



DEBRA BOWEN | SECRETARY OF STATE | STATE OF CALIFORNIA
1500 11th Street, 6th floor | Sacramento, CA 95814 | Tel (916) 653-7244 | Fax (916) 653-4620 | www.sos.ca.gov

January 15, 2013

The Honorable Mark Leno, Chair
Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
State Capitol, Room 5100
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Bob Blumenfield, Chair
Assembly Budget Committee
State Capitol, Room 6026
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairmen Leno and Blumenfield:

Attached please find a copy of a status report on the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) activities carried out over the past calendar year, provided pursuant to budget control language adopted under Item Number 0890-001-0890, of the 2012-13 Budget. In addition, I have included the 2012 Election Day and Poll Worker Training Observation Reports for the 2012 Presidential Primary Election and the 2012 General Election.

I hope you will find the report informative and helpful. If there are any questions from your office about this report, please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-7244.

Sincerely,

Susan Lapsley
Deputy Secretary of State, HAVA Director and Counsel

Attachments

cc: The Honorable Bill Emmerson, Vice Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
The Honorable Jeff Gorell, Vice Chair, Assembly Budget Committee
The Honorable Paul Fong, Assembly Elections and Redistricting Committee
The Honorable Lou Correa, Chair, Senate Elections, Reapportionment and Constitutional Amendments Committee
The Honorable Tom Daly, Chair Assembly Budget Subcommittee, State Administration
The Honorable Gloria Negrete McLeod, Chair, Senate Budget Subcommittee, State Administration
Mr. Mac Taylor, Legislative Analyst
Ms. Ana Matosantos, Director, Department of Finance
Ms. Diane Boyer-Vine, Legislative Counsel

Status Report: Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA) Related Activities

Pursuant to Budget Control Language, the Secretary of State is required to report, by January 15th of each year, on the following activities, until the Statewide Voter Registration System (VoteCal), required by Section 303 of HAVA, is fully implemented. This status report, in accordance with 2012-13 Budget Control language, is required to address the following areas:

- Poll monitoring;
- The expected General Fund exposure for completion of HAVA compliance, including the expected costs of administration; and
- Completion of the VoteCal system, including information on the costs associated with the use of contractors and consultants, the names of the contractors and consultants used, and the purposes for which contractors and consultants were used.

The information contained herein comprises the sixth annual status report.

Poll Monitoring

Election Day Observation (also known as poll monitoring) was conducted for the 2012 Presidential Primary Election and the 2012 General Election. For the June 5, 2012, Presidential Primary Election, the Secretary of State sent 22 observers to 21 counties. Counties visited were: Alameda, Lake, Sacramento, San Mateo, Calaveras, Los Angeles (two observers), San Bernardino, Santa Clara, Contra Costa, Merced, San Diego, Sonoma, Fresno, Napa, San Francisco, Stanislaus, Glenn, Riverside, San Joaquin, Ventura, and Kings.

For the November 6, 2012, Presidential General Election, the Secretary of State sent eight observers to seven counties. Counties visited were: Alameda, Los Angeles (two observers), Sacramento, Fresno, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Kern.

Observers were instructed to:

- Look for posted signs and flags to determine if polling places were easy to find;
- Report on any accessibility problems related to parking or the facility itself;
- Assess the effectiveness of poll worker training and voter education;
- Report if there were any groups present at the polls trying to intimidate voters and/or other groups making sure voters were not being intimidated;
- Note if there was a high incidence of voters going to the wrong polling place, and describe how poll workers handled the situation;

- Assess the voting environment as to proper lighting, effective staging of poll worker tables and voting equipment, and voter privacy;
- Determine if all required voter information was posted or available and easy to read in all legally required languages;
- Observe whether accessible voting booths and equipment were set up and readily available;
- Assess if the voting process was well organized;
- Report if voters were required to wait in line for more than 10 minutes;
- Report any issues that appeared to be confusing to either poll workers or voters;
- Determine if security measures for ballots and voting equipment were being followed; and,
- If possible, without disrupting the voting process or disturbing voters, ask poll workers if they had experienced any difficulties with equipment, procedures, or voter confusion.

Secretary of State (SOS) observers were instructed to call in reports of any problems or challenges they felt needed immediate attention from either county elections officials or the SOS. They were also asked to provide an overview on issues that were common to the polling places they visited and any apparent underlying causes and/or possible remedies.

The 2012 Election Day Observation program reports are attached for your reference and are posted on the Secretary of State's website at www.sos.ca.gov/voting-systems/oversight/eday-reports.htm

Expected General Fund exposure for completion of HAVA compliance (including expected costs of administration)

➤ Voting Systems

The voting system upgrade contracts for California's 58 counties provide reimbursement to counties for the cost to purchase or lease voting systems to meet federal voting system standards or to upgrade local voting systems. No General Fund exposure is expected for current or future activities related to meeting these voting system requirements.

➤ Statewide Voter Registration System (VoteCal)

An interim solution to meet the requirements of Section 303 of HAVA for a statewide voter registration system was implemented pursuant to a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) executed with the U.S. Department of Justice (US DOJ) – the enforcement authority for HAVA – on November 2, 2005. The interim solution voter registration system is still in use at this time. No General Fund exposure is expected for the activities related to the interim solution.

Under the terms of the MOA, the Secretary of State is required to pursue a long-term solution to meeting HAVA Section 303 requirements. The Secretary of State is now in the procurement phase of that project, called VoteCal. Additional details about the VoteCal project are provided later in this report.

➤ Polling Place Accessibility

The Secretary of State has undertaken projects to improve polling place accessibility pursuant to a grant program conducted under HAVA Section 261, which is administered by the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Through this grant program, the Secretary of State has awarded three competitive bids, two non-competitive bids, and entered into an interagency agreement with the Department of Rehabilitation (DOR), the state agency with expertise on physical accessibility standards for buildings. Funds from the three competitive grant programs awarded in 2008, 2009, and 2011, for a total of \$3,815,331.90, were awarded to 29 counties for use in categories specified by DHHS, including:

- Improving physical accessibility to polling places for voters with disabilities;
- Improving access and participation by voters with disabilities;
- Training elections officials on promoting access and participation by voters with disabilities; and
- Providing information on opportunities for participation to voters with disabilities.

Funds from the two non-competitive grant programs awarded in 2010 and 2011, for a total of \$925,390, were awarded to 54 counties to use for training on assessing polling place accessibility, surveying polling places for accessibility, and for purchasing supplies needed to modify barriers in order to make polling places accessible.

In 2010, in conjunction with DOR, county elections officials and the Secretary of State's Voting Accessibility Advisory Committee (VAAC), the Secretary of State developed and published updated Polling Place Accessibility Guidelines required by the federal Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act of 1984 and referenced in California Elections Code section 12280. This effort was followed by a statewide training program in 2010 for county elections officials on how to adhere to the Polling Place Accessibility Guidelines to assess accessibility of polling places in their counties. The Secretary of State conducted a second round of statewide training for counties on how to adhere to the Polling Place Accessibility Guidelines in early 2012. This round of training included intermediate classes for experienced county staff.

The Secretary of State has continued to collaborate with DOR to create a series of video training programs to supplement the in-person trainings offered in 2010

and 2012. These video training programs are intended for use by the counties as stand-alone training sessions for polling place surveyors and poll workers.

➤ Administration of the HAVA program

The following ongoing needs are associated with the administration of the HAVA program:

Internally, ongoing Secretary of State staffing costs are estimated at \$1.7 million for each of the next two fiscal years. This funding will support the staff working on HAVA activities, a portion of the cost of the voter hotline in use prior to each statewide federal election, and administrative support (budgeting, accounting, and contracting services) for:

- Tracking and implementing changes to federal voting system testing and certification protocols and voting system standards;
- Activities related to further modifications to the statewide voter registration system project;
- Review and payment of claims for reimbursement against voting system upgrade contracts and contracts executed to improve polling place accessibility;
- Reporting to state and federal agencies as required; and
- Coordinating activities relating to audits of the HAVA program.

While these near-term costs associated with HAVA implementation are a certainty, long-term estimates are difficult to project because they may be affected by evolving federal standards and programs, including new oversight activities.

Completion of the VoteCal system (including information on the costs associated with the use of contractors and consultants, the names of contractors and consultants used, and the purposes for which contractors and consultants were used)

As previously indicated, California achieved interim compliance with HAVA Section 303 requirements to establish a statewide voter registration system. However, under the MOA executed with the US DOJ, California is required to implement the long-term, fully compliant VoteCal project. With the publication of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a VoteCal System Integrator (SI) on December 13, 2007, the Secretary of State initiated the procurement process for a primary contractor to provide a business solution for the project. When the contract initially awarded in response to this RFP was subsequently terminated, the procurement process was re-initiated on October 29, 2010, with the publication of a revised RFP. The history of the VoteCal project to date includes:

- A Secretary of State Feasibility Study Report (FSR) for the statewide voter registration system project (VoteCal) was approved on April 14, 2006, and an updated Special Project Report (SPR) on VoteCal was issued August 15, 2007.
- A Request for Proposal to solicit vendor bids for VoteCal was issued on December 13, 2007. A solution-based procurement process, as provided for in state law, was used for the project.
- Under the auspices of this process, potential bidders notified the Secretary of State by December 31, 2007, of the intent to bid on the project and thereafter engaged in a series of discussions with Secretary of State staff under the direction of Department of General Services (DGS) personnel in preparation for submission of a bid. During this process, in response to bidder questions and to clarify the RFP, addenda were issued.
- The final addendum to the RFP was issued on December 31, 2008, and a deadline for submission of bids was set for January 29, 2009.
- Under the direct supervision of DGS personnel, a team of evaluators analyzed three bids submitted against the pre-established criteria defined in the RFP. Of the three bids, only one vendor was deemed eligible to proceed to cost opening.
- A Notice of Intent to Award the contract was issued on April 24, 2009.
- As required by the state procurement process, an SPR describing the project in greater detail based upon the winning bid was completed and the SPR submitted to state control agencies, including the Department of Finance (DOF) and the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) on June 23, 2009, which provided copies to the Legislature.
- Meetings with county representatives to describe the project, answer questions and receive input commenced on July 17, 2009. These meetings and related communications were discontinued after May 2010 due to termination of the contract with the initial SI contractor (see later item in this report for information about contract termination).
- The Legislature formally received SPR #2 on July 23, 2009, from the DOF, and approved the project on August 25, 2009.
- An amended Spending Plan requesting expenditure authority for VoteCal costs for fiscal year (FY) 2009-10 was received by the Legislature from the DOF on August 6, 2009, and approved by the Legislature on August 25, 2009.
- The contract for the VoteCal project was fully executed with the winning bidder – Catalyst Consulting Group, Inc. (Catalyst) – on September 8, 2009.
- The project completed the Planning Phase – Phase I – on December 11, 2009.
- On April 7, 2010, Catalyst proposed a new deployment date that would complete the project in 2013. The SOS asked Catalyst to provide a more detailed schedule and approach before the SOS would consider the request. Catalyst's approach did not consider the network blackout dates.

- The SOS asked Catalyst to revise its schedule to reflect these dates per the contract, which would result in deploying VoteCal in 2014.
- On April 19, 2010, the SOS determined Catalyst had not yet provided a performance bond per the contract. Additionally, the SOS and its Independent Project Oversight Consultant (IPOC) expressed concerns about Catalyst's performance, including its ability to meet contractual deadlines. The SOS began working with Catalyst to resolve those issues at that time.
 - On April 24, 2010, DGS emailed Catalyst a letter dated April 26, 2010, requesting that Catalyst submit the performance bond to DGS by April 30, 2010. (Performance bonds from vendors are issued to DGS by the surety company and sent directly to DGS by the vendor.)
 - On April 27, 2010, DGS indicated to the SOS that DGS would lead the cure process to resolve these issues and transmit the cure letter outlining the issues to Catalyst.
 - On April 29, 2010, Catalyst sent a letter to DGS indicating its attempts to secure the performance bond with the expectation it would take an additional 60 to 90 days – or between 9 and 10 months beyond the contractually required date.
 - On May 3, 2010, DGS informed the SOS that the SOS would lead the cure process with Catalyst. When asked for policies or procedures to guide the SOS, DGS indicated it did not have any direction to provide to the SOS and that its legal counsel and procurement staff would not participate in the process.
 - On May 4, 2010, the SOS sent Catalyst a letter with a requirement to resolve the issues identified above within 30 days and concurrently offered to meet with Catalyst to discuss the issues.
 - On May 6, 2010, Catalyst responded to the cure letter stating it would need 120 days to secure a performance bond – 11 months beyond the contractually required date, but conditioned securing the performance bond on payment that could not be made until the bond was issued, per DGS direction to the SOS.
 - Catalyst requested a meeting to discuss options, which eventually led to a discussion of negotiating termination of the contract. On May 21, 2010, Catalyst and the SOS mutually agreed to terminate Catalyst's contract.
 - On July 19, 2010, the SOS submitted to the OCIO SPR #3 describing the project status based on the initial FSR for the VoteCal project. SPR #3 incorporated lessons learned to date, and provided an evaluation of project and HAVA requirements, as noted above.
 - On July 23, 2010, the SOS submitted an Information Technology Procurement Plan (ITPP) to DGS. DGS approves all large information technology procurements in the State of California. An ITPP describes the procurement approach proposed by the requesting department. Approval for this ITPP was received on August 4, 2010. (This ITPP approval was moot, however, based on OCIO direction to reduce project scope as noted below.)

- In June and July, the VoteCal team met daily to review the scope requirements in an effort to clarify them. On July 26, 2010, the OCIO directed the SOS to reduce the project budget and schedule (and thus the scope).
- On August 3, 2010, the SOS submitted a revision to SPR #3 to OCIO that reflected OCIO's direction to reduce one-time costs and shorten the schedule. OCIO approved SPR #3 on August 31, 2010.
- On August 6, 2010, the SOS submitted a revised ITPP to DGS. The revised document reflected the reduction in budget and schedule (and therefore scope) directed by the OCIO in response to the July 2010 SPR. Approval of the ITPP was received on August 23, 2010.
- The SOS invited county elections officials to review the original RFP and provide input to the SOS on which requirements should remain in a new RFP that more narrowly focused project scope on voter registration and list maintenance requirements. Six county elections officials reviewed the requirements during August 24-26, 2010, meetings and provided input on each of the functional requirements.
- During September, the SOS team concluded its review and revision of the business and technical requirements.
- On October 29, 2010, the revised RFP for the VoteCal SI was issued, and seven vendors indicated an interest in bidding on the project.
- In November and December 2010, bidders were allowed to ask questions and protest RFP requirements. Questions were answered with the information being made available via both DGS and SOS websites. No vendor formally protested any requirement.
- After receiving pre-qualification packages from bidders on January 24, 2011, DGS decided, on February 8, 2011, to exercise its authority to return bidder pre-qualification packages and reinitiated the RFP process. SOS worked closely with DGS, during the months of March and April to resolve issues relating to the terms of the RFP.
- On May 18, 2011, California Technology Agency (formerly OCIO) recommended discontinuing the VoteCal procurement process and issuing a Request for Information (RFI) as a way to address issues raised in December 2010 discussions with vendors about the terms of the RFP and subsequent discussions between SOS, DGS, and California Technology Agency (CTA). Further discussion among DGS, CTA, and SOS instead resulted in addressing bidder issues by making some material changes to the RFP. Those RFP revisions were published as an addendum to the RFP on June 10, 2011.
- Bidders responded to the June 10, 2011, RFP addendum with additional questions in July 2011 and responses to those questions were published on August 18, 2011.
- On August 26, 2011, bidders' protests to RFP requirements were received by DGS.
- An addendum to the RFP was published on September 22, 2011, in response to bidder protests. That addendum established a new

September 30, 2011, deadline for submission of bidder pre-qualification packages.

- During the month of November 2011, pursuant to state procurement procedures and under the direction of DGS, the SOS held confidential discussions with bidders to discuss the terms of the RFP.
- The SOS and DGS jointly developed revised VoteCal RFP Key Action Dates (KADs) and published these to bidders in Addendum #7 on January 23, 2012.
- During the month of February 2012, in collaboration with DGS, the SOS established final responses to all pending bidder questions, consolidated responses, and submitted them to DGS for final review.
- In March 2012, the SOS worked with DGS to finalize Addendum #8, which was published on March 22, 2012.
- The deadline to protest the VoteCal RFP requirements was March 29, 2012. No protests were received.
- In April 2012, the SOS completed another set of confidential discussions with bidders. Based on feedback received from bidders during and after those discussions, the SOS agreed to accept DGS' recommendation to eliminate the draft proposal step in the VoteCal procurement process and collaborated with DGS to publish a revised schedule reflecting this and other changes in Addendum #9.
- Addendum #10 was published May 22, 2012. This addendum included RFP revisions reflecting SOS responses to bidder questions and concerns raised in the April 2012 confidential discussions.
- A Request for Information (RFI) for VoteCal Backup, Restore, and Disaster Recovery (BRDR) services was issued in May 2012. A Q&A set and addendum were subsequently issued in response to vendor questions. RFI responses were received from vendors on September 14, 2012.
- In June 2012, the SOS received and responded to VoteCal RFP questions from prospective bidders. The SOS published those responses to bidders on July 3, 2012.
- An additional set of confidential discussions was conducted with bidders the week of July 9, 2012. Addendum #11 was published on July 24, 2012, to reflect responses to bidders' questions and to incorporate revisions and clarifications agreed to during the July confidential discussions.
- The SOS prepared, submitted and received DGS approval of the VoteCal RFP Evaluation and Selection Plan on July 14, 2012.
- The deadline for bidders to protest the RFP requirements was August 2, 2012. No protests were received.
- On August 20, 2012, final VoteCal SI proposals were received. Evaluation of the SI proposals began August 21, 2012, and concluded on September 7, 2012. The draft Evaluation and Selection Report was submitted to DGS on September 10, 2012. DGS approved the draft on September 14, 2012.
- DGS conducted the VoteCal proposal cost opening on September 19, 2012.

- The SOS completed the Evaluation and Selection process and submitted the final version of the VoteCal RFP Evaluation and Selection Report to DGS on September 24, 2012. DGS approved the final report on October 11, 2012.
- On September 26, 2012, the SOS submitted a preliminary draft of SPR #4 that reflected the costs associated with the VoteCal solution proposed by the selected bidder to CTA. After receiving and incorporating CTA's feedback, the SOS formally submitted the finalized SPR #4 to CTA on October 19, 2012, and to the Legislative Analyst's Office on October 22, 2012.
- On October 12, 2012, DGS published the Notification of Intent to Award the VoteCal SI contract and established October 17, 2012, as the last day to protest selection. No protests were received.
- During November 2012, the SOS responded to SPR #4 and Section 11.00 questions and recommendations relayed by the DOF IT analyst and CTA oversight manager coordinating with SOS on these project approval documents. DOF also provided SOS guidance concerning the strategy and timeline for formally submitting the Section 11.00 after receiving SPR #4 approval from CTA.
- On November 21, 2012, the SOS received SPR #4 approval from CTA. However, due to an increase in the estimated Election Management System Remediation Services costs, CTA and SOS established an abbreviated SPR #5 approach.
- On November 27, 2012, SPR #5 was submitted to CTA.
- On November 28, 2012, CTA forwarded SPR #5 to the DOF IT analyst.
- Throughout December 2012, the SOS worked closely with DOF to clarify and refine the VoteCal Section 11.00 and supporting materials to facilitate DOF review and to expedite DOF transmittal of the final Section 11.00 to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC). During December the SOS also focused on activities required to prepare for VoteCal SI contract award, for post-award contract implementation and commencement of the project's execution phase.
- SPR #5 was approved January 10, 2013. The Section 11.00 was formally submitted to DOF on January 11, 2013. Upon DOF approval, JLBC will have 30 calendar days for review and approval.

For the foreseeable future, there is a continuing need for internal Secretary of State staffing to accomplish tasks relating to HAVA Section 303 requirements to maintain the "interim solution" statewide voter registration list and to pursue the fully compliant VoteCal project, as required under the terms of the MOA with the US DOJ, including:

- Elections Division (program) support to maintain the interim solution voter registration system and to assist in planning for the fully compliant VoteCal voter registration system.

- Information Technology Division (technical) support to maintain the interim solution and to assist in planning for the fully-compliant VoteCal voter registration system.
- Administrative support (budgeting, accounting and contracting services) for activities related to planning and executing contracts for development and deployment of VoteCal.

Current costs for contractor and consultant needs to support the VoteCal project are listed below. SOS contracts with state departments are not included in this list.

- Project Management: A contract was issued for \$1,043,440 to Kiefer Consulting for services of Linda Wasik as project management consultant for fiscal years 2006-2008. Actual invoices under this contract, which expired June 30, 2009, totaled \$780,290. In July 2009, a contract was issued for \$308,752 to VIP Consulting for services of Fred Wood as a project management consultant through May 31, 2010. \$223,260 was expended under this contract, \$159,120 of it in 2010. In June 2010, a contract was issued for \$1,046,429 to VIP Consulting for project management services provided by a consulting team consisting of Jonathan Kerhlikar, Mardell Hall, and headed by Kerry Washburn. That contract expired on December 31, 2011. A total of \$971,658 was expended under that contract. A new contract with VIP was executed extending through August 30, 2014, with \$3,109,067 budgeted for the project management team comprised of the following individuals: Kerry Washburn, Mardell Hall, Anand Deshmukh, Sean Malone, and Debbie Moorhouse. To date, \$567,255 has been expended under this extended contract.
- Project Assistant: A contract was issued for \$243,168 to COMSYS for the services of Melissa Crowley from December 2007 through December 31, 2009. Actual invoices under this contract totaled \$226,950. In January 2010, a contract was issued to Net InComm through December 31, 2011, in the amount of \$283,710. In January 2011, the contract was extended through June 30, 2012, at no additional cost. Pat Melo performed the services under this contract in 2010, followed by Kathleen Cook in 2010 – 11. A total of \$161,787.50 was expended under this contract. A new contract with Net InComm was issued for \$325,200. Kathleen Cook is providing the services under the new contract for 2012 – 2015.
- Technical Architect: A contract was issued for \$328,455 to R Systems, Inc. for the services of Pooja Deshmukh from November 2, 2009, through June 30, 2011. A total of \$85,900 was paid under this contract.
- Required Independent Project Oversight Consulting: A contract was issued for \$762,900 to Continuity Consulting for the services of Joan Rene, Tim Jacobs, and Christine Walker from May 2007 to December 31, 2009. Actual invoices under this contract totaled \$566,525. Effective January 1, 2010, a new contract was issued to Meta Vista Consulting

Group for \$98,550 for the services of Payson Hall, Rochelle Furtah, and Michelle Colodzin. On March 30, 2012, the contract was extended until February 28, 2013, with no increase in cost. To date, \$87,255 has been expended under this contract.

- Required Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Consulting: A contract was issued for \$846,715 with Information Integration Innovation & Associates (I Cubed) for the services of Dr. Michael Cox, Arthur G. Mulligan, Al Pangelinan, and Paula Grose from May 2007 through December 31, 2010. Actual invoices totaled \$602,795 during the life of this contract. In March 2011, following a competitive bid process, a new contract in the amount of \$532,585 was issued to I Cubed for the services of Dr. Michael Cox, Arthur G. Mulligan, Al Pangelinan, and Aftab Mohammed. To date, \$384,395 has been expended under this contract.
- A primary system integration vendor contract: A deliverables-based contract was signed September 8, 2009, for \$18,177,000 to Catalyst Consulting Group, Inc. (Catalyst) for a fully operational system. The bid included the services of Scott Hilkert, Don Westfall, Kurt Schwartz, Matt Benton, Kalyn Ferris, and Timothy Smith to serve in lead roles for the project. Actual invoices under this contract totaled \$1,869,666 for both 2009 and 2010.
- A contract for a Quality Assurance Manager was issued to Andes Consulting in March 2010 in the amount of \$386,840 for the services of Chris Moore through October 31, 2011. A total of \$26,790 was expended under this contract before it expired. A new contract will not be issued for these services. The SOS has adopted an approach that leverages quality management expertise resident within the existing project management team integrated with various state and contractor expertise to ensure comprehensive quality management across the project and throughout the project implementation.
- Contracts with counties were executed:
 - In the amount of \$254,344 for county staff participation in the design sessions conducted by the originally selected VoteCal SI vendor (Catalyst). A total of \$128,824 was expended under these contracts, which have subsequently expired.
 - In the amount of \$2,698,920 to migrate those counties that needed to change to a different local election management system (EMS) in order to fully integrate with the VoteCal solution and to support county EMS data conversation activities throughout the life of the project. A total of \$566,347 was expended under these contracts, which have subsequently expired.
- Legal Services: \$56,454 was expended in 2011 to advise the SOS as the SOS prepared the revised RFP for publication. A new contract will not be issued for legal services as SOS intends to continue its current approach of utilizing internal legal counsel.

Other contracts yet to be issued include:

- Web language translation: Projected budget amount is \$114,487 for 2014 – 2016.
- Security Auditor: Projected budget amount is \$100,000 for 2013 – 2016.
- SI Vendor: A VoteCal SI RFP was issued on October 29, 2010. Based on DGS' formal procurement guidelines, a Notification of Intent to Award was issued for the selected vendor on October 10, 2012. The SI's budgeted one-time cost is projected to be \$38,751,929 for 2013 – 2017.
- EMS vendors for remediation services: Projected budget amount is \$18,566,347 for 2013 – 2016.
- Third-party BRDR services for the system: Projected budget amount is \$921,141 for 2013 – 2017.
- Contracts with counties: Projected budget amount is \$4,236,056 for county staff to participate in deploying the VoteCal solution proposed by the new, recently selected VoteCal SI vendor for 2013 – 2016. These contracts will be executed for:
 - County staff participation in the design sessions to be conducted by the SI vendor.
 - Costs incurred by those counties that need to change to a different local election management system (EMS) in order to fully integrate with the VoteCal solution.
 - County staff participation in EMS data conversion, testing, and other county support required to implement the total VoteCal solution.
- Test Lead: Projected budget amount is \$964,000 for 2013 – 2016.
- Technical Architect: Projected budget amount is \$538,000 for 2013 – 2016.

The total VoteCal project cost is estimated to be \$98.16 million (including one year of maintenance and operations). These costs will be funded with federal HAVA money allocated to California. The state will incur some future General Fund costs associated with continued operation and maintenance of the VoteCal statewide voter registration system once all available HAVA funding has been expended.