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CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Okay, I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Voting Modernization Board for November 16th, 2005. Good morning everybody.

And, Katherine, would you call the roll, please.

MS. MONTGOMERY: John Perez?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Here.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Here.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Expected, but not here.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

And Tal is in the building.

And Carl Guardino?

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Here.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Thank you for joining us, Carl.

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Mr. Chair, just to let you know, I am home in bed with the flu and a fever. I will stay on as long as I can, but I've had better mornings.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Lots of liquids.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Thank you, we appreciate the effort.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: And Mr. Finney is only three minutes late.
BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: But I was actually in the building, so that would be 20 minutes normally.
CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: That actually counts you late. Okay. The first item before us, well, actually, we have a quorum.

Next we have public comments for items that are not on our agenda.
Do we have any cards, Jana?
MS. LEAN: No.
CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: No cards, okay.

Next is Item 4, adoption of our October 17th action items and meeting minutes.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: And I will move adoption of the minutes.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: And I reviewed them and I will second them.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Kaufman moved and Mr. Finney seconds.

Anything on the item, Mr. Guardino?
BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Nothing.
CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Okay. All in favor?
(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: None opposed. That's approved.

Item 5, Project Documentation Package Review and
Funding Award Approvals. The first one before us, 5A, is Contra Costa.

MS. LEAN: Okay. Contra Costa County plans to upgrade their voting system in phases. For their first phase, staff is recommending them $4,959,984.00. They're upgrading to the ES&S Model 100 Precinct Count Ballot Counters, 758 units, and the ES&S Model 600 High Speed Central Count Ballot Counters, 4 units. They are also upgrading to the AutoMARK Voter Assisted Terminals. They used a hundred in this current election and they will be for their second phase getting 658 units by the June 6, 2006, Primary Election.

Contra Costa County has secured the Phase 1 voting equipment and used it in the November 8th election. As I said, during the second phase they will receive the additional 658 units by December of '05, and these units will be implemented in time for the June 6th, 2006, Primary. They expect their project completion date to be upon certification of the June 6th, 2006, Primary.

The Accessible Voter Verified Paper Audit Trail requirement does not apply to Contra Costa County as this system is a paper-based optical scan voting system.

Contra Costa County's Phase 1 Project Documentation Plan meets the requirements for completeness and the ES&S Model 100, 650 and AutoMARK units are certified
for use in California.

Contra Costa began acquiring their new ES&S optical scan voting system in October of 2005, and the County has received all of their Model 100s and 650s, and a hundred of their AutoMARK units for the November 8 Special Election.

The County will be using the 100 AutoMARK units for the first time at the November 8th election. Contra Costa County will be implementing the AutoMARK units in a limited number in the Phase 1 rollout and have an opportunity to effect the smaller implementation and make adjustments for the Primary Election in June of '06.

The AutoMARK offers touchscreen capabilities, but it is not a vote recording device, and it provides voters with a variety of disabilities to vote privately and independently. During their Phase 2, the County will receive another 658 AutoMARK units and they will be implementing those for the June 6th, 2006, Primary. With the placement of one AutoMARK unit in every one of their polling places, it will bring the County into compliance with the Help America Vote Act and state accessibility requirements.

Contra Costa County will only receive Voting Modernization Board payments once they have submitted invoices for the purchase of any voting equipment. Please
note that the staff proposed funding award is based upon allowable reimbursement under Proposition 41 for voting equipment hardware and software only. The Election Support Services, Voter Education/Outreach and warehouse racking costs listed in Contra Costa Phase 1 plan would not be covered as reimbursable claims under Prop 41.

It is our recommendation that Contra Costa's Phase 1 Project Documentation Plan be approved and a Funding Award letter be issued in the amount of $4,959,984.00.

Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: I have none.

Does anybody else have questions?

MS. LEAN: We do have one card for Steve Weir, he's the Registrar of Contra Costa.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Steve, if you would come forward. Good to see you again.

MR. WEIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members present and not here.

Just very briefly, I once again appreciate the work that you've put into this. You guys have labored long and hard. I have a feeling there is more to come, but I'm just grateful to have the chance to finally be bringing part of our application before you.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: I was just curious to ask
how the implementation went for last week's election?

MR. WEIR: Very well. We actually rolled out the M-100s March 8 and June 7 at Special Elections, which was great for us. So we're getting the M-100s down very well.
We took delivery of a hundred AutoMARKs, we placed them in 77 polling places, those polling places that we used March 8 and June 7 so we wouldn't be introducing two pieces of equipment to our pollworkers at one time. We did not heavily advertise the fact that the AutoMARK was out there and it was used very sparingly.

The feedback that I've gotten from reading the journals for the pollworkers and some cards were that the AutoMARK was well received. I don't think it's fully been tested under a full steam of a lot of people trying to vote it. And the majority of the people that voted it could have voted a regular ballot, they did it for the novelty and again they were appreciative.

We'd actually tested it separately with people who have certain impairments without priming them and they navigated the system very, very well, had extraordinarily complimentary things to say about it, that it's intuitive, that it was easy to use. They made some suggestions for us which we will take to heart. I'm glad to have the chance to roll it out on a test basis before we have to roll it out countywide.
CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: So there's going to be two or three Special Elections you've had this year.

MR. WEIR: We had two Specials, plus November 8. So we're now getting the real experience which is great to test how you've trained, because no matter how you set it up, there are nuances in your training programs that you need to address. So we've now rolled it out for three elections, and we're going to end up with a 58 percent turnout, so it got a good test.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Very good.

Mr. Finney?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Guardino?

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: I'm fine.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Okay, is there a motion?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I will make the motion.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: And I will second.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Finney moves, Mr. Kaufman seconds.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: The staff recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Yes. The staff recommendation in the amount of $4,959,984.00.

MS. MONTGOMERY: John Perez?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: All in favor. Thank you very much.

The next item before us, 5B, Kings County.

MS. LEAN: Kings County will be upgrading their voting system in one phase. Staff recommends allocating their full allocation of $581,008.11.

Their precinct-based system will be the AVC Edge, the Sequoia-based system, it's a touchscreen unit, 200 units. They are also purchasing 250 units of the VeriVote DRE Printers, and they are purchasing one Optech 400 Ballot Counter unit for their absentee system.

Kings County plans to begin using the DRE voting equipment as a precinct-based system in the November 8th election. Kings County projects that their project completion date will be upon certification of the June 6th, 2006, Primary. The AVC Edge DRE unit being purchased by Kings include a VeriVote Printer, which is an AVVPAT component.

Kings County's Project Documentation Plan meets all of the requirements for completeness. The Sequoia AVC
Edge units with the VeriVote Printers and the Optech 400 unit are certified for use in California, as has been stated before.

Please note that the software being used to run the AVC Edge units currently has a condition on the certification for its use as the software cannot be used in a California Primary. This condition is expected to be resolved shortly.

Kings County will continue to use their Optech 400-C Optical Scan with their absentee system and they will be implementing the AVC Edge DRE units in the November 8th election.

Kings County staff has had an opportunity to talk to all their pollworkers individually while preparing for the November 8th Special Statewide Election. And the County plans to solicit feedback from the staff, the pollworkers and voters after the election and will adjust their procedures accordingly.

Kings County believes that by deploying a DRE unit in all of their polling places it will bring the County to full compliance of the requirements of the Help America Vote Act, as a DRE system provides access to voters with disabilities and it also satisfies the second-choice voting requirement by not allowing overvotes and identifying undervotes to the voter.
Kings County will only receive VMB payments when they have submitted invoices for the purchase of their voting equipment.

Please note that the staff proposed funding award is based upon allowable reimbursement under Proposition 41 for voting equipment hardware and software only. The training and other support services listed in Kings County would not be covered as a reimbursable claim under Proposition 41.

Staff recommends, it is our recommendation, that Kings County's Project Documentation Plan be approved and a Funding Award letter be issued in the amount of $581,008.11.

Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: I have none of staff. Does anybody else have any questions of staff?

Is Ken Berry here or somebody else from Kings?

MS. LEAN: I'm unaware of their attendance.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Nobody from Kings in the room? Okay, then I actually do have the question you anticipate. Where are we on our Primary application on the issue?

MR. MCDANNOLD: My last conversation with a representative of the vendor last week was they are now, actually with two different representatives of Sequoia, are talking about timingwise not coming forward to us with an
application until January most likely. Still possibly
December, but very possibly it's going to be January now.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: So we will amend the staff
report to be the beginning of 2006, not the end of the year.

MS. LEAN: As I indicated in my oral report, I
said --

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: She said very soon.

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: She said shortly.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: I just want to amend the
written report that said end of the year, although it
doesn't say which year.

MS. LEAN: No, it does not. And we do hope that
they will have it in by then.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: We are talking about the
condition of -- and Mr. Bustamante is now with us. The
condition and the inability for using the technology in
California primaries, something a couple of us think might
be an important thing for the technology to be able to be
used for.

MR. MCDANNOLD: There is a log jam at the federal
level in terms of qualification right now and the
overwhelming number of systems and applications that are
trying to go through the federal process and meet the
January 1 deadline.
CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: But the issue is a state standard, not a federal standard, but it has to be federally approved first?

MR. MCDANNOLOLD: It has to be federal qualified first.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: All right. Okay. Anybody else on this item?

Is there a motion?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: I will move to adopt the staff recommendation.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I will second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Kaufman moved and Mr. Finney seconds.

Please call the role.

MS. MONTGOMERY: John Perez?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Okay. We have an approval.
That is the end of Item 5 for us.

Now, Item 6, Staff Report on Related Issues. The first is discussion of proposed language for County Quarterly Status Reports. I note that we have a copy of your draft in each of our packets and I hope we've all have a chance to review.

Do you have anything to add to this?

MS. LEAN: I just wanted to indicate that at the September 23rd, 2005, meeting, the Board unanimously approved extending the deadline to submit the Project Documentation Plan to 1/1/07, but will require counties who have not submitted their plan by December 31st, 2005, to submit quarterly status reports. After we indicated that staff would come up with some draft language, we did include the language that Stephen Kaufman requested at the last meeting into the quarterly status report. The only question that I have and I brought it back forward to you again is because Mr. Bustamante had indicated he wanted some language and you were not in attendance last time, but I still want you to take a look at this and make sure that you're okay with this?

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Yeah, the BOS.

MS. LEAN: Yes, okay, great. We will make minor adjustments. But if the language is approved, staff recommends that the report be due to us by January 20th,
which is a Friday, and the report to be given to the Board
in the February meeting on the status of where all the rest
of the counties who do not submit a plan by December 31st.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: The first couple of them are
right. On Item 4, as you county. And Item 8, it's during
not sure. They changed the first letter.

So are we correct that your is the second word in
Point 4 and during is the first word in Point 8?

MS. LEAN: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: We do read what you give us.

MS. LEAN: We are glad that you pay attention, thank you, sir.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Do we need to approve this? I
don't think we do, I think we already -- we directed staff
to create this, I don't think we need to go backwards.

MS. LEAN: You've adopted this and it is adopted.

I will send out notice to all the counties who have not
submitted a plan by December to make sure that they submit
this interim or this quarterly status report by January
20th.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Very good. The next item
before us, 6B, update on Del Norte County and San Benito
County's amendment from their vendor contract language.

Jana, do you want to start us off on this or does
Michael.
MS. LEAN: I will go ahead and start us off on this.

Sequoia Voting Systems and our executive office did come to an agreement on the contract language. It was provided in your package, I did e-mail it out as soon we got it finalized. It was finalized on November 4th, so it wasn't that long ago.

San Benito County very diligently got their contract amended and they have submitted the amendment in their packet. Del Norte County did get their contract amended. They signed it, but they haven't had the vendor sign it yet. So they currently have it in the works, but they haven't actually submitted the forms yet.

But I wanted to bring these forward to let you know that the contract language was changed and it was agreed upon, and we can issue funding awards if we choose to, Funding Award letters, if you choose to at the time.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: It satisfies the issues that I raised in our last two meetings from my perspective, but I want to see if it satisfies everybody else's issues.

I do have one question on the final paragraph of the language in our packet. See the bold type, the any voting system purchase or funds allocated by the Secretary of State's office. Do you follow where I'm reading?

MR. KANOTZ: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: My question is this, am I to not read that to be applicable to the actions of this Board because technically it's not an allocation by the Secretary's Office?

Jana?

MS. LEAN: It does actually go further on and say that the California Elections Code and the Voting Modernization Board was created through those bonds acts, which is part of the code. So if you read it that way. Although the Secretary of State doesn't authorize the money, the Board does.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Right. My only concern was the reference of the term allocated.

MS. LEAN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: I track with you in terms of the reference to the Code, but I would just -- either way we're coming from the same point of view as the Secretary's Office, I just wanted to flag that because I don't think that allocation actually -- allocation by the Secretary doesn't actually capture from my perspective, although I may be wrong on that, the actions that we undertake here.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: The Secretary of State, as I understand it, allocates money that comes to the State through HAVA.

MS. LEAN: Correct.
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: But the money that we allocate, this Board allocates, is coming from a pool of money that this Board got it's allocation, and not the Secretary of State. So I think that's where the Chair's comments were directed. So I guess the only issue is whether this somehow limits this language, limits this application.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: I think regardless of whether this language limits, I think in concept and in spirit we're in the same place as the Secretary's Office. My reading of it though doesn't limit or control our actions. I just want to hear feedback on that as I read that again this morning on the plane.

MR. KANOTZ: Well, I don't think via contract the Secretary of State could impose these requirements on the Board, and therefore I think that's probably why they phrase it as they have.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: We don't have a problem with that, I just wanted to flag the issue.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: We just wanted to understand and make sure everybody understands it the same way.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: And it's not to raise the issue or raise an issue of contention, it's just to get some consistency and understanding of what the language means.
But we're coming from I think through our previous discussions and through our previous actions from the same area of concerns that the Secretary has stressed.

So anything else on that?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: No. But I did want to go back to the Del Norte and San Benito issue. I just want to make sure that we're following the procedure that we voted on last time, if we specifically said that the approval was contingent on amendment of the contract?

MS. LEAN: That's correct. San Benito County, in your packet, but in front of you today, has signed the contract, has amended the contract. And they did make some minor adjustments when they went back to review the contract. They are going to purchase some additional DRE equipment and one less of their special count ballot counters. It all comes out to the same amount of money.

But their information is here.

Del Norte County, it is true we do not have their signed, amended contract in front of us. I did talk to Vicky Frasier. It was done right at the very end of Friday, November 4th, and the election was on the 8th. So while I really applaud San Benito for getting it done and getting the job done really quickly, I understand why Del Norte County hasn't been able to provide us with that information.

What the Board could do, if you want to is we could just
make a caveat to awarding them the money, but they will not receive any money until we've received that signed amendment.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: I think the way we addressed our concern was about the adoption of the language, it wasn't about the execution of the signatures on the document.

MS. LEAN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: So I'm satisfied with that. But my only concern would be that they not further amend the document after November 15th. If there was further amendment after November 15th, then I actually think it's inconsistent with our previous action and I would want it to come before us.

MS. LEAN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: You mean to further amend the contract to add more purchases?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Anything.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: They are only approved for a certain amount.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Right. No, no. But further amended terms of their contract, not expanding purchase.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: But my understanding is Del Norte is that the contract may or may not even be amended.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: No, no, the contract's
amended, it's signed by the county, but not signed by the vendor, even though the vendor signed the same language with a different county.

MS. LEAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: So that's why, as long as --

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Is it just the signature that's missing?

MS. LEAN: That's correct. And it wasn't any fault of the vendor or the county, it just happened right at the election time.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: So that's why I raised the issue. As long as they're signing a document consistent with the document that was approved prior to November 15th, I'm fine with it.

MS. LEAN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: But if the parties decide to reopen discussions at any point prior to the final signature by the vendor, then I think it comes back before us. So that's the caveat I would rather have in the letter, as long as it's the document that is partially signed at this point.

MS. LEAN: We can amend the letter after the meeting.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Should we have the originals to this or did they make original copies for us or something?
MS. LEAN: They gave us original copies.

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Yes, I was wondering about that.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: For all the Board Members?

MS. LEAN: They did, yes. They went above and beyond.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: So I guess a motion would be in order to issue the funding allocation letters consistent with the conversation we just had.

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Bustamante moves and is there a --

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: I will second.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Kaufman seconds.

MS. LEAN: Would you like me to read the staff recommendation so that it's on record?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Sure.

MS. LEAN: Okay. For San Benito County, it is our recommendation that San Benito County's Funding Award Letter be issued in the amount of $303,222.05.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: So we will take these separately.

Mr. Bustamante is your motion on that?

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Kaufman, do you still
second?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Yes, I still second.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Did you put in the contingency?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: We're not getting there yet.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: That's the next one.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Well, wait a minute, I'm still not comfortable voting yet. Could you please restate the motion for the record.

MS. LEAN: I'm sorry. For San Benito County who has amended their contract and that's provided in your packet, it is our recommendation that San Benito County's Funding Award Letter be issued in the amount of $303,222.05.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Finney?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I was under the impression that you added some --

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: No, that was to Del Norte that I added some.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Oh, I see. Okay. Okay. I'm fine.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Now?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Please.

MS. MONTGOMERY: John Perez?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Aye.
MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Very good.

Now, would you walk us through the staff recommendation and capture the amendment to the extent that you can for Del Norte.

MS. LEAN: Okay. And it is the staff recommendation that Del Norte County's Funding Award Letter be issued in the amount of $164,420.41 -- let me make sure I get this.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: The caveat being that the letter reflect the Board's assertion that it not be based on any modifications to the agreement after November 15th, 2005, because that was the deadline we set for them to resolve this matter. The matter was resolved, they just don't have a wet signature on it. So I just want to make sure that the wet signature is on the document that was negotiated prior to our deadline.

Is there a motion?
BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: I will so move.

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: And I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Mr. Kaufman moves, Mr. Bustamante seconds.

If you would call?

MS. MONTGOMERY: John Perez?

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Very good.

The next item I have before us is Item 6C, an update on the Voting Modernization Finance Committee meeting.

MS. LEAN: I wanted to let you know that on October 19th, the Pool Money Investment Board extended our loan for $93,870,000 for this year, calendar year, and they also backed the -- the Finance Committee approved the sale of the bonds of up to $137,370,000.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Let's try that number one more time.
time.

MS. LEAN: Yes, okay. $137,370,000. Is that right? That's right. Sorry about that. This will bring us up to the $195 million that's been allocated. So for this year, we have the money available, so if all the counties that are supposed to come in front of us this coming year in 2006, the money is available to allocate for that.

I just wanted to give you an update on that.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Any questions?

Then it will be the third year we will be here that we didn't think we were going to be here.

MS. LEAN: The next thing I wanted to bring up to you also in your packet is the proposed dates for 2006. I'm proposing that the Board meet every third Wednesday of the month, if that will work for your calendars. Of course, these dates can be changed if you can't make it, but I wanted you to take a look at this calendar and perhaps you could at least adopt the first two months, January and February for next year.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Let's take a second.

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Mr. Chair, this is Carl Guardino, with your permission, I'm fading fast here, so I'm going to disconnect if may.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Well, I'm not going to give you permission to fade fast, but I give you permission to
sign off.

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Get better, Carl.

BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Thank you very much. Have a nice holiday. Bye bye.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: January is fine with me.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: It's the what, the --

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: The 18th. February 15th is --

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: At what time, 10:30?

MS. LEAN: 10:30.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: January and February are both fine with me.

Anybody else have a problem with January or February?

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Not so far.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Fine by me.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Let's try March too. Yes, right now my January, February and March, all three dates are doable. So if could each try to clear our calendars for these dates, but feel as confident as we can to move forward especially for January and February.

You don't need adoption on this, do you?

MS. LEAN: No. I'm going to go ahead and place these dates on our website, indicating this is subject to change, but we do have January and February set or we have a
quorum set.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: And our next meeting is December 5th?

MS. LEAN: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: And just again for everybody, it's in Los Angeles at the Ronald Reagan State Office Building, correct.

MS. LEAN: That's correct. At 300 South Spring Street at 10:30 in the morning.

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: The one in January.

MS. LEAN: The one in December. December 5th, it's a Monday. It's coming up pretty close. I just got off the phone before the meeting with Ventura County, they will be submitting their plans and we will have at least one county ready with their plans for that meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: It's a shorter drive for me, come down to LA.

BOARD MEMBER KAUFMAN: Do we anticipate we're going to see anything from LA?

MS. LEAN: They have indicated at the last meeting they had submitted another phase to their plan and they withdrew that.

CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: Okay. Any other business that you have for us?

MS. LEAN: No, sir.
CHAIRPERSON PEREZ: And no other cards to come before us?

Anybody else have anything to discuss before we adjourn?

Then we stand adjourned.

(Thereupon the meeting of the Voting Modernization Board was concluded at 11:03 a.m. on November 16, 2005.)
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