



# COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

## Independent Redistricting Commission

### COMMISSIONERS

David Bame, Chair  
Sonia Diaz, Vice Chair  
Colleen Brown  
Amy Caterina  
Chris Chen  
Elidia Dostal  
Rosette Garcia  
Barbara Hansen  
Kenneth Inman  
Kristina Kruglyak  
Arvid Larson  
Fernandez Ponds  
John Russ  
Rameses Surban

### AGENDA ITEM

**DATE:** January 28, 2021

**Item 6**

**TO:** Independent Redistricting Commission

**SUBJECT: REVIEW AND POTENTIAL ACTION ON AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE PROPOSAL FOR COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

#### **Ad Hoc Subcommittee Proposal for Competitive Procurement Process – Summary Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) Meeting, January 28, 2021**

At the IRC Meeting on January 14th, an ad hoc subcommittee was created to review all proposals related to the competitive procurement process and to propose one additional option for consideration by the full IRC. The subcommittee was also tasked with recommending whether the Demographer/Mapping Software RFP should be separated into two unique RFPs. The subcommittee met on January 20th and made modifications to the County’s ‘Option 1’ regarding the competitive procurement process.

The goals of the ad hoc subcommittee were to ensure a high level of public input, increase participation by the full IRC, and allow for a confidential selection process to protect the integrity of the RFP. The main differences from ‘Option 1’ are the creation of an ad hoc subcommittee to finalize each RFP and having the SSC make a recommendation to award. Having a subcommittee for this deliverable, rather than the full IRC iterating on the document over multiple IRC meetings, will expedite the process. Having the SSC make an award recommendation, rather than an award decision, allows for concurrence of the recommendation by the full IRC in a public meeting.

The RFP ad hoc subcommittees would consist of three IRC members: one (1) with direct RFP experience and two (2) selected by random draw. County Staff would provide these subcommittees the current Evaluation Criteria, Submittal Requirements and Statement of Work drafts and any relevant supporting documents, including example RFPs from other locales for reference. The proposed Evaluation Criteria, Submittal Requirements and Statement of Work would be presented publicly for review in an Industry Day for Procurements (possibly noticed as an IRC Special Meeting) and applicable public feedback would be incorporated ahead of the subsequent full IRC Meeting. At this meeting, the draft RFP would be presented to the full IRC to either adopt or reject. If adopted, the RFP would be posted for two (2) weeks to allow Offerors to respond. If rejected, the ad hoc subcommittee would revise the draft RFP per IRC feedback and the process would repeat at the

**SUBJECT: REVIEW AND POTENTIAL ACTION ON AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE  
PROPOSAL FOR COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT PROCESS**

subsequent IRC Meeting. Once the final RFP is adopted, the ad hoc subcommittee would be dissolved.

Upon closure of the posting period, a confidential 3-to-6 person SSC composed only of County Staff would convene to review and score all Offerors per the IRC defined criteria in the RFP. The final number of members will be defined following recommendation from County Staff. After completion of review, County Staff will present an award recommendation to the full IRC at the following regular IRC meeting which will be subject to the IRC's concurrence and vote. If the IRC agrees that the SSC accurately applied the scoring criteria in determining their recommended Offeror, the IRC would concur with the recommendation. If the IRC concluded that the scoring criteria were inaccurately applied, they would reject the recommendation with explanation, and the SSC would reconvene to re-score Offerors. At the following full IRC meeting, the SSC would present either a revised recommendation or propose an alternate appropriate action for IRC concurrence. Once the award recommendation is adopted by the full IRC, County Staff would, subject to successful negotiations, finalize and award a contract to the winning Offeror.

Regarding the potential separation of the existing RFP for a Demographer and Mapping Services, the subcommittee recommended keeping the current form, noting that the two functions are tightly coupled and should be hired from a single RFP. Additionally, the subcommittee could not find an example of another IRC that separated these functions. The subcommittee did recommend clarifying the RFP title, noting that mapping software largely falls under Demographer Services, and if stated separately could be misunderstood to refer to a unique deliverable.