

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? IF THERE ARE NO OTHER QUESTIONS, I DON'T THINK ANYONE HAS ASKED TO SPEAK ON THIS. THEN SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY MOVES, ANTONOVICH SECONDS; WITHOUT OBJECTION. I HAD HELD ANOTHER ITEM ON THE -- REALLY, I JUST HELD IT IN ORDER TO ASK FOR THE REGISTRAR TO COME FORWARD. IS THE REGISTRAR HERE? THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I KNOW A LOT OF PEOPLE HAVE ASKED THIS. ONE OF THE THINGS THAT CAME TO MY ATTENTION WAS THAT ONE OF THE LARGEST PERCENTAGES OF INDEPENDENTS WHOSE BALLOTS WERE NOT COUNTED WAS IN ONE OF THE AREAS IN, I GUESS, SUPERVISOR KNABE AND MY DISTRICT, THE 37TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. AND OF COURSE THE UNFORTUNATE PART OF ALL THIS IS THAT, AS YOU SAY, IT DOESN'T AFFECT THE OUTCOME OF THE RACE, THE FACT THAT WE'RE THROWING OUT -- ABOUT HOW MANY ARE WE THROWING OUT, ABOUT?

DEAN LOGAN: WELL BASED ON THE STATISTICAL SAMPLING THAT WE DID LAST WEEK, WE PROJECT THAT ABOUT 26 PERCENT OF THE NONPARTISAN OR DECLINED TO STATE VOTERS WHO SHOWED UP TO VOTE WHICH CALCULATES OUT TO ABOUT 49,500.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ABOUT 49,900 VOTES WILL NOT BE COUNTED.

DEAN LOGAN: CORRECT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND, SEE, THE THING THAT -- IT'S NOT THE OUTCOME OF THE STATE OR ANYTHING ELSE. IN A CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, THOUGH, IT DOES AFFECT IT, IS THAT CORRECT?

DEAN LOGAN: I BELIEVE THAT, MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE DELEGATE ALLOCATIONS--

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IN TERMS OF DEMOCRATS, IT'S BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

DEAN LOGAN: CORRECT. THEY DO ALLOCATE THE DELEGATES BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. I DON'T KNOW THE EXACT FORMULAS THAT THEY USE FOR THAT. I KNOW THAT THERE HAS BEEN AT LEAST ONE REPORT FROM THE STATE DEMOCRATIC PARTY THAT THEY DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THIS WOULD HAVE IMPACTED THE DELEGATE SELECTION. BUT I HAVE NOT PERSONALLY CONFIRMED THAT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND IN THE 37TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT THERE WERE HOW MANY PEOPLE, ABOUT?

DEAN LOGAN: WELL AGAIN, THIS IS BASED ON A STATISTICAL SAMPLE. IN THE 37TH DISTRICT, IT WAS A MUCH HIGHER PERCENTAGE IN THE SAMPLE. THERE WAS IT LOOKS LIKE THERE WAS 56 PERCENT OF THE NONPARTISAN VOTERS IN THAT PARTICULAR SAMPLE.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WILL NOT BE COUNTED?

DEAN LOGAN: THAT THEIR VOTES IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST WERE NOT COUNTED, AGAIN IN THAT SAMPLE PRECINCT WITHIN THAT DISTRICT, YES.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND THAT'S THE LONG BEACH CARSON DISTRICT?

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. LAURA RICHARDSON.

DEAN LOGAN: RIGHT. CONGRESSWOMAN RICHARDSON'S DISTRICT, RIGHT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. AND YOU'RE OF THE OPINION THERE'S NOTHING WE CAN DO ABOUT IT, IS THAT IT?

DEAN LOGAN: RIGHT, WELL, SUPERVISOR, I GUESS WHAT I WANT TO BE REAL CLEAR ON IS THAT FROM ELECTION DAY ON, IT'S BEEN MY COMMITMENT TO LOOK AT THIS ISSUE AND TRY TO DO WHATEVER WE CAN WITHIN THE LEGAL PARAMETERS AVAILABLE TO US AND WITHIN THE CONSTRAINTS OF OUR VOTING SYSTEM TO COUNT ANY OF THE VOTES. THERE'S NOTHING MORE IMPORTANT TO ME THAN THAT. WHAT WE COMMITTED TO LAST WEEK IS THAT WE WOULD USE THE 1 PERCENT MANUAL COUNT SAMPLE TO LOOK AT THOSE NONPARTISAN BALLOTS TO TRY AND DETERMINE WHAT THE SCOPE OF THE SITUATION WAS. AND IN DOING THAT, WE CAME TO THE FIGURES THAT WE'VE JUST DISCUSSED. WE HAVE ALSO CONSULTED BOTH WITH

COUNTY COUNSEL AND WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE. AND THE CONCERN IS THAT WHILE YOU CAN MAKE A VERY LOGICAL ASSUMPTION THAT THOSE WERE NONPARTISAN VOTERS THAT INTENDED TO CROSS OVER AND VOTE IN THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY, AND I THINK THAT IS A LOGICAL ASSUMPTION, WE CANNOT WITH CERTAINTY DETERMINE BY LOOKING AT THE BALLOT THAT THAT IS IN FACT WHAT THEY DID. AND IN MY DISCUSSIONS WITH COUNTY COUNSEL AND WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THEY'VE COME TO THAT SAME CONCLUSION.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: HAVE YOU DISCUSSED WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE CHANGING THE BALLOT SO THAT IT WOULDN'T HAPPEN AGAIN IN JUNE?

DEAN LOGAN: ABSOLUTELY. AND LET ME ALSO BE REAL CLEAR ON THAT, BECAUSE I UNDERSTAND THAT SOME PEOPLE DIDN'T CLEARLY GET THAT FROM THE REPORT. I AM ABSOLUTELY COMMITTED -- WE WILL NOT PRESENT CROSSOVER VOTING TO THE VOTERS IN L.A. COUNTY IN THIS MANNER AGAIN. I HAVE SAID PUBLICLY THAT WHAT I INTEND TO DO IS TO WORK WITH MY STAFF TO DETERMINE WHAT OPTIONS ARE AVAILABLE WITHIN THE LIMITATIONS OF OUR VOTING SYSTEM. AND THEN I DON'T WANT TO MAKE THAT DECISION WITHIN A VACUUM. I WANT TO BRING IN VOTERS AND STAKEHOLDERS TO LOOK AT THOSE OPTIONS, TO TEST THEM AND TO DETERMINE WHAT WILL BE THE MOST EFFICIENT AND THE LEAST CONFUSING WAY TO DO THAT IN JUNE AND IN SUBSEQUENT PRIMARIES.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: BUT THE SECRETARY OF STATE HAS ASSURED YOU THAT YOU CAN DO THAT? THAT YOU CAN ELIMINATE THE BUBBLE?

DEAN LOGAN: YES. YES. THE BUBBLE IS NOT -- IN FACT, I THINK THE -- I DON'T WANT TO SPEAK FOR THE SECRETARY, BUT I WOULD THINK THAT THE SECRETARY WOULD SAY THE OPPOSITE OF THAT. SHE WOULD SAY THE BUBBLE IS NOT AN OPTION MOVING FORWARD.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IT'S NOT-- PARDON ME?

DEAN LOGAN: I BELIEVE THAT THE SECRETARY OF STATE WOULD ADVISE US THAT USING THE BUBBLE WOULD NOT BE PERMISSIBLE GOING FORWARD.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: DO WE HAVE TO TAKE SOME ACTION TO ASK THAT IT BE CHANGED? AS I UNDERSTAND, IT WAS PUT THERE BECAUSE WE REQUESTED IT.

DEAN LOGAN: THAT IS NOT MY UNDERSTANDING. MY UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THIS WAS A PROCESS DEVELOPED WHEN THE PRIMARY CHANGED AND IT WAS DEVELOPED WITH SOME LOGIC BASED ON THE MODIFIED PRIMARY AND THE LIMITATIONS OF THIS VOTING SYSTEM. BUT I DON'T THINK IT'S THE EXCLUSIVE MANNER OF DOING THAT. AND I THINK THAT AS LONG AS WE'RE WITHIN THE REGULATORY ENVIRONMENT OF THE ELECTIONS CODE, I THINK AS THE REGISTRAR, I CAN MAKE CHANGES TO THAT PROCESS.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: YOU CAN CHANGE THAT?

DEAN LOGAN: YES.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. ARE THERE OTHER QUESTIONS?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I'M NOT COMPLETELY CONVINCED AS TO WHY YOU CAN'T COUNT ANY OF THE OTHER BALLOTS. ANY OF THESE BALLOTS THAT FALL INTO THE CATEGORY --

CLERK SACHI HAMAI: YOU'RE ON.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I'M NOT CONVINCED THAT YOU CAN'T COUNT ANY OF THE BALLOTS. AND I DON'T KNOW WHETHER THIS IS A LEGAL REASON OR WHETHER IT'S A PRACTICAL REASON. YOU HAVE ABOUT 50,000 BALLOTS THAT FALL INTO THIS CATEGORY OF PEOPLE WHO MAY HAVE BEEN CONFUSED OR MISINFORMED ABOUT HOW TO CAST A BALLOT IN A CROSSOVER SITUATION, CORRECT?

DEAN LOGAN: RIGHT. THAT'S WHAT WE PROJECT BASED UPON THE SAMPLES, YES.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: BASED UPON YOUR SAMPLE. AND YOU'VE TESTIFIED LAST WEEK AND YOU TOLD US IN YOUR REPORT AND ELSEWHERE THAT THERE WERE SOME ON THE BALLOT CARD, THERE WERE SOME BUBBLES, NUMBERED BUBBLES THAT WERE ASSIGNED TO

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES THAT OVERLAPPED WITH OTHER PARTIES' PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES, THE AMERICAN INDEPENDENT AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY CANDIDATES OVERLAPPED ON POSITIONS 8 THROUGH 10, I BELIEVE, IF MY MEMORY SERVES ME CORRECTLY. IS THAT RIGHT?

DEAN LOGAN: THAT'S CORRECT. FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES, IT WAS RESPONSE POSITIONS 8 THROUGH 15. FOR THE AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY, IT WAS RESPONSE POSITIONS 8 THROUGH 10.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY. SO WHY WOULDN'T YOU BE ABLE TO COUNT THOSE BALLOTS WHERE PEOPLE MARKED ANYTHING FROM 11 THROUGH 15?

DEAN LOGAN: I THINK TWO CONCERNS HAVE BEEN RAISED THERE. AND THOSE ARE THAT THOSE RESPONSE POSITIONS WERE ALSO USED ON THE REPUBLICAN PARTY BALLOT, RESPONSES 8 THROUGH 18, ACTUALLY. AND SO THERE IS THE POSSIBILITY THAT, THE POTENTIAL THAT A VOTER, A NONPARTISAN VOTER TOOK THEIR BALLOT INTO AN INCORRECT BOOTH AND MIGHT HAVE ATTEMPTED TO CROSS OVER AND VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE. IN THE PAST, THAT'S BEEN AN OPTION. IT WASN'T THIS TIME. I'M NOT QUANTIFYING WHEN THAT HAPPENED, I'M JUST SAYING THAT POTENTIAL EXISTS. THE OTHER ISSUE THAT HAS BEEN OF CONCERN AND THAT I'VE DISCUSSED WITH COUNSEL AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE IS THE FACT THAT 8, 9 AND 10 ARE DUPLICATED BETWEEN

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT AND DEMOCRATIC. AND THAT IN GOING BACK AND LOOKING AT THOSE, BECAUSE THOSE CANDIDATE NAMES ARE ROTATED BY ASSEMBLY DISTRICT, THE NAMES DON'T APPEAR IN THE SAME ORDER IN EVERY PRECINCT, THAT THERE COULD BE A DISPROPORTIONATE NUMBER OF TIMES THAT ONE CANDIDATE APPEARED IN 8 THROUGH 10 VERSUS ANOTHER.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ON THE SECOND POINT, I'LL GET BACK TO THE FIRST POINT IN A SECOND. ON THE SECOND POINT, WHY CAN'T YOU ASCERTAIN THOSE BALLOTS? THESE BALLOTS, YOU KNOW WHICH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT THEY COME FROM. WHEN YOU ROTATE THE NAMES, ARE THEY ROTATED BY ASSEMBLY DISTRICT? BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT?

DEAN LOGAN: BY ASSEMBLY DISTRICT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YOU KNOW WHAT ASSEMBLY DISTRICT THESE CAME FROM?

DEAN LOGAN: YES. WE CAN TELL ON A PRECINCT BY PRECINCT LEVEL.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO YOU CAN TELL WHERE THE REMAINING CANDIDATES WHO ARE STILL IN THE ELECTION, I THINK THERE WERE ONLY TWO OF THEM, WHERE THEY DID NOT APPEAR IN 8, 9 AND 10, WHERE THEY ONLY APPEARED IN 11 THROUGH 15, CORRECT?

DEAN LOGAN: YES, WE CAN.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND YOU COULD IDENTIFY THOSE VOTES AND REASONABLY ASCERTAIN THAT THAT'S HOW THEY INTENDED TO VOTE, COULDN'T YOU?

DEAN LOGAN: I BELIEVE WE CAN. I THINK THAT THE LEGAL QUESTION IT COMES DOWN TO IS REASONABLY ASCERTAIN MEET THE LEGAL STANDARD?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WELL, I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE LEGAL STANDARD IS, AND I HAVEN'T ASKED A LAWYER. BUT RIGHT NOW WE'RE JUST TALKING ABOUT THE LOGICAL WAY TO APPROACH IT.

DEAN LOGAN: YES, THAT'S CORRECT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I THINK WHAT I'M DRIVING AT HERE IS WE'RE NOT GOING TO COUNT EVERY SINGLE BALLOT AND TALLY IT AS PART OF THIS ELECTION. THAT'S CLEAR JUST BASED EVEN ON LOGIC. YOU DON'T NEED A LAWYER TO TELL YOU THAT BECAUSE OF THE OVERLAPPING SITUATION.

DEAN LOGAN: RIGHT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THE QUESTION NOW IS: OF THOSE THAT DON'T FALL INTO THAT NEVER-NEVER LAND, HOW -- WHY WOULDN'T WE BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY AT LEAST THOSE AND THEN SEGREGATE THE ONES

THAT COME INTO THE OVERLAP SO AT LEAST WE KNOW EXACTLY HOW MANY WERE IN THAT CATEGORY AND THEN COUNT THE ONES THAT ARE COUNTABLE? IT MAY BE A PAIN IN THE BUTT TO DO IT. IT MAY BE SOMEWHAT COSTLY TO DO IT. BUT IT SEEMS TO ME IT'S DOABLE. I'VE SEEN STRANGER -- NOT STRANGER, BUT MORE COMPLICATED TASKS DONE DOWN IN NORWALK THAN THIS. I MEANS IT'S LABOR INTENSIVE, YOU HAVE TO GET PEOPLE FOR THE NEXT THREE WEEKS TO SCOUR THOSE THINGS AND THEN MAKE THE TALLY. THAT'S SEPARATE AND APART FROM WHETHER IT'S LEGAL. AND THAT'S NUMBER ONE. NUMBER TWO, THIS BUSINESS -- THE FIRST ISSUE YOU RAISED OF YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER THE INDEPENDENT PERSON, THE NONPARTISAN PERSON WHO CAME INTO THE POLLS, HOW DO WE KNOW HE DIDN'T GO INTO THE REPUBLICAN POLLING BOOTH AS OPPOSED TO THE DEMOCRATIC POLLING BOOTH AND PUNCHED ALL OF THOSE NUMBERS? AND I SPOKE TO YOU THIS MORNING ABOUT THAT. AND I SAID TO YOU, "HOW DO YOU KNOW I DIDN'T GO INTO THE REPUBLICAN POLLING BOOTH?" I'M A DEMOCRAT. I'M A REGISTERED DEMOCRAT. I GOT MY DEMOCRATIC BALLOT. I MIGHT HAVE HAD A FEW THINGS ON MY MIND. I MIGHT HAVE BEEN IN A HURRY TO GET TO WORK. PEOPLE BEHIND ME MIGHT HAVE BEEN SAYING WHAT'S TAKING YOU SO LONG? AND SO I GOT FUZZY HEADED AND WENT INTO THE REPUBLICAN BOOTH. AND IT DIDN'T OCCUR TO ME THAT JOHN MCCAIN WAS NOT ONE OF THE PEOPLE ON MY SAMPLE BALLOT. HYPOTHETICALLY IT'S POSSIBLE, ISN'T IT? BUT IT'S NOT REASONABLE. SO IF YOU SET UP ALL OF THESE HYPOTHETICAL, WHAT IF A TORNADO HIT MY POLLING BOOTH BUT ONLY THE DEMOCRATIC POLLING BOOTH AND NOT THE INDEPENDENT POLLING

BOOTH OR THE REPUBLICAN POLLING BOOTH AND WIPED OUT THE MACHINE? I MEAN IT GETS TO THE REDUCTUM AD ABSURDUM SITUATION. I DON'T BUY THAT. AND I DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT'S A LEGAL TEST AGAIN. I'M NOT VOUCHING FOR THE LAW. I'M NOT A LAWYER. BUT FROM A LOGICAL POINT OF VIEW, I WOULDN'T PUT THAT -- YOU MAY HAVE HAD SOME CALLS ABOUT PEOPLE WHO WERE DIRECTED TO THE WRONG BOOTH. THERE WERE NEWS REPORTS ABOUT PEOPLE WHO WERE DIRECTED TO THE WRONG BOOTH. BUT THERE ARE NEWS REPORTS EVERY ELECTION ABOUT THINGS THAT WENT WRONG. I MEAN WHAT ABOUT THE PEOPLE WHO DIDN'T GET TO VOTE BECAUSE THE POLLING MACHINES DIDN'T SHOW UP UNTIL 12:00, 12:30 AT NIGHT AT THE WEST SIDE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER ON OLYMPIC BOULEVARD IN SUPERVISOR BURKE'S-- OR WHEREVER. ONE PROBLEM OR ANOTHER. WE ALWAYS HAVE PROBLEMS. WE'VE NEVER RUN A PICTURE PERFECT ELECTION. NOBODY EVER DOES. BECAUSE HUMAN BEINGS ARE INVOLVED. BUT ON THE NATURAL, YOU CAN LOGICALLY ASSUME THAT -- YOU CAN MAKE CERTAIN ASSUMPTIONS THAT ARE BASED IN LOGIC. HERE'S WHAT I'M CONCERNED ABOUT. I'M CONCERNED THAT PEOPLE WHO VOTED THIS WAY -- AND I MAY BE A LITTLE OFF HERE. SOME OF MY FRIENDS MAY NOT TOTALLY AGREE WITH ME. I THINK THEY WOULD LIKE THEIR VOTES COUNTED. SOME OF THEIR VOTES MAY NOT BE ABLE TO BE COUNTED FOR THE REASONS YOU'VE ALREADY INDICATED. AND I UNDERSTAND THAT. BUT SOME OF THEM, AND A GOOD PORTION OF THEM, AND FROM MY JUST ROUGH ESTIMATE, MAYBE FIVE-EIGHTHS OF THEM MIGHT BE ABLE TO BE COUNTED OR SOMETHING ALONG THOSE LINES, MAYBE A LITTLE LESS, BUT AT LEAST HALF. WHATEVER IT IS, IT IS. BUT

TO SAY OUT OF THE BOX "WE'RE NOT EVEN GOING TO TRY," THAT REALLY IS ANGERING PEOPLE. IT ANGERS ME AND I'M NOT ONE OF AGGRIEVED VOTERS, BECAUSE I VOTED CORRECTLY AS I HAVE FOR SOME 40 YEARS, 35 YEARS, WHATEVER IT IS. BUT PEOPLE WHO FEEL LIKE THEY MAY HAVE BEEN CONFUSED OR WERE MISINFORMED OR WHATEVER THE REASONS WERE FOR WHY THEY DIDN'T CAST THEIR BALLOT CORRECTLY DON'T WANT TO HEAR FROM THE COUNTY THAT "WE'RE NOT EVEN GOING TO TRY." THAT'S WHAT'S BOTHERING ME. AND THAT'S WHAT'S BOTHERING THEM. AND I THINK THIS IS A SERIOUS ISSUE, DEAN. AND I'M NOT BLAMING YOU FOR IT. AND THIS IS A SYSTEM WE'VE HAD SINCE 2002, LONG BEFORE YOU WERE IN TOWN, AND THAT'S THAT. BUT WHAT I AM CONCERNED ABOUT IS THAT WE MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO COUNT AS MANY OF THE BALLOTS AS WE CAN THAT WE CAN LEGALLY COUNT, THAT WE MAKE THAT EFFORT AND THAT WE EXPLAIN TO PEOPLE AND COMMUNICATE TO PEOPLE THAT WE'RE GOING TO MAKE THAT EFFORT, THAT WE'RE NOT SAYING "TOUGH. YOU SCREWED UP OR WE SCREWED UP, WHATEVER IT IS, WE'RE NOT GOING TO BOTHER. YOU'RE HISTORY." THAT'S THE MESSAGE THAT'S COMING ACROSS. SO I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU -- FIRST OF ALL, I HAD COME PREPARED WITH A MOTION HERE, WHICH I WON'T BOTHER TO READ, BECAUSE YOU HAVE SAID AND IT'S GOOD THAT YOU'RE GOING TO CHANGE THE BALLOT FOR JUNE. I'D LIKE THE BOARD TO AT LEAST GO ON RECORD DIRECTING AND SUPPORTING YOUR RECOMMENDATION AND DIRECTING THAT IT BE DONE IN THE MANNER IN WHICH YOU'VE JUST DESCRIBED. I THINK IT'S CRITICAL THAT WE ABANDON THE BUBBLE.

DEAN LOGAN: I AGREE COMPLETELY.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I DON'T THINK THERE IS ANYBODY AROUND HERE THAT'S GOING TO ENDORSE THE BUBBLE AFTER THIS. I MEAN IF ROUGHLY 25 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE WHO VOTED NONPARTISAN HAD THIS PROBLEM, THAT'S A MARKETING PROBLEM WE HAD. WHETHER WE WERE RIGHT OR WRONG.

DEAN LOGAN: ABSOLUTELY.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IF WE WERE TRYING TO SELL WIDGETS AND 25 PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE WENT TO THE WRONG ADDRESS, WE'D FIGURE OUT WHY AND WE'D CHANGE IT. SO I'D LIKE TO DO THAT. AND THE SECOND THING I'D LIKE TO DO IS I'D LIKE TO FIGURE OUT A WAY THAT -- I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU TO FIGURE OUT A WAY WHERE YOU COULD, EITHER IN CONSULTATION WITH OUR COUNTY COUNSEL AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE TO GET A -- AND I'M GOING TO SAY IT VERBALLY RATHER THAN REWRITE A WHOLE THING AS A MOTION, THAT YOU CONSULT WITH OUR ATTORNEYS AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE TO DETERMINE WHAT, IF ANYTHING, THEY RECOMMEND COULD BE DONE TO TALLY AS MANY OF THE VOTES AS POSSIBLE BEFORE THE CERTIFICATION PERIOD IS OVER. AND IF THERE IS A WAY TO DO IT BUT YOU CAN'T DO IT BEFORE THE CERTIFICATION PERIOD IS OVER, TO FIGURE OUT A WAY YOU MIGHT EVEN BE ABLE TO PETITION THE COURT TO GIVE YOU MORE TIME. BUT THAT'S A SECONDARY ISSUE. I'D LIKE THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S OFFICE TO WEIGH IN. AND I'D LIKE OUR

ATTORNEYS TO WEIGH IN ON THIS. AND MAYBE EVEN THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S ATTORNEYS TO WEIGH IN ON WHAT, IF ANYTHING, COULD BE DONE. AND IF YOU COULD GIVE US A REPORT ON THAT, I WOULDN'T EVEN WAIT UNTIL NEXT WEEK. JUST GET TO THE BOTTOM OF IT. CIRCULATE IT TO US LIKE YOU CIRCULATED YOUR REPORT FROM YESTERDAY. IS THAT A REASONABLE REQUEST OF YOU?

DEAN LOGAN: SUPERVISOR, I CAN CERTAINLY DO THAT. AND I WANT TO BE REAL CLEAR THAT THE INTENT OF MY REPORT WAS NOT TO INDICATE THAT THERE WAS CONCERN ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN OF GOING THROUGH AND LOOKING AT THOSE BALLOTS. IF THERE IS A LEGAL REMEDY THAT ALLOWS US TO DETERMINE WHAT THE VOTER INTENT WAS AND IF THAT TAKES LONGER THAN THE CERTIFICATION PERIOD, AS YOU SAY, AND WE NEED TO GO TO COURT TO GIVE A JUDGE TO GIVE US THE ADDITIONAL TIME TO DO THAT, I'VE SAID FROM DAY ONE, IT'S IMPORTANT TO ME, JUST AS IT IS TO YOU TO COUNT THOSE VOTES. MY CONCERN IN DOING THE SAMPLE AND IN MY PRELIMINARY CONVERSATIONS WITH COUNTY COUNSEL AND WITH SECRETARY OF STATE WAS THAT THERE WAS GOING TO BE A LEGAL ISSUE WITH BEING ABLE TO DISCERN THAT. AND I JUST DIDN'T WANT TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THAT IF WE ULTIMATELY WEREN'T GOING TO BE ABLE TO COUNT THE VOTES. SO I'M HAPPY TO GO FURTHER IN THAT CONVERSATION WITH OUR COUNTY COUNSEL AND WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S COUNSEL. AND IF THAT DETERMINATION CAN BE MADE, THEN --

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: LET ME TELL YOU. I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL IF THE COUNTY COUNSEL AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND HER COUNSEL BOTH AGREE WITH WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, THAT THEY PUT IT -- THAT THEY SAY SO PUBLICLY. NOT JUST TO YOU. I'D LIKE TO HEAR THEIR RATIONALE FOR THIS.

DEAN LOGAN: I WOULD LIKE THAT, TOO.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH, I KNOW YOU WOULD. WE ALL WOULD. ON THE OTHER HAND, THEY MAY FIND, AFTER SCRUBBING ALL OF THIS STUFF, THAT THERE IS A WAY THAT YOU CAN AT LEAST COUNT HALF OF THEM OR A THIRD OF THEM OR TWO-THIRDS OF THEM, WHATEVER IT IS THAT COMES OUT IN THE WASH. AND I THINK WE'RE VERY FORTUNATE IN ONE RESPECT. AND THAT IS THAT IT APPEARS THAT THIS SITUATION DID NOT ALTER THE OUTCOME OF THE ELECTION. IT APPEARS. I DON'T KNOW FOR SURE. NOBODY WILL KNOW FOR SURE. BUT BECAUSE OF THE WAY THAT DELEGATES ARE APPORTIONED BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT AND ALL, IT'S NOT LIKELY. WE'LL STIPULATE TO THAT IF THERE IS ANY IMPACT, IT APPEARS TO BE NEGLIGIBLE. BUT IMAGINE IF THIS WAS A VERY CLOSE ELECTION, A VERY TIGHT ELECTION ON WHICH THE PRESIDENCY OF THE UNITED STATES HUNG IN THE BALANCE. I DON'T THINK WE'D THROW 50,000 VOTES OUT THE WINDOW WITHOUT A FIGHT.

DEAN LOGAN: AND THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT MY STATEMENT ON ELECTION NIGHT WAS ABOUT, THAT IF THERE WAS A DETERMINATION THAT IT POTENTIALLY WOULD CHANGE THE OUTCOME OF AN

ELECTION, I WOULD HAVE BEEN THE FIRST PERSON IN LINE GOING TO COUNTY COUNSEL AND ASKING THAT WE GO TO COURT TO FIGURE OUT WHAT WE DO ABOUT THAT. YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT. WE'RE FORTUNATE THAT THAT DIDN'T HAPPEN. IT DOESN'T CHANGE THE SIGNIFICANCE TO THE VOTERS WHO FEEL THAT THEY'VE BEEN DISENFRANCHISED. AND I'M NOT INSENSITIVE TO THAT AT ALL.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IN THE 37TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WITH 56 PERCENT, IT DOESN'T CHANGE? THERE'S NO POTENTIAL CHANGE?

DEAN LOGAN: I WOULD HAVE TO CONFIRM THAT WITH THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OFFICIALS IN TERMS OF THEIR DELEGATE ALLOCATION.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND I'M NOT SAYING IT WILL NOT CHANGE, YVONNE. IT APPEARS NOT TO CHANGE. BUT I DON'T KNOW.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WE DON'T KNOW.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WE DON'T KNOW. AND WE MAY NEVER KNOW.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. BUT IN A CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT 56 PERCENT OF THOSE WHO VOTED.

SUP. KNABE: NONPARTISAN.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NONPARTISAN, RIGHT.

SUP. DON KNABE: OF NONPARTISAN CAST THOUGH. I MEAN, THE PERCENTAGE WAS HIGHER BUT THE NUMBERS OF VOTES THAT CAST WERE MUCH SMALLER IN THE 37TH.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. THAT'S RIGHT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO CAN I ASK YOU, DEAN, IF WHAT WE WERE PREPARING TO ASK YOU TO DO WAS TO CONDUCT A PHYSICAL REVIEW OF NONPARTISAN BALLOTS THAT WERE CAST IN THIS LAST WEEK'S ELECTION THAT SHOW EVIDENCE OF THE VOTERS' FAILED ATTEMPT TO CROSS OVER AND VOTE IN THE PRIMARY FOR ONE OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES. AND UTILIZING THE BALLOTS CAST IN THE THE 1 PERCENT SAMPLE OF PRECINCTS AS WELL AS AN ADDITIONAL PRECINCT PER CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT TO UP THE SAMPLE?

DEAN LOGAN: SURE.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: OKAY, TO BE CHOSEN WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, SINCE THIS IS THE AGGRIEVED PARTY, OR THROW IN THE AMERICAN INDEPENDENT, THAT'S FINE. BUT WE KNOW WHAT THIS IS ALL ABOUT. AND THAT THIS REVIEW, IF POSSIBLE, BE DONE BEFORE THE ELECTION RESULTS ARE CERTIFIED, WHICH I THINK YOU HAVE, WHAT? THREE MORE WEEKS?

DEAN LOGAN: RIGHT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THREE WEEKS AND A DAY. IS THAT A REASONABLE --

DEAN LOGAN: THE SCOPE OF THAT, YES. WE COULD ACCOMPLISH THAT. AND WE COULD REPORT BACK. AND IN THE MEANTIME, WE CAN CONTINUE TO TALK WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND WITH COUNTY COUNSEL ABOUT THE LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: AND I'M GOING TO TALK TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, TOO, PERSONALLY, BECAUSE I'D LIKE THEM TO WEIGH IN. IF THEY HAVE A LEGAL ISSUE AS OUR LAWYERS APPEAR TO HAVE A LEGAL ISSUE, I HAVE NOT TALKED TO OUR LAWYERS DIRECTLY, BUT THEN I THINK THEY NEED TO STEP UP AND MAKE THAT CLEAR TO THIS BOARD AND TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. AND I THINK JUST FOR CONFIDENCE-BUILDING PURPOSES, THAT WOULD BE A GOOD THING. ANYWAY, I WON'T SAY ANY MORE THAN THAT. BUT I REALLY -- THIS IS A SMALL PRICE TO PAY FOR THIS SITUATION. AND I APPRECIATE THAT THIS IS NOT SOMETHING OF YOUR MAKING. THIS WAS BEFORE YOUR TIME. BUT YOU'RE THE GUY NOW. AND WE'RE THE FIVE SUPERVISORS NOW. AND WE'VE GOT TO STEP UP TO OUR RESPONSIBILITY AND INSURE THAT THIS, A, WE FIND OUT WHAT HAPPENED HERE AND COUNT AS MANY OF THE VOTES WE CAN, IF WE CAN. AND SECONDLY, AND JUST AS IMPORTANTLY, IS CHANGE THIS BALLOT SO THIS NEVER HAPPENS AGAIN. AND WHATEVER WE HAVE TO DO. AND I THINK YOU ALREADY HAVE SOME IDEAS. BUT I APPRECIATE YOU'RE GOING TO SOLICIT OTHER STAKEHOLDERS'

IDEAS ON THIS, WHICH I THINK WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL. THANK YOU. SO I'LL MAKE THAT IN THE FORM OF A MOTION.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. AND IN ORDER TO DO THAT, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO DO A COUPLE THINGS.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: MAKE A FINDING?

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: NO. WHAT I'M GOING TO DO IS ASK TO RECONSIDER ITEM NO. 15. I'LL MOVE THAT. AND IF YOU'LL SECOND IT? THEN WITHOUT OBJECTION, ITEM 15 IS RECONSIDERED. THEN YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A CHANCE TO SPEAK. WHAT I'M GOING TO DO IS ON ITEM 14 AND 15, I WANT TO ASK YOU ABOUT THESE SYSTEMS WHETHER OR NOT THAT'S GOING TO HELP THIS PROBLEM.

DEAN LOGAN: YES. THANK YOU. AND I APPRECIATE THE RECONSIDERATION OF THOSE ITEMS. ITEM 14 IS A CONTRACT TO ALLOW US TO IMPLEMENT A SYSTEM OF ONLINE POLL WORKER TRAINING. THIS SYSTEM WOULD BE -- IT WOULD AUGMENT THE EXISTING IN-PERSON TRAINING THAT WE DO FOR POLL WORKERS AS WELL AS OTHER FORMS OF ELECTION WORKERS, THOSE WHO WORK ELECTION NIGHT, THOSE WHO ARE PRECINCT COORDINATORS. AND IT REALLY DOES GO TO ONE OF THE BIG ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE CROSSOVER ISSUE THAT WE'VE BEEN DISCUSSING, AND THAT IS THAT PART OF THE DISPARITY, AND CERTAINLY THE BUBBLE ISSUE AND THE BALLOT LAYOUT WAS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT, BUT PART OF THAT ISSUE WAS SOME VARIANCE IN HOW THE POLL WORKER

TRAINING WAS GIVEN AND HOW IT WAS ADMINISTERED AT THE 4,300 POLLING PLACES AROUND THE COUNTY ON ELECTION DAY. WHAT THE ONLINE POLL WORKER TRAINING PROGRAM WOULD ALLOW US TO DO IS AGAIN, AUGMENT THE TRAINING. BUT IT WOULD ALSO ALLOW US TO GET SOME DATA TO DETERMINE HOW EFFECTIVE OUR TRAINING METHODS ACTUALLY ARE. WE COULD DO ASSESSMENTS. SO AFTER POTENTIAL POLL WORKERS WENT THROUGH THE TRAINING, WE WOULD BE ABLE TO ACTUALLY LOOK AND SEE HOW DID THEY DO, IF YOU WILL, ON A SELF-TEST. OR TO GATHER DATA FROM THEM ON THAT. SO I THINK IT WOULD BE -- IT'S EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. AND AS I TESTIFIED LAST WEEK, THE ELECTIONS PROCESS ON AN ELECTION-BY-ELECTION BASIS IS GETTING MORE AND MORE COMPLICATED. AND WE ARE ASKING A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF THESE GREAT CITIZENS, 28,000 IN L.A. COUNTY, THAT SHOW UP TO WORK FOR US ON ELECTION DAY, AND IT IS A THANKLESS JOB. IT'S A VERY CHALLENGING ENVIRONMENT. WE ASK THEM TO BE SOMEWHAT TECHNICIANS, SOMEWHAT ADMINISTRATIVE. AND AT THE END OF THE DAY AFTER THEY'VE WORKED ALL DAY WE ASK THEM TO DO WHAT MAY BE SIMPLE MATH, BUT IT'S AFTER A VERY LONG DAY. SO I THINK ANYTHING WE CAN DO TO ENHANCE OUR ABILITY TO TRAIN AND TRAIN IN A UNIFORM AND CONSISTENT MANNER WILL IMPROVE THE ACCURACY AT THE POLLS. SO I REALLY WOULD APPRECIATE THE ABILITY TO DO THIS. THIS SYSTEM IS -- CAN BE REIMBURSED FOR FUNDING THROUGH THE HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT AS AN ELECTION IMPROVEMENT. SO IT WOULD BE A GRANT FUNDED THROUGH THE FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAM. AND IT IS A PROGRAM THAT IS CUSTOMIZABLE. IT WOULD BE SPECIFICALLY TO L.A. COUNTY'S

VOTING SYSTEM AND L.A. COUNTY'S VOTING PROCEDURES. ITEM 15 IS A, IF YOU WILL, A COMPANION SYSTEM TO THAT. IT'S AN ELECTION MANUAL TOOL. IT'S A TOOL THAT WILL ALLOW US TO AUTOMATE THE TASK MANAGEMENT AND ELECTION CALENDAR SO THAT WHEN WE HAVE OVERLAPPING ELECTIONS SUCH AS WE HAVE RIGHT NOW, AS WE'RE FINISHING THE FEBRUARY 5TH ELECTION, WE ARE ACTUALLY CONDUCTING CANDIDATE FILING FOR THE JUNE 3RD ELECTION. IT WOULD ALLOW US TO MONITOR THE TASKS AND REQUIREMENTS OF THOSE ISSUES SIMULTANEOUSLY. IT HAS SOME EXCELLENT MANAGEMENT FEATURES IN TERMS OF IF A PARTICULAR WORK UNIT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR A TASK, IT WILL GIVE ME INFORMATION AUTOMATICALLY AS A MANAGER, AN EMAIL TO TELL ME THE STATUS OF THAT TASK SO AT ANY GIVEN TIME I COULD TELL YOU WHETHER WE'RE ON TRACK WITH REGARD TO PLANNING FOR THAT ELECTION. SO THAT SYSTEM AS WELL IS REIMBURSABLE THROUGH HELP AMERICA VOTE ACT FUNDS. AND WE BELIEVE BOTH OF THESE SYSTEMS WOULD ENHANCE OUR ABILITY TO BETTER TRACK AND BETTER MANAGE THE ELECTIONS PROCESS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. WE HAVE THREE PEOPLE WHO HAVE ASKED TO SPEAK. ROBIN GIBSON ON BOTH 14 AND 15. JAMIE ALTER. AND ALICIA, ALICIA DID NOT GIVE HER LAST NAME. I'M SORRY, IS IT RICK? YES, PLEASE COME FORWARD.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YOU'RE FREQUENTLY CONFUSED WITH ALICIA.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THE NAME UP HERE SAYS ALICIA, BUT I GUESS IT WAS RICK JACOBS WHO REALLY WANTED TO SPEAK. OKAY, WOULD THE THREE OF YOU PLEASE COME FORWARD? I'M SORRY, ALICIA.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALICIA, IF YOU EVER HAVE TROUBLE COMMUNICATING WITH ME, JUST CALL ME. [LAUGHTER.]

ROBIN GIBSON: WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO ADDRESS THE FORMER ISSUE ABOUT THE COUNTING OF THOSE BALLOTS IN ADDITION?

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ABSOLUTELY. AND THE AMENDMENT TO BOTH OF THEM.

ROBIN GIBSON: THEY CAN BE COUNTED. WE'VE GIVEN HIM TWO PLANS OF HOW TO DO IT. FIRST OF ALL, THE ROSTER BOOKS HAVE WRITTEN EVERY VOTER WHO VOTED NONPARTISAN, WHETHER THEY WERE DEMOCRAT OR AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY. THE NUMBERS OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTIES ARE VERY SMALL. SO IF YOU GO THROUGH THE PRECINCT ROSTER AND NOT EVEN USE THEIR NEW COMPUTERIZED EDITION, THE ONE THAT PEOPLE WROTE IN, YOU WILL SEE, PER PRECINCT, HOW MANY NONPARTISAN VOTERS WANTED TO VOTE DEM AND HOW MANY WANTED TO VOTE INDEPENDENT. SAY YOU HAVE TWO WHO VOTED INDEPENDENT. WORST CASE SCENARIO, YOU COULD CALL THOSE TWO PEOPLE AND HAVE THEM SIGN A SWORN AFFIDAVIT OF HOW THEY VOTED. YOU WOULD THEN TAKE THOSE TWO VOTES, 8, 9 AND 10, COUNT THEM AND ALL THE REST ARE

DEMOCRAT. THE NUMBERS ARE VERY SMALL OF INDEPENDENTS. AND I'D LIKE TO ADD THAT JUST FROM A FIVE-MINUTE ANALYSIS ON ELECTION NIGHT, WE HAVE AN 11-1/2 PERCENT UNDER VOTE FOR PRESIDENT IN THIS ELECTION. THE NORM IS 3 PERCENT. SO IT IS NOT TRUE THAT IT'S ONLY 50,000 VOTES. THERE ARE 165,000 VOTES LISTED WITH NO VOTE CAST FOR PRESIDENT. YOU KNOW THAT SOME OF THOSE PEOPLE DIDN'T WANT TO, BUT NOT 11 PERCENT OF THE VOTERS. SO ELECTION PROTECTION ADVOCATES HAVE GIVEN A PLAN TO THE REGISTRAR SEVERAL DAYS AGO. AND THESE VOTES CAN BE COUNTED. IN ADDITION, THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION SAYS THAT EVERY VOTE MUST BE COUNTED IF CAST LEGALLY. SO IT WOULD ACTUALLY BE ILLEGAL NOT TO COUNT THEM. IT'S NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND, THAT YOU NEED LEGAL PERMISSION TO COUNT THE BALLOTS. IF YOU ARE TO SAY THIS MAY OR MAY NOT MAKE A DIFFERENCE TO THE DELEGATES, THEREFORE WE MAY OR MAY NOT COUNT THEM, THAT POSITION IS NOT -- IT GOES AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION. SO THEY CAN BE COUNTED. AND THEY SHOULD BE COUNTED. AND THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE WILLING TO HELP. PEOPLE HAVE ALREADY OFFERED PLANS. I DON'T KNOW WHY THEY'RE NOT CONSIDERED YET. SO I'D BE GLAD TO HELP. JUST WITH COMMON SENSE, IT'S EASY TO DEVISE A PLAN TO COUNT THOSE ABOUT THAT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. DID YOU WANT TO SPEAK ON --

ROBIN GIBSON: I DID. OKAY. SO I HAVE FIVE REASONS TO OPPOSE AMENDMENTS 14 AND 15. THREE ARE BIG HUGE REASONS AND TWO

ARE SMALL. AND I ONLY FOUND OUT ABOUT IT AT 8 O'CLOCK THIS MORNING, SO I'M NOT WELL-PREPARED OR ANYTHING. BUT HERE WE GO. FIRST OF ALL, WE DO HAVE SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN OUR COUNTY ELECTION SYSTEM. BUT HIRING A PRIVATE CORPORATION TO DO POLL WORKER TRAINING WILL NOT SOLVE ANY OF THEM. MANY OF THE VOTERS THOUGHT THAT THE PROBLEM WAS THE POLL WORKERS AND THE TRAINING. IT WAS NOT. I PERSONALLY ADVISED THE REGISTRAR'S OFFICE 2-1/2 WEEKS BEFORE THE ELECTION THAT THIS WAS GOING TO HAPPEN. IT WAS CLEAR TO SEE, IT JUST TOOK COMMON SENSE TO SEE. THE REASON IT HAPPENED IS THAT TWO BALLOTS WERE COMBINED INTO ONE. AND THAT SAVES MAYBE \$800, \$1,000. THE SAME THING WAS DONE WITH PRECINCTS, AND THE RESULTS HAVEN'T COME OUT YET. THERE ARE GOING TO BE A LOT MORE PROBLEMS THAT WE HAVEN'T SEEN YET. SO COMBINING BALLOTS WAS AN OBVIOUSLY BAD SOLUTION. WE DID TELL THEM THAT IT WAS A BAD SOLUTION, THAT IT SHOULDN'T BE DONE. AND THE ELECTION INTEGRITY PEOPLE WEREN'T HEARD. THIS PARTICULAR COMPANY AND ITS OWNER--

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: CAN I ASK YOU A QUESTION? HOLD HER TIME. DON'T PENALIZE HER. WHEN YOU SAY ON THE PRECINCTS, THE SAME THING IS GOING TO HAPPEN ON THE PRECINCTS, WHAT ARE YOU REFERRING TO?.

ROBIN GIBSON: THE PRECINCTS WERE CONSOLIDATED IN L.A. COUNTY. YOU HAVEN'T GOTTEN REPORTS YET. WE'RE STILL TYING TO FIND DATA. I WOULD GUESS, I DON'T KNOW THE NUMBERS, BUT

WE LOST A LOT OF PRECINCTS. AND THAT SAVED \$500 PER PRECINCT. AND A LOT OF VOTERS, I BELIEVE, WE'RE WAITING FOR DATA, BUT YOU'VE ONLY HEARD ABOUT THE BUBBLES. THERE ARE A LOT MORE PROBLEMS IN THIS ELECTION.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WHAT PROBLEM ARE YOU REFERRING TO?

ROBIN GIBSON: PEOPLE COULDN'T FIND THEIR PRECINCT. PEOPLE COULDN'T VOTE. AND IT'S TO SAVE MONEY, WHICH IS UNDERSTANDABLE, BUT THAT'S JUST NOT WHERE YOU SAVE MONEY, BECAUSE THEN YOU'RE GOING TO GO SPEND \$2 MILLION TO BRING A PRIVATE CORPORATION IN TO TRAIN THE POLL WORKERS. THAT \$2 MILLION COULD GO TO POLL WORKERS AND HAVING PRECINCTS AND NOT CAUSING SO MUCH CONFUSION TO VOTERS. AND DESIGNING PROPER BALLOTS, WHICH IS REALLY PRETTY SIMPLE. THEN THE SECOND REASON, IS THIS PARTICULAR COMPANY IS NOT A COMPANY THAT I THINK WE SHOULD BE DOING BUSINESS WITH. HERE'S A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST THE OWNER FOR SECURITIES FRAUD THAT'S STILL PENDING AFTER 10 YEARS. THEY HAVEN'T COME TO A CONCLUSION. THIS PARTICULAR COMPANY HAS A STRATEGIC TEAMING AGREEMENT WITH DIEBOLD CORPORATION, THIS S.O.E. SOFTWARE. THEY'RE PARTNERS. AND THIS IS ALL BEING DONE IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE DIEBOLD CORPORATION. I THINK EVERYBODY SHOULD BE AWARE OF THEM. DO YOU GUYS KNOW OF THEIR FAME? THEY ARE HIGHLY PARTISAN. THEY HAD TO CHANGE THEIR NAME TO PREMIER BECAUSE THEIR STOCK WENT DOWN SO FAR. THESE ARE PEOPLE WHO SAID IN 2004 THAT THEY WOULD MAKE SURE THAT THE ELECTION

WENT TO BUSH IN OHIO. AND THEY WERE THE PEOPLE RUNNING THAT ELECTION. SO THESE ARE THE PARTNERS. AND IT SAYS "OUR AGREEMENT WITH S.O.E. SOFTWARE WILL ENABLE THE DIEBOLD ELECTION SYSTEMS TO BROADEN OUR ELECTION SOLUTION OFFERING TO OUR CURRENT AND FUTURE CUSTOMERS IN A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT AREAS," INCLUDING POLL WORKER TRAINING. AND 15 IS WORSE, MANAGING OUR ELECTION. WE DON'T WANT THESE PEOPLE MANAGING OUR ELECTIONS. WE JUST NEED GOOD MANAGERS. AND WE ALSO HAVE HERE AN ARTICLE "SOFTWARE FIRM CAUSES ELECTION NIGHT GLITCHES IN PALM BEACH COUNTY. THE SAME COUNTY THAT BROUGHT AMERICA THE HANGING PAPER CHADS IN 2000 ON TUESDAY BUNGLED RESULTS ON ITS \$250,000 WEBSITE. THE SUPERVISOR WHO WAS HIRED TO FIX THE FIRST MESS WITH ELECTIONS SAID IT WAS NOT HIS STAFF'S FAULT BUT IT WAS AN ERROR OF S.O.E. SOFTWARE OF TAMPA, WHICH CREATED THE SOFTWARE THAT OPERATES THE WEBSITE AND CAUSED THE ELECTION CONFUSION." SO THIS COMPANY ITSELF IS NOT A GOOD COMPANY TO BE HIRING. MY THIRD REASON IS IN TWO MONTHS, YOU WILL BE HIRING A REGISTRAR, WHICH MAY OR MAY NOT BE THE CURRENT REGISTRAR. WE DON'T KNOW WHO IT'S GOING TO BE. THERE ARE 10 CANDIDATES RIGHT NOW BEING INTERVIEWED. SO I THINK IT'S INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE COUNTY TO MAKE A SIX-YEAR ELECTION PLAN WITH ANY CORPORATION TWO MONTHS BEFORE YOU HIRE A REGISTRAR. I THINK THAT THE REGISTRAR, WHOEVER THAT IS, SHOULD WEIGH IN ON THIS PLAN. AND GOING -- TAKING PUBLIC WORKS PRIVATE ISN'T ALWAYS THE BEST WAY TO GO. NUMBER 15 IS REALLY SERIOUS. IT MANAGES ELECTIONS. THIS IS NOT A GOOD CORPORATION. THE TWO

SMALLER REASONS ARE NUMBER 1, THE BIDDING PROCESS. THERE WERE 40 COMPANIES AND ONLY 1 BID. I DON'T KNOW WHY THAT IS BUT I THINK IT'S WORTH CHECKING INTO. IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO ME. FOR \$2,000 I COULD TRAIN POLL WORKERS ALL OVER AMERICA. I MEAN, WHY WOULD ONLY ONE COMPANY BID ON THIS GREAT JOB? PERHAPS THE BID WAS MADE FOR THIS COMPANY IN SOME WAY? I DON'T KNOW. I HAVE NO PROOF OF ANYTHING. I JUST THINK IT SHOULD BE CHECKED INTO.

SUP. KNABE: TIME'S UP.

ROBIN GIBSON: ALL RIGHT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME.

JAMIE ALTER: HI, MY NAME IS JAMIE ALTER. I'M AN UNAFFILIATED VOTER. I WAS MOVED HERE AND BECAME AN UNAFFILIATED VOTER ACCIDENTALLY, WHICH I ACTUALLY THINK IS A HUGE PROBLEM BECAUSE I DIDN'T FILL -- I NEGLECTED TO WRITE IN THE WORD DEMOCRAT. THERE IS NO OPTION IN L.A. COUNTY WITH A LITTLE CHECK BOX, AT LEAST ON THE FORM I GOT. SO YOU HAVE A HUGE PROBLEM HERE JUST IN VOTER REGISTRATION, IN MY VIEW. HAVING SAID THAT, I WALKED INTO MY POLLING PLACE AND WAS NOT TOLD TO MARK MY BUBBLE, MY DOUBLE BUBBLE. AND I VOTED FOR MY CANDIDATE AND I VOTED FOR THE BALLOT MEASURES. I, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, DO NOT THINK YOU SHOULD

ASK FOR ANOTHER SAMPLE OF THESE BALLOTS. I THINK -- I WOULD URGE YOU TO RUN A RECOUNT OF THE FULL NUMBER. THERE IS NO REASON TO DO ANOTHER SAMPLE. YOU'RE GOING TO SAMPLE THIS TO DEATH. WE NEED TO RUN THE RECOUNT. AND BY THE WAY, I BELIEVE THEY RAN THIS ON A COMPUTER. I DON'T BELIEVE THEY HANDED IT. DOES ANYONE KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT?

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: COMPUTER.

JAMIE ALTER: THEY RAN IT ON A COMPUTER. THIS IS NOT ROCKET SCIENCE. LET'S RUN THE BALLOTS THROUGH THE COMPUTER. MR. LOGAN REPORTS TO YOU, YOU REPORT TO US. WE DON'T HAVE ANY RECOURSE. WE CAN'T FIRE HIM. BUT THE VOTERS ARE THE ONES THAT YOU GUYS REPORT TO. SO LET'S GET THE VOTING SYSTEM RIGHT. IT'S NOT GOING TO HELP YOU GUYS IN YOUR ELECTION EITHER. WE NEED TO GET THIS DOWN OR YOU YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A LOT OF VERY, VERY ANGRY VOTERS. I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO RECOMMEND THAT WHEN YOU RUN IT AND YOU GET THE RESULT, AS ZEV POINTED OUT -- I'M SORRY.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THAT'S ALL RIGHT.

JAMIE ALTER: SORRY. EXCUSE ME. I HAVE LARYNGITIS -- POINTED OUT, WE HAVE A NUMBER OF WHAT WE COULD CALL SPOILED BALLOTS, ACTUALLY. THE BUBBLE WASN'T PUNCHED. THEY COULD BE CALLED SPOILED. IF WE'RE GOING TO CALL THOSE SPOILED BECAUSE WE'RE NOT READING THE PRESIDENT INK MARK ON THOSE,

THEN WE SHOULDN'T COUNT THE BALLOT MEASURES ON THOSE. AND IF YOU DON'T COUNT THE BALLOT MEASURES ON 100,000 BALLOTS, YOU'RE GOING TO BE RUNNING INTO A LOT OF OTHER PROBLEMS. SO I THINK THAT TO ERR-- TO JUST NOT COUNT MY ONE MARK FOR PRESIDENT IS ACTUALLY VOTER DISENFRANCHISEMENT. YOU'RE GOING TO COUNT MY BALLOT MEASURE VOTE? IS IT SPOILED OR NOT? I THINK THERE IS A LEGAL -- THE IDEA THAT THERE ISN'T A LEGAL ARGUMENT THAT YOU SHOULD EITHER THROW THE WHOLE BALLOT AWAY OR COUNT THE WHOLE BALLOT I THINK IS A BIG PROBLEM. AND TO YOUR POINT, IF YOU RUN INTO OVERLAP WITH THE AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY ON 1,500 BALLOTS OUT OF 100,000, THEN YOU COUNT THOSE SPOILED.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IT WON'T BE 1,500 BALLOTS. IT WILL PROBABLY BE THREE-EIGHTHS OF THE BALLOTS ROUGHLY. I MAY BE OFF.

JAMIE ALTER: I'M SORRY, HOW MANY?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ABOUT THREE-EIGHTHS OF THE BALLOTS. SO IF THERE ARE 100,000, JUST TO MAKE IT EASY ARITHMETIC, IT WOULD PROBABLY BE 37,000 BALLOTS.

JAMIE ALTER: THAT VOTED FOR JOHN EDWARDS?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: NO. BECAUSE OF THE OVERLAP. I'M NOT GOING TO GET INTO IT. I'M NOT COMPETENT. MATH WAS A GOOD SUBJECT BUT NOT A GREAT SUBJECT.

JAMIE ALTER: MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE OVERLAP, IT WAS AN AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY AND ONE OF THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES.

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

JAMIE ALTER: RIGHT. JUST LIKE YOU COUNTED MY VOTE ON THE BALLOT MEASURES. YOU COUNTED THAT BECAUSE IT WAS CLEAR. YOU GOT THAT THAT'S MY VOTE ON THAT. MY VOTE FOR PRESIDENT IS CLEAR TOO.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: RIGHT. THANK YOU.

RICK JACOBS: MY NAME IS RICK JACOBS, I'M CHAIR OF THE COURAGE CAMPAIGN. THANK YOU, MR. YAROSLAVSKY, FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP ON THIS ISSUE, AND SUPERVISOR BURKE. TO ME, THIS IS REALLY SIMPLE. FIRST OF ALL, OUR LAWYERS GAVE YOU LAST NIGHT, STEVE REYES AND STEVE KAUFFMAN, GAVE TO ALL OF THE SUPERVISORS OUR RESPONSE TO MR. LOGAN'S LETTER YESTERDAY. WE THINK IT IS VERY SIMPLE, ACTUALLY. I THINK WHAT ROBIN SAID IS MORE OR LESS THE WAY TO DO IT. BUT THE BIGGEST ISSUE HERE IS WHAT YOU SAID, ZEV, WHICH IS THE PUBLIC TRUST. AND PEOPLE FIRST NEED TO KNOW WHAT THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM IS. DOING AN ESTIMATE THAT ESTIMATES THAT WE HAVE 49,500 VOTES THAT ARE IN QUESTION DOESN'T MAKE ANYBODY FEEL ANY BETTER. WHAT WE NEED TO DO RIGHT NOW FIRST IS TALLY ALL OF THE VOTES, FIGURE OUT OF THOSE 95,000 VOTES, HOW MANY OF THOSE PEOPLE VOTED FOR PRESIDENT? SET THE REST ASIDE. THEN, IF PEOPLE CAME PRECINCT BY PRECINCT, AS ROBIN SAID, SIGNED IN A BOOK AND ASKED FOR A DEMOCRATIC BALLOT AND NOBODY IN THAT PRECINCT ASKED FOR AN AMERICAN INDEPENDENT BALLOT, YOU CAN COUNT EVERY ONE OF THOSE. THERE'S NO QUESTION ABOUT IT. IF SOMEBODY ASKED FOR AN

AMERICAN INDEPENDENT BALLOT, WELL, WE CAN FIGURE OUT WHAT TO DO AFTER THAT. MY GUESS IS IT'S GOING TO BE TINY. SO THE BIGGEST THING IS TALLY, COUNT, AND DO IT FAST BEFORE THE ELECTION IS CERTIFIED. I'LL TELL YOU FROM OUR ORGANIZATION'S POINT OF VIEW, COURAGE CAMPAIGN IDENTIFIED THIS, OUR LAWYERS IDENTIFIED THIS A WEEK AGO MONDAY. WE'VE BEEN IN CONSTANT CONTACT WITH MR. LOGAN'S OFFICE. HERE'S THE ONE THING I DON'T UNDERSTAND. WHY WOULD ANYBODY WHOSE JOB IT IS TO DO ONE THING AND ONE THING ONLY, AND THAT'S COUNT VOTES, THAT'S HIS JOB. WHY WOULD HE NOT FIRST SAY "LET'S FIGURE OUT WHAT THE PROBLEM IS. LET'S TALLY. LET'S COUNT. THEN LET'S TALK TO THE LAWYERS OR TALK TO THEM ALONG THE WAY AND FIGURE OUT IF WE CAN LEGALLY INCLUDE THEM IN THE CERTIFIED VOTE." SO THOSE ARE TWO THINGS I WOULD ASK YOU TO DO. AND I WOULD ASK YOU TO INSTRUCT MR. LOGAN TO DO THAT FORTHWITH SO THAT WE DON'T END UP IN COURT OVER THIS. THE LAST POINT I WANT TO MAKE IS FROM A PURE POLITICAL AND AGAIN PUBLIC TRUST POINT OF VIEW. WE STARTED OUT -- ASKED OUR MEMBERS, WE HAVE ABOUT 100,000 MEMBERS NOW. WE ASKED THEM ONLINE, WE SAID "ARE YOU INTERESTED IN THIS?" IT TOOK US, IN 3-1/2 DAYS, WE'VE GOTTEN CLOSE TO 30,000 PEOPLE WHO HAVE SAID "WELL WHAT'S GOING ON IN THERE? I MEAN COUNT THE VOTES." SO AGAIN, OUR LAWYERS HAVE GIVEN YOU THEIR OPINION. WE THINK THAT THEY ARE RIGHT. YOU HAVE GREAT COUNSEL. THE SECRETARY OF STATE HAS GREAT COUNSEL. BUT THE BEST THING YOU ALL HAVE IS VERY, VERY GOOD PUBLIC POLICY AND POLITICAL

JUDGMENT. GIVE PEOPLE THE CONFIDENCE THAT THEIR VOTES ARE COUNTED AND THAT THEY'RE BEING PAID ATTENTION TO.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. YES, SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. CAN I ASK DEAN TO COME BACK UP FOR A SECOND?

RICK JACOBS: DO YOU WANT US TO EVACUATE?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YES. THANKS THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR FLOW OF INFORMATION. IT'S BEEN VERY HELPFUL. I'D LIKE YOU TO ADDRESS THE QUESTION THAT WAS RAISED BY ONE OF THE LADIES WHO WAS UP HERE A MINUTE AGO, I FORGET WHICH ONE, THAT SAID -- COULD YOU PROGRAM THE COMPUTER TO COUNT BALLOTS THAT WERE ONLY MARKED IN POSITION 11 THROUGH 18? NOT 8, 9 AND 10?

DEAN LOGAN: I BELIEVE THAT OUR TECHNICAL STAFF COULD CREATE A NEW ELECTION TO RUN THOSE THROUGH, YES, WITH THAT PARAMETER.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IS IT POSSIBLE TO DO THAT BEFORE THE CERTIFICATION PERIOD IS OVER?

DEAN LOGAN: I CAN'T ANSWER THAT FOR SURE. YES, I BELIEVE IT IS.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THE INTENT OF THE MOTION THAT I'VE CIRCULATED WAS TO UTILIZE THE 1 PERCENT AND AN ADDITIONAL SAMPLING PRECINCT BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO THAT. AND SHE RAISED AN INTERESTING POINT WHICH NEVER OCCURRED -- WELL IT MAY HAVE OCCURRED TO MY STAFF BUT WENT OVER MY HEAD. IS IF YOU COULD DO THIS, IF YOU COULD SEGREGATE OUT THE BALLOTS THAT ARE NOT THE IN THE OVERLAP CONDITION AND COUNT THE REMAINDER THROUGH THE MACHINE, THROUGH A COMPUTER, THEN YOU WOULDN'T HAVE TO HIRE 10,000 MINIMUM WAGE WORKERS TO LOOK AT EVERY BALLOT AND ALL THAT SORT OF THING. I MEAN IT SEEMS TO ME -- AND THIS IS AGAIN, SEPARATE FROM THE LEGAL ISSUE. YOU MAY NOT BE PERMITTED TO FACTOR THAT INTO THE ELECTION RESULT, YOU MAY OR MAY NOT, I DON'T KNOW. THAT'S A SEPARATE ISSUE. BUT AT LEAST THAT THE EFFORT WAS MADE TO DO THAT.

DEAN LOGAN: I CAN CERTAINLY CHECK.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: WOULD YOU LOOK INTO THIS AS PART OF THIS?

DEAN LOGAN: YES. THE ONE CAUTION, I WILL DEFINITELY LOOK INTO IT. BUT THE ONE CAUTION IS WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO SET THAT ELECTION UP WHEN THE OTHER ELECTION IS STILL RUNNING ON THE SYSTEM. BUT I'LL FIND THAT OUT AND GET BACK TO YOU.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IF YOU CAN, IT WOULD BE GREAT. IF YOU CAN'T, IF YOU HAVE TO WAIT UNTIL THE ELECTION CERTIFICATION IS OVER, I MEAN, THAT MAY BE THE POINT WHERE YOU SEEK JUDICIAL RELIEF.

DEAN LOGAN: RIGHT. BUT PREFERABLY -- HOW MANY COMPUTERS DO YOU USE TO COUNT THIS STUFF? IS IT ONE?

DEAN LOGAN: WE USE 36 SYSTEMS, 36 CARD READERS TO DO A COUNTY-WIDE ELECTION.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YOU FIGURE IT OUT. MAYBE YOU COULD TAKE ONE OF THEM. OR MAYBE SET UP -- I DON'T KNOW. I DON'T KNOW WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT WHEN IT COMES TO COMPUTERS. BUT MAYBE YOU COULD FIGURE OUT A WAY TO DO IT. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT'S SUCH AN EASY -- IT APPEARS TO BE A SIMPLE WAY TO RESOLVE THIS PROBLEM WITHOUT CREATING A MONSTER WORKLOAD FOR EVERYBODY. AND THEN THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THEY'RE COUNTABLE OR NOT, THAT'S A LEGAL ISSUE THAT MAYBE THEY'LL SUE, MAYBE WE'LL SUE, GET JUDICIAL RELIEF. BUT AT LEAST PEOPLE WILL FEEL THAT WHERE WE COULD COUNT THEM, WE COUNTED THEM. AND I JUST WANT TO SAY ONE MORE THING. WHERE THERE'S AN OVERLAP, IT'S GOING TO BE A PROBLEM. AND I THINK RICK, I'VE TALKED TO YOU ABOUT THIS. YOU RECOGNIZE THAT. I THINK OTHERS HAVE RECOGNIZED THAT. AND I HOPE THAT EVERYBODY RECOGNIZES IT. THERE'S GOING TO BE A GROUPING OF BALLOTS

THAT ARE SIMPLY -- THAT TIPS ON THE SIDE OF NOT COUNTING.
BUT I THINK THE BULK ARE COUNTABLE BY MY LAYMEN'S
DEFINITION. I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE LEGAL. SO IF YOU COULD
LOOK AT THAT AS PART OF THIS MOTION, I'D APPRECIATE IT.
THANK YOU.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: IS THERE A MOTION ON THIS?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I'VE CIRCULATED, AT THE END OF THE DAY, I
CIRCULATED THE WRITTEN MOTION BECAUSE I THINK IT LAYS
EVERYTHING OUT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: ON THE MAIN MOTION, ON 14 AND 15?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SO WOULD I BE AMENDING 14 AND 15? IT
WOULD BE SEPARATE, RIGHT?

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: 14. OKAY. IS THERE A MOTION TO APPROVE
14?

SUP. KNABE: I'LL MOVE IT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SECOND.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED AND SECONDED ON 14. AS AMENDED.

SUP. KNABE: AS AMENDED IN WHICH WAY HERE? THERE'S BEEN A LOT OF DISCUSSION.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: WITH ZEV'S AMENDMENT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: MY AMENDMENT IS NOT TO 14 AND 15. I'M GOING TO MAKE A MOTION, THAT WE MAKE A FINDING THAT IT CAME UP AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA, SEPARATE AND APART FROM 14 AND 15 AND HTEN APPROVE IT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SEPARATE FROM IT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: IT'S THE ONE YOU HAVE IN WRITING BEFORE YOU.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: SO WE ARE TAKING THIS AS AN EMERGENCY THAT CAME UP. WELL, LET'S TAKE 14 AND 15 FIRST. IS THERE A MOTION ON 14?

SUP. KNABE: I MOVED.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: SECOND.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED AND SECONDED BY ANTONOVICH WITHOUT OBJECTION ON 14. ON 15?

SUP. DON KNABE: MOVE IT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED BY KNABE, SECONDED BY ANTONOVICH, WITHOUT OBJECTION, 15. NOW AN ITEM HAS COME UP WITHIN LESS THAN 48 HOURS. IS THERE A MOTION BY SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY?

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I'LL MOVE THAT WE MAKE THE FINDING THAT CAME TO OUR ATTENTION AFTER THE POSTING OF THE AGENDA.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: AND SECONDED BY ANTONOVICH. WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED. NOW YOUR MOTION IS BEFORE US.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: I WOULD MOVE IT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: MOVED AND SECONDED. WITHOUT OBJECTION, IT'S ADOPTED.

SUP. KNABE: AND THAT'S ALL WITHIN EXISTING RESOURCES.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: YEAH. IF HE NEEDS ANY MORE RESOURCES, HE GOING TO HAVE TO COME BACK. I MEAN THAT GOES WITHOUT SAYING.

SUP. KNABE: YEAH, I MEAN, I UNDERSTAND WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO, AND I WANT TO BE AS HELPFUL AS POSSIBLE, BUT THERE IS A CERTAIN VOTER RESPONSIBILITY INVOLVED IN THIS, AS WELL, TOO.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: THAT'S ANOTHER SUBJECT.

SUP. BURKE, CHAIR: I'M GOING TO CALL UP ITEM 11 AND I AM GOING TO PASS OUT AN AMENDMENT.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY: MADAME CHAIR, JUST ON THE RESOURCE ISSUE, IF IT'S A RELATIVELY SMALL AMOUNT OF RESOURCES, I MEAN, I'M SURE THE C.E.O. WILL WORK WITH HIM TO FACILITATE THAT. IF WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS, IT'S A DIFFERENT STORY, BUT IF IT'S \$50,000 TO RESOLVE THIS THING, I WOULD ASSUME YOU WOULD WORK WITH HIM TO GET THAT DONE.

C.E.O. FUJIOKA: YES, WE'LL TAKE CARE OF THAT.