

BOARD MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECRETARY OF STATE
VOTING MODERNIZATION BOARD

SECRETARY OF STATE BUILDING
1500 11TH STREET
AUDITORIUM
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2007

10:50 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. John A. Pérez, Chairperson
Mr. Stephen Kaufman, Vice Chairperson
Mr. Michael Bustamante
Mr. Tal Finney(via teleconference)
Mr. Carl Guardino

STAFF

Mr. Michael Kanotz, Staff Counsel
Ms. Jana Lean, Staff Consultant
Mr. Bruce McDannold
Ms. Katherine Montgomery

ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Billie Alvarez, Santa Barbara County
Ms. Riva Correa, Yolo County
Ms. Carolyn Crinch, Humboldt County
Ms. Connie McCormack, Los Angeles County
Ms. Kathleen Smith, Nevada County

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I Call to Order | 1 |
| II Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum | 1 |
| III Public Comment | 1 |
| IV Adoption of October 25, 2006 Actions & Meeting Minutes | 2 |
| V Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award Approval | |
| (A) Humboldt County | 6 |
| (B) Lassen County - Phase 2 | 3 |
| (C) Marin County - Phase 2 | 12 |
| (D) Modoc County | 15 |
| (E) Yolo County | 18 |
| VI Project Documentation Submittal Deadline | |
| (A) Review County responses to the Deadline & Second Funding Round survey. | 23 |
| (B) Consider extension of the March 1, 2007 deadline for counties to submit their first Project Documentation Plan. | 52 |
| (C) Discuss setting a January 1, 2008 deadline on the use of funds for counties who have submitted a Phased Approach Project Documentation Plan. | 55 |
| VII Staff Report on Related Issues | |
| (A) Discuss possibility of second funding round. | 60 |
| (B) Discuss 2007 VMB Meeting Schedule. | 60 |
| VIII Adjournment | 64 |
| Reporter's Certificate | 65 |

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I'd like to call to order the
3 meeting of the Voting Modernization Board for January of
4 2007.

5 And, Jana, do you want to call the roll for us?

6 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Sure.

7 John Pérez?

8 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Here.

9 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Stephen Kaufman?

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Here.

11 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Tal Finney?

12 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Here.

13 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Michael Bustamante and
14 Carl Guardino are absent at this time.

15 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. And we're expecting
16 Mr. Bustamante and Mr. Guardino to join us in person
17 shortly. They both said they would be 15 minutes late.
18 They're now 5 minutes late of their 15-minute late period.

19 (Laughter.)

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: We do have a quorum.

21 The next item before us is public comments on
22 items not specifically agendized. I don't see any cards
23 for that.

24 Is there anybody seeking recognition for an item
25 not on our agenda?

1 Seeing not, we'll move forward to adoption of our
2 October 25th meeting minutes.

3 Mr. Kaufman.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: And I'll move adoption
5 of the minutes.

6 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll second.

7 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: It's been moved and seconded.

8 I just have one question. When I'm looking at
9 the actual report transcript, it lists panel members, but
10 it also includes staff under the designation as panel
11 members. Is that fine for our uses or should we separate
12 that out?

13 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: We can separate that.

14 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. So if you can just
15 separate out the panel members for that one to be listed
16 as Stephen, Michael Bustamante telephonically and Carl
17 Guardino telephonically, and then list the others as staff
18 members. Make sure that for consistency sake we do the
19 same as this meeting.

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: It also has my middle
21 initial as S. So maybe we can correct that since it's J.

22 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: All the other issues I had
23 were just very minor. For example, using the term
24 "extension" instead of "abstention" in a couple places.
25 But I think that for content they're fine.

1 So it's been moved and seconded.

2 Any other discussion?

3 All in favor of approving the minutes, please say
4 aye.

5 (Ayes.)

6 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Guardino, welcome.

7 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: The next item before us is
9 Item 5, Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding.

10 I've been informed that the representatives from
11 Lassen County have to catch a plane. And so, unless
12 there's objection, I'd like to hear Item 5B first, Lassen
13 County - Phase 2.

14 So, Jana, if you'd walk us through that.

15 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Lassen County has come
16 forward with their Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan.
17 And staff is recommending funding of \$81,528.66. They
18 have purchased the Diebold AccuVote-TSX with the AccuVote
19 Printer Module, 15 units.

20 Lassen County secured this new voting equipment
21 in late September of '06. And this equipment was used for
22 the first time during the March 2006 General Election.

23 The voter verified paper audit trail -- Okay. A
24 voter verified paper audit trail requirement is met, as at
25 the AccuVote-TSX with the AccuVote printer component being

1 purchased by Lassen is a voter verified paper receipt.

2 Lassen County's Phase 2 Project Documentation
3 Plan meets the requirements for completeness. And the
4 Diebold AccuVote-TSX touch screen units are certified for
5 use in California.

6 At the July 16th, 2003, meeting of the Voting
7 Modernization Board, the Board approved Lassen County's
8 Phase 1 Project Documentation Plan and awarded funding in
9 the amount of \$105,635.48. Lassen County has received
10 this funding for the reimbursement of purchase of 15
11 AccuVote optical scan precinct ballot tabulators. Lassen
12 County will continue to use the AccuVote optical scan
13 units as their primary voting system.

14 Lassen County believes that the deployment of one
15 optical scan unit and one DRE unit in every polling place
16 brought the county into full compliance with requirements
17 of the Help America Vote Act.

18 Lassen County began securing their new
19 AccuVote-TSX units only 48 days prior to the November 2006
20 General Election. However, the county was able to conduct
21 staff and poll worker training on the new equipment and
22 develop voter education materials about the new system.

23 The county recognized the need for extensive
24 training on the new equipment and offered their poll
25 workers and election day troubleshooters several

1 opportunities to attend hands-on training. Lassen County
2 is conducting post-election surveys to determine the
3 effectiveness and overall impact of their new voting
4 system.

5 Lassen County will only receive VMB payments once
6 it has submitted detailed invoices for its certified
7 voting equipment. Please note that the staff-proposed
8 funding award is based upon allowable reimburse under
9 Proposition 41 only for voting equipment hardware and
10 software. The training and election support services
11 listed in Lassen County's contract with Diebold would not
12 be covered as reimbursable claim under Proposition 41.

13 It is our staff recommendation that Lassen
14 County's Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan be approved
15 and a funding award letter be issued in the amount of
16 \$81,528.66.

17 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. Are there any
18 questions on Lassen County?

19 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I have nothing.

20 And I'll move approval, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Thank you.

22 Mr. Finney moves.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: I'll second.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Kaufman seconds.

25 Seeing no further discussion, Jana, will you call

1 the roll.

2 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: John Pérez?

3 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Aye.

4 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Stephen Kaufman?

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Aye.

6 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Michael Bustamante is
7 absent.

8 Tal Finney?

9 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

10 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Carl Guardino?

11 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Four ayes. We have approval.
13 Thank you.

14 Next item before us is Item 5A, Humboldt County.

15 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Can we turn off any cell
16 phones?

17 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Yeah, if somebody's got a
18 cell phone, if they would --

19 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Any cell phones or
20 Blackberries.

21 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Tal, turn off your cell
22 phone.

23 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I don't need my cell phone.
24 I actually have my phone -- my land line is on most of the
25 time.

1 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Do your clients have to pay
2 extra for you to stay on mute call?

3 (Laughter.)

4 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. I guess we don't know
5 what that feedback problem is.

6 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I'm sorry. I thought
7 it -- we were told that it was cell phones or
8 Blackberries,

9 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: We'll have to just marshal
10 through.

11 So Humboldt County.

12 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Okay. Humboldt county is
13 requesting and staff is recommending an allocation of
14 \$467,470.58. They have purchased a Hart InterCivic, the
15 eSlate, 80 units. And Humboldt County has secured its new
16 voting equipment and this equipment was used for the first
17 time during the November 7th, 2006, General Election.

18 The Hart eSlate purchased by Humboldt includes a
19 verified ballot option, which is a VVPAT component.

20 Humboldt County's Project Documentation Plan
21 meets the requirements for completeness. And the eSlate
22 and corresponding components are certified for use in
23 California.

24 Humboldt County has implemented a blended system.
25 Humboldt county has augmented its existing Diebold

1 AccuVote Optical Scan Precinct Ballot Tabulators with the
2 placement of one eSlate DRE in every polling place in the
3 county. Humboldt believes that the deployment of the
4 eSlate DRE units brought the county into compliance with
5 the Help America Vote Act and the state accessibility
6 requirements.

7 Humboldt County was allowed to use the
8 above-stated independently tested and certified voting
9 equipment together to meet the federal and state
10 requirements so long as their interface was limited to the
11 exchange of aggregate vote totals. The continued
12 authorization to use this blended system will be
13 contingent upon review and evaluation by the new Secretary
14 of State administration.

15 Given the compressed timeframes in which Humboldt
16 County implemented its new DRE voting equipment, the
17 county plans to make greater efforts to provide outreach
18 to its disabled community and to expand training efforts
19 to poll workers and county staff on how to effectively
20 operate the new eSlate machines.

21 Humboldt County's Project Documentation Plan
22 explicitly states that it is the county's desire and
23 intention that the remaining of its Proposition 41
24 allocation continue to be available to Humboldt for future
25 voting system modernization plans.

1 The InFusion voting software listed in Humboldt
2 County's contract with Hart InterCivic has not yet gained
3 certification in California and, therefore, is not
4 eligible for reimbursement under Proposition 41.

5 Humboldt County will only receive VMB payments
6 once it has submitted detailed invoices for its certified
7 voting equipment. Please note that the staff-proposed
8 funding award is based upon allowable reimbursement under
9 Proposition 41 only. And it's for voting equipment
10 hardware and software. The professional services and
11 optional extended warranty line items listed in Humboldt
12 County's contract with Hart would not be covered as a
13 reimbursable claim under Proposition 41.

14 It is our staff recommendation that Humboldt
15 County's Project Documentation Plan be approved and a
16 funding award letter be issued in the amount of
17 \$467,470.58.

18 We do have a representative from Humboldt County
19 here today.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. Would the
21 representative like to come forward.

22 MS. CRINCH: I'm Ms. Carolyn Sernich, and I'm the
23 County Registrar of Voters for Humboldt County.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Good morning. Thank you for
25 being with us.

1 Your request basically uses less than 50 percent
2 of the total allocation that we've set aside for Humboldt.
3 And then you've asked for us to basically set aside the
4 remaining amount for future phases.

5 MS. CRINCH: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Are there any specific future
7 allocations that you have in mind that you're working on,
8 or you just want to reserve your rights?

9 MS. CRINCH: Both. We're not at the point yet
10 that we would be comfortable submitting to you a plan for
11 the next phase. But it is our hope that we would be able
12 to upgrade our central count system to more effectively
13 manage the necessity of counting returns, and we hope that
14 we can do that -- be used for that.

15 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Kaufman.

16 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17 You went in the very direction that I was
18 intending to go. And I just wanted to know further
19 whether that contingency that you built in -- or the
20 request that you made to build the contingency, was it all
21 tied to the Secretary of State's review of the current
22 system or the integration of the system that you were
23 employing, or whether it was just more general than that?

24 MS. CRINCH: Well, yes, it was contingent upon
25 that, but also more general. There may be other areas

1 that we need improvement. After all, most of our system
2 is over ten years old. And it could be that this is the
3 point -- and it could be that this is the point and the
4 opportunity that upgrades would become necessary for the
5 system that's in place now.

6 And first review of our blending system, which
7 worked well for us in November, but we need to -- there's
8 more work that we can do to make it work better for the
9 voters in Humboldt County.

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Thank you.

12 Anybody else have any questions?

13 Welcome, Mr. Bustamante.

14 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Thank you. I apologize
15 for being so late.

16 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: No questions from me.

17 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. Is there a motion?

18 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Yeah, I'll move to
19 approve Humboldt County's funding award request.

20 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll second it.

21 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Kaufman moves, Mr. Finney
22 seconds.

23 No further discussion.

24 Katherine, if you could call the roll.

25 MS. MONTGOMERY: John Pérez.

1 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Aye.

2 MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Aye.

4 MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

5 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

6 MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

7 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

8 MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

9 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

10 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Very good. We have approval.

11 Thank you. Congratulations.

12 MS. CRINCH: Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Next item is Item 5C, Marin

14 County - Phase 2.

15 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Marin County has brought

16 forward a Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan. And staff

17 is recommending funding of \$541,379. This will leave an

18 allocation of \$658,116.98.

19 Marin County has upgraded to the ES&S AutoMARK

20 Voter Assist Terminals, 130 units. Marin used the

21 AutoMARK units for the first time during the June 2006

22 Primary Election.

23 The VVPAT requirement does not apply to Marin

24 County's Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan, as the system

25 is a paper-based optical scan voting system.

1 Marin County's Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan
2 meets all the requirements for completeness. The ES&S
3 AutoMARK Voter Assist Terminals are certified for use in
4 California.

5 Marin County has implemented a blended system.
6 They are augmenting their existing Diebold AccuVote
7 Optical Scan Precinct Ballot Tabulators with the placement
8 of one AutoMARK unit in every polling place in their
9 county. Marin County believes that the deployment of the
10 Phase 2 AutoMARK Voter Assist Terminal optical scan units
11 bring their county into compliance with the Help America
12 Vote Act and state accessibility requirements.

13 Marin County's blended system has gained
14 permanent approval for the use by the Secretary of State,
15 with the caveat that the county adhere to the official use
16 procedures adopted for the use of the ES&S AutoMARK in
17 conjunction with the Diebold GEMS/AccuVote Optical Scan
18 system.

19 Marin County fully implemented and deployed the
20 AutoMARK units in the June 2006 election. While there was
21 minimal use of the AutoMARK during the past two election
22 cycles, the county has committed to track the use of this
23 equipment and has solicited feedback from voters about how
24 to improve future use.

25 Marin County plans to continue upgrading their

1 voting equipment through a Phase 3. The county's ultimate
2 goal is to achieve optimal integration of the optical scan
3 and ballot marking devices and to maintain compliance with
4 state and federal voting system requirements.

5 The "Unity On-Line" voting system software listed
6 in Marin County's contract with ES&S has not gained
7 certification in California and, therefore, would not be
8 eligible for reimbursement under Provision 41.

9 Marin County will only receive VMB payments once
10 it has submitted detailed invoices for its certified
11 voting equipment. Please note that the staff-proposed
12 funding award is based upon allowable reimbursement under
13 Proposition 41 for only voting equipment hardware and
14 software. The elections support services and installation
15 line items listed in Marin County's contract with ES&S
16 would not be covered as reimbursable claims under
17 Proposition 41.

18 It is our staff recommendation that Marin
19 County's Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan be approved
20 and a funding award letter be issued in the amount of
21 \$554,379.

22 We do have a representatives here from Marin
23 County.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Any questions for Marin?

25 Okay. Is there a motion?

1 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll move it, move approval
2 of the staff.

3 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Finney moves approval of
4 the staff -- and their recommendation?

5 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Absolutely.

6 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Oh, okay.

7 (Laughter.)

8 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: I'll second that.

9 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Guardino seconds.

10 On the question, Katherine will take the vote.

11 MS. MONTGOMERY: John Pérez?

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Aye.

13 MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Aye.

15 MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

16 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

17 MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

18 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

19 MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

20 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Five ayes. We have approval.

22 Thank you.

23 Next item is 5D, Modoc county.

24 Jana.

25 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Modoc County has

1 submitted their Project Documentation Plan for their full
2 allocation at \$76,314.42. They have purchased a Diebold
3 AccuVote Optical Scan Ballot Tabulator, 12 units; and the
4 Diebold AccuVote-TSX, AccuView Printer Module (Touch
5 Screen), 10 units.

6 Marin County acquired optical scan voting
7 equipment --

8 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Modoc.

9 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Did I say Marin County?

10 Sorry.

11 Modoc County acquired an optical -- I should
12 actually read it and not try to --

13 (Laughter.)

14 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: All right. Modoc County
15 acquired its optical scan voting equipment prior to the
16 2002 Primary Election, and it was used for the first time
17 during that election. Modoc County secured the new DRE
18 voting equipment in October of 2006 and used the equipment
19 for the first time during the November 2006 General
20 Election.

21 The voter verified paper audit trail requirement
22 is fulfilled as the AccuVote-TSX has a component of the
23 AccuView printer component.

24 Modoc County's Project Documentation Plan meets
25 the requirements for completeness and the AccuVote Optical

1 Scan Ballot Tabulator and the AccuVote-TSX touch screen
2 units are certified for use in California.

3 Modoc County originally converted from the
4 Datavote punch card voting system to a blended optical
5 scan and touch screen voting system. Modoc County has 20
6 precincts, 11 of which are designated as all-mail ballots.
7 Modoc County chose to purchase the Diebold system because
8 the equipment allowed the county to maintain a paper-based
9 optical scan system for the majority of its voters while
10 adhering to state and federal accessibility and language
11 requirements.

12 Modoc County believes that the deployment of one
13 optical scan unit and one DRE unit in each polling place
14 brought the county into full compliance with the
15 requirements of the Help America Vote Act.

16 Modoc County will only receive VMB payments once
17 it has submitted detailed invoices for its certified
18 voting equipment. Please note that the staff-proposed
19 funding award was based upon allowable reimbursement under
20 Proposition 41. And the support services listed in Modoc
21 County's contract with Diebold would not be covered as a
22 reimbursable claim under Proposition 41.

23 It is our staff recommendation that Modoc
24 County's Project Documentation Plan be approved and a
25 funding award letter be issued in their full allocation of

1 \$76,314.42.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Any questions with regard to
3 Modoc's application?

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: I'll move to approve
5 the Project Documentation Plan and the funding award.

6 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll second it.

7 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Kaufman moves, Mr. Finney
8 seconds.

9 MS. MONTGOMERY: John Pérez?

10 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Aye.

11 MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Aye.

13 MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

14 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

15 MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

16 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

17 MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

18 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Five ayes. We have approval.

20 Our last item under 5 is 5E, Yolo County.

21 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: All right. Yolo County
22 has moved forward with their Project Documentation Plan.

23 And staff are recommending their full allocation of
24 \$1,085,882.12.

25 They are purchasing the Hart InterCivic eSlate.

1 And they have also purchased five high volume scanners.

2 Yolo County acquired its optical scan voting
3 equipment prior to the 2006 Primary Election, and it was
4 used for the first time during that election. Yolo County
5 secured the new DRE equipment in September of 2006 and
6 this equipment was used for the first time during the
7 November 2006 General Election.

8 The Hart eSlate units being purchased by Yolo
9 County include a Verified Ballot Option printer, which is
10 a VVPAT component.

11 Yolo County's Project Documentation Plan meets
12 the requirements for completeness. And the eSlate and
13 corresponding components are certified for use in
14 California.

15 Yolo County began a comprehensive research of
16 replacing their punch card system in 2003. Yolo County
17 converted from the Datavote punch card optical scan
18 system.

19 Yolo County chose to purchase the Hart Intercivic
20 optical scan because the equipment allowed the county to
21 maintain a paper-based optical scan system for a majority
22 of its voters, while adhering to state and federal
23 accessibility requirements. Yolo County will continue to
24 use optical scan technology as its primary voting system
25 and has a policy to only encourage the use of the DRE

1 units by people who cannot independently vote a paper
2 ballot.

3 Yolo County deployed the eSlate DREs at their
4 polling sites during the November 2006 General Election.
5 Yolo County believes that the deployment of the DRE units
6 in all its polling places brought the county into full
7 compliance with the requirements of the Help America Vote
8 Act.

9 Yolo County will only receive VMB payments once
10 it has submitted detailed invoices for its certified
11 voting equipment. Please note that the staff-proposed
12 funding award is based upon allowable reimbursement under
13 Proposition 41. And the professional services, optional
14 extended warranty line items, and the Fusion and the
15 InFusion software were listed in Yolo County's contract
16 with Hart would not be covered as reimbursable claims
17 under Proposition 41.

18 It is our recommendation that Yolo County's
19 Project Documentation Plan be approved and a funding award
20 letter be issued in their full allocation of
21 \$1,085,882.12.

22 We do have a representative from Yolo if you
23 would like to talk to them.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: I had a question of

1 Yolo completely unrelated to the --

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Sure, for the representative
3 of Yolo.

4 MS. CORREA: I'm Riva Correa from Yolo County.

5 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I'm sorry. Your name again?

6 MS. CORREA: Riva Correa.

7 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Riva Correa.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Good morning, Ms.
9 Correa. I just wanted to ask you -- because I saw
10 something noted in the staff report here about the fact
11 that your county hired computer technology students from
12 University of California at Davis to assist with the
13 implementation of the new equipment, I guess both on
14 election day and in training poll workers. And I wondered
15 if you could just share with us your experience and how
16 that helped or hindered the process on election day.

17 MS. CORREA: Well, it helped in the delivery.
18 Because we didn't want to have the machines spend the
19 night with the inspectors, and so we had them meet us in
20 our parking lot at 4 a.m. in the morning. And we had a
21 technology person and a ride-along county staff go. And
22 they covered, like we gave -- we gave them two to four
23 polling places to go set up and do the zero tape. And it
24 worked very well. It got us open by 7 a.m. in the
25 morning. So it worked -- it worked good.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Were they also
2 available to assist voters with the technology on election
3 day?

4 MS. CORREA: We kept 30 of them during the day
5 to -- we also had rovers, but they were kind of a roving
6 technology person. And so they kept in touch with us and
7 we were able to send them out if there were any problems.
8 Actually we experienced very little problems.

9 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: How many polling places did
10 you have?

11 MS. CORREA: We had 114.

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And you didn't have problems
14 with your parent?

15 MS. CORREA: Pardon me?

16 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: You didn't have problems with
17 the VVPAT on the equipment?

18 MS. CORREA: No, not the printer. We had just
19 very few issues. Set up in the wrong place, had to go in
20 and change the position. But there were very few issues
21 that we had. And we think that that happened because we
22 did use the technology people.

23 Now we think that the inspectors are, you know,
24 experienced enough to where they may be able to handle it
25 and -- along with our roving inspectors.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Any other questions?

3 Is there a motion?

4 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: I'll move the staff
5 report and recommendation.

6 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll second it.

7 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante moves, Mr.
8 Finney seconds.

9 Seeing no further discussion.

10 MS. MONTGOMERY: John Pérez?

11 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Aye.

12 MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Aye.

14 MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamente?

15 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

16 MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

17 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

18 MS. MONTGOMERY: Carl Guardino?

19 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Aye.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Very good. Five ayes. We
21 have approval.

22 Thank you.

23 Okay. The next item is Item 6, Project
24 Documentation Submittal Deadlines.

25 First we'll hear from the staff. And then I have

1 two cards for folks in the audience seeking to speak on
2 this. If anybody else would like to speak on Item 6, make
3 sure you fill out a card and pass it forward as well.

4 BOARD MEMBER GUARDINO: Mr. Chair, I have to
5 leave at 11:20, so just to let you know. But for purposes
6 of a quorum, obviously we'll be fine too.

7 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Thank you.

8 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Okay. So at the last --
9 at the October 25th meeting you asked that we survey the
10 counties to find out what their preference was on actually
11 extending the March 1st, 2007, deadline for the six
12 remaining counties, which is now the three remaining
13 counties. And you also asked that we get some more
14 feedback on setting a deadline for the phased counties and
15 what kind of formula should be use. So we'll just walk
16 through it.

17 With respect to the question of: Should the
18 March 1st, 2007, deadline be extended? Overwhelmingly --
19 of the counties that did respond, it was overwhelming yes,
20 that this deadline should be extended further. We've
21 gotten four letters from counties. They're in your
22 packets and they're posted on the website. And all of
23 them have -- actually feel the same way, that this
24 deadline should be extended; and to go even further, that
25 the January 1, 2008, deadline that has been proposed not

1 be implemented.

2 So with regards to: Should the Board establish a
3 January 1, 2008, deadline on the use of funds for counties
4 who've submitted phased approach project documentation
5 plans? Overwhelming amount of the people who did respond
6 voted that this deadline -- actually they did respond
7 that, yes, this deadline should be established. We had 22
8 counties responding yes. We had 10 counties responding
9 no. And we had some undecided. So based on that,
10 actually most of the counties that did respond to the
11 deadline -- or to the survey said that there should be a
12 deadline established.

13 Whether or not any of the counties will be using
14 the remaining of their allocation if they haven't already
15 submitted invoices, also these counties all responded,
16 yes, they're going to use their money. We have 18
17 counties still pending that have submitted complete
18 plans -- and invoices, and 7 counties with
19 phased-approach, counties who are interested in using
20 their allocation -- their initial allocation.

21 We did have three counties who said they would be
22 interested in reverting the funds that weren't used under
23 their initial allocation. And also -- overwhelmingly.

24 And we asked whether their counties would be
25 interested in applying for a second funding round. And 26

1 of the counties that responded -- that's a majority of the
2 counties -- 65 percent of the counties who responded said,
3 yes, they would definitely be interested in a second
4 funding round.

5 Also we asked: Should the Board use the same
6 formula to distribute the second funding round? A
7 majority of the counties said yes. But some did point out
8 that they would like the Board to update the registration
9 numbers based on that formula.

10 So 17 counties did not respond to the survey. So
11 we -- we have a good idea of what most of the counties are
12 looking at.

13 But I would just like to open it up for
14 discussion or if the Board has any questions of me.

15 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Do we want to hear from our
16 two speakers first and then come back to us?

17 Okay. The first card I have is from Kathleen
18 Smith from Nevada County.

19 And thank you for having been with us in Los
20 Angeles at our last meeting too.

21 MS. SMITH: Thank you. It was a nice trip.

22 Good morning. I believe our county is one of the
23 counties that you have received information in your
24 packet. So I won't go over that. But ideally -- I just
25 have a few more salient points to make, which is that:

1 Nevada County is currently without an election
2 vendor, as all of our software and hardware maintenance
3 agreements have expired. So for the November election
4 what we did do is we rented HAVA compliant equipment.

5 Nevada County's Voting Modernization Project
6 includes an absentee solution as well as to address the
7 HAVA mandates. We're very close to completing our project
8 and submitting the Project Documentation Plan to you.

9 And our ultimate goal is to use our full
10 allocation as long as it is available to us. So we are in
11 favor of extending the March deadline. And I had written
12 that I was undecided on the remainder of the questions on
13 the survey, because I feel like I'm not in a position to
14 really make an intelligent recommendation to that since we
15 haven't -- we're probably behind the 8 ball as far as the
16 rest of the counties in the state.

17 We have showed good faith effort since I've been
18 in office July 1st of '04. And this is our third RFP
19 process that we've gone through. And I believe that it
20 will be successful. We do have two vendors that have
21 responded and we've set up our demonstrations for later on
22 this month.

23 I'd be happy to address any questions.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Well, in your letter I see
25 that you're looking at January 23rd and 29th for a formal

1 vendor presentation and public demonstration. And I
2 understand you think March is too soon. And I'm not
3 asking you to say when do you think the appropriate
4 deadline is. But when do you think you'll probably come
5 to us?

6 MS. SMITH: Depending upon your schedule, we --
7 and if we you'll be meeting monthly basis, I would like to
8 present our plan to you no later than the June meeting.
9 That gives us -- I mean there is quite a bit of lead time
10 involved in putting that together.

11 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante.

12 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Didn't your letter say
13 something about July of 2007?

14 MS. SMITH: I think basically we were talking
15 about July 1st.

16 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Oh, okay. So it
17 probably -- it may not be June and it probably will be
18 August, but it would be right in that ballpark?

19 MS. SMITH: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay.

21 MS. SMITH: Obviously we need to be prepared to
22 proceed with the Primary Election in 2008.

23 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. Anybody else?

24 Thank you.

25 MS. SMITH: I really appreciate your

1 consideration on these issues. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: The next card we have is from
3 Conny McCormack from Los Angeles.

4 MS. McCORMACK: Good morning. Conny McCormack,
5 Los Angeles County.

6 And I'd like to start by thanking the members of
7 the Voting Modernization Board. The stability you have
8 offered in this process has been invaluable to all the
9 counties. I can recall, Mr. Chair, your saying at several
10 meetings a couple of years ago you thought you'd come into
11 this and you'd have about a two years job to give out this
12 money and you'd be out of there. And here we are five
13 years later and --

14 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And four Secretaries of State
15 later.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MS. McCORMACK: Oh, that was -- my next comment
18 is the difference is that in the five years your Board has
19 been very stable, knowledgeable. You've had the benefit
20 of a great staff consultant in Jana. And we haven't had
21 that in the Secretary of State. We've had constant change
22 and it's been very disruptive and stressful to everyone.
23 And so I just wanted to say thank you for your knowledge,
24 your background. And as we go into this very important
25 issue of where you're heading in with the funding, I think

1 that's really going to serve you well and serve all of us
2 well. So I'd like to start by saying that.

3 The second thing I'd like to say is that when we
4 started the process in L.A., we came to you I believe as
5 the first county with a phased-in approach to voting
6 system acquisition. And this is back at a time when
7 things looked a lot more stable than they do now. But we
8 still felt that we were not ready for our county to embark
9 upon a beginning and end solution. And indeed I believe
10 subsequent to that quite a few other counties chose a
11 phased-in approach and are moving along in that manner.

12 And I know for myself, and I'm assuming those
13 other counties, we've advised our board of supervisors
14 that the funding -- in many reports to them and constant
15 reports to them, they're on our website, that this process
16 and this funding is available, that we do do periodic
17 reports as to where we are. And I think it's really
18 important for you to realize too, and you probably already
19 do, that as counties move into '08 many of us are
20 reassessing the amount of equipment that we had in '06 and
21 the higher expected voter turnout in '08, and I know for
22 the case of Los Angeles County we fully expect within the
23 next few months to purchase more equipment --
24 significantly more equipment to be prepared for those
25 elections. And I think other counties will be doing the

1 same thing. And this is the year to make those
2 assessments and to get ready to get them fully tested and
3 ready to go for '08.

4 So I think it's really important that we could
5 maintain the flexibility of the Phase 1 funders with those
6 who have put in project documentations for. You set up a
7 formula that everyone sort of thought we had a floor in
8 what we would expect. Beyond that of course there's a
9 Phase 2. And that I think is what you're grappling with.
10 And we've heard from you on one of the counties that is in
11 a situation that's pretty unique that didn't apply yet.
12 In my thought, and this is just my personal opinion, on
13 the survey -- it's really always interesting to see how
14 counties respond to a survey like this. But to me the
15 most important thing is how the counties who haven't
16 applied at all would answer that. And I don't know how
17 many there are.

18 And certainly we just heard, and I thought, a
19 very legitimate argument from Nevada County.

20 But in terms of the second concept of putting a
21 deadline on funding that we -- and phase the project and
22 expect to continue, it would seem to me that it probably
23 is a little self-serving to ask counties who have spent
24 their money if they'd like to tack on, you know, something
25 else. It's the money, I mean being logical, that if I'd

1 spend all my money, I see L.A.'s still has got, you know,
2 \$40 million sitting there, that I'd like to have a piece
3 of that. So I'm not sure that it isn't just everyone just
4 responding that they would like to get some money rather
5 than more intellectually what is appropriate policy-wise.
6 So I'd just like to add that to the record. But I
7 think -- I do apologize that we didn't formally respond.
8 I knew I'd be here today.

9 But I think it's very important for the stability
10 that we have the opportunity as we move forward and are
11 buying more equipment and the systems are changing almost
12 hourly, federal laws are getting ready to change, I mean
13 all kinds of things are happening, that we not be limited
14 to when we can spend this money. So I just wanted to get
15 on the record for that.

16 And that's really all I wanted to comment on.

17 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Thank you very much.

18 Mr. Kaufman.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: I had a question,
20 Conny.

21 You addressed the -- you know, the proposed
22 deadline or the date that's been thrown out there more
23 than anything for counties using -- counties like yourself
24 that were awarded funds and hadn't yet used them, which
25 Jana told us 22 counties responded yes to establishing a

1 deadline. And, again, there was also a fairly strong
2 response from counties who were interested in applying for
3 a second round of funding. Of course your county would be
4 presumably a beneficiary of the second round as well. So
5 I'm just wondering, you know, how you see that playing
6 into the thought process with respect to any deadline
7 or -- I mean there is a pot of money that's going to be
8 sitting out there again to reallocate --

9 MS. McCORMACK: I don't think that pot of
10 money --

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: -- even apart from
12 your use -- your county's use and other counties who are
13 using a phased approach, using up that pot of money.

14 MS. McCORMACK: I think it would be easier for us
15 to -- all of us to know what that potential pot of money
16 is. But I would imagine it's pretty small. But for
17 counties that haven't applied yet, out of 200 million or
18 195, it's probably a very small amount if those counties
19 chose not to apply at all and miss the deadline,
20 whatever that deadline might be. I'm assuming that could
21 be an extremely small amount of money.

22 So, you know, I'm not that concerned about that
23 pot of money as I am the money that we've already -- and
24 we haven't been allocated it, but it's been reserved. I
25 guess we should call it a reserve, because if you're not

1 allocated, I think that's appropriate and I supported it.
2 Do not allocate until you've actually got a purchase
3 order.

4 But it's money in reserve that counties have
5 held. And I would suspect, although I haven't looked, the
6 22 counties that say, "Yeah, I'll put that money back in,"
7 are counties that have spent their money. I mean if I had
8 spent my money, I probably would have answered that way to
9 the survey too. So I just don't know whether the survey
10 is particularly the way to make policy decisions based on
11 a decision we've had for five years, that counties who are
12 moving at a different pace, and we feel a very successful
13 pace in L.A. County, would potentially be penalized and
14 not have an opportunity to get money for future
15 improvements to our voting system, which all of us are
16 wanting to do continuous improvement.

17 And this is an area that hasn't stabilized yet.
18 Equipment is changing almost hourly, software, hardware,
19 everything. So our board is -- my board of supervisors
20 has been advised by me -- and of course it was a change --
21 I had to let them know that we had this money and it's
22 there as we move along. So I just think it's -- again, 22
23 counties, maybe they didn't all spend their money, but I
24 would kind of think they probably did.

25 And I would just hope that that open-endedness of

1 the policy you had so far would remain, especially given
2 the environment right now. If we had a stable environment
3 and everybody knew we had the same equipment for ten
4 years, that might be a different picture. But we're never
5 near that kind of environment.

6 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante.

7 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Yeah, a couple things.

8 First off, I don't know that our policy is
9 open-ended. I think we've kind of -- the tail is kind of
10 wagging the dog here. I mean I think we've tried to set
11 guidelines and tried to set dates. And, you know, as a
12 result of a variety of different factors we ended up
13 having to be patient and flexible.

14 Since you didn't have a chance to answer the
15 question -- maybe I wasn't listening carefully enough.

16 Should the Board establish a January 1, 2008,
17 deadline?

18 MS. McCORMACK: I would say no. I don't want to
19 see a deadline established.

20 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: So you would propose no
21 deadline at all?

22 MS. McCORMACK: Going back to old VMB hearing
23 minutes, that it's -- my impression that when you had a
24 phased-in program, as long as you were showing where you
25 were in your phases, it was pretty open-ended. And there

1 hasn't been talk of a deadline, except for finalizing the
2 initial so that there could be a second pot of money. And
3 I totally support that. I think probably everyone does.
4 And there's just a few counties that haven't applied.

5 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: So you think 2010,
6 2012?

7 MS. McCORMACK: I would think right now on this
8 environment --

9 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: I mean my point is that
10 you need to just -- I mean whenever you want --

11 MS. McCORMACK: I think, you know, maybe five
12 years ago how many of us would have been shocked to think
13 that we'd be siting here five years later and not have
14 spent this money. But that's not the environment that was
15 thrust on any of us. And so now, if anything, it seems
16 almost less stable than it's been a couple years ago. So
17 I think we just need to let the debate play out a little
18 bit. And that's what I would request.

19 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I guess -- if I may, there
20 are a couple of different situations. There are one, two,
21 three -- there are seven counties that are in phased
22 approaches, as is Los Angeles. And I think that you were
23 very clear when you came in with your first allocation
24 request or award request that you wanted to establish on
25 the record then that you were reserving the full amount,

1 but that you were only drawing down that first phase at
2 that point in time.

3 MS. McCORMACK: That's correct.

4 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So I look at the situation of
5 those seven counties somewhat differently than the
6 remaining 51 counties. And there are at least two
7 different situations for the remaining 51. Some are
8 counties -- for example, there are three counties that as
9 of the end of today's meeting will have not requested any
10 money, will have not submitted any funding award
11 allocations. And that only totals about \$2 million.

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Including Nevada
13 County?

14 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Right, right. Merced,
15 Nevada, and Trinity. That comes out to about \$2 million.

16 Then there are other counties who came forward
17 for a single-phased approach, drew down a certain amount
18 of money. In some cases it was the entirety of their
19 allocations. In some cases it was less than the entirety.
20 Of those, some of them spent the entire allocation, so
21 they basically spent the entirety of Phase 1.

22 The other counties that may have come in under
23 budget still have money in their Phase 1 allocation but
24 have completed the work in their single phase, and that
25 totals 4.239 million. So we're talking about 6 million

1 out of 195 million that's -- that obviously compared to
2 the 48 million that Los Angeles still has in reserve to
3 use in future phases is small. But for small counties,
4 that 4.239 million may be a significant amount of money to
5 supplement the work that they've done up to that point.
6 So I am more concerned about making that money available,
7 if it's not going to be used by the counties that it's
8 originally allocated for, to assist counties who have
9 spent down their entire money and still have more work to
10 be done. And I'd be interested to hear your responses to
11 that.

12 MS. McCORMACK: I think that's a very good
13 description of the history of where we are. But I also
14 caution that with '08 some of those counties may say, "We
15 need to take another look if we have enough equipment."
16 The turnout -- there's always 20 to 25 percent more
17 turnout in a presidential year. And it could be
18 shortsighted if some of them think they're done. They may
19 be. They may have bought plenty of equipment. I don't
20 know. But I would imagine there'll be some counties
21 looking at that this year. And maybe even in '08 after
22 the first primary somebody says, "Whoa. Wait a minute. I
23 think we need to relook at that."

24 So perhaps they could be surveyed, whoever those
25 counties are that didn't do a phase, and say, "Do you

1 really feel like you're done?" or "Are you looking at
2 buying more equipment, are you considering that?" It's a
3 good question to continue to --

4 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: But shouldn't we then say,
5 you're either done and we should revert this money back
6 after a date certain, or you should come back and propose
7 a second phase to draw down that money? Otherwise that
8 money will go back into a pool that we look to allocate
9 for the benefit of all the communities.

10 MS. McCORMACK: I think that would make a lot of
11 sense, Mr. Chairman, because they -- as you've said, they
12 are -- they didn't apply for a phase-in. They said they
13 were going to a new system. And now maybe spur them into,
14 "Well, this is going to happen. I'm either going to not
15 have it or I am. Maybe I'd better take a quick look to
16 see if I have enough equipment and go from there." So
17 maybe a deadline for that would spur some decision making.

18 For those of us in the phased-in, I do appreciate
19 the additional -- the continuation of the flexibility
20 you've shown so far to us.

21 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: My only concern is also not
22 encouraging counties to say, "It's a use-it or lose-it
23 situation. I better go buy something just so that I don't
24 lose the money," and encourage people to buy something
25 that isn't necessarily the optimum for their needs in the

1 out years.

2 MS. McCORMACK: That's always a risk.

3 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Kaufman.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Once again, Mr. Chair,
5 you went exactly where I wanted to go with this in looking
6 at the distinction between counties that have taken a
7 phased approach and those that haven't expressed a phased
8 approach but may want to use a phased approach. So I mean
9 in that sense I'm not sure there's a big distinction in
10 the seven and the others. But I do like the concept of
11 placing some requirement on it, because even though some
12 of them may have said, "Jana, no. You know, we don't
13 intend to use the money. We'll let it revert back," I
14 would hardly consider this chart a legally binding
15 document and I think that we should take some action to
16 basically either commit those counties to taking a phased
17 approach or not, so that we know if there is at least some
18 set of a pooled money, we could then reallocate that.

19 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I would totally agree.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: See, I was looking at this as
21 an election and that 17 counties chose not to vote, some
22 undervoted --

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: -- somebody I think spoiled
25 her ballot on the first question.

1 (Laughter.)

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I agree.

3 MS. McCORMACK: I would also like to say that
4 some of us had to spend our HAVA 301 -- our HAVA 301 money
5 by a certain date. And one of the reasons, for example,
6 L.A. County spent something like 28 million so far in new
7 voting equipment. If we hadn't of spent the 16 or 17
8 million in one category and another cat -- there were some
9 hard deadlines. So we were very cognizant of this sort of
10 shell game, that we have to go spend this money by this
11 deadline, this money by this deadline. This money let's
12 you do voter outreach, but, as you know, VMB money
13 doesn't. We've really spent a lot of time. And now we've
14 sort of drawn down a lot of those other accounts. So now
15 for the -- there's 700 more equipment I want to buy -- we
16 just had a meeting the other day -- we're going to go into
17 the VMB money now.

18 So we're making these strategic decisions, but
19 they've been driven by some other decisions. And, indeed,
20 we had a discussion with the Secretary of State's people
21 that these contracts for the 301 HAVA money by state law
22 have to be annual. They can get renewed, but we're really
23 worried that -- the next deadline is June of '07, and of
24 course we're certainly hoping that those are going to be
25 renewed, and we anticipate they will be, but we don't

1 know. I mean right now our contract says June of '07.

2 So, again, we've been under a little bit of a
3 complexity here and the -- the freeing up of all this
4 absentee money to buy absentee systems, because a lot of
5 people have upgraded absentees given how many absentees
6 there are. That's another factor in here that really
7 wasn't around so much three or four years ago.

8 So there are a lot of factors into this. But all
9 of you know them because you're been around and you're
10 familiar with them. But I appreciate the opportunity to
11 give some input on that.

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante.

13 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: How many phases do you
14 see in your phased-in approach?

15 MS. McCORMACK: Well, you know, we had this chart
16 on our wall at the office. And every time we'd go in one
17 direction, it seems to -- something out of our control
18 happens. It's a joke now in our office, how many phases.
19 I don't mean it to be a joke. But, you know, it's pretty
20 disturbing to sit there and go along the path and then
21 realize that you aren't going to get to that part of that
22 path, and what does that mean? And so we're sort of in a
23 reassessment mode on that.

24 When we started our project, it was the Two in
25 Two Committee, two voting systems in two years. And now

1 we -- and we have an internal advisory committee, with our
2 chief administrative officer, our county counsel, our --
3 chief administrative officer, our CIO -- all these people
4 on our internal advisory committee. And somehow that's
5 sort of like -- how many voting systems in how many years
6 is -- we don't call it the Two in Two Committee anymore.
7 It's another -- it's now the Elections Advisory Committee.

8 So I can't answer that question because we're in
9 flux. And we appreciate the opportunity that we can be in
10 flux. There's Still money left. To be in flux without
11 money is much worse than being in flux with money.

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay.

13 MS. McCORMACK: That answer did not help you,
14 but --

15 (Laughter.)

16 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Well, it actually made me
17 feel better because in describing it I've sometimes said I
18 think Los Angeles has 10 phases and then I say I think Los
19 Angeles has 63 phases. So I'm somewhere in the ballpark?

20 MS. McCORMACK: Probably.

21 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. McCORMACK: Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Finney, anything?

24 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: No, I'm good.

25 It's okay if she answers these questions. I'm in

1 the same area.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. Anybody else seeking
3 to shed light on this?

4 Come on up and you can fill out a card after
5 you're done speaking.

6 It's an important issue. I want to make sure
7 everybody who wants to speak has a chance.

8 MS. ALVAREZ: Well, I'm Billie Alvarez from Santa
9 Barbara County. And our registrar submitted a letter to
10 the Board in regards to our concern for a deadline for a
11 phased approach.

12 And I'd like to reiterate a lot of what Conny
13 said. Over 50 percent of our vote is done by absentee
14 ballot now. And we're counting on that Phase 3 approach
15 to get the new equipment to more efficiently process those
16 ballots.

17 Well, because of the changes that have happened,
18 including the equipment was in federal testing and because
19 of a recent EAC decision, it has to go through E-testing
20 again through the Cisco Lab, I think it is. So,
21 consequently, we don't really know when this is going to
22 be certified. And by establishing a deadline on it, it
23 makes it very difficult for us.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Yes, please.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: And you are an

1 example, at least according to our list, of a county that
2 did not necessarily indicate that you were taking a phased
3 approach but now nonetheless --

4 MS. ALVAREZ: Well, we did submit a project
5 documentation plan that has three phases.

6 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: The last one that they
7 submitted was a Phase 2 with a potential for a Phase 3.
8 But there wasn't anything submitted for a Phase 3 yet. So
9 there was a potential.

10 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Because they're --
12 actually now they should be probably --

13 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: They should be in this
14 first --

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: -- moved up in this
16 first group.

17 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: They were never allocated
18 that money though. So -- I mean your initial -- certain
19 counties who were allocated money based upon the project
20 plan that was submitted. So the project plans that
21 they've submitted thus far is for Phase 1 and 2. They
22 have not submitted a project documentation plan for that
23 \$1 million.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So we approved \$1,721,151.32
25 for Phases 1 and 2?

1 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And we've disbursed that
3 amount as well?

4 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Correct.

5 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Leaving them with
6 \$1,028,642.74?

7 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Correct.

8 MS. ALVAREZ: And we have indicated in that
9 original response our intent to have that Phase 3
10 approach. And we will be submitting that detailed
11 documentation on that.

12 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: And there is a letter, as
13 she said, in your packet.

14 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Got the letter.

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: So there may actually
16 be more people in that phased category and that four
17 million two hundred plus thousand that you referred to may
18 actually be a smaller pool?

19 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I believe that will be
20 true.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: This is a huge impact. I mean
22 you'll -- bringing absentees, because it's growing
23 dramatically throughout the state.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Thank you.

25 Is there anybody from Merced or from Trinity?

1 Because, in looking at the responses, Merced did respond
2 to all the questions, but didn't give us any additional
3 comments and hasn't yet come forward. And I'm wondering,
4 you know, where they're at. And then Trinity -- Trinity
5 didn't even respond and they've never come forward. So
6 I'm trying to figure out the status of that county as
7 well.

8 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Well, I have been in
9 contact with Merced County, and they were interested in
10 submitting a plan before the March 1st deadline. So
11 they -- at the last CACEO meeting they did contact me and
12 said that they will submit a plan. They did purchase the
13 ES&S AutoMARK units and they do plan to submit a plan on
14 that equipment.

15 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And they're in favor of a
16 January 1st, 2008, deadline.

17 Okay. And Trinity?

18 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I have not heard from
19 Trinity County.

20 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Sounds like it's one
21 county voting with no date.

22 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I think Mr. Kaufman and I
23 should go to find Trinity County.

24 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Mr. Chair?

25 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante.

1 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: I may be in the
2 minority, but -- I mean I really -- when I look at this
3 list, I kind of -- you know, it really comes down to -- in
4 my mind it comes down to three counties. I mean it comes
5 down to the one county who hasn't done anything that you
6 were just referring to. And then, you know, my concern
7 isn't so much about the counties who have already drawn
8 down a majority of their funds, but really the two
9 counties with a phased approach that kind of have a
10 toe-in-the-water approach; I mean Los Angeles being one of
11 them. I mean just what, \$49 million sitting out there,
12 600,000 is basically used.

13 I mean I appreciate -- I mean I've been here
14 since the first day. So I've lived through all these
15 problems and various Secretaries of state. But I think in
16 the end I mean the problem -- my concerns really come down
17 to those three counties: San Luis Obispo; Los Angeles;
18 you know, and the one county that hasn't even bothered to,
19 you know, answer any of our requests.

20 And I think, you know, the other counties who
21 have -- even the counties with phased-in approaches who
22 have drawn down the majority of their funds, I mean
23 clearly there's a path that's been taken and difficulties
24 that, you know, folks have encountered, but at least
25 there's an effort that's been underway that seems to be

1 meeting the spirit of what we started with in 2000.

2 And, you know, I'm curious to hear what you guys
3 have to say, but I mean I'm just -- for my part I think
4 those are the three counties that I'm most concerned
5 about.

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: And I guess I share
7 your concern about the counties we haven't heard from.
8 But I think we -- Los Angeles is the obvious focal point,
9 but we just heard from Ms. McCormack that L.A. has in fact
10 done a lot with respect to its voting systems over the
11 last few years, but it's these other pools of money that
12 have been available. So --

13 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: That weren't VMBS?

14 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: That were not --

15 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Yeah, basically they drew
16 down the equivalent of the majority of their VMB
17 allocation, but they drew it down from other sources that
18 were available to them.

19 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Right. So I don't
20 think they should be penalized for the fact that they
21 chose to use other available funds rather than these funds
22 in going through those phases, whereas other counties may
23 have used these funds first. I mean we don't really know
24 the full picture as we sit here because there are so many
25 other pots available. We only know based on the numbers

1 that are in front of us.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I guess what I look at is,
3 for example, the Orange County example since it's, you
4 know, where my office is, where they originally came to
5 us, they drew down the entirety of their funds; and then
6 because of changes in both federal and state law, came
7 back to us, reimbursed the entirety of the funds that were
8 allocated to them, availed themselves of federal money,
9 and then reapplied for money from us to make sure that
10 they maximized utilization. We went through extensive
11 steps to make sure that they were doing all that in
12 compliance with state and federal law and to maximize, you
13 know, the impact of what we were trying to do in assisting
14 the county's technology.

15 That a county like Los Angeles had the
16 forethought to identify which funds to use for which
17 purposes early on is of less concern to me. If they
18 hadn't been making progress, if the 600,000 that we've
19 expended from VMB were the extent of their modernization
20 efforts, I think I'd be very frustrated. But since it
21 represents 600,000 of what, 26 million in change?

22 MS. McCORMACK: (Nods head.)

23 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: -- it's of less concern to me
24 because I see -- while I joke about how many phases, I do
25 see some real progress there, and I do see the complexity

1 of the voting system there.

2 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: And they have responded
3 to quarterly reports we've asked them to respond to. So
4 they have let the Board know that they are moving forward
5 and they have steps that they're taking.

6 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Is that the same for
7 San Luis Obispo County as well?

8 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I think where we all -- we
10 all share, just from a slightly different perspective, the
11 same frustrations that the counties do in that the rules
12 keep getting changed. The overall vision may be similar,
13 but the rules and how you get there keep getting changed.
14 And we're all -- we're frustrated because we thought we'd
15 be done, you're frustrated because you thought you'd be
16 done. And we just want to make sure that we're not a big
17 impediment and that we're not letting folks be an anchor
18 on the system at the same time.

19 The other thing I would add is in conversations
20 with the Secretary, it's my understanding that the
21 Secretary's office will be doing a pretty thorough review
22 of systems. And while I'm anxious to set a deadline
23 that's sooner rather than later, I also don't want to
24 create an artificial deadline that's in conflict with
25 reality on the ground for counties once the Secretary's

1 review is complete.

2 With that, maybe we should move on to the next
3 item.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Well, do we need to
5 deal with the March date on this -- 2007?

6 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Well, that's what this item
7 is --

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: -- consideration of extension
10 of the March 1st, 2007, deadline.

11 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: See, I read ahead.

12 (Laughter.)

13 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So the next specific
14 sub-items here is 6B and C.

15 6B is consideration of extension of the March
16 1st, 2007, deadline for counties to submit their first
17 Project Documentation Plan.

18 The second is discussion of January 1st, 2008,
19 deadline on the use of funds for counties who have
20 submitted a phased approach Project Documentation Plan.

21 So really 6B only at this point relates to
22 Merced, Trinity, and Nevada.

23 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Correct.

24 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: And Nevada, you said,
25 was --

1 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Nevada was saying that March
2 last doesn't give them the time they need because they
3 anticipate being before us in June or July.

4 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: It's what -- what year
5 am I in?

6 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So we're in 2007.

7 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: That's right. Sorry.

8 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So mindful of where Nevada's
9 coming from, what deadline do we want to set for those
10 counties?

11 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Let me ask just one
12 question.

13 Does June the 1st work for you -- or July 1?

14 MS. SMITH: We've had failed negotiations with
15 vendors in the in past. So --

16 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Because it sounds like
17 you're close.

18 MS. SMITH: We are close. But the negotiation
19 process is the most arduous and can take the longest time.
20 So I'm -- we're using a consultant as part of our process.
21 And so I feel optimistic that -- I would prefer July 1st
22 deadline myself.

23 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Right. But you'd have
24 to have it in June --

25 MS. SMITH: So that would give us all of June to

1 dot the i's and cross the t's.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And we're expecting to hear
3 from Merced prior to March, correct?

4 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Correct. That's what
5 they indicated.

6 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Except they also said
7 in their response that they'd like to see the March 1st
8 deadline extended. So I suspect maybe we won't if we
9 extend it.

10 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Jana probably -- you
11 were saying probably June, right?

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So if we did July 1st, that
13 would cover -- understanding that things can change --
14 and, quite frankly, we're clear about that because we've
15 extended the deadline several times to respond to, you
16 know, reality on the ground --

17 MS. SMITH: Yes, you'd have to.

18 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I'm sorry?

19 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Nothing.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So July would probably be
21 responsive to the needs of Merced and Nevada.

22 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Then that would be
23 that.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And that would be that, yeah.

25 So is there a motion?

1 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'll
2 move that we extend the deadline for counties submitting
3 their first Project Documentation Plan to July 1, 2007.

4 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: And I'll second.

5 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante moves, Mr. --
6 I almost called you Mr. Finney. Sorry.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Please. There are a
8 lot of things you could call me, but don't call me that.

9 (Laughter.)

10 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Kaufman seconds.

11 On the question?

12 MS. MONTGOMERY: John Pérez.

13 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Aye.

14 MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

15 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Aye.

16 MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

17 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

18 MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney.

19 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I wanted to vote on behalf
20 of Carl Guardino.

21 (Laughter.)

22 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll say aye.

23 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Very good.

24 Next is 6C, discussion of setting a January 1st,
25 2008, deadline for the use of funds for counties who have

1 submitted a phased approach Project Documentation Plans.

2 Right now there is no deadline, correct?

3 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Correct, there's no
4 deadline.

5 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Okay. So this would be
6 establishing a deadline where none has existed before.

7 I would suggest that -- I've been working under a
8 misperception about which counties are truly in a phased
9 approach. I thought it was limited to the handful of
10 counties on the top of the one report. So I thought it
11 was Colusa, Lassen, Los Angeles, Marin, Placer, San Luis
12 Obispo, and Siskiyou. I'm now hearing that it's
13 actually -- Santa Barbara's included. There are other
14 counties.

15 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Could potentially be.
16 They have not -- Santa Barbara's the only other county
17 indicated -- out of those 12 that indicated that they may
18 want to submit another phase.

19 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So maybe what we can do is
20 get our arms around which counties are really included in
21 this universe, and not set a deadline without having a
22 full understanding of who we're setting the deadline for.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Yeah, I mean my -- I
24 agree. I think that's a perfectly responsible approach.
25 And I'm just wondering if we can couple that with some

1 sort of -- I don't know, maybe this is overstepping -- but
2 some kind of a deadline for a commitment that they may
3 undertake a phased approach. So that if --

4 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: May possibly.

5 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: May possibly.

6 So if the county says, "Absolutely not. We're
7 done. We're not coming back to you," we know we have a
8 pot of money.

9 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Is that something that you
10 can --

11 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante, are you
13 comfortable with us -- having that for us at the next
14 Board meeting and considering once we have a fuller set of
15 data?

16 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Sure.

17 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I'd like to send a formal
18 letter to all these counties. And I'll have the Chair
19 review it before we send it out. Just basically request
20 them to let us know if they will in fact be doing a phased
21 approach.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Or if they -- or if
23 it's something they'll get -- if it's something they'll
24 contemplate, I don't want them to do it.

25 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: They may not be able
2 to commit this month, but they're absolutely going to do
3 it. But if it's something that they want --

4 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: I think Mr. Bustamante wants
5 to tighten up the language.

6 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Well, I'm just curious
7 if the Secretary of State's office contemplates any type
8 of closure of this Board and the funding.

9 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I'm not sure I understand
10 your question.

11 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: They can't --

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: -- till our job is
13 done.

14 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: They can't because we're not
15 established by the Secretary of State but rather by the
16 Act.

17 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: It's by the Act, and
18 there's no --

19 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: -- there is no end to
20 the Act.

21 (Laughter.)

22 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: No, sir.

23 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: We were looking for a second
24 act.

25 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: I'm just wondering if

1 we should give people more time than the next meeting.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Sure. Well, how about if we
3 give them till March 1st?

4 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: We don't have anybody
5 up in February, right?

6 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Not at this time.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Then maybe we can --
8 when we March 1st to report to us at the March meeting.

9 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Okay. And I'll work with
10 the Chair and Vice Chair on the language, and so that
11 we're asking the questions you want to ask.

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Finney, are you
13 comfortable?

14 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I am comfortable with that.

15 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: He's in a smoking
16 jacket --

17 (Laughter.)

18 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: And I didn't hear that.

19 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Mr. Bustamante was --

20 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: That I was wearing a nice
21 warm jacket or something?

22 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Smoking jacket.

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: All right. Then I think, you
25 know, we've basically put 6C over to our March meeting.

1 Next, Item 7, Staff Reports on Related Issues.

2 7A is regarding a second funding round. That's
3 really not an appropriate discussion to have at this
4 point, so let's put that off.

5 7B is the 2007 VMB meeting schedule. And if
6 you'd like to walk us through that, Jana.

7 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I did have a chance to
8 talk to the Chair prior to this meeting. And we were
9 hoping to go to quarterly meetings. We did come up with
10 some dates, today being one of the dates that's in your
11 packet. February 21st is a potential date if Merced were
12 to submit something or if another phased county wanted to
13 submit a plan, setting the February 21st, 2007, date. Our
14 March 21st, 2007, date. And then going quarterly to June
15 20th, September 19th, and December 19th.

16 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: The only thing I would say is
17 because we're setting a July 1st deadline, we may want to
18 move that June date to be a July meeting.

19 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So maybe can we make the June
21 meeting a July meeting instead, and we'll keep September
22 and December, if that's okay with everybody.

23 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Conceptually it's fine
24 with me. Check your dates.

25 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Is it quarterly or are

1 we going to --

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Well, see, we basically do --

3 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: No, no. I mean are we
4 going to do quarterly or not?

5 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Well, we basically do monthly
6 until March.

7 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Well, we don't have --
8 it doesn't look like we're going to have a February
9 meeting at this point.

10 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Well, that will come
11 off if Merced does --

12 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Right. You know, if that
13 would go off, then we would do March, July, September and
14 December. So it's quasi-quarterly.

15 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Well, I was thinking
16 rather than July, September, and December, that we would
17 just do July and then maybe November.

18 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And --

19 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: So do you want to just
20 leave it at that?

21 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: July and November?

22 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: So we actually have
23 quarterly meetings.

24 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Then it will be October and
25 January. So it would be July, October, and January?

1 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: No. It would be --

2 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: Quarter ends
3 September.

4 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: It ends September.

5 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Yeah.

6 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: So it would be November
7 and January.

8 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: What happened to
9 October?

10 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Well, that's what
11 July's for.

12 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: I'm going to leave
13 this to you, Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So we've got January
15 obviously. We're doing it. In all likelihood we will not
16 meet in February.

17 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Right.

18 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: We will meet in March.

19 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Right.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: We will meet in July.

21 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Right. July or
22 September is the third quarter.

23 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Right. But then it would
24 be -- the meeting in July. It's going to be August --
25 October would be the next meeting.

1 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Oh, okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So if we did October --

3 BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: We're looking at the
4 completion of a quarter and then a meeting --

5 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So then if we did October,
7 maybe we wouldn't do another meeting until 2008.

8 BOARD MEMBER BUSTAMANTE: Unless of course
9 there's something that came up.

10 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Right. All subject to
11 change. If you want to have another meeting to discuss
12 things, we could do that.

13 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And --

14 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: Let's do the third
15 Wednesday --

16 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Let us establish now that the
17 March meeting will be in Los Angeles.

18 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: March in Los Angeles?
19 Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: And we've got to enjoy July
21 in Sacramento.

22 (Laughter.)

23 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: I have looked at this
24 room. It is available for every third Wednesday of the
25 month. So we can move those dates and I'll send them back

1 out.

2 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Perfect.

3 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: So July 18th?

4 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: So July 18th and October --

5 you're quicker with your Treo than I am with my

6 Blackberry.

7 VICE CHAIRPERSON KAUFMAN: It will be October the

8 17th.

9 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: October 17th.

10 Okay. Very good.

11 Let's see. That's all I have before us.

12 Is there any other item of business to come

13 before us?

14 STAFF CONSULTANT LEAN: No. I just wanted to let

15 you know that you will be having to fill out your Form 700

16 again soon, but I'll be sending it out to you.

17 CHAIRPERSON PÉREZ: Nobody likes us. Nobody

18 gives us gifts. Nobody gives the Secretary any money.

19 Okay. With that, we are adjourned.

20 Thank you.

21 (Thereupon the Voting Modernization Board

22 adjourned at 11:57 p.m.)

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing Secretary of State's, Voting Modernization Board
7 meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters,
8 a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,
9 and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
11 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
12 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14 this 28th day of January, 2007.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR

23

Certified Shorthand Reporter

24

License No. 10063

25