteria and a combined evaluation of price and technical evaluation criteria. Offerors will also be evaluated on their interviews with the State. The Price Proposal contents are set forth in Attachment C.

Pre-Proposal Meeting

A pre-proposal process meeting will be held on Friday, November 9, 2018 at 10:00 AM (Mountain Time) with the Division of Purchasing to provide information to Offerors regarding this procurement process. Please RSVP to waphayrath@utah.gov by Thursday, November 8, 2018 at 2:00 PM (Mountain Time).

All pre-proposal meetings will be recorded and posted as amendments to the RFP.

Examination of RFP

It is the sole responsibility of the Offerors to examine, with appropriate care and diligence prior to submitting its response to the RFP, the RFP and all conditions which may in any way affect its response or performance under the Contract (if awarded).

Number of Anticipated Contracts

The State intends to award a single contract to the Offeror that has the highest total combined score.

Anticipated Schedule

The following is the anticipated schedule for this procurement. The Division reserves the right to alter these dates. All deadlines are prevailing (Daylight or Standard) Mountain Time.

ACTIVITY	DATE
RFP issued	November 2, 2018
Offeror Pre-Proposal Process Webinar Google Meeting	November 9, 2018, 10:00 AM Mountain Time
Deadline for Questions during the Question and Answer Period	November 27, 2018 at 2:00 PM Mountain Time
RFP Offeror Submittals Due Date	December 7, 2018 at 2:00 PM Mountain Time
Interview including product demonstration	December 12-14, 2018 (Times to be announced)
Identification of Potential Awarded Offeror	December 14, 2018
Clarification Kick Off Meeting (on site)	January 8, 2019 (Time to be announced)
Signing of Contract	January 22, 2019

Offerors are required to meet the dates set for the meetings and the information submittal outlined in the summary sheet. Failure to meet these dates may result in the proposal being considered non-responsive.

Offer Forms

Offers shall include the following Offer Forms completed accurately, in the format provided and according to any instructions contained within the form. Failure to follow Offer Form instructions may result in disqualification.

Attachment	Form	Section that Describes Form	Value
Attachment A	RFP Cover Page, Declaration & Checklist	IV.1.a	Pass / Fail
Attachment B	Key Personnel Proposal Form	IV.1.b	Pass / Fail
Attachment C	Price Proposal Form	IV.1.c	Pass / Fail

Attachment D	Project Capability Submittal (LE, RA, VA) Checklist and Format	IV.1.d	Pass / Fail
Attachment D1	Level of Expertise (LE) Plan	IV.1.d	Value
Attachment D2	Risk Assessment (RA) Plan	IV.1.d	Value
Attachment D3	Value Added (VA) Plan	IV.1.d	Value

Submitting a Response

All proposals must be submitted electronically through SciQuest. It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure that they have completed all requirements, read and reviewed all documents, submitted all required information, uploaded all required forms, and submitted their proposal prior to the closing time. Even if an Offeror completes all sections, but does not submit their proposal, the State of Utah Division of Purchasing will not be able to receive their proposal and they will be deemed non-responsive.

All proposals are due no later than 2:00 PM Mountain Time, December 7, 2018. Late proposals shall not be accepted.

All materials submitted become the property of the State unless otherwise requested by the Offeror in writing at time of submission.

Materials may be evaluated by anyone designated by the State as part of the evaluation committee.

All costs incurred in the preparation and presentation of the proposal response will be paid entirely by the Offeror. Any costs incurred in making necessary studies or designs for the preparation will be paid entirely by the Offeror.

III. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

To determine which proposal provides the best value to the conducting procurement unit, the evaluation committee shall evaluate each responsive and responsible proposal that has not been disqualified from consideration under the provisions of Part 7 of Utah Code 63G-6a, using the criteria described in this RFP.

An evaluation committee will evaluate and score the responses to the RFP based on the information provided in each response and the State's evaluation of the Offeror's understanding of the objectives of this project. The State may elect to contact listed references to gather information specific to their past history with the Offeror's firm.

Proposals will be reviewed based on the five criteria listed below. These points have been evaluated as critical qualifications to the success of the project.

No.	Rating Criteria	% Weighting
1	Level of Expertise Plan (LE)	25
2	Risk Assessment Plan (RA)	10
3	Value Added Plan (VA)	10
4	Interview/Product Demo	30
5	Price Proposal Form	25

Scoring Methodology

Offerors' responses to all of the rating categories, except price, will be scored using the following methodology:

The evaluation team will provide a score using the above mentioned methodology using the following:

- 1 point – Offeror has demonstrated experience but was poor performing with supporting metrics
- 5 points – Offeror has no experience or experience with no demonstrated or verifiable metrics
- 10 points – Offeror has experience and is high performing with supporting or verifiable metrics

Evaluation of the Price Proposal Form will be the Offeror with the lowest cost proposal will receive all points available. All other vendors will receive a percentage of points as it relates to the lowest cost proposal. The State reserves the right to reject any Proposal if it determines that the Price Proposal is significantly unbalanced to the potential detriment of the State.

Description of Submittal Process and Evaluation Process

Questions Regarding Solicitation

All questions must be submitted through SciQuest during the Question and Answer period.

The Question and Answer period closes on the date and time specified on SciQuest. All questions must be submitted through SciQuest during the Question and Answer period. Answers from the State will be posted on SciQuest. Questions may include notifying the State of any ambiguity, inconsistency, scope exception, excessively restrictive requirement, or other errors in this RFP. Questions are encouraged.

Questions may be answered individually or may be compiled into one document.

Questions may also be answered via an addendum. An answered question or an addendum may modify the specification or requirements of this RFP. Answered questions and addenda will be posted on SciQuest. Offerors should periodically check SciQuest for

answered questions and addenda before the closing date. It is the responsibility of the Offerors to submit their proposals as required by this RFP, including any requirements contained in an answered question and/or addenda.

Submittal Process

To ensure that a proposal is complete and addresses all key RFP issues, proposals must adhere to the following format.

Proposals shall be organized into the following sections, in the order listed, and inclusive of all requested information:

- a) RFP Cover Page, Declaration and Checklist - Offerors will prepare and submit the RFP Cover Page, Declaration and Checklist – Using Attachment A, complete the forms.
- b) Key Personnel – Using Attachment B, complete the Key Personnel Proposal Form. The Offerors shall provide the name of the Primary Project Lead (the personnel must be the person who will be interviewed if shortlisted) that the Offerors propose to provide services pursuant to a resultant contract.
- c) Price Proposal Form – Using Attachment C, complete the Price Proposal Form. The price proposal form must provide the fully-loaded cost per electronic pollbook unit for the full length of the contract.
- d) Project Capability (PC) Submittal - The Project Capability Submittal has three components; Level of Expertise Plan (LE), Risk Assessment Plan (RA), and Value-Added Plan (VA). See Attachments D, D1, D2 and D3.
 - i. Purpose of PC Submittal
 - (i) Assist Division in prioritizing Offerors submittals based on their expertise and ability to understand and deliver the deliverables for the project.
 - (ii) Provide high performing Offerors the opportunity to differentiate themselves from their competitors due to their experience and expertise by using verifiable performance metrics and previous performance results.
 - ii. PC Submittal Format Requirements
 - (i) PC submittal must **NOT** contain any names that can be used to identify who the Offerors are (such as firm names, personnel names, Project names, or product names).
 - (ii) A PC proposal template is included in this RFP. This document must be used by all Offerors. Offerors are NOT allowed to re-create, re-format, or modify the template in any manner. Offerors must type their responses on the Word template provided.
 - (iii) Failure to comply with any of the PC format requirements may result in disqualification.
 - (iv) The PC submittal shall not contain any marketing information. The submittal should be used to prove to the State that the Offeror has expertise for the specific project being proposed on.
 - iii. Overview of the Level of Expertise Plan - The Level of Expertise Plan is to allow

Offerors to differentiate themselves based on their technical capability and understanding of the State's specific needs. Offerors should identify high performance claims based on their expertise and experience supported by verifiable performance metrics that show the capability to this specific project environment and requirement. All cost associated with technical capabilities listed in the LE plan must be included in the price proposal form. (See Attachments C and D1).

- iv. Overview of the Risk Assessment Plan - Offerors should list and prioritize major risk items that are caused by other stakeholders on this project that could cause the Offeror's "vision" or "plan" to deviate or not meet the expectations of the client (i.e., risks that the Offeror does not control). This includes sources, causes or actions that are beyond the scope of the contract that may cause cost increases, delays, change orders, or dissatisfaction to the State. Do not include in this submittal any risks caused by a lack of the Offeror's technical competency. The risks should be described in simple and clear terms so that non-technical personnel can understand the risk. Offerors must also explain how they will mitigate, manage, and/or minimize the risk. The supporting performance information can include how many times the risk was previously mitigated, and the impact on the performance on the project in terms of customer satisfaction (see Attachment D2).
- v. Overview of the Value-Added Section - The purpose of the Value-Added Plan is to provide Offerors with an opportunity to identify any value-added options or ideas that may benefit the State. These options or ideas may also be referred to as additional or optional services. Where applicable, the Offeror should identify: 1) what the State may have excluded or omitted from its scope; and 2) how these options or ideas have been successful through verifiable performance information of previous projects. The Offeror should list the cost and time impact of its options or ideas. The ideas identified in the Value-Added Plan must NOT be included in the Offeror's Price Proposal Form. (See Attachment C and D3).
- e) Interviews including product demonstrations - The Offerors will be required to participate in a 30-minute interview, and a 15-minute product demonstration. The State selection committee will interview only the Offeror's project lead. Interviews may be held either in person or via an electronic method (by telephone, Google Hangouts, etc.)
- f) Clarification Phase - The potential best-value Offerors will be required to perform the Clarification Phase functions outlined in Attachment E. The intent of this period is to allow the Offerors an opportunity to clarify their proposal, address any issues or risks, allow The State to add any concerns, and to prepare a Clarification Phase document. If the State cannot come to an agreement with the potential best-value Offeror then the State may move onto the next best-value Offeror.

IV. Award

After the evaluation and final scoring of proposals is completed, the State shall award the contract as soon as practicable (subject to the requirements of Utah Code Section 63G-6a-708)

to the eligible responsive and responsible Offeror, subject to Utah Code Section 63G-6a-709(2), provided the RFP is not canceled in accordance with Utah Code Section 63G-6a-709(2)(b).

The State will notify each Offeror of the State's selection in writing.

- a. The State reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and to award to more than one Offeror and to other than the lowest-priced Offeror. The decision of the RFP award(s) by the State is final.
- b. The State at its sole discretion may decide to take no procurement action as a result of the RFP and/or may re-issue all or portions of the RFP.
- c. The State reserves the right to accept or reject without consideration proposals that do not address the full requirements of the RFP or that do not reach the designated address and contact before the proposal due date and time identified.

The final award(s) is dependent upon the Offeror's Scope of Work (SOW) being acceptable to the State. Proposal responses and contents provided by the Offeror will be considered contractual obligations. Any existing agreements with the selected Offeror are construed as representative of minimum terms and conditions between the State and the Offeror. Any new or unique requirements as a result of the RFP response can be added or amended, at the State's sole option, to the existing agreements. It should be understood that obligations of confidentiality will be an important condition of any resulting contractual arrangement. The selected Offeror and all employees performing duties on this project will be required to keep all aspects of this project in confidence.

The awarded Offeror's performance will be tracked through the Weekly Risk Report System (See Attachment F).

V. Length of Contract

It is anticipated that the awarded contract will have a term of 10 years.

VI. Price Guarantee Period

Offeror must guarantee its pricing for the length of the contract.

VII. Administrative Fee

If an Offeror is awarded a contract from this RFP then it is required to provide a quarterly utilization report.

The following Contract Administrative Fee and Quarterly Report requirements will apply to the awarded contract:

Quarterly Administrative Fee: The Administrative Fee will be 0% and will apply to all purchases (net of any returns, credits, or adjustments) made under the awarded contract.

Quarterly Utilization Report: Offeror agrees to provide a quarterly utilization report, reflecting net sales to the State during the associated fee period. The report will show the dollar volume of purchases by each Eligible User. The quarterly report will be provided in secure electronic format through the Division’s Automated Vendor Usage Management System found at: <https://statecontracts.utah.gov/Vendor>.

Report Schedule: The quarterly utilization report shall be made in accordance with the following schedule:

Period Ends:	Reports Due:
March 31st	April 30th
June 30th	July 31st
September 30th	October 31st
December 31st	January 31st

Fee Payment: After the Division of Purchasing receives the quarterly utilization report, it will send the Offeror an invoice for the total quarterly administrative fee owed to the Division of Purchasing. Offeror shall pay the quarterly administrative fee within thirty (30) days from receipt of invoice.

Timely Reports and Fees: If the quarterly administrative fee is not paid by thirty (30) days of receipt of invoice or the quarterly utilization report is not received by the report due date, then the Offeror will be in material breach of the awarded contract.

Eligible User(s): Pursuant to the Utah Procurement Code the following entities are Eligible Users and are allowed to use the awarded contracts.

This State of Utah Cooperative Contract will be for the benefit of all Utah public entities, nonprofit organizations, and agencies of the federal government, i.e. State of Utah departments, agencies, and institutions, political subdivisions (colleges, universities, school districts, special service districts, cities and counties, etc.).

The following Eligible Users are allowed to use the awarded contract: State of Utah’s government departments, institutions, agencies, political subdivisions (i.e., colleges, school districts, counties, cities, etc.), and, as applicable, nonprofit organizations, agencies of the federal government, or any other entity authorized by the laws of the State of Utah to participate in State Cooperative Contracts will be allowed to use this Contract.

Each Eligible User is considered an individual customer. Each Eligible User will be responsible to follow the terms and conditions of this RFP. Eligible Users will be responsible for their own charges, fees, and liabilities. Contractor shall apply the charges to each Eligible User individually. The State is not responsible for any unpaid invoice.