

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

922



FROM: Registrar of Voters

SUBMITTAL DATE:
May 31, 2007

SUBJECT: Approval of provider services agreement with NetFile for online campaign filing

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Approve the agreement for provider services between the County of Riverside and Westcoast Online Information Systems, Inc. DBA NetFile; and
2. Authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to sign four copies of the agreement.

BACKGROUND: On January 9, 2007, Board of Supervisors' Chairman John Tavaglione announced online campaign disclosure filing among his priorities for the upcoming year. Online filing improves public access and facilitates locating information through search criteria.

The Registrar of Voters participated in San Bernardino County's demonstration by two bidders for online campaign disclosure filing systems in early 2006. The advantages of the NetFile system were obvious, but the technology at that time was not pursued due to upcoming Gubernatorial primary and general elections.

Barbara Dunmore
Barbara Dunmore
Registrar of Voters

FINANCIAL DATA	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	In Current Year Budget:	Yes
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	Budget Adjustment:	No
	Annual Net County Cost: \$ 60,000	For Fiscal Year:	2007/08

SOURCE OF FUNDS:	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY *Jennifer L. Sargent*
Jennifer L. Sargent

County Executive Office Signature

Dep't Recomm.: Consent Policy
Per Exec. Ofc.: Consent Policy

Prev. Agn. Ref.: | District: ALL | Agenda Number:

ATTACHMENTS FILED
WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

3.32

PURCHASING & FLEET SERVICES: Robert Howdyshell, Director

IT DEPT: Matt Frymire, CIO

The Registrar of Voters is now prepared to implement this system and have it operational for the January 2008 semiannual filing of Forms 460 for any person or group that chooses to use this technology. After implementation, persons or groups will still be able to continue filing documents through the mail or at the Registrar's office if they choose.

Implementation of the online filing technology will:

- Allow candidates and committees to file their periodic campaign revenue and expense reporting documents over the internet, and update information at any time;
- Eliminate the need to handle these transactions in person at the Registrar of Voters office, unless desired;
- Improve access and the ability of interested parties to research such information over the internet by using search criteria;
- Reduce copying and paper handling of financial forms in the Registrar of Voters office;
- Provide filers with timely reminders to avoid penalties for missed filing dates.

The cost of the system is \$15,000 per quarter in advance and is included in the submitted FY 2007/08 budget.



Date: May 31, 2007
From: Barbara Dunmore, Registrar of Voters
To: Board of Supervisors
Via: Purchasing Agent
Subject: Sole Source Procurement; Online Campaign Disclosure Filing Services

The information provided below in support of the Registrar of Voters Office requesting approval for a sole source.

Supply/Service being requested: Online campaign disclosure filing services

Supplier being requested: Westcoast Online Information Systems, Inc. DBA NetFile

Alternative suppliers that can or might be able to provide supply/service: The Registrar of Voters office participated in San Bernardino County's demonstration by two providers; NetFile and Global 360. Global 360 is a document imaging product; whereas, NetFile allows filers to enter information online 24 hours a day 7 days a week. In addition, NetFile makes research more efficient by allowing the public to conduct research using search criteria. Global 360 requires scrolling through each form to look for information. At the time of the demonstration, Global 360 was looking for their first client to implement this new service.

Extent of market search conducted: A request for proposals performed in San Bernardino produced two vendors able to provide the service (see above). In addition, an ElecNet inquiry of all Registrars in California regarding their use of online campaign disclosure filing services only turned up one additional "home grown" system used by the City of Long Beach. Long Beach's system allows filing online, but does not provide search criteria for ease of use.

Unique features of the supply/service being requested from this supplier, which no alternative supplier can provide: NetFile provides the public the ability to conduct research using search criteria for campaign contributions and expense information. In addition, NetFile hosts the application so there is no server or database on the ROV end to manage. Attached to this justification is the Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco's March 2007 recommendation for a similar recent procurement. Their conclusion on page two was "No private vendor other than Netfile currently maintains an agency on-line filing system for any California jurisdiction at this time or has a comparable system currently under development."

- continued -

Reasons why my department requires these unique features and what benefit will accrue to the county: The ability to search the campaign disclosures with criteria supplied by the user provides for more efficient and thorough research and is a user-friendly interface. This function will facilitate the public's use of the service. E-filing is the only way to guarantee redaction of confidential information.

Price Reasonableness: San Bernardino County is currently paying \$14,500 per quarter for NetFile service and Santa Clara County pays \$45,200 per year. Pricing is based on population since that is what drives demand on the system. San Bernardino receives a discount because they also use NetFile for Form 700s. Santa Clara received a price break for being a beta site. Therefore, the quoted \$15,000 per quarter for Riverside is based on population.

Does moving forward on this product or service further obligate the county to future similar contractual arrangements? No



Department Head Signature

May 31 2007
Date

Purchasing Department Comments:

Approve

Approve with Condition/s

Disapprove

Purchasing Agent

Date