

## **Inmate Reallocation RFP**

Through your research and discussions with NCSL around this topic, it sounds like many states completing inmate data reallocation used internal data staff for some or all of the reallocation process that we are seeking a contractor for. For this reason, I think limiting the qualifications requirements to only contractors who have specifically completed inmate data reallocation for congressional or legislative redistricting restricts our pool of potential applicants, and requiring 3 references for that very specific work might eliminate the pool entirely. Because the technical work we are asking for (e.g., address cleaning and standardization, geocoding, adjusting population data, etc.) is applicable to other work in the field of data, I think we can broaden the definition of previous experience while still ensuring any potential contractors are capable of demonstrating that they can do the work. Thus, my suggested edits to the "Offeror Qualifications" section are as follows:

### **OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS**

#### **References**

Offeror shall provide a minimum of three references using the attached client references forms. The references must be from clients that are currently using or have previously **used geocoded addresses and Census data similar to** the type proposed in this RFP. The references may include state governments or universities for whom the offeror, preferably within the last 10 years, has successfully completed **address geocoding and merging that data to polygon shapefiles or similar mapping data or tables.** At a minimum, the offeror shall provide the company name, location where **the services** were provided, contact person(s), contact telephone number, e-mail address, and a complete description of **the data provided**, and dates of service. These references may be contacted to verify offeror's ability to perform the contract. The State reserves the right to use any information or additional references deemed necessary to establish the ability of the offeror to perform the contract. Negative references may be grounds for proposal disqualification.

#### **Company Profile and Experience**

Offeror shall provide documentation establishing the individual or company submitting the proposal has the qualifications and experience to provide the specified in this RFP, including, at a minimum:

- a detailed description of any similar past projects where the contractor cleaned and geocoded residential addresses, **merged addresses or points with polygons, and has worked with Census data shapefiles or similar formats,** including a description of services provided and dates the services were provided;
- the client for whom the services were provided; and
- a general description of the firm including its primary source of business, organizational structure and size, number of employees, years of experience performing services similar to those described within this RFP.

I also think 8(b) of the "Scope of Work" section should say that the contractor will provide the final adjusted data to us but that Caliper, our redistricting software vendor, would do the actual upload to Maptitude. That potential edit would read:

### **Scope of Work & Contractor Responsibilities**

The services must include the following tasks:

8. Return adjusted P. L. 94-171 data to the commission and Caliper for use in Maptitude. The dataset may only be considered to be returned to the commission when the contractor has:
- (a) reestablished the tabular relationships between the adjusted P.L. 94-171 data and the TIGER/Line shapefiles; and
  - (b) provided all of the necessary files to Caliper for upload to Maptitude.

### **Commission Responsibilities**

- Provide contractor with inmate addresses collected by the Montana Department of Corrections as an Excel or .csv file.
- Respond to contractor questions during the contract period to ensure the contractor has the guidance necessary to complete the task.
- Verify that the dataset has been received in the proper format and uploaded to Maptitude by Caliper.

### **Racial Bloc Voting Analysis RFP**

For the Racial Bloc Voting Analysis RFP, I have two smaller suggested edits. The first is a clarification about VTDs in the "Introduction":

#### **Introduction**

Montana has complete coverage of voting districts (VTDs) for the 2020 Census but did not have complete VTD coverage for the 2010 Census. Of Montana's 56 counties, 20 did not participate in the U.S. Census Bureau's Voting District Project in 2010. Six of those counties include portions of five reservations. With adoption of the current legislative plan in 2013, counties adjusted/finalized current precinct lines prior to the 2014 election, with minimal precinct consolidation and splitting since 2013.

The second edit would be under the "Offeror Qualifications" section. Similar to the edits I'm suggesting for the Inmate Reallocation RFP, I think we should broaden the current language slightly to include potential contractors who may have completed racial bloc analysis for legal proceedings and served as expert witnesses. For this project, I think it's correct to require that they have completed the specific task of racial bloc voting analysis, but given how common racial bloc voting analysis is in VRA lawsuits and that the State wouldn't always necessarily be the client, I think we should add to the list of entities that might be references.

### **OFFEROR QUALIFICATIONS**

#### **References**

Offeror shall provide a minimum of three references using the attached client reference forms. The references must be from clients that are currently using or have previously received racial bloc voting analysis of the type proposed in this RFP. The references may include state governments, organizations involved in legal disputes concerning Voting Rights Act claims, or other entities similar to the commission for whom the offeror, preferably within the last 10 years, has successfully completed a racial bloc voting analysis.