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CHAIR KAUFMAN: Now that you have joined us, we are going to call the meeting of the Voting Modernization Board to order. Welcome, everyone. Hello, Katherine.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Here.
MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?
VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Present.
MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?
BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Present.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: We have a quorum, which is a good thing.

Do we have any public comment cards?
MS. MONTGOMERY: We have the written comment submitted by Judy Alter, but no public.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. I don't know if your mike is working.

We received a letter in advance from Judy Alter, Director of Protect California Ballots, regarding actions for SB 360, which are part of the materials that were distributed, I believe, to be put in the record.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Yes.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Next on the agenda is adoption of May 18th, 2012, actions and meeting minutes. These were circulated to us for the last meeting.
Have you guys had a chance to take a look at them and do we have a motion to adopt those action and meeting minutes?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I'll move to adopt.
BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll second.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Bustamante moves. Finney seconds.

Since he's not here, let's do roll call votes.
MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.
MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?
VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Aye.
MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?
BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Those action and meeting minutes are approved.

I did not see the February 24 meeting minutes in my packet. Did you get them?
VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE:
MS. MONTGOMERY: I e-mailed them to you. They're not printed out. I apologize.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: I didn't see them in either packet.
VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Maybe it was in the previous e-mail for the previous meeting maybe?
MS. MONTGOMERY: I could have done that. I'm sorry. I apologize.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I don't remember seeing them.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I went through my e-mail packet this morning and didn't see it. Okay. Well, we will have to defer.

MS. MONTGOMERY: I can certainly send those to you. I'm sorry.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Tal, did you see them?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Yes, I did.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: You did. Okay. Well, we could take it on Tal's good word if you've had a chance to take a look at them.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Are you going to move?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll move.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I'll second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Let's do a roll --

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: He wasn't there at the last meeting.

Why don't we defer approval of those until those of us who were here actually have a chance to take a look at them to make sure they accurately reflect whatever happened.
MS. MONTGOMERY: I'm sure we'll meet again soon.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I'll sure we'll meet again soon.

Okay. Thank you.

Obviously, some of us didn't miss a document when we were downloading.

Okay. Next on our agenda is a project documentation and plan review and funding award approval for Placer County.

So Katherine are you or Robbie who will make the presentation?

MS. MONTGOMERY: That will be me.

And are you folks from Placer County?

Unidentified speakers: Yes, we are.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Why don't we have the staff presentation and then we'll hear from all of you.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Placer County's Phase 2 project documentation plan meets the requirements for completeness.

Placer County first purchased an optical scan voting system in 2002.

In 2006, Placer County added the touch screen component to meet HAVA Title 3 voting system requirements.

Since 2001, the number of voters requesting vote by mail, also known as VBM, ballots has more than quadrupled in Placer County.
Of the counties 204,000 plus registered voters, 63 percent have requested permanent VBM status with the possible additional five percent depending on the election, residing in an all-mail ballot precinct.

Placer County maintains the purchase of ballot sorting systems, such as the Runbeck Agilis -- I think I'm saying that right -- will help it keeping up with the increasing number of VBM voters in this county.

Currently, Placer County manually processes each return VBM pallet. This process requires that staff handle every envelope numerous times. First to sort in terms of precinct level and then checking signatures on envelopes to determine eligibility, noting receipt in the data management system, auditing branches for accuracy and transparency, opening envelopes for counting and duplicating ballots when necessary.

Accordingly, Placer County states this time-consuming and labor-intensive workload has greatly increased its labor costs. Placer County hopes to reduce its VBM labor costs by at least 75 percent by purchasing the Agilis automated VBM sorting scanning system from Runback Election Services. The Runback Agilis a third-party combination of hardware and software to support the voting system and does not itself require certification as a voting system used in California.
Placer County is also hoping to improve the process by which they provide daily vote by mail and over-the-counter ballot requests by purchasing two Runbeck Sentio ballot printing systems, also known as ballot on demand printers. Every election requires a different set of ballots, known as ballot types, which vary accordingly to the combination of federal, State, and county and local district offices that are up for election, as well as any measures that have qualified for the ballot. During election year, Placer County can count up to 150 different ballot types.

The county must provide a sufficient number of ballots for each voter, along with enough overage for each ballot type to allow for newly registered voters, provisional voters, and spoiled or replacement ballots. The number of ballots ordered must also take into account expected voter turnout for a given election.

In addition to the difficulties previously explained, Placer County is also thinking ahead to the potential issues they will place once Chapter 947 statue 2012 goes into effect. This legislation creates conditional voter registration also referred to as same-day voter registration in California. Once the statewide voter registration system is up and running, it's currently expected by 2016. Voters will be able to
register up until the close of the poles on election day, greatly complicating the task of estimating how many ballots and of what type to order.

Placer county believes the ballot on demand printers will allow the county to reduce ballot printing costs by an estimated 45 percent, greatly minimizing ballot spoilage and help managing the issues that will be created by conditional voter registration.

This is the first time the county has come before this Board to request funding for a ballot on demand printer. Although not technically a voting system, arguably this voting equipment can be used to improve the administration of elections. Ballot on demand printers can potentially increase security by eliminating the need to store pre-printed ballots, while simultaneously lessening the potential for human errors when providing ballots to voters over the counter at the elections office.

Placer County's attempt to modernize the way they handle the increasing number of VBM voters and the impending same-day registration of voters while potentially saving tax payor money by using ballot on demand printers can certainly be seen as in line with the spirit of the Voting Modernization Board Act of 2002. Sentio is certified for use in California, as well as
specifically certified to print Premiere ballot on demand ballots.

Placer County will need to obtain pallet printing and storage certifications from the Secretary of State's office in order to use the Sentio ballot on demand system.

The third component of Placer County's request for funding is the Dominion non-volatile Accuvote-OS memory card. The non-volatile memory cards are for use with Placer County's precinct ballot scanners and will eliminate costly battery replacement in the cards each election and will provide a more stable system with reduced equipment failure on election day.

Placer County states that fewer equipment failures will provide a more efficient election day for poll workers and permanent staff in greater confidence in the voting experience for the voters of Placer County. The Dominion Accuvote-OS memory cards have been certified for use in California.

Please note that the staff proposed funding award is based upon allowable reimbursement under Prop. 41 for voting equipment hardware and software only. The extended service maintenance line items listed in the Placer County contracts with Runbeck Election Services would not be covered as a reimbursable claim under Proposition 41.

Also while recommending the approval of funding
for the purchase of two ballot on demand printers, we
would like to make it clear to the county that the cost
for ink or paper for the ballot on demand printers is not
a reimbursable expense under Proposition 41.

Placer County will only receive VBM payments once
it has submitted detailed invoices for its voting
equipment. It is our recommendation that Placer County's
Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan be approved and funding
award letter be issued in the amount of $315,725.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you. Why don't we hear
from Placer County and then we can ask questions of both
staff and Placer County.

Is there one or more people who would like to --
MS. HARRIS: We're all here for a reason. Would
you like me to introduce who you see before you before we
start?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yes. You all made the trip here.

MS. HARRIS: Exactly.

My name is Lisa Harris, and I'm the Placer County
Elections Manager.

MR. EYE: I'm Steven Eye (phonetic), the Placer
County Election's IT Supervisor.

MR. MC CAULEY: I'm Jim McCauley, the County
Clerk Recorder for Placer County.

MS. MYREN: I'm Gina Myren, the Administrative
Services Officer.

MR. SUBER: My name is Jim Suber. I'm with Runbeck. I'm Vice President of Business Development.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you all for coming.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Did you have anything that you wanted to say specifically or are you just here to answer questions?

MS. HARRIS: I'm basically here to answer questions for you guys. So we're all yours. And I know that this is the first time for the BOE so obviously we want to answer any questions you have on that and any other system operationals or concerns you might have.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. I actually had one question about the -- I guess what you referred to as the BOD. I guess it's directed more to staff.

We have that sentence in there it says it's not technically a voting system, but it's voting equipment that can be used to further the administration. Can you just address that issue? Maybe it's you, Robbie, or you, Katherine, to address the issue just so we're all clear here that it's acceptable to provide funding for this mechanism under our mandate.

I guess that's you, Susan.

HAVA CONSULTANT LAPSLEY: That would be me,
although it would be fun to listen to them try to explain it.

The ballot on demand system is not part of the voting system. It is a hardware and software that is used to print ballots. It's separate and apart from the voting system and isn't tied into the voting system.

What we do here at the Secretary of State's Office, because we are responsible for certification facilities and different factors, we do review it and certify it. So --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: So it gets certified but not as a voting system. It's certified voting equipment.

HAVA CONSULTANT LAPSLEY: Not to get into the weeds, but there are other voting systems that their ballot on demand is built in to as part of their voting system, but this one is not. This one is separate and apart.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Did you have any questions about that?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Yeah, I was just curious what's staff's justification for bringing this forward and saying it's covered under our charge?

HAVA CONSULTANT LAPSLEY: That's me, too. I help advise on voting system issues. HAVA, I think their reliance -- and if I'm speaking out of turn, please kick
me.

I think that HAVA has not -- their reliance is on HAVA in the interpretation by HAVA and HAVA Director for the Secretary of State's Office. And HAVA money, you have different pots of money. One of them is 301 as you guys know. Part of that 301 money is 251 money, which is more broad in its application rather than just straight voting systems. It's to improve the administration of elections.

The ballot on demand, while not part of the voting system, is something in our estimation that improves the administration of elections. HAVA has through their advisory opinions, they have said the ballots -- you cannot use the HAVA money to print ballots, which makes total sense. It's something counties are supposed to do, states of supposed to do regardless.

However, the hardware on here, the ballot on demand presents -- is an efficiency to the voting system. Without ballot on demand gauging how many ballots you have, especially with the increase in vote by mail, provisional voting, all those different changes we're making here in California, the functionality of ballot on demand is an improvement to the administration of election and makes it more efficient and makes it more streamlined and makes it a better process.

So from a HAVA standpoint, we have taken the
position that you can use this 251 to improve the
administration of elections money to buy the hardware.
You can't use it -- and the software. You can't use it to
buy ballots. You can't use it to buy ink. You can't use
it to buy those things that would constitute the actual
ballots.

But this piece of equipment that makes the
process more efficient would be reimbursable and I think
that's what staff relied upon in making their assessment.
If you analogize on the back end the sorting equipment has
always been reimbursable. HAVA has reimbursed for it. To
draw a line in the sand and say that on the front end
something that makes it more efficient we're not going to
reimburse for, but on the back end, to sort and do all the
things we have to do anyway we're going to be reimbursing
for, there is a logical disconnect that doesn't make any
sense.

So our position has been that as long as there's
the correct parameters on there that this is reimbursable.
From a HAVA perspective, that being said, at any point
they can come back and say, no, you can't do that. You
shouldn't done that, and the county would be responsible
to reimburse the costs and pay back.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I asked the question
because based on the reading of the staff report, it
sounds like this effort -- it seems it's more to help reduce administrative costs within the county than to necessarily improve the voting experience. Is that accurate?

MS. MONTGOMERY: That may have been my fault for not emphasizing the security of not having to store re-printed ballots. I did concentrate on that wasn't --

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: This is going to help reduce the fact that the county has to do every vote by mail application by hand one at a time. And this is going to essentially save the county money with its staff costs, it's administrative costs, as opposed to most of the things we've been dealing with, which is to actually modernize the actual voting experience and to ensure that a vote is a vote as opposed to everyone and a half times -- that a vote is a vote every time. That's the one thing that struck me as I read that.

MR. ANDERSON: I think it will --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Are you addressing the ballot on demand or the sorting issue, which is the first one which is --

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: It's the first one --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- sort of a function of doing which is different from this ballot on demand printer. Those are two different items.
VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Yeah. There's like three items.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: There's three items, but I wanted to make sure that you were speaking to number two which we were talking about.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Sorry for switching.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LEAN: The number three component you're talking about, the ballot sorting, that is actually something that the Board has approved funding for in other counties because we considered it a part of the component of the vote by mail voting system.

I think that's kind of what we were looking at from the ballot on demand. It obviously would help modernize, and I think that's how we got there, would modernize voting with looking forward to same-day registration or what is called conditional registration I think this would be essential to have. So I think if we're looking at it in a modernization aspect, I think absolutely this would be something that if you would allow -- it would be something that would definitely help not just this county, but other counties moving forward and modernizing how voters are voting.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Did I understand Susan's comment correctly that there are other voting systems that this is already included?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LEAN: Correct.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: It's part and parcel of a system, but this is a separate stand-alone piece.
HAVA CONSULTANT LAPSLEY: It's a functionality of the type of system they have in Placer County.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: We could have -- would have, could have, and maybe have approved a system that included this piece along the way?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LEAN: Correct. If it was rolled up into the actual voting system they were purchasing, yes.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.
VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I have a question for the county just separate from all of this stuff.
We had a presentation at our last meeting about the idea of vote by mail as kind of waning. Yet, you know, everything I see, vote by mail is increasing. And obviously, you guys are kind of trending up as opposed to others that perhaps think down the line may be trending down.
What do you think about the idea of early voting and do you guys do that in your county?
MR. MC CAULEY: Yes, we do. They would have to come into the office if they want to do early voting. We don't have satellite offices out and about.
But I feel that all the pieces that we're requesting funding for is going to make the voter's experience more easy, will be more correct. If the voter come in, as soon as we get his address he wants to register to vote, same day registration. We don't have to store 150 different ballot types. We can go to the computer punch out for ballot and it's there. She doesn't have to wait 15 minutes to get the ballot.

So I feel that all the things we're requesting are good things. And do they help staff time a little bit? Yes. But I'm doing it because I want the voter to have the best possible experience voting, period. That's why.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Could you explain for me the third piece of equipment I had a little trouble understanding exactly what it is, the Accuvote-OS memory cards. All I kept reading about is they don't require batteries. I wasn't clear about what they do.

MR. MC CAULEY: I'll let Steve handle it.

MR. EYE: The current Accuvote memory cards that hold ballot and hold the votes that are counted --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: This is if you're using the electronic voting --

MR. EYE: No, the actual optical scan. They fill out a paper ballot and feed it through a scanner once they
filled it out.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: In the polling place?

MR. EYE: In the polling place. The memory card that holds that precinct's information and counts all the votes, that memory card currently has a small battery in it. Those have to be replaced every election. They cause failures, the new one, the new memory cards that Dominion has produced is non-volatile. It's like a USB thumb drive, if you use that. There's nothing that needs.

So they hold -- they don't die, basically, which we see -- even though we replace batteries every election, you still see a certain amount of failure of those batteries. When you're buying 250 batteries every time, you're bound to get one that doesn't hold a charge or five to ten percent is generally the case.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: So in your county, the 25, 30 percent people who are left not voting by mail at this point, it sounds like from your numbers, are voting in the polling place. Their ballots are being counted in the polling place when they submit or they're being tallied in the polling place. They submit them, and then devices then go back to central county --

MR. EYE: And then we upload those. We upload --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: The data --

MR. EYE: Yes, into our central server.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: But you don't have to count the ballots there because they've already been running at the polling place?

MR. EYE: Correct. Unless the memory card fails, and then we have to count them again.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Got it.

Tal, did you have any questions?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: No. I'm good.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I'll move the staff recommendation.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Do we have a second on that?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Seconded by Tal Finney. Shall we take a roll call vote?

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Tal?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I said aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We didn't hear you.

Okay, Placer County. Congratulations. Your award of $315,725. And we'll be getting you a letter to
confirm that.

        MS. HARRIS: Thank you so much. Appreciate it.

        CHAIR KAUFMAN: You're welcome. And thank you
        for making the trip to address us.

        MS. HARRIS: And thank you, Secretary of State's
        office.

        CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. The next item on our
        agenda is kind of a continuance from our prior meeting at
        which staff presented us with a proposal for amending our
        funding application and procedure guide in light of SB
        360, the legislation that took effect at the beginning of
        this year expanding -- well, among other things expanding
        the universe of voting equipment that this Board can
        consider in its purview.

        And as you recall, at the last meeting, we were
        not able to approve these changes because we didn't have a
        quorum and now we do. There have been a couple of
        modifications that were made to the procedures that were
        presented to us at the last meeting as a result of some
        comments that were given.

        Robbie, do you want to quickly mention what
        changes have been made since the last meeting?

        MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. It's on page 2. We
        modified the application submittal deadline. It still
        kind of read strangely because information from the
original guide. So we just made it clear, "to be eligible for the initial round of funding, counties were required to submit applications for funding consideration to the VMB by 4:00 p.m. on September 3, 2002."

And then we did add a new clause on page 2. "The additional funding rounds" -- and this states, "the VMB may establish additional funding rounds and procedures for the application process for those additional rounds."

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Tal, since you weren't here last time and didn't get a chance to ask any questions, do you have any questions of staff regarding the proposed changes to the procedures?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I reviewed the material and I don't have any questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Michael?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I'm good.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I just had a couple of questions or issues. And I think what I'd like to do -- I have a couple potential changes. But I think we can talk about them, if we're okay. We could approve the procedures subject to these changes being implemented so that we don't have to come back again and do this again.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Sure.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And namely, at the last meeting, it was suggested that we change the references within the
document from SB 360 to the actual Election Codes that were changed as a result of SB 360 so that on a going forward basis we're now referencing the actual legislation.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: You mean the Code?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, in the Elections Code. So I would request, unless there is any other thought, that we go ahead and do that.

And I think, you know, you have this definitional section where you talk about SB 360. I think that's fine to explain where it came from. But then in the rest of the document, we should indicate in there what it codified. And then the rest of the document, wherever SB 360 is referenced, it should reference either Election Code Section, whatever et seq. or the particular Code section, if appropriate.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And then the last suggestion that I had was on page 6 under the section entitled "application submittal deadlines." And somewhat conforming to the change you made on page 2 where you talked about additional funding rounds. What I would suggest to modify this language would be it starts with "initially." I would -- instead of "initially," I would say -- I can reread this -- "to be eligible for the
initial round of funding," and then I would include, "the
application for funding consideration and authorizing
resolution were to be received by the VMB no later than
4:00 p.m. on September 3, 2002." Then I would add another
sentence that says, "The VMB will establish application
deadlines for any additional funding rounds." So it just
makes clear where we came from and where we are today.

MR. ANDERSON: That was the VMB --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I can read it back to you.

Conceptually, did that --

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- sound all right to everybody?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Do you just eliminate the
second sentence?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Under the "currently"?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Uh-huh.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think that still stands.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LEAN: Project documentations
are after the application.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: After the application, correct.

But actually, what I would do is take out the
word "currently." So I would just say, "The project
documentation and package and all required attachments
must be received by 4:00 p.m. by a date to be specified by
the Board."
So to read it back, I would take out "initially" and just say, "to be eligible for the initial round of funding, the application for funding consideration and the authorizing resolution were to be received by the VMB not later than 4:00 p.m. on September 3, 2002."

The new sentence would be, "The VBM will establish application deadlines for any additional funding rounds." And additional funding rounds would be initial capped because you designed it earlier on in the document.

MR. ANDERSON: Got it.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: And then we take out "currently" and just say "the project documentation." Okay. So does anybody want move adoption subject to those changes?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: I'll move it.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Tal moves.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: I'll second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Bustamante seconds.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Stephen Kaufman?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Michael Bustamante?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Aye.

MS. MONTGOMERY: Tal Finney?

BOARD MEMBER FINNEY: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So we have new procedures in place, which will now allow the counties to move
forward and presumably county of Los Angeles, which is itching to come before us. It will allow them to move forward with their new applications.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LEAN: Would you like to see it one more time before we publish it?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Why don't you run it by me just to make sure that what we've talked about is done prior to publication. Okay.

Any other business from staff?

MS. MONTGOMERY: We have no other business.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Board members, anything else you want to raise?

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: No.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then I guess we'll take a motion to adjourn.

VICE CHAIR BUSTAMANTE: Here here.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think we have a unanimous vote to adjourn.

Thank you, everybody.

(Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 11:04 AM.)
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