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CHAIR KAUFMAN: We are going to call the meeting of the Voting Modernization Board to order. Good morning to those in the room.

Let’s start off with a role call from Staff.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Good morning.

Stephen Kaufman, Chair?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Here.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: June Awano Lagmay?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Here.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Gabriel Sandoval?

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Present.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Teri Holoman is absent.

It appears we have a quorum.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Once again, we have a quorum.

All right.

Let’s start with any public comment for items that are not in the agenda. Anyone wishing to be heard?

Okay, seeing none, let’s go to the next item on our agenda, which is an adoption of the May 31st, 2019 action items and meeting minutes from our last meeting.

I know that June has some technical changes and corrections to the minutes and, I think, one to the action
items.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Yes.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Why don’t we just put the action --

the action item one seems easy. Why don’t we put that on the

record? And then I think the rest of them can be, if it’s

okay with everybody, just submitted --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Okay.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- to Staff for correction following

the meeting?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: On the staff report for El

Dorado? Oh, wait a minute. Let me just make absolutely

sure.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Was it the action items or is it the

staff report?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: It’s the staff report. Oh.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Oh. Well, then that --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: No. No. This was just from

the minutes and this is from the staff report.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Nothing for the action.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We don’t have to deal with that.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Okay.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: All right. So we just, we have some

technical changes to the minutes, so those will just be

handed to Staff following the meeting. They are typos and --
COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Ministerial.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- ministerial-type changes.

Gabe, did you have any other --

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: I do not.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- changes or corrections?

So with that, can we have a motion to adopt the minutes, subject to changes submitted by Commissioner Lagmay?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. All in favor?

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. We have approval of the minutes.

All right, next we have a number of standing items that the Board had requested of Staff to be addressed at all future meetings.

So, Arman, why don’t you go ahead and start by giving us the standing items?

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Sure. So NaKesha Robinson, our OVSTA person, unfortunately, could not be here with us this morning, so I will be reading her report on the status on Notice of Withdrawal of Certification and Conditional Approval of Voting Systems.
So the system is currently under review, under testing, complete. There’s a public hearing on September 4th, 2019. And the Dominion Voting System’s Democracy Suite 5.10 is currently completing testing or have completed testing.

The Election and Software, Inc., EVS 6.04.2 has also completed testing.

Currently testing, the County of Los Angeles Voting Solutions for All People, V-S-A-P, VSAP, Tally Version 2.0 is undergoing functional testing.

The Hart InterCivic’s Verity 3.10 is pretesting and request for proposal.

Request for a conditional approval for extension of use. Forty-six counties have or are in the process of implementing a CVSS, Certified Voting System. The remaining 12 counties are in various stages of procuring a CVSS, Certified Voting System, or have submitted a request for extension.

Here are some upcoming key dates. On August 27th, 2019 the withdrawal effective is -- withdrawal is effective. However, on August 27th, 2019 to February 27, 2020, elections scheduled six months from August 27th, 2019 shall be affected by this action therefore, and federal, state, county, municipal district or school election scheduled from August 27, 2019 until February 27, 2020 may continue to use voting
systems not tested and certified to CVSS.

February 28th, 2020; voting systems not tested and certified to CVSS may no longer be used, except for those jurisdictions that have received a conditional approval for extension of use of the Secretary of State.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Any questions of Staff regarding the status of the certification efforts?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: No questions.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: No questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: All right. Then the next standing item is the status of L.A. County’s implementation of their voting system.

Do we have a further report on that?

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Yes, Mr. Chair. So here is the status or update on VSAP for L.A. County.

Testing continues on Los Angeles County’s VSAP Tally Version 2.0. They have received the test units from their manufacturing vendor and are on track to conduct a two-day mock election during the weekend of September 28th and September 29th. They’ll have 50 vote center sites with the new equipment to familiarize the public with the new process and voting experience and hope to engage over 100,000 people in L.A. County.

In addition, they will have a traveling demonstration center that will travel throughout L.A. County to community
meetings to familiarize voters with the new system, October through January.

And they’re on track for a limited pilot to educate the public on the new solution model in order to test the hardware and e-Poll Book components to a live election on November 5th of this year with approximately ten jurisdictions participating.

So that concludes the update.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So they appear to be on track with what Mr. Logan had told us when he was here at the last meeting?

MS. LEAN: So far.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Any questions from either of you regarding --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: No questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- that item?

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: No questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then the next standing item we had was giving us an update on the status of counties making requests for additional VMB funding. And I see we have a chart in our book that’s been prepared.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So on June 27th the Voting Modernization Board staff sent out an email to counties who had a remaining balance in their Voting Modernization Board account with a purpose of
reminding these counties that they are eligible to seek additional reimbursement for voting equipment, as well as to establish a projection of when these counties plan to appear before the Board at a future meeting.

This email was sent out to two different groups of counties which are represented in the chart provided in the handout. The first group consists of nine counties who have been paid for an entire voting system but may be reimbursed for the purchase of voting equipment to expand their existing system. The second group consists of 15 counties who have not yet submitted all phases to replace their voting system but may submit a new project plan to seek reimbursement for a future phase to complete the replacement of their existing voting system.

As a result of this email we sent out the Voting Modernization Board staff received responses from 9 out of the 24 counties, who we expect will appear at a future Voting Modernization Board at either the September 25th meeting, the November 13th meeting, or at a future meeting sometime in 2020. The staff plans to send out a follow-up survey to gather responses from the counties in each group who have not yet replied.

I’m happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So we have a number of counties that haven’t replied. We don’t know whether they’re
going to leave money sitting on the table or not at this point; right?

Do we have any confirmations that any counties do not intend to seek any additional funding?

MS. LEAN: We do not. So I anticipate with the big changeover of voting systems, we will hear from all of them. I think that they’re in the process of procuring their equipment right now and so they want to figure out, you know, where the RFP stands, when they’re going to get, so they can figure out what they could come forward with.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So does Staff feel it would be unwise for us at this point to put any kind of deadlines for submission, or what have you, given that we have all these changes taking place between now and February of 2020?

MS. LEAN: Yes. I do not think that would be a good idea, sir.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. Okay.

And I had one question on this, the list of counties who have not submitted all phases to replace the voting system. There was another chart, I know, that I received back in, I think it was as of May AND --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: I have a copy here.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. Madera --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: In May? It was erroneously included.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: Oh. Madera was erroneously included on the original one? Is that what happened? Because I know Madera was on an earlier list and they’re not on this list.

MS. LEAN: The reason why Madera was included is they hadn’t yet submitted their payment requirements.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Um-hmm.

MS. LEAN: And we did receive that and they are in the process of getting their check. I think they’ve already gotten their check, so they’ve been taken off.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. All right. So that list of 16 is now 15. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SANOVAL: Any planned --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Any --

COMMISSIONER SANOVAL: Yeah. Any planned follow-up you have, other than sending an email to these counties, is anybody tasked with following up with any particular office by phone or some other way?

MS. LEAN: Yes, sir, we are. And we have a new staff member. I think -- so I’ll put this on the record. This is Arman’s last meeting.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Oh.

MS. LEAN: And so he is going to go work for the --

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: So I’ll be working for the Chancellor’s Office at California Community Colleges.

COMMISSIONER SANOVAL: Congratulations.
MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Oh, thank you. And I’ll be working as a Legislative Liaison. So I’ll be starting that job in a week, so thank you.

MS. LEAN: So his replacement we already have. And she was on staff with the Elections Division before. She was our NVRA coordinator. And it’s Jordan Kaku and she’s here today. And I’d like to --

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Congratulations.

MS. LEAN: -- introduce you to her when -- after the meeting.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Great.

MS. LEAN: But I just wanted to let you know, we do have a continual staff and we have somebody to take care of it. But she’ll be the one who will be following up with the rest --

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Great.

MS. LEAN: -- of the counties.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Thank you.

MS. LEAN: Um-hmm.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, we will miss Arman, who’s wearing a couple of hats today.

And welcome to Jordan.

Okay, June, do you have any --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: I only want to --

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- questions?
COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: -- complement Staff that the addition of the last column, anticipated date to appear before the Board, is very helpful. Thank you for adding that.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you for the update. Let’s go to item six on the agenda which is a staff report. There’s, I guess, two issues here -- well, no, just one. A staff report on the -- it’s an update regarding the clarification of Elections Code section 19254(c)(3). This was the subject of much discussion at the last meeting we had. I know Robbie Anderson has been working on a legal analysis to address those issues and, as I understand it, is still putting together some final thinking on that before a final opinion is issued.

So, Robbie, do you want to just speak to that for a moment?

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. We’re still working on the research and analysis for the question that the Board requested a resolution to last time which is the meeting of the first provision of section 19254(c)(3) which refers to counties who have made previous requests for reimbursement for a new voting system. So we’re still working through those issues and will have any subsequent conversations, if need be, with Mr. Kaufman, just to ensure we’re headed down the path to answer the Board’s question. And we’ll have that
ready for discussion for the September 25th meeting.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. The plan is to have that
before we have any -- at least before we decide on any of the
counties that may be subject to those provisions. So --

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- we’ll expect to see that in sept.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you. All right. And now for
the main portion of our show today, we have the funding
requests, the Project Documentation Plan and Funding Request
from El Dorado County. Alameda County is listed here on our
agenda but Alameda County has requested to put this over
again until the next meeting, as I understand it. So El
Dorado will be up.

And, Arman, you want to provide us with a staff
report on El Dorado County’s Project Documentation Plan?

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So this is El Dorado County’s Phase 2 Project
Documentation staff report highlights.

Just as a note before I start reading, I had reworked
the table appearing on the staff report based on June’s
feedback.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: I have seen that. It’s great.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Yeah. Oh, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: It makes a lot more sense,
logically, from a true timeline from beginning to end --

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI:  Great.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: -- of the money and how it has been disbursed.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Thank you very much.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: I’m glad it’s helpful. Cool.

So El Dorado County’s initial allocation amount was

$1,095,674.94. Their Phase 1 funding award amount was

$877,911.89 cents. However, the amount disbursed to the County for their Phase 1 award was $474,468.54, leading to a remaining allocation of $621,206.40.

The Phase 2 with El Dorado County that’s coming before the Board today. The funding award request is in the amount of $621,206.40 which, if approved, would leave the remaining allocation for El Dorado at zero.

So El Dorado has purchased voting system hardware, including the Dominion Voting Systems’ ImageCast high-speed central counting systems and the Dominion Voting Systems’ ImageCast Ballot Marking Systems, as well as Dominion Voting Systems’ software, including the Ballot Adjudication System software and the Remote Accessible Vote-by-Mail software.

In addition, El Dorado County has contracted with two additional vendors, Runbeck and OPEX Corporation, to purchase
equipment to expand the current voting technology, including
hardware, including the Runbeck Election Services Agilis
Mailing Sorting System and the OPEX Corporation Envelope
Extractors.

So El Dorado County anticipates receiving it’s new
voting equipment beginning in July 2019 through August 2019.
The County plans to begin using this equipment in the August
27th, 2019 uniform district election. El Dorado County
projects that its project completion date will be upon
certification of the March 2020 Presidential Primary
election.

El Dorado County’s Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan
meets the requirements for completing this. The ImageCast
Voting System is certified for use in California.

At the March 27th, 2006 meeting the Voting
Modernization Board approved El Dorado County’s Phase 1
funding award in the amount of $877,911.89. However, El
Dorado only submitted invoices in the amount of $474,468.54.
Therefore, a check in the amount of $474,468.54 was mailed to
El Dorado County on August 17th, 2007, resulting in a
remaining allocation amount of $621,206.40.

El Dorado County began its search for a new voting
system to aid in the transition from a precinct voting model
to a vote center model, as set forth under the Voter’s Choice
Act of 2020. A voting system selection committee comprised
of the election staff, members of the public, poll workers, trainers, former Board Members, and members from the League of Women Voters provided guidance and assistance in the selection of a new voting system.

Following an extensive evaluation of bidders and rating of each proposed system, El Dorado County ultimately purchased an array of new voting equipment from three separate vendors, Runbeck Election Services, OPEX Corporation and Dominion Voting Systems to achieve its goal of a comprehensive and modernized system.

As approximately 80 percent of all voters are projected to vote by mail in future elections, El Dorado County has acquired two voting technology expansions to enhance the processing of mailed ballots. The Agilis Mail Sorting System and OPEX Envelope Extractors will both streamline signature verification resulting in quicker processing and reduced errors.

El Dorado County believes the acquisition of high-speed central counting units from Dominion Voting Systems will enhance -- will enable more efficient and quicker tabulation of results. The new centralized tabulation process will permit election staff to timely return ballots before the closing of vote centers on Election Day.

The deployment of three ImageCast X ballot marking devices at each vote center will allow voters with auditory,
visual or physical limitations to utilize a customizable touchscreen interface to both understand their ballot and cast their vote privately and independently.

El Dorado County has also purchased a Remote Accessible Vote-by-Mail system, or RAVBM, to allow voters to mark their ballot at home, further increasing accessibility for voters with disabilities.

A Voting Accessibility Advisory Committee is currently developing an extensive voting outreach program to introduce the new voting system to its voters and solicit feedback. The County plans to hold demonstrations of the new voting equipment at community events, elderly centers, and plans to involve the local media to promote the new voting method.

El Dorado County will only receive VMB payments once it has submitted detailed invoices for its certified voting equipment and additional voting technology components.

Please note: The staff proposed funding award is based upon allowable reimbursement under Proposition 41. Software licenses, warranties after the first year, and training costs listed in the El Dorado contract with Runbeck, OPEX Corporation, and Dominion Voting Systems would not be covered as a reimbursable claim under Proposition 41.

So with that, it is our recommendation that El Dorado County Phase 2 Project Documentation Plan be approved and a
funding award letter be issued in the amount of $621,206.40.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Arman. So in summary, it sounds like El Dorado’s proposal here is to expand their current system to, basically, facilitate quicker and more accurate vote-by-mail tabulations, and to be able to address the fact that El Dorado is moving to a vote center model and away from precinct voting to address the changes that will be in place of the 2020 election; runoff?

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Correct. That is our view.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Before we turn to El Dorado County, do either of you have questions of Staff?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: A very quick question.

In the closing paragraph, it is noted that certain costs are not covered.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Um-hmm.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: I was just curious, did the County ask for them to be covered and were turned down or never asked because they knew they would not be covered?

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: We just wanted to be extra clear that we did notice there were some warranties included in the invoices out of the first year, that it explicitly asked for reimbursement for that. But just -- we wanted to clear up any confusions, we wanted to make that clear in the staff report, that any warranties out of the first year would not be considered reimbursable.
COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: So they did ask and were told, there are not appropriate --

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: I believe so.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: -- to be covered and --

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: -- there’s --

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: -- everybody understands that?

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Right.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Okay.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: They have an understanding of that.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. I know that Mr. O’Neill, Bill O’Neill is here, the Registrar of Voters from El Dorado. Do you wish to be heard and address the Board?

MR. O’NEILL: Sure. I never pass up an opportunity to talk.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: There you go.

MR. O’NEILL: First, I want to thank the Chairman and Members of the Board for being here. I know it’s a lot of time and travel that it takes for you to be here and thank you for that.

I also want to thank Arman. I’m sorry that he’s going to be leaving but Arman and Joanna have been really
incredibly helpful in getting us through the process. As we all know, there’s a lot of intricacies to this, so they’ve really been very helpful for this.

We’re just really excited as a county to be moving towards a vote-center model, as well as improving our ability to tabulate more quickly. That’s something we just never had with our existing system. It didn’t have a high-speed central count. We were counting, manually, ballots at about maybe 12 a minute, and now we’re going to be able to do about 50 a minute per machine which is going to be very helpful, especially since we’re going all-mail quasi under SB 450.

So I just want to say thank you to the staff and everyone for helping, and Jana for leading such a great team. So if you have any questions, that’s great.

Otherwise, I will stop talking.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: I would just be curious because, you know, we’ve had a few folks come before us as we’re shifting to this new vote center environment, if you can just share with us a little bit your experience in identifying -- I know El Dorado County is very different from, for example, L.A. County -- but what your experience has been identifying appropriate vote centers and what you all are --

MR. O’NEILL: Yeah.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- doing to kind of place those vote centers throughout your county?
MR. O’NEILL: That’s a great question. And you mentioned L.A. County. And I called Dean, and I know he’s got $46 million or so left, I asked him if we could get half of that because we want one of those remote, you know, vote-mobiles to go and introduce stuff to people, but he said, no. So our process in identifying vote centers, because we’re a rural county, we’ve got everyone from, like South Lake Tahoe which is a very transient environment but also a lot of residents there, right up through areas where there’s only a few thousand people that live out there, and down through areas like El Dorado Hills which is very high-density population. We’ve got folks who have no internet access and we’ve got folks who are extremely involved in the tech world that spend a lot of time in that world.

So we had to look at several factors. And the state identifies 14 key factors, including the location near public transportation, accessibility, disability groups, elderly communities. So as we started looking at where we’re going to place these things, we started with our most populace areas, and then we started looking at the least populous areas and how we’re going to best serve folks that live in a community where there might only be 200 or 300 people, the nearest voting center would be, you know, ten miles away potentially.

And then we started to filter through. We held a lot
of meetings with the public to get their input on where we should put these and we got a lot of great feedback.

In our county, we’re required to have 13 total, with 3 of these being 11 days and the remainder being 4-day vote centers.

So we spent a lot of time going out and visiting locations. We looked at ones that we currently use, the places people are used to going to, the fire houses, libraries.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: As polling places?

MR. O’NEILL: Yeah, as polling places. Sorry. So we started looking at those first and they’ve always been great partners with us. We found some of them wouldn’t work. They weren’t geographically located where we could serve our community best. There wasn’t public transportation or other things that would just restrict access to it. And they didn’t have internet access. Under the new SB 450, we’re going to have direct connectivity to our voter registration system.

So we surveyed about 20 locations to pick the 13 to 15 that we’re going to use. And we sought a lot of public input. We looked in areas. Some of the areas we looked were retirement communities so that we could get the older population, the folks who might have limited mobility, and they were very welcoming to us.
We’ve worked with MORE (phonetic), which is a disabled-access kind of community business up near us, and they’ve provided a lot of great input.

So it’s been a whole process. We worked with Mindy Romero, who does a lot of the -- or has worked with a lot of the counties that have gone to vote centers and done the demographic information. We’ve worked our GIS folks, as well as just our own knowledge and experience of our county. So that’s an ongoing process.

We’re pretty close to having them all nailed down. I think we, by the end of next week, we’ll probably have all of them identified. So it’s just been this long process of identifying everything that we can.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: So it sounds like some of the venues are private or at least they’re -- or if not that, nonprofit-type organizations? I guess you mentioned there was a retirement community.

MR. O’NEILL: Yeah. There’s a retirement community that really wants us there.

The biggest issue that we find in looking for locations is we’re now talking 11 days or 4 days. When it was one day, they were like, yeah, that’s terrific. Some of the locations, like the retirement community, really want us there, they just can’t give up their community center for four days, especially over a weekend, so we’re not going to
be able to use that one.

The other ones that we’re using, primarily, are going
to be libraries, public utility district offices, our own
county offices, Child Support Services, which we thought was
a great fit because they get a lot of people coming in there
that need services already and we want to serve the
community, single mothers and single fathers who need access
to services.

So most of the locations that we’re using, if not all
of them, are some kind of a public agency.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Still public.

MR. O’NEILL: Yeah. But they also have internet
access, you know, most of them, the fire stations and
libraries, et cetera. And many are on the county network
which helps secure the system as well.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Great. Well, it sounds like a
challenge that you are meeting.

MR. O’NEILL: We’ll know on March 6th if we’ve met
the challenge. But, yes, we’re working really hard.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We’ll all know that.

MR. O’NEILL: But my staff, who is here, Cindi and
Linda, have just been amazing at making this happen.

So if there are other questions?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Commissioner Lagmay, any questions?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: I was trying to use this as an
opportunity to get an education for myself.

I don’t know much about El Dorado County. What is your ethnic breakdown? And are you finding the need to translate into multiple languages at all or not really?

MR. O’NEILL: We have a Spanish requirement and a Chinese requirement in a couple of precincts, but that’s the state requirement. We do expect that we’re going to end up with, out of the census, we’ll probably end up with a Spanish requirement. We are -- we’re probably, I’m going to say, around 15 percent Hispanic, is my best guess, primarily Caucasian. We have some Russian community and some other.

It’s not really geographically diverse just because we’re more of a farming-rural community. But there’s a lot of people that are moving up into what would be the western part, like El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park area, so it’s getting more ethnically diverse.

We hired someone to be our Spanish outreach person. We’ve been delivering flyers and other things to the Spanish mercados and working with Lease agreement La Familiar up in South Lake Tahoe to try to draw as much in as we can. They tend to be more private, a more private community. I think government coming in is a little concerning to them, so we’re doing everything we can to kind of break through that and help with that, working with the Catholic Church and others.
COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Any provision being made for the Russian community?

MR. O’NEILL: Not yet. It’s still a pretty small community up by us, so we haven’t had a chance to really work with a lot of the Russian community yet. We’re finding they’re kind of moving out of, a little bit more, out of like the Fair Oaks/Rancho Cordova area up in our area but it’s still very small.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Okay. Very interesting. Thank you for --

MR. O’NEILL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: -- the education.

MR. O’NEILL: Sure.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Commissioner Sandoval?

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Yeah. You asked my question. It was a good question about the landscape of El Dorado.

But a question for you is: What is the total number of registered voters in the County? What does the voter turnout look like in presidential elections, given past election? So I would love to hear about that.

MR. O’NEILL: Great question. We have roughly 123,000 registered voters, give or take, depending on the month, 122,500 to 123,500. The turnout, our turnout, is generally among the highest in the state, this state. I think in the last Presidential we were the third highest
turnout percentage-wise, roughly, between third and fifth, so our turnout is very high. We’ve got a lot of very active voters in our community.

We’ve got a lot of service organizations, as well, which is what we’re looking at for vote centers, is we’re meeting with service organizations, like the Lions Club --

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Um-hmm.

MR. O’NEILL: -- the Rotary, Kiwanis, and those types of clubs to adopt a vote center. So we’re putting together a program that’s literally called Adopt a Vote Center. They come in, they work the vote center, they make it their own vote center. They make it a community event. And then the money that they make goes directly to their service organization, so it’s a fundraiser for them as well.

So we have a very active voter community up by us.

We had, in the special District 1 election, probably the lowest turnout we’ve ever had; it was about 30 percent, 32 percent.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Wow.

MR. O’NEILL: But during the Presidential, we’re -- I am anticipating next year, the Presidential General, I’m hoping for about 75 percent.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Wow.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: That’s amazing.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: That would be great.
MR. O’NEILL: I really hope so. We’re doing a lot of outreach to really encourage people to vote. We, Linda and I, probably go to two or three, gosh, maybe up to five meetings a month with different organizations, Republican Central Committee, Democrat, service organizations, et cetera.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Thank you.

MR. O’NEILL: Um-hmm.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you.

MR. O’NEILL: Anything else? Great. Thank you very much.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: We’re good. Thank you very much. Do we have any public comment related to El Dorado County’s submission? Okay. Seeing none -- oh.

MS. ALEXANDER: Just a quick question. Thanks for bringing these issues up. One thing I was wondering about was there were no e-Poll Books that were listed in the reimbursement and I just wondered if that was something that was outside of the VMB allocation because you hit your limit? I just wondered if that was something that --

MR. O’NEILL: Yeah.

MS. ALEXANDER: -- was missing?
MR. O’NEILL: Yeah. Thanks, Kim. Yeah. We’re going to -- so we didn’t submit it with this because, for two reasons, one, we’ve reached our allocation limit and, two, we haven’t decided on what we’re going with yet. We’re working with DFM on their DFM Light System.

MS. ALEXANDER: Okay.

MR. O’NEILL: So we’ll probably use laptops for that.

MS. ALEXANDER: Thank you.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you.

All right, do we have a motion to approve El Dorado County’s Phase 2 document -- or Project Documentation Plan and issue a funding award in the amount of $621,206.40?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: I so move.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. We have a first and a second. I think we can probably just call the vote. All in favor?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: No opposed.

And congratulations to El Dorado County. And, hopefully, your money will be arriving soon. Okay, very good.

Let’s see. Do we have any other business that we need to address today?
MS. LEAN: We do not but we’d like to ask if there’s anything else you’d like the staff to do or any other reports for the next meeting?

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Like we -- I think speaking for everybody, or I’ll take the liberty of speaking to everybody, thank you for addressing the topics that we had requested. I think it’s helpful for us just to get the constant update on those.

Our next meeting is scheduled for September --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: 25th.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: 25th.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- 25th. Can we -- I guess we will anticipate having the memo addressing the one legal analysis that’s still pending --

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- on the permissibility of certain submissions to this Board. We will presumably have Alameda County on tap.

And just going back to your list here, it looks like we may have a couple of other counties coming before us in September?

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: That’s correct. So in the email we sent out, we received responses from two counties who indicated they would be interested in coming before the Board at the September 25th meeting, and then as well as two
counties who are the fence about appearing at the September meeting versus the November 13th meeting.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: So we’ll know more once we send out the CCROV to formally announce a review deadline, so we can get you updated.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. It sounds like we may have a little lengthier time in September, so we’ll plan accordingly.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: So possibly five counties, possibly?

MS. LEAN: Potentially.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Okay.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. That’s good. Okay.

Anything else from either of my fellow Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: I regret that I’m ignorant on the state budget cycle, but it does it operate on a fiscal year? And so only because at the last meeting there was a comment made about the hope that the Governor included additional funds in the budget.

MS. LEAN: And he did --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: oh.

MS. LEAN: -- so it was $87 million. The contracts that the voting -- that are currently under -- we -- they’re -- okay, so at the last budget there was $134 million
allocated for upgrades of voting systems. There’s another
$87 million that was allocated in this current budget. So
those contracts that we have with the counties currently are
being amended so that the full allocations are available to
the counties who are moving forward with new voting system.
So the $87 million has a broader expansion of what
could be reimbursed. Not only can they get expansions on
technology, it’s also earmarked a specific amount of upgrades
and/or replacement of election management systems.
So those -- that just went out. There was a CCROV,
it is what we call our memos to the counties, that just went
out a few weeks ago, so the counties know that they have even
more money.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: That’s great.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: That’s great.
COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: That’s great.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: And to be clear to everybody
listening, this is money that’s separate and apart --
COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Um-hmm.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- from the bond money --
MR. HIROSE-AFSHARI: Right.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- that we are awarded.
MS. LEAN: Absolutely.
CHAIR KAUFMAN: But it does help fill the gap between
what we can award and what we’re not permitted to --
COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Um-hmm.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- award to counties.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Do those funds cover our research and development?

MS. LEAN: I don’t believe so but let me -- I’ll have to get back to you on that.

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Okay.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: No further questions.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Well, with that, can we hear a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: So moved.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: It’s been moved --

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Second.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: -- and seconded. All in favor?

COMMISSIONER SANDOVAL: Aye.

COMMISSIONER LAGMAY: Aye.

CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye. Okay. We are adjourned for the day. Thank you everybody.

(Thereupon, the Hearing was adjourned at 11:13 a.m.)
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