

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 Voting Modernization Board )  
 Board Meeting )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

VOTING MODERNIZATION BOARD (VMB)

TELECONFERENCE MEETING ONLY

FRIDAY, AUGUST 26, 2022

10:02 A.M.

Reported by: Elise Hicks, CER

## APPEARANCES

VMB BOARD MEMBERS:

Stephen Kaufman, Chair  
June Awano Lagmay  
Gabriel Sandoval

SOS VMB STAFF PRESENT:

Paula Ritter, Staff Consultant  
Joan Hackeling, Staff Consultant  
Jana Lean, Chief of Elections  
Robbie Anderson, Elections Counsel  
NaKasha Robinson, Office of Voting Systems Technology

PRESENTERS:

Brian Gegarian, San Joaquin County  
Stephanie Duarte, Santa Clara County

## INDEX

	Page
I. Call to Order	4
II. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum	4
III. Public Comment: This time is set aside for public presentations regarding Board-related matters not appearing on the agenda. Members of the public making presentations are limited to two (2) minutes per speaker	4
IV. Adoption of May 10, 2022 Meeting Actions and Meeting Minutes	5
V. Allotments for San Joaquin and Santa Clara Counties: Receive staff report correcting a clerical error to the allotments approved for the counties at the May 10, 2022 meeting.	5
VI. Change Proposal from San Joaquin County: Receive staff report requesting a revision to the Application for Additional Funding Consideration approved at the May 10, 2022 meeting.	8
VII. Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award Approval: Receive staff reports for approval of funding awards.	13
VIII. Additional Funding Round: Receive Staff Report on closing the Voting Modernization Fund.	27
IX. Other Business	44
X. Adjournment	48
Reporter's Certificate	49
Transcriber's Certificate	50

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 AUGUST 26, 2022 10:02 A.M.

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, let's go ahead and take roll  
4 and call the meeting to order.

5 MS. HACKELING: Stephen Kaufman?

6 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Present.

7 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

8 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Present.

9 MS. HACKELING: Gabriel Sandoval?

10 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Present.

11 MS. HACKELING: Thank you.

12 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, thank you, Joan.

13 All right, good morning everybody. We are here for  
14 the August 26, 2022 meeting of the Voting Modernization  
15 Board. Thank you all for attending.

16 As the next order of business let's see if there's  
17 any public comment. This is public comment for items that  
18 are not currently on the agenda. Staff, do we have any  
19 public comment requests?

20 MS. RITTER: We have not received any.

21 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. I noted in one of the emails  
22 that went around there was an issue about Mono County, and  
23 their submission. Are they going to be commenting or is  
24 that going to be brought to our  
25 attention at some other point in the agenda or were they

1 planning on public comment?

2 MS. RITTER: We recommended they address the Board  
3 under other business.

4 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, just wanted to make sure  
5 we're giving them the opportunity.

6 All righty, then let's proceed to Item IV on the  
7 agenda, which is the adoption of the May 10, 2022 action  
8 items and meeting minutes.

9 I guess I will turn to my fellow Board members to see  
10 if we have a motion to approve. I know June is always our  
11 watch dog on going through the minutes and ably identifying  
12 any issues. So, do we have a motion?

13 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I move that we adopt the  
14 minutes of May 10, 2022.

15 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. We have a first, we have a  
17 second.

18 All in favor of adoption of the May 10, 2022 action  
19 items and meeting minutes say aye.

20 (Ayes)

21 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Any opposed?

22 Okay, we have a three/nothing vote in favor of  
23 adoption. Thank you.

24 All right, then let's turn to Item V on the agenda  
25 which are the allotments for San Joaquin and Santa Clara

1 Counties that were approved at our last Board meeting on May  
2 10th. And I understand we have a correction about the actual  
3 amounts to be awarded to those counties.

4 So, if we can have the staff report on that?

5 MS. RITTER: Yes, good morning. This is Paula and I  
6 will be presenting the staff report on this.

7 At the May 10, 2022 meeting of the Voting  
8 Modernization Board, the Board was presented with a staff  
9 report that included a recommendation to approve additional  
10 funding round applications for San Joaquin County in the  
11 amount of \$428,169, and for Santa Clara County in the amount  
12 of one thousand -- or, \$1,532,032.92. And we issued  
13 application approval letters to those counties for those  
14 amounts.

15 Subsequently, we discovered that the calculation of  
16 the amounts approved contained an error in that both  
17 counties' applications had unallowable amounts that were  
18 deducted from the VMB funding amount at 100 percent of the  
19 cost, rather than being deducted at 75 percent of the cost  
20 that's reimbursable by the VMB.

21 Correcting the calculations would result in  
22 increasing San Joaquin's approval amount by \$2,400, to  
23 \$435,569, and increasing Santa Clara's approval amount by  
24 \$18,520.81 to \$1,550,553.74.

25 So, we would like to request that the Board approve

1 correcting these amounts and authorizing us to issue revised  
2 application approval letters. One to San Joaquin in the  
3 amount of \$430,569 and one to Santa Clara in the amount of  
4 \$1,550,553.74.

5 All the other counties' calculations were correct as  
6 they were originally presented. And then, we did provide  
7 tables of the corrected calculations for reference on the  
8 second page of the staff report.

9 If there's any questions?

10 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you. I had one question just  
11 for clarification. These adjustments are taking place in the  
12 additional funding round, so there are no limits or any issues  
13 about them hitting any thresholds or exceeding any  
14 thresholds, right?

15 MS. RITTER: That is correct.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Fellow Board members, any  
17 questions?

18 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No. It's a straight  
19 forward correction of an administrative error, so I'm fine  
20 with this.

21 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, do we have a motion to approve?

23 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: So moved.

24 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Second.

25 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. And just for clarity, Joan or

1 Paula, I don't know who's doing it, but do you want to take  
2 a vote?

3 MS. HACKELING: Sure. Stephen Kaufman?

4 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

5 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

6 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

7 MS. HACKELING: And Gabriel Sandoval?

8 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

9 MS. HACKELING: Thank you.

10 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So, I'll receive revised  
11 funding award letters?

12 MS. RITTER: Yes, that's correct.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Okay --

14 MS. RITTER: Actually --

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sorry.

16 MS. RITTER: Sorry. They'll actually be the  
17 application approval letters.

18 CHAIR KAUFMAN: The application -- oh, that's right  
19 because the funding award -- this was just the applications  
20 phase and now we're --

21 MS. RITTER: Not the initial.

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Now, we're going to get to the  
23 approval after this. Got it. Okay.

24 All right, so now Item VI we have a change proposal  
25 from San Joaquin County. So, do you want to explain what's



1 going on there?

2 MS. RITTER: I would be happy to do that. At the May  
3 10th meeting the Board approved San Joaquin's application for  
4 additional funding consideration for 320 ePollbooks. And  
5 that totaled \$428,169. And then, we just corrected that  
6 amount to \$430,569.

7 The actual cost of the ePollbooks ended up being  
8 significantly less than the amount that was presented in the  
9 approval application because the unit cost on the ePollbooks  
10 decreased from \$1,640 per unit on the Phase 1 invoice to \$430  
11 per unit on the Phase 2 invoice that they received from the  
12 vendor.

13 So, this leaves the county with the remainder of  
14 \$258,440.81 in unutilized funds. So, in order to utilize the  
15 remainder of the VMB allotment, the county identified  
16 additional equipment that's necessary to improve their voting  
17 system technology and to keep up with the population growth  
18 that they're experiencing in their county. It also allows  
19 them to efficiently process an increasing volume of vote-by-  
20 mail ballots.

21 The county submitted a change request seeking  
22 reimbursement for a ballot sorter and an upgrade to their  
23 ballot-on-demand system, in addition to the ePollbooks that  
24 were contained on their original application.

25 The total reimbursement amount on the change request

1 is \$670,772.04, which exceeds the amount of the approved  
2 application by \$240,203.04.

3           The county would like to add a ballot sorter as it  
4 will allow for integrity and transparency when processing the  
5 growing number of mail-in ballots that the county expects to  
6 receive in the future, as it is likely that many voters  
7 throughout the state will continue the adoption of vote-by-  
8 mail as their primary voting choice.

9           And the county would also like to upgrade their  
10 ballot-on-demand system because the system previously  
11 utilized became obsolete due to unavailability of parts for  
12 repairs. The upgraded system allows the county to automate  
13 and streamline ballot production and distribution, and it  
14 offers flexible options for on-demand ballot printing needs.

15           It also enables election staff to print the exact  
16 number of ballots needed for each precinct of any allowable  
17 ballots filed based on voter turnout, and this will increase  
18 efficiency and reduce cost and waste.

19           Staff recommends that San Joaquin County's change  
20 request be approved and a revised additional funding award  
21 approval letter issued to the county in the amount of  
22 \$670,772.04.

23           And again, this is still back at the application  
24 phase. We haven't gotten to the PDP phase yet.

25           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, so thank you for saying that.

1 So again, just for clarification back in May we agreed to an  
2 amount for San Joaquin and other counties to submit final  
3 claims for an additional round of funding. This is just  
4 adjusting the amount that we are allowing them to submit an  
5 additional claim for. It doesn't go against any allotment  
6 amount, other than the fact that it's eating into whatever --  
7 the excess is eating into whatever would be left in the VMB  
8 fund after these funding awards -- this funding award round.  
9 Correct?

10 MS. RITTER: That is correct.

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Am I clarifying or making it more  
12 confusing?

13 MS. RITTER: It all made sense to me, you're  
14 absolutely correct.

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, good. At least you and I are  
16 on the same page.

17 Okay, June, Gabriel, do you guys have any questions  
18 of staff on this?

19 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No, I'm clear, but I just  
20 want to review the math. The error, the clerical error that  
21 we changed in the previous item, so that increased them  
22 \$2,400. But we're also asking to approve additional funding  
23 of \$240,203 and that is to pay for the additional equipment,  
24 which they find now they can afford to buy because the ballot  
25 books were so inexpensive. Is that right?

1 MS. RITTER: Yes. Yeah, it's the ePollbooks were  
2 less.

3 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Right.

4 MS. RITTER: But the new equipment is more. So, the  
5 overall total is the 670.

6 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Right, the overall total  
7 is 430, plus 240, which is the 670.

8 MS. RITTER: Correct.

9 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: And that's the -- yeah,  
10 okay, got it. All right, no more -- no further questions,  
11 thank you.

12 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I have no questions.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Then do we have a motion to  
14 approve?

15 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I move to approve the  
16 change proposal from San Joaquin, which is Item VI on our  
17 agenda.

18 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: And second.

19 CHAIR KAUFMAN: And again, Paula or Joan, do you want  
20 to take a vote?

21 MS. HACKELING: Yes, I will. Stephen Kaufman?

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

23 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

24 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

25 MS. HACKELING: And Gabriel Sandoval?

1 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

2 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Okay, so now we've  
3 straightened out and figured out how much we've agreed the  
4 counties have in an additional round of  
5 funding.

6 Now, we will get to Item VII, which is the actual  
7 document plans, project documentation plans that have been  
8 submitted within those allocations to receive an award of  
9 funding. Correct?

10 MS. RITTER: Correct.

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Who's presenting on that?

12 MS. RITTER: That will be Paula again.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, let's hear it.

14 MS. RITTER: Okay, so --

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: So, should we -- so, let's take them  
16 one at a time. So, the first one up is Los Angeles County.

17 MS. RITTER: Yes, sir. Los Angeles County's  
18 additional funding round project document plan meets the  
19 requirements for completeness. When the Secretary of State's  
20 Office implemented VoteCal in 2016, the integration between  
21 the county's EMS, election management system, and VoteCal had  
22 a significant impact on business processes and began to  
23 strain the capabilities of their EMS.

24 The county is seeking to implement a flexible --  
25 flexible and scalable EMS that allows them to continue to

1 adjust to new regulations and continue to enhance services.  
2 The vision for this future state EMS is built around a  
3 solution that uses modern technology, is highly aligned to  
4 operational needs, and has the ability to streamline  
5 processes.

6 The EMS will support new voting administration models  
7 and will better integrate with other systems, such as  
8 VoteCal, and the county's recently implemented Voting  
9 Solutions for All People System.

10 For the additional funding round, the county is  
11 seeking reimbursement for the replacement of an automated  
12 signature recognition solution, which includes hardware and  
13 software modifications. The ESR solution is the backbone of  
14 the process which facilitates the processing of vote-by-mail  
15 ballots.

16 The new ESR solution will increase the volume of  
17 ballots processed from 8,000 per hour to 40,000. It will  
18 also ensure the disposition of duplicate ballots and vote-by-  
19 mail ballots returned by voters who already voted at a vote  
20 center.

21 In addition, the new ESR solution will capture the  
22 entire envelope image, instead of just the signature area.  
23 This important upgrade allows staff to quickly identify  
24 ballots of voters that did not sign their ballot envelope in  
25 the correct signature area due to visual impairment. These

1 enhancements will increase processing speed and provide  
2 faster ballot status updates to voters, and confidence that  
3 their ballot was processed in a timely manner.

4 It is our recommendation that Los Angeles County's  
5 additional funding round Project Documentation Plan be  
6 approved and a funding award letter be issued in the amount  
7 of \$816,959.55.

8 And that concludes the Los Angeles staff report.

9 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Paula.

10 Is there any representative from Los Angeles County  
11 with us today, that wishes to be heard on this matter?

12 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Apparently not.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, apparently not.

14 I guess it's, you know, my observation that with Los  
15 Angeles and some of the other counties it seems like the  
16 requests we're getting are kind of a recognition and response  
17 to the fact that the counties are being asked to process and  
18 deal with significantly more vote-by-mail ballots than they  
19 could have imagined when we last heard from them. So, this  
20 is another way to increase efficiency and the processing of  
21 vote-by-mail ballots, which I'm sure we all are supportive of  
22 and can appreciate.

23 So, I see this as a positive and think it is a  
24 appropriate way for us to help spend our remaining dollars.

25 So, other comments or questions from fellow Board

1 members?

2 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No questions.

3 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.

4 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Well, with that, then, do we  
5 have a motion to approve Los Angeles County's Project  
6 Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award request?

7 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I move for approval of  
8 L.A. County's Project Documentation Plan Review and Funding  
9 Award request.

10 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Joan, you want to take a roll  
12 call vote?

13 MS. HACKELING: Absolutely. Stephen Kaufman?

14 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

15 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

16 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

17 MS. HACKELING: And Gabriel Sandoval?

18 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

19 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Great, we have a three/nothing  
20 vote.

21 Let us move on, then, to San Joaquin County.

22 MS. RITTER: That would be me again. Just one  
23 second. Before we go to San Joaquin, there actually is one  
24 thing that I wanted to call to the Board's attention. And  
25 that is that at the February 9th Voting Modernization Board



1 meeting the Board set a deadline of December 7, 2022 for  
2 counties to submit payment requests for all the outstanding  
3 amounts awarded.

4 And L.A. confirmed with their vendor that the  
5 equipment they were ordering would be delivered no later than  
6 December 2022. But I don't think there's an exact date for that  
7 delivery. And it's my understanding that the VMB can't  
8 reimburse for items that haven't been received.

9 So, we may have a payment request timeline like  
10 super, super squeaky tight, or maybe not even workable. And  
11 we need to take into consideration there may be some  
12 unforeseen supply chain issues, maybe even some  
13 administrative issues that could delay submission of a timely  
14 payment request.

15 And you're going to see the same thing when we go  
16 through San Joaquin. They've got some equipment listed with  
17 acquisition dates in January and July of 2023 due to long  
18 lead times that are required by their vendors. And we really  
19 want to be able to pay out as much as possible to the  
20 counties, so we're hoping at some point the Board may  
21 consider extending the payment request timelines.

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: I think from my perspective we -- you  
23 know, if we're talking about extending deadlines for awards  
24 we've already made, rather than kind of keeping -- you know,  
25 keeping deadlines open for submission, I think I'd be, you

1 know, receptive to that.

2 I guess I will want to hear from Robbie about, you  
3 know, whether that slows -- how much that slows down our  
4 timeline for doing anything else in terms of winding up the  
5 business of the Board. I mean it seems like there's a few  
6 things that have to happen under the scenario that Robbie  
7 laid out in his staff report that will require us to remain  
8 in business, if you will, until things get wound down. But I  
9 don't know if we have to have an exact amount or whether we  
10 have to have paid out or done anything in order to be able to  
11 trigger some of those events from happening.

12 So, maybe we can deal with that issue at the end.  
13 And if you can remind us, Paula, to not overlook that once we  
14 consider Robbie's presentation under Item, where are we, VIII  
15 on our agenda.

16 MS. RITTER: Sounds good. Okay.

17 Okay, so next up we have the staff report for San  
18 Joaquin County. San Joaquin County's additional funding  
19 round project documentation package meets the requirements  
20 for completeness pending the receipt of signed vendor  
21 agreements.

22 And I will say, as a kind of a sidebar, that  
23 subsequent to the staff report being prepared San Joaquin did  
24 submit additional documents. So, I believe they have most of  
25 the signed vendor agreements, but there are still a couple

1 that I need to look at a little bit further.

2 So, San Joaquin County has experienced growth over the  
3 past few election cycles, which increased the need for voting  
4 system technology upgrades, allowing the ability to maintain  
5 high voter satisfaction. Processing voters at polling  
6 locations, and vote-by-mail ballots, as well as having the  
7 ability to produce ballots on demand ensures the county will  
8 remain current with the most recent technologies that provide  
9 the ability to scale upwards.

10 As San Joaquin County prepares for the future, the  
11 strategy will be to increase efficiency and improve the  
12 overall voting experience for voters in the county. To be  
13 successful in the implementation of this strategy,  
14 technological advancements to the current hardware and  
15 software deployed within the County Registrar of Voters  
16 Office is mandatory.

17 For the additional funding round the county seeks  
18 reimbursement for ePollbooks, a ballot sorter, and ballot-on-  
19 demand equipment.

20 The benefit of having additional ePollbooks include  
21 increasing access to voters requiring accessibility  
22 assistance, mitigating long lines with fast and secure voter  
23 lookup capability, providing election office staff with  
24 election management and reporting tools, customizing workflow  
25 and reducing dependency on election office staffing.

1           The electronic poll books offer the ability to  
2 collect data on polling place activity related to issues  
3 affecting the voters' experience with the county's voting  
4 system equipment. This new equipment will also help  
5 determine the real-time status of vote-by-mail ballots issued  
6 to voters within the county, and assist with organizing and  
7 tracking the issuance of replacement ballots.

8           The ballot sorter provides increases in efficiency  
9 when handling high volumes at throughputs from 18,000 to  
10 45,000 ballots per hour. The current throughput is  
11 approximately 7,000 per hour.

12           It also offers cost savings by consolidating manual  
13 multiple manual steps into fewer automated steps, which reduces the  
14 amount of temporary staffing required. These gains in  
15 efficiency will allow the county to reach their certification  
16 and election results reporting requirements more efficiently.

17           And the update to the ballot-on-demand system allows  
18 for necessary changes to components that were not previously  
19 available on their older system.

20           So, our recommendation is that the Board approve San  
21 Joaquin County's additional funding round Project  
22 Documentation Plan, and issue a conditional funding award  
23 letter in the amount of \$680,772.04, with the understanding  
24 -- and again, this goes back to the timing of the receipt of  
25 some of the equipment -- with the understanding that the VMB

1 can only reimburse the county for equipment that's been  
2 received by the payment request deadline, which sounds like  
3 it's subject to change. The funds would be released upon the  
4 county's submission of signed vendor agreements and vendor  
5 invoices.

6 And that concludes San Joaquin.

7 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Paula.

8 Do we have any representatives of San Joaquin County  
9 that wish to be heard?

10 MR. GEGARIAN: Yeah, this is Brian with San Joaquin  
11 County. Just to add, we are awaiting the contract from our  
12 vendor for the poll pads, so we're sort of on their timeline  
13 for this, and their acquisition schedule, you know, for when  
14 they can deliver the equipment. So, just putting that out  
15 there that it's really -- you know, things are in motion and  
16 we want to make sure that we, you know, meet the deadline of  
17 the Board, but it's really, you know, we're at the mercy of  
18 our vendors for when they can deliver.

19 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, thank you for that.

20 Fellow Board members, any questions of Brian from San  
21 Joaquin County?

22 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No questions to San  
23 Joaquin. But quickly to staff, is December 7th the same  
24 deadline for L.A. County and San Joaquin?

25 MS. RITTER: That was the deadline established for

1 all counties.

2 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Oh, for all counties.

3 So, yeah, I understand, yeah, supply chain issues are  
4 impacting L.A. and San Joaquin both, so that's something we  
5 will talk about later in the meeting. Okay, thank you.

6 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.

7 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, so then with that do we have a  
8 motion to approve San Joaquin County's Project Documentation  
9 Plan?

10 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I move --

11 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I move -- go ahead,  
12 Gabriel.

13 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Go ahead.

14 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I move that the  
15 Documentation Plan Review and Funding Award approval item for  
16 San Joaquin County be approved. It is a conditional  
17 approval. It's a conditional funding award.

18 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

19 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Joan?

20 MS. HACKELING: Stephen Kaufman?

21 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

22 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

23 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

24 MS. HACKELING: Gabriel Sandoval?

25 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

1           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, thank you all. Congratulations  
2 to San Joaquin County.

3           And last on our list, Santa Clara County.

4           MS. RITTER: This is Paula again. I'll be presenting  
5 the staff report for Santa Clara County.

6           Santa Clara County's additional funding round project  
7 documentation package meets the requirements for  
8 completeness. In 2003, Santa Clara County implemented its  
9 initial voting modernization strategy with the purchase of  
10 the Sequoia ABC Edge-Touch Screen and Sequoia Optech 400 and  
11 C systems. The VMB reimbursed the county for these systems,  
12 which replaced their Poll Star punch card voting system.

13           The county has since replaced the Sequoia system with  
14 the Dominion Democracy Suite, Dominion Ballot On-demand and  
15 KNOWiNK Electronic poll books. The new systems were in place  
16 for the March 3, 2020 presidential primary election and  
17 allowed for conditional voter registration and voting at all  
18 vote centers, reducing the need for provisional voting and  
19 expediting post-election canvass processes.

20           The county's implementation of the Voters Choice Act  
21 resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of vote-by-mail  
22 ballots cast. In the November 3, 2020 presidential election  
23 approximately 804,000 voters opted to vote by mail compared  
24 to 534,000 who voted by mail in the November 8, 2016  
25 presidential election, which represents an increase of 50

1 percent.

2           In response to the county's increasing vote-by-mail  
3 turnout, they reassessed their vote-by-mail processing  
4 equipment and determined they were using aged equipment which  
5 was prone to system failure and mechanical breakdown that  
6 could not be eliminated due to the age of the equipment.

7           For the additional funding round, the county seeks  
8 reimbursement for the expansion of its existing voting system  
9 to increase efficiency and eliminate the risks associated  
10 with using outdated equipment.

11           The county acquired 12 rapid extraction desks which  
12 were placed in service for the September 2021 recall  
13 election, and two mail sorting machines which were placed in  
14 service for the June 7, 2022 primary election. The rapid  
15 extraction desks removed laborious manual practices which  
16 allowed the county to reduce staffing requirements from  
17 dozens of extra help staff down to one operator.

18           The efficiency gained from the rapid extraction desks  
19 allowed staff to focus on other tasks critical to the timely  
20 completion of post-election canvassing procedures.

21           The mail sorting machines streamlined the process of  
22 vote-by-mail ballots by removing manual activities and  
23 allowing the county to run two sorters simultaneously.

24           The county also requests reimbursement for the  
25 acquisition of 150 Cradlepoint routers and 450 Smart UPS



1 devices which they placed in service for the November 3, 2020  
2 presidential election. The county experienced brief  
3 connectivity issues at the center locations during the March  
4 3, 2020 presidential primary election and acquired these  
5 devices to mitigate such occurrences from future elections.

6 The devices optimize power supply and connectivity,  
7 mitigate downtime, and positively impact the overall  
8 experience for voters and vote center workers.

9 It is our recommendation that Santa Clara County's  
10 additional funding round Project Documentation Plan be  
11 approved and a funding award letter be issued in the amount  
12 of \$1,529,268.74.

13 And that concludes Santa Clara's staff report.

14 CHAIR KAUFMAN: I was struck when reading this report  
15 that every election cycle, when folks get all up in arms  
16 about how long it takes for election officials to process  
17 vote-by-mail ballots that people don't realize things as  
18 simple as opening ballot envelopes and removing ballots from  
19 ballot envelopes can be such a laborious and time-consuming  
20 process.

21 So, if folks really had an appreciation for what goes  
22 into the process, I think we'd probably hear some, you know,  
23 less noise about it.

24 But appreciate that Santa Clara is taking efforts to  
25 try and streamline and improve the process as much as they

1 can.

2 Do we have a representative or representatives from  
3 Santa Clara with us this morning that wish to be heard?

4 MS. DUARTE: Good morning, this is Stephanie from  
5 Santa Clara County. We don't have anything additional to  
6 add, other than we truly appreciate the additional funding  
7 round opportunity and the Voting Modernization Board's  
8 efforts in supporting the modernization of our voting system  
9 technologies.

10 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you. Thank you for doing all  
11 you can to improve your processes to adjust to new  
12 conditions.

13 Gabriel or June, any questions of Santa Clara County?

14 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: No questions.

15 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Nope, no questions.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Any questions of staff?

17 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: No.

18 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Seeing none, do we have a motion with  
19 respect to the requests of Santa Clara County?

20 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Go Gabriel.

21 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Move Santa Clara County's  
22 additional funding round Project Documentation Plan be  
23 approved as recommended by the staff.

24 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I second.

25 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Joan, do you want to take roll call?

1 MS. HACKELING: Absolutely. Stephen Kaufman?

2 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

3 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

4 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

5 MS. HACKELING: And Gabriel Sandoval?

6 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

7 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. Thank you, Santa Clara County  
8 and congratulations on your additional funding award.

9 All right, now we will go to Item VIII on our agenda,  
10 which is a staff report on, sadly, the closing of the Voting  
11 Modernization Board and what our options are for the  
12 remaining funds that were authorized, but have not been  
13 allocated.

14 Robbie?

15 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, sir. Good morning, everybody.  
16 So, staff was asked to look into the question as to whether  
17 or not the VMB can dissolve prior to issuing all the  
18 authorized debt that was provided for in Elections Code  
19 Section 19254(a). And the answer to that is the VMB can  
20 dissolve prior to extinguishing all of that debt. We would  
21 need legislative action for that, which we'll get into.

22 But by way of background, so the Voting Modernization  
23 Board Act was passed back in March of 2002, when Stephen  
24 began his long career at the Chair. And so, it established  
25 the VMB to establish the distribution of \$195 million in bond

1 funds to elections officials to modernize voting systems in  
2 California.

3 In August of 2021, after 19 years of administering  
4 the funds, the VMB voted to implement a final deadline on  
5 December 20th, '21 for counties to request reimbursement of  
6 any unspent amounts from each county's original allotment.  
7 And after this final round of funding, any unawarded amounts  
8 will revert back to the Voting Modernization Fund to be  
9 distributed to the remaining counties.

10 And then, in February of this year the Board voted to  
11 offer an additional funding round that required counties to  
12 submit applications by April 6, '22.

13 So that right now, if the current applications are  
14 approved by the VMB, approximately \$8,787,870 in bond funds  
15 will remain.

16 And so, with Paula's help, we reached out to the  
17 Treasurer's Office to see how the process would work. And  
18 first, they provided an example for us to take a look at.  
19 So, in the 1988 General Election voters passed Proposition  
20 82, which was known as the Water Conservation Law of 1988,  
21 and this Prop. 82 created a new statute under Water Code  
22 which authorized bonds in the total amount of \$60 million.

23 And so that code section, Water Code 12879.7 is  
24 produced here. And again, it allows the authorization of up  
25 to \$60 million in bonds to carry out the purposes of

1 Prop. 82.

2 But in 2020, the Legislature adopted AB 19 -- or, I'm  
3 sorry, AB 92, which was Chapter 18 of the Statutes of 2020,  
4 and that reduced the amount of authorized bond to  
5 \$54,765,000. And the unissued amount that remained from the  
6 original 60 was \$5,235,000, and that authorized bond amount  
7 was extinguished.

8 And then, for some insight in the process, we got two  
9 separate excerpts from Assembly Floor analysis and the Senate  
10 Floor analysis. And for the Assembly, their explanation was  
11 that it extinguishes old general obligation bonds that are no  
12 longer needed to reduce administration costs by reducing the  
13 amount of indebtedness authorized by the Earthquake, Safety,  
14 and Public Buildings Rehabilitation Bond back in 1990, and  
15 the Water Conservation Bond Law of 1988.

16 This provision is intended to relieve the need to  
17 administer minimal remaining balances that are not enough to  
18 support another project.

19 And a similar message from the Senate, which  
20 extinguishes the bonds, and it saves on ongoing  
21 administration to administer minimal remaining balances that  
22 are not enough to support another project.

23 And so, upon the passage of AB 92, that Code section  
24 referenced earlier, of Water Code 12879.7, which originally  
25 authorized \$60 million, was reduced to the \$54,765,000, and

1 the \$5 million plus was extinguished. And so, basically, the  
2 water -- the allowable bonds went down to zero because  
3 they've already issued all of those.

4 And so, if the VMB wishes to follow that route and  
5 close the -- and exhaust the VMB without exhausting all of  
6 the authorized funds, the Board would need to order our  
7 office to reach out to the State Treasurer's Office and/or  
8 the Department of Finance. So, we would request the office,  
9 the Treasurer's Office to review the VMB Act of 2002, and  
10 also the State General Obligation Bond Law with the  
11 Department of Finance and the Attorney General's Office. And  
12 that's found in Section 19251.

13 And so, the Treasurer's Office or Finance, they will  
14 create a fact sheet which would include, but not limited to,  
15 the amount of bonds that are unissued, which will be  
16 extinguished, any outstanding commercial paper on when bonds  
17 will be issued to refund outstanding commercial paper in the  
18 amount of unused proceeds and distribution -- or, I'm sorry,  
19 disposition.

20 And we're just figuring the final step would likely  
21 be a legislative action like for the Water Bond, and that's  
22 typically handled by the Department of Finance.

23 So, if the Board does wish to begin the process of  
24 dissolving the VMB, the Board should make a motion to require  
25 the SOS VMB staff to reach out to either the State

1 Treasurer's Office or the Department of Finance to begin the  
2 process of winding down the VMB.

3 And the end result would likely be an amendment to  
4 Section 19254(A) of the Elections Code, which will reduce the  
5 amount of authorized debt by the bonds that have already been  
6 issued. And once that is complete, there would no longer be  
7 any funds to authorize or any reimbursement, and the VMB  
8 would be dissolved.

9 And we feel that once the legislative action has been  
10 chaptered, we would likely need one last meeting just to move  
11 to dissolve the Board.

12 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you, Robbie.

13 MR. ANDERSON: You're welcome.

14 CHAIR KAUFMAN: And so, the --

15 MR. ANDERSON: Oh, Stephen, you're on mute.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. Thank you, Robbie.

17 MR. ANDERSON: And so, the earlier question about the  
18 holding off for the two counties that don't have the  
19 equipment yet, I would assume we would have to wait to begin  
20 the process, so Finance and the Treasurer's Office would know  
21 the exact amount. But we can reach out to them to see if  
22 there's a way to, you know, start the process now knowing  
23 there are, you know, some bonds that are -- some  
24 reimbursement that will occur and, hopefully, the end of the  
25 year, the first part of '23.

1 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah.

2 MR. ANDERSON: And we can see what they'd like to do  
3 and how it works. They might want to wait until it's final,  
4 just so they have the final numbers, but we can check on  
5 that.

6 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, given the examples that you've  
7 provided, it looks like there would have to be a number in  
8 the final piece of legislation that, you know, specifically  
9 reduces the bond amount by that amount. And I would imagine  
10 we want to have a solid guarantee of the monies that we've  
11 actually paid out, less there be any mishaps at the end of  
12 the day.

13 So, I think it would be good for us, you know, at  
14 some point to have a timeline. I mean, frankly, whether it's  
15 December 7th, or end of January 2023, I don't think matters  
16 that much. But I think we need to get a realistic timeline  
17 of what we're talking about as we look to dissolve the fund.

18 I guess I'd just like to reiterate for everybody's  
19 benefit, as we're looking to consider this action item and  
20 just in terms of how we got here, we've -- I know that the  
21 staff reached out to everybody, all the counties who had been  
22 awarded initial rounds of funding where there were funds  
23 remaining, unallocated funds remaining and reached out to all  
24 the counties to make sure that everybody knew that there was  
25 a deadline pending and coming to submit requests for funding



1 around the initial round of funding. Those who responded,  
2 you know, had their awards considered. There were some folks  
3 that did not use up their full allocations.

4 We then went through a process of considering another  
5 round of funding. Staff again reached out to all of the  
6 counties to see who would be interested in an additional  
7 round of funding. And essentially, what we received back  
8 were requests from a handful of counties that were interested  
9 in receiving additional funding awards that were less than  
10 the amount that was available, which resulted in the funding  
11 awards that we made earlier today as kind of the last ones  
12 submitted.

13 So, you know, I don't feel that we've cut off anybody  
14 who may have wanted to receive additional funds under the --  
15 under the Act, which is why we are here today considering  
16 this action item.

17 So, thank you, Robbie, for your summary. It sounds  
18 like it is a doable process, but does require some precision  
19 on our part. So, I want to make sure that we've, you know,  
20 got our ducks in a row and given the counties every  
21 opportunity that they've had to receive this  
22 additional funding award, without getting too ridiculous in  
23 terms of how far we drag this out.

24 But I want to hear from my fellow Board members on  
25 any thoughts you may have on what we've been presented with.

1 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: It makes sense --

2 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I was --

3 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Sorry, go ahead, Gabriel.

4 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Go ahead, Gabriel.

5 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Well, it makes sense, it's  
6 clear. Thank you, Robbie, it's a good approach to take. And  
7 I have no questions. It's just a matter of assuring that the  
8 precision that Stephen was referring to is in place, but it's  
9 a very clear process and it makes sense. Yeah, so thank you.

10 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I just am requesting a  
11 staff clarification. So, as I understand it, we are seeking  
12 legislative action that would change the original amount of  
13 the bond fund of \$195 million. And since we have \$8.8  
14 million, approximately, left to spend, the new total would be  
15 186.2 approximately, we would be asking legislative action  
16 to rename the issuance of bond to 186.2. Do I have that  
17 correct.

18 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, June, that's correct. So,  
19 whatever final --

20 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay.

21 MR. ANDERSON: -- whatever we've expended, we would  
22 subtract that from the --

23 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay. Then, my other --  
24 my other question is, and please forgive me if I'm  
25 articulating this clumsily, the 195 that was originally

1 approved, that's not an amount that's actually sitting in a  
2 pot somewhere. So, there isn't 8.8 that would be, for  
3 example, reverted back to the state's general fund. When you  
4 say extinguish, it isn't money that goes back, it's money  
5 that is never pulled. Is that correct?

6 MR. ANDERSON: Right, so the bonds aren't sold, and  
7 so it would just extinguish the amount that could be sold.

8 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Got it. So, there's no  
9 money going back, it's an adjusted amount being pulled?

10 MR. ANDERSON: Correct.

11 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay, thank you. That's  
12 all I needed to know, thank you.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Good questions.

14 And Robbie, again, since this is a multi-step  
15 process, I guess, you know, my question or my comment would  
16 be that if we can begin a process that ultimately leads to,  
17 you know, the introduction of legislation that requires a  
18 precise result, then I would ask that we do whatever we can  
19 to get the wheels in motion so that we're not starting from  
20 scratch after we wait for these, you know, final amounts to  
21 be paid out and for the counties to be -- you know, deliver  
22 their product.

23 In other words, I hope we're not having this  
24 conversation again in like mid-2024 or 2025, where we're  
25 still dragging along on this.

1 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, we can reach out to the  
2 Treasurer's Office and let them know that we're going to --  
3 we'd like to start the process of, you know, extinguishing  
4 that debt, but we've got X amount out there that will need  
5 paid, you know, the end of the year, first part of next year,  
6 and then we'll be done. And just see, they might say no, you  
7 have to wait or they might -- maybe they'll begin the  
8 process. So, we can reach out and see if we can get moving.

9 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. It sounds like in any event,  
10 the legislation's going to have to take place in the next  
11 session, after the first of the year.

12 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. So, Finance handles that. And  
13 this was in a Budget Bill, so probably the same thing.

14 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah. Okay.

15 MS. LEAN: I actually think it would be closer to the  
16 -- when the budget is passed, so we know that's in the middle  
17 of the year, right. So, I was just trying to understand the  
18 timing.

19 And I want to make one clarification. So, the Voting  
20 Modernization Fund, so the Board and the Fund was established  
21 by that proposition. And the actual amounts of bond funds  
22 that were authorized was \$200 million. But we were advised  
23 at the time that we would only be able to allocate \$195  
24 million.

25 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I remember, okay.

1 MS. LEAN: Do you remember that. Yeah, okay.

2 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I do remember that.

3 MS. LEAN: So, it's actually \$200 million that's in  
4 the Bond Fund, but they told us right at the very beginning  
5 you have to leave \$5 million that can be sold, and that's  
6 just to handle the processing of the bonds, and selling of  
7 the bonds, and all of the -- all of the like internal State  
8 Treasurer processes, administrative stuff.

9 So, we didn't get any money at the Secretary of  
10 State's Office to administer the stuff, but they did in order  
11 to get all the Bond Fund sold.

12 Robbie, that --

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Huh, I did not recall that.

14 MS. LEAN: Yeah, just put that on the record, just so  
15 that we have that clarification.

16 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Thank you, Jana.

17 Okay, Robbie, I don't know if it's in your report or  
18 not, well, how long was the entire process for the analogy  
19 that you used from the beginning to the end, and legislation  
20 being signed, et cetera? Do you have a sense of that?

21 MR. ANDERSON: I don't have that, no.

22 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Okay.

23 MR. ANDERSON: I can look back to the -- it might be  
24 in the bill analysis but --

25 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Okay.

1 MR. ANDERSON: -- I don't -- I'm not sure.

2 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: That would give us a good  
3 idea, maybe, about how long the process from beginning to end  
4 will last or take.

5 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, it sounds like as far as the  
6 end is concerned that we're looking at, at the earliest,  
7 sometime mid next year. Because as we just mentioned, I mean  
8 the bills aren't introduced again until the next legislative  
9 session, and then they need to be through that process.

10 MR. ANDERSON: Right.

11 CHAIR KAUFMAN: So, again, I just want to make sure  
12 that whatever we do, we don't miss the window to kind of get  
13 this bill introduced in that -- you know, in that next  
14 session.

15 So, you know, for staff, if you can kind of just work  
16 on fleshing that out over the next, you know, couple months  
17 or so, so we can get a better handle on the process. And  
18 again, whether we can kind of start it now so that we hit it  
19 at the right moment, that would be great.

20 So, I guess before we get too far ahead of ourselves,  
21 can I get a motion from one of my fellow Board members along  
22 the lines suggested I guess in the third paragraph from the  
23 bottom of Robbie's staff report regarding, you know, the  
24 efforts to begin winding down the VMB.

25 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Okay, yes, I move that

1 the Board ask staff to reach out to the State Treasurer's  
2 Office and/or the Department of Finance to begin the process  
3 of winding down the VMB, as recommended by the staff report  
4 dated August 23, 2022.

5 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

6 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Joan, will you take a vote, please.

7 MS. HACKELING: Stephen Kaufman?

8 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

9 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

10 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

11 MS. HACKELING: Gabriel Sandoval?

12 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

13 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. So, staff, you have your  
14 direction from the Board and let's, again, just kind of keep  
15 in mind the moving parts on timing and such as you begin the  
16 process, and begin to talk with the Treasurer's Office and/or  
17 Department of Finance, and/or, you know, both, so that we  
18 can, you know, get a handle on how this winds its way through  
19 the process.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Okay.

21 CHAIR KAUFMAN: And then along those lines, and per  
22 our earlier conversation, I guess I don't -- I don't have an  
23 objection, just given the marketplace, to extending our  
24 deadline for the counties that have been awarded their  
25 funding requests to receive delivery of the items that we've

1 agreed to pay for. Although, I think we need to put some  
2 parameters around that.

3 I know that -- well, was it both of them that  
4 suggested that January of 2023 was the project delivery time  
5 frame, so both L.A. and San Joaquin?

6 MS. RITTER: Los Angeles had a delivery date of  
7 December 2022, but we do need to allow time for processing  
8 and putting together the payment request, and actually paying  
9 it out.

10 San Joaquin had January 2023 for the ballot sorter,  
11 which is the biggest dollar component piece of equipment in  
12 their request. And then, the second phase of their  
13 ePollbooks was projected for August of 2023. That's \$91,000  
14 approximately.

15 MS. LEAN: I would have a suggestion, Mr. Kaufman --

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yes?

17 MS. LEAN: -- for San Joaquin.

18 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah.

19 MS. LEAN: So, what I would propose is that we look  
20 at establishing some Board dates, meeting dates towards the  
21 beginning of next year and we can revisit that if there's a  
22 deadline that looks reasonable, and ask San Joaquin to work  
23 extensively with their vendor to secure the equipment,  
24 assuming there's going to be a much sooner deadline for  
25 reimbursement. But that's way into 2023 and I mean there's



1 no guarantee for the legislation, but I think that would just  
2 extend the process and the Board until after that would be  
3 done.

4 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, like a whole other year. Yeah,  
5 so thank you, Jana. And I'm wondering if we should put a  
6 date of, you know, like January 31, 2023. Extend the date  
7 now to January 31, 2023 to take a little pressure off of the  
8 counties in terms of the deadline, but also that will provide  
9 the counties with an opportunity to go to their vendors and  
10 say, hey, we have this deadline so we need you to kind of,  
11 you know, get things moving.

12 And then, we can revisit it again, you know, with a  
13 meeting early next year.

14 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: That sounds reasonable to  
15 me.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Gabriel, any thoughts on that?

17 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Is San Joaquin still  
18 participating in this meeting? Do they have any comment to  
19 make on this?

20 MR. GEGARIAN: Yes, San Joaquin is still here. This  
21 is Brian. That sounds fine. It sounds like, you know, for the  
22 January 3rd deadline we could reach back out to the vendor to confirm  
23 their timeline. But what was presented to us from the vendor  
24 was that, you know, the July, August mid-year time-frame for the  
25 additional ePollbooks that are on the table.

1 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Was that an --

2 MR. GEGARIAN: So, we can just contact them and give  
3 you an update as soon as we learn anymore and just -- yeah,  
4 we can agree to that.

5 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: The date that was given you  
6 by the vendor, was that an estimate?

7 MR. GEGARIAN: Yeah, that is an estimate.

8 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: So, it could be November or  
9 December, too, is that correct?

10 MR. GEGARIAN: It was an estimate. I'm not sure if  
11 that was an estimate as far out as November, but as far -- we  
12 can again connect with them to --

13 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: It could be November?

14 MR. GEGARIAN: Yeah, we're over here. We believe we  
15 could -- it could be sooner, but that's their -- maybe their  
16 ballpark safeguard for themselves, knowing what they know  
17 internally.

18 So, yeah, we can definitely connect with them to  
19 hopefully push it up in our favor, and the Board's favor.

20 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Be that as it may, if San  
21 Joaquin is amenable to what we're discussing right now, and  
22 it gives them something to go to the vendor with and say,  
23 look, hey, you know, we have a deadline that we have to work  
24 against, what can you do, I'm amenable to proceeding with the  
25 Chair's recommendation.

1           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, I mean, for the gentleman from  
2 San Joaquin, I'm sure you can appreciate where we're at here.  
3 We certainly want to do everything we can to make sure you  
4 get the funding that you're entitled to. On the other hand,  
5 keeping an entire government agency in business simply  
6 because we're waiting for the delivery of a piece of  
7 equipment from one vendor seems to be getting, you know, a  
8 little bit far out there.

9           So, you know, we would appreciate whatever input you  
10 have as the process goes along, and any updates you have.  
11 And, you know, I think we'll take a vote now but, you know,  
12 proceed as suggested, and we can always adjust as we need to,  
13 and particularly based on more information about the process  
14 of winding down the affairs of the Voting Modernization  
15 Board.

16           MR. GEGARIAN: Absolutely. Completely acknowledge  
17 that and we definitely can.

18           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Thank you. Thanks for your input.

19           So, with that do one of my fellow Board members want  
20 to make a motion about extending the deadline for counties to  
21 receive the voting equipment that we have awarded them  
22 reimbursement for?

23           BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I so move with the dates  
24 of that extension being January 31, 2023.

25           BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Second.

1 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Great. And Joan, you want to take a  
2 vote?

3 MS. HACKELING: You bet. Stephen Kaufman?

4 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Aye.

5 MS. HACKELING: June Awano Lagmay?

6 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Aye.

7 MS. HACKELING: And Gabriel Sandoval?

8 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Aye.

9 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you to the staff for  
10 putting some thinking into that. And thanks to everybody for  
11 trying to work hard towards getting our business wrapped up.

12 Okay, the next item on the agenda is other business.  
13 And do we have anyone from Mono with us today, Mono County?

14 MS. RITTER: Scheereen, are you there? I don't see  
15 her on the meeting. But there's a couple phone numbers that  
16 I don't know who they belong to.

17 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, if anyone from Mono County is  
18 plugged in and online, please speak up now so we can hear you  
19 or acknowledge your presence. Okay, it doesn't seem like it.

20 MS. LEAN: Could we briefly go over the issue, just  
21 so that we can have it on the record?

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah.

23 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Yeah, I'm curious.

24 MS. LEAN: So, Paula, could you just give us what the  
25 issue is?

1 MS. RITTER: Mono was approved, was given an approval  
2 letter at the -- for the additional funding round they were  
3 given an approval letter, and they didn't submit their PDP  
4 by the PDP submission deadline. And she asked if she could  
5 submit it a few days late.

6 And so, we had to wait until the Board meeting to get  
7 the Board to approve a late submission. It's 2,000, it's a  
8 little over -- it's less than \$3,000. It should be fairly  
9 simple.

10 But I guess the question is would the Board accept a  
11 late application?

12 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: And what was the deadline  
13 that they were supposed to submit by, please?

14 MS. RITTER: I believe it was July 15th.

15 CHAIR KAUFMAN: What --

16 MS. RITTER: And she had asked if she could submit it  
17 on July 18th, but so far we haven't received anything.

18 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: What was the reason why they  
19 missed the deadline? Did they give you the reason?

20 MS. RITTER: Resourcing, other work got in the way.

21 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I'm not inclined to award.  
22 Deadlines are set for a reason. And there's no one present  
23 to discuss the issue and I'm not inclined to make that award,  
24 albeit small.

25 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Today is the 26th and the

1 deadline was July 15th. And except for the one request that  
2 they made to extend to July 18th, which we could not approve  
3 because this Board did not have a meeting until now, but we  
4 have not heard anything. And in light of the fact that I  
5 agree that a deadline is in place for a reason, which is why  
6 we have deadlines, and everything else in election world, I  
7 am also so inclined not to -- not to approve.

8           And for clarification, according to the notes from  
9 the last meeting, the amount is \$2,182.50.

10           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, I -- I don't know, I guess how  
11 many times can you ask people to do what it is to help  
12 themselves, and they're not here again today. So, I know  
13 it's not that much. But as of right now, I don't think we  
14 even have any other reason for other meetings until, you  
15 know, perhaps January of 2023.

16           Do we have any other meetings on the schedule this  
17 year? Do we have one in December?

18           MS. LEAN: You have one in October and December, so  
19 we might want to consider making some sort of conversation  
20 here, a motion to put those off until January, just so we  
21 have those documented.

22           CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, I mean I don't think we have  
23 any other reason to do a meeting before then. It seems like  
24 January would be appropriate for our -- given that we just  
25 set an end-of-January deadline to get an update on the status

1 of everything.

2 So, anyway, I guess my point is, you know, so we  
3 don't have any other meetings, really, scheduled for other  
4 business at this point, so it doesn't sound like there is a  
5 impetus for extending, again, Mono County's submission. So,  
6 I think we'll let that lie at this point.

7 And we should really just talk about setting another  
8 meeting date for an update in January.

9 Is there any other reason from staff, that staff can  
10 see why we'd want to have a meeting before that date?

11 MR. ANDERSON: I don't see one.

12 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay. Not hearing one, staff, if you  
13 can solicit an appropriate date from the, you know, Board  
14 members after we're out of this meeting, once you go through  
15 your calendars, to try and pinpoint a good day in January  
16 that would be great. And I think we're good.

17 Any other comments, any other business we should be  
18 considering while we're all together?

19 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I'm sorry, backing up a  
20 little bit, what is the agenda item that we would be putting  
21 on for our January, supposed January meeting?

22 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Well, we just extended the deadline  
23 to January 31st, so if we need to consider extending that  
24 deadline again, given whatever dynamics are in place --

25 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Oh, I understand. I

1 remember now. Okay, thank you.

2 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Yeah, we should do that before the  
3 January 3st deadline and then, hopefully, we can also have  
4 updates from Robbie and other staff about whether we've been  
5 able to move the ball forward in terms of the process for  
6 winding down the VMB.

7 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Very good. Thank you.

8 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: Okay.

9 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay? All right, with that do I have  
10 a motion to adjourn the meeting?

11 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: Go ahead, Gabe.

12 BOARD MEMBER SANDOVAL: I move to adjourn the  
13 meeting.

14 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay.

15 BOARD MEMBER AWANO LAGMAY: I second.

16 CHAIR KAUFMAN: All in favor of adjournment say aye.

17 (Ayes)

18 CHAIR KAUFMAN: Okay, this meeting is now adjourned.

19 (Thereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 11:07 a.m.)

20 --oOo--

21

22

23

24

25



## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 23rd day of September, 2022.



ELISE HICKS, IAPRT CERT\*\*2176

**TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE**

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 23rd day of September, 2022.



---

Barbara Little  
Certified Transcriber  
AAERT No. CET\*\*D-520