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 (Attending)

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

Keith Taylor, Treasurer (CAA Treasurer), Assessor Ventura County, 800 S. Victoria Ave, Ventura, CA 93009 (Attending)

Craig Kay, (Small County Member) Assessor Siskiyou County, 311 4th Street #108, Yreka, CA 96097 (Attending)

Kristen De Paul, (CAA President) Assessor/Recorder Modoc County, 204 Court Street, Suite 106, Alturas, CA 96101 (Attending)

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

John Tuteur, (Medium County Member), Assessor/Clerk/Recorder/Registrar 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)

Wednesday June 3, 2026

Special Board Meeting
1:30 PM-2:30 PM

California County Assessors' Information Technology Authority Board Meeting
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

This is virtual meeting, with public access also available at the
Board Member locations noted above as attending.
https://zoom.us/j/92567206389?pwd=N2XwczoHAzuL3bhAavsE3LJ3EJiwQz.1

Meeting ID: 925 6720 6389
Passcode: 421980

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

   Phong La: Absent
   Steve Bestolarides: Present
   Keith Taylor: Present
   Craig Kay: Present
   Kristen de Paul: Present
   Marina Camacho: Present (joined late)
   John Tuteur: Present
   Jennifer Perry: Present
   Don Gaekle: Present

2. **Approval of the Minutes** — **Don Gaekle**

a. April 15, 2026 (Mission Inn, Riverside)

Motion to Approve by Assessor Tuteur.

Seconded by Assessor Taylor.

Phong La: Absent
Steve Bestolarides: Abstain – did not see the minutes
Keith Taylor: Y
Craig Kay: Y
Kristen de Paul: Y
Marina Camacho: Absent
John Tuteur: Y
Jennifer Perry: Y
Don Gaekle: Y

3. Public Comment **Don Gaekle**

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

4. Executive Director Report **Rob Grossglauser**

Rob Grossglauser: Short report – many a thank you to Keith and Luz for helping us finish up the insurance items and policies. The other thank you goes to Mona for helping us with the State Controller's Office. One of the filings, via a notice that was late from us, stated that they will be doing a site visit because there was documentation that was missing. We have corrected this with the SCO and also updated the address so that all communication from the SCO will come directly to my office at my office address. Happy to answer questions.

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

a. Progress Status/Update from Ad Hoc Committee Chair and Project Manager
    i. John Tuteur/Justin Winn

John Tuteur: The ad hoc committee has been meeting for a long time and working on the RFP then the scoring of the responses, now we are in the vendor selection phase. We have made great progress in this phase; we have Justin Winn who remains our Project Manager, has been working on the vendor selection and we have Gartner, the consulting on the vendor selection. We will have a report to the board in the near future as we have a few items that need to still be cleared up. The purpose of today's meeting is for the board and anybody who is attending to review a proposal from Gartner to provide what are called Project Manager Quality Assurance Services for once a contract is signed with a vendor. It is the committee's recommendation that the board adopt the amendment to the Gartner contract. I'd like to turn it over to Justin who will then turn it over to Chris Ragan at Gartner.

Justin Winn: I want to thank all the volunteers from every county that participated. I have never met a more caring, concerned, engaged leadership group than the ad hoc committee. In the background as

we are working through our due diligence, it is the next key in doing all that we can to give us the best chances of success. The history of large enterprise projects has concluded with one of the ost of the failures, is that there was no third-party integrator. We would not have been able to do this without the volunteers, the leadership, and Gartner. This is the best scenario in my mind and over two years ago when I wrote the prospective, and what I wrote as being the greatest risk. With that, thank you everybody and I thank you for your time and the trust that you have placed with me. I am going to pass it over to Chris.

b. Presentation by Gartner, Inc. for proposed Program Management Quality Assurance amendment to the current support agreement

Chris Ragan: We have been doing this for a while now and it has been refreshingly collaborative and wonderful to move forward. I want to bring forth our proposal that is based on Gartner's research. We have been doing research for 47 years now and one of the items are titled 'Why Projects Fail' and based on this, since we advise civic governments, public sector clients, the goal of that research is to not let that happen where it affects all of us. I am going to put up a presentation here that walks through what it is that we see what makes sense to move forward with.

In brief, what we call Program Management Quality Assurance (PMQA) is tailored support for the program management team where we participate in the project and provide advice and support. Gartner, Inc., is the world leader in business technology research and are the consulting arm. We remain independent and have no conflicts of interest. This slide I am showing shows the research that Gartner has done. Without PMQA, 7% of projects are completed below budget but with PMQA it goes up to 55%. Only 12% of projects are completed on time without PMQA but is 60% with PMQA.

Our proposal is to join you in that roll and to help you all scope based on what is allowed and what is deliverable. Our PMQA will enable prevention of issues and identify those risks, we will offer practitioner experience and reduce project complexities. This next slide shows the steps that we will take to be successful. I will not be reading the fine print so feel free to screenshot. The mindset and vision, executive leadership from you all and your commitment, managing the resources across vendors, contracts, internal, etc., is something that Justin has done very well with all of you. Lastly, we need to ensure we communicate and engage and that we are intentional change management about what is coming, how it rolls out, and the way it works.

Our goal remains to be proactive, and evidence based and rooted in the research. We need this to then honestly push forward. Day to day, our engagement plan would be to be in all the meetings and participate in all formal and informal meetings. This next slide shows what is ahead between 18-24 months. The investment, because that is always a question – for us to do this under our existing contract is a monthly amount and we do not work ahead. We work under a retainer scenario where we can continue to do so for the next 18-24 months. Open to any questions.

Don Gaekle: Any board members with questions?

Steve Bestolarides: Again, Rob if you stay on afterwards, I want to talk about what I don't have….what you are basically saying is that Gartner is going to be a project managing partner and it's going to be a 2-2.1-million-dollar collaborative to ensure that we get deliverables done on time. Is this how I understand it?

Chris Ragan: That is correct, but we don't work ahead so it will be on a monthly basis.

Steve Bestolarides: How do you bill that? How does the work get assigned?

Chris Ragan: We have been already working for 2 years now, and the invoices are done through the actual JPA. On a staffing perspective, we work closely with Justin and will continue to do so with him along with the executive team to work on meeting the needs of the county base.

Steve Bestolarides: At what point do we bring the board in because at this point there's been a lot of action with the ad hoc committee and I am grateful that, but it may be that I am a board member, but I have not received a lot of information and it may be that it's in my junk mail. I have not received anything for this meeting and just had my assistant look to. The touch point by the board, and the 18-24 months or however long it will take, I would appreciate more feedback and more information to the board because this is a public process. The more public and transparent that we are, we will have time for more input. Again, mine may be due to email issues but that's how I feel.

John Tuteur: If I can jump in, as chair of the ad hoc committee, I appreciate what you said and getting to the nub of this on how much it will cost. From the perspective of the ad hoc committee, we are willing to serve through the award of the contract and through the actual delivery of the platform. In your case, those dashboards include regular reports so there will be reports to the board and members of the JPA as well. We will eventually be on a schedule with the board to show you everything and all of the communication that was had once we choose a vendor. That will be laid out at the time a contract is awarded, and you will see exactly what the PMQA will do and what we are investing in. This project is competitive and this is a reasonable charge, and this is why I am going to make a motion soon to move this forward. There are other firms who do this but we did not do an RFP as we have been working with them and have an existing contract so all that was necessary was an amendment to the contract.

Steve Bestolarides: So, the existing contract was not competitively bid?

Rob Grossglauser: The existing contract was competitively bid through what we call in California a Leveraged Procurement Agreement (LPA). That LPA was utilized by the JPA for Gartner and what John is alluding to is that the same agreement will be what we use for this Gartner extension as well. And, to your earlier question, I don't have anything on this presentation as this is the first time I am seeing this as well, as designed. This is the first for most of us to see.

Chris Ragan: I'd also like to add, Steve, that part of the work we will do here is have a dashboard so if you have any questions, you can get answers in real time.

Rob Grossgluaser: Chris, do you foresee any issues with the dashboard being publicly available? I'd assume it's a no but do you also see any materials on there that could be a cybersecurity issue? If so, is this something we should bring in our legal counsel to be involved with, so we know exactly what needs to be publicly available etc.,

Chris Ragan: There are policies and procedures in statute in the state of CA and locally that do feed into sensitive information being made publicly available. What will be seen as sensitive and confidential will be restricted to the public or those who cannot see it. You are always open to ask about anything.

Kristen de Paul: Assessors are a very fiscally conservative group. The ad hoc committee did not take a $2 million dollar price tag lightly at all. We went back and forth about it a lot before taking a recommendation to the board, but a failed project would cost us more. Another thing is that we are all very busy individuals and so are our SMEs so we can't always help Justin. We feel like Justin needs the support because it's a big project, and that's how we came to this conclusion but it was not taken lightly.

c. Subcommittee recommendation for Board action to proceed with an amended agreement with Gartner, Inc.

John Tuteur: I am going to make my motion to authorize the board and the chair to sign amendment to Gartner contract to provide PMQA services upon execution of the contract with the selected vendor.

Kristen de Paul: Seconded.

Steve Bestolarides: So, your motion is to sign the amendments?

Don Gaekle: John's motion is to approve the concept and give the Board the authority to formalize and make the agreement on behalf of the board.

Steve Bestolarides: So that's the thing and I don't want to hold things up, but we are essentially saying let's just do it and then whatever happens will happen.

John Tuteur: Steve that was the point of the presentation from Gartner. You have seen the key points in that presentation. We have also done this in the past to allow the Chair to sign with legal counsel to extend the contracts.

Don Gaekle: Yes, we have done this before and are usually legal terms and certain contract issues regarding responsibilities and liabilities that attorney's worry about and that's usually the only thing that gets changed before I sign it. Okay – any comments on this from the public before we call for a vote?

Phong La: Absent
Steve Bestolarides: Y
Keith Taylor: Y
Craig Kay: Y
Kristen de Paul: Y
Marina Camacho: Y – joined the meeting late.
John Tuteur: Y
Jennifer Perry: Y
Don Gaekle: Y

Motion passes.

John Tuteur: Want to thank Justin and Chris for helping us bring this forward and for getting us to this point.

6. **Announcements** **Don Gaekle**

Don Gaekle: No announcements.

John Tuteur: I am also the chair of the ad hoc committee on future projects and we are currently working with counsel and Rob to figure out what we are going to do as it relates to shared systems.

7. **Adjourn** **Don Gaekle**

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.