

# CALIFORNIA COUNTY ASSESSORS' INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AUTHORITY BOARD

## Board of Directors

**Don H. Gaekle, Chair** - (Large County Member), Assessor Stanislaus County, 1010 10<sup>th</sup> Street Suite 2400, Modesto, CA 95350 (**In-Person**)

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

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

**Keith Taylor, Treasurer** (CAA Treasurer), Assessor Ventura County, 800 S. Victoria Ave, Ventura, CA 93009 (**In-Person**)

**Jeff Prang**, (CAA President), Assessor Los Angeles County, 500 W. Temple Street, Room 225, Los Angeles, CA 90025 (**In-Person**)

**Kristen De Paul**, (Small County Member), Assessor/Recorder Modoc County, 204 Court Street, Suite 106, Alturas, CA 96101 (**In-Person**)

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

**John Tuteur**, (Medium County Member), Assessor/Clerk/Recorder/Registrar Napa County, 1127 First Street, Suite A, Napa CA 94559 (**In-Person**)

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

**Tuesday, October 7, 2025**

**Regular Board Meeting**

**3:45PM**

## **California County Assessors' Information Technology Authority Board Meeting Minutes**

**Knott's Hotel - 7675 Crescent Ave, Buena Park, CA 90620**

**This is a hybrid, in-person/virtual meeting. Public access will also be available at:**

Assessor Alameda County, 1221 Oak Street, Room 145, Oakland, CA 94612

Assessor Del Norte County, 981 H Street, Suite 120, Crescent City, CA 95531

Main street, Kokkari 831 00, Greece (Coordinates 37.777227, 26.894625)

<https://zoom.us/j/6615679410?pwd=MIQ5M1UvVTRfbmlkMlFRbFYzSnh1UT09&omn=96144920366>

**Meeting ID: 661 567 9410**

**Passcode: 433131**

### **1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

**Don Gaekle**

Don Gaekle: Present

Phong La: Present

Steve Bestolarides: Present

Keith Taylor: Present

Jeff Prang: Present  
Kristen De Paul: Present  
Marina Camacho: Present  
John Tuteur: Present  
Jennifer Perry: Present

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

**a. August 5, 2025**

**Don Gaekle**

Don Gaekle: Yes  
Phong La: Yes  
Steve Bestolarides: Yes  
Keith Taylor: Yes  
Jeff Prang: Yes  
Kristen De Paul: Yes  
Marina Camacho: Yes  
John Tuteur: Yes  
Jennifer Perry: Yes

Minutes Approved.

**3. Public Comment**

**Don Gaekle**

**N/A**

**4. Executive Director Report**

**Rob Grossglauser**

Rob Grossglauser: We decided the Executive Directors Report would be our year 3 report to the Department of Finance. We have submitted that report to the Department of Finance and we plan to continue to do so as we progress with the report if needed.

Question: Could you circulate your annual report to the Board?

Answer: Yes, it should have been included in the packet and is posted online. It is available for the public as well.

**5. Financials**

**Keith Taylor**

**a. Treasurer's Report**

**b. Q3 Financial Statements**

**c. Audit Update**

Keith Taylor: I have the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter report to go over today and the 2025 financial statements. Interest earning 4/29 from the Wells Fargo account \$291,415.74 for our Cal Trust. Public disbursements for the quarter are \$375,756.40. We paid some attorney fees, our project manager, used it for our office in

general, administrations, and contracting professional services. Our Wells Fargo account balance as of September 30<sup>th</sup> is \$149,192.42 and our CalTrust account is \$46,708,366.72 and interest is \$291,215.74.

Moving on to the financial data statement, we showed our total expenses there \$375,756.40. Our interest of \$291,420.03. Our reserve is set at \$26,852,558.94 and we had accounts payable for the quarter at \$65,265 with our total equity being at \$26,787,292.94. Our cash disbursements are on Best Best & Krieger LLP, Bill.Com, Gartner Inc., GoDaddy, QuickBooks payments, and TekSystems.

That concludes the financial report. Now, to report out the audit that is being conducted for June 30, 2023- June 30, 2024, it is in progress with the audit team. They have asked us for additional information and we have provided that to them. We are hoping to wrap this up soon.

## 6. RFP Ad Hoc Committee Presentation

**John Tuteur, Kristen De Paul, Phong La**

- a. **Progress Status/Update** on Proposition 19 & Exemptions System (RFP# 01-25) from Project Staff (Justin for the JPA, Kyle for Gartner)
- b. **Recommended JPA Board Action Items**
  - i. Approve Final Selection of Vendor and Contract Negotiation
  - ii. Authorize continued participation of Project Manager and Gartner in this phase
  - iii. Authorize Gartner to use their negotiating team at an additional cost, if required.

John Tuteur: The Ad Hoc Committee has been observing and participating in the responses to the RFP. There were two scoring sets. One scoring set was the SMEs and the scores of the written proposals, and the second set of scoring possibilities were the presentation. All of those figures have been submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee is myself and Phong La representing the exemptions side and Kristen representing the Prop 19 side and we are ready to ask the board to take steps to implement the next stages of the RFP process which is the eventual award of the contract to someone to perform the services that the RFP set forth.

Justin Winn: Just wanted to give you guys some date points first on behalf of the entire project team, John, Kristen, Phong, and Don. Also, a hat tip to Rob and Luz and to our partners at Gartner. I wanted to share with you beyond what you guys have heard so far. We are still in process, so to date, this started on January 13<sup>th</sup> - 267 days, 38 weeks, or just under 10 months ago. In this process, we've gone through the actual evaluation. A little over 395 meeting hours, 504 plus hours of finalized review individual, over 290 hours spent viewing the oral presentations. All that rolled up in the 5 dimensions of approximately 18 people working in siloed isolation; this means for months they worked by themselves going through every detail to come up with their best opinion of all of the proposers. So, that comes out to be just a little over 1,000 data points that were analyzed over the course of almost 10 months. And the selection we have, I will say, falls on the shoulders of very confident, capable people. We are on track with no changes to the process and we are ready for the next stage. I will hand it over to Kyle.

Kyle Hiatt: To add comments on the process, our goal has been to have a structured and transparent process for the vendors, for the folks acting as SMEs and scorers to know what was coming and what their responsibilities would be to both the JPA and to make sure this was seen as a fair and competitive

solicitation from the get-go. So just a little bit about how the proposals were scored. We used 6 criteria that were rated by priority. Of those 6 criteria, the weights of those criteria were communicated in the RFP itself. So, we looked at the scores, the proposer company and staff experience. We looked at the business functionality and technical functionality that was being proposed in the solutions. We looked at the implementation approach, the maintenance and operations, and the post implementation approach. Lastly, cost was a factor that was taken into consideration. As John mentioned, we went through two phases. First, there were 12 scorers across those 6 criteria - the scorers looked at the written proposals that were submitted, and each vendor was given a score. Four vendors moved forward into the oral presentation stage, and those presentations were also scored. We used an online evaluation tool where the scorers went in and submitted their responses on a 0-5 scale, organized by those criteria I mentioned before. Then, those scores across the written phase and the oral presentation phase were tabulated together, and we were left with a combined photo score for each of the vendors. That's what we've been using to advance from stage to stage. In terms of next steps, pending the deliberations of the Board today, we would move into a contract negotiation stage with both the finalist vendors.

John Tuteur: Bringing it back, I am going to have a motion. Before I do that, I'd like to give the floor to Kristne De Paul to add anything on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Kristen De Paul: The Ad Hoc Committee wanted to thank the SMEs and the scorers because they put a lot of hours into this and we really appreciate everything that they did. They deserve our appreciation. We also want to thank the Assessors that allowed their staff to take time to do this.

John Tuteur: My motion is to ask the Board of the JPA to authorize the Ad Hoc Committee to move forward with negotiation of the finalist vendors to use the services of the project manager and Gartner in that process. Finally, to allow Gartner, if needed, in the process to bring in their specialist negotiating team at an additional cost with what our normal cost would be with Gartner and the project manager and to bring us back a contract whenever it's ready.

Steve Bestolarides: Is it in the negotiations with the vendors, are there some objectives or any kind of information that we're going to get about what's being negotiated? What are they negotiating and what will it entail?

John Tuteur: As I understand it, the next step is that we have best and final offers from the finalists. That will be the starting point from their perspective; it's not our starting point. I believe that the Ad Hoc Committee has an understanding with the project manager and Gartner of our goals, which is to bring in a contract that meets the needs of the portal, at a cost that is affordable not just for the initial cost of the JPA but also the O&M operation and maintenance cost. Once it's turned over to the JPA, those costs are not covered by the funds that we were given and will be the responsibility of the counties that decide to use the portal. So, Justin and Kyle, perhaps I can ask you to chime in as to what you expect on the reporting back to the Ad Hoc Committee on your progress and how the committee will respond to the committee with our progress.

Justin Wynn: As we progress, we will keep very similar to our cadence that we had before; it will be bi-monthly. The intention is to get the most competitive contract so that we can meet the needs. From all

parts encompassing, which I just said, from the actual implementation cost, application cost, to the maintenance cost. What we will be doing over the next several weeks is preparing for those conversations with the various vendors that are moving forward. We do have an aggressive schedule to try to get at least a draft for the one that we will be moving forward with by the end of the year. That is pushing it; we do know that there's a limited number of actual working days between now and the first of the year because of the holidays. We'll keep our foot on the gas as much as we possibly can and respect everybody's schedules. We'll keep everybody posted as we have before on the previous three phases; we'll keep that going every other week.

Steve Bestolarides: Since you have the last and best offer, I am assuming the negotiations are going to be the details about the deliverables and the timing of that and the O&M ongoing basis.

Justin Wynn: Yes, not just the triple constraints but it will also be the administrative as well.

John Tuteur: The best and final offer is the vendors, and it's not our offer. The Ad Hoc Committee has had brief conversations with our PM and our government consultants, and they have a good idea of what the numbers should be for a project of this size. There is nothing set in stone – their number is going to be our number.

Steve Bestolarides: I appreciate the detail and follow up.

Don Gaekle: We have a motion on the table. Are there any comments from the public or the board. If none, we will vote on Don's motion.

Don Gaekle: Yes

Phong La: Yes

Steve Bestolarides: Yes

Keith Taylor: Yes

Jeff Prang: Yes

Kristen De Paul: Yes

Marina Camacho: Yes

John Tuteur: Yes

Jennnifer Perry: Yes

Motion passes.

## 7. Announcements

**Don Gaekle**

N/A

## 8. Adjourn

**Don Gaekle**

Members of the public may make comment on items listed on the agenda when recognized by the Chair. Comments will be limited to 3 minutes per speaker. 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](mailto: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.