California County Assessors' Information Technology Authority board

Board of Directors

Don H. Gaekle, Chair - (Large County Member), Assessor Stanislaus County, 1010 10th Street Suite 2400, Modesto, CA 95350 (Attending)

Phong La, (Coordinating Assessor & Secretary), Assessor Alameda County, 1221 Oak Street, Room 145, Oakland, CA 94612

Steve Bestolarides, (Large County Member), Assessor San Joaquin County, 44 North San Joaquin Street, 2nd Floor, Suite 230, Stockton, CA 95202 (Attending)

Keith Taylor, Treasurer (CAA Treasurer), Assessor Ventura County, 800 S. Victoria Ave, Ventura, CA 93009 (Not Attending)

Craig Kay, (Small County Member) Assessor Siskiyou County, 311 4th Street #108, Yreka, CA 96097 (Not Attending)

Kristen DePaul, (CAA President) Assessor Modoc County, 204 Court Street, Suite 106, Alturas, CA 96101 (Attending)

Marina Camacho, (Medium County Member), Assessor Monterey County, 168 W Alisal Street, First Floor, Salinas, CA 93901 (Attending)

John Tuteur, (Medium County Member), Assessor Napa County, 1127 First Street, Suite A, Napa CA 94559 (Attending)

Jennifer Perry, (Small County Member), Assessor Del Norte County, 981 H Street, Suite 120, Crescent City, CA 95531 (Attending)

July 30, 2026

Special Board Meeting
4:00 PM – 5:00 PM

California County Assessors' Information Technology Authority Board Meeting

Virtual Meeting via Zoom

https://zoom.us/j/96831919489?pwd=07gB118eDDalKectK5Ia44gvEqJMCs.1
Meeting ID: 968 3191 9489
Passcode: 148348

In-person public access is available at the Board Member locations noted above.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call** — **Don Gaekle**

   Don Gaekle: Present
   Kristen DePaul: Present
   Steve Bestolarides: Present
   John Tuteur: Present
   Phong La: Present
   Jennifer Perry:
   Craig Kay: Present
   Keith Taylor:
   Marina Camacho: Present

2. **Public Comment** — **Don Gaekle**

   Members of the public may comment on topics not listed on the agenda. Time limit 3 minutes per speaker.

3. RFP Ad Hoc Committee Presentation **John Tuteur, Kristen De Paul, Phong La**

a. Presentation on scoring of RFP submissions
    i. John Tuteur (Ad Hoc Committee Chair) & Justin Winn (Project Manager)
b. CCAITA Ad Hoc Committee recommends adoption of Intent to Award Contract to Oracle Inc. for a consumption-based Oracle Cloud Infrastructure (OCI) platform, a transparent negotiated 10-year total cost of $17,047,140.79 and a phased, reasonable cost implementation and maintenance approach that directly addresses the Authority's requirements for all 58 counties. (Staff report attached)

John Tuteur: As Chair of Ad Hoc committee that has been working on this for the last couple of years, on the process for the prop 19 transfer and exemptions portals up and running, we are at the point that we were receiving RFPs. Those responses were reviewed in a thorough matter by the SMEs in various counties. Purpose of today's meeting is to recommend adoption of intent to award contract to Oracle. The final contract is still under negotiation with the attorney for the JPA, the vendor Oracle, and our consultants Gartner, and PM Justin Winn. We expect these negotiations to be done by our next meeting on August 6th.

We have decided/approved that we will continue work with our PM Justin Winn, and consultant at Gartner Chris to oversee the implementation. We hope to go live in 2027 with the portal active and available to all counties. We are not sure who the preliminary counties will be but it will all be part of reports to this board once the contract is awarded.

Another item for today's meeting is the continuity of members.

My motion will be, it's not on the floor yet, but will be: CCAITA issue an intent to award to Oracle America Inc., the contract for the statewide Prop 19 and Exemption System. Oracle's proposal provides the strongest overall value through proven production experience in LA County, a consumption-based Oracle Cloud Infrastructure (OCI) platform, a transparent negotiated 10-year total costs of $17, 047,140.79 and a phased, reasonable cost implementation and maintenance approach that directly addresses the Authority's requirements for all 58 counties.

Public Comment:

Susan Silverman: I am a CA homeowner and long-term resident. I am here because of the intention to award a $17 million dollar award to Oracle. I have three questions:
1. What are the criteria and how was this scored and is it transparent to the public?
2. Was this the cheapest option? If not, how much more was it more than the other options?
3. Does the whole Assessor committee take the responsibility of this recommendation?

John Tuteur: We have volumes of material on how the selection was made. They are available and can be given to you if you request. I can give you my email and send all of this information to you but it might be more documents than your computer can take. I can be your point of contact and continue to provide you anything you need.

To your second question, this was the cheapest option. In terms of the ten-year cost and the long-term operation and maintenance costs, this was the most reasonable for the 58 counties to take this one. To your third question, the committee was unanimous on that decision. You will see later when my motion is made that it will be seconded and voted on by all board members that are present.

Susan Silverman: So, is it too early to ask that the entire committee takes on the responsibility of this recommendation?

John Tuteur: That is what the vote will be today. But this is also just for an intent to award. Our next meeting on August 6th at 10am will be where you can see everyone who is behind this recommendation. The broader Association gave some of us the role to represent them with Assessors representing small counties, medium-size counties, and large counties. Thank you for joining this call.

Laura Avila: I have a few questions on this – why a ten year? This is a long contract with technology changing drastically. Even since we started this project, three years ago, things have changed drastically. I am asking this because right now I am going through a termination of a contract for the Recorders office. I lost money on the way, and cannot imagine being in a ten-year contract with a vendor. I also want to make sure we have a strong out-clause that if they are not performing, we can get out of the contract. Lastly, how can we agree and approve something if we don't have a timeline; John you said sometime in 2027.

John Tuteur: Main reason for ten-year contract gives the authority the ability to finance this overtime rather than pushing the costs onto counties. All counties without contribution, will be able to join this platform and that because the authority will be able to do so. I understand your concerns for the length of the contract but that was the main reason for this. I have not looked at every term of our contract but our attorney will be doing so. On the recorder side and election side, we have worked with Megabyte for long-term contracts and have had no problems. I've never worked with Oracle, but will ensure that the contract reflects that partnership and out-clause/termination clauses on performance. As for the timeline for implementation, that will be shown later on in the meeting.

Don Gaekle: Bringing it back to the board, any comments?

Assessor Steve Bestolarides: Mine is more comments than questions on the process. Today is a good example that some have a general idea of what's going on and some of us don't. For obvious reasons such as the Brown Act, but from my perspective, that's where I feel I have been frustrated because we get summaries and synopsis of processes, but my SMEs that did the scoring did it without divulging what the scoring was. Their expression of their scoring and understanding of the process was much different than what was recommendation. I am not doubting what was said, but this process has only been summaries to board members and members of the JPA and the ability to interact has been severely impacted because of the lack of information and lack of board meetings that we've had. As far as next steps, the board will authorize the Chair to sign the contract when we haven't even seen the contract. We are taking action to essentially award the contract but not award it through an intent to award and I wish I was more informed to make a good decision rather than an intent to award.

John Tuteur: Because of the Brown Act, we have asked our PM to go over whatever detail at whatever length with any Board Members on the process, and two Board Members did not join those meetings – one being you. Multiple attempts were made to contact all board members. That was one major opportunity that you've asked for was not acted on.

Steve Bestolarides: I was given a short timeframe to respond and picking us off individually, rather than having a real joint meeting is the problem. I don't view a team concept like that.

John Tuteur: That's the reason for this meeting. We wanted every board member to be briefed publicly as it relates to how we got to the intent to award. I think we have done the best we can. I haven't spoken to Chair

Gaekle or the attorney as to what detail the contract will be in, so I agree with you that we should see the contract. I don't see a reason why we won't be able to but I don't know the timing as to when we will see that.

Justin Winn: What you are looking at here [shared screen] is right-sizing the efforts to each individual county. This is a general view of the approach of an enterprise deployment. This graph shows the work that is left on the front end and this is relative to the data. Counties will be different and the systems will be different, making integration different. We are currently negotiating with Oracle and they have met us at the deliverable level. A good intent to award is not done without negotiations. What I can tell you is that if we go all the way back to the beginning, the biggest concern is the contract and the statement of work. We are in that final stage of Oracle going back and forth on the iterations. We can drill down even deeper into every phase deliverable by deliverable if necessary. As far as the schedule, what you will see when they give us their final version of the contract, they will have the drill down to the WBS level where it is deliverable by deliverable for everything that they have to do. They will go down to the first cohort of 5-6 counties and that process is repeatable.

John Tuteur: What do you think the first cohort timing is?

Justin Winn: Depending on the counties and the level that the portal comes up, for smaller counties, it can be at the time from when the portal is ready and up and can be as short as 90 days depending on the complexity of the counties and can go as long as 9 months. We won't know until we receive more from Oracle but there have been zero red flags so far from the legal team. Oracle has until close of business on August 3rd.

Laura Avila: I have more questions but not sure if I can ask since we've moved onto board comments.

Phong La: Don has the authority to bring us back to public comment.

Don Gaekle: Moving us back to public comment.

Laura Avila: So, if I heard this correctly, Oracle will work with every individual county to bring them onto the portal? My county is on a mainframe, so, if this is a ten-year contract, and if my county gets a new system, how will my county get implemented into a new system while I am technically in contract with Oracle under this authority?

Justin Winn: The JPA brought it up that things will change. So, we went to the vendors and presented this scenario. In this specific case goes down to that new contract for that new system would need to integrate with what already exists. Nothing will infringe on new development for counties. The portal will work with homegrown, or biggest systems in the state, Oracle is on board to work with all systems and all new systems.

Laura Avila: Are there other counties that are currently not included that can join later on?

John Tuteur: Yes, counties will be included even if they are not in the JPA. This was just the platform to get us there.

Justin Winn: From the purview of my chair and the role in this – Steve, I heard from you. If Oracle gets this contract, I will get with you individually and collectively once we get into execution mode. As far as the experience to date, the organization and design of communication is very different and was orchestrated entirely from me so that we can be aware to not go against the Brown Act. For everybody here, if there is a break down on communication, that is on me, Justin.

Shelly Scott: Will we be emailed Justin's slides?

Justin Winn: I can make those available.

John Tuteur: We have a comment in the chat from Lauren Chapman asking if the public can obtain detailed scores and costs from all vendors. I will input my email into the chat and I will be her point of contact.

Don Gaekle: John, anything else from you.

Rob Grossglauser: One thing from my comments from legal counsel is that we either put the scoring on the website and make it publicly accessible to everyone via our website or it can be PRA.

John Tuteur: Chair Gaekle, can we add this to our August 6th meeting so we can decide on how we want to move forward with this.

Steve Bestolarides: Wouldn't we want this decision to be made before we award the contract?

John Tuteur: In my experience, it's usually after. But it's not on today's agenda so I don't think we can make this decision.

Don Gaekle: I will follow up with our counsel.

John Tuteur: Ms. Chapman asked another question on whether we will post this on our website. The answer is that once we talk with counsel we will go from there and give her and everyone else an answer.

John Tuteur – Motion:
Motion to recommend that the California County Assessors' Information Technology Authority (Authority) issue an Intent to Award to Oracle America, Inc. the contract for the Statewide Proposition 19 & Exemptions System (RFP #01-25). Oracle's proposal provides the strongest overall value through proven production experience in Los Angeles County, a consumption-based Oracle Cloud Infrastructure (OCI) platform, a transparent negotiated 10-year total cost of $17,047,140.79 and a phased, reasonable cost implementation and maintenance approach that directly addresses the Authority's requirements for all 58 counties.

Kristen DePaul: Seconded.

Don Gaekle: Y
Kristen DePaul: Y
Steve Bestolarides: N
John Tuteur: Y
Phong La: Y
Jennifer Perry:
Craig Kay: Y
Keith Taylor:
Marina Camacho: Y

Don Gaekle: Motion Passes 6-1

c. CCAITA Ad Hoc Committee recommends continuance of an Ad Hoc Committee to oversee the Project Management, Quality Assurance and Implementation processes once the contract is signed. (Staff Report Attached)

John Tuteur – Motion:

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the full Board continue the existence of an Ad Hoc Committee during these next phases. The three current members of the committee are willing to serve in that capacity. The Board can consider expanding or changing the membership of the committee during discussion of this item.

Don Gaekle: Well, we have an Ad Hoc committee and the contract has not been awarded so we technically still have an Ad Hoc committee. Perhaps we add this to our August 6th meeting.

John Tuteur: That is a good idea Chair Gaekle. Since you recommend and appoint members, perhaps folks can send you recommendations prior to the August 6th meeting.

Don Gaekle: Anyone can send in suggestions to me and I will think about this. We can bring this back on August 6th.

4. Announcements **Don Gaekle**

Don Gaekle: As of July 1, Riverside County is no longer a member of the JPA so I want to make that clear since this is our first meeting since then.

5. Adjourn **Don Gaekle**

Don Gaekle: Adjourned at 5:01pm.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Compliance: Individuals requiring special accommodations to participate in this meeting are requested to contact the Chair at gaekled@stancounty.com . Notification as soon as possible prior to the meeting will enable the Board to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. Office addresses listed for each Director are for reference only.