



**REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI)**

**The City and County of San Francisco's Voting System**

**RFI# REG2015-01**

**CONTACT: Shane Burgos, [sandro.burgos@sfgov.org](mailto:sandro.burgos@sfgov.org)**

On behalf of the City and County of San Francisco (City), the San Francisco Department of Elections (Department) is issuing this Request for Information (RFI) in relation to obtaining a new voting system. The Department seeks information from organizations and firms that provide comprehensive voting system solutions that are fully accessible to all voters, are based on voters marking paper ballots, and conduct ranked-choice elections. Further, the City has established a policy that gives preference to implementing voting systems designed using open source software (see Attachment A). Additionally, the Department seeks to increase the transparency of all election functions by providing the public with information in open data formats. The Department invites responses from any organization or firm that currently offers a voting system approved by the California Secretary of State for use in California as well as any organization or firm that is building or intends to build such voting systems.

The City's current voting system contract with Dominion Voting Systems (Dominion) expires in December 2016; thus, the Department expects to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) in early 2016 to purchase, lease, or otherwise replace the current system. The current system is comprised of optical scan tabulators and accessible touch-screen equipment that the Department delivers to every polling place, and, high-speed optical scan tabulators that are permanently staged in the Department's office in City Hall and are used to tabulate vote-by-mail, provisional, and other ballots. A central database manages all of the voting equipment, including the system's functionality to tabulate ballots using the ranked-choice voting method as required under San Francisco Charter section 13.102 (see Attachment B). The central database allows for the issuance of various results reports at the precinct level.

The Department may use information included in any response to this RFI to further refine the City's goals when drafting the RFP for a new voting system and when developing specifications for the solicitation of competitive bids. The City does not intend to award a contract based on this RFI; however, the City reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to request additional information, demonstrations, presentations, or participation in any test or pilot programs from the Responders to this RFI. The Department may modify this RFI by issuing a written addendum before the deadline for submission of responses, by posting it on [sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem](http://sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem).

**Schedule\***

RFI Issued: 08/06/2015  
 Questions Due: 08/14/2015 (5:00 PM)  
 Answers Posted: 08/21/2015 (5:00 PM)  
 Deadline for RFI Responses: 08/28/2015 (5:00 PM)

*\*Dates are subject to change*

**Questions and Communications**

Any questions, requests for clarification or additional information regarding this RFI must be submitted via email to Shane Burgos, [sandro.burgos@sfgov.org](mailto:sandro.burgos@sfgov.org).

To ensure fair and equal access to information, the Department will post any questions, requests for clarification or additional information, and the Department's responses, on [sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem](http://sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem).

## I. Purpose of this RFI

### A. Preparation to Replace Existing Voting System

The basis for issuing of this RFI, and the subsequent issuing of a RFP, is to obtain a new voting system since the City's contractual agreement with Dominion expires in December 2016. The Department intends to issue the RFP in the beginning of 2016. Before drafting the RFP the Department seeks to determine the options available to the City to replace the current system.

The elements included in this RFI anticipate many of the criteria that likely will appear in the subsequent RFP. Responses to this RFI may affect elements of the RFP, i.e. criteria used to evaluate proposals, scoring responses, expected time frame for implementing a system, etc.

California Elections Code section 19006(a) requires that the City use a voting system that the Secretary of State has approved for use in California. Still, the Department encourages all organizations and firms that are developing voting systems that are yet to obtain approval from the Secretary of State to respond to this RFI, especially if those organizations and firms are nearing the testing phase of their systems.

The City formally supports the development and eventual implementation of open source voting systems; thus, any organization or firm that has developed or is developing a voting system based on open source code, or intends to do so, and is moving, or, is preparing to move, its open source system through the certification processes is encouraged to reply to this RFI. Ultimately, any system that the City chooses must include the capability to conduct elections using the ranked-choice voting method as required by the San Francisco Charter. The new system will preferably allow for a number of rankings equal to the number of candidates in a contest.

The Department is also committed and highly motivated to provide its election-related information in open data formats. Open data information includes not only results reporting after the polls close, but also statements of the vote with precinct-by-precinct breakdowns of votes cast, including neighborhood and district breakdowns, in formats such as JSON, XML, HTML, TXT, CSV, etc. For this reason, the Department encourages all responses to both this RFI and the eventual RFP to highlight how each system will support the Department's efforts to provide information to the public in open data formats.

### B. Identify Options for New Voting System

Section III of this RFI presents a basic set of criteria for the City's next voting system and related services. Accordingly, the City is interested in obtaining any additional information on functionalities or features not included in Section III but which Responders consider as pertinent for the City's consideration. The Department strongly encourages each Responder to highlight and describe any requirements, features or services that the Responder thinks are necessary or advisable in addition to or in lieu of those specifically identified in this RFI.

This RFI is intended to allow the City to conduct an industry review of potential hardware and software solutions associated with San Francisco's next voting system as well as inform the City of other methodologies or approaches to voting that may be available within the next several years. Although the City will not award a contract based on this RFI, information received in response to this RFI may inform the City's scoping process when preparing the expected RFP in 2016.

## II. Responding to this RFI

The City requests that responses encompass and address all criteria listed in this section. If any Responder's system does not include or cannot currently meet any criteria, but expects to do so within two years, Responders must note that more than one year is necessary before the City could implement a Responder's system. While not mandatory, the City prefers that the Responders to this RFI have experience in providing voting solutions for governmental agencies equal in size or larger than the City and County of San Francisco within the last five (5) years. For more detailed information on the City and County of San Francisco, see Attachment C.

The Department will post all responses on its website, [sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem](http://sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem), and the information will be freely available to the public. Other than the personal information associated with any Responder, the Department will not consider any information included as being private and unavailable for publicly posting on the Department's website.

As noted earlier, the Department may invite selected Responders to make presentations and demonstrate their systems for the purpose of advancing the City's understanding of available solutions and to increase City's understanding of near-term solutions that are applicable to the City's next voting system.

All such invitations will be issued in writing. Organizations and firms that are selected to demonstrate their hardware, software, and/or services may receive a list of questions to address during the presentation at least two weeks prior to the presentation. Any such requests on the Department's part will also be posted on its website. The costs of such presentations shall be solely the responsibility of those providing the demonstrations.

### A. Summary Statements of Proposed System and References

Responders must submit the requested information in the format specified in this section. The page maximum does not include brochures, literature or other materials. Any additional items are welcome but are not equivalent to responding directly to the individual items below or to the criteria for the new voting system that follow.

Responses to these Summary Statements must not exceed twenty (20) pages.

Each numbered item below requires a response.

1. Provide organization's or firm's legal name and address.
2. Provide the name, title, address, telephone number, and email address of the person(s) who will serve as the contact(s).
3. Provide a letter of introduction with a brief description of the organization or firm, including organizational structure, experience in the industry, number of years providing voting systems and election support services to federal, state, or local governments.
4. Provide a summary of the products and services offered, including annual license fees, annual support fees, and/or annual subscription fees. Include third party applications that are being recommended. List prices are acceptable.
5. Describe any election-related services that the organization or firm offers, including, without limitation, integration assistance, training, and ongoing support. Provide a rate structure or other costing information (i.e. hourly rate or pricing methodology) for the professional services offering. List prices are acceptable.

6. Describe the different implementation approaches (i.e. big bang vs phased roll out) that the organization or firm can offer to the City to fully implement a particular solution. Include the benefits and/or risks of each.
7. Provide a brief description of the overall software and architectural design of applicable products.
8. Describe the recommended operating environment(s) required to install and use any relevant systems and the minimum system requirements necessary to run such systems. Include any suggested production, development/test, and disaster recovery environments.
9. Describe how the organization or firm envisions its software and hardware solutions changing over the next five to ten years.
10. If applicable, submit at least two (2) references of federal, state or local governments equal in size or larger than the City and County of San Francisco that have implemented the proposed system, or, a similar system, within the last five (5) years. Include:
  - a. Name of the client
  - b. Contact information (name, address, phone, email)
  - c. Date system fully implemented
  - d. Total # of employees
  - e. Technical environment, i.e. commercial off-the-shelf (COTS), proprietary, mixture of COTS and proprietary. If your organization's or firm's voting system is a combination of elements that are COTS and proprietary, note which items are COTS and those that are proprietary.

Alternatively, for any organization or firm that is unable to provide references associated with the actual implementation and use of a voting system, indicate any pilot programs, testing, etc. that sufficiently support a proposed system being successfully implemented and operated.

## **B. SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR NEW VOTING SYSTEM**

The list below represents the initial criteria that the Department considers to be necessary elements of a new voting system that the City will obtain and implement. The Department does not consider this list as final and expects to modify some elements before issuing a RFP. Still, since these criteria are the initial basis for a new system, all organizations and firms shall indicate in their responses whether their proposed systems include or meet each of the individual criterion, or, if any criterion is currently not associated with a Responder's current system, when/whether any proposed system will include such criterion.

Responses to these Specific Criteria must not exceed twenty-five (25) pages.

### **1. Functionality**

- a. Approved by the Secretary of State for use in California before the City obtains the new system.
- b. Designed for votes to be cast and tabulated using paper ballots.
- c. Designed so that all or part of the system's software operates using open source software.
- d. Assigns the least restrictive software license so that third parties may also utilize the code.
- e. Incorporates ranked-choice voting and allows for the formatting and tabulation of ballots that list the same number of selections as there are candidates, including qualified write-in candidates.

- f. Accommodates the formatting of multiple-language ballots and is designed to integrate additional languages with minimal preparation of and modification to the overall system.
- g. Requires the staging of one piece of equipment per precinct for each polling place and supports all voters.
- h. Utilizes high-speed scanners to tabulate vote-by-mail ballots.
- i. Creates a digital image of all (paper) ballots cast and facilitates the posting of the images on the Department's website while allowing for quick referencing between the paper ballot and its digital image.
- j. Meets or exceeds the most recent security standards set as minimum requirements for voting systems by the Election Assistance Commission and the California Secretary of State.
- k. Allows for automated formatting of ballots with minimal manual manipulation of content by importing candidate information from the Department's existing election management system.
- l. Includes auxiliary battery power to run polling place equipment for at least two hours of continuous use.
- m. Designed with minimal moving parts to reduce maintenance and associated costs of any mechanical operations.
- n. Includes clearly written documentation available before implementation for both hardware and software functions and provides instruction and reference materials for all system-related processes.
- o. Permits the auditing of ballot cards at multiple points in the tabulation process and with minimal disturbance of operations to reduce the reliance on post-Election Day audits and to affirm the system is operating successfully.
- p. Produces easily customizable reports containing any audit data or other information collected by the system.
- q. Logs all normal and abnormal events and ensures that event logging cannot be disabled or altered.
- r. Seamlessly supports risk limiting auditing of results by generating random samples, reconstructing electronic records for comparison, and handling statistics.
- s. Facilitates the review of voted ballots or contests by election personnel using digital images to resolve issues when possible using a digital interface, and subsequently facilitates the posting of such actions on the Department's website.
- t. Allows for reporting results in near real time in such manner that does not require elections personnel to manually prepare and post results-related information.
- u. Designed so that the Department can transport equipment using minimal resources and requires a small footprint inside delivery vehicles.
- v. Allows elections personnel to set voting patterns when preparing logic and accuracy testing.
- w. Operates in a manner that is compatible with the Department's existing election management system from DFM Associates.
- x. Allows elections personnel to meet the pre-election testing requirements for automated reporting established by the California Secretary of State in such a manner that does not require manual results generation.

## 2. Usability/Transparency

- a. Accessible to all voters to cast ballots in an independent and confidential manner.
- b. Provides fully accessible and intuitive features for all voters and includes connections and ports to fit all currently known types of assistive devices.
- c. Promotes intuitive setup and operation of equipment in the polling places so that poll workers do not require specialized training on the equipment.
- d. Indicates how the system tallied each vote on every ballot card and indicates if any votes were unreadable while ensuring the confidentiality of each voter's ballot.
- e. Indicates any action taken for every ballot card or contest that elections personnel reviewed and generates a digital audit log for posting on the Department's website that records such actions.

- f. Issues all result reports, ballot tally files, audit logs, in open data formats (machine-readable) and human-readable formats to increase the scope of election transparency.
- g. Creates and facilitates the posting of ballot image files on the Department's website so that members of the public can tabulate the same vote information that the Department uses when tallying the official results.
- h. Collects and then converts the election information in a manner that facilitates the Department's ability to provide reports in data formats and styles requested from other agencies, the media, and members of the public.

### 3. Results Reports

- a. Produces rapid, versatile, and easily customizable reports, including in real-time, when issuing results reports on Election Night.
- b. Provides easily customizable reports for a wide variety of purposes, including the reporting of partial election returns throughout Election Night, final unofficial election returns, and canvass reports.
- c. Organizes and exports data in a variety of formats including but not limited to TXT (delimiter-separated), CSV, XLSX, PDF, and XML/EML that the Department can upload to its website and provide to the Secretary of State, the media, etc. with minimal intervention.

### 4. Adaptability

- a. Anticipates the City modifying its use of the system or the system's components in response to changes in law such as the possible implementation of Senate Bill 450 that would allow the City to conduct mail-ballot elections with voting centers staged at multiple locations in the City.
- b. Implemented in the City under a possible final agreement that institutes a purchase, lease, lease-to-own, or any other mechanism that best suits the City's interests in obtaining a new system.
- c. Allows the City to obtain the new system and its components and also provides the City with the flexibility throughout the term of the agreement to upgrade components, including software, when improvements to the new system become available, including an option to fully replace the new system.
- d. Allows the Department to continue to select how all voting-related services are obtained such as for ballot printing and translations without restrictions from the design of the new system.

## C. RESPONSE SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

All questions, requests for clarification or for additional information regarding this RFI must be submitted via email to Shane Burgos at [sandro.burgos@sfgov.org](mailto:sandro.burgos@sfgov.org). The Department will post any such requests, as well as the Department's responses to the submitting parties, on [sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem](http://sfelections.org/rfi/votingsystem).

The Department's responses to any questions and requests shall be at the Department's sole discretion and nothing in this RFI shall create an obligation by the Department to provide any response to the submitting party.

Responses MUST be received by 5:00 pm PT on the Response Due Date, August 28, 2015. The Department prefers to receive all responses via email. When emailing responses, place "Response to RFI for New Voting System" in the subject line.

If submitting any hard copy materials, Responders shall submit such attachments, in a sealed envelope clearly marked "Response to RFI for New Voting System."

Email:

[sandro.burgos@sfgov.org](mailto:sandro.burgos@sfgov.org)

Re: Response to RFI for New Voting System

Mail and Personal Delivery:

Sandro Burgos

Attn: Response to RFI for New Voting System

Department of Elections

City Hall, Room 48

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

### **III. TERMS AND CONDITIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS RFI**

Responses to this RFI become the exclusive property of the City and subject to the California Public Records Act and the City's Sunshine Ordinance. Responders are advised that any information submitted may be disclosed to the public.

Responders are solely and fully responsible for all costs associated with the development, preparation, transmittal, and submission of any material in response to this RFI. The Department may, in its sole discretion, ask any Responder to present its material in public meetings and to the City's representatives, and the Responder shall be solely responsible for the associated costs of such demonstrations. The City will recognize no claims whatsoever for reimbursement from any Responder for any costs accrued in responding to this RFI.

The submittal of a response to this RFI does not guarantee any additional contact from the City or the Department associated with the response. This is not a Request for Proposal (RFP). The City, in its sole discretion, will determine when a RFP or other competitive solicitation will be issued at a later date. Any RFP issued by the City may differ significantly in content from the requirements and services described in this RFI document. This RFI is to be used solely for the purpose of an industry review and the City and the Department assume no responsibility for any other use of this document. Participation in this industry review is strictly voluntary and is not a requirement to submit a bid to any subsequent competitive solicitation regarding the City obtaining a new voting system. Responding to this RFI does not guarantee any future business with the City. The issuance of this RFI does not constitute agreement by the City that any contract will actually be entered into by the City. The City expressly reserves the rights to:

1. Waive or correct any defect or informality in any proposal, response or response procedure;
2. Re-issue a new RFI or to next issue a RFQ or RFP;
3. Prior to submission deadline for responses, modify all or any portion of the RFI;
4. Procure any materials, equipment, products or services specified in this RFI by any other means; or
5. Determine that no project will be pursued.

## ATTACHMENT A

San Francisco Board of Supervisors' Resolution # 460-14

<http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/resolutions14/r0460-14.pdf>



1 [Supporting the Creation of Open Source Voting Systems - Studying New Models of Voting  
2 System Development]

3 **Resolution committing the City and County of San Francisco to work with other**  
4 **jurisdictions and organizations to create new voting systems using open source**  
5 **software; and to study the feasibility of the City and County of San Francisco**  
6 **developing and using a new voting system, either whole or in part, through a**  
7 **collaborative model like the Los Angeles County Voting Systems Assessment Project.**

8  
9 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco holds it in the interest of its citizens  
10 to conduct efficient and accurate elections in a manner which promotes public trust in the  
11 integrity of every aspect of the elections process; and

12 WHEREAS, Transparency in the recording, collection, transmission, aggregation and  
13 tally of votes promotes public confidence in the integrity of elections; and

14 WHEREAS, A growing number of government leaders, good government groups,  
15 citizens, and media reports have questioned the value and integrity of the existing, limited  
16 choices of voting systems certified for use in conducting elections; and

17 WHEREAS, A limited number of vendors dominate the voting systems marketplace,  
18 reducing incentives to innovate, and their refusal to make public their voting system software  
19 and hardware designs conflicts with the goal of election transparency; and

20 WHEREAS, In order to address these issues, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors  
21 on November 18, 2008, adopted Ordinance No. 268-08, File No. 081227, amending the  
22 Administrative Code by adding Sections 5.400-410 to establish a Voting Systems Task Force  
23 comprised of individuals with backgrounds in good government, computer science or the  
24 computer industry, election administration, and accommodations of persons with disabilities,  
25 to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors about voting system standards, design

1 and development; and

2 WHEREAS, Pursuant to Ordinance No. 268-08, the San Francisco Voting Systems  
3 Task Force was created to provide the City with recommendations on: standards and  
4 guidelines for development and acquisition of voting systems; methods for acquiring voting  
5 systems in conformity with federal, state and municipal laws; models for the development of a  
6 voting system; business models, including the City and County of San Francisco acting as its  
7 own vendor, which promote transparency; and any other issues related to voting systems  
8 which will engender public trust in the elections processes of the City and County of San  
9 Francisco; and

10 WHEREAS, In June 2011, "Recommendations on Voting Systems for the City and  
11 County of San Francisco – A Report by the San Francisco Voting Systems Task Force  
12 (VSTF)" was completed, in which the VSTF recommended that San Francisco advocate with  
13 the California Secretary of State and the State legislature for a new, comprehensive state  
14 certification process to replace the existing requirement for federal certification; and

15 WHEREAS, California Governor Jerry Brown on October 5, 2013, approved California  
16 Senate Bill No. 360 amending the California Elections Code to create a comprehensive state  
17 certification process and adding a new Section 19006 to the Elections Code stating the intent  
18 of the Legislature that:

19 (a) All voting systems be certified or conditionally approved by the Secretary of State,  
20 independent of voluntary federal qualification or certification, before they are used in  
21 future elections to ensure that the voting systems have the ability to meet accuracy,  
22 accessibility, and security standards.

23 (b) The Secretary of State adopt and publish testing standards that meet or exceed  
24 federal voluntary standards set by the United States Election Assistance Commission  
25 or its successor agency.

1 (c) The Secretary of State study and encourage the development of voting systems  
2 that use nonproprietary source code and that are easy to audit.

3 (d) A local jurisdiction may use available public funds to purchase and maintain any  
4 certified or conditionally approved voting system or part of a voting system.

5 (e) California receives the benefits of the publicly funded development of a  
6 nonproprietary voting system in the state.

7 (f) A local jurisdiction may use available public funds to research and develop a  
8 nonproprietary voting system that uses disclosed source codes, including the  
9 manufacture of a limited number of voting system units, for use in a pilot program or for  
10 submission to the Secretary of State for certification; and

11 WHEREAS, The VSTF in its June 2011 report also recommended that:

12 (a) the San Francisco Department of Elections give strong preference to a voting  
13 system licensing structure that gives San Francisco all of the rights provided by a  
14 license approved by the Open Source Initiative, a global non-profit that supports and  
15 promotes the open source movement (“OSI-approved license”), even if the system is  
16 maintained by an external party.

17 (b) San Francisco work with other jurisdictions and organizations, if an open source  
18 model is used, to develop and manage the code-base in order to leverage additional  
19 resources and expertise, and participate during the requirements gathering stage of  
20 development so that its unique requirements can be incorporated into the system  
21 design and implementation.

22 (c) San Francisco be an active participant in the movement toward more open and  
23 transparent voting systems, acknowledging the complexity of moving from the existing  
24 marketplace toward more innovative voting systems; urging San Francisco to move  
25 steadily toward the goal of transparency—even if it must do so in incremental steps;

1 encouraging the City to be a strong advocate in the private sector marketplace for more  
2 transparent systems and to be open as well to new collaborative development models;  
3 and

4 WHEREAS, The Los Angeles County Voting Systems Assessment Project (VSAP) is a  
5 collaborative project to design and implement a new voting system that was launched by the  
6 Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk and is a project that San Francisco  
7 officials can learn from; and

8 WHEREAS, The City and County of San Francisco recognizes that development and  
9 certification of these systems will entail substantial investment, but by pooling resources from  
10 other jurisdictions and organizations, the cost to each participant can be reduced; now,  
11 therefore be it

12 RESOLVED, That the City and County of San Francisco supports the movement  
13 toward more open and transparent voting systems and the creation of new voting systems  
14 using open source software and inexpensive commodity components; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors requests that the Local Agency  
16 Formation Commission conduct a study of the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the City  
17 and County of San Francisco leading an effort to develop and use a new voting system, either  
18 whole or in part, through a collaborative model, and which includes researching and  
19 presenting options for structuring such a development project, as well as reviewing the work  
20 of the Los Angeles Voting Systems Assessment Project (VSAP) and its process of voting  
21 system design and acting as its own vendor, as a model for San Francisco in its pursuit of  
22 transparent, secure and fair elections.



**City and County of San Francisco**  
**Tails**  
**Resolution**

City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

**File Number:** 141105

**Date Passed:** December 09, 2014

Resolution committing the City and County of San Francisco to work with other jurisdictions and organizations to create new voting systems using open source software; and to study the feasibility of the City and County of San Francisco developing and using a new voting system, either whole or in part, through a collaborative model like the Los Angeles County Voting Systems Assessment Project.

December 03, 2014 Rules Committee - RECOMMENDED

December 09, 2014 Board of Supervisors - AMENDED

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

December 09, 2014 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED AS AMENDED

Ayes: 10 - Avalos, Breed, Campos, Cohen, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Tang, Wiener and Yee

File No. 141105

**I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED AS AMENDED on 12/9/2014 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.**

**Angela Calvillo**  
**Clerk of the Board**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Unsigned

**Mayor**

\_\_\_\_\_  
12/19/14

**Date Approved**

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, or time waived pursuant to Board Rule 2.14.2, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter or Board Rule 2.14.2.

**Angela Calvillo**  
**Clerk of the Board**

# ATTACHMENT B

## Ranked-Choice Voting Charter Amendment

### SEC. 13.102. INSTANT RUNOFF ELECTIONS.

(a) For the purposes of this section: (1) a candidate shall be deemed "continuing" if the candidate has not been eliminated; (2) a ballot shall be deemed "continuing" if it is not exhausted; and (3) a ballot shall be deemed "exhausted," and not counted in further stages of the tabulation, if all of the choices have been eliminated or there are no more choices indicated on the ballot. If a ranked-choice ballot gives equal rank to two or more candidates, the ballot shall be declared exhausted when such multiple rankings are reached. If a voter casts a ranked-choice ballot but skips a rank, the voter's vote shall be transferred to that voter's next ranked choice.

(b) The Mayor, Sheriff, District Attorney, City Attorney, Treasurer, Assessor-Recorder, Public Defender, and members of the Board of Supervisors shall be elected using a ranked-choice, or "instant runoff," ballot. The ballot shall allow voters to rank a number of choices in order of preference equal to the total number of candidates for each office; provided, however, if the voting system, vote tabulation system or similar or related equipment used by the City and County cannot feasibly accommodate choices equal to the total number of candidates running for each office, then the Director of Elections may limit the number of choices a voter may rank to no fewer than three. The ballot shall in no way interfere with a voter's ability to cast a vote for a write-in candidate.

(c) If a candidate receives a majority of the first choices, that candidate shall be declared elected. If no candidate receives a majority, the candidate who received the fewest first choices shall be eliminated and each vote cast for that candidate shall be transferred to the next ranked candidate on that voter's ballot. If, after this transfer of votes, any candidate has a majority of the votes from the continuing ballots, that candidate shall be declared elected.

(d) If no candidate receives a majority of votes from the continuing ballots after a candidate has been eliminated and his or her votes have been transferred to the next-ranked candidate, the continuing candidate with the fewest votes from the continuing ballots shall be eliminated. All votes cast for that candidate shall be transferred to the next-ranked continuing candidate on each voter's ballot. This process of eliminating candidates and transferring their votes to the next-ranked continuing candidates shall be repeated until a candidate receives a majority of the votes from the continuing ballots.

(e) If the total number of votes of the two or more candidates credited with the lowest number of votes is less than the number of votes credited to the candidate with the next highest number of votes, those candidates with the lowest number of votes shall be eliminated simultaneously and their votes transferred to the next-ranked continuing candidate on each ballot in a single counting operation.

(f) A tie between two or more candidates shall be resolved in accordance with State law.

(g) The Department of Elections shall conduct a voter education campaign to familiarize voters with the ranked-choice or "instant runoff," method of voting.

(h) Any voting system, vote tabulation system, or similar or related equipment acquired by the City and County shall have the capability to accommodate this system of ranked-choice, or "instant runoff," balloting.

(i) Ranked choice, or "instant runoff," balloting shall be used for the general municipal election in November 2002 and all subsequent elections. If the Director of Elections certifies to the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor no later than July 1,

2002 that the Department will not be ready to implement ranked-choice balloting in November 2002, then the City shall begin using ranked-choice, or "instant runoff," balloting at the November 2003 general municipal election.

If ranked-choice, or "instant runoff," balloting is not used in November of 2002, and no candidate for any elective office of the City and County, except the Board of Education and the Governing Board of the Community College District, receives a majority of the votes cast at an election for such office, the two candidates receiving the most votes shall qualify to have their names placed on the ballot for a runoff election held on the second Tuesday in December of 2002.

# ATTACHMENT C

## Supplemental Information Associated with Elections in San Francisco

The City and County of San Francisco was established by Charter in 1850, and is the only legal subdivision of the State of California with the governmental powers of both a city and a county. The City's legislative power is exercised through a Board of Supervisors, while its executive power is vested upon a Mayor and other appointed and elected officials. Under the City Charter, the Department of Elections is responsible for conducting all public federal, state, district and municipal elections in the City and County of San Francisco in a manner that is free, fair and functional.

Elected officials include the Mayor, Members of the Board of Supervisors, Assessor-Recorder, City Attorney, District Attorney, Public Defender, Sheriff, Judges of the Superior Court, Treasurer, and Board of Education and Community College Board Members. Since November 2000, the eleven-member Board of Supervisors has been elected through district elections. The eleven district elections are staggered for five and six seats at a time, and held in even-numbered years. Board members serve four-year terms and vacancies are filled by Mayoral appointment.

In March 2002, San Francisco voters amended the Charter to require the use of ranked-choice voting to elect most City officers. Ranked-choice voting applies to all City elected officials except members of the Board of Education and the Community College Board.

The Department conducts elections following federal, state, and local laws – notably, the Voting Rights Act, the Help America Vote Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the City's Language Access Ordinance; maintaining an open process that inspires public confidence in the election system; providing and improving upon a public outreach and education plan to engage eligible potential voters in San Francisco; and continuing to improve its services by streamlining processes and anticipating the future needs of San Francisco voters.

Serving a registered voter base of approximately 430,000 citizens, the Department:

- Facilitates the filing of candidate nomination papers, ballot measures, and the ballot arguments that appear in the Voter Information Pamphlet;
- Produces San Francisco's official and sample ballots and Voter Information Pamphlet;
- Administers the vote-by-mail program for approximately 220,000 voters;
- Organizes an Official Observer Panel;
- Secures polling places for Election Day;
- Recruits and trains poll workers to administer mandated procedures and serve a linguistically and culturally diverse voter population;
- Facilitates voting at City Hall starting 29 days before every election;
- Organizes the collection of ballots and election results data on election night;
- Provides for ballot tabulation and reporting of election results; and
- Conducts the official canvass of votes cast to ensure the accuracy and validity of election results.

### Statistics

- Population: 852,469 (Data from U.S. Census Bureau as of July 2014)
- District Composition: San Francisco has two Congressional districts, one State Senate districts, two State Assembly districts, three BART districts, and eleven Supervisorial districts. The number of different ballot types the City may use in an election, which is based in part on the number of districts and political parties, can be as high as 37.



- Number of Registered Voters: 437,110 (as of July 31, 2015)
- Number of Voters who vote by mail (permanent vote-by-mail and military and overseas voters): 236,594 (as of July 31, 2015)
- Number of precincts: 597
- Number of polling places: 576 to 390, depending on type of election
- Number of poll workers: 1,800 to 2,500, depending on type of election
- Language requirements: the Federal Voting Rights Act - Chinese, Spanish; the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance - Chinese, Spanish, and Filipino.