

## C-9 Correspondence Laurie Angel

**From:** Laurie C. Angel [<mailto:lcangel2012@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 4:47 PM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

**Cc:** Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[District6@longbeach.gov](mailto:District6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Jonathan Kraus <[Jonathan.Kraus@longbeach.gov](mailto:Jonathan.Kraus@longbeach.gov)>; Mayor <[Mayor@longbeach.gov](mailto:Mayor@longbeach.gov)>; City Manager <[CityManager@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityManager@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** City Council Agenda item 9 for April 14, 2020 - Election Results Measure A

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear City Clerk,

Please enter this e-mail into the record for this agenda item and provide copies to the council members and city manager.

The new Los Angeles County voting system has been documented with numerous problems including security issues and a common issue of not reading votes correctly. In the limited effort conducted several votes were found to be in contention.

These issues with the voting system combined with the new practice of allowing Los Angeles county residents to vote from any poll or by mail also has created an undue burden on voters interested in challenging an extremely close and contentious ballot measure, Measure A.

I ask that you pull any declaration regarding Measure A due to multiple issues, as noted, and a failure by the county to effectively conduct a recount of the measure as paid for daily via deposit. You must acknowledge and understand that if a couple dozen votes had resulted in a No, the city and challengers would have had the same recount issues and unfair cost burden.

Please encourage the county to work out the extensive issues that are effecting the city's election. We can not have the serious issues with the new county voting system perpetuated.

Thank you for your deliberation and sincere consideration.

Laurie Angel

**C-9 Correspondence Ann Boyker**

-----Original Message-----

From: Ann Boyker [<mailto:aboyker@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:44 PM

To: CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

Subject: Measure A

-EXTERNAL-

Please recount Measure A votes.

Sent from my iPhone

## C-9 Correspondence Jordan Bradley

**From:** Jordan Bradley [<mailto:eldorecapital@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 15, 2020 7:39 AM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Measure A election results

**-EXTERNAL-**

Item 9 20-0278 is to adopt a resolution declaring the election results for Measures A and B. We are asking the Council to only read into the record the number of votes for and against measure A and to make a statement that there is a recount and a legal challenge being filed on Measure A.

Jordan Bradley

## C-9 Correspondence Steve Brannigan

**From:** [shazam13@charter.net](mailto:shazam13@charter.net) [<mailto:shazam13@charter.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:22 PM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Agenda Item 9-2078

**-EXTERNAL-**

Please read into the record the number of votes for and against measure A and make a statement that there is a recount and a legal challenge being filed on Measure A. Thank You.

Steve Brannigan

## C-9 Correspondence Anna Christensen

**From:** Anna Christensen [<mailto:achris259@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:49 PM  
**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fw: re declaring the results of the Special Election

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear Ms De La Garza, I hope my comments in this email will be included in tonight's City Council Meeting. I gave up trying to submit them through SpeakUp Long Beach. The program would not allow me to register either through FB or by submitting my email/etc. It also froze up, and is still not working at this time.

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Anna Christensen <[achris259@yahoo.com](mailto:achris259@yahoo.com)>  
**To:** Council District 4 <[district4@longbeach.gov](mailto:district4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[district2@longbeach.gov](mailto:district2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[district6@longbeach.gov](mailto:district6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[district7@longbeach.gov](mailto:district7@longbeach.gov)>; Councilmember Rex Richardson <[district9@longbeach.gov](mailto:district9@longbeach.gov)>; City of Long Beach <[district8@longbeach.gov](mailto:district8@longbeach.gov)>; City of Long Beach <[district5@longbeach.gov](mailto:district5@longbeach.gov)>; Councilwoman Mary Zendejas <[district1@longbeach.gov](mailto:district1@longbeach.gov)>; City of Long Beach <[district3@longbeach.gov](mailto:district3@longbeach.gov)>; City of Long Beach <[mayor@longbeach.gov](mailto:mayor@longbeach.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020, 03:39:32 PM PDT  
**Subject:** re declaring the results of the Special Election

Agenda Item re 20-0278 Recommendation to adopt resolution declaring the results of the Special Municipal Election held in the City of Long Beach, California, on Tuesday, March 3, 2020, for the two (2) ballot measures which had been submitted to a vote of the qualified electors of the City;

Please Remove this item from tonight's City Council Meeting Agenda and let the recount continue on Measure A. The City has been called out and sued over similar actions which, at the time, appeared to be a clever way to outsmart the opposition. In some ways, ignoring democracy involves little risk, lawsuits, even one's that are lost or settled, are paid for by the public, not the individuals who made bad decisions in the first place. So it's really a matter of ethics and taking responsibility for doing the right, not the sleazy, thing. Please be your better selves. Anna Christensen

## C-9 Correspondence Genevieve Douglass-Beckham

**From:** [5625774561@pm.sprint.com](mailto:5625774561@pm.sprint.com) [<mailto:5625774561@pm.sprint.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:38 PM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:**

**-EXTERNAL-**

Sent from my mobile.

---

To the Long Beach City Clerk, Mayor, City Counsel Members. City Attorney and LA County Registrar,

I am writing to document my opinion regarding today's City Counsel Agenda Item #29-0278. My vote on Measure A & B on March 3, 2020 was "NO". There is a Recount in process and legal challenges filed.

I want my voice heard & acknowledged in today's meeting to remove Item 20-0278 from the agenda until a true legal & professional Recount of Measure A votes is completed. This Agenda Item is premature as a legal Recount has not been completed & voter approved by the legal challenges representatives.

Respectfully,  
Genevieve DouglassBeckham

**C-9 Correspondence Roger Goulette**

**From:** Roger Goulette [<mailto:roger.goulette@verizon.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:55 PM  
**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>  
**Cc:** Roger Goulette <[roger.goulette@verizon.net](mailto:roger.goulette@verizon.net)>  
**Subject:** Election Results for Measure A

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear City Clerk,

I am a resident of Long Beach; have lived in Park Estates for over 40 years.

I understand that the City Council is meeting today, and considering adopting a resolution, Item 9 20-0278, declaring the election results for Measures A and B.

I request that the Council include in the record:

1. the number of votes for and against measure A, and
2. a statement that there is a recount and a legal challenge being filed on Measure A

Please address my request with the City County.  
Please advise of the outcome.

Sincerely,  
Roger Goulette

Roger Goulette

## C-9 Correspondence – Wendy and John Henning

**From:** Wendy R. Henning [<mailto:wrlenning@earthlink.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 4:40 PM

**To:** Monique DeLaGarza <[Monique.DeLaGarza@longbeach.gov](mailto:Monique.DeLaGarza@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Dee Andrews <[Dee.Andrews@longbeach.gov](mailto:Dee.Andrews@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>; CityAttorney <[CityAttorney@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityAttorney@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Anti-Measure A Recount Update #7: By 4pm TODAY, Please Send in Public Comment Objecting to Council Item Accepting Election Results

**-EXTERNAL-**

Honorable Dr. Mayor Garcia and Respected Council Members,

I would like to express my opinion in objecting to the acceptance of Measure A.

Thank you,  
Wendy and John Henning



## C-9 Correspondence George Kulcsar

**From:** george kulcsar [[mailto:gkulcsar2000@yahoo.com](mailto:gakulcsar2000@yahoo.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:53 PM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[District6@longbeach.gov](mailto:District6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Agenda Measure A-Item 9 20-0278

**-EXTERNAL-**

To All,

I'm a long beach resident in district 5 and I'm asking the City Clerk and city councilmen/councilwomen to only read into the record the number of votes for and against Measure A, and to make a statement that there is a recount and legal challenge being filed on Measure A

Surly you all will let the recount move forward unhinged and without prejudice. The residents of Long Beach have spoken and want a fair and accurate accounting of a votes. If you do read into the record Accepting County-Counted 16-Vote Passage of Measure A Despite Ongoing Recount, then you will all be on record that you suppressed the people and whoever is up for re-election will have to deal with the consequences.

Mr. Dean C Logan is a borderline criminal who is in charge of LA county elections. I'm sure you have heard of his past If not please look him up online got a great history in the state of Washington.

Respectfully,

District 5 Resident

**From:** george kulcsar [<mailto:gkulcsar2000@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 15, 2020 11:58 AM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[District6@longbeach.gov](mailto:District6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Agenda Measure A-Item 9 20-0278

**-EXTERNAL-**

9-0 Vote so you all went against the citizens wishes! We will start mounting an army to start unseating everyone who will be up for re-election.

Including Mayor Garcia and no 3rd term. You all should be ashamed!

Good Luck

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 14, 2020, at 2:53 PM, george kulcsar <[gkulcsar2000@yahoo.com](mailto:gkulcsar2000@yahoo.com)> wrote:

To All,

I'm a long beach resident in district 5 and I'm asking the City Clerk and city councilmen/councilwomen to only read into the record the number of votes for and against Measure A, and to make a statement that there is a recount and legal challenge being filed on Measure A

Surly you all will let the recount move forward unhinged and without prejudice. The residents of Long Beach have spoken and want a fair and accurate accounting of a votes. If you do read into the record Accepting County-Counted 16-Vote Passage of Measure A Despite Ongoing Recount, then you will all be on record that you suppressed the people and whoever is up for re-election will have to deal with the consequences.

Mr. Dean C Logan is a borderline criminal who is in charge of LA county elections. I'm sure you have heard of his past If not please look him up online got a great history in the state of Washington.

Respectfully,

District 5 Resident

**From:** [corlisslee@aol.com](mailto:corlisslee@aol.com) [mailto:[corlisslee@aol.com](mailto:corlisslee@aol.com)]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 1:10 AM

**To:** Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[District6@longbeach.gov](mailto:District6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>; CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Agenda item 9 20-0278

**-EXTERNAL-**

City Clerk,  
Please provide a copy of the comments below to the council.

Certifying the results of an election seems to be a rubber stamp process required by a city ordinance. However, I agree with Bill Pearl in his article at this link:  
<https://www.lbreport.com/news/apr20/recount6.htm>

*"The Council isn't required to add the words to its resolution that "the proposition is hereby approved." A Councilmember(s) could pull the item from the consent calendar and make a motion to amend the resolution to delete those five words. Section 10264 only requires a statement of the "number of votes given...for and against each measure."*

- *(2) Nothing in the Elections Code prevents the Council from adding text to its resolution noting that a statutory recount of the results on Measure A is as of the date of its voted action underway with the recount results pending."*

Half the voters opposed the extension of this tax,

There are a lot of eyes on this election because of the razor thin win that came about in a voting pattern never before seen by those that work in elections in our city. Voters are skeptical of the results and willingly provided donations to have the outcome validated. It would be respectful to withhold validation of Measure A until the recount is completed.

Corliss Lee  
President, Eastside Voice

**From:** LA VONNE MILLER [<mailto:lmiller853@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:26 PM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Agenda item #9

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear Council members,

Please read into the record the number of votes for and against measure A and to make a statement that there is a recount and a legal challenge being filed on Measure A.

Thank you,  
La Vonne Miller  
District 8

## C-9 Correspondence Larrence Montgomery

**From:** Larry Montgomery [<mailto:larrym@charter.net>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:01 PM  
**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>  
**Subject:** Item 9 20-0278

**-EXTERNAL-**

I hereby request that members of the City Council be asked to read into the record only the number of votes for and against Measure A, and to make a statement that there is a recount and a legal challenge being filed on Measure A. I request that no resolution declaring the election results for Measure A be voted upon at this time.

Any further action on this matter at this time would be an affront to the voters in Long Beach who feel that vote counting on this issue is highly suspect, and who support the legal challenge of the way the razor-thin "winning margin" for this discovered by its supporters.

I am a resident and property owner in Long Beach, and ask your immediate attention to this matter.

Larrence A. Montgomery

## C-9 Correspondence Juan Ovalle

**From:** jeovalle [<mailto:jeovallec@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 4:13 PM

**To:** Mayor <[Mayor@longbeach.gov](mailto:Mayor@longbeach.gov)>

**Cc:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[District6@longbeach.gov](mailto:District6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Long Beach City Council - April 14, 2020 - Agenda Item 9 20-0278 (on consent calendar)

**Importance:** High

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear Councilmembers, Mayor, and City Clerk,

Tonight you will be presented with the option to adopt resolution Item 9 20-0278 certifying the election results of the March 3, 2020 election. The action as it pertains to Measure A, would be inappropriate. I ask that you only read into the record the number of votes for and against measure A, and to make a statement that there is a recount and a legal challenge being filed by residents of Long Beach.

The respectful action would be to admonish the facts and merits of those seeking clarification by challenging the County for its flawed voting process. The City of Long Beach paid or will pay a substantial share to the county for conducting the March 3 election and future elections; yet County's conduct of the election, under the direction of the County Clerk/Registrar/Recorder, was marred by needless flaws which contradicted legal as well as moral requirements to conduct a fair election and produce credible results on Measure A.

A flawed system that did not allow for a proper recount of votes as stipulated by the county itself in its own Handbook dated March of 2020, that should have allowed for a speedy manual recount of ballots. Residents of Long Beach attempted to work with the County Clerk, yet it was impossible. The County did not take kindly to the residents request to follow through as noted in their own handbook and arrogantly stopped the count yesterday.

Therefore, do not certify the count, only after receipt final tallies form the complete hand recount or legal challenge by resident of Long Beach. I also remind you that as members of City Council and the Mayor your are the representatives of the residents of our City.

Sincerely,

Juan E. Ovalle  
Resident 8th District

**From:** Ian Patton [<mailto:ispatton@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:01 PM

**To:** Mayor <[Mayor@longbeach.gov](mailto:Mayor@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[District6@longbeach.gov](mailto:District6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>; CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>; CityAttorney <[CityAttorney@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityAttorney@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Comment & Documents for the Record Re Tonight's City Council Agenda Item #9

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear Mayor & Council,

You should amend the text of Agenda Item 9 for tonight's meeting so that it does not say that Measure A "is hereby approved". It should merely acknowledge the vote count in the certified results and note that those results may be re-certified, pending likely litigation pertaining to a recount process and the completion of the recount. Enough votes have already changed during the recount process to demonstrate that Measure A remains too close to call until completion of a hand recount.

For more on this process, please see the attached correspondence between myself, as the official requestor of the recount, and Los Angeles County Counsel. I can assure you that the halted recount process will come before a judge to make a final determination as to whether it will continue.

Here is further news coverage of the matter, as well:

["Measure A Recount Stops, Opponents Say They Will Sue"](#), *Grunion*

["County Cuts-Off Measure A Recount; Refuses Tendered Payment; Reform Coalition Prepares Court Challenge"](#), *LBReport.com*

best,

Ian S. Patton

*Cal Heights Consultancy*

[LBReformCoalition.org](http://LBReformCoalition.org)



# Long Beach Reform Coalition

Long Beach Reform Coalition  
407 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Long Beach, California 90802  
(562) 246-8949 \* consultant@calheightsconsult.com  
www.LBReformCoalition.org (ID# 1409361)

*For Hand Delivery To Mr. Alex Olvera for Mr. Dean Logan*

April 13, 2020

Mr. Dean Logan  
Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk  
12400 Imperial Highway  
Norwalk, CA 90650

Re: Long Beach Measure A Recount – Final Request for Reasonable Recount Process

Dear Mr. Logan,

The deposit check in the amount of \$10,854.50 which I am providing herewith, if accepted under the terms outlined herein, is being offered for a reasonable recount process (in this case eight recount boards with physical ballots), as a final attempt to allow you to perform the recount you are required to carry out properly and reasonably, in accordance with the law and our official recount request, validated by your Order Of Recount issued 4/7/20. This check is only being offered for a reasonable and proper recount process, not a continuation of the farce we have observed for the first three days of “the recount”. That process was a recount in name only and a complete failure to execute your responsibilities under the state election code.

There is no ambiguity as to what a proper and reasonable recount would look like. You published your “Requesting A Recount 2020” handbook quite recently and *after* your \$300 million new voting system was in place. Indeed the handbook appears, according to the metadata embedded in the PDF, to have been created on 3/26/20, one day before certification of the March 3<sup>rd</sup> election and well into the current public health crisis. The handbook made clear the following:

- There are two methods for recounting ballots, a “manual recount” and a “machine recount”.
- The handbook states that the recount requestor “may specify the method of counting to be used” and cites E.C. § 15627, which only provides for manual and machine recount methods, not a novel scanned image or digital facsimile method of recount as you have attempted to employ, despite my explicit rejection of that method.
- The recount requestor may select the number of “recount boards” (each a team of four recount workers, as defined in E.C. § 15625) per day, at an estimated cost per day, to be used as the required daily deposit, of \$4,163.00 for one board per day, \$4,563.00 for two boards per day, \$5,557.15 for four boards per day, and so on with marginal additional costs per additional board per day. The cost estimates are





specified for up to eight boards per day, that being at a cost of \$10,854.50, and an asterisk indicates that “additional deposit amounts are available for 9 or more boards up to 75 upon request.”

- Furthermore, your Election Division manager, Mr. Olvera, who says that he has administered recounts for your office for two decades, says that a physical ballot recount has typically counted ballots at a rate of 5,000 to 10,000 ballots per “recount board” per day. Therefore, a recount of Long Beach Measure A should already have been completed, at the latest, by the morning of Day 3 of the recount.

Given the ongoing COVID-19 public health crisis, we enquired with your office early in the process, before officially filing our recount request, whether you would be seeking a judicially ordered extension to the time frame laid out for recounts by the Election Code. At first we were told by Mr. Olvera that County Counsel was exploring this option, then we were told that instead the option of requesting a delay from Secretary of State Padilla was being explored, then, less than 24 hours before our recount process began, we were told that both options had been abandoned and the recount would proceed on April 8<sup>th</sup>.

It has become abundantly clear that the availability of your personnel has been reduced drastically by concerns over the health crisis, as much as 50% on any given day according to Mr. Olvera, and has completely impeded your statutory responsibility to carry out this recount. Yet your office, represented by County Counsel, has steadfastly insisted that your ability to carry out the recount has in no way been compromised by the health crisis and has refused, in a letter to me dated 4/9/20, to seek judicial assistance.

Instead, your office has chosen to pursue an illegitimate recount process fraught with unreasonable demands upon myself as the recount requestor and questionable practices putting the integrity of the entire process in jeopardy:

- Less than 24 hours before the recount process began, Mr. Olvera emailed me a new, made up set of recount method “options” in the form of inflated cost estimate tables, two of which applied to nonexistent, novel, illegitimate recount “methods” not sanctioned by the Election Code.
- The first “option” for a recount method of physical ballots, unreasonably inflated the cost of that method by a factor of at least ten by charging for an unreasonable process of ballot retrieval which is apparently a by-product of the incompetent and incoherent design of your new voting system. Whereas ballot retrieval for a local election such as ours took only a few minutes under the old system, Mr. Olvera has provided us an estimate that it will now take 16 days at a daily cost of \$11,694.49, for an estimated total of \$187,111.84 before any ballots have even been counted. Based on your published “Requesting A Recount 2020” handbook, recount requestors could estimate a total cost for a recount of approximately 100,000 ballots, as is the case in Long Beach, of no more than approximately \$25,000 and possibly far less. To suddenly add an additional cost of \$187,111.84, less than 24 hours before the recount is to commence, is not a reasonable demand. It appears to be an intentional obstacle placed in the path of completing the recount and a deprivation of due process and the right to equal treatment under the law. The Election Code burdens the recount requestor with paying reasonable costs



associated with a recount, not an enormous sum to fix the improper design of your own new system, which inexplicably mixes together millions of ballots rather than keeping them sorted by precinct.

- The second “option” also included suddenly inflated cost estimates for a method of counting scanned, digital facsimile ballot images. This brand new method is not allowed under the Election Code, was contrived on the fly, and is completely untested, unproven, and inappropriate. Despite my objections in writing, you attempted to employ this method, first charging me to build your own infrastructure for it on Day 1 (the interface, for which I am apparently to be charged even though you will retain it after this recount), then only beginning to deploy it with two recount boards for the last couple hours of Day 2, and then deploying finally for a full day with four recount boards on Day 3.
- Day 3 allowed us to observe this illegitimate scanned ballot method fully, and what we saw and documented was highly disturbing. Initially, the requirement, for the workers marking down the votes being called out, to periodically compare tallies (every ten or 25 votes) was not being followed and at least one precinct had to be restarted from the beginning due to a supervisor noticing an inconsistency. We also saw a shocking glitch in the technology—we had been told that each worker on a recount board and observers would have separate screens which would all display the same thing at the same time. Instead, in at least one room (which we documented videographically), the worker calling out votes and the worker whose job was to verify the calls had screens highly out of sync. We later learned from Mr. Olvera that while some screens were connected directly to the same computer, others were connected through a “Skype meeting” connection and network delay was a major factor. We also observed and documented an enormous difference in counting speed between the four boards, with the fastest board counting ballots at a rate of just over four seconds between vote calls on average, versus the slowest board counting ballots at a rate of over 8 seconds between vote calls on average. The difference may have been due to the motivation of the caller, technological delays, or both.
- Even if we had any faith left in this scanned ballot display method, the rate at which your four recount boards overall executed it was so pathetically slow as to make a complete recount functionally impossible. We had been told by Mr. Olvera that physical ballot recounts in the past normally counted at a rate of 5,000 to 10,000 per board per day. He revised those estimates for the new scanned image method to 6,000 per board per day, which when pressed he admitted was the high end estimate. The reality was that these boards were counting scanned images at a rate of about 1,550 ballots per board per day. In total, 7,749 ballots were recounted by the end of Day 3, according to the number of ballots in completed precincts and the number of the last ballot counted in partially completed precincts. The ballot counting day is required to last six hours, while in fact on Day 2 there were two boards which only counted for about 2.5 and 2 hours respectively. To be generous, and account for acclimation of the workers to a new process, we might count Day 2 as equivalent to one full board-day, plus Day 3 as four full board-days. Therefore, dividing 7,749 by five full board days equals 1,550. Four boards was the most your office could finally muster by Friday, meaning at the current rate of ballot counting

those four boards would require 16 more days to finish, at a cost of an additional \$131,000. (The new daily cost estimate table conjured by your office less than 24 hours before the recount, for this illegitimate scanned method, states that four boards cost \$8,244.66 per day and eight boards cost \$13,142.01 per day. ) If you somehow doubled the number of boards available per day to eight, those eight boards would require an additional 8 days, for an additional cost of \$104,000, to finish. These figures would be on top of the \$21,145.68 we have already paid your office (with the result that only 7.3% of ballots have so far been counted, using an illegitimate and suspect process). Given that this is a recount that should have been completed *already*, in less than three days and for less than \$25,000, this is not a reasonable performance.

- The third “option” offered was an absurd notion of recounting reprinted scanned images of ballots, which would have been even more expensive than the second “option” and involved two untried and illegitimate modalities (both scanning and reprinting ballots) rather than just one untried and illegitimate modality.

For all the reasons outlined above, you have thus far completely failed me, as a resident of Los Angeles County and as the official requestor of this recount, in your legally required responsibilities as elections administrator to carry out properly, reasonably, and accurately this recount.

If you choose now, at this final opportunity short of litigation, to perform a proper and reasonable recount, this attached deposit is yours in order to carry on. If you need to seek judicial intervention in order to perform your statutory responsibilities, that is your business and you should have done so already and should do so immediately.

If you choose not to perform a proper and reasonable recount, then you are choosing to flaunt your legally mandated responsibilities and deny me, my organization, and the people of Long Beach our recount, a core part of our democratic rights under the Election Code.

The choice is yours.

Sincerely,



**Ian S. Patton**  
**Executive Director**  
**Long Beach Reform Coalition**  
**Cell (562) 810-9329**



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

648 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012-2713

MARY C. WICKHAM  
County Counsel

April 13, 2020

TELEPHONE  
(213) 974-1832  
FACSIMILE  
(213) 443-0461  
E-MAIL  
EChu@counsel.lacounty.gov

VIA E-MAIL ONLY

Ian S. Patton  
Executive Director  
Long Beach Reform Coalition  
[ispatton@yahoo.com](mailto:ispatton@yahoo.com)

**Re: Long Beach Measure A Recount**

Dear Mr. Patton:

Your letter dated April 13, 2020, to Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk Dean Logan ("Registrar") was forwarded to this office for response.

First, please refer to a letter dated April 9, 2020, from Gina Eachus of this office, which sets forth the recount requester's legal obligations to deposit the estimated deposit cost as determined by the Registrar and to pay for the actual costs of the recount. (See California Elections Code section 15624; California Code of Regulations 2 C.C.R. § 20815.) This letter was sent in response to your letter dated April 8, 2020, and statutory compliance with the provisions referenced therein is mandatory.

Second, we are informed that on April 8, 2020, the recount for Long Beach Measure A proceeded with the digital ballot method at your direction. The recount continued to proceed with the digital ballot method through the end of day on April 10, 2020. We are in receipt of your letter dated April 13, 2020, in which you now assert that you oppose the digital ballot method, and indicating an intent to submit a deposit that is less than the advance deposit amount required to continue with the recount using the method of manually retrieving ballots.

In light of the foregoing, the Registrar will continue to accommodate you by resuming the recount with the manual retrieval of ballots. Please specify the

Ian S. Patton  
April 13, 2020  
Page 2

order of precinct counting if you have a preference. Because the Registrar staff will now be manually retrieving ballots for the recount in the order of precincts as directed by you, the previously provided deposit aligned to this method is \$11,694.49, and the Registrar reserves the right to seek additional sums if the actual costs incurred exceeds the deposit amount. Your proposed deposit of \$10,854.50 is thus insufficient. Please remit the full deposit amount of \$11,694.49 and confirm in writing your intention to proceed with the physical retrieval of ballots by no later than 5:00 p.m. today and we will proceed accordingly on April 14, 2020. Importantly, please note that failure to advance the deposit amount required by the Registrar pursuant to Elections Code section 15624 by the date and time indicated could result in the termination of the recount.

Thank you for your consideration. Please contact Gina Eachus ([geachus@counsel.lacounty.gov](mailto:geachus@counsel.lacounty.gov)) or Eva Chu ([echu@counsel.lacounty.gov](mailto:echu@counsel.lacounty.gov)) if you have any questions regarding the foregoing.

Very truly yours,

MARY C. WICKHAM  
County Counsel

By  for  
EVA W. CHU  
Deputy County Counsel  
Government Services Division

EWC:eb

c: Dean C. Logan, Registrar/Recorder County Clerk

---

**Re: Long Beach Measure A Recount - 04/13/20 Letter**

---

From: Ian Patton (ispatton@yahoo.com)  
To: echu@counsel.lacounty.gov; geachus@counsel.lacounty.gov  
Cc: dlogan@rrcc.lacounty.gov; ebrowder@counsel.lacounty.gov  
Bcc: ispatton@gmail.com  
Date: Monday, April 13, 2020, 5:26 PM PDT

---

Dear Ms. Wickham (c/o Ms. Eachus and Ms. Chu),

This letter was completely unresponsive to the points made in my demand letter this morning and continues with the fallacy that County Clerk Logan has been engaged in anything resembling a legitimate, legal recount process.

This letter also wrongly states "that on April 8, 2020, the recount for Long Beach Measure A proceeded with the digital ballot method at [my] direction."

As you are aware, I stated quite clearly in my protest letter submitted along with my check on April 8th that "Mr. Olvera has provided us the false 'option' of an untried and possibly illegitimate 'digital' process of recounting only scanned images of ballots." The same letter also stated, "I demand that you immediately provide physical ballots for counting, as recounts have always been conducted in the past in Los Angeles County." Furthermore, during the initial briefing with Mr. Olvera on April 8th, Ms. Eachus on speakerphone insisted that I should choose one of the false method 'options' contrived just before our recount was to begin. I acceded to no such 'option', and the County Clerk nonetheless chose to move forward with scanned ballot image counting for Measure A.

We observed this illegitimate process, at great expense, as it was very slowly put into motion over the course of three days, in the hope that the County Clerk would see the error of his ways and rectify the situation. We now realize he never had any interest in doing so, nor in respecting the state Election Code as it pertains to recounts.

best,  
Ian S. Patton  
c562.810.9329  
*Cal Heights Consultancy*  
[LBReformCoalition.org](http://LBReformCoalition.org)

---

On Monday, April 13, 2020, 2:21:05 PM PDT, Ebony Browder <ebrowder@counsel.lacounty.gov> wrote:

Good Afternoon

Per County Counsel's request, please see the attached document. For further questions or concerns, please contact County Counsel Eva Chu, via email at [EChu@counsel.lacounty.gov](mailto:EChu@counsel.lacounty.gov).

Thank you,

*Ebony Browder*

Ebony Browder

Legal Office Support Assistant I

Office of The County Counsel,

Government Services Division

Phone: (213) 974-5853

Fax: (213) 617-7182

**Email:** [EBrowder@counsel.lacounty.gov](mailto:EBrowder@counsel.lacounty.gov)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message, including any attachments, from the Office of the County Counsel is intended for the official and confidential use of the recipients to whom it is addressed. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempted from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify us immediately by reply email that you have received this message in error, and destroy this message, including any attachments.



Long Beach Measure A Recount - 041320 Ltr..pdf  
54.5kB

**C-9 Correspondence Jean Ratkowski**

**From:** Jean Ratkowski [<mailto:jmratkow@gmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:22 PM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Tonight's council meeting.

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear City Clerk, I understand there is an agenda item tonight (item 9 20-0278) that addresses Measure A and B. I am voicing my vote to only read into the record the number of votes for and against Measure A and make a statement that there is a recount and legal challenge being filed on Measure A.

Thank you.



## C-9 Correspondence Fred Springer

**From:** Fred Springer [<mailto:wfspring@aol.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 4:26 PM

**To:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** re -count of measure A

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear Council Members,

Please exercise your right, as a council member, to insure that there was an accurate tally of the vote on Measure A on the recent election. There has been enough question as to the validity of the count, to warrant a recount to certify, and publicize, the true results of the vote.

Fred Springer

**From:** Joe Weinstein [<mailto:jweins123@hotmail.com>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 14, 2020 2:34 PM

**To:** Council District 1 <[District1@longbeach.gov](mailto:District1@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 2 <[District2@longbeach.gov](mailto:District2@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 3 <[District3@longbeach.gov](mailto:District3@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 4 <[District4@longbeach.gov](mailto:District4@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 5 <[District5@longbeach.gov](mailto:District5@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 6 <[District6@longbeach.gov](mailto:District6@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 7 <[District7@longbeach.gov](mailto:District7@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 8 <[District8@longbeach.gov](mailto:District8@longbeach.gov)>; Council District 9 <[District9@longbeach.gov](mailto:District9@longbeach.gov)>; Mayor <[Mayor@longbeach.gov](mailto:Mayor@longbeach.gov)>; CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

**Subject:** Long Beach City Council - April 14, 2020 - Agenda Item 9 20-0278 (on consent calendar)

**-EXTERNAL-**

Subject: Long Beach City Council - April 14, 2020 - Agenda Item 9 20-0278 (on consent calendar)

Dear Council Members, Mayor, Clerk,

One of this item's recommended actions is that Council resolve to certify 2020 Measure A as duly passed in the March 3 election.

**For reasons given below, such action would be utterly inappropriate.**

**Instead, the self-respect of the City of Long Beach - and due respect to the City's voters - calls for two other actions (see below).**

The City paid the County good money to conduct the March 3 election; yet County's conduct of the election, under the direction of the

County Clerk/Registrar/Recorder, was badly marred by two utterly needless flaws which contradicted legal as well as moral requirements

to conduct a fair election and produce credible results on Measure A:

(1) The County Clerk claims that from over 100,000 votes cast on the measure, there were precisely 16 votes more for YES than for NO.

With such a narrow margin, a credible election result requires careful hand recount. Preliminary recount - arbitrarily and arrogantly stopped yesterday by the County Clerk - has indicated that the vote canvass tallies incorporate notable and perhaps decisive computer errors.

APPROPRIATE ACTION RESPONSE #1:

Certify Measure A, either as passed or not passed, NOT NOW BUT ONLY AFTER RECEIPT OF, AND BASED ON, FINAL TALLIES FROM A COMPLETE HAND RECOUNT.

(2) In February the County led voters to believe that they could trouble-free show up at a voting center on any of several days, including Election Day.

Some centers were unready for use on the earlier days. Far worse, the County fatally failed to warn or discourage voters from keeping, quite predictably, their traditional habit of showing up en masse on Election Day.

The County went to huge extra expense and complexity to create and operate voting centers and a new unfamiliar e-voting system at those centers.

The reason given for doing so - rather than simply enabling universal vote-by-mail - was an alleged need to allow voters to keep a strong tradition: in-person voting.

Yet, the centers could not and did not accommodate the usual form of that tradition: voting precisely on Election Day. The delay at voting centers caused

needless time loss and deprivation of voting rights of individual voters, and may also have incurred, directly or indirectly, notable extra needless costs to the City.

APPROPRIATE ACTION RESPONSE #2:

For timely information well before this November, HAVE MANAGEMENT NOW INVESTIGATE AND REPORT ON OPTIONS - with estimates

of capital, maintenance, and operation costs - FOR CONDUCT OF SOME OR ALL ELECTIONS BY THE CITY OF LONG BEACH.

Sincerely,

Joe Weinstein (Joseph M. Weinstein, Ph.D.)

**C-9 Correspondence Diane Zalk**

-----Original Message-----

From: Diane Zalk [<mailto:dhzalk@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2020 3:09 PM

To: CityClerk <[CityClerk@longbeach.gov](mailto:CityClerk@longbeach.gov)>

Subject: Re: measures A & B

-EXTERNAL-

I strongly urge the council not to adopt measure A and only read the election results into the record. Because the outcome was so very close & is being contested, and because of irregularities on the part of the county in regards to the recount causing a legal challenge, the council should await the outcome of the recount before moving forward on it.

Thank you,  
Diane Zalk