



Alameda County Elections Commission

Meeting Agenda

October 15, 2026

4:00 p.m.

1225 Fallon Street, Room G-1

Oakland CA 94612

Zoom: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82793627419>

Teleconference Locations: City Hall, 34009 Alvarado-Niles Road, Union City, CA 94587 and 265 Peachtree Center Avenue, Atlanta, GA 30303. Pursuant to Government Code section 54953(b), this notice and agenda will be posted, and members of the public may attend and provide public comment at the teleconference locations.

Pursuant to California Government Code section 54957.5, any public records related to a matter subject to discussion at this meeting that are distributed to a majority of the Elections Commission's members less than 72 hours before the meeting will be made available for public inspection at the Registrar of Voters' Office, 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, California 94612, Room G-1.

Speaking times for the public comments are three minutes per person, unless the chair determines otherwise. Written comments can be sent to Elections.Commission@alamedacountyca.gov, which goes to all members of the commission, the Registrar of Voters, the Deputy Registrar, and the clerk for the Elections Commission.

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

2. Agenda Changes

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- a. August Minutes - Attachment - pp. 4-6
- b. September Minutes - Attachment - p. 7

4. Announcements and Communications on Issues Not on the Agenda - *No discussion on these items.*

- a. From staff - A list of jurisdictions in the November 2026 elections is provided. Attachment - p. 8
- b. From commissioners

5. Public Comment on Issues Not on the Agenda

6. Monthly Update from Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office

7. Ongoing Agenda Items

7-A Ad Hoc Committee Reports - Temporary and task-specific committees were formed to address particular issues. The point person for each committee has an asterisk by their name.

7-A(1) **Voting Participation** (Seabrook,* Moore, Whitehurst, Lindsay, Hernandez) – Action Item
Formed in November 2024, this committee is looking into how the ROV can increase voter participation in Oakland Districts 6 & 7. *The commission will consider whether to request that the ROV develop a pilot voter registration and civic engagement initiative in Oakland District 7, west of I-580.*

Attachment - pp. 9-10

7-A(2) **Youth Participation** (Varlack,* Whitehurst, Butter, Hernandez) – Discussion Only
Formed in October 2025, this committee is working to support efforts to strengthen youth civic engagement regarding elections, and to coordinate with the ROV on outreach and program development.

7-A(3) **Budgeting for Elections** (Wagner,* Pham, Lindsay) – Action Item
Formed in February 2026, this committee is working with the ROV office to produce a written fee schedule that clearly defines exactly how jurisdictions will be charged with an explanation of those charges, including RCV, Youth Voting, and the reallocation of five or more ballot measures. *The commission will consider asking the ROV to revise the accounting for which costs are considered RCV-related, and not treat ballot production costs (including ballot printing of ballot cards, envelope printing and stuffing, transport costs, etc.) as RCV-related. These changes to cost apportionment should take effect beginning July 1, 2027, or earlier.*

Attachment - pp. 11-14

7-A(4) **Rules and Procedures** (Dieter*, former commissioner Henderson) – Action Item
Formed in April 2026, this committee has completed its task to update the commission's rules and procedures, and the revised version is available online, accessible on the Useful Links document. *The commission will consider disbanding the committee.*

8. Regular Agenda Items

8-A **Post-election Assessment for August election** – Action Item

Commissioners are invited to offer feedback on the August congressional district 14 special election. *The commission will consider whether to form an ad hoc committee to prepare an assessment or combine identified issues from this election with the November assessment.*

Attachment - p. 15

8-B **Scheduling a December meeting date** – Action Item

The ordinance requires that we meet monthly, at least 10 times a year. The September meeting was cancelled due to a lack of quorum. Thus, to reach 10 meetings, *the commission will decide when to meet in December.* The ROV is available on December 10, or possibly December 9.

8-C **Notifications on Observation of Election Processing** – Action Item

The commission has a standing recommendation that the ROV make incremental improvements on alerting subscribers when a particular process is about to start. The ROV's notification currently states: "An election process will be conducted today. For ongoing updates check the

website where all election processes will be posted.” At the July 18 Elections Commission meeting, commissioners requested an update on any progress. As explained at the July meeting, the ROV currently does not have the capability of having an automatic notification system as a process begins/ends and another process begins. Also, signature checking, opening ballots, sorting ballots, and scanning ballots can happen 10-12 times a day in a continual flow, which would require sending out alerts throughout the day. *The commission will consider whether to keep, withdraw, or modify its standing recommendation.*

9. Special Report from the ROV – Roles of staff

Review the work responsibilities of ROV staff, particularly those who attend commission meetings—their role during and outside the meeting.

Attachment - p. 16

10. Adjournment (by 6:30 p.m. if viable)

If you would like to receive email notifications for upcoming agenda postings, please send an email to https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CAALAME/subscriber/new?topic_id=CAALAME_467

Attachment for Agenda Item #3a – **August Meeting Minutes**

Alameda County Elections Commission

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 27, 2026	4:00 PM	1225 Fallon Street, Room G-1 Oakland CA 94612
---------------------------	---------	--

1 Call to Order / Roll Call

The Elections Commission meeting convened at 4:00 p.m. with President Dieter presiding as chair.

Present

Commissioners Karen Butter, Jim Lindsay, Tiega Varlack, Alexander Ramon, David Wagner, Irene Dieter, Sasha Ritzie-Hernandez, and ex officio Thai Nam Pham participated via teleconference. Judy Belcher and Karl Seabrook arrived late.

Absent

Commissioners Alissa Moore and Allie Whitehurst.

Staff Present

Registrar of Voters: Cynthia Cornejo, Charles Smithline, and Shaheer Siddiqui.

County Counsel: Jason Allen.

2 Agenda Changes

There were no changes to the agenda.

3 Approval of Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the July 16, 2026 meeting minutes was made by Commissioner Butter, seconded by Vice President Ramon, and passed 5-0 with two abstentions.

4 Announcements and Communications on Issues Not on the Agenda

a. From staff

Interim Registrar Cornejo reported the ROV is conducting two elections simultaneously.

b. From commissioners

President Dieter announced that the approved June 2, 2026 post-election assessment was emailed to the Board of Supervisors, and that the ROV sent to the Secretary of State the commission's recommended changes to the California State Voter Information Guide.

5 Public Comment on Issues Not on the Agenda

There was no public comment on non-agenda items.

6 Monthly Update from Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office

Interim Registrar Cornejo reported that ROV is in the middle of the August 18, 2026 election canvass, posting scheduled updates and will certify the election on September 17, per the Secretary of State's guidelines. The ROV is currently preparing for the November general election, including the voter information guide and ballot information. There are 28 local measures, 14 state propositions, 216 candidate statements for 268 versions of the voter information guide that have to be translated into four languages. She answered questions.

7 Ongoing Agenda Items

7-A Ad Hoc Committee Reports

7-A(1) Voting Participation

video time 14:23

Commissioner Ritzie-Hernandez reported the progress the committee has made with Fuerza. They've asked for demographic statistics throughout Alameda County, including race, ethnicity, eligible voters, registered voters and actual voters, and turnout for the last five general elections. No public comment was made. Discussion ensued.

7-A(2) Youth Participation

24:01

Commissioner Varlack reported that the committee did not meet during the month. The committee requested to continue to receive reports from the ROV and the Oakland and Berkeley school districts regarding youth voting and from the working group that was formed to make sure it is successful. No public comment was made. Discussion ensued. Ms. Cornejo said the results of youth turnout by jurisdiction is on the website and reported on the ROV's efforts to work with the school administrators regarding educating youth about voting in California, and youth volunteering as vote center workers.

7-A(3) Budgeting for Elections

39:15

Commissioner Lindsay reported the committee is trying to meet for the second time with an ROV cost expert before offering advice on clarifying the cost of doing business. The meeting had already been scheduled for September 9. No public comment was made.

7-A(4) Rules and Procedures

41:50

Commissioner Dieter said the commission's edits to the rules were made and that county counsel had reviewed it for compliance with the Brown Act, adding that the county has a handbook for all Boards and Commissions. Jason Allen explained that the commission is not an eligible legislative body that requires additional Brown Act requirements. No public comment was made. Discussion ensued. A motion was made to approve the rules and

procedures with amendments—moving B-12 to B-1, adding in-person and on time barring emergencies after attend all meetings, and adding language clarifying that the county handbook supersedes the commission’s rules in the event of a conflict by Commissioner Lindsay and seconded by Commissioner Varlack. The motion passed unanimously.

8 Regular Agenda Items

8-A Election Services Discussions and Potential Memorandum(s) of Understanding

57:50

Commissioner Lindsay pointed out that the agenda item description needed to be changed from the month of July to June, and officials to clerks. Ms. Cornejo reviewed the processes already in place that impact cities, the recent meeting with the city clerks, and the possibility of conducting a debrief after the election regarding their ballot measures as well. No public comment was made. Discussion ensued. Mr. Allen clarified that the Elections Code already spells out what the ROV’s and the cities’ duties are, so adding a MOU may potentially change the legal dynamic, so the ROV has not promised to enter into a MOU. Commissioner Pham explained that improving communications with the clerks may alleviate the need for MOUs. Ms. Cornejo said the ROV has provided the clerks with updated guidelines and the media toolkit.

8-B Workshop on Election Commission Interests

1:18

President Dieter reminded everyone that commissioners and the public help create the agenda, and asked for possible agenda items. No public comment was made. Discussion ensued. Commissioners and staff offered their ideas for agenda items.

8-C Commission member restrictions

1:57

President Dieter said campaign season had arrived so it is important for the commissioners to know the restrictions, particularly on political activities. No public comment was made. Discussion ensued. Mr. Allen clarified the primary concern is for the commission to maintain an appearance and actual objectivity on oversight of elections.

9 Special Report from the ROV

2:18

Ms. Cornejo reported on the process of screening, testing, hiring, onboarding, training, and deploying around 300 internal temporary workers through the Human Resources department.

10 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

Attachment for Agenda Item #3b – **September Meeting Minutes**

Alameda County Elections Commission

Unapproved Meeting Minutes

September 17, 2026

4:00 PM

1225 Fallon Street, Room G-1
Oakland CA 94612

1 Call to Order / Roll Call

The Elections Commission meeting was called to order at 4:25 p.m.

Present

Commission Members: Karen Butter, Irene Dieter, Jim Lindsay, David Wagner, and Allie Whitehurst.

Absent

Commission Members: Judy Belcher, Alissa Moore, Alexander Ramon, Sasha Ritzie-Hernandez, Karl Seabrook, Tiega Varlack, and ex-officio Thai Nam Pham.

Staff Present

Registrar of Voters: Cynthia Cornejo, Noe Lucio, Charles Smithline, and Shaheer Siddiqui.
County Counsel: Jason Allen.

President Dieter adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m. for lack of quorum.

Attachment for Agenda Item #4 – Announcements and Communications

List of Jurisdictions in the November 3, 2026 General Election

COUNTY: Measure RTM - Regional Transit Measure

SCHOOL DISTRICTS Ohlone Community College District (1 Trustee, Area 6); Chabot - Las Positas Community College District (3 Trustees, Areas 2, 3, 6); Peralta Community College District (1 Trustee, Area 5); Alameda Unified School District (2 Governing Board Members, Full Term); Castro Valley Unified School District (1 Governing Board Member, Area 2 – Short Term) (2 Governing Board Member, Area 3, 4 – Full Term); Dublin Unified School District (1 Governing Board Members, Area 3 – Short Term) (1 Governing Board Members, Area 5 – Full Term) Measure I; Emery Unified School District (3 Governing Board Members); Hayward Unified School District (2 Governing Board Members, Areas 2, 4); Livermore Valley Joint Unified School District (3 Governing Board Members); New Haven Unified School District (2 Governing Board Members, Areas 4, 5); Pleasanton Unified School District (1 Governing Board Member, Area 5); San Lorenzo Unified School District Measure J; Sunol Glen Unified School District (2 Governing Board Member) Measure K

SPECIAL DISTRICTS: Alameda – Contra Costa Transit District (3 District Director, Wards 3, 4, 5); Alameda County Water District (2 District Directors, Wards 2, 3); Bay Area Rapid Transit District (1 District Director, Ward 4); Castro Valley Sanitary District (2 District Directors); Eden Township Healthcare District (1 District Director, Area 3); East Bay Municipal Utility District (2 District Directors, Wards 3, 7); East Bay Regional Park District (2 District Directors, Wards 3, 5); Fairview Fire Protection District (2 District Directors); Hayward Area Recreation & Park District (2 District Director, Areas 2, 4); Livermore Area Recreation & Park District (3 District Directors); Oro Loma Sanitary District (3 District Directors)

CITIES: Alameda (1 Mayor) (2 City Council Members) Measures L, M, & N; Albany (2 City Council Members) (4 Members of the Board of Education) Measures O, P, Q, R, S, & T; Berkeley (5 Rent Stabilization Board Commissioners) (3 School Directors) (4 City Council Members, Districts 1, 4, 7, 8) (1 City Auditor) Measures U, V, W, X, Y, Z and AA; Dublin (1 Mayor) (2 City Council Members, District 2, 4); Emeryville (2 City Council Members) Measure BB; Fremont (3 City Council Members, Districts 2, 3, 4); Hayward (1 Mayor) (2 City Council Members, Districts 1, 6) Measure CC; Livermore (1 City Council Member, District 2); Newark (1 Mayor) (2 City Council Members) Measure DD; Piedmont (3 City Council Members) Measure GG; Pleasanton (1 Mayor) (2 City Council Members, Districts 1, 3) Measure HH; San Leandro (1 Mayor) (4 City Council Members, Districts 1, 2 short-term, 3, 5); Union City (3 City Council Members, Districts 2, 3, 4) Measure II; Oakland (1 Mayor) (3 City Council Members, Districts 2, 4, 6) (1 City Auditor) (3 School Directors, Districts 2, 4, 6) Measures EE and FF

Attachment for Agenda Item 7-A(1) – Voting Participation

October 6, 2026

Hello Commissioners,

On behalf of the Voting Participation Subcommittee, I am providing an update on our work, the challenges we have encountered, and potential recommendations as we continue to advance our mission.

Mission Statement

"To seek better ways to provide services and develop new outreach techniques to encourage and support all eligible disenfranchised voters to exercise their right to vote, while creating measurable goals and monitoring outcomes."

As discussed during our meeting earlier today, the Voting Subcommittee meets twice each month and has been working to identify meaningful strategies to increase voter participation among historically disenfranchised communities.

A significant challenge throughout this process has been obtaining the data necessary to establish measurable goals and make informed recommendations. We reached out to several organizations, including the Alameda County Registrar of Voters (ROV) and UC Berkeley. Unfortunately, due to limited capacity and available resources, these efforts did not produce the information we needed.

More recently, we were able to connect with the organization "Fuerza", who has assisted us in identifying and obtaining relevant voter participation data.

The subcommittee requested the following information for all districts in Alameda County:

- Voter data disaggregated by ethnicity.
- Election data covering at least the last five elections, with ten elections preferred.
- For each election:
 - Total population
 - Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) / Eligible Voters
 - Number of registered voters
 - Number of actual voters
 - Demographic breakdowns by:
 - § Race/Ethnicity
 - § Gender
 - § Age

This turned out to be too big a request. We were, however, able to get two sets of data:

The first dataset we received focused on Black voter participation across all Oakland districts. Upon reviewing the data, we identified District 3 as an area of particular concern, where only approximately 40% of eligible Black voters participated in elections. District 7 came in a close second, with only 43% of eligible Black voters actually voting.

The second data set, received on August 26, provided voter participation information for Alameda County and Oakland as a whole, broken down by ethnicity and covering elections over the past 10 years. While the data was not available at the district level, it revealed that voter participation rates among AAPI and Latino communities were significantly lower than those of Black voters, both within Oakland and Alameda County overall.

In addition, it was noted that West Oakland has been gentrifying, and that District 7's statistics are messy, because it includes high voting propensity voting populations east of I-580.

Therefore, based on the information currently available, the subcommittee believes it is appropriate to begin considering recommendations. Our recommendation would be the development of a pilot voter registration and civic engagement initiative in Oakland District 7 west of I-580. This effort could leverage trusted, community-based organizations that are already deeply rooted within the neighborhood to increase voter registration, voter education, and voter participation.

In addition, given the participation trends identified in the countywide data, the Commission and ROV may wish to explore future outreach strategies specifically designed to engage AAPI and Latino communities.

We welcome the Commission's feedback and guidance as we continue this important work and look forward to discussing potential next steps.

Respectfully,
Karl Seabrook
On behalf of the Voting Participation Subcommittee

RECOMMENDATION: Request that the ROV develop a pilot voter registration and civic engagement initiative in Oakland District 7, west of I-580.

Attachment for Agenda Item #7-A(3) – Budgeting for Elections

SUMMARY:

The committee has worked together with the Registrar of Voters to understand how election costs are apportioned to jurisdictions. The committee proposes to summarize to the Commission what it has learned and make several recommendations for the Commission to consider and act on.

REPORT:

The committee studied how election costs are apportioned to jurisdictions (e.g., cities) and the county in Alameda County, and gathered information about concerns that have been expressed by city clerks and others about this process. The Registrar of Voters' office has done an exceptional job of supporting the committee in understanding current practice, and the committee is grateful for this support and has a high regard for the ROV staff's professionalism and competence.

The concerns that the committee is aware of tend to fall into four categories:

1. Predictability of billing
2. Costs for cities/jurisdictions that have more than 4 ballot measures
3. Costs for cities that use Ranked Choice Voting (RCV)
4. Costs for cities that use youth voting

Regarding category 1 (predictability of billing), earlier this year the Registrar of Voters responded to predictability of billing concerns by updating the web page to improve communication to jurisdictions. The committee previously reviewed this update and expressed its support and appreciation for this change. Since then, the committee has focused on the remaining concerns.

To inform the committee's deliberations regarding categories 2-4, the committee learned how these costs are apportioned, has prepared a detailed technical document describing our understanding of cost allocation, and shared it with the Registrar of Voters' office for feedback and corrections. The committee is grateful for the time that ROV staff have spent educating the committee about its practices and commends this transparency and support to the Commission.

At a high level, election costs are apportioned between the county and other jurisdictions (e.g., cities, special districts, school boards), based on the number of registered voters in each jurisdiction and the number of ballot cards needed for that jurisdiction. Each jurisdiction, including the county, is apportioned a share of total costs that is proportional to the number of registered voters in that jurisdiction, except that the county's share of the costs is doubled, and any jurisdiction that has 5 or more ballot measures in the election has its share doubled. Informally, this splits the cost of elections between the county and cities, with the county paying a significant part of the cost of elections.

The ROV accounts for costs that can be associated with Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) or youth voting separately. The RCV-associated costs are allocated to RCV cities, in proportion to their number of registered voters. The youth voting-associated costs are allocated to cities using youth voting proportionally. The RCV/youth-voting charges to cities are in addition to other charges to those cities. When the ROV Office identifies which election costs it considers to be associated with RCV, it includes all labor and materials that have been logged as RCV costs by ROV employees. *It also includes all ballot printing, ballot stuffing, ballot transport, ballot mailing, etc. costs in RCV contests in RCV cities, even though these costs would also have been incurred even in the absence of RCV.*

One implication of this procedure is that RCV cities pay more for elections, beyond what can be explained by the increase in cost caused by their adoption of RCV. RCV cities pay for a share of ballot production costs twice -- once in their share of ballot production costs the ROV designates as RCV-associated, and once in their share of ballot production costs the ROV designates as non-RCV-associated -- even though the adoption of RCV appears to leave ballot production costs largely unchanged.

No ballot production costs (except for RCV education inserts; see below) should be considered RCV-associated, as RCV has little impact on ballot production costs. Because ballot production costs are the largest contributor to election costs, this procedure has a significant impact on the allocation of election costs and how much each jurisdiction pays as their share.

Note that there are legitimate costs that are specifically RCV costs. These include costs for the RCV tallying software license, the RCV information insert that goes into the ballot, and employee time spent on RCV education. These should be paid only by RCV cities.

Regarding category 4, another implication is that there is a significant increase in costs for cities if the number of ballot measures increases beyond 4 ballot measures. If a city has up to 4 ballot measures, it is charged its share; but if it has 5 or more ballot measures, its share is doubled. Thanks to the Registrar of Voters' improvement in communications earlier this year, this increase has now been clearly communicated to cities, so this increase in costs will be predictable.

The committee finds the allocation of costs for youth voting reasonable. It is a high cost, but it is appropriate that only cities that choose to implement youth voting pay for those costs.

Regarding category 2 (number of ballot measures), the Commission could consider whether it wishes to charge this committee to continue considering category 2 (costs for cities/jurisdictions that have more than 4 ballot measures) further and return to the Commission with a recommendation.

The Commission could consider two recommendations that have emerged from the committee's deliberations.

Possible recommendation 1: Revise the accounting for which costs are considered RCV-related. Do not treat ballot production costs (including ballot printing of ballot cards, envelope printing and stuffing, transport costs, etc.) as RCV-related.

Rationale: This possible recommendation is intended to provide equity and fairness to all jurisdictions, and to follow the principle that cities and counties share the cost of elections, but cities that adopt RCV must pay for all increases in costs caused by adoption of RCV. It is the committee's impression that ballot production costs are almost the same whether a city adopts RCV or not, and do not represent a true increased cost that can be attributed to adoption of RCV. Cities that choose to adopt RCV should pay for the real incremental cost increase due to RCV; the county and other jurisdictions should not have to pay for the increase in cost due to adopting RCV.

There is a narrow exception: in some elections the ROV has included an extra RCV education card in ballot packages where there is an RCV race. If this is done, this should be considered a specific RCV cost and apportioned entirely to the RCV cities, without the county or other jurisdictions paying a share of the cost for RCV education cards.

If this possible recommendation were adopted, it would have implications on the cost to jurisdictions. Costs would increase for jurisdictions that do not use RCV and for the county. Costs would decrease for cities that do use RCV. This is an effect of adjusting the practice to better provide long-term equity of costs and fairness to all jurisdictions.

Possible recommendation 2: These changes to cost apportionment should take effect beginning July 1, 2027, or earlier.

Rationale: This would provide time to implement the changes and provide notice to affected jurisdictions. It would ensure that the changes are in place before the beginning of the fiscal year for most or all jurisdictions, enabling them to plan. If this possible recommendation were adopted, these changes would first affect cost

apportionment to the 2028 primary and general elections. They would not change how election costs are apportioned in the 2026 general election.

Attachment for Agenda Item # 8-A Post-election Assessment for August election



[ELECTIONS](#) [VOTING](#) [RESOURCES](#) [COMMUNITY](#) [CANDIDATES](#)

[Skip to Content](#)
VOTER PROFILE

Preliminary/Unofficial - Post Election Update #3

Last Updated: Tuesday, September 15, 2026; 5:13 PM

[Click here to request the Cast Vote Record](#)

[Click here for the August 18 Results Update Schedule.](#)

▼ FILTER

↑ COLLAPSE ALL

↓ EXPAND ALL

[ELECTION RESULTS MAP](#)

Registration & Turnout

+

Federal

-

U.S. Representative, 14th Congressional District

-

323 of 323 Precincts Partially Reported from Vote Centers (100.00%)

Vote for One (1) Only

Contest	Votes	Percentage
Aisha Wahab	51,734	53.10 %
Melissa Hernandez	45,700	46.90 %

[Back to Top](#)



[ELECTIONS](#) [VOTING](#) [RESOURCES](#) [COMMUNITY](#) [CANDIDATES](#)

Official Election Site of Alameda County
[Skip to Content](#)
VOTER PROFILE



Congressional District 14 Special General Election - August 18, 2026

Certified Final Results

Last Updated: Thursday, September 17, 2026; 2:53 PM

[Click here to request the Cast Vote Record](#)

[Click here for the August 18 Results Update Schedule.](#)

▼ FILTER

↑ COLLAPSE ALL

↓ EXPAND ALL

[ELECTION RESULTS MAP](#)

Registration & Turnout

-

Registration & Turnout

-

323 of 323 Precincts Partially Reported from Vote Centers (100.00%)

Total Registration:431872

	Turnout	Percentage
Election Day Reporting Turnout	2,988	0.69 %
Vote by Mail Reporting Turnout	94,857	21.96 %
Total Ballots Cast	97,845	22.66 %

[Back to Top](#)

Attachment for Agenda Item #9 – Special Report from ROV

