

## Election Cost Analysis 17-18 Board of Directors

The table below illustrates the comparison of the voting results for the Property-Based Improvement District between FYI516 and FYI617. Utilizing the new electronic system (Election Runner) only 69 votes were cast in FYI617 a 50% decrease from paper ballots in FYI516. Of the 69 votes cast, 17 votes were from returning voters. As of September 22, 2017 the number of postcards that were undeliverable were 172, 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	(69)				
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 FYI516 and FYI617. Utilizing the new electronic system (Election Runner) only 46 votes were cast in FYI617 a 2% increase from paper ballots in FYI516. 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)				



Below is the cost analysis for the FY1617 Board Election process. Overall, the process cost DLBA \$11,380 of which \$6.7k was in material expenses, a 17% decrease from the previous year and \$4.6K in staff time or a total of 126 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		FY1516	FY1617	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	FY1516	FY1617	DELTA
				DLLIA
Austin Metoyer	17	-	\$509.15	DELIA
		- -		DELIA
Austin Metoyer	17	- - -	\$509.15	DELIA
Austin Metoyer Safety Ambassador	17 12	- - -	\$509.15 \$161.56	DELIA
Austin Metoyer Safety Ambassador Steve Be Cotte	17 12 2	- - - -	\$509.15 \$161.56 \$54.80	DELIA
Austin Metoyer Safety Ambassador Steve Be Cotte Ryan Suburu	17 12 2 30	- - - - -	\$509.15 \$161.56 \$54.80 \$792.00	DELIA
Austin Metoyer Safety Ambassador Steve Be Cotte Ryan Suburu Melissa Wilson	17 12 2 30 35	- - - - -	\$509.15 \$161.56 \$54.80 \$792.00 \$910.00	
Austin Metoyer Safety Ambassador Steve Be Cotte Ryan Suburu Melissa Wilson Broc Coward	17 12 2 30 35 10	- - - - - - - \$5,085.77	\$509.15 \$161.56 \$54.80 \$792.00 \$910.00 \$500.00	(\$458.26)

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

	FY1516	FY1617	DELTA (\$)	DELTA (%)
Cost Per Mailed Ballot	\$2.00	\$1.91	(\$0.09)	-5%
Undeliverable	\$990.05	\$664.09	(\$325.96)	-33%
(Return to Sender)		Ф664.09	(\$323.76)	
Not Returned	\$9,387.51	\$8,190.44	(\$1,197.06)	-13%
Returned	\$365.28	\$219.46	(\$145.83)	-40%
Rate of Return	3%	2%		



## **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.