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## Election Cost Analysis <br> 17-18 Board of Directors

The table below illustrates the comparison of the voting results for the Property-Based Improvement District between FYI5I6 and FYI6I7. Utilizing the new electronic system (Election Runner) only 69 votes were cast in FYI6I7 a $50 \%$ decrease from paper ballots in FYI5I6. Of the 69 votes cast, 17 votes were from returning voters. As of September 22, 2017 the number of postcards that were undeliverable were I72, this is $44 \%$ lower than previous year.

| Property Based Improvement District |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Stakeholders that Voted |  |
| Fiscal Year 2015-16 | 138 |
| Fiscal Year 2016-17 | 69 |
| Delta | $\mathbf{( 6 9 )}$ |
| Returning Voters | 17 |
| Postcards: Return to Sender |  |
| Fiscal Year 2015-16 | 309 |
| Fiscal Year 2016-17 | 172 |
| Delta | $(137)$ |

The table below illustrates the comparison of the voting results for the Downtown Parking Improvement Area between FYI5I6 and FYI6I7. Utilizing the new electronic system (Election Runner) only 46 votes were cast in FYI6I7 a $2 \%$ increase from paper ballots in FYI5I6. Of the 46 votes cast, 10 votes were from returning voters. As of September 22, 2017 the number of postcards that were undeliverable were 179, this is $4 \%$ lower than previous year.

| Downtown Parking Improvement Area |  |
| ---: | :---: |
| Stakeholders that Voted |  |
| Fiscal Year 2015-16 | 45 |
| Fiscal Year 2016-17 | 46 |
| Delta | I |
| Returning Voters | 10 |
| Postcards: Return to Sender |  |
| Fiscal Year 2015-16 | 187 |
| Fiscal Year 2016-17 | 179 |
| Delta | $(8)$ |
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Below is the cost analysis for the FYI6I7 Board Election process. Overall, the process cost DLBA $\$ 11,380$ of which $\$ 6.7 \mathrm{k}$ was in material expenses, a $17 \%$ decrease from the previous year and $\$ 4.6 \mathrm{~K}$ in staff time or a total of I 26 hours.

While, there was considerably more time spent in preparation and planning of the new electronic voting system, this was offset by elimination of temp services (60hrs) used for folding/stuffing ballot envelops.

| MATERIALS |  | FY 1516 | FY16I7 | DELTA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outreach (postcards, board election, print , mail and postage) |  | - | \$2,306.12 |  |
| Election Runner Login Info Postcards |  | - | \$3,447.93 |  |
| Election Runner - Add Service Raw Ballot |  | - | \$570.60 |  |
| Election Runner - DPIA Voters |  | - | \$151.74 |  |
| Election Runner - PBIDA Voters |  | - | \$276.21 |  |
| TOTAL MATERIAL COSTS |  | \$8,145.65 | \$6,752.60 | (\$ 1,393.05) |
| LABOR | HOURS | FYI5I6 | FY16I7 | DELTA |
| Austin Metoyer | 17 | - | \$509.15 |  |
| Safety Ambassador | 12 | - | \$161.56 |  |
| Steve Be Cotte | 2 | - | \$54.80 |  |
| Ryan Suburu | 30 | - | \$792.00 |  |
| Melissa Wilson | 35 | - | \$910.00 |  |
| Broc Coward | 10 | - | \$500.00 |  |
| Kraig Kojian | 20 | - | \$1,700.00 |  |
| TOTAL STAFF HOURS | 126 | \$5,085.77 | \$4,627.5 I | (\$458.26) |
| TOTAL MATERIAL \& LABOR COST |  | \$13,231.42 | \$ I 1,380. 11 | (\$1,85I.31) |

The table below shows cost per mailed ballot excluding initial outreach postcards.

|  | FY 1516 | FY 1617 | DELTA (\$) | DELTA (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost Per Mailed Ballot | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 1.91$ | $(\$ 0.09)$ | $-5 \%$ |
| Undeliverable    <br> (Return to Sender) $\$ 990.05$ $\$ 664.09$ $(\$ 325.96)$ <br> Not Returned $\$ 9,387.51$ $\$ 8,190.44$ $\mathbf{( \$ 1 , 1 9 7 . 0 6 )}$ <br> Returned $\$ 365.28$ $\$ 219.46$ $(\$ 145.83)$ <br> Rate of Return $3 \%$ $2 \%$ $\quad-40 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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## Opportunities for Savings \& Efficiencies

While costs savings during the transition of paper ballots to an electronic system were minimal overall, there are opportunities for savings next year. With a better understanding of the processes and procedures for an online election, there are expected efficiencies that should occur with regard to staff time. In addition, there is an opportunity to decreases the cost of Election Runner by $\$ 200$ next year by reducing the number of raw ballots required after the election is closed. While the number of return to sender postcards were on par with last year's return rate, potentially using a different courier delivery services, might decrease the number of correctly addressed ballots returned to the DLBA as a result of "undeliverable." Lastly, there is an opportunity to follow-up on past voters. As mentioned earlier, the number of returning voters was relatively low. While efforts should always be made to continue to grow the pool of individuals voting, efforts should also be made to follow-up with individuals that have consistently voted from year-to-year.

