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MR. PEREZ: I'd like to call to order the August 15, 2007, Voting Modernization Board.

MR. KAUFMAN: Stephen Kaufman, Vice Chair.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Michael Bustamante.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney and Carl Guardino are not here.

MR. PEREZ: Very good. We have a quorum.

The next item before us is "Public Comments."

I don't see any for public comment. So we'll move adoption of the May 16, 2007, actions and meeting minutes.

MR. KAUFMAN: I will move adoption of the action items and minute meetings.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: I'll second.

MR. PEREZ: Mr. Kaufman moves. Mr. Bustamante seconds. Everyone in favor ayes?

MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

MR. PEREZ: Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding Reward Approval.

And Jana, if you would talk to us about
that.

MS. LEAN: Okay. So Nevada County is here today to submit a Project Documentation Plan. They submitted a plan to use their entire Modernization Board allocation of $866,431.28. They are purchasing the Hart InterCivic System. They are purchasing 72 of the eScan Optical Scan units and 74 of the eSlate Electric Voting Appliances. The Nevada County anticipates receiving its new voting equipment between late August of this year and mid-September of this year.

The County plans to begin using this equipment at the February 5th, 2008, Presidential Primary Election, and they expect their completion date of this project to be upon certification of the February 5th, 2008, Presidential Primary Election. The eSlate units purchased by Nevada County include a Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trail component. Nevada County's Project Documentation Plan meets requirements for completeness, and eScans and eSlates with the corresponding components were certified for use in California.

Nevada County began comprehensively researching the replacement of their voting system in June of 2004. Nevada County made several attempts to
upgrade their voting system to become HAVA compliant

They finally entered into agreement on June 12, 2007, with Hart InterCivic for their new voting system. Nevada County will be implementing a blended optical scan and touchscreen voting system. The County believes that the deployment of one eScan Optical Scan unit and one eSlate touchscreen unit in all the voting places will bring the County into full compliance with the Help America Vote Act. The eSlate units will provide access to those voters with disabilities and will also satisfy the second-chance voting requirements by not allowing over-votes and identifying under-votes to each voter.

Nevada County plans to use the paper-based optical scan unit as its primary voting system, thus allowing the majority of their voters to vote on a paper ballot. The County believes that this approach will assist in avoiding some of the controversy surrounding the current touchscreech technology while still adhering to state and federal accessibility requirements.

Nevada County is currently developing an
extensive voter outreach program to introduce the new
voting system to its voters.

I wanted to bring to your attention that
the InFusion and Fusion voting software listed in
Nevada County's contract with Hart InterCivic has not
gained certification in California and is, therefore,
not eligible for reimbursement under Proposition 41.

Furthermore, at this time the Secretary of State's
Office has not received any technical specifications
nor other relevant information on the TAG and SCORE
software components listed in Nevada County's
contract with Hart. This software has not been
provided to the Secretary of State's Office to gain
certification to be used with this voting system, and
therefore, it's also not eligible for reimbursement
under Prop 41.

Nevada County will only receive VMB
payments once it has submitted detailed invoices for
its certified voting equipment. Please note that the
staff-proposed funding award is based upon allowable
reimbursement under Proposition 41 only for voting
equipment hardware and software. The professional
services, optional extended warranty line items, and
the identified non-certified software listed in the
Nevada County contract with Hart InterCivic would not
be covered as reimbursable claims under Proposition 41.

It is our recommendation that the Nevada County's Project Documentation Plan be approved and that a funding award letter be issued in the amount of $866,431.28.

We do have representatives here from Nevada County, if you have any questions of them, and we also have Ryan Macias from the Office of Voting Systems Technologies to explain the actions that were taken on August 3rd by Secretary of State Bowen and related to this voting system decertification and withdrawal approval and recertification.

MR. PEREZ: Why don't we do this if it meets with everyone's approval. Ryan, if you would, walk us through that first so we all have consistent understanding of where we stand with respect to the Secretary of State's actions and specifically as they relate to the Hart InterCivic products that we are talking about today.

And then if we could have the representatives of that County come up, make any statements they want. I have a couple of questions for them. I'm sure my colleagues do as well.

MR. MACIAS: All right. The Secretary on
August 3rd decertified and recertified Hart InterCivic's System 6.2.1. The eScan, the only changes to that are the auditing conditions and the new security procedures that have been implemented prior to use on February 5th, 2008.

The eSlate DRE System was also decertified and recertified for use. It can be used full-fledged as well as before. It also has new security and auditing conditions added to it, as the eScan has, to be implemented prior to the February 5th, 2008, election.

At this time other than those auditing and security procedures that have to be implemented, there has been no other changes to Hart InterCivic System 6.2.1. Now, the system 6.1 was decertified completely.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Which system is this?

MR. MACIAS: This one. The way the contract is written, it's only going to be used with the certified system.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: So the hardware is the certified system and the software decertified; is that right?

MR. MACIAS: No. There are two different systems. There was 6.1 that was only being used by
(inaudible) County at the time, and that was
decertified completely. Hart did not bring further
the review, and they removed certification
themselves.

MR. PEREZ: Let me ask you this because I've got
a similar concern to Mr. Bustamante.

So both the eSlate and the eScan were
decertified and recertified, the ones that we are
talking about today, with respect to that accounting?

MR. MACIAS: Right.

MR. PEREZ: But the recertification was
conditional on a change in auditing and security? Or
did that auditing and security requirement -- was it
met immediately on the date of decertification and
recertification?

MR. MACIAS: It is -- it will --

MR. PEREZ: While you are looking for that, let
me ask you another question. This is why it's better
for Ryan to go first.

MS. LEAN: I can answer one question.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: I just have one, out of
curiosity. Were you involved in any of this stuff,
or are you just here to read from this text?

MR. MACIAS: No, I was involved in reviewing the
Secretary's decision before it went out.
MR. BUSTAMANTE: What do you for the Secretary?

MR. MACIAS: I work for the Office of Voting Technologies Assessment, which pretty much we do all the certification for the State of California. And yeah, that's our main --

MR. BUSTAMANTE: I didn't have that.

MR. PEREZ: Let me tag on one other question.

MR. KAUFMAN: Actually, let me tag on a question. Maybe what we are getting to is why was it necessary to decertify the system before recertifying it again on the same day, and was there anything that happened in the interim that led to the recertification?

Isn't that basically the heart of what we are getting at?

MR. PEREZ: But much too simply put.

MR. KAUFMAN: Whoever can answer that question.

MS. LEAN: I think a certification itself is certification. You can't add conditions to it. The only way you can add conditions is to withdraw that certification, recertify it with conditions. So they would have to withdraw the certification in order to add new security conditions to it.

MR. PEREZ: So then that gets me to my question
which is, so is it certified, or is it conditionally certified?

MS. LEAN: That's the question we asked the attorneys, and according to Michael Kanotz and Pam Giarrizzo, who is our chief counsel, it is currently certified. It's a currently certified system, and these conditions have to be met, these certifications have to be met, before the February 5th, 2008, Election. But it's not decertified.

MR. PEREZ: Right. But here's my problem. And maybe you can try our cell phone to get ahold of Mr. Kanotz so we can get him on the phone because, really, for my own sense of comfort, before I vote on this, I want to be clear on the distinction between certification that exists on these systems today and conditional certification.

The problem I have is when we looked at -- I think it was the Diebold TSx.

MS. LEAN: It hadn't been certified to be used in the primary software.

MR. PEREZ: There was a system -- I thought it was Diebold TSx -- that was conditionally certified in San Diego, and then it was decertified. So it had a conditional certification, and then it was decertified right before a major municipal election.
And quite frankly, the inability to use the DRE, in my opinion, was determinative of the outcome of the election because the whole question in that election became a question of voter intent and how it was recorded based on the voting system that was used versus the DRE that previously had conditionally been certified.

So there are serious implications with these switches, and I just want to be sure that we're not voting to fund a program, spend out 100 percent of the money that has been reserved for Nevada County, have something fall short in terms of the condition, have Nevada County out all of their Prop 41 money and left holding the bag to find a system that works for voters and comply as with both state and federal law.

MS. LEAN: Michael can address that because that was a question that was addressed before this meeting happening. Once these decertification and recertification orders came out -- and this was on the agenda -- he was asked to review the certification orders and determine whether or not we should move forward and how we should approach you.

The response was it is currently certified; we can move forward to you. And he felt -- and so
did our chief counsel -- comfortable with -- as it's
written now, it's still certified. I understand
where you are going.

MR. PEREZ: Let me ask two other questions.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: It's all about voter
confidence. When you talk about -- or at least the
Secretary made a comment about lack of voting
confidence. These types of actions and then redo
actions and re-redo actions are exactly what is
exacerbating this, quote, "lack of voter confidence."

MR. PEREZ: So let me ask you a couple of other
questions. So Fusion and InFusion -- maybe it was in
the previous packet which I don't have today, but
explain to me what Fusion and InFusion do. And I'm
trying to figure out where we're at in the
certification process for Fusion and InFusion.

MR. KAUFMAN: In other words, are we approving a
system that is certified that basically can't operate
because we've got software that isn't certified and,
therefore, makes the whole thing moot?

MR. PEREZ: If I want to buy a car and you tell
me the engine is great but the transmission doesn't
work, I'm not driving off the lot with it.

MR. MACIAS: As I understand, the InFusion and
Fusion is a utility that they use. It's not required
for the DRE or optimal scan to work. But we do have
Nevada County here that can answer more questions.

MR. PEREZ: The gentleman from Nevada County,
feel free to jump in, if you want. We just want to
clear up some of these issues that are really before
the Secretary before we -- because they impact you,
but they're not caused by you.

MR. O'NEILL: I appreciate that. Members of the
Board, my name is Bill O'Neill with Shamrock
Associates. I am a consultant that was hired by the
County to help them select and implement a system.
And then with me is Susan German. She's the
Assistant Registrar of that County.

The questions that you are asking are the
exact, same questions that Nevada County attorneys
and Hart attorneys are going to be talking about. As
we speak, they are on a conference call, trying to
determine the best course of action. They're
concerned about the same things that you guys are
raising.

So as far as Fusion and InFusion, they are
a utility program that handles the import of election
data from the system. The County doesn't need them
to move forward with the election. They can enter it
by hand. It just automates the process rather than
make a process whereby somebody sits down and enters
by hand the information. That information is stored
in the store system and can be imported into the
system.

MR. KAUFMAN: That applies to both the optical
scan and the DRE system?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes. That imports it -- and Ryan,
correct me if I say anything incorrectly -- but it
imports it into the Tally program which handles the
jurisdictions and the reporting, et cetera, as well
as the ballot layout and design.

MR. PEREZ: But is this tally system TAG or
SCORE? The tally system?

MR. O'NEILL: No. TAG is --

MS. LEAN: The tally system is called "Tally."

So it is part of the election management system.

MR. PEREZ: What is TAG and SCORE then.

MS. LEAN: TAG and SCORE are two other utilities
that have not been brought forward to the Secretary
of State's Office. We did get a minimal amount of
specifications of what they are, but it was not
enough for us to make a determination.

MR. PEREZ: What function do they serve?

MS. LEAN: You can jump in on this one better.

MR. O'NEILL: TAG is asset-tracking system. So
you enter the serial numbers and the polling place, et cetera, and you check the equipment out, and then you check it back in. It doesn't have anything to do with --

MR. PEREZ: And SCORE?

MR. O'NEILL: I can't remember exactly which. I keep getting TAG and SCORE confused.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: These are all security issues; right? I mean, it sounds like TAG is where things are located, who is voting where. The other one that you talked about was, you know, uploading -- I mean, inputting, downloading of the actual ballot proposition names and all of that.

I mean, are all of these things consistent with the Secretary's new approach to security? I mean, this is all of her new ideas about the security measures?

MS. LEAN: I can't --

MR. PEREZ: Let me -- look, I understand, but here's my problem. As I sat at the Secretary of State's Office a couple weeks ago for a public hearing Top to Bottom Review and as the principal investigator was discussing some of the issues that came up -- some of which required mitigation that he felt were simple, some of which required more
detailed mitigation -- one of the issues was a
question of sleep-over equipment. The question of
security on equipment. The question of seals.
So if TAG is tracking where equipment is
yet it hasn't been certified, I don't know about
anybody else, but it doesn't give me the confidence
that we're actually addressing some of the issues
that even the principal investigators raised.
So while I don't want to put Nevada County
in a difficult position of financing this system, I
also don't want to finance a system only to have you
come back and not have a system that works.
And maybe if you can speak to the tone of
where we're coming from, and the conversation is
going to continue from there.
MS. GERMAN: Thank you, Chairman Perez and
Members. I actually have just been appointed as the
assistant; so I haven't gotten to that; and this bill
is to keep on this project right now. So although I
will be involved in the future --
MR. KAUFMAN: Let me ask this. It sounds to me,
though, that what we're talking about are systems
that could be add on and could be used to make life
easier, but they're not systems that are a necessary
part of that system operating. And as I read this,
we're not being asked to fund those particular software systems. So these are ways to potentially improve the system, but they are not necessary functions of the system. I think that's the distinction. And perhaps you can confirm that and address that.

MR. O'NEILL: That's exactly right. The TAG system which tracks where the equipment is -- there's a lot of these systems out there and available that the County has used. There is one called Tiger Eye and one called Asset Shadow. It's a bar code reading system that tracks where the system is and --

MR. PEREZ: But why did the County then choose this system as opposed to one of the systems -- I mean, look, I understand that we have a narrow area of what we can find, but I view systems as being integrated with all of the moving parts -- some of which we fund, some of which we don't, but all of which have an impact on the integrity of the election process and all of which have an impact in voter confidence.

So if you were to sit here and tell me TAG isn't certified and, therefore, we are using system "X," which is certified, I'd be okay with that. But I'm a little concerned that I don't see, you know, a
full system. Especially because I have this underlying concern about whether the certification is a real certification or a conditional certification. Are you with us, Mr. Kanotz? Michael?

MR. KANOTZ: I am, Mr. Chair. Forgive my tardiness.

MR. PEREZ: If you can hear me okay, one of our first and kind of fundamental questions we're talking about is the Hart InterCivic products, both their eSlate and eScan. And so it's our understanding that 6.2.1 was decertified and recertified the same day. The purpose for that was to enumerate certain conditions prior to it being able to be used in the February election. And so what I, for one -- and I think my colleagues are asking similar questions -- want to know is what's the distinction between that certification and a conditional certification like we've seen previously?

MR. KANOTZ: Mr. Chair, I believe that the recertification is very similar in most respects to the conditional certification that we've seen before. According to conditions, here are a little -- if what you are thinking about the conditional certification, the previous conditional certification of Sequoia,
that the system could not be used in a California primary --

MR. PEREZ: I was thinking -- although I do remember the Sequoia issue, I was thinking of the Diebold TSx and that conditional certification which then was revoked, and the system was decertified prior to the San Diego Municipal Election two or three years ago.

MR. KANOTZ: Okay. I'm not quite familiar with that one. That was before my time at the Secretary of State's Office. But I do believe, if I know the facts of that situation right, that this is a similar situation to those, and it is our view -- my view and I think the view of the Secretary of State's Office -- that this remains a certified voting preferred for purposes of the Voter Modernization Act.

MR. KAUFMAN: Semantics between --

MR. PEREZ: I understand there could be --

MR. KAUFMAN: -- certified or certified subject to conditions.

MR. PEREZ: Right. And here's the problem. The TSx was conditionally certified and satisfied Prop 41; and a much younger, more optimistic Board at that time, you know, decided to approve the funding for the TSx in San Diego; and I think we approved the
Sequoia system in a couple counties.

MS. LEAN: With conditions.

MR. PEREZ: Yes, but they spent their money -- if not all, a significant portion of their Prop 41 money -- and then they were left with a system that wasn't certified for use in California. They weren't --

MS. LEAN: That's actually incorrect. Until the TSx was recertified, they did not draw any money.

MR. PEREZ: We approved it, but they didn't draw it down?

MS. LEAN: That's correct. And then it was decertified, and we couldn't pay them out any money until it was recertified.

MR. PEREZ: But that was because of the timing of the decertification, not because --

MS. LEAN: That's correct.

MR. PEREZ: What I'm trying to avoid is us getting into a situation where, you know, the County is left in a lurch.

Convince us, Michael.

MR. KANOTZ: Well, I think at this point it's something that's in the Board's discretion as to whether or not to approve the application. Certainly I don't have the certification orders in front of me,
but I believe that they are milestones up to 60 days.

Certainly in 60 days there will be a little more

certainty, with regard to the certification, as to

whether they will be able to use this. But as it

stands, I believe it's a certified system.

MR. PEREZ: I'm also drawn to another section of

the Bond Act. I don't have it before me, but it

basically gives us the weasel clause to not fund

something, even if it is consistent with purposes of

the act, if we have other concerns.

And you can help me find that weasel clause

in the Bond Act. I understand this is your first

week. I don't want your first week to be a bad week.

But quite frankly, I'd rather not give you money

today, have you have a system that's more dependable

that you can count on, and have you have money then.

What are the moving pieces with respect to

your contract with Hart InterCivic? And is there a

downside if we don't act or don't approve today? Can

you still move forward in preparing? It's not that

we are opposed to the concept; it's that we want to

make sure we don't get in a situation where they

don't meet the conditions and you don't have a

certified system.

MS. LEAN: I have one suggestion.
MR. PEREZ: Sure.

MS. LEAN: There are some milestones they have to meet, and there's a 30-day or 45-day, and the vendor has to meet with the County in order to come up with all the security plans. What the Board could do is hold off on voting on this, and we can re-meet on this plan itself once those conditions have been approved by the Secretary of State's Office. Would that be more in your comfort zone?

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Mr. Chair, I was going to suggest we continue this for 30 days or 60 days or a period of time that makes more sense to you. And I apologize. I wish -- well, I'm not going to get into it.

MR. KAUFMAN: But I'd like to hear the answer to the question that the Chair proposed. I mean, is there any harm to the County if we do wait 30 days or 60 days?

MR. O'NEILL: My answer would be "maybe." And that's -- the County has the exact, same concerns you do. We had lengthy discussions with Hart on, What does this mean? Is it conditional or nonconditional? What happens in February if it's decertified?

The County is very concerned. One of the options is they're meeting this afternoon, as I
mentioned, as we speak, for the attorneys to put
language into the contract, whether that be an agenda
or otherwise, to say if this system isn't
decertified, then they can go forward with using it,
and the vendor will get paid. If it's decertified,
the vendor won't get paid.
Because their concern is the exact, same
one you have, is that, what happens if there's a 60
days? The 60-day is the farthest deadline, and they
have 30 days to respond. That puts us 90 days from
August 3rd before the County knows they have a system
eye can use in February.
They are very concerned in implementing the
25-day. They will make everything they can to make
that happen. But honestly, the registrar couldn't be
here today because of these talks with the attorneys,
because they have the exact, same concerns that you
guys have. They are very concerned.
MR. BUSTAMANTE: But our action or lack of
action today doesn't inhibit your time line?
MR. O'NEILL: It really doesn't. The only thing
the County will do is if the money is in jeopardy,
then we also have to back off.
MR. PEREZ: Here's the situation. Even if we
act today and we approve, you don't get any money
from us until you've already spent it. What I want
to avoid is the situation where you actually spend
the money, your system is decertified, and then we
can't reimburse you. So then you're really out the
money.

MR. O'NEILL: The County has that exact, same
concern. So if the Board takes the action to not
fund today, I don't think the County is going to
be -- I don't think that's going to bother them.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Not postpone. Not actually not
fund.

MR. PEREZ: I think we are all comfortable with
continuing this matter in hope that this stuff gets
clarified.

MR. O'NEILL: Because the County doesn't want to
spend --

MR. PEREZ: It's hard to say, "We're not giving
you money, but it's in your best interest," but I
think that's really what we're doing.

MR. O'NEILL: They have a full understanding of
that.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: From my part -- and I think we
all agree -- we certainly don't want to send a
negative message back to anyone about the question of
funding because I think we all want to do it. We
just want to do it once and do it right.

MR. O'NEILL: They don't want to have a $1.3 million voting thing either.

MR. PEREZ: Sure.

With that, we are going to continue this item.

MR. KAUFMAN: Should we give the staff discretion as to the timing consideration whether 30 days or 60 days?

MR. PEREZ: Look, if the County is able to resolve these issues more quickly than we're normally scheduled to meet, I think we're open to scheduling a meeting specifically to clear this up.

MS. LEAN: Okay. Our next scheduled meeting is in October. I think it's October 17. I think by that date this will all be pretty well understood.

MR. PEREZ: If you think it'll be cleared up more quickly than that and if there's value to the County of Nevada for us to act more quickly than that, I think, you know, we would make our best efforts to put together a meeting before October 17.

MS. LEAN: Okay. Staff will work with Nevada County.

MR. PEREZ: If it really doesn't have an impact but you just have a desire for us to meet quicker,
that's different. But if us meeting more quickly
does have an impact, we will make our best efforts to
meet more quickly to expedite this for the County.

MS. LEAN: So can we formally say we are going
to hold this over to the October 17th meeting?

MR. BUSTAMANTE: I move we move this to our next
meeting.

MR. PEREZ: Yes, to our next meeting. By saying
"next meeting," we create that flexibility to do it
sooner.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.

MR. PEREZ: There's been a motion and a second.

Mr. Bustamante moves. Mr. Kaufman seconds. To put
this item over to our next meeting, all in favor?

MR. BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.

MR. PEREZ: All ayes, no nays.

The next item is "Appointment of New
Executive Officer."

MS. LEAN: That should be a little easier, I hope.

MR. PEREZ: We all want to vote for this one because in
the interim I'm the executive officer, too.

MR. BUSTAMANTE: So you have to abstain. I'm
voting no and -- no.

MS. LEAN: At the first meeting of the Voting
Modernization Board way back in June of 2002, the Board approved its operating structure, policies and procedures, and a Memorandum of Understanding with the Secretary of State's Office. We entered into it with the Board for administrative support services. The MOU provided for the Secretary of State to designate a staff member to serve as the executive officer to the Board to assist the VMB in carrying out its duties.

At the December 17, 2002, meeting of the VMB, the Board appointed former Chief of Elections John Mott-Smith as the executive officer to the Board. As the executive officer to the Board, Mr. Smith acted as -- Mr. Mott-Smith -- sorry -- acted as the SOS policy advisor to the Board and was responsible for executing any and all documentation, on behalf of the Board, necessary to accomplish the loan application process, bond programs, and the process of payment requests from the counties.

On July 5, 2007, Mr. John Mott-Smith retired from the Secretary of State's Election Division, and his retirement necessitates the appointment of a new executive officer to fulfill all the duties.

This is staff recommendation that we
appoint the new Chief of Elections Cathy Mitchell as
the new Voting Modernization Board Executive Officer.
Do you have any questions?
MR. KAUFMAN: I would move to accept the staff
recommendation.
MR. BUSTAMANTE: Second.
MR. PEREZ: Mr. Kaufman moves. Mr. Bustamante
seconds. All in favor?
MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
MR. BUSTAMANTE: Aye.
MR. PEREZ: No one opposed. Very good. The
action carries.
No other business before us, we are
adjourned.
(End Time: 12:49 P.M.)
***
STATE OF CALIFORNIA    )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES    )
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THAT THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS WERE TAKEN BEFORE ME AT THE TIME AND PLACE THEREIN SET FORTH AND WERE TAKEN DOWN BY ME IN SHORTHAND AND THEREAFTER TRANSCRIBED UNDER MY DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION, AND I HEREBY DECLARE THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES SO TAKEN.

I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE HEREUNTO SUBSCRIBED MY NAME THIS 6TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2007.

_______________________________
    ROSA I. GUZMAN, CSR NO. 12024