

M I N U T E S

REDISTRICTING TECHNOLOGY SELECTION COMMITTEE

January 31, 1990

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

The meeting of the Redistricting Technology Selection Committee was called to order by Senator Bill Hutchins, Chairperson, on January 31, 1990 at 10:15 a.m. in the Senate Majority Leader's office of the Statehouse, Des Moines, Iowa. Members present in addition to the Chairperson were:

Senator Calvin Hultman
Representative Bob Arnould
Representative Kay Chapman
Representative Harold Van Maanen

Also present were Representative Darrell Hanson, Mr. Greg Nichols, Administrative Assistant to the Senate Majority Leader; Mr. Bob Haus, Director, Senate Republican Caucus; Mr. Joe O'Hern, Chief Clerk of the House; Ms. Judy Vinchattle, Administrative Assistant to the Senate Minority Leader; Mr. Sandy Scharf, Director, Computer Support Bureau; Ms. Diane Bolender, Director, Legislative Service Bureau; Ms. Liz Isaacson, Assistant Chief Clerk of the House; Mr. Dennis Harbaugh, Director, Senate Democratic Caucus; Mr. Gary Kaufman, Senior Legal Counsel, Legislative Service Bureau; Mr. Gary Rudicil, Research Analyst, Legislative Service Bureau; members of the press and other interested persons.

Senator Hultman moved that the minutes of the December 19, 1989, meeting be approved as distributed, and the motion was adopted.

REDISTRICTING COMPUTER VENDOR DISCUSSION

Chairperson Hutchins explained that at its December 20, 1989, meeting, the Legislative Council had directed the Redistricting Technology Selection Committee to negotiate with Election Data Services, Inc. and Public Systems Associates, Inc. for a redistricting computer system with a \$600,000 maximum expenditure, which was less than the original bid of each vendor. He explained that responses to the proposal had been received from each vendor,

and he asked the Committee to consider the responses. Copies of the responses are on file in the Legislative Service Bureau.

Mr. Nichols distributed a list comparing the features offered by Election Data Services, Inc. (EDS) and Public Systems Associates, Inc. (PSA) and a memorandum concerning the selection of EDS as the vendor for the Connecticut redistricting effort. Both are on file with the Legislative Service Bureau.

Chairperson Hutchins noted that both PSA and EDS can currently provide or have expressed a willingness to provide the necessary features of a redistricting computer system for Iowa. He continued that both vendors have national reputations in the field of redistricting and that even though there are several features that EDS does not currently support, EDS has promised to provide these features in the future.

Representative Van Maanen expressed the belief that the comparison between PSA and EDS was not fair because the two systems do not provide exactly the same features. Chairperson Hutchins responded that exactly equal comparisons of the two computer systems are rather difficult. He noted that the final cost proposal from PSA exceeds the \$600,000 maximum expenditure specified by the Legislative Council. He continued that EDS utilizes personal computers that would have an overall value of between \$50,000 and \$100,000 and these computers could be used by the General Assembly after redistricting is completed. Representative Chapman noted that PSA utilizes Microvax mini-computers which would not have as much value to the General Assembly after redistricting because this type of computer is currently not used anywhere else within the legislative branch of government.

In reference to Mr. Nichols' memorandum, Chairperson Hutchins said that Connecticut had narrowed its choice of a redistricting computer vendor to PSA and EDS just as Iowa had, and that a bipartisan legislative committee unanimously chose EDS to provide a computer system for the redistricting process. He also noted that a consultant who was a Republican and was hired by the bipartisan committee had also chosen EDS as his first choice to provide a redistricting computer system to the state. Chairperson Hutchins opined that because of the events in Connecticut, he does not believe EDS is a politically biased firm.

Senator Hultman expressed his support for PSA, recognizing their good reputation and the fact that they could demonstrate most of the features that Iowa is looking for in a redistricting computer system, while EDS still lacks many of the same features. He also expressed concern about EDS's statement that it had tended to support the Democratic party more often in the past than the Republican party. He suggested that because the timeframe for the redistricting process is so strict, a date of July 1, 1990, should

be established as the deadline for the provision of the required computer functions, after which the contract with the vendor would be terminated. Chairperson Hutchins agreed with this deadline.

Chairperson Hutchins noted that to obtain a fair perspective between the costs of the EDS and PSA systems, approximately \$60,000 should be added to the PSA cost proposal because that is the estimated value of the personal computers that would be purchased to run the EDS system, and these personal computers would be retained and used by the General Assembly after redistricting is completed.

Representative Van Maanen expressed some concern about the interpretation of the words "substantially all" to describe the computer features which must be provided by the vendor by the July 1, 1990, deadline. He also stated that a contract between Iowa and either computer vendor should include a guarantee that the vendor will not work for any other organization or individual in Iowa while the redistricting process is progressing. Representative Arnould and Representative Chapman agreed with this suggestion.

Mr. Kaufman said that Option 3 of the most recent PSA cost proposal would require the caucuses to develop their own data bases and this suggests that an additional outside consultant would be needed to provide that service. Therefore, any cost savings under Option 3 would probably be offset by the additional consultant fees. He continued that PSA's Option 2 would require the Legislative Service Bureau to perform some of the original data base work that would otherwise be done by the vendor, but that this added work can most likely be completed by the Legislative Service Bureau staff.

Mr. Nichols suggested that the desirable features not yet provided by PSA and EDS should be ranked in order of their importance so that during contract negotiations, it can be specified which features are most important. Mr. Kaufman said that either 1) the ability to change line widths and colors or 2) the ability to show the names of features or the feature population should definitely be made available by the vendor. Mr. Kaufman continued that a "rest of" function should also be made available as soon as possible. He suggested that several other features should be included in the contract, including a contiguity check and a "cancel" feature. He commented that further negotiation with EDS should take place concerning the ability to use subsets of the state, the ability to calculate "compactness", and the capability to combine and renumber districts in printed reports. Mr. Kaufman noted that most of these features are expected in the June 1990 update of the EDS redistricting software package.

Representative Hanson suggested that any contract with either vendor should include language forbidding the vendor to enter into a contract with any other political party entity within Iowa until September 1, 1991.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Kaufman asked for clarification from the Committee regarding the interpretation of section 42.4, subsection 2, Code 1989, which states that "The number of counties and cities divided among more than one district shall be as small as possible. When there is a choice between dividing local political subdivisions, the more populous subdivisions shall be divided before the less populous, but this statement does not apply to a legislative district boundary drawn along a county line which passes through a city that lies in more than one county." He expressed the belief that this passage is ambiguous when applied to towns that are split by a township line where the part of the town in one township has a greater population than the rest of the entire township. Representative Van Maanen, Senator Hultman and Representative Chapman agreed that it would be more desirable to keep a city whole if possible.

MOTION ADOPTED

Representative Chapman moved that the Committee recommend that the Legislative Council authorize that the Redistricting Technology Selection Committee should conduct further negotiations with EDS for EDS to provide a redistricting computer software package for the Congressional and legislative redistricting activities of the Iowa General Assembly at a maximum expenditure of \$600,000, as provided in correspondence from EDS dated January 5, 1990. The software package will include specified data base development and redistricting system support. As part of the contract, EDS must agree to provide the required redistricting features that have already been demonstrated by them to the Redistricting Technology Selection Committee. In addition to the features already demonstrated, the contract shall require provision of the following additional features not yet demonstrated by EDS: delineation of the hierarchy of political subdivisions; provision of a "rest of" function so that the computer will automatically assign the remaining pieces of isolated territory of a county or city into the next designed district; a contiguity check of pieces of territory which have not yet been assigned to a district; a cancel feature that will cancel a command and move on to another command relatively quickly; the ability to draw plans using subsets of the state; the ability to compute and generate written reports on length-width compactness and population dispersion compactness; and the ability to generate written reports combining and renumbering house and senate

districts. The contract shall provide that all required software features be demonstrated by July 1, 1990, with the satisfactory performance of this requirement to be determined by the bipartisan subcommittee of the Redistricting Technology Selection Committee or the contract will be terminated. The contract shall provide that EDS and its employees agree not to perform any Iowa reapportionment or Iowa redistricting related consulting services, either directly or indirectly, with or without compensation, other than services provided to the Iowa Legislative Council, until September 1, 1991. Also, the redistricting computer data base should be developed so that the generally smaller sized cities will not be divided along township boundaries except for cities divided by county lines. The motion was adopted with Chairperson Hutchins, Representative Arnould, and Representative Chapman voting in the affirmative and Senator Hultman and Representative Van Maanen voting in the negative.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

GARY RUDICIL
Research Analyst