STATE OF CALIFORNIA
VOTING MODERNIZATION BOARD
BOARD MEETING
TUESDAY, June 2, 2015
2:00 P.M.

Ronald Reagan Building
Auditorium
300 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, California

Reported by:
Troy A. Ray
APPEARANCES

BOARD
Stephen Kaufman, Chair
June A. Lagmay
Gabriel Sandoval

STAFF
Robbie Anderson
Katherine Montgomery
Ryan Macias
Jana Lean

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
Dean Logan

PUBLIC
David Holtzman
Mark Shaw
INDEX

I. Call to Order 4

II. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum 4

III. Public Comment 5

David Holtzman

Mark Shaw

VI. Other Business 10

(A) Future meeting dates

IV. Adoption of March 26, 2015 Minutes 7

V. Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award Approval 11

(A) Los Angeles County

VII. Adjournment 65

Certification 66
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Now that we have muddled through some of our technology issues, we’re going to call the meeting of the Voting Modernization Board to order a bit late but calling it nonetheless.

We are -- in case those of you in the audience are not perceptive enough -- we are a little short on a quorum right now. One of our Board members is on the way over, so we’re going to start with just a couple items of business. Hope that he’ll show up in the interim; and if not, we’ll take a few minute break to await his arrival for any action items.

So I guess with that, Katherine, do you want to do a roll call and not declare a quorum for the present time?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Sure. Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Here.

MS. MONTGOMERY: June Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Present.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. We have one item of public comment, and that is David Holtzman.

So David, if you want to comment on
matters that are not on the agenda presently --

MR. HOLTZMAN: Yes, thank you, Chairman Kaufman.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I understand that you may have things you want to comment on that are on the agenda, which we can take up when we --

MR. HOLTZMAN: Yeah, that I certainly will want to do later.

Board members, just briefly, I wanted to say I think you could do a little better job of noticing your meetings. It would be nice if you maintained an email list of people who are interested in receiving the agendas when they come out, because I didn’t find out about this meeting until over this weekend, to tell you the truth.

I also didn’t see on the website some of the materials that might be related to this meeting, such as the actual proposal or application that L.A. County submitted, so it would be great if those could show up on the website, and also the minutes.

So my comment on Item 4 is simply that the minutes weren’t available to look at in advance of the meeting. So I’m finished with my comment on Item 4 now.
So that’s what I wanted to say about your procedures.

I want to thank you again for doing this in Los Angeles, it’s a great convenience for the biggest city in the state.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Holtzman. And we will note the request about trying to perhaps get our agenda out to folks that we know are regulars. Is there something we can do about that?

MS. LEAN: Yeah, we can get his contact information and we can put him on the list to receive the agenda.

It was noticed ten days before the meeting. It’s also posted on the Voting Modernization Board’s website. We are in the process of redesigning that website, making it more user friendly so it’s easier to find.

It was posted but perhaps it is not the easiest thing to find on the website, so we will take note of that and make sure that happens in the future.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, we’ll make every effort to do what’s within our power to do on that.
MR. HOLTZMAN: Thank you. My email address is on the list back there.

MS. LEAN: Great.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Excellent.

Why don’t we skip ahead to Item No. 6, a review of our schedule. So now that you’re here, Mr. Holtzman, you’ll hear what we have planned for the next few months.

MR. HOLTZMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And if staff can kind of review where we’re at for our upcoming schedule.

MS. LEAN: So we have four meetings scheduled so far for the rest of the year. It’s contingent upon getting additional information from Los Angeles County and any other county that wants to come forward to the Board.

The first meeting after today’s meeting that’s scheduled is for Thursday, July 23rd. The location is to be determined but is at the request of the staff that that location be in Los Angeles.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I thought you said Sacramento.

MS. LEAN: I’m sorry, in Sacramento. I’m in Los Angeles.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.
MS. LEAN: The next meeting is scheduled for August 13th, which is a Thursday. We also have another meeting scheduled for September 3rd, which is a Thursday. And we also have one scheduled for October 9th, which is a Friday.

And all those locations are to be determined, and once we have information on which counties are coming forward or if Los Angeles is coming forward, we will be in discussions with those counties and the members to make sure where to have that meeting.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And to be clear, all these dates have been discussed with or cleared by the members, so hopefully we will avoid as many scheduling conflicts as possible given that these have all been precleared on peoples’ schedules.

MS. LEAN: We will notify everyone three weeks ahead of time whether or not we have received any information to come forward to the Board, and only if we absolutely have to have the meeting will we have it; otherwise, it’ll be cancelled and then anything else will come up for the next month’s scheduled meeting.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.
BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: But the 23rd is anticipated for Sacramento; is that correct?

MS. LEAN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Anything else on scheduling from you?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: No, no thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. All right. So other than adjournment, it looks like the other items that we have on our agenda are going to require a quorum for adoption, and I don’t want L.A. County to present until we have our third member here.

So we’re going to ask you all to indulge with us for just a short while until Mr. Sandoval makes his arrival, and we’ll take a short break and then we’ll proceed with the rest of the meeting. Okay. Thank you.

(Off the record 2:35 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.)

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. We’re going to go back on the record here, and we’ve been joined by Mr. Sandoval.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: My apologies.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Our third Board member, and we now have a quorum to proceed.

I want to thank everybody here for your
patience. We wanted to get through this today and so we’ll proceed accordingly.

If folks have public comment on a matter that’s agendized, we’ll take public comment at that time, sir.

So we’re going to proceed with Item No. 4, which is the adoption of the March 26, 2015 Actions and Meeting Minutes. Ms. Lagmay has some nonsubstantive corrections to the minutes, so she’s going to submit those to staff to correct. But if we could get a motion to approve the minutes.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: (Inaudible)

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Subject to the changes?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Yes.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Second?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: I second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We’ll take a vote on that.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: June Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, great,

Now we’re going to turn to Item No. 5 on the agenda, which is the project documentation plan and funding award approval for Los Angeles County. We’re going to ask staff to provide us with the staff report. We’ll probably have some questions from the Board. Then we’ll have L.A. County speak to their submission after the staff presentation, and then we’ll take any public comment that there is on the matter.

So Katherine.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Thank you.

FEMALE VOICE: (Inaudible)

CHAIR KAUFMAN: As I just indicated, we will do public comment following L.A. County’s presentation.

Go ahead, Katherine.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Los Angeles County plans to wrap up their design and engineering phase, Phase 3, in March of 2016 and move into their manufacturing and certification phase, Phase 4, in June of 2016.

Los Angeles County plans to complete their design and engineering Phase 3 in March of 2016 with the anticipation of producing certified
units beginning in the fall of 2017.

Los Angeles County is in the process of completing their design and engineering phase of what they refer to as the voting systems assessment project or commonly referred to as VSAP.

The VSAP was launched by Los Angeles County in response to growing voting system needs and unique challenges faced by the County due to its size and complexity. According to Los Angeles County, the goal is to acquire a new voting system for the County through a transparent process that engages the public and is founded on sound data. The County asserts this system will be designed using a human-centered process which will produce a system that best suits the needs of voters and will ultimately be owned by the public.

As has been discussed at previous Voting Modernization Board, or Board meetings, in October of 2013 Senate Bill 360 was signed into law by Governor Brown. SB360 allows a county to contract and pay for funding to be allocated by the Board for the following.

One, research and development of a new voting system that has not been certified or
conditionally approved by the Secretary of State and uses only nonproprietary software and firmware with disclosed source code except for unmodified commercial off-the-shelf software and firmware as designed.

Two, manufacture of the minimum number of voting system units reasonably necessary for either of the following purposes.

A, to test and seek certification or conditional approval for the voting system;

B, to test and demonstrate the capabilities of the voting system in a pilot program as defined.

The counties may use the authorization of a Funding Award Letter to secure a contract with a vendor and/or consultant to begin the research and development process of a proposed voting system. During the research and development process, counties may come to the VMB iteratively to request further authorization or funding as the research and development phases progress.

In October of 2014, Los Angeles County entered into an agreement with IDEO for the development of detailed designs and engineering specifications for a new ballot marking device.
sometimes referred to as BMD, and related voting system components. The completion of this phase will provide Los Angeles County with the necessary engineering package to transition into the manufacturing and implementation of a new voting system. It is Los Angeles’s intent to certify and implement the new voting system for use in future elections.

Recently, Los Angeles County provided the Board with invoices or documentation for items in the amount of $8,275,829 for work already completed. Using the 3:1 match formula, Los Angeles County is seeking reimbursement in the amount of $6,206,871.75 for this purpose.

The County also seeks authorization for funding in the amount of $7,148,000 for future expenditures. Using the 3:1 match formula, Los Angeles County in the future will be seeking reimbursement in the amount of $5,361,000 for this purpose.

These two requests for reimbursement, current and future, comprise the county requested funding award amount of $11,567,871.75.

Work already completed: The $8,275,829 requested for work already completed can be broken
down into three categories: invoices for deliverables, travel costs, and personnel costs.

Deliverables: At the request of the staff to the Board, Los Angeles County has provided copies of 16 invoices from IDEO and one invoice from Atkins Research Global, along with the supporting documentation regarding each deliverable in the amount of $7,633,020.

Travel costs: Travel expense claims for Los Angeles County staff, the VSAP Advisory Committee, which provides expert analysis on initial research findings and continuous input and guidance throughout the project. And the VSAP Technical Advisory Committee, which provides ongoing technical expertise in the fields of usability, accessibility, and security -- membership rosters for both of these committees are attached -- have been submitted to the Board in the amount of $25,719.

Before these costs can be considered for reimbursement, a succinct itemization of travel costs, including specific trips and associated staff, will need to be provided to the Board.

Personnel Costs: The County has submitted a request for the reimbursement of
County personnel costs as they relate to their work on VSAP. Those claims total $617,090. Specifically, Los Angeles County is asking the Board to reimburse them for salaries of those County staff members working full-time on VSAP.

The County’s salary calculations also include employee benefits and overhead. Employee benefits include benefit costs other than salaries or wages earned by County employees. These benefits include health, dental, and life insurance, unemployment, disability, workers compensation, deferred compensation plans, etcetera.

Overhead costs include those costs that cannot be readily identified to a specific service but are incurred while employees perform their duties. For example, utilities, custodial, security, and administrative functions such as payroll, personnel, and accounting.

Before these personnel costs can be considered for reimbursement, a succinct itemization that clearly differentiates between the cost of employees’ salaries and wages, benefits and overhead will need to be provided to the Board.
This is the first time the Board has been asked to cover the cost of overhead. The Board will need to decide if Proposition 41 Bond funds can be used to reimburse counties for overhead while conducting research and development as it relates to a new voting system.

It should be noted that while administering the Health America Vote Act, or HAVA, Secretary of State staff has decided that HAVA funds will not be made available for reimbursement to counties for the cost of overhead while staff performs work specific to HAVA.

Future expenditures: Los Angeles County is also requesting that the Board authorize funding in the amount of $7,148,000 for future expenditures. The County expects to be invoiced by IDEO during the remainder of 2015 and early 2016 as their design and engineering phase, or Phase 3, wraps up.

It is our recommendation that Los Angeles County’s Project Documentation Plan be approved and the Board authorize the issuance of a Funding Award Letter in the amount of $11,567,871.75.

At this time we recommend the reimbursement of the County’s deliverables in the
amount of $7,633,020.

Los Angeles County must submit a fully executed research and development payment request form, Appendix E-2, in the Funding Application and Procedural Guide, and include a copy of each invoice along with documentation regarding the matching fund requirement before reimbursements in the amount of $5,724,765, which is the $7,633,020 amount reduced by the 3:1 match formula, will be made.

At this time we cannot recommend reimbursement for either the travel costs, $25,719, or the personnel costs, $617,090, as they have been submitted to the Board as part of the project documentation plan until such time Los Angeles County provides concise itemization of all associated costs.

Additionally, when Los Angeles County is ready to submit invoices for payment related to the authorized funding in the amount of $7,148,000, it is the recommendation that the County must come back before the Board in order to provide an update regarding the progress of the project before reimbursement can be made.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Before we turn to
the County, I wanted to ask a couple questions of clarification from Katherine or Jana, just so we’re all clear as the Board on what the recommendation is that the staff is making. So we’ve got a recommendation as it currently stands to issue a Funding Award Letter that covers everything that the County has requested, correct?

MS. MONTGOMERY: That’s correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Including past deliverables and future costs.

MS. LEAN: And future costs. Once they come forward and have the additional itemization for the personnel costs, which includes the travel and overhead, and when they have the additional information moving forward on any deliverables that they get moving forward.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So there’s the Funding Award Letter, which is kind of everything, and then there’s what they’re being reimbursed for pursuant to the Funding Award Letter.

MS. LEAN: Correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And the current recommendation is we issue an award letter for everything, and then we reimburse for the
deliverables.

MS. LEAN: Correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And that we await additional information to make a decision on reimburse of travel costs, personnel expenses, and other future, I guess deliverables that will be forthcoming in accordance with their contract.

MS. LEAN: Correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: But I guess as a preliminary matter this Board still has to make a decision about whether we feel that what you’ve classified as overhead expenses are in fact covered, covered VMB expenses, and want to make that award. That would affect the Funding Award Letter too if we made a determination that that was not, for example, a reimbursable expense.

MS. LEAN: That’s correct. We would have to adjust the Funding Award Letter amount.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And when you say that overhead expenses, the percent the Board has been asked to cover the cost of overhead, you’re referring just to the overhead component, you’re not referring necessarily to personnel costs, or when you’re referring to overhead here are you talking about personnel travel and overhead?
MS. LEAN: Personnel travel and overhead.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, so all of that is being referred to colloquially as overhead.
MS. LEAN: Colloquially in one lump sum
as overhead.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. I mean, those are
the items that jumped out at me when I was going through this about whether they’re even items that we could or should be awarding under the authority that’s given to us. And I guess that’ll have to be an issue for the Board to take up.
But to clarify, we could, depending on where we come out with those issues, we could issue a Funding Award Letter to cover those matters that we know and are clear about and have consensus on today. Like if we were to award the deliverables and still visit the issue of these other issues, overhead and what have you.
MS. LEAN: At a later date or different meeting, that’s correct.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: If we chose to go that route.
MS. LEAN: Correct.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Did you have any follow-up, June?
BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Yeah. That jumped out at me too. Maybe if I iterate it in a different way so that I can personally understand it.

So it appears to me that the award of a Funding Award Letter is a different concept than the actual payment of costs.

MS. LEAN: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: So in other words, a Funding Award Letter is almost like an appropriation or an allocation or an escrow or a putting aside, but the money is not guaranteed to be paid out.

MS. LEAN: Until we have sufficient invoices, correct, or deliverables.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: That’s, again, a separate process then when the County comes back with actual invoices, which the Board peruses and upon staff recommendation says yes, pay A, B and C, but do not pay D, E and F.

MS. LEAN: It’s a little bit different moving forward for this under SB360. Previously there was a contract for an entire amount and when they’re delivered voting equipments, then we would issue, the Board would issue a Funding Award
Letter for the entire contract amount, and then once those invoices come in, they’re reviewed by staff, it’s gone over with the Chair before we make any sort of payment.

Typically, we wouldn’t necessarily have to come back in front of the entire Board and have a meeting to go over those invoices, but because this is a new process and it was anticipated with this new process, we’re suggesting that if anything that isn’t approved today would need to come back in front of the Board for a discussion. Or if there’s anything that you don’t feel comfortable with moving forward at this time until we have different information or specific documentation that meets your needs for any kind of specific payment, that’s what we’re suggesting too.

Whatever you’re feeling is comfortable and is consistent with SB360 and what’s allowable under that bill and related to the voting modernization fund, that’s what it is.

So in the past what we have done under other project documentation plans is if we had the contract here we would recommend for the full amount of what’s being requested by the County.
So I think what Mr. Kaufman, if I understand your question, sir, is what specifically has been delivered and what has been contracted for and what we can move forward with today. And if I’m understanding you, that’s potentially what you would feel more comfortable with moving forward with?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, I want to hear what the County has to say and we’ll have a conversation here, but I just kind of wanted to know what the spectrum of our options are, because my gut reaction in looking at this was that there were certain items that seemed to be in that comfort box or whatever way we want to refer to it, and then there’s some other stuff that’s very new that we may decide is appropriate, but we haven’t really contemplated items like that before and I think we need to have a conversation about it.

So that was just my initial thought is if we felt like we needed to have more conversation about that, you know, can we still issue a funding award based on what we know and what we’re comfortable with and potentially hold off on other pieces with it, if that’s what it came to.
MS. LEAN: That’s absolutely an option. And we could give you the funding amount award that is for deliverables that they’ve gotten so far and that you have been presented with, and then anything else moving forward we can have them come back to us, present us with more information, do another staff report and go through each one of those items.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Because there’s a difference between saying we’ve approved this, now just give us the documentation to show you’ve incurred this; that’s one thing. And then it’s another thing to say, well, we’re not sure we want to approve this, we still need to figure out if this even falls into that category.

MS. LEAN: That’s correct.

So Los Angeles County does have the formula that was originally adopted for the Voting Modernization Board, they have approximately $49 million in their allocation, so that they do have that entire allocation that’s earmarked for Los Angeles County.

But as we’ve talked about previously under project documentation plans, they come forward iterably, most of the counties have, to
get different portions of their voting systems. So while this is a whole new process, we thought we’d bring it all forward what they’ve requested and take it to your opinions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Mr. Sandoval, before we hear from L.A. County did you have any process questions you wanted to ask staff?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I’d like to hear what the County has to say first. And I agree with you that there’s a two-step process. One is what is permissible first, and then we make a decision whether or not that’s something that is going to be supported by whatever the County says in terms of those matters that are already permissible clearly under governing authority. But I would like to hear what the County has to say first on these issues.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Mr. Logan, are you going to take the lead here? Welcome to our Board meeting, and thank you to you and your entire group for coming here today, and we apologize for the delay but we wanted to make sure you had your chance to be heard and considered today.

MR. LOGAN: Great. Well, thank you very much. So good afternoon, Chairman Kaufman, Mr.
Sandoval and Ms. Lagmay. It is good to be here,
and despite the delay, I do appreciate being in
L.A. County and your accommodation in that regard.
   My name is Dean Logan. I am the Registrar
Recorder County Clerk for Los Angeles County, and
I want to thank the Board for considering our
funding proposal today.
   I also want to take just a moment to
thank the staff from the Secretary of State’s
office who have worked on this, as has been noted
and probably will be noted again throughout the
rest of the meeting. We’re in new territory here
with regard to the Prop 41 funding and the changes
that were made to the use of those funds under
Senate Bill 360, so we appreciate the work that
they’ve done to help us prepare the funding
package and to prepare the information for you
today.
   Before I address the specific funding
request that’s before you for consideration, I
would like to take a moment to give you a brief
update on the voting systems assessment project. I
was unable to be here at the last meeting but I
know that you were given an overview and
presentation of the background of the project.
But I wanted to let you know that last week our internal project team along with the design firm IDEO conducted user experience testing with the latest prototypes of the ballot marking device. The testing sessions focused on particular voter categories where obstacles or barriers to voting have been issues in the past and have been identified as issues with current voting systems.

Specifically, we had user sessions with senior citizens, disabled veterans, voters with limited vision, Spanish speakers, Korean speakers, and new or inexperienced voters. All total out of three days worth of sessions last week, which were fairly dynamic and intense, we had 176 participants come through, touch the devices, walk through a scenario and give valuable feedback that I think will be of particular value, quite frankly, not just to this project but overall to the desire for an improved and more modernized voting experience in California, and that certainly parallels well with conversations going on in Sacramento with the State Legislature right now about potentially fundamentally changing some of the says elections are conducted in California. So I did want to let you know about that.
The funding authorization before you today comes at a critical time for the project as we move toward completion of the design and engineering phase, so getting those tangible deliverables that will actually lead to a public and competitive procurement process that is still yet to be defined, but that is the next step once we have the design and engineering phase completed.

Los Angeles County did submit an application to your Board for California Proposition 41 Voting Modernization Bond Act funds through a project documentation package dated March 18th, and those were received by your Board on April 10th.

At this time, as was indicated in the staff report, we are requesting, first, authorization of funding for approximately $11.6 million, which is 75 percent of the approximately $15.4 million total projected cost of the current and prior activity.

Secondly, we are requesting payment for research and development expenses that have already taken place in the project in the amount of just over $6 million. And again, that’s 75
percent of the total of close to $8.3 million
detailed in documents you’ve received. So we are
asking for approval of those funds.

I understand that staff has requested
additional information on the travel and personnel
costs that they received. We certainly understand
that and appreciate that. We’re in the process of
gathering that data and will provide that at a
future time, and we’re certainly prepared to come
to future meetings to address those issues and
have no objection to that. I think that speaks to
the transparency both of the project and of the
process that you oversee.

I would like to address just briefly the
issue of the cost of overhead in general since it
sounds like that is a new area for you and for all
of us, and I think it’s something that’s specific
to the new scope that was provided under SB360,
and I know that you’re likely not to be making a
decision on that today but I do want to give you
some feedback just to consider.

These costs are an important component of
the project and we believe they should be
considered for reimbursement by this Board. As you
may be aware, project overhead and deliverables
are tightly integrated and these types of costs are not uncommon within technology related contracts.

I think what is different about this than past funding prior to SB360 is those funding requests have been primarily for the purchase of equipment, so those are tangible equipment purchases that came in place and were implemented.

We’re talking about research and development, and we’re talking about a publicly owned system, so there is a deliberative process that we have to go through. We’ve intentionally conducted the project in a way that has a high level of transparency, a high level of involvement. We have two very active advisory boards that were referenced in the staff report, an ongoing advisory committee as well as a very well respected technical advisory committee. And in order to have that level of expertise and involvement in a project of this magnitude, we need to be able to engage those people, and in order to do that, we need to be able to get them to meetings and to presentations so they can see and hear the research and advise us on that, so there are costs associated with that that would
not be associated with a typical procurement of equipment, and so I would just ask that you keep that in mind.

I also would say that in the spirit of the proposition and in the spirit of Senate Bill 360, the money that has been allocated on a formula basis to cover modernization of voting equipment in L.A. County, based on our projections for the project, is sufficient to cover those costs and that money is so we’re not competing with other jurisdictions or other purchasers for that money, so I’d ask that you consider that as well.

We’ve invested significant resources including overhead costs in support of modernizing the voting system, and there are no other dedicated sources of funding for those activities. Without the funding that comes through this process, we would be hard pressed to be able to absorb that, much the way we’re asked to absorb the cost of special vacancy elections that we conduct on a regular basis in Los Angeles County.

So I strongly urge your Board to include those costs among those that are reimbursable. Again, we appreciate that there’s a level of
documentation that’s needed for that. We want to 
be prudent in that. We want to maintain the 
integrity of this funding source and the integrity 
of our project, and we’re prepared to work with 
your Board and the staff to be sure that you get 
whatever detailed documentation you need for that. 

So the request before you today is 
necessary to fund the continued research and 
development of a new voting system and the 
development of accompanying manufacturing and 
design specifications that we fully intend to move 
forward with public procurement options for the 
manufacturing, certification, and implementation 
of a new voting system for Los Angeles County. 

I thank you for your time and 
consideration of our request. I appreciate your 
availability and interest in this very important 
project. 

I want to thank also the members of the 
public. It’s somewhat discouraging that we don’t 
see more members of the public actively engaged in 
this process, but I can tell you within our 
project there is a high degree of involvement and 
public participation. 

So again, I thank you and I’m available
to answer any questions at this time.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Logan. I guess again I just want to be clear that we’re all operating under the same understanding about the figures that are in front of us. I don’t know if I’m the only one who’s still a little unclear on it so just want to walk through it with you.

MR. LOGAN: Sure.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: If that’s okay, because you made reference to the $11.6 million figure that you referred to as, I guess, current costs?

MR. LOGAN: It’s the formula, the 75 percent of the current costs and existing investment that the County’s already made.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And that includes the payments that have been made to IDEO, right?

MR. LOGAN: Under our current contract with them, correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Under your current contract, the already made payments. And then also part of that component are the personnel costs, travel and other overhead that make up that amount of, let’s call it sunk costs that you’ve already incurred.

MR. LOGAN: Correct.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: And then in addition to that, on the research and development side there is money that was specified for future expenditures, which I guess according to the staff memo, was $7 million of which 75 percent I guess is in the $6 million range. And that includes IDEO contract payments, future IDEO contract payments, correct?

MR. LOGAN: Yeah, that represents the remaining deliverables of our current engagement with IDEO.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And does that figure include any additional personnel overhead costs on the research and development side or is that strictly a number that includes the IDEO contract?

MR. LOGAN: That’s specific to the contract with IDEO. Assuming that your Board makes a policy based on the current funding request with regard to those overhead or what you described as sunk costs, we would anticipate coming forward in the future for additional reimbursement as those costs accrue in the course of the project. But again, we don’t have a specific amount for that at this time so that’s not included in the funding authorization so we would come with a separate
request for that.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Ms. Lagmay, did you have any questions for Mr. Logan?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Not specific to Dean. When we get back to discussing the staff recommendation I want to weigh in, but I think he’s described his side of the story very well, thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And Mr. Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We may ask you to come back and address --

MR. LOGAN: I’ll stick around.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- additional questions, you or your staff. So yeah, don’t go too far.

MR. LOGAN: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And we received one public comment card from David Holtzman on this matter, so Mr. Holtzman.

MR. HOLTZMAN: Thank you, Chairman Kaufman, Board members. Last time I was here at your meeting last time and I was talking a little bit about rank choice voting. I’m not here to talk about rank choice voting today. I’m here to talk about a constitutional issue that bars your
approval of the proposal and request that’s before you under this agenda item. I was a little hesitant to bring it up last time because I think bringing it up last time committed me to follow through and pursue litigation if need be. And I also didn’t want to come across as someone who was willing to let a constitutional violation slide if my pet project, rank choice voting and runoff voting was included. So I have actually gone and had a preliminary discussion with counsel about bringing litigation if this item is approved.

So let me remind you, first of all, I did flag a couple of things last time. I also flagged the possible need for Ms. Lagmay to recuse herself because she was on one of the committees at one point for the voting system assessment project. You’ll see the committee listing in the staff report today that shows Holly Wolcott, who is the current City Clerk of the City of Los Angeles -- June Lagmay was on the committee when she was the city clerk of our fair city. And that’s not a monetary conflict but it’s something she or you all might want to consider.

The constitutional violation, I simply pointed you to the one section, the first sentence
of Article 16 of the State Constitution, to find whether it would be a constitutional issue with relying on SB360 to issue funds under Prop 41.

If you’re a person like I am who’s involved in municipal election reform and you read that sentence, you automatically see the issue, because it’s very much like an issue familiar to people involved with municipal election reform.

The City Constitution, Article 11, Section 5, says a city can choose its own election method by specifying it in the city charter. And the Constitution is clear, the election method has to be specified therein. The word that’s used in the city Constitution is “therein”.

So that means since a city charter amendment has to go before a vote of the people, that means there is accountability to a voter. The same structure, the same word “therein” is used twice actually in the city section of the Constitution to which I called your attention at the last meeting.

So I submitted a written summary of the issue. I was going to at this point in my testimony ask that you take a break because you have such a long meeting and not much to do during
the two hours that were allocated before we passed
those two hours. I would like for you to read that
submission and consider the argument, basically
that SB360 was not -- well, first of all, that
Prop 41 could not constitutionally provide for
(inaudible) code amendment by the Legislation.

And also the Legislature in enacting
SB360 could not amend the Bond Act. In fact, under
the terms of Prop 61, the constitutional terms of
Prop 61, a two-thirds vote is required and SB360
didn’t even get a two-thirds vote of both houses,
so there’s another ground under which it might be
considered invalid.

But my argument today is about the
constitutional violation, the Constitution which
does not allow the Legislature to essentially get
a player to be named later, a purpose to be named
later. It’s about how the Constitution, as I
specified in my written submission, says that the
specific object of a bond act has to be in the
bond act and it has to go before the voters.

So it’s kind of ironic that we have a
registrar of voters now today coming before you
asking to do something without putting it before
the voters as required by the State Constitution.
I think that’s somewhat disrespectful to voters. Now, last time I was here, I heard you all take an oath, or at least the new members of the committee (sic) take an oath to -- of the Board -- take an oath to serve the Constitution of the state of California. And this is such an obvious violation of the state of California, I don’t think it would be sufficient to say, well, nothing’s unconstitutional until it’s been declared so by the court.

The plain language of the Constitution clearly indicate that using Prop 41 funds for anything other than the specific object stated therein, which was to buy already certified equipment, would be a violation of the Constitution.

So it’s plain to see and I hope you’ll uphold your oath to serve the Constitution and not also put the state at risk of having to pay attorneys fees and costs of litigation, which would probably ensue if you vote to approve the proposal as put forth before you today.

I know you want to finish your job, get all the money that’s been allocated out; you mentioned that last time, but I think you really
have to choose from the available menu of certified equipment as something to be purchased. That’s the only thing that can be purchased using Prop 41 funds because it’s the only purpose the voters of the state of California have agreed to.

At this point since we have passed our time that was noticed for the meeting, you might actually consider taking this matter under advisement and bringing it up again at a future meeting.

My parking meter actually runs out at 4:30 because I didn’t expect to come later, but if you think you can wrap it up today, obviously you can do so at your discretion, but that’s really what I wanted to say.

My comments are the written submission that I provided. I have, if you really need to see it, the vote count in the Assembly for SB360. It got 53 Ayes and the understanding is you need 54 Ayes in the Assembly for two-thirds vote, so that’s another thing that’s there.

Anyway, thank you for your time and thank you for again holding your meeting in Los Angeles.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Holtzman, we appreciate your thoughtful comments. I’ll just
say for the record that SB360 was passed by the Legislature, signed by the Governor. It is the law of the state. This Board has followed the direction given by the Legislature and we have adopted our policies accordingly based on what is the current law of the state, and so we will make decisions based on that and we don’t intend to litigate here in these meetings the issue of SB360. That’s an issue that was presented to the Board a year ago and decisions that were made then, so it’s the duty of this Board to proceed along the lines of current state law and that’s what we will do in considering the County’s submission to us.

So with that, I think we should try and frame the issues for our consideration of the County’s submission.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: I’d like to say something.

MR. SHAW: (Inaudible)

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Mr. Holtzman got his public comments. It’s the only card we’ve received.

MR. SHAW: Well, I’m a member of the public, too.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: You’ve had two hours to submit a public comment card but if you want to comment --

MR. SHAW: I’ve been standing here waiting for a public comment period. You told me.

You told me --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: If you want to submit a card so that you can appear and speak before the Board --

MR. SHAW: You didn’t say that before.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- please do so now and we will give you an opportunity to speak.

MR. SHAW: I’d like you to verify that’s a legally required procedure.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Please complete a card so that you can properly appear before the Board and you can speak to whatever issue you want to speak to as with respect to Matter No. 5 on our agenda. Did you want to while we wait?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Just on Mr. Holtzman’s statement that these meetings are supported by our excellent staff and our state council attends all our meetings and we depend on the state council to keep us correct and constitutional and within the law, and I would be
confident that we would get advice from that
office if we were venturing into any territory
that might be nebulous.

Maybe we’ll take this comment first
before I go on to the Dean Logan thing.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Mr. Shaw?

MR. SHAW: Yeah.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Can you please
speak your comment.

MR. SHAW: You declared that you were
going to follow the laws of the State of
California. Does that include the Constitution of
the State of California?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: You can proceed with your
comments.

MR. SHAW: But I’m asking you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We’ve already sworn to
uphold the Constitution of the State of
California.

MR. SHAW: Good. All right. It’s been
pointed out to you that the Constitution plainly
states that according to this law, which is
approved by the people, shall not be modified for
any other purpose than what it states, which is to
provide funding for election equipment. You
understand that.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I don’t believe I’m here to testify, sir, so if you have some public comments to complete you can continue.

MR. SHAW: All right. Well, let the record show that you have declared that you were sworn to uphold the Constitution of the State of California, and in the face of that you’re considering an application for funding for purposes for which the Proposition 41 was not intended. Correct? I hear no response.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shaw.

Okay, Ms. Lagmay, did you want to complete your --

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Yes. When I was reading the staff report and I was trying to articulate this when I was asking clarification from staff, it seems like there was two different kinds of math going on. So if it is staff’s recommendation that the Funding Award Letter be awarded for 11.56 mil, but that amount includes overhead and personnel and travel, which staff goes on to say do not approve at this time until we get additional documentation, it seems to me it would be better to be straightforward and reduce
the Funding Award Letter for the amount for those expenses for which you recommend that we approve so that it’s apples to apples and not this funny math that is making me crazy.

MS. LEAN: We can absolutely do that, ma'am.

One of the things as we were talking about earlier was the authorization to spend up to that amount, but absolutely we could make a recommendation to you or you could choose to take a vote to just base the Funding Award Letter on the deliverables that have already been presented to the Board for that specific, I believe the amount would be for $7,633,020, and then that would be the 3:1 math for Los Angeles would be $5,724,765 if they get reimbursed based on invoices they submit to that amount. So we could make that recommendation to you if that’s what you want going forward.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: I ask my fellow Board members for their input but I just wanted to put that out there for discussion.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, I guess my feeling on it is I think there’s a few different categories of -- a few buckets of costs that are
before us. There’s the contract costs for the research and development of the project that have already been incurred; I kind of see that in one category. And frankly, for me it seems like an easy category.

I think SB360 was intended to provide some flexibility to deal with issues that may not have been thought of in 2001 when it seemed like an easy fix and all of a sudden we got to a point where there was no certified voting equipment.

So I think we want to reward innovation and not stop it when it comes to reaching solutions to these very serious problems that are before us here in not being able to move forward with voting systems that we can all have confidence in, so that part of it seems pretty easy for me.

I also think, even though it’s unusual or in a different place than we were, the idea of paying personnel costs who are charged with developing this project, and we could talk a little bit more about whether these are people who have other tasks within the Registrar’s Office or maybe they’re just hired to do this task; I don’t know, I’m just throwing that out. The point is,
it’s different but it’s still a cost that’s going directly in my mind to the research and development and creation of this voting system.

Where I start to get a little fuzzy is travel costs and overhead costs, you know, where does that all fit in? And in my mind just on first glance, it seems to be getting into other areas that I’m not sure I’m as comfortable with right now, so I think that’s all something we have to talk about.

But I think there are some categories with some certainty with categories that we could approve today and which I agree with you should match whatever the Funding Award Letter is. Or maybe the Funding Award Letter includes, as I’ve called them, sunk costs with IDEO and there was a ceiling for future IDEO costs but we just focus on the IDEO contract, that’s another way to go.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I like that thought best. I have concerns, some of which are similar to what my colleague Lagmay mentioned as well as Stephen Kaufman.

It seems to me that there was a recommendation made by the staff about a certain amount that should be approved, but then in a
particular paragraph on Page 3 you make mention, whoever wrote the report, that we have to decide whether or not we’re going to deal with these overhead costs. So the decision needs to be made by the Board and I think it’s important to figure out what guidance if any have we received to date as to whether in fact these are permissible under governing law. And maybe you’ve already looked into that with state counsel or not, but are these in fact permissible.

And then there was a sentence that you include on Page 3 that says in reference to HAVA funds that the Secretary of State has chosen not to reimburse counties for similar types of costs, so I wanted to ask why was that particular sentence included; what were you trying to convey with that, or direct the Board to consider on that front?

MS. LEAN: We wanted to let you know, because we are also staff to the Secretary of State’s Office as we are staff to the Voting Modernization Board, so what we want to let you know is overhead costs in general have not been permissive under HAVA, reimbursements for HAVA.

As you understand that the Voting
Modernization Board has authorized that HAVA funds be used for the 3:1 match, so that’s where we’re trying to marry them together, that’s one of the things.

Under HAVA staff costs have been allowable, so sorry if it was confusing in the staff report; we were just trying to give you some clarity to, while we have never had this come forward, we are unclear whether or not the comfort level is there with the Board to authorize these type of costs.

While we understand they absolutely were incurred and this was specifically, based on information from Los Angeles, all these costs were specifically related to this research and development of the voting system, so that’s why we wanted to bring it forward to you. It’s what they’ve submitted to you for reimbursement, but we don’t have a recommendation per se on that; we wanted to just provide that information to you on what staff under HAVA have or have not been paid for.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: For clarification, you state that Secretary of State staff has decided that HAVA funds will not be made
available; that’s one statement. The question is how did they decide that it’s not legally permissible?

MS. LEAN: Under HAVA? That was their determination under HAVA.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Okay. I want to be clear because right now it makes it seem as if it could have but there was a decision. Sometimes it can be a policy decision that is still consistent with the law, or maybe a decision was made because it was important for the entity, in this case Secretary of State, to be in compliance with the law.

And as I understand it, there hasn’t been any kind of guidance provided by state counsel as it relates specifically to what we can do as related to direct costs for these funds, has there been any direction on that front?

MS. LEAN: That’s correct, there has not.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Okay. I would recommend we get counsel on that.

MS. LEAN: And that’s one of the reasons why we wanted to bring this specific costs forward to the next meeting, so we have more time to discuss this with their counsel and to also
discuss this with Los Angeles to get as much
documentation that we can to make ourselves feel
comfortable to make a recommendation to the Board.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: At the very least
we should get --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: At the very least. And
just to be clear, you said that under HAVA there
was a decision to reimburse for personnel costs.

MS. LEAN: Correct.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And those personnel costs
in the HAVA context are what kind of costs? Just
time spent by staff dealing with purchasing voting
equipment?

MS. LEAN: I would like to defer that to
our HAVA coordinator, and at the next meeting I’d
like to have her present and we can discuss each
one of the costs and different things that are
allowable for that.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: The reason why
it’s a little bit confusing is because you use the
word “overhead” with HAVA, and then with regard to
this memo overhead includes personnel costs, so I
think there should be more clarity in the
memorandum and more detail.

MS. LEAN: Absolutely, we can do that in
the future.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think that’s where we’re all stumbling a bit.

So let’s see if we have kind of a consensus on one set of issues. Do we have a consensus to direct staff to at the next meeting in July provide us with more information and legal counsel with respect to, let’s call it non-contract costs incurred by the County, which include personnel, overhead, travel costs?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Yes, including a clearly definable opinion from the State Counsel’s Office.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Is that agreed, clear?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Agreed.

MS. LEAN: Yes.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I don’t think we need a motion for that, we’re just giving direction to staff.

MS. LEAN: You don’t need a motion.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: But I want to be sure that we all understand what the categories are that we’re asking for direction on.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: That’s fine.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: So we’re kind of putting
the County -- and Mr. Logan, if you want to
comment on this or correct us on anything we may
be confusing, but it seems to us there’s the
contract costs with IDEO either present or future,
and then there’s incurred costs by the County, be
it personnel, overhead, travel. Anything else
we’re missing?

MR. LOGAN: Right, and thank you very
much, Mr. Chair. I do understand what you’re
saying and I certainly support the legal
clarification. I would just ask a couple of things
to be noted in the minutes so when that legal
clarification is sought that we cover the full
breadth of the issue, because I think some of this
could be potentially semantics because there are
different governing requirements for the federal
money for the Help America Vote Act than there are
for Prop 41; for instance, the match.

So one way of looking at this would be
that some of these what you’ve termed as sunk
costs or overhead are investments the County has
made. We would like at a minimum for those to
count toward the match for the funds, so if that’s
a way to make the distinction that you’re not
awarding Prop 41 funds to cover those costs but
you’re recognizing that the County has made that investment of those funds, to match the request that we’re making of your Board. That may be another way to look at it and may be more transparent in terms of what it actually is.

And again, I would make the distinction between the HAVA funds have been, as Prop 41 funds have in the past been used to purchase equipment, and I would argue that that equipment purchase from commercial vendors, whether it’s itemized or not, includes the costs of development and research, which is exactly what we’re seeking reimbursement for here. But again, we definitely want a clean legal opinion on that as well.

I will say that I think the overall, in our mind, the distinction between the authorization letter and the actual disbursement is also an important distinction. I think the authorization amount that is before you today, the cost of the contract for IDEO with the remaining deliverables will probably equal the amount of that authorization, so I think those are two separate things.

So from our perspective, an authorization letter and the amount of what’s recommended today
is separate from this issue; it really has more to

do with the disbursement and the staff

recommendation is that you only disburse those

funds where there is clarity today, which was the

original deliverable.

So with that said, I just offer that for

the record so that when counsel is looking at this

they have the full record.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Mr. Logan, may I

ask, if we were to reduce the funding letter to

the amount that we’re going to be paying out, is

that going to cripple you in any way? Is this

going to disadvantage you in your future planning

on the progress of the VSAP?

MR. LOGAN: I don’t believe that would

stall the project in any manner. We would not want

to leave that outstanding for a long period of

time because the County of Los Angeles has entered

into a contract for the full dollar amount with

IDEO, so I guess our preference would be at least

to get a Funding Award Letter that covers the

remaining deliverables of that contract, just to

that is off the table.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, I think we’d like
to see a letter that has some relation to what’s been authorized, be it present or future, so I don’t want to start getting into mismatched amounts.

And I think we do need to keep in mind, again, we’re now looking at this issue from a different perspective than we have traditionally. But at the end of the day, I suppose you could say that the County could wait until this product is completely done and then purchase it and we’d be reimbursing the County for the purchase of something that probably includes everything that we’re now taking into account of when we’re doling out money as you go, so I think we need to bear that in mind when we look at this in its overall perspective. It’s different, and we’re all going to have to work our way through that.

So I think you’ve got direction from us. We’re going to hold on these other costs, call them what you will, but as long as we all know what we’re talking about, we should be clear on what we’re talking about.

MS. LEAN: I believe we’re clear and we will take Mr. Logan’s comments into consideration.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So I guess I would
then like to have us consider, going back to the other piece of this, issuing an award letter and authorizing reimbursement to the County for those costs that have been paid out under their contract to IDEO. And in my perspective, also provide for in the Funding Award Letter those projected additional costs which are to be paid out under the same contract since it seems to me they fall in the same category of costs.

And to equate it to Funding Award Letters that we’ve done in the past, we’ve authorized a purchase up to a certain amount and allowed for additional receipts or invoices to be submitted in accordance with that, so I guess I’d like to see us consider taking action along those lines if either of you are so inclined or if you have another way to go about it, but it seems to me that issue is coupled, both the present and future costs that are incurred with the vendor to develop the project.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Well, certainly we should act to reimburse Dean and his staff for the money that is owed and for which staff has recommended that payment should be made, so that bill should be paid.
And as long as it’s clearly understood that the letter, the Funding Award Letter, at its maximum does not necessarily reflect that that’s all the entirety of what’s going to be spent but it’s merely a ceiling; is that correct?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. So we have deliverables of $7,633,000 which have been paid thus far.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: And which need payment, yeah.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. And then we have under future expenditures we have an amount listed of $7,148,000, which I believe reflects the amount anticipated to be invoiced by IDEO during the remainder of 2015 and 2016.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Is that correct?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Are those figures correct?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: 7.6 and 7.2.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, yeah. Specifically 7,148. So I would suggest that we issue a Funding Award Letter in that combined amount specifically for those aspects of this project.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: I agree.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: So if either one of you
would be inclined to make a motion along those lines or --

MS. LEAN: We have an exact amount.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We’ve got an exact amount.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I have a question. What is the difference for the County if we just have them come back for another reimbursement as opposed to authorizing a certain amount of money now in excess for future expenditures?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, they are going to have to come back, but I think on this particular point, rather than them having to come back to us every time they pay another bill, we’ve said for these kind of bills, as long as your documentation is sufficient and staff determines that the documentation meets our requirements, we’ll continue to pay for this category of expense, rather than having to hold a meeting for them to come back. That’s the point.

And it’s consistent with the way we’ve done things in the past once we award funding to purchase any particular voting system.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Which does not
preclude the possibility of reimbursing for overhead, personnel, or travel in the future once we’ve made the determination of its permissibility.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Correct. Correct.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: That’s fine with me.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: And I assume there are no concerns with IDEO?

MR. LOGAN: The general answer is no. The contract is in good standing and County is well protected.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Okay. That’s all I’m asking.

MR. LOGAN: So if I could, just to be sure. If I heard the recommendation correctly, if I’m doing my math correctly, if we combine those two amounts and then apply the 3:1 match would be 75 percent of that, then I believe the authorization you’re recommending would be $11,288,265.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Ryan?

MR. MACIAS: I’m getting $11,085,765, which is a 3:1 match on the amount of $14,781,020.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I’m going to leave it to
others to do the match.

      MR. LOGAN: Yeah, you should rely on your staff. I think in ultimate dollar amounts we’re talking about a handful of dollars that will be resolved by invoices and documentation in future meetings.

      CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

      MS. LEAN: Just so we’re clear, that doesn’t preclude any of -- the total allocation for Los Angeles County is $49 million, so this is just --

      CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, all we’re talking about is funding -- why don’t I try and articulate something and then one of you can --

      BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Proceed.

      CHAIR KAUFMAN: So the motion would be that the Board approves a Funding Award Letter to the County of Los Angeles in the amount of --

      Ryan, 11 million --

      MR. MACIAS: $85,765.

      CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay -- to cover reimbursement of the County’s current deliverables and future expenditures under its contact with IDEO for the research and development of the County’s voting systems assessment project. You
want to second that or move it? I guess I could
make a motion.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Oh, go ahead and
move it and I’ll second it.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I’ll move that.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: I second it.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Any further
discussion on this?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: June Lagmay?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: And Gabriel Sandoval?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, great.

Congratulations, L.A. County, you can
start on your way.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: You approved the
minutes but didn’t approve the action.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Actions, need to approve
that?

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: Yeah, just to clean
up.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And staff, you have
direction on the remainder of Item 5.
June just pointed out to me that we may not have properly adopted the actions on Item 4 from the March 26th meeting. Do we need to do that separate from the minutes?

MS. MONTGOMERY: We do not but we can right now if you’d like to.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. June move that.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: I move that the action items of March 26th be approved by the Board.

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. All in favor?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Do we have any other business from staff?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Not at this time.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then do I have a motion to adjourn? Gabe?

BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER LAGMAY: I second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: All in favor?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, everybody.

Thank you for your patience.

(Meeting Adjourned)
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