THE STATE OF ARIZONA

CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

## REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

Phoenix, Arizona June 27, 2024 9:30 a.m.

> Miller Certified Reporting, LLC PO Box 513, Litchfield Park, AZ 85340 (P) 623-975-7472 www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

Reported By: Angela Furniss Miller, RPR Certified Reporter (AZ 50127)

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	0	1	
1 2 3	2 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION, convened at 9:30 a.m. on June 27, 2024, at the State of Arizona, Citizens Clean Elections Commission, 1110	1 2	3 PROCEEDING
45	West Washington, Suite 250, Phoenix, Arizona, in the presence of the following Board Members:	3	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Good morning. Agenda Item I
6	Mr. Mark S. Kimble, Chairman	4	is the call to order.
	Mr. Galen Paton	5	It is 9:30 a.m. on June 27th, 2024. I call
7	Ms. Amy Chan (videoconference)	6	this meeting of the Citizens Clean Elections Commission to
8	Ms. Christina Estes-Werther	7	order.
Ů	OTHERS PRESENT:		
9		8	With that, we will take attendance.
4.0	Thomas M. Collins, Executive Director	9	Commissioners, please identify yourself for the record.
10	Paula Thomas, Executive Officer Mike Becker, Policy Director	10	COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Christina
11	Gina Roberts, Voter Education Director	11	Werther.
	Avery Xola, Voter Education Manager	12	COMMISSIONER PATON: Galen Paton.
12	Alec Shaffer, Web Content Manager	13	COMMISSIONER CHAN: Amy Chan.
13	Kara Karlson, Assistant Attorney General Cathy Herring, KCA	14	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And I'm Mark Kimble, and we
	Paige Jarrell, KCA	15	do have a quorum. Thank you.
14	Emma Cone-Roddy, Osborn, Maledon (videoconference)	16	Item II, discussion and possible action on
15	Jonathan Berkon, Elias Law Group (videoconference) Rivko Knox, Member of the Public (videoconference)	17	minutes for the May 16th, 2024, meeting.
15	Rived Riber, Heinber of the Fublic (Videocomerence)	18	
16			Commissioners, you have the minutes from our
47		19	last meeting in the packet. Is there any discussion?
17 18		20	Hearing none, do I have a motion to approve
19		21	the minutes?
20		22	COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Motion to
21 22		23	approve.
23		24	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?
24		25	COMMISSIONER PATON: I'll second.
25	Miller Centified Demention, 11 C		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	4		5
1	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded	1	certain things operates. So we'll try to get you a
2	that we approve the meeting the minutes from our last	2	summary of that as soon as we can. I got it just the time
3		3	
	meeting.		the meeting started. So that's about all I have, just a
4	I will call the roll. Commissioner Chan.	4	heads-up.
5	COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.	5	COMMISSIONER PATON: Until the next.
6	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.	6	MR. COLLINS: That's right.
7	COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.	7	And if if Emma, if you happen to get a
8	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.	8	chance to digest this in the next 45 minutes, let me know.
9	COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.	9	So, this has been an exciting month and Gina
10	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.	10	is going to talk in the next agenda item about our voter
11	Minutes are approved 4-to-nothing.	11	education efforts, but, you know, last night we concluded our
12	Item III, discussion and possible action on	12	broadcast debate part of the primary. Legislative debates
13	Executive Director's report.	13	will continue through next weeks next week.
14	Tom.	14	You know, Gina will have more to say about
15	MR. COLLINS: Hi. So four minutes ago, the	15	this, but I want to say that the broadcast debates, I think,
16	2 .		
	Court of Appeals released an opinion in the case <u>Toma v.</u>	16	have been exceptional and well-received and and really
17	<u>Fontes</u> , which is our one of the cases regarding Prop 211.	17	supported the overall mission of the Commission to provide
18	The challenge is on separation of powers' grounds; I haven't	18	information to voters, and and so we're really I mean,
19	had a chance to read it because it came out four minutes ago.	19	I really can't say enough about it or I'll get verklempt.
20	The bottom line is part of it was part of	20	Likewise the voter education guide is being
21	the trial court's decision was affirmed; part of it was	21	delivered across the state; those have started arriving.
22	reversed, and part of it was and it was remanded.	22	Interesting, I really think the baseline of questions we're
23	It looks like the main issue there on remand	23	getting from folks writing in about the voter education
24	has to do with 6974 which is a statute that talks about how	24	guide, we're getting more attention to it than we have in the
25	the delegation of authority to the Commission to to do	25	past. We're getting specific questions about, you know,
1	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
1		1	
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	6		7
1	content; we're getting questions about the details. Things	1	' been as staff members and representative commission as we've
2	that we haven't really gotten in the past and I think that,	2	been just over the past month.
3	again, that's an attribute to the fact that we're getting	3	The we have an update on our participating
4	some traction here in this.	4	candidates. We now have 43 participating candidates; we've
5	You can see we've had in addition to those	5	funded 26. I think we're getting to a place now our numbers
6	on-site and and activities, we've continued to do a range	6	are on relative parity with what we've had in in the past
7	of of appearances at a variety of different events. Just	7	couple of election cycles.
8	to highlight a few, Gina and the Maricopa County Recorder's	8	There's been a little bit of a lag as
9	Office did a tele-town hall that reached 4,000 voters about	9	candidates are more likely to be not file their
10	election process. Avery and I were at the Navajo Voters	10	application for certain until they file their their whole
11	Coalition Conference last week in outside of Flagstaff.	11	filing, so there's a lag now in terms of knowing what the
12	We all were at the Phoenix Fan Fusion, which is basically	12	number is; but I think that's good.
13	Phoenix's equivalent of Comic-Con where we launched	13	We have another advisory opinion request.
14	Captain Activate!, which is without a doubt my favorite	14	That was filed this week and then and then
15	one probably my favorite thing we've ever done. This is	15	I'd also want to highlight that we have a that we have a
16	Avery's comic book; it was well received. Captain Activate!	16	report that we worked on with Arizona State Senate for
17	was there in person. And I mean, it was great. It was a	17	Independent and Sustainable Democracy that's attached that
18	great event, and it was really cool.	18	gets into the views and attitudes of younger voters, which we
19	So we're just we've got a it's we	19	think is designed to provide some ballast to both election
20	just got a really a lot of stuff going on and I and I	20	officials and and the public generally. But and
21	think that we're reaching a broad variety of different folks	21	policymakers on the administrative side, in terms of trying
22	around around the state. And we're reaching	22	to understand where those voters are coming from.
23	essentially I mean, you know, I don't think that four	23	So that's that's really the main the
24	years ago, certainly during COVID, I guess, or even six years	24	main issues I wanted to highlight.
25	ago, we were in a position to be in as many places as we've	25	You know, I think one other thing I will note,
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	8		9
1	and I think it's worth talking about because it will be an	1	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: or discussions
2	ongoing issue, you know. Arizona Republic, there's a big	2	COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a discussion
3	long story about filings in Maricopa County particularly	3	comments.
4	around campaign finance, how the failure to file system	4	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: from the Commissioner
5 6	works, and so I think that's something that we will be	5	Paton.
7	keeping an eye on. But I think that basically completes my	6 7	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I got my Voter Election Guide [verbatim], and I noticed that there were one
8	my my report and what I wanted to highlight.	8	or two candidates that didn't fill anything out. I mean,
9	And as I said, if we'll get more of soon as	9	what's the the reason for that?
10	I get before the end of the meeting, if I if I have a	10	They just don't think it matters or?
11	better understanding of where the the and how the <u>Toma</u>	11	MR. COLLINS: You want to
12	<u>v. Fontes</u> breaks down on remand, I will let you know.	12	COMMISSIONER PATON: They're late or
13	We did just want to make clear that we did put	13	I mean, I find it very peculiar I guess.
14	in the executive report we expected a decision at any time,	14	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, and it's not unique to
15	and "any time" includes 9:30 on Thursday morning, so.	15	the voter's guide. In our debates last night in the U.S.
16	Everybody had notice that we could talk about this.	16	Senate debate, two of the three candidates opted not to
17	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Tom.	17	appear, so.
18	I think I speak for all Commissioners when I	18	Gina.
19	say, is Captain Activate! going to be coming to any of our	19	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, out
20	upcoming meetings?	20	of the entire, I think, approximately 200 candidates that
21	Possibly?	21	were eligible to appear in the guide, we had maybe 6 I think
22	Well, we don't need to do it right now, but	22	off the top of my head that did not do a submission. We
23	it's something we can look forward to.	23	still do list their name and their details in there.
24	Are there any other questions	24	We do extensive outreach to try to connect
25	COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a	25	with these candidates, and so these are the ones that we just
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com	1	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

<ul> <li>Last night I had the opportunity to observe</li> <li>the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was</li> <li>greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the</li> <li>professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve</li> <li>have some legislative debates that are occurring, and we will</li> <li>general elections schedule now.</li> <li>So essentially what we'll be doing is</li> <li>identifying the debates that we wish to host through our</li> </ul>		10		11
3         connect with them, and they just did not complete the submission.         3         don't think it's on our end or anything let that, other than maybe they think that we're doing something nefarious with the control of anything let thet, "that we're doing something nefarious with the control of anything let thet," that people don't debate that - that between some something that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something that people don't debate that - that between something and the parts that people don't debate that - that between something that this people don't debate that - that between something that this people don't debate that - that between something that this people don't debate that - that between that that that that that this people don't debate that - that between that that that that that that the	1	get zero response from. So we don't actually know why they	1	know what more we can do.
4         submission.         maybe they think that we're doing something netarious with their content, i don't know. But it's just and the parts is the the other's me as well.           7         what their their jurpose is. And I find it just either         1           7         indoit even have to do it."         1           8         Ti don't cen that about the voters, or "I'm as sure that in the voter so or a bout source in the voter so or a bout source in the voter so in a bout source in the voter so in a bout source in the voter so in a bout source in the voter source in the vote	2	don't submit anything, but we do extensive outreach to	2	COMMISSIONER PATON: I mean, I don't I
5         COMMISSIONER PATON: You would think that it, be would be to their detriment to not let somebody know what	3	connect with them, and they just did not complete the	3	don't think it's on our end or anything like that, other than
5         COMMISSIONER PATON: You would think that it, be would be to their detriment to not let somebody know what	4	submission.	4	maybe they think that we're doing something nefarious with
6         would be to their detriment to not tele somebody know what	5	COMMISSIONER PATON: You would think that it	5	
7         What their their purpose is. And I find it just either         7         Like, if you're so sure about yourself or whatever, then tell           8         T don't care that about the voters, or T'm so sure that         9         everybody and let everybody hear it instead of being, you           10         I guass that's it, 1 don't know.         10         I don't care that about the voters, or n'the source           11         MS. ROBERTS: I It can Mr. Chairman,         10         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commission or questions           13         get inquires from the voters saying, "Where's this person's         14         (No audble response.)           16         So the voters do notice because we         16         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commission or Tom's report?           14         to us asking why.         To would bin exponse.)         16         Item 1, discussion possible action on updates           17         for the source doubt memory of would would bin source.         18         To the vource douction quide is hitting mailboxes around the           10         us asking why.         COMMISSIONER PATON: Ch, yeah. I would1         12         As Tom metioned, this week, the Commission           12         COMMISSIONER PATON: Ch, yeah. I would1         23         state.         23           14         the doubte for intiterestinin running and 1don't         His pessif	6	would be to their detriment to not let somebody know what	6	
8       "I don't care that - about the voters," or "I'm so sure that       9       8       everybody and let everybod and let everybody and let everybody and let	7		7	
9       I don't even have to do it."       9       know, surreptitious about stuff; I don't know.         10       I guess that's I, I don't know.       10       Just bothersome to me.         11       MS: ROBERTS: I - I can - Mr. Chairman,       10       Just bothersome to me.         12       Commissioners, I can tell you the voters do notice because we       11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner questions         13       get inquires from the voters saying, "Where's this person's       11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Nay, thank you.         16       So the voters do notice and they do reach out       15       cleates?       16       Term HV, discussion possible action on updates         19       noticed.       19       wrapped up our broadcast debate program for the primary       20       cleation. Our legislative debates wrap up early next week         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think       18       As Tom mentioned, this week, the Commission         21       incredible program.       12       This this is crunch time for the clean         23       uould think so.       12       Miler Certified Reporting, LLC         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think       Miller Certified Reporting, LCC       www.MillerCertifiedReporting, LCC         24       Incredible program.       12       Mile cartified Re	8		8	
10       I guess that's it, I don't know.       10       Just bothersome to me.         11       MS. ROBERTS: I I can Mr. Chairman,       11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner         13       get inquires from the voters aping, "Where's this person's       13       from the Commission on Tom's report?         14       statement?" Or "Why didn't this person participate in the       14       Chairman,       15         15       debate?       So the voters do notice because we       14       (No audble response.)         15       debate?       16       Item IV, discussion possible action on updates         16       coMMISSIONER PATON: Exactly. Well, I       18       As Tom mentioned, this week, the Commission         17       for the 2024 voter education guide is hitting mailboxes around the       16       Item IV, discussion possible action on updates         18       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I wouldI       18       As Tom mentioned, this week, the Commission         19       would think so.       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I wouldI       12       14         13       the debate program.       12       14       Item IV, discussion pathers, the Arizona Media         14       hatespesionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media       6       identifying the debates, have wrapped up and we still				
11       MS. ROBERTS: I I can Mr. Chairman,       11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commission or questions         12       Commissioners, I can tell you the voters do notice because we       12       Ar there any other discussion or questions         14       statement?" Or "Why didn't this person participate in the       14       The met any other discussion or questions         15       debate?"       14       (No audible response.)       15         15       COMMISSIONER PATON: Exactly. Well, I       16       So the voters do notice and they do reach out       16       To reliave any other discussion on updates         19       noticed.       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know       16       As Tom mentioned, this week, the Commission         14       usual think so.       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know       16       As Tom mentioned, this week, the Commission         14       usual think so.       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think       14       Athe voter education guide is hitting mailboxes around the         14       state night I had the opportunity to observe       14       Elections stheful any advestill         14       the debate program.       12       14       Have some legislative debates that we owking on our         15       micredible program.       12       14       I debates, our broadcast debates, h	10		10	
12       Commissioners, I can tell you the voters do notice because we       12       Are there any other discussion or questions         13       get inquires from the voters saying, "Where's this person's       13       from the Commission or To's report?         14       Gaudble response.)       13       from the Commission or puestions         15       debate?"       CMAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, thank you.         16       To us asking why.       16       To the 2024 voter education efforts.         19       noticed.       17       for the 2024 voter education efforts.         19       orapped for the primary       16       Chairman, KitMBLE: Okay, thank you.         10       CAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know       10       As Torm mentioned, this week, the Commission         20       COMMISSIONER PATON: On, yesh. I would ~ I       12       18       As Torm mentioned, this meek, the Commission         21       Mould think so.       23       This ~ this is crunch time for the Clean         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think       12       14       debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up and we still         2       Last night I had the opportunity to observe       14       debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up and we still         2       Last night I had the opportunity to observe		-	11	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioners,
13       get inquires from the voters saying, "Where's this person's statement?" Or "Why didn't this person participate in the debate?"       13       from the Commission or Tom's report?         14       statement?" Or "Why didn't this person participate in the debate?"       14       (No audible response.)         15       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commission or Static and they do reach out       16       The Why didn't this person participate in the         19       noticed.       16       ChAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         21       Gina hammers these people to respond.       23       This this is crunch time for the Clean         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know       20       This this is crunch time for the Clean         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think       24       Elections staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery,         25       Last night I had the opportunity to observe       12       the debate program an Elifer Studos, and I can say I was         3       Goldstein, Mary Råbago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this       5       So essentially what well be doing is         4       fordiscussion, Riseter; gun moderators, Jim Ninzel, Steve       5       So essentially what well be doing is         6				
14       statement?" Or "Why didn't this person participate in the       14       (No audible response.)         15       debate?"       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, thank you.         16       So the voters do notice and they do reach out       15       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, thank you.         17       to us asking why.       16       Term IV, discussion possible action on updates         17       to us asking why.       17       for the 2024 voter education efforts.       18         18       COMMISSIONER PATON: Exactly. Well, I       18       As Tom mentioned, this week, the Commission         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know       18       and the voter education efforts.         21       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I wouldI I       23       Thisthis is crunch time for the Clean         23       Would think so.       24       Elections staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery,         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think       24       Election staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery,         25       Last night I had the opportunity to observe       12       thate some legislative debates that are occurring, and we will         24       Last night I had the opportunity to observe       12       debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up as well. And we are working on our         25			13	
15       debate?"       15       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, thank you.         16       So the voters do notice and they do reach out       16       Item IV, discussion possible action on updates         19       noticed.       17       for the 2024 voter education efforts.       18         19       noticed.       19       wrapped up our broadcast debate program for the primary         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know.       19       wrapped up our broadcast debate program for the primary         21       Gina hammers these people to respond.       20       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would -I I         24       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would -I I       would think so.       23       This this is crunch time for the Clean         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think       Elections staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery,         25       that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't       Miller Certified Reporting, LC         www.MillerCertified Reporting, LC       www.MillerCertified Reporting, LC       14         4       general elections schedule now.       5       So easentially what we'll be doing is         3       for the zobay, diar, Mary Rabago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this       5       So easentially what we'll be doing is         4       general election schedule n				•
16       Item IV, discussion possible action on updates         17       to us asking why.         18       COMMISSIONER PATON: Exactly. Well, I         19       noticed.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         21       Gina hammers these people to respond.         23       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would I         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think         25       that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me poorting, LLC         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think         26       Last night I had the opportunity to observe         3       the debate program.         2       Last night I had the opportunity to observe         3       forleater program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was         4       greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the         5       So essentially what well be doing is         6       identifying the debates that we wish to host through our         7       Goidstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this         8       program to a new level.         9       We ve heard remarkably positive feedback fro	15			
17       to us asking why.         18       COMMISSIONER PATON: Exactly. Well, I         19       noticed.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         21       Gina hammers these people to respond.         22       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would ~-I         23       Would think so.         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         25       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would ~-I         26       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         27       This this is crunch time for the Clean         28       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let mey don't, I think         29       Way Miller Certified Reporting, LLC         www. Miller Certified Reporting, LLC       Www. MillerCertified Reporting, LLC         11       incredible program.       12         12       Last night I had the opportunity to observe       13         3       greaty impressed. The technology, the facility, the       5         4       professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media       5         6       adsoration, Riester; our moderators, Jim Ninzel, Steve       5         7       Goldstein, Mary Ridago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this       5         8       proregram to a new level.       5 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
18       COMMISSIONER PATON: Exactly. Well, I         19       noticed.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know         21       Gina hammers these people to respond.         22       COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would I         23       would think so.         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think         25       that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't         26       Miller Certified Reporting, LLC         www.MillerCertified Reporting.com       12         11       incredible program.       12         2       Last night I had the opportunity to observe       13         3       the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was       9         4       greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the       5         5       professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media       5         6       Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve       7         7       Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this       5         8       professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media       5         6       iconcerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.       14         14       alon the votere beinterested enough to tune				
<ul> <li>19 noticed.</li> <li>10 noticed.</li> <li>10 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know.</li> <li>11 Gina harmers these people to respond.</li> <li>12 COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would I</li> <li>13 would think so.</li> <li>14 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think.</li> <li>15 that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't.</li> <li>16 Masse and the opportunity to beserve</li> <li>17 incredible program.</li> <li>18 the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was</li> <li>19 greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the</li> <li>10 greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the</li> <li>11 Galdetes about their experiences.</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>11 also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>11 also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have sets ol all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>13 So as son as we get that schedule finalized,</li> <li>14 we will be marking it public so that all of our candidates can save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>31 Ms. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>32 All right, if we can git to the first slide,</li> <li>33 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>34 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>35 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>36 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know</li> <li>Gina hammers these people to respond.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would I</li> <li>would think so.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>This this is crunch time for the Clean</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>This this is crunch time for the Clean</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>This this is crunch time for the Clean</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>This this is crunch time for the Clean</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</li> <li>www.MillerCertifiedReporting. Com</li> <li>the debate program.</li> <li>debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up and we still</li> <li>have some legislative debates that we care or partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve</li> <li>Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this</li> <li>professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>for candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>says to to watch the debates.</li> <li>Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>your voter education efforts.</li> <li>Gina.</li> <li>Gina.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>All right, if we can pull those up.</li> <li>All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>21 Gina hammers these people to respond.</li> <li>22 COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would I</li> <li>23 would think so.</li> <li>24 CHARMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>25 that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't</li> <li>26 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</li> <li>27 www.Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</li> <li>28 www.Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</li> <li>29 Www.Miller Certified Reporting, com</li> <li>12</li> <li>1 incredible program.</li> <li>12</li> <li>1 incredible program.</li> <li>12</li> <li>1 debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up and we still</li> <li>30 the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was</li> <li>4 greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the</li> <li>5 professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>6 Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Ninzel, Steve</li> <li>7 broadcast, method and also the debates that we wish to host through our</li> <li>5 So essentially what we'll be doing is</li> <li>6 identifying the debates that we wish to host through our</li> <li>7 broadcast method and also the debates that we will create a</li> <li>9 We've heard remarkably positive feedback from</li> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>18 All right, if we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>24 Ist. The very were so overwhelmed with the reach that it</li> <li>24 Ist. The vear will those up.</li> <li>25 All righ</li></ul>		CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know		
<ul> <li>22 COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would I</li> <li>23 would think so.</li> <li>24 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>25 that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't</li> <li>26 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</li> <li>www.MillerCertified Reporting, Com</li> <li>27 Incredible program.</li> <li>28 Last night I had the opportunity to observe</li> <li>3 the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was</li> <li>4 greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the</li> <li>5 professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>6 Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve</li> <li>7 Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelsa have brought this</li> <li>1 program to a new level.</li> <li>9 We've heard remarkably positive feedback from</li> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Cormissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 Mir exan pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>24 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>25 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>26 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>27 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>28 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>29 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>20 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>20 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> </ul>	21		21	
<ul> <li>would think so.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't</li> <li>Miller Certified Reporting. LC</li> <li>www.MillerCertified Reporting. LCC</li> <li>www.MillerCertified Reporting. LCC</li> <li>uww.MillerCertified Reporting. LCC</li> <li>usta right i had the opportunity to observe</li> <li>f each the debates, and i can say I was</li> <li>g errail elections schedule now.</li> <li>5 So essentially what we'll be doing is</li> <li>6 identifying the debates that we wish to host through our</li> <li>7 broadcast method and also the debates that we are capable of</li> <li>8 hosting through our streaming method. And we will create a</li> <li>9 Schould the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 sould the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina.</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,<th>22</th><th></th><th>22</th><th></th></li></ul>	22		22	
<ul> <li>24 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think</li> <li>25 that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com</li> <li>12</li> <li>1 incredible program.</li> <li>1 debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up and we still</li> <li>2 Last night I had the opportunity to observe</li> <li>3 the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was</li> <li>4 greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the</li> <li>5 professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>6 Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve</li> <li>7 Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this</li> <li>8 program to a new level.</li> <li>9 We've heard remarkably positive feedback from</li> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,</li> <li>14 we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can</li> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina.</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>17 five can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>24 Elections staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery,</li> <li>24 Elections staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery,</li> <li>25 Mike, and Tom for the effort it takes to pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>24 Charman Atta a great</li> </ul>				
25       that speaks for their interest in in running and I don't Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertified Reporting.com       25       Mike, and Tom for the effort it takes to pull off this Miller Certified Reporting. LLC www.MillerCertified Reporting.com         1       incredible program.       12         1       incredible program at BitFire Studies, and I can say I was       13         4       greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the 5       5         5       professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media       5         6       Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve       5         7       Goldstein, Mary Råbago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this 8       5         9       We've heard remarkably positive feedback from 10       5         11       I also was impressed that members of the 12       13         12       Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive 13       5         14       Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very 15       easy to to watch the debates.         16       Gina.       Gina.         17       your voter education efforts.         18       Gina.         19       MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 20         20       If we can pull those up. 33       All right, if we cang et to the first slide,	24	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think		Elections staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery,
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertified Reporting.comMiller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertified Reporting.com1121 <t< th=""><th>25</th><th>• •</th><th>25</th><th></th></t<>	25	• •	25	
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.comwww.MillerCertifiedReporting.com12131incredible program.132Last night I had the opportunity to observe143the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was144greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the25professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media56Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve57Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this8program to a new level.9We've heard remarkably positive feedback from10candidates about their experiences.11L aizona media have set aside their natural competitive13So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,14should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very15easy to to watch the debates.16Gina.17your voter education efforts.18Gina.19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,20Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep21If we can pull those up.23All right, if we can get to the first slide,				Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
1incredible program.2Last night I had the opportunity to observe3the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was4greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the5professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media6Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve7Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this8program to a new level.9We've heard remarkably positive feedback from10candidates about their experiences.11I also was impressed that members of the12Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive13concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona16Gina is going to update us on the progress of17your voter education efforts.18Gina.19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,20Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep21If we can pull those up.23All right, if we can get to the first slide,		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
2Last night I had the opportunity to observe3the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was4greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the5professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media6Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve7Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this8program to a new level.9We've heard remarkably positive feedback from10candidates about their experiences.11I also was impressed that members of the12Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive13concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of aris going to update us on the progress of16Gina is going to update us on the progress of17your voter education efforts.18Gina.19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,20Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep21If we can pull those up.23All right, if we can get to the first slide,		12		13
<ul> <li>3 the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was</li> <li>4 greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the</li> <li>5 professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>6 Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve</li> <li>7 Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this</li> <li>8 program to a new level.</li> <li>9 We've heard remarkably positive feedback from</li> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>10 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>3 get those wrapped up as well. And we are working on our</li> <li>4 general elections schedule now.</li> <li>5 So essentially what we'll be doing is</li> <li>6 identifying the debates that we wish to host through our</li> <li>7 broadcast method and also the debates that we are capable of</li> <li>8 hosting through our streaming method. And we will create a</li> <li>9 schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot</li> <li>10 measures bringing bringing those into the fold as well,</li> <li>11 too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the</li> <li>12 information.</li> <li>13 So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,</li> <li>14 we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can</li> <li>15 save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 But as far as our debates from the primary</li> <li>17 election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said,</li></ul>	1	incredible program.	1	debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up and we still
4greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the4general elections schedule now.5professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media5So essentially what we'll be doing is6Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve6identifying the debates that we wish to host through our7Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this5So essentially what we'll be doing is8program to a new level.6identifying the debates that we are capable of9We've heard remarkably positive feedback from8hosting through our streaming method. And we will create a9We've heard remarkably positive feedback from9schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot10candidates about their experiences.10measures bringing bringing those into the fold as well,11I also was impressed that members of the11too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the12Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive13So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,14Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very14we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can15save the dates until our formal invitations go out.16But as far as our debates from the primary17your voter education efforts.18have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters18Gina.19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,1020Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mos	2	Last night I had the opportunity to observe	2	have some legislative debates that are occurring, and we will
<ul> <li>5 professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media</li> <li>6 Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve</li> <li>7 Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this</li> <li>8 program to a new level.</li> <li>9 We've heard remarkably positive feedback from</li> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>5 So essentially what we'll be doing is</li> <li>6 identifying the debates that we wish to host through our</li> <li>7 broadcast method and also the debates that we are capable of</li> <li>8 hosting through our streaming method. And we will create a</li> <li>9 schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot</li> <li>10 measures bringing bringing those into the fold as well,</li> <li>11 too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the</li> <li>12 information.</li> <li>13 So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,</li> <li>14 we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can</li> <li>15 save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 But as far as our debates from the primary</li> <li>17 election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we</li> <li>18 have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on tr</li></ul>	3	the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was	3	get those wrapped up as well. And we are working on our
<ul> <li>6 Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve</li> <li>7 Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this</li> <li>8 program to a new level.</li> <li>9 We've heard remarkably positive feedback from</li> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>6 identifying the debates that we wish to host through our streaming method. And we will create a</li> <li>9 schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot</li> <li>10 measures bringing bringing those into the fold as well,</li> <li>11 too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the</li> <li>13 So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,</li> <li>14 we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can</li> <li>15 save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 But as far as our debates from the primary</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>6 identifying the debates that we wish to host through our streaming method. And we will create a</li> <li>9 schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot</li> <li>10 measures bringing bringing those into the fold as well,</li> <li>11 too, for discussion. Th</li></ul>	4	greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the	4	general elections schedule now.
<ul> <li>7 Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this</li> <li>8 program to a new level.</li> <li>9 We've heard remarkably positive feedback from</li> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>7 broadcast method and also the debates that we are capable of hosting through our streaming method. And we will create a schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot</li> <li>10 measures bringing bringing those into the fold as well,</li> <li>10 too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the</li> <li>11 too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the</li> <li>12 information.</li> <li>13 So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,</li> <li>14 we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can</li> <li>15 save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 But as far as our debates from the primary</li> <li>17 election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we</li> <li>18 have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>24 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>25 All right, if we can get to the f</li></ul>	5	professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media	5	So essentially what we'll be doing is
8program to a new level.8hosting through our streaming method. And we will create a9We've heard remarkably positive feedback from9schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot10candidates about their experiences.10I also was impressed that members of the1112Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive11too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the13concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.13So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,14Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very14we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can15easy to to watch the debates.15save the dates until our formal invitations go out.16Gina is going to update us on the progress of16But as far as our debates from the primary17your voter education efforts.19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,1920Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep20that this is the most professional debate progression that21me on track.22If we can pull those up.2223All right, if we can get to the first slide,23you for making these available on TV, and that's a great	6	Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve	6	identifying the debates that we wish to host through our
9We've heard remarkably positive feedback from candidates about their experiences.9schedule as well as potentially having items such as ballot measures bringing bringing those into the fold as well, too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the information.11I also was impressed that members of the 1211too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the information.13concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.11So as soon as we get that schedule finalized, we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can save the dates until our formal invitations go out.14Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very teasy to to watch the debates.11So as soon as we get that schedule finalized, we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can save the dates until our formal invitations go out.16Gina is going to update us on the progress of your voter education efforts.16But as far as our debates from the primary election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, me on track.19and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said that this is the most professional debate progression that they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that it has. The voters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank you for making these available on TV, and that's a great	7	Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this	7	broadcast method and also the debates that we are capable of
<ul> <li>10 candidates about their experiences.</li> <li>11 I also was impressed that members of the</li> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> </ul>			8	
11I also was impressed that members of the12Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive13concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.14Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very15easy to to watch the debates.16Gina is going to update us on the progress of17your voter education efforts.18Gina.19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,20Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep21If we can pull those up.23All right, if we can get to the first slide,	9			
<ul> <li>12 Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive</li> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>11 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>12 information.</li> <li>13 So as soon as we get that schedule finalized,</li> <li>14 we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can</li> <li>save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 But as far as our debates from the primary</li> <li>17 election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we</li> <li>18 have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters</li> <li>and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said</li> <li>20 that this is the most professional debate progression that</li> <li>21 they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i</li> <li>has. The voters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank</li> <li>you for making these available on TV, and that's a great</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>13 concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona.</li> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep me on track.</li> <li>21 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>13 So as soon as we get that schedule finalized, we will be making it public so that all of our candidates can save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 But as far as our debates from the primary election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that it has. The voters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank you for making these available on TV, and that's a great</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>14 Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very</li> <li>easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>Gina is going to update us on the progress of</li> <li>your voter education efforts.</li> <li>Gina.</li> <li>Gina.</li> <li>Gina.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>me on track.</li> <li>If we can pull those up.</li> <li>All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>We will be making it public so that all of our candidates can save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>We will be making it public so that all of our candidates can save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>But as far as our debates from the primary</li> <li>election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters</li> <li>and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said that this is the most professional debate progression that</li> <li>they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that if has. The voters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank you for making these available on TV, and that's a great</li> </ul>		•		
<ul> <li>15 easy to to watch the debates.</li> <li>16 Gina is going to update us on the progress of your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>19 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep me on track.</li> <li>16 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>20 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>21 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>15 save the dates until our formal invitations go out.</li> <li>16 But as far as our debates from the primary election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said the this is the most professional debate progression that they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i has. The voters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank you for making these available on TV, and that's a great</li> </ul>				-
16Gina is going to update us on the progress of your voter education efforts.16But as far as our debates from the primary election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters18Gina.18have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep me on track.19and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said that this is the most professional debate progression that they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i they've seen; they oters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank you for making these available on TV, and that's a great				
<ul> <li>17 your voter education efforts.</li> <li>18 Gina.</li> <li>19 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,</li> <li>20 Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep</li> <li>21 me on track.</li> <li>22 If we can pull those up.</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>17 election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we</li> <li>17 election have gone, to echo what the Chairman has said, we</li> <li>18 have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters</li> <li>19 and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said</li> <li>20 that this is the most professional debate progression that</li> <li>21 they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that in</li> <li>22 If we can get to the first slide,</li> <li>23 All right, if we can get to the first slide,</li> </ul>				
18Gina.18have received nothing but positive feedback from both voters19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,19and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said20Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep19and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said21me on track.20that this is the most professional debate progression that22If we can pull those up.2123All right, if we can get to the first slide,2224All right, if we can get to the first slide,23				
19MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,19and from the candidates. From the candidates, they have said20Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep20that this is the most professional debate progression that21me on track.21they verseon; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i22If we can pull those up.223All right, if we can get to the first slide,23				
20Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep me on track.20that this is the most professional debate progression that21me on track.21they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i 2223If we can pull those up.223All right, if we can get to the first slide,234If we can get to the first slide,234If we can get to the first slide,244If we can get to the first slide,254If we can get to the first slide,264If we can get to the first slide,274If we can get to the first slide,284If we can get to the first slide,204If we can get to the first slide,284If we can get to the first slide,294If we can get to the first slide,204If we can get to the first slide,20 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>				
21me on track.21they've seen; they were so overwhelmed with the reach that i22If we can pull those up.22has. The voters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank23All right, if we can get to the first slide,23you for making these available on TV, and that's a great		• • • •		
22If we can pull those up.22has. The voters, we got an e-mail from a voter saying thank23All right, if we can get to the first slide,23you for making these available on TV, and that's a great				
23All right, if we can get to the first slide,23you for making these available on TV, and that's a great				
<b>25</b> So as as the Chairman mentioned, our <b>25</b> We continue to get that type of feedback from				
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	1			
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com	1			

	14		15
			15
1	the voters and from the candidates. The campaigns have been	1	photographer come in that does these professional photos
2	really amazing to work with as well, and so we do so we	2	throughout the debate, and then we make those available to
3	have seen a great effort from those candidates that have	3	all the candidates, the campaigns, the media outlets. And so
4	chosen to participate in them to be a part of this	4	they are getting used widely right now, which is great
5	production.	5	because part of this debate process and and for all of our
6	So they, again, overwhelming praise from all	6	voter education efforts, we know that it is important for
7	of the parties that have been participating in the debate	7	voters to understand where this information is coming from in
8	process.	8	this day and age of misinformation. So we make sure that
9	And, again, as going back through the reach	9	it's very clear that these are Clean Elections productions so
10	through this partnership with the Arizona Media Association,	10	that they know it's coming from a trusted brand.
11	we still have to tally up our numbers, and, of course, keep	11	And so far our primary election debates have
12	track of of our data points so that we can measure success	12	been successful, and we will report back more thoroughly
13	but, again, it has been unprecedented. So far we have seen	13	on on our metrics at the end of the year when we have that
14	everything from the, you know, the live broadcast from when	14	data available.
15	we are actually conducting the debate live to it being reran	15	So we can move to the next slide.
16	over the weekend to we have had news stations where they have	16	Because of the success of our primary election
17	their 6 o'clock news, and they will cut to the live stream	17	debates, we have seen in the news that our presidential
18	and say, "Hey, here is a clip of this debate" and then "Go	18	campaigns have put forth criteria that they wish to see in
19	watch it live now."	19	their debates that they would be willing to participate in,
20		20	and we are very pleased to say that those criteria match the
21	An amazing amount of media partners across the state who have been streaming it on their platforms, airing	21	production and the format of our current debate program
22	it on the radio, doing post-debate analysis shows on their	22	almost to a "T."
23		23	
23	programs about these. And then of course, too, the imagery	23	And so with the program that we have built,
24 25	from it. We have for every debate, we've had a pool	24	we're in a very unique position to offer the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate with our
25	photographer come in which essentially means we have a single	25	
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	16		17
1	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach	1	(Applause.)
2	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation	2	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so
2 3	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates,	2 3	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal
2 3 4	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format	2 3 4	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we
2 3	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place.	2 3 4 5	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And
2 3 4 5 6	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format	2 3 4 5 6	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are
2 3 4 5 6 7	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position	2 3 4 5 6 7	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are
2 3 4 5 6 7	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how our debate productions work. Again, this is in the hope of,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the next few days, certainly before the start of early voting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how our debate productions work. Again, this is in the hope of, one, showcasing all of the work that goes into and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the next few days, certainly before the start of early voting which is July 3rd. We sent out approximately 2.3 million
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how our debate productions work. Again, this is in the hope of, one, showcasing all of the work that goes into and the professionalism that goes into the productions of our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the next few days, certainly before the start of early voting which is July 3rd. We sent out approximately 2.3 million pieces.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how our debate productions work. Again, this is in the hope of, one, showcasing all of the work that goes into and the professionalism that goes into the productions of our debates. And we do intend to use this as part of our pitch	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the next few days, certainly before the start of early voting which is July 3rd. We sent out approximately 2.3 million pieces. And, again, as Tom had mentioned in his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how our debate productions work. Again, this is in the hope of, one, showcasing all of the work that goes into and the professionalism that goes into the productions of our debates. And we do intend to use this as part of our pitch to the presidential candidates.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the next few days, certainly before the start of early voting which is July 3rd. We sent out approximately 2.3 million pieces. And, again, as Tom had mentioned in his Executive Director report, we do really feel that voters are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how our debate productions work. Again, this is in the hope of, one, showcasing all of the work that goes into and the professionalism that goes into the productions of our debates. And we do intend to use this as part of our pitch to the presidential candidates. So we can play that now, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the next few days, certainly before the start of early voting which is July 3rd. We sent out approximately 2.3 million pieces. Mnd, again, as Tom had mentioned in his Executive Director report, we do really feel that voters are certainly reading this information because we are getting a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3 24	system, which means that we have the ability to, again, reach every household in the State of Arizona and across the nation through all of our media affiliates, the network affiliates, through the system we currently have. And, again, the format that they're looking for is what we already have in place. So because of the nature of our production and how we have built it, we believe we are in a great position to offer a formal invitation to the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate, and so we will be extending that invitation today. We have a press release that is available to go out. We also have created some information that we think will help drive the support of this, and we have some great contacts that we have for the campaigns as well, too. So we believe we can certainly make a great effort to pitch a debate, a Clean Elections debate, with the presidential candidates. We do have a video here of some filming that we did with sort of "behind the scenes," if you will, of how our debate productions work. Again, this is in the hope of, one, showcasing all of the work that goes into and the professionalism that goes into the productions of our debates. And we do intend to use this as part of our pitch to the presidential candidates. So we can play that now, please. (Video plays.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(Applause.) MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so with our current lineup of of debates we have done federal debates, our state debates, our legislative debates, and we also have county debates that we have done as well, too. And so we are continuing to hear from candidates; they are reaching out to us saying, "Can you do a debate for my race that I'm I'm running for?" So we know that the appeal is there for candidates at all levels and the voters looking forward as well, too, and so we hope to make what is hopefully a very successful pitch to our presidential candidates. So we got to at least try, right? So we can go to the next slide and we can talk about our Voter Education Guide now that is has been completely delivered to the United States Postal Services. And they still are we have a handful that are still arriving in homes, but they will all be delivered within the next few days, certainly before the start of early voting which is July 3rd. We sent out approximately 2.3 million pieces. And, again, as Tom had mentioned in his Executive Director report, we do really feel that voters are certainly reading this information because we are getting a lot of inquiries, again, just based off of what they are

	18		19
1	reading, questions. And it's great because we're seeing	1	be able to fully do that, we have been working with the
2	community groups who want bulk shipments of the guides.	2	Secretary of State's Office on getting access to additional
3	Avery has done a lot of outreach to our our libraries,	3	information on voters so that way when they come to the Clear
4	our our Native American communities such as Chapter Houses	4	Elections website, they can securely look up their
5		5	
6	and the Postal Services that actually serve those communities	6	information, confirm that they're a registered voter, confirm
	as well, so we can have stacks available there too; we send	7	all of their districts, which when we have their district
7	them to teachers, to our educators who are interested in		information, that gives us the ability to show them, here is
8	them.	8	all the candidates who are running and will be on your
9	So we're seeing the community, again, looking	9	ballot. So essentially creating this sample ballot for them
10	forward to this as a resource. So we're very excited with	10	if you will.
11	the production of the guide. We also had great feedback,	11	And so we currently do that to some extent
12	too, that for the first time ever we put a sticker, an	12	within our site as well, but having access to this data will
13	English and voter Spanish "I voted" sticker in there and that	13	just create a more a full create a fuller picture for
14	is certainly a great piece of social currency. So we know	14	the voters.
15	people are/were excited about receiving that as well too.	15	So we are working on testing that data now.
16	So, our primary voter guide has gone off without a hitch.	16	We are updating our dashboard with all of the primary voting
17	And we can go to our next slide, please.	17	locations so we can be ready for the start of early voting
18	And, again, we will have full metrics	18	and election day voting.
19	available and data points for you at the end of the year.	19	And our website is available to every
20	These are just some high-level updates.	20	candidate in the State of Arizona, not just statewide and
21	So with our website right now, as part of the	21	legislative and federal, but any candidate who is running to
22	Governor's task force that she had put together and convened,	22	create a profile on our website. And this has been really
23	one of the recommendations was very specific to the Clean	23	great this year because we are seeing so many more local
24	Elections' website to utilizing the website as a central	24	candidates wanting to utilizing this service. We're seeing
25	source for voters across the state for information. And to	25	city clerks contacting all of their candidates and sharing,
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	20		21
1	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your	1	We recently created an infographic at the
2	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile."	2	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to
2 3	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know,	2 3	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important
2 3 4	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these	2 3 4	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year.
2 3 4 5	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles	2 3 4 5	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules
2 3 4 5 6	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better	2 3 4 5 6	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where
2 3 4 5 6 7	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters.	2 3 4 5 6 7	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. And then the No Labels Party, they're actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. And then the No Labels Party, they're actually not having a primary. So that means that that they have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. And then the No Labels Party, they're actually not having a primary. So that means that that they have gone to court and as a result of this litigation, there will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate in action in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. And then the No Labels Party, they're actually not having a primary. So that means that that they have gone to court and as a result of this litigation, there will be we have approximately 30,000 No Label voters in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate in action in a debate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. And then the No Labels Party, they're actually not having a primary. So that means that that they have gone to court and as a result of this litigation, there will be we have approximately 30,000 No Label voters in the State of Arizona, so there will be a ballot created for them,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate in action in a debate. So that is an update for our website.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. Mo thaving a primary. So that means that that they have gone to court and as a result of this litigation, there will be we have approximately 30,000 No Label voters in the State of Arizona, so there will be a ballot created for them, but there will be no federal, statewide or legislative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate in action in a debate. So that is an update for our website. Next slide, please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. Mot having a primary. So that means that that they have gone to court and as a result of this litigation, there will be we have approximately 30,000 No Label voters in the State of Arizona, so there will be a ballot created for them, but there will be no federal, statewide or legislative candidate no partisan candidates, I should say, on that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile."</li> <li>So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters.</li> <li>And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue.</li> <li>And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate in action in a debate.</li> <li>So that is an update for our website. Next slide, please.</li> <li>We are continuing, of course, to work with all</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. Mo thaving a primary. So that means that that they have gone to court and as a result of this litigation, there will be we have approximately 30,000 No Label voters in the State of Arizona, so there will be a ballot created for them, but there will be no federal, statewide or legislative candidate no partisan candidates, I should say, on that ballot for them.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate statement or going to look at the candidate in action in a debate. So that is an update for our website. Next slide, please. We are continuing, of course, to work with all of our county partners across the state. This is just a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate in action in a debate. So that is an update for our website. Next slide, please. We are continuing, of course, to work with all of our county partners across the state. This is just a small snapshot of the work that we are doing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We recently created an infographic at the request of Pima County that just talks about how to participate in the primary election, which is very important this year. So, as we know, every election, the rules change. And for our primary elections, we do have where Independent voters can participate. And we have five recognized political parties. We have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Green Party, Libertarian, and the No Labels Party. Independent voter cans participate by selecting either the Republican or the Democratic ballot. The Green Party and the Libertarian Party have closed primaries, and which means Independents cannot select that ballot. Mot having a primary. So that means that that they have gone to court and as a result of this litigation, there will be we have approximately 30,000 No Label voters in the State of Arizona, so there will be a ballot created for them, but there will be no federal, statewide or legislative candidate no partisan candidates, I should say, on that ballot for them.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	"Hey, go to the Clean Elections website; create your profile." So we have candidates ranging from, you know, city council to mayor to to school boards, to all of these offices; to justice of the peace, who are creating profiles on our website. Which, again, that just creates a better picture and more information for our voters. And then we are working on launching our candidate compass tool. Just a reminder, that tool is essentially a questionnaire that we present to both the candidates and the voters, the same questions, and then we just mirror up how they respond together. So that way, it's a binary question, but we do allow the candidates a sentence or two to kind of explain why they chose this, because we've heard voters in the past say just tell us quickly; give us the bullet points, where do you stand on this issue. And so of course, through that process, they can always dive deeper into going into the candidate statement or going to look at the candidate in action in a debate. So that is an update for our website. Next slide, please. We are continuing, of course, to work with all of our county partners across the state. This is just a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text>

	20		22
	22		23
1	or go to the polls, they will see one of two things. They	1	partnership with the counties, we created this ad which we
2	will see either a completely blank ballot or they will see a	2	will play for you, and it will air in English in this Harkins
3	ballot that only has local races on there if they happen to	3	theater, but we are also utilizing our resources through
4	be in a jurisdiction that has a local nonpartisan race.	4	digital targeting where any voter in the vicinity of this
5	And so we're making sure that we are doing	5	location will receive the ad in this Diné language as well,
6	education to that for those voters. We're also making sure	6	too.
7	that they understand that the No Labels Party is a political	7	So it's a great opportunity to reach voters
8	party, and that you are not an Independent if you are	8	where they are and give them voter education in the format
9	registered as a No Labels voter.	9	that they are looking for in their native language.
10	So lots of education points around there, and	10	So we can go to that we can actually play
11	where we are working with our counties to to do that.	11	that video, please.
12	And then we also have the opportunity, which I	12	(Video played.)
13	think this was something that I personally thought was pretty	13	MS. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, that
14	cool, we have worked with Coconino County specifically, but	14	phone number that you saw in there, that is a toll-free
15	this is also for Navajo and Apache County to create	15	number that Clean Elections has set up for many years
16	additional ads in the Navajo language of Diné.	16	thank you to Paula for helping us with this where it's
17	Coconino County has recognized that so when	17	actually an auto-attendant line. So any voter in those
18	we talk about voter education, we know that we have to meet	18	counties, they can call this phone number and then get, okay,
19	voters where they are, and that is different for you know,	19	press 1, you go to Apache County; 2, Navajo; 3, Coconino; and
20	we're a diverse state in terms of geography and so we have to	20	4 Clean Elections.
21	look at all of the methods that we utilize to reach voters.	21	When they go to the counties, they are
22	There is a movie theater in Coconino County	22	automatically connected with their staff members there that
23	that is the single location that services voters from Apache,	23	speak Diné. So it's a service for them to be able to connect
24	Coconino, and Navajo County and they have a high population	24	directly with the staff people who can help them in their
25	of Navajo voters that visit that. So we through this	25	language. So we're excited that we were able to create this
23	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	23	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	24		25
1	ad.	1	up for you. But with that, we can end with if there's any
2	And we can go to the next slide.	2	questions, Chairman and Commissioners.
3	And this is my final slide that I wanted to	3	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Gina. Let me
4	leave. This is kind of a teaser, like a very exciting	4	just say that's that was a very impressive video you did
5	thing that we have a lot of exciting things we get to do	5	of the tour of BitFire Studios; and kudos to you for standing
6	in vote ed.	6	outside the studio
7	But one of the things that we have coming up	7	MS. ROBERTS: It was hot.
8	in July is we have four cast members from <i>Hamilton</i> , which is	8	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: in 115-degree heat and
9	currently playing right now at ASU, who have agreed to come	9	and recording that.
10	in and talk to Clean Elections and talk about voting. So	10	But that was a very helpful video, and I hope
11	it's very exciting just given the history and the story of	11	the presidential candidates take us up on that.
12	the Hamilton play and how it, you know, goes over the	12	Any comments or questions from Commissioners?
13	biography of Alexander Hamilton and talks about the early	13	COMMISSIONER PATON: Yes.
14	United States of America and in our political history.	14	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.
15	We thought it would be a great opportunity to	15	COMMISSIONER PATON: I would just like to say
16	talk with voters through this creative idea and get those	16	I went to some debates in the 1990s. I remember one in
17	Hamilton cast members into studio and talk about, okay, let's	17	particular in Sierra Vista and there was like 12 people
18	talk about voting today and any connections and correlations	18	there, all family and friends of the people debating. So
19	to what you've seen in the play, talk about political	19	this has come, you know, a long way that you're inviting the
20	discourse and, you know, apathy towards actually taking	20	presidential candidates to to come and debate. So very
21	action and wanting to vote and participate. So this is	21	good job, and I'm proud of our whole situation that's
22	something that we have that is on the horizon as well.	22	developed out of all this.
23	So these are, again, just some very you	23	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Very well said Commissioner,
24	So these are, again, just some very you		
1	know, few highlights of what we have going on right now.	24	thank you.
25		24 25	thank you. Any other comments or questions from
	know, few highlights of what we have going on right now.		

	26		27
1	Commissioners?	1	request filed by Star Spangled Media. This question deals
2		2	
	COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Chairman.		principally with how the media exception to Proposition 211
3	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.	3	applies as well as whether a grant qualifies as business
4	COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Also just well	4	income under the law.
5	done everybody and Gina. That was yeah, that's fantastic	5	Tom, do you want to summarize the opinion
6	all the work that you've been doing for voter education.	6	draft?
7	And I also just really want to highlight and	7	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I'm going to do my do
8	thank you for reaching out more to the local candidates and	8	my best. I think I always feel like we've you guys
9	the local government, and I think as most of you know,	9	we've had the Commission eat dessert first when I
10	they're always at the end of the ballot, and so it's really	10	COMMISSIONER PATON: This is the liver and
11	nice to have the opportunity to at least be sort of on that	11	onion?
12	same that same presence, that same level on the on the	12	MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
13	website and have that opportunity. So just wanted to thank	13	First, I want to thank Jon Berkon and his
14	you.	14	colleague Emma Anspach, if I'm pronouncing their name
15	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioners.	15	correctly, for their submission of the request. You know,
16	Any other comments from Commissioners?	16	Jon is here and I think that, you know, these requests we've
17			
	(No audible response.)	17	been getting regularly I hope I hope the process is being
18	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Gina.	18	effective. We certainly from from our end in analyzing
19	MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	19	these, think that they are helpful and we hope that you
20	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Very impressive job.	20	know, that so we hope to continue working on them.
21	Moving on to Item V, advisory opinion	21	So I was going to sort of summarize where
22	advisory excuse me. Advisory opinion arising from a	22	where we are. This if we could Cathy, if we could go
23	request by Star Spangled Media under the Voters Right to Know	23	to the next slide.
24	Act.	24	One of the things that, you know, you know,
25	Commissioners, we have advisory opinion	25	we've talked about in analyzing statute and in addressing the
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	28		29
1	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated	1	The reason we have redrafted the questions
1 2	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these	1 2	The reason we have redrafted the questions presented is because we think for the broader public we think
	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated		· · · · ·
2	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these	2	presented is because we think for the broader public we think
2 3	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're	2 3	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated
2 3 4	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through	2 3 4	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks
2 3 4	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated.	2 3 4 5	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think
2 3 4 5 6	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and	2 3 4 5 6	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for
2 3 4 5 6 7	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these	2 3 4 5 6 7	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion. Bo with the issues presented by this and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know, then you have certain reports that are due and those reports
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion. So with the issues presented by this and these are the issues that we drafted. So the issues that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know, then you have certain reports that are due and those reports have to contain particular information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion. So with the issues presented by this and these are the issues that we drafted. So the issues that were presented in the draft which were fine would was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know, then you have certain reports that are due and those reports have to contain particular information. So broadly speaking what that means is if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion. So with the issues presented by this and these are the issues that we drafted. So the issues that were presented in the draft which were fine would was was was the the you know, whether or not Star	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know, then you have certain reports that are due and those reports have to contain particular information. So broadly speaking what that means is if you're an entity like the Star Spangled Media or any other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion. So with the issues presented by this and these are the issues that we drafted. So the issues that were presented in the draft which were fine would was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know, then you have certain reports that are due and those reports have to contain particular information. So broadly speaking what that means is if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion. So with the issues presented by this and these are the issues that we drafted. So the issues that were presented in the draft which were fine would was was was the the you know, whether or not Star Spangled Media is a covered person, whether or not there is campaign media spending.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know, then you have certain reports that are due and those reports have to contain particular information. So broadly speaking what that means is if you're an entity like the Star Spangled Media or any other entity that finds itself in a in a position where it might
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	questions that are asked and raised by the regulated community in this context is, you know, that some of these tests, the tests that exist in law already that we're applying and in some cases that we're working through ourselves are pretty complicated. And this one, based on my understanding and our understanding of staff of how the FEC analyzes these kinds of questions around the media exception, you know, it's it's literally it's supposed to be a two-part test, but it's a two-part test where each individual part has two parts. And I don't I'm and I don't so getting to a place where there's a and I think I think we've ticked through and we'll go through this in a second those that that list, and then we get to one that's one area where it's harder under our understanding of the existing test to have sort of a black letter, bright-line rule that we can apply here. But, you know, so we as you'll see in the draft as you've seen in the draft we don't we have sort of a non conclusion. So with the issues presented by this and these are the issues that we drafted. So the issues that were presented in the draft which were fine would was was was the the you know, whether or not Star Spangled Media is a covered person, whether or not there is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	presented is because we think for the broader public we think that this is more helpful for creating broader regulated community, we think that this is a better way of giving folks notice of what is covered in the opinion; and and I think that in and we hope that the regulated body that asked for it can you know, can apply the analysis as relevant to their questions. If that becomes a thing that folks don't you know, especially the regulated folks don't think works or what have you and we need to you know, I'm I'm happy to talk about that, but that's the reason why we're actually kind of taking the questions presented and trying to present them in a way that focuses we think on the specific issues. So those those really are the issues. And and you can based on the overall the overarching principles behind the Voter Right to Know Act are: If you are a covered person, that is to say if you spent at the threshold of the Act on campaign media spending, you know, then you have certain reports that are due and those reports have to contain particular information. So broadly speaking what that means is if you're an entity like the Star Spangled Media or any other entity that finds itself in a in a position where it might be subject to the Act, you know, determining whether or not

			31
1	30	4	
1	you are a covered person is a is a question of their own.	1	in there as a watermark so everybody knows this is not
2	And and then the subsidiary question to determine that is		generated by AI. The "Are the" and it's reproduced in the
3	whether or not you engaged in campaign media spending. Those	3	opinion in case anybody is worried about that.
4	are both defined terms.	4	Are the materials available to the general
5	Here so here there question is if you have	5	so in 2B, these are subsidiary questions to 2B. Step 1,
6	a news website, you know there's an exception then, as there	6	Step 2, Step 3, Step 4, Step 5. But they're nested, you
7	is in all campaign finance laws, at least that I know of in	7	know.
8	the U.S. to for for the media, for the press.	8	So are the materials available to the general
9	And so so, you know, that really is a focus	9	public and are the materials comparable in form to those
10	here because this is a website that produces news content.	10	ordinarily issued by the press entity.
11	So that's issue one.	11	So that that you know, are the materials
12	And I guess we can go on to the next slide,	12	available to the general public we'll see is, we think, are
13	Cathy.	13	pretty simple. The materials comparable in form we think is
14	So we tried to break down at the two-part test	14	a somewhat more complicated question based on the
15	that's a three-part test and that's the first part of the	15	circumstances and and of the entity.
16	test there, so. And we'll so that that's in the we	16	So I guess can we go to the next one, Cathy;
17	put this figure into the opinion draft to try to hopefully	17	thank you.
18	help folks understand at least how we think the test works.	18	So first question: "Is it a press entity?"
19	So you you go through is is the entity a	19	We think the answer to that question is it is a press entity.
20	press entity, is it owner controlled, owner controlled by a	20	The company, you know, regularly disseminates political and
21	party committee or a candidate. And then is the activity	21	nonpolitical news stories, commentaries and editorials. And
22	itself part of a legitimate press function. Those are what	22	we reviewed the website and confirmed that, in fact, there
23	we think are the big big steps along the way.	23	are news stories on nonpolitical topics as well as other
24	And then if we can go to next slide.	24	other stories. Both positive and negative stor I mean,
25	And then and I you know, I put that typo	25	there are both positive and negative stories. Or, I mean, I
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	32		33
1	wouldn't say there is I should back up a second.	1	policies be neutral in some kind of way or some kind of
2	There are some more positive profiles than	2	some kind of, you know, Associated Press, you know, sort of
3	others, but the bottom line is that they're profiles of	3	approach to journalism.
4	candidates and elected officials.	4	And so but then the the real issue comes
5	And "Is it owned or controlled by a party,	5	in for us now in terms of trying to gauge this is treatment
6	committee, or candidate?" No, and we have no reason to	6	of political and nonpolitical coverage, we concluded that we
7	believe otherwise.	7	would need some more information and/or perhaps the site
8	So we can go to the next slide.	8	might in its in its in its correlated issue of boosting
9	"Are the materials available to the general	9	the coverage, we'd need more information.
10	public?" Again, yes, we think that they they are; it's on	10	So really what we're looking there to just
11	a website; you can look it up, you know.	11	boil it down as much as possible is, you know, the site's
12	"Comparable in form?" This is where we came	12	been available since at least at least March, and there's
13	to the sort of nonconclusion that at this point it's	13	content dating until at least April. There is significant
14	it's we're not in a position to say whether or not this	14	amount of candidate profile-type content. You know, there is
15	particular aspect would apply to Star Spangled Media.	15	less noncandidate or nonpolitical-type coverage.
16	We know some things for certain. The fact	16	And so on the record, we have, when you
17	that it is a new website is not a factor. So so it's	17	compare it to the FEC General Counsel's analysis to which
18	so when doing the analysis, we're we're we're saying,	18	the the company cites, we think it's not we're not
19	you know, it is, in fact, you know, a relatively new website	19	really in a position to say if if that particular part of
20	but that's not that's not really the the issue that we	20	the test is met in a way that would you know, the idea of
21	consider on its own terms, right? The fact it's new is not	21	this opinion, right, this opinion is to create essentially a
22	an issue.	22	safe harbor for the folks who are who are asking for them.
23	And ideology is not a factor. In other words,	23	And and we don't think we have enough information to do
24	you can the press exception does not require you to a	24	that yet because the the baseline on the coverage in terms
25	news outlet to have its news coverage or its editorial	25	of the breakdown we think is is just not sort of developed
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
1	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	34		35
1	well enough yet for us to make that determination.	1	the company's own money.
2	That that could change, you know,	2	So this is sort of the for for, you
3	obviously. And and you know, but	3	know, especially for Commissioner Chan and Commissioner
4	So we want to be clear, though, that we're not	4	Werther when you think about the the Halcyon days
5	saying that this organization is outside of of the press	5	immediately after Citizens United came down when when, you
6	exception, right. So, so it's important to say that as much	6	know, this sort of perception that I think folks had, you
7	as we are saying we need more information that is not	7	know, who might have been outside of the intricacies of of
8	we're not asking or or suggesting to the Commission in	8	the of campaign finances how campaigns are, in fact,
9	contemplating this issue we've issued the contrary	9	financed, there was sort of a notion of, oh, okay, so
10	conclusion. That's not not not the case.	10	corporation spending money.
11	So that's sort of the brass tacks of that	11	Well if Coca-Cola goes out and spends money
12	issue because of yeah.	12	that it has from selling Coca-Cola or Cherry Coke Zero, you
13	So, again, the business income question I	13	know that money there's there's no way to trace; there's
14	think on this record is somewhat simpler. So why does this	14	no influence there. There's no corruption there; it's simply
15	income matter? Going back to if you're a covered person	15	the company spending money, its own money. And so that's
16	engaged in campaign media spending, your business income is	16	where the definition gets at.
17	not does not make you a covered person.	17	If we can go to the next slide then.
18	So, for example, the sort of, you know, very	18	So here we have a for-profit LLC that is
19	obvious example of would be if Circle K Corporation, you	19	receiving grants sort of that as I understand the request are
20	know, sells sodas and then goes out and spend adver buys	20	looking at sort of underwriting the overall operations of
21	advertising as Circle K Corporation, they're they would	21	Star Spangled Media. There's no there's nothing in the
22	not be a covered person under the Act. And the notion behind	22	AOR that suggests that, you know, there's an exchange here in
23	that is that that regular commercial transactions that	23	terms in the in the nature you might see in on a on
24	generate revenue for the company are not something that	24	a national public radio station where your, you know, your
25	involves any sort of donation and and so it's essentially	25	underwriting is actually advertising.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	36		07
	50		37
1	And, you know, there may be, you know so	1	37 those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied.
1 2		1 2	
	And, you know, there may be, you know so		those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied.
2	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that	2	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from
2 3	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand	2 3	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to
2 3 4	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that	2 3 4	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're
2 3 4 5	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically?	2 3 4 5	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here.
2 3 4 5 6	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that	2 3 4 5 6	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the
2 3 4 5 6 7	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the	2 3 4 5 6 7	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically that media exception could apply, for example.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a person could be a covered we're simply we're just not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically that media exception could apply, for example. So, you know, that's that's where we left	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a person could be a covered we're simply we're just not we're just not providing an answer saying they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21 22	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically that media exception could apply, for example. So, you know, that's that's where we left things. You know, it's a it's a little complex, but our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a person could be a covered we're simply we're just not we're just not providing an answer saying they're definitively not a covered person.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically that media exception could apply, for example. So, you know, that's that's where we left things. You know, it's a it's a little complex, but our endeavor here was to try to provide as much as we could some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a person could be a covered we're simply we're just not we're just not providing an answer saying they're definitively not a covered person. So, you know, I thought about how to try to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically that media exception could apply, for example. So, you know, that's that's where we left things. You know, it's a it's a little complex, but our endeavor here was to try to provide as much as we could some clarity to the to the transactions that the company's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a person could be a covered we're simply we're just not we're just not providing an answer saying they're definitively not a covered person. So, you know, I thought about how to try to make this simpler. I don't know that I succeeded.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically that media exception could apply, for example. So, you know, that's that's where we left things. You know, it's a it's a little complex, but our endeavor here was to try to provide as much as we could some clarity to the to the transactions that the company's engaged in. We do, I want to note, you know, do check off	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a person could be a covered we're simply we're just not we're just not providing an answer saying they're definitively not a covered person. So, you know, I thought about how to try to make this simpler. I don't know that I succeeded. But that that is our goal with is to try
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And, you know, there may be, you know so so so how does this fit in here? You know, what it means is that the fact that this is not, at least as we understand it from the AOR, business income, you know, what does that what does that mean here practically? What it means is that it does not mean that Star Spangled Media is a covered person. That's not the consequence of of this at all. It simply says that that if you know, as we understand the grant, it and if this company or another company went out and spent money from a grant like this and that turned out and they did it on campaign media spending above the thresholds, that they might have to report who those donors are. But but the opinion does not say and and the question presented is not whether or not whether or not the the we're not saying that Star Spangled Media is necessarily a covered person. We can't make that determination because we don't we are we are we are back to the first part of the opinion saying specifically that media exception could apply, for example. So, you know, that's that's where we left things. You know, it's a it's a little complex, but our endeavor here was to try to provide as much as we could some clarity to the to the transactions that the company's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	those things that we think are, in fact, already satisfied. In other words, they would they would from a reliance perspective on the AOR, you know, it's designed to say: Look, you've got this, this, and this. And we're just we don't we have a question here. And then likewise on the grant piece, the grants as we understand them, are not are not under the business income definition. But that would only be relevant in the event that the company took an action that made it a covered person by engaging in campaign media spending. And also, obviously, if the grants turn out to be different from what we've described or what we understand them to be, you know, there's there's some nuances there potentially. So this is a long way of saying, you know, this is an opinion that in some ways we hope provides some can sheds some light on how to walk through the analysis here, but it's not it's not designed to say a person is is a covered person. It's simply saying that a that a person could be a covered we're simply we're just not we're just not providing an answer saying they're definitively not a covered person. So, you know, I thought about how to try to make this simpler. I don't know that I succeeded.

	38		39
1	to try to provide an analytical framework for	1	such you know, generic names that would lead you to
2	practitioners who are trying to advise their clients on	2	believe that it was a news website. And they have
3	navigating the both the media exception and the business	3	primarily well, maybe not primarily, but they have a lot
4	income issues.	4	of political coverage about favored candidates, and they
5	And, you know, so that that's sort of where	5	cloak some of this with other news not about those
6	we are where we end up.	6	candidates, general news from other sources and stuff. But
7	So I guess I would I would leave it there,	7	to even the casual reader, it is clear the purpose of the
8	Commissioners. If you have questions and then when we	8	website is to support certain candidates or certain points of
9	do and I do have a correction to the to the that's	9	view.
10	on the on the supplement that I sent out last night to	10	If I'm right about the kind of websites I'm
11	clarify the really does seek to make clear that particular	11	talking about and would would other would they be
12	box along the way regarding the ownership control was	12	covered would they be exempt because they are cloaking
13	checked.	13	their political views with some kind of canned news?
14	So that's that's sort of where we leave	14	And I don't know if I've explained what I mean
15	things. Like I said, Mr. Chairman, I Jon is here so I'm	15	but
16	sure he well, I don't know, but he may want to he may	16	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I think no, I
17	have comments or observations on any number of things.	17	mean, I think that's that's that's I think that's
18	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any questions or comments	18	sort of I mean, that is an issue here in in in this
19	from members of the Commission?	19	general zone.
20	(No audible response.)	20	The the way that the FEC has analyzed that
20	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Tom, I let me see if I	20	specific question takes some of the things that you're
21		21	concerned about off the table. It takes off the table
22	can explain my concerns on this.	22	
	MR. COLLINS: Sure.	-	ideological predisposition from the from the content. In
24	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: There are a number of of	24 25	other words, if you're I mean, and that, you know, that
25	websites that purport to be news websites that have names	25	kind of makes sense in the sense that if you read the
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com 40		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com 41
1	New Republic or the National Review right those those	1	
1	New Republic or the National Review, right, those those	1	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and
2	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think	2	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there.
2 3	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of	2 3	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the
2 3 4	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view.	2 3 4	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which
2 3	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment	2 3 4 5	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has,
2 3 4 5 6	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the	2 3 4 5 6	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I
2 3 4 5 6 7	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much	2 3 4 5 6 7	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life had a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose of this website to promote Democratic party interest is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life had a newsletter that went out regularly. And then during the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose of this website to promote Democratic party interest is not that's not that's not an issue that we're going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life. Massachusetts Citizens For Life had a newsletter that went out regularly. And then during the election they did a bonus issue, if you will, of a newsletter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose of this website to promote Democratic party interest is not that's not that's not an issue that we're going to cause them to lose their media exception. Rather, we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life. Massachusetts Citizens For Life had a newsletter that went out regularly. And then during the election they did a bonus issue, if you will, of a newsletter with a different production staff, with a broader	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose of this website to promote Democratic party interest is not that's not that's not an issue that we're going to cause them to lose their media exception. Rather, we're going to look at, you know, what are they doing as an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life. Massachusetts Citizens For Life had a newsletter that went out regularly. And then during the election they did a bonus issue, if you will, of a newsletter with a different production staff, with a broader distribution. They, I think, printed it in a different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose of this website to promote Democratic party interest is not that's not that's not an issue that we're going to cause them to lose their media exception. Rather, we're going to look at, you know, what are they doing as an editorial policy? Are they running, you know, different
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life. Massachusetts Citizens For Life had a newsletter that went out regularly. And then during the election they did a bonus issue, if you will, of a newsletter with a different production staff, with a broader distribution. They, I think, printed it in a different place, and so the Supreme Court, in looking at that said,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose of this website to promote Democratic party interest is not that's not that's not an issue that we're going to cause them to lose their media exception. Rather, we're going to look at, you know, what are they doing as an editorial policy? Are they running, you know, different are they are they actually running a mix of nonpolitical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	organizations are clearly media I mean, I don't think anyone would dispute that and they clearly have a point of view. And so I think recognizing the First Amendment concerns there, the FEC says: Look, ideology is not the issue. You can't be just like: Hey, this is too much coverage of Democrats or Republicans or whatever. That's not the issue. What and in the MUR that that that is discussed in the opinion and in the AOR the, you know, General Counsel's office talks about that and other other opinions of the FEC talk about that. What then the question is and what the Supreme Court has looked at in the First Amendment context is what are the notion what are the what the Supreme Court calls "considerations of form." So the paradigm example in the Supreme Court case law is a case involving the group Massachusetts Citizens For Life. Massachusetts Citizens For Life had a newsletter that went out regularly. And then during the election they did a bonus issue, if you will, of a newsletter with a different production staff, with a broader distribution. They, I think, printed it in a different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Well, here's what they do and here's what they did here and there's there's a break there. And and so in the context of exactly the news, the type of news sites that you're talking about which is the Star Spangled Media pointed to, is that the FEC has, in fact, dealt with this in the context of a different I believe different company that had, you know, a similar business model. And, for example, they looked specifically at memo in that case, they looked specifically at memos that the publisher in that publication wrote that said quite in black and white: The purpose of our or a purpose of our publication and a benefit of our publication will be to benefit Democratic candidates, etc. And the FEC said that's not that's not the issue, right. So you've got essentially in the FEC records in the case sort of case that has all these has all those similarities to this one, they said: Look, the fact that you got a memo from the publisher that says the purpose of this website to promote Democratic party interest is not that's not that's not an issue that we're going to cause them to lose their media exception. Rather, we're going to look at, you know, what are they doing as an editorial policy? Are they running, you know, different

	42		43
1	and political news, what's their what's their general	1	MR. COLLINS: Well, I guess I wouldn't say
2	approach to this, and are they operating consistent with	2	that we are opening a loophole at all. That that rather
3	that?	3	what we're trying to deal with is the the outskirts of the
4	And in that particular case based on, you	4	media exception, right.
5	know, sort of our reading of the General Counsel's FEC's	5	So there is there are a number of different
6	report in that case versus this one, we don't know as much	6	theories on why there ought to be a media exception, most of
7	now about where this group is at, at least in our	7	them are grounded in some kind of way within the First
8	perspective, because we as we counted it, you know, we	8	Amendment's press protections.
9	have, you know, somewhere around ten general interest stories	9	So if you to go back to the example of
10	in different categories and then somewhere a larger number	10	National Review/New Republic, which I know dates me
11	of profiles of public officials and and and candidates.	11	significantly in the current climate, but we know we know
12	So, so you know it's a little hard for us	12	that those publications have different ideologies and
13	it's a little hard for us to gauge that exactly what you're	13	definitely promote the issues of their their ideologies at
14	talking about from a forum issue. But I think the most	14	a minimum, not the parties.
15	important takeaway is as much as someone might be concerned	15	So so we're trying what we're trying to
16	about ideology or the fact that a publication, you know,	16	do is say, okay, there's still you know, is it is it a
17	necessarily has an ideological interest, that's that's	17	legitimate I mean, that's the words in the test
18	not, for First Amendment purposes and for regulatory	18	legitimate test function, so that we are trying to probe on
19	purposes, that's just not the factor we're going to look at.	19	the question of whether or not it's legitimate. But
20	Does that make sense?	20	legitimacy, the framework of answering the question, is going
21	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It makes sense. I guess my	21	to have to do with whether or not there's a norm established
22	bottom bottom line concern is, are we potentially opening	22	that that we can that, within the publication
23	up a loophole that Proposition 211 was designed to close	23	essentially, that that we can look to.
24	telling people that if you put some general other stuff	24	And here, right, so we get we have a ver
25	around your political message, it therefore becomes media.	25	we have limited facts and I understand there's some tension
_	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	44		45
			45
1	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that	1	45 COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball
1 2		1 2	
	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that		COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball
2	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content	2	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike.
2 3	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on	2 3	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know.
2 3 4	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do	2 3 4	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the
2 3 4 5	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with	2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why
2 3 4 5 6	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR.	2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us.
2 3 4 5 6 7	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like,	2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which dealt with a lot of these same issues, that how that works	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not intend to engage in campaign media spending.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which dealt with a lot of these same issues, that how that works and why we don't think that we can on the record say that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not intend to engage in campaign media spending. Equally important however, the Commission is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which dealt with a lot of these same issues, that how that works and why we don't think that we can on the record say that say that the monitor, the Star Spangled Media, fits fits	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not intend to engage in campaign media spending. Equally important however, the Commission is not including the oppo is not concluding the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which dealt with a lot of these same issues, that how that works and why we don't think that we can on the record say that say that the monitor, the Star Spangled Media, fits fits within that at that point, so.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not intend to engage in campaign media spending. Equally important however, the Commission is not including the oppo is not concluding the opposite. Simply put, more facts about Star
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which dealt with a lot of these same issues, that how that works and why we don't think that we can on the record say that say that the monitor, the Star Spangled Media, fits fits within that at that point, so. COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not intend to engage in campaign media spending. Equally important however, the Commission is not including the oppo is not concluding the opposite. Simply put, more facts about Star Spangled Media's internal operation and news
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which dealt with a lot of these same issues, that how that works and why we don't think that we can on the record say that say that the monitor, the Star Spangled Media, fits fits within that at that point, so. COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a question/comment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not intend to engage in campaign media spending. Equally important however, the Commission is not including the oppo is not concluding the opposite. Simply put, more facts about Star Spangled Media's internal operation and news presence in Arizona would be necessary for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	because the fact it's a new publication and the fact that it's a you know, and the and the amount of content available. So we're we're simply saying, you know, on balance here, you know, is the the AOR emphasizes: We do both; we do nonpolitical and political. You know, with emphasis. There's an emphasis on the "and" in the AOR. But then looking at that in context it's like, well. That's exactly where we are; we just don't have we don't feel like we have enough information setting this. Because what the FEC analysis sort of asks is: Are we trying to is trying to establish a baseline, a comparison essentially, going forward. So, you know, we did you know, we struggled with that, but we think that and we think that for the time being the the the correct answer is to sort of try to point to where the General Counsel why the General Counsel concluded that the courier case which it had which dealt with a lot of these same issues, that how that works and why we don't think that we can on the record say that say that the monitor, the Star Spangled Media, fits fits within that at that point, so. COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a question/comment. MR. COLLINS: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	COMMISSIONER PATON: So I'd like to see a ball or a strike. MR. COLLINS: I know. I know. COMMISSIONER PATON: And so I mean, the great minds are thinking of all this, you know, that's why they're proposing this this this question to us. Should we have like a percentage? Are you going to sit down and say, well, its got to be 51 percent dog bite stories compared to, you know, Trump or Biden or whatever? Is that what you're fishing for? CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well before you answer, Tom, let me follow up on what Commissioner Paton said. Your your draft says: "Because the Commission cannot conclude the press exception applies, the Commission cannot conclude the Star Spangled Media is not a covered person, does not intend to engage in campaign media spending. Equally important however, the Commission is not including the oppo is not concluding the opposite. Simply put, more facts about Star Spangled Media's internal operation and news presence in Arizona would be necessary for the Commission to reach a reasoned conclusion about

	46		47
1	So what use is this to Star Spangled Media?	1	MR. COLLINS: Right.
2	Does this provide them any guidance or not?	2	COMMISSIONER PATON: and we're going to
3	MR. COLLINS: Well well, if I could answer	3	say: Well, Tom, can you count how many articles were about
4	Commissioner Paton's question then your question, and I	4	dog bite stories
5	assume at this point Jon would love to answer your your	5	MR. COLLINS: Right, right.
6	question. So I guess I'll get to go first on that.	6	COMMISSIONER PATON: and we're going to
7	To your question, I don't read the FEC as	7	have to go from there.
8	as saying there's a percentage and I I'm I would be	8	MR. COLLINS: Right.
9	real hesitant to do that in an opinion. You know, if if	9	COMMISSIONER PATON: I think if we have a
10	it's it's there's a there's a I	10	target
11	mean, there's the problem is there's a real is that it	11	MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
12	is just is really right in the in the in the	12	COMMISSIONER PATON: then they know what
13	intersection between, you know, core First Amendment issues	13	they can do and what they can do I think. Do you understand
14	of press protection, which are their own thing	14	what I'm saying?
15	COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah.	15	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I do
16	MR. COLLINS: and and the regulation of	16	COMMISSIONER PATON: This is this is
17	money and politics, and you know, so I don't I think	17	gobbledygook to me right now.
18	that quite honestly, Commissioner Paton, as much as it, you	18	MR. COLLINS: No, I understand.
19	know, pains us, we will end in a qualitative universe not a	19	MR. PATON: I tried to read this last night
20	percentage universe.	20	and I was
21	COMMISSIONER PATON: Except for this is going	21	MR. COLLINS: Yeah
22	to come before us and	22	COMMISSIONER PATON: You know.
23	MR. COLLINS: No, I understand.	23	MR. COLLINS: Well, I
24	COMMISSIONER PATON: and we're going to be	24	COMMISSIONER PATON: This is what lawyers do,
25	hashing this	25	you know. And you're a lawyer so I can pick on you, too.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	48		49
			49
1	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure.	1	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get
1 2		1 2	
	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure.	_	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get
2	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the	2	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would
2 3	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that	2 3	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we
2 3 4	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever.	2 3 4	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different
2 3 4 5	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right.	2 3 4 5	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions
2 3 4 5 6	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate	2 3 4 5 6	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules.	2 3 4 5 6 7	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say about that is this, there's as much as I'm sure that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry. But the so so I take your point. And I think that if we want to work through that question, we would need some more time to talk to internally, come back with a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say about that is this, there's as much as I'm sure that well, I'm not sure, but but as much as there is an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry. But the so so I take your point. And I think that if we want to work through that question, we would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say about that is this, there's as much as I'm sure that well, I'm not sure, but but as much as there is an incentive institutionally to get this voted on today and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry. But the so so I take your point. And I think that if we want to work through that question, we would need some more time to talk to internally, come back with a recommendation on two points. Number one, whether or not we can in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say about that is this, there's as much as I'm sure that well, I'm not sure, but but as much as there is an incentive institutionally to get this voted on today and produced and out, right, that's not that's not there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry. But the so so I take your point. And I think that if we want to work through that question, we would need some more time to talk to internally, come back with a recommendation on two points. Number one, whether or not we can in recanalyzing the the reanalyzing this question, looking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say about that is this, there's as much as I'm sure that well, I'm not sure, but but as much as there is an incentive institutionally to get this voted on today and produced and out, right, that's not that's not there's nothing there's nothing that requires that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: This is this of a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry. But the so so I take your point. And I think that if we want to work through that question, we would need some more time to talk to internally, come back with a recommendation on two points. Number one, whether or not we can in reanalyzing the the reanalyzing this question, looking for more a better, more black-and-white, definitive way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say about that is this, there's as much as I'm sure that well, I'm not sure, but but as much as there is an incentive institutionally to get this voted on today and produced and out, right, that's not that's not there's nothing there's nothing that requires that. So if there's stuff we think we would want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: 1's just not, I'm sorry. But the so so I take your point. And I think that if we want to work through that question, we would need some more time to talk to internally, come back with a recommendation on two points. Number one, whether or not we can in reanalyzing the the reanalyzing this question, looking for more a better, more black-and-white, definitive way that provides more guidance and/or maybe reaches a conclusion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that or whatever. MR. COLLINS: Right, right. COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we I hate to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's enough a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff MR. COLLINS: Right. COMMISSIONER PATON: then I then maybe they're okay. You know? MR. COLLINS: I I mean, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, I think I take I take all those points. I think that there's I think there's a case being made there. I think if we if we just before we get to back to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say about that is this, there's as much as I'm sure that well, I'm not sure, but but as much as there is an incentive institutionally to get this voted on today and produced and out, right, that's not that's not there's nothing there's nothing that requires that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would as a staff want to make a recommendation that that if we are going to go that route, that it go through a different regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: and we could come back to those in a subsequent meeting. COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, is this something that that you see coming to us and that we're going to be stewing about on MR. COLLINS: This is this is the Executive Director's role COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: This is this of a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: it's not a Kara question. COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry. But the so so I take your point. And I think that if we want to work through that question, we would need some more time to talk to internally, come back with a recommendation on two points. Number one, whether or not we can in reanalyzing the the reanalyzing this question, looking for more a better, more black-and-white, definitive way

	50		5	51
1	that's we could I mean, I don't know, we would have to do	1	client but also to the regulated community at large insofar	
2	that research.	2	as I do think it first of all, I think it notes that the	
3	And secondly, to specifically answer the	3	Commission would follow the Federal Election Commission's	
4	question of, you know, what would be a rule that anybody	4	test, both the judicial precedence and also the Federal	
5	could pick up and be like, boom, this is it.	5	Election Commission's own enforcement of its comparable media	
6	COMMISSIONER PATON: Right.	6	exception.	
7	MR. COLLINS: What is the avenue to do that	7	So that in and of itself is enormously helpful	
8	COMMISSIONER PATON: Right.	8	because there is a at this point, almost a 40-year history	
9	MR. COLLINS: because that's through an	9	regarding enforcement of this of this rule. So that's I	
10	AOR, too. I'm happy to do that.	10	think very, very helpful.	
11	COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we can ask him what	11	The consideration and I think it applies	
12	he wants.	12	the right test. Right? I think the hard part here, which	
13	MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I think well, I think	13	all of you have touched on and it is, it is legitimately a	
14	that's what Mark wants to do so, yeah.	14	hard area of the law, is I think we get into trouble "we"	
15	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, yes. So Mr. Berkon,	15	meaning kind of like those who try to figure out how speech	
16	the floor is yours.	16	is regulated generally when we engage in content-based	
17	MR. BERKON: Thank you, and, first of all,	17	rules in this area.	
18	very much appreciate giving me the time and your	18	And so the emphasis on forum and	
19	consideration of this opinion and the others that that our	19	considerations of forum which the Federal Election Commission	
20	firm has submitted. As as Mr. Collins noted, I think this	20	has focused and on which this this opinion focuses on, I	
21	process is very helpful to the regulated community in order	21	think is actually the right test and provides a standard	
22	to get a sense of how these issues will be flushed out, and	22	against which, you know, both my client and other media	
23	so we we very much appreciate that.	23	entities in the space can you know, can determine whether	
24	Regarding the draft opinion, I mean, my own	24	or not their conduct conforms to it and, if not, to conform	
25	view is I I do find the opinion to be helpful both to my	25	their conduct to it.	
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com	
	52		F	
	02		5	53
1	So I do think it provides an objective test.	1	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the	53
1 2		1 2		53
	So I do think it provides an objective test.		back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the	53
2	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to	2	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you	53
2 3	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain	2 3	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know.	53
2 3 4	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets	2 3 4	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated	53
2 3 4 5	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally	2 3 4 5	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an	53
2 3 4 5 6	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with.	2 3 4 5 6	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have	53
2 3 4 5 6 7	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you	2 3 4 5 6 7	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action,	53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the	53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think,	53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional	53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts.	53
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon.	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission?	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission? COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of the the factual presentation is necessary in order to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission? COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of the the factual presentation is necessary in order to get a firm answer of something we are all trying to figure out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission? COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther. COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: So I also	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of the the factual presentation is necessary in order to get a firm answer of something we are all trying to figure out. So I think, you know, given the timeline here,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission? COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther. COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: So I also understand sort of the reasoning for why we'd like a	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of the the factual presentation is necessary in order to get a firm answer of something we are all trying to figure out. So I think, you know, given the timeline here, this provides us with a significant amount of guidance. I think, clearly, the Commission is not saying yes or no such that if we wanted an advisory opinion to say	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission? COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther. COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: So I also understand sort of the reasoning for why we'd like a bright-line test; I think that always helps everyone. But in this instance, we do have an existing test, and I think people are comfortable and the community is comfortable kind	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of the the factual presentation is necessary in order to get a firm answer of something we are all trying to figure out. So I think, you know, given the timeline here, this provides us with a significant amount of guidance. I think, clearly, the Commission is not saying yes or no such that if we wanted an advisory opinion to say "you have a shield from enforcement," we would have to come	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission? COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther. COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: So I also understand sort of the reasoning for why we'd like a bright-line test; I think that always helps everyone. But in this instance, we do have an existing test, and I think people are comfortable and the community is comfortable kind of relying on what the FEC has already outlined, as well as	h,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So I do think it provides an objective test. I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to get there just because I think it was necessary to explain why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally understand and are familiar with. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his recommendation? MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you know, we have our views about our particular our client, but I understand the reservations given the newness of the organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of the the factual presentation is necessary in order to get a firm answer of something we are all trying to figure out. So I think, you know, given the timeline here, this provides us with a significant amount of guidance. I think, clearly, the Commission is not saying yes or no such that if we wanted an advisory opinion to say	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you know. But setting us aside from the regulated community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, you know, would have to come back with with additional facts. But I think the test articulated is is the right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Berkon. Are there any other questions or comments from members of the Commission? COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther. COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: So I also understand sort of the reasoning for why we'd like a bright-line test; I think that always helps everyone. But in this instance, we do have an existing test, and I think people are comfortable and the community is comfortable kind	h,

1         the fact that there is already case law to support it.         1         ophinion or send it back for more work or whatever your           2         So 1 think from our perspectue, while we         2         plassier?           3         Control create an percentage or control percentage or control back for more work or whatever your         2           4         control create an percentage or control percentage or control back for more work or whatever your         3           5         control create an object or back chains percentage or control back back back back back back back back	<b>—</b>	54		55
2     So I misk from our perspective, while we account of the chains are account. We would sort of be chains account. We actually have some other cases for the set of the chains account. We actually have some other cases that have the account. We actually have some other cases that have the actual have some the actual have some other cases that have the actual have actual	1		1	
3         COMPUSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: M: Chaiman.           4         something like that, we would sort of be charling new         4         CHAIRMAN KIMELE: Commissioner Werther.           6         forward to us as a complaint, we actually have something like the come         6         approve the AdVisor Optimic Store Werther.         6           7         CHAIRMAN KIMELE: Commissioner Werther.         8         approve the AdVisor Optimic Store S				
4         something like that, we would sort of be charting new throtay in a sense varies if something like this come forward to us a complaint, we clustly have some other cases that have been handled by the TCT for we clustly have some other cases that have been handled by the TCT for we clustly have some other cases that have been handled by the TCT for we critical we clustly have some other cases that have been handled by the TCT for we critical we clustly have some other cases that have been handled by the TCT for we critical we clustly have some other cases that have been handled by the TCT for we critical we clustly have some other cases been handled by the TCT for we critical we clustly have some other analysis and sort of the text that already existing.         7         CCMMIDSIONER RATON: Ts there a second?           10         to make that saturation, shift some other cases that have analysis and sort of the text that already existing.         13         the advisory opinion. If the the row, commissioner that some other comments from members of the commissioner due to the row. The already existing.         13         the advisory opinion. So written. Thi call the roll.           13         remoters of the public or any other interested parties?         16         COMMISSIONER RATON: Tay.           14         remoters of the public or any other interested parties?         18         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you clustly by make a motion whether to approve the advisory diverse or the public cartified Reporting. LCC www.MillerCartified Reporting. LCC wwww.MillerCar				
5     territory in a sense variau if something like this come     5     COMMISSIONER ESTES WERTHER: I motion to       6     onward to us as a completit, we study have something else     6     approve the Advisory Option 2024-05.       7     CHARIMAN KIMBLE: Coll we are relying on this test.     9     9       9     So Tim hopediu that have on work get     9     0       10     tormuch in the situation, although I know that might occur.     10     10       12     analysis and sort of the test that's already existing.     11     12     It's been moved and seconded that we approve       13     CHARIMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.     13     It's been moved and seconded that we approve       14     Any other comments from members of the public arow you their intersted parties?     16     COMMISSIONER RETICE WHERE: Any.       15     COMINISSIONER MINEL: Conv. The first option that set.     17     COMMISSIONER RETICE WHERE: Any.       16     COMINISSIONER MINEL: Conv. The first option intersted parties?     16     COMMISSIONER RETICE WHERE: Any.       16     CHARIMAN KIMBLE: Conv. The first option on the set.     17     COMMISSIONER RETICE WHERE: Any.       17     CHARIMAN KIMBLE: Not there on the they option.     17     COMMISSIONER RETICE.       18     termines on the public arow you during comments you     20     CHARIMAN KIMBLE: Conv. Themothin is also approve the advisory option.			-	
6       forward to us as a complaint, we actually have something else we an look at an alook at maybe some other cases that have else of an its stat.       6       approve the Advisory Opinion 224-05.         7       we can look at an alook at maybe some other cases that have else of an its stat.       8       approve the Advisory Opinion 224-05.         8       been handled by the TECT we are relying on the stat.       8       approve the Advisory Opinion. Its there a second?         10       to much this statution, altong that a aready estimant might occur.       10       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.         11       analysis and soft of the stat harders develop using in a switch.       11       Battorian Statute and that we approve the Advisory Opinion as written. If Load that we approve the Advisory Opinion as written.       11         12       ChAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.       13       the advisory Opinion as written. If Load that we approve the Advisory Opinion as written. If Load that we approve the Advisory Opinion as written.       11         13       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from members of the public or any other interested parties.       17       COMISSIONER CAN: Any.         14       Many Other we devolue any other interested parties.       18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       20         15       Commissioner Paton.       17       ComMISSIONER CAN: Any.       21         24       Many Other we devolue			-	
7       we can look at an look at maybe some other cases that have       7       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, there's a motion to         8       been handled by the FEC if we are relying on this test.       9       So I'm hopedu that that will we wort get       9       COMMISSIONER PATON: TIl second.         10       too much in that situation, although 1 know that might occur.       10       COMMISSIONER PATON: TIl second.         11       But 1 tink would be more in favor of just relying on the       10       COMMISSIONER PATON: TIl second.         13       commission?       10       Commissioner Werther:       14         14       commission?       15       COMMISSIONER PATON: TIl second.       16         15       commission?       16       COMMISSIONER PATON: TIl second.       17         16       commission?       16       COMMISSIONER PATON: TIl second.       17         17       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17       COMMISSIONER PATON: Ase.       18         17       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Nay, other comments you       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner wither       17         18       COMMISSIONER PATON: Til second.       17       COMMISSIONER PATON: Ase.       18         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Nay, other comments you       21       The avou semuch: approved 4-to nothin as approved 4-t			-	
B         been handled by the FEC if we are relying on this test.         B         approve the advisory opinion. Is there a second?           9         So Tm hopful that that will – we wort get         9         COMMISSIONER PATION. If second.           11         But 1 think 1 would be more in favor of just relying on the         11         Paton.           12         Lit think 1 would be more in favor of just relying on the         11         Paton.           13         analysis and sort of the set that's already existing.         12         It's been moved and seconded that we approve           14         Commissioner Werther.         Any other comments from members of the         14         Commissioner Werther.           15         Commissioner Verther.         15         Commissioner Paton.           16         (Na audble response.)         16         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you         20         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you         20         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Char yother you         20           21         Mr. epstkown. Nothing more form me, thank you.         20         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Char yother you         20           22         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Nothing more form me, thank you.         20         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Char yote ayyot.           23         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Nothing more form me, thank you         20         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Nothing N			-	
9     COVMISSIONER PATON: T1 second.       10     too much in that statution, athough I how that might occur.     10     COVMISSIONER PATON: T1 second.       12     analysis and sort of the test that's already existing.     11     Paton.       13     CARRMAK KINBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.     12     It's been moved and secondad that we approve       14     Any other comments from members of the     14     Commissioner Wether.       15     Commissioner     16     Commissioner Wether.       16     Commissioner Wether.     16     Commissioner Wether.       17     CHAIRMAK KINBLE: Any other comments from     17     COMMISSIONER ESTES-WETHER: Aye.       18     members of the public or any other interstead partiels?     18     CARRMAK KINBLE: Commissioner Paton.       19     (No audible response.)     19     COMMISSIONER ESTES-WETHER: Aye.       20     CHAIRMAK KINBLE: Any other comments you.     20     CHAIRMAK KINBLE: Maye.       21     MR. BERKON: Nathing more from me, thank you.     21     The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.       23     CARAMAK KINBLE: Okay. Thank you.     23     MR. BERKON: Nathing more from the, that you.       24     MR. BERKON: Nathing more from the, that you.     24     MR. BERKON: Make you way much, for occumissioner       24     MR. BERKON: Nathing more from me, thank you.     24     MR.		-		
10       too much in that situation, atthough I know that might occur.       10       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner         13       but J think I would be more in favor of just relying on the       11       Paton.         13       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.       13       the advisory optimion as written. Thait and the weight occur.         14       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.       13       the advisory optimion as written. Thait and the weight occur.         15       Commission?       16       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from members of the       16         16       (No audible response.)       16       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17         16       (No audible response.)       18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         17       (No audible response.)       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes ave.       21         18       members of the public or any other interested parties?       18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chay other comments you       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         21       Mr. you wanted to make, M. Berkon?       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         23       wish to make a motion whether to approve the advisory Miler Cerlified			_	
11       But I think I would be more in favor of just relying on the analysis and sort of the test that's already existing.       12       Paton.         12       analysis and sort of the test that's already existing.       12       I's been moved and seconded that we approve         14       Any other comments from members of the (No audible response.)       13       the advisory opinion as written. I'll call the roll.         16       Commission?       16       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17         17       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17       COMMISSIONER RESTES-WERTHER: Aye.         18       members of the public or any other interesting particles.       19       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         19       (No audible response.)       19       COMMISSIONER RESTES-WERTHER: Aye.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       21       The mother sponse A).       22         21       MR. BERKON: Nothing more from me, thank you.       22       Thank you wore nothing.       23         23       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chain.       24       CMAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.       25         24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       CMAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.       25         25       Interentile de corentenes and suggestions from the public on as areal o			_	
12       analysis and sort of the test that's already existin.       12       It's been moved and seconded that we approve         13       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.       13       the advisory opinion as written. 101 call the roll.         14       Commissioner       16       Commissioner Warther.         15       Commissioner Nather ALMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17       COMMISSIONER RATOR: Aye.         16       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17       COMMISSIONER RATOR: Aye.         17       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         17       (No audile response.)       19       COMMISSIONER RATOR: Aye.         18       members of the public or any other interested parties?       18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner 20         14       Nr. you wanted to make, Mr. BerkON?       21       The motion is approved 4-to onthing.         14       Nr. byou wanted to make, Mr. BerkON?       23       much, Jon, for your comments.         14       reconderation of comments and suggestions from the       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Their you you wuch; appreciate it.         15       reconderation of comments and suggestions from the       2       COMISSIONER RATOR: Aye.         14       reconderation to conorments and suggestions from the       1 <th></th> <th></th> <th>-</th> <th></th>			-	
13       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.       13       the advisory opinion as written. Til call the roll.         14       Any other comments from members of the       14       Commissioner Verther.         15       Commissioner Paton.       16       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.         16       Commissioner Paton.       17       COMMISSIONER STES-WERTHER: Aye.         17       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17       COMMISSIONER NATION: Aye.         19       (No audible response.)       19       COMMISSIONER NINBLE: Commissioner Paton.         19       (No audible response.)       19       COMMISSIONER NINBLE: Commissioner Paton.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Naye. Thank you.       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Naye.       21         21       Mryou wanted to make, Mr. Berkon?       23       much, Jon, for your comments.       24         24       Okay, So dos any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Nank you every much. Tom. And thank you every work.         25       wish to make a disagestion from the       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you every much.       25         26       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and suggestion from the       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         27       rimited to directing staft to study the matter or				
14     Any other comments from members of the     14     Commissioner Werther:       15     Commissioner Werther:     Applied State		analysis and sort of the test that's already existing.		
15       Commission?       15       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.         16       (No audble response.)       16       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         17       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Aye.       16       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         18       members of the public or any other interested parties?       18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         19       (No audble response.)       19       COMMISSIONER CHAIX: Aye.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chaix y other comments you       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         21       MR. BERKON: Nathing more from me, thank you.       23       much, Jon, for your comments.         24       Okary. So does any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you so much; appreciate it.         25       Whith to make - make a motion whether to approve the advisory       25       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         26       Whith or comments and suggestions from the       25       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Item VI. This is the time         29       Jubic. Action taken as a result of public comment will be       2       COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.         3       Inmited to drate or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       7       3		CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner.		the advisory opinion as written. I'll call the roll.
16       (No audible response.)       16       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         17       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other interested parties?       18       CCHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         19       (No audible response.)       19       COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other interested parties?       18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         21       Mr you wanted to make, Mr. Berkon?       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         22       MR. BERKON: Nothing more from me, thank you.       23       much, Jon, for your comments.         23       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: ICAy. Thank you.       23       much, Jon, for your comments.         24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you.       25         24       Miler Certified Reporting. LCC       www.MillerCertified Reporting. LCC       Miller Certified Reporting. LCC         25       public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be       2       COMMISSIONER Paton: Aye.       77         3       imited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       GHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.       7         4       reacheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.       7         5       commis		Any other comments from members of the		Commissioner Werther.
17       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from       17       COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.         18       members of the public or any other interested parties?       18       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         20       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       20       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Charvotes aye.         21       Mr vou wanted to make, Mr. Berkon?       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         23       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.       22       Thank you very much, Tom. And thank you very much, Tom. And thank you very much, Jon, for your comments.         24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Charvotes aye.         25       wish to make andtom whether to approve the advisory       26       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner So         25       www.MillerCartifiedReporting.com       76         26       recrimed to indicate and suggestions from the comment will be include to directing staff to study the matter or       1       CHARMAN KIMBLE: Charvotes aye.         26       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and take a doment?       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         36       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       7         17       rescheduling the matter of ruther consideration and to adjourn.       16	_		_	COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.
18       members of the public or any other interested parties?       18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.         19       (No audible response.)       19       COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         21       Mr you wanted to make, Mr. BerkON?       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         23       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         23       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       Thank you very much, Tom. And thank you very         25       wish to makemake a motion whether to approve the advisory Miller Certified Reporting. LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting. LC       36         26       1       for consideration of comments and suggestions from the public. Action taken as a result of public comment line usit of make a or mesonding to critisom.       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         3       imited to directing staff to study the matter or minutes.       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at later date or responding to critism.       5       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.	16	(No audible response.)	16	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.
19       (No audible response.)       19       COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         21       Mr you wanted to make, Mr. BerkOP?       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         23       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.       23       much. Jon, for your comments.         24       Okay. 50 dees any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you so much; appreciate it.         25       wish to make - make a motion whether to approve the advisory       Mile Certified Reporting. LLC       Mile Certified Reporting. Com         26       r crossideration of comments and suggestions from the       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         3       limited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         4       r escheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)       6         7       minutes.       7       10         10       (No audible response.)       10         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is tho seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13 <th>17</th> <th>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from</th> <th>17</th> <th>COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.</th>	17	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from	17	COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.
20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you       20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         21       Mr you wanted to make, Mr. Berkon?       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         23       MR. BERKON: Nothing more from me, thank you.       23       much, Jon, for your comments.         24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you every much, Tom. And thank you very much, Jon, for your comments.         25       wish to make make a motion whether to approve the advisory Miler Certified Reporting. LLC       WW. Miler Certified Reporting. COM         26       To consideration of comments and suggestions from the       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         2       public. Action take nas a result of public comment will be       2       COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.         3       limited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       minutes.       7       7       7         7       minutes.       7       7       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comme		members of the public or any other interested parties?	_	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.
21       Mr you wanted to make, Mr. Berkon?       21       The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.         22       MR. EERKON: Nothing more from me, thank you.       22       Thank you very much, Tom. And thank you very         23       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.       23       Thank you so much; appreciate it.         24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you so much; appreciate it.         25       wish to make make a motion whether to approve the advisory       Miller Certified Reporting. LLC       www.MillerCertified Reporting. LLC         26       ro consideration of comments and suggestions from the       26       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         3       limited to directing staff to study the matter or       5       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)       6       7         7       minutes.       7       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       9       9         9       wish to make a comment?       10       (No audible response.)       11         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Kots esend anyone.       11         12       Th	19	(No audible response.)	19	COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.
22       MR. BERKON: Nothing more from me, thank you.       22       Thank you very much, Tom. And thank you very much. The second of decision at a later date or presponding to criticism.         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       7         7       10       (Na adible response.)       10         11       CHAIRNAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       Commission by e-mail at cce@arizonacleanelections.gov.       13         14       Item VII, adjournemet. At this time, I would       15     <	20	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments you	20	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.
23       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.       23       much, Jon, for your comments.         24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you so much; appreciate it.         25       wish to make make a motion whether to approve the advisory       Miller Certified Reporting, LLC       Www.MillerCertifiedReporting. Com         7       for consideration of comments and suggestions from till be       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Charing staff to study the matter or       3         8       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       6         7       minutes.       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       wish to make a comment?       10         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       Commission by e-mail at cece@aizonacleanelections.gov.       13         14       commission by e-mail at cece@aizonacleanelections.gov.       13         15       commission by e-mail at cece@aizonacleanelections.gov.       14         16       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion       16	21	Mr you wanted to make, Mr. Berkon?	21	The motion is approved 4-to-nothing.
24       Okay. So does any member of the Commission       24       MR. BERKON: Thank you so much; appreciate it.         25       wish to make make a motion whether to approve the advisory       25       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Item VI. This is the time         26       www.MillerCertified Reporting, LLC       Www.MillerCertified Reporting, LLC       3         27       for consideration of comments and suggestions from the       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         2       public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be       2       COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.         3       limited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       7       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       wish to make a comment?       11         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       Commission by e-mail at ccce@aizonacleanelections.gov.	22	MR. BERKON: Nothing more from me, thank you.	22	Thank you very much, Tom. And thank you very
25       wish to make make a motion whether to approve the advisory Miler Certified Reporting, LLC www.MilerCertified Reporting, LLC www.MilerCertified Reporting, LLC www.MilerCertified Reporting, LLC       State         56       57         1       for consideration of comments and suggestions from the public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be       1         2       public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be       2         3       limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two minutes.       7       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom 9       9       10       (No audible response.)       10         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11       11       11         12       The public may also send comments to the 12       12       14       Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would       14         14       Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would       15       16         15       0       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?       18	23	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.	23	much, Jon, for your comments.
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC     Miller Certified Reporting, LLC       www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com     56       57     57       58     57       59     57       50     57       51     0       52     57       53     57       54     0       55     57       56     57       57     5       58     57       59     57       50     57       51     57       52     57       53     57       54     57       55     57       56     57       57     5       56     57       57     5       56     57       57     5       56     57       57     5       56     57       57     5       57     5       56     57       57     5       57     5       57     5       57     5       57     5       57     5       57     5       57     5       57     5	24	Okay. So does any member of the Commission	24	MR. BERKON: Thank you so much; appreciate it.
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com         www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com           56         57           1         for consideration of comments and suggestions from the         1           2         public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be         2           3         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.           4         rescheduling the matter for study the matter or         3           4         rescheduling the matter for further consideration and         4           4         rescheduling the matter for further consideration and         4           6         please limit your comment to no more than two         6           6         minutes.         7           8         Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom         8           9         wish to make a comment?         9           10         (No audible response.)         10           11         CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Isot seeing anyone.         11           12         The public. May also send comments to the         12           13         Commission by e-mail at ccce@arizonacleanelections.gov.         13           14         Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would         14           15         entertain a motion to adjourn.         16           16	25	wish to make make a motion whether to approve the advisory	25	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Item VI. This is the time
56       1       for consideration of comments and suggestions from the       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.       COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.       2         3       limited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         4       decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       7       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         7       minutes.       8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       (No audible response.)       10       11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11       12       The public may also send comments to the       12         12       The public may also send comments to the       12       13       14       Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would       14         15       entertain a motion to adjourn.       16       17       17         18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?       18       19       20         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there not.       21       21         21       Commissioner Chan. <t< th=""><th></th><th>Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</th><th></th><th>Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</th></t<>		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
1       for consideration of comments and suggestions from the       1       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.         2       public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be       2       COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.         3       limited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       6       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         7       minutes.       7       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       wish to make a comment?       9         10       (No audible response.)       10         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion       16         16       COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.       19         19       COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.       19         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I's been moved and seconded       20         21       that we adjourn. I will call the roll.       21         22       Co		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
2       public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be       2       COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.         3       Imited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       6         7       minutes.       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       wish to make a comment?       9         10       (No audible response.)       10         11       ChAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       Commission by e-mail at coce@arizonacleanelections.gov.       13         14       Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would       14         15       entertain a motion to adjourn.       17         16       COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.       19         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded       20         11       that we adjourn. I will call the roll. <t< th=""><th></th><th>56</th><th></th><th>57</th></t<>		56		57
3       Imited to directing staff to study the matter or       3       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.         4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       6         7       minutes.       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       wish to make a comment?       9         10       (No audible response.)       10         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       Commission by e-mail at coce@arizonacleanelections.gov.       13         14       Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would       14         15       entertain a motion to adjourn.       16         16       COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.       19         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded       20         11       that we adjourn. I will call the roll.       21         21       Commissioner ChAIN: Aye.       23         22       Commissioner Ch	1	for consideration of comments and suggestions from the	1	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.
4       rescheduling the matter for further consideration and       4       We are adjourned. Thank you very much.         5       decision at a later date or responding to criticism.       5       (Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)         6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       6         7       minutes.       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       wish to make a comment?       9         10       (No audible response.)       10         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       Commission by e-mail at ccec@arizonacleanelections.gov.       13         14       Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would       14         15       entertain a motion to adjourn.       16         16       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion       17         18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?       18         19       COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.       19         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded       20         21       that we adjourn. I will call the roll.       21         22       Commissioner Chan.       22	2	public. Action taken as a result of public comment will be	2	COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.
<ul> <li>decision at a later date or responding to criticism.</li> <li>6 Please limit your comment to no more than two</li> <li>7 minutes.</li> <li>7 Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom</li> <li>8 Anyone wish to make a comment?</li> <li>9 wish to make a comment?</li> <li>10 (No audible response.)</li> <li>11 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.</li> <li>11 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.</li> <li>11 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.</li> <li>13 Commission by e-mail at ccec@arizonacleanelections.gov.</li> <li>13 entertain a motion to adjourn.</li> <li>15 entertain a motion to adjourn.</li> <li>16 COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion</li> <li>17 to adjourn.</li> <li>18 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded</li> <li>20 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded</li> <li>21 that we adjourn. I will call the roll.</li> <li>22 Commissioner Chan.</li> <li>23 COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.</li> <li>23 COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.</li> <li>24 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.</li> <li>25 COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.</li> <li>31 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</li> <li>41 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC</li> </ul>	3	limited to directing staff to study the matter or	3	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chair votes aye.
6       Please limit your comment to no more than two       6         7       minutes.       7         8       Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom       8         9       wish to make a comment?       9         10       (No audible response.)       10         11       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.       11         12       The public may also send comments to the       12         13       Commission by e-mail at coce@arizonacleanelections.gov.       13         14       Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would       14         15       entertain a motion to adjourn.       16         17       to adjourn.       17         18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?       18         19       COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.       19         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?       12         21       that we adjourn. I will call the roll.       21         22       Commissioner Chan.       22         23       COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.       23         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.       24         25       COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.       23         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.       24	4	rescheduling the matter for further consideration and	-	We are adjourned. Thank you very much.
7minutes.78Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom89wish to make a comment?910(No audible response.)1011CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.1112The public may also send comments to the1213Commission by e-mail at ccec@arizonacleanelections.gov.1314Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	5	decision at a later date or responding to criticism.	5	(Proceeding concludes at 10:49 a.m.)
8Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom89wish to make a comment?910(No audible response.)1011CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.1112The public may also send comments to the1213Commission by e-mail at cccc@arizonacleanelections.gov.1314Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2121that we adjourn. will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.2426COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2427Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	6	Please limit your comment to no more than two	6	
9wish to make a comment?910(No audible response.)1011CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.1112The public may also send comments to the1213Commission by e-mail at cccc@arizonacleanelections.gov.1314Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	7	minutes.	7	
10(No audible response.)1011CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.1112The public may also send comments to the1213Commission by e-mail at ccce@arizonacleanelections.gov.1314Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	8	Anyone wish to make a comment? Anyone on Zoom	8	
11CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.1112The public may also send comments to the1213Commission by e-mail at ccec@arizonacleanelections.gov.1314Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	9	wish to make a comment?	9	
12The public may also send comments to the1213Commission by e-mail at cccc@arizonacleanelections.gov.1314Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	10	(No audible response.)	10	
13Commission by e-mail at ccc@arizonacleanelections.gov.1314Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	11	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Not seeing anyone.	11	
14Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would1415entertain a motion to adjourn.1516COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	12	The public may also send comments to the	12	
15       entertain a motion to adjourn.       15         16       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion       16         17       to adjourn.       17         18       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?       18         19       COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.       19         20       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded       20         21       that we adjourn. I will call the roll.       21         22       Commissioner Chan.       22         23       COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.       23         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.       24         25       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.       25         Miller Certified Reporting, LLC       Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	13	Commission by e-mail at ccec@arizonacleanelections.gov.	13	
16COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion1617to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	14	Item VII, adjournment. At this time, I would	14	
17to adjourn.1718CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	15	entertain a motion to adjourn.	15	
18CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?1819COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	16	COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I make a motion	16	
19COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.1920CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	17	to adjourn.	17	
20CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded2021that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	18	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?	18	
21that we adjourn. I will call the roll.2122Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	19	COMMISSIONER PATON: Second.	19	
22Commissioner Chan.2223COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.2324CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.2425COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.25Miller Certified Reporting, LLCMiller Certified Reporting, LLC	-	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded	-	
23       COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.       23         24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.       24         25       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.       25         Miller Certified Reporting, LLC       Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		that we adjourn. I will call the roll.	21	
24       CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.       24         25       COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye.       25         Miller Certified Reporting, LLC       Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Commissioner Chan.		
25 COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye. Miller Certified Reporting, LLC 25 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	23	COMMISSIONER CHAN: Aye.	23	
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	24	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther.		
		COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: AVE	25	
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com	25	connissioner estes werther. Aye.		
	25			Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

1	CERTIEICATE	
3	STATE OF ARIZONA )	
1234567	) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA)	
7	BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter	
8	No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and	
9	thereafter reduced to print under my direction.	
10	I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome	
11	thereof.	
12	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the	
13 14	requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 2nd of July, 2024.	
15	Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)	
16	* * *	
17		
18	I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and	
19	7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 2nd of July, 2024.	
20	MCR	
21	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC Arizona RRF No. R1058	
22 23 24 25		
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com	

	29:19, 29:25, 34:22	29:7, 32:18, 33:17,	<b>ASU</b> [1] - 24:9	<b>big</b> [3] - 8:2, 30:23
1	action [7] - 4:12,	37:17, 44:10, 52:8,	attached [1] - 7:17	binary [1] - 20:13
<b>1</b> [2] - 23:19, 31:5	11:16, 20:19, 24:21,	54:12	attendant [1] - 23:17	biography [1] - 24:13
<b>10:49</b> [1] - 57:5	37:9, 53:7, 56:2	analytical [1] - 38:1	attention [1] - 5:24	bit [2] - 7:8, 52:13
<b>115-degree</b> [1] - 25:8	Activate [3] - 6:14,	analyzed [1] - 39:20	attitudes [1] - 7:18	<b>bite</b> [3] - 45:9, 47:4,
<b>12</b> [1] - 25:17	6:16, 8:19	analyzes [1] - 28:7	attribute [1] - 6:3	48:10
<b>1990s</b> [1] - 25:16	activities [1] - 6:6	analyzing [2] - 27:18,	audible [6] - 11:14,	BitFire [2] - 12:3, 25:5
	activity [1] - 30:21	27:25	26:17, 38:20, 54:16,	black [3] - 28:16,
2	ad [3] - 23:1, 23:5,	Anspach [1] - 27:14	54:19, 56:10	41:11, 49:24
	24:1	answer [8] - 31:19,	authority [1] - 4:25	black-and-white [1] -
<b>2</b> [2] - 23:19, 31:6	addition [1] - 6:5	37:21, 44:15, 45:12,	auto [1] - 23:17	49:24
<b>2.3</b> [1] - 17:20	additional [3] - 19:2,	46:3, 46:5, 50:3,	auto-attendant [1] -	blank [1] - 22:2
<b>200</b> [1] - 9:20	22:16, 53:10	52:20	23:17	boards [1] - 20:4
<b>2024</b> [1] - 11:17	addressing [1] - 27:25	answering [1] - 43:20	automatically [1] -	<b>body</b> [1] - 29:6
<b>2024-05</b> [1] - 55:6	adjourn [3] - 56:15,	<b>AOR</b> [7] - 35:22, 36:4,	23:22	<b>boil</b> [1] - 33:11
<b>211</b> [3] - 4:17, 27:2,	56:17, 56:21	37:3, 40:11, 44:4,	available [13] - 13:23,	bonus [1] - 40:22
42:23	adjourned [1] - 57:4	44:6, 50:10	15:2, 15:14, 16:11,	<b>book</b> [1] - 6:16
<b>26</b> [1] - 7:5	adjournment [1] -	<b>Apache</b> [3] - 22:15,	18:6, 18:19, 19:19,	<b>boom</b> [1] - 50:5
<b>2B</b> [2] - 31:5	56:14	22:23, 23:19	31:4, 31:8, 31:12,	boosting [1] - 33:8
	administrative [1] -	apathy [1] - 24:20	32:9, 33:12, 44:3	bothers [1] - 11:6
3	7:21	appeal [1] - 17:9	avenue [2] - 49:5, 50:7	bothersome [1] -
<b>3</b> [2] - 23:19, 31:6	ads [1] - 22:16 adver [1] - 34:20	Appeals [1] - 4:16 appear [2] - 9:17, 9:21	<b>Avery</b> [3] - 6:10, 11:24, 18:3	11:10
<b>30,000</b> [1] - 21:19	advertising [2] -	appearances [1] - 6:7	Avery's [1] - 6:16	<b>bottom</b> [4] - 4:20,
<b>3rd</b> [1] - 17:20	34:21, 35:25	applause [1] - 17:1	<b>aye</b> [12] - 4:5, 4:7, 4:9,	32:3, 42:22 <b>box</b> [1] - 38:12
	advise [1] - 38:2	application [1] - 7:10	4:10, 55:15, 55:17,	brand [1] - 15:10
4	advisory [12] - 7:13,	applies [4] - 27:3,	55:19, 55:20, 56:23,	brass [1] - 34:11
	26:21, 26:22, 26:25,	45:16, 45:25, 51:11	56:25, 57:2, 57:3	break [2] - 30:14, 41:2
<b>4</b> [2] - 23:20, 31:6	52:14, 52:24, 53:1,	apply [4] - 28:17, 29:7,		breakdown [1] - 33:25
<b>4,000</b> [1] - 6:9	53:6, 53:9, 54:25,	32:15, 36:20	В	breaks [1] - 8:12
4-to-nothing rol -				
4-to-nothing [2] -	55:8, 55:13	applying [1] - 28:4		bright [2] - 28:16,
4:11, 55:21	Advisory [2] - 26:22,	appreciate [3] - 50:18,	back-and-forth [1] -	<b>bright</b> [2] - 28:16, 53:22
4:11, 55:21 <b>40-year</b> [1] - 51:8	<b>Advisory</b> [2] - 26:22, 55:6	<b>appreciate</b> [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24	52:16	
4:11, 55:21 <b>40-year</b> [1] - 51:8 <b>43</b> [1] - 7:4	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22
4:11, 55:21 <b>40-year</b> [1] - 51:8	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2
4:11, 55:21 <b>40-year</b> [1] - 51:8 <b>43</b> [1] - 7:4 <b>45</b> [1] - 5:8	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13
4:11, 55:21 <b>40-year</b> [1] - 51:8 <b>43</b> [1] - 7:4	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9,	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10
4:11, 55:21 <b>40-year</b> [1] - 51:8 <b>43</b> [1] - 7:4 <b>45</b> [1] - 5:8	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19,	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20,	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9,	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21 broadcast [6] - 5:12,
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 5 [1] - 31:6	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11, 55:21	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2,	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21 broadcast [6] - 5:12, 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21 broadcast [6] - 5:12, 5:15, 11:19, 13:1, 13:7, 14:14
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11, 55:21 April [1] - 33:13	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} \ [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} \ [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} \ [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} \ [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} \ [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} \ [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, \ 11:19, \ 13:1,\\ 13:7, \ 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} \ [3] - 29:2,\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11, 55:21 April [1] - 33:13 are/were [1] - 18:15 area [3] - 28:14, 51:14, 51:17	52:16 <b>balance</b> [1] - 44:4 <b>ball</b> [1] - 45:1 <b>ballast</b> [1] - 7:19 <b>ballot</b> [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 <b>based</b> [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 <b>baseline</b> [3] - 5:22,	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21 broadcast [6] - 5:12, 5:15, 11:19, 13:1, 13:7, 14:14
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11, 55:21 April [1] - 33:13 are/were [1] - 18:15 area [3] - 28:14, 51:14, 51:17 arising [1] - 26:22	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} \ [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} \ [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} \ [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} \ [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} \ [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} \ [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, \ 11:19, \ 13:1,\\ 13:7, \ 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} \ [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, \ 40:23\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ ,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9,	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} \ [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} \ [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} \ [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} \ [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} \ [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} \ [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, \ 11:19, \ 13:1,\\ 13:7, \ 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} \ [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, \ 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} \ [1] - 29:22\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22,	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ ,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} \ [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} \ [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} \ [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} \ [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} \ [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} \ [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, \ 11:19, \ 13:1,\\ 13:7, \ 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} \ [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, \ 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} \ [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} \ [1] - 12:7\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ ,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18,	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8 amazing [2] - 14:2,	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ ,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \textbf{bunch} [1] - 48:7\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8 amazing [2] - 14:2, 14:20	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ , 21:20, $45:23$	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18,	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \textbf{bunch} [1] - 48:7\\ \textbf{business} [7] - 27:3,\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8 amazing [2] - 14:2, 14:20 Amendment [4] -	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ ,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12,	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \textbf{bunch} [1] - 48:7\\ \textbf{business} [7] - 27:3,\\ 34:13, 34:16, 36:4,\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8 amazing [2] - 14:2, 14:20	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11, 55:21 April [1] - 33:13 are/were [1] - 18:15 area [3] - 28:14, 51:14, 51:17 arising [1] - 26:22 Arizona [12] - 7:16, 8:2, 12:5, 12:12, 12:13, 14:10, 15:25, 16:2, 16:9, 19:20, 21:20, 45:23 arriving [2] - 5:21,	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \textbf{bunch} [1] - 48:7\\ \textbf{business} [7] - 27:3,\\ 34:13, 34:16, 36:4,\\ 37:8, 38:3, 41:8\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A a.m [1] - 57:5	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8 amazing [2] - 14:2, 14:20 Amendment [4] - 40:5, 40:15, 42:18,	appreciate [3] - 50:18, 50:23, 55:24 approach [2] - 33:3, 42:2 approve [5] - 4:2, 54:25, 55:6, 55:8, 55:12 approved [2] - 4:11, 55:21 April [1] - 33:13 are/were [1] - 18:15 area [3] - 28:14, 51:14, 51:17 arising [1] - 26:22 Arizona [12] - 7:16, 8:2, 12:5, 12:12, 12:13, 14:10, 15:25, 16:2, 16:9, 19:20, 21:20, 45:23 arriving [2] - 5:21, 17:18	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21 BERKON [4] - 50:17,	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \textbf{bunch} [1] - 48:7\\ \textbf{business} [7] - 27:3,\\ 34:13, 34:16, 36:4,\\ 37:8, 38:3, 41:8\\ \textbf{but.} [2] - 34:3, 39:15\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A a.m [1] - 57:5 ability [2] - 16:1, 19:7	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8 amazing [2] - 14:2, 14:20 Amendment [4] - 40:5, 40:15, 42:18, 46:13	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ , 21:20, $45:23arriving [2] - 5:21,17:18articulated [1] - 53:12aside [2] - 12:12, 53:4$	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21 BERKON [4] - 50:17, 52:10, 54:22, 55:24	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line}\left[2\right]-28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter}\left[1\right]-49:2\\ \textbf{bring}\left[1\right]-12:13\\ \textbf{bringing}\left[2\right]-13:10\\ \textbf{broad}\left[1\right]-6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast}\left[6\right]-5:12,\\ 5:15,11:19,13:1,\\ 13:7,14:14\\ \textbf{broader}\left[3\right]-29:2,\\ 29:3,40:23\\ \textbf{broadly}\left[1\right]-29:22\\ \textbf{brought}\left[1\right]-29:22\\ \textbf{brought}\left[1\right]-29:22\\ \textbf{brought}\left[1\right]-29:22\\ \textbf{brought}\left[1\right]-20:16\\ \textbf{bunch}\left[1\right]-48:7\\ \textbf{business}\left[7\right]-27:3,\\ 34:13,34:16,36:4,\\ 37:8,38:3,41:8\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A a.m [1] - 57:5	Advisory [2] - 26:22, 55:6 affiliates [2] - 16:3 affirmed [1] - 4:21 age [1] - 15:8 agenda [1] - 5:10 ago [4] - 4:15, 4:19, 6:24, 6:25 agreed [1] - 24:9 Al [1] - 31:2 air [1] - 23:2 airing [1] - 14:21 Alec [1] - 11:24 Alexander [1] - 24:13 allow [1] - 20:13 almost [2] - 15:22, 51:8 amazing [2] - 14:2, 14:20 Amendment [4] - 40:5, 40:15, 42:18, 46:13 Amendment's [1] - 43:8 America [1] - 24:14	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ , 21:20, $45:23arriving [2] - 5:21,17:18articles [1] - 47:3articulated [1] - 53:12aside [2] - 12:12, 53:4aspect [1] - 32:15$	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21 BERKON [4] - 50:17, 52:10, 54:22, 55:24 best [1] - 27:8	$\begin{array}{c} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \textbf{bunch} [1] - 48:7\\ \textbf{business} [7] - 27:3,\\ 34:13, 34:16, 36:4,\\ 37:8, 38:3, 41:8\\ \textbf{but.} [2] - 34:3, 39:15\\ \end{array}$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A a.m [1] - 57:5 ability [2] - 16:1, 19:7 able [3] - 19:1, 23:23,	Advisory $[2] - 26:22$ , 55:6 affiliates $[2] - 16:3$ affirmed $[1] - 4:21$ age $[1] - 15:8$ agenda $[1] - 5:10$ ago $[4] - 4:15$ , $4:19$ , 6:24, $6:25agreed [1] - 24:9Al [1] - 31:2air [1] - 23:2airing [1] - 14:21Alec [1] - 11:24Alexander [1] - 24:13allow [1] - 20:13almost [2] - 15:22,51:8amazing [2] - 14:2,14:20Amendment [4] -40:5$ , $40:15$ , $42:18$ , 46:13 Amendment's $[1] -$ 43:8 America $[1] - 24:14$	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ , 21:20, $45:23arriving [2] - 5:21,17:18articles [1] - 47:3articulated [1] - 53:12aside [2] - 12:12, 53:4aspect [1] - 33:2$	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21 BERKON [4] - 50:17, 52:10, 54:22, 55:24 best [1] - 27:8 better [4] - 8:11, 20:6,	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21 broadcast [6] - 5:12, 5:15, 11:19, 13:1, 13:7, 14:14 broader [3] - 29:2, 29:3, 40:23 broadly [1] - 29:22 brought [1] - 12:7 built [2] - 15:23, 16:7 built [2] - 15:23, 16:7 built [1] - 20:16 bunch [1] - 48:7 business [7] - 27:3, 34:13, 34:16, 36:4, 37:8, 38:3, 41:8 but. [2] - 34:3, 39:15 buys [1] - 34:20 <b>C</b>
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A a.m [1] - 57:5 ability [2] - 16:1, 19:7 able [3] - 19:1, 23:23, 23:25 access [3] - 13:11, 19:2, 19:12	Advisory $[2] - 26:22$ , 55:6 affiliates $[2] - 16:3$ affirmed $[1] - 4:21$ age $[1] - 15:8$ agenda $[1] - 5:10$ ago $[4] - 4:15$ , $4:19$ , 6:24, $6:25agreed [1] - 24:9Al [1] - 31:2air [1] - 23:2airing [1] - 14:21Alec [1] - 11:24Alexander [1] - 24:13allow [1] - 20:13almost [2] - 15:22,51:8amazing [2] - 14:2,14:20Amendment [4] -40:5$ , $40:15$ , $42:18$ , 46:13 Amendment's $[1] -$ 43:8 America $[1] - 24:14$ American $[1] - 18:4$ amount $[4] - 14:20$ ,	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ , 21:20, $45:23arriving [2] - 5:21,17:18articles [1] - 47:3articulated [1] - 53:12aside [2] - 12:12, 53:4aspect [1] - 33:2Association [2] - 12:6,$	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21 BERKON [4] - 50:17, 52:10, 54:22, 55:24 best [1] - 27:8 better [4] - 8:11, 20:6, 29:4, 49:24	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21 broadcast [6] - 5:12, 5:15, 11:19, 13:1, 13:7, 14:14 broader [3] - 29:2, 29:3, 40:23 broadly [1] - 29:22 brought [1] - 12:7 built [2] - 15:23, 16:7 bulk [1] - 18:2 bullet [1] - 20:16 bunch [1] - 48:7 business [7] - 27:3, 34:13, 34:16, 36:4, 37:8, 38:3, 41:8 but. [2] - 34:3, 39:15 buys [1] - 34:20 C campaign [10] - 8:4,
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A a.m [1] - 57:5 ability [2] - 16:1, 19:7 able [3] - 19:1, 23:23, 23:25 access [3] - 13:11,	Advisory $[2] - 26:22$ , 55:6 affiliates $[2] - 16:3$ affirmed $[1] - 4:21$ age $[1] - 15:8$ agenda $[1] - 5:10$ ago $[4] - 4:15$ , $4:19$ , 6:24, $6:25agreed [1] - 24:9Al [1] - 31:2air [1] - 23:2airing [1] - 14:21Alec [1] - 11:24Alexander [1] - 24:13allow [1] - 20:13almost [2] - 15:22,51:8amazing [2] - 14:2,14:20Amendment [4] -40:5$ , $40:15$ , $42:18$ , 46:13 America $[1] - 24:14$ America $[1] - 24:14$ America $[1] - 18:4$ amount $[4] - 14:20$ , 33:14, $44:2$ , $52:22$	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ , 21:20, $45:23arriving [2] - 5:21,17:18articles [1] - 47:3articulated [1] - 53:12aside [2] - 12:12, 53:4aspect [1] - 33:2Association [2] - 12:6,14:10$	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21 BERKON [4] - 50:17, 52:10, 54:22, 55:24 best [1] - 27:8 better [4] - 8:11, 20:6, 29:4, 49:24 between [1] - 46:13	$\begin{array}{r} 53:22\\ \textbf{bright-line} [2] - 28:16,\\ 53:22\\ \textbf{brighter} [1] - 49:2\\ \textbf{bring} [1] - 12:13\\ \textbf{bringing} [2] - 13:10\\ \textbf{broad} [1] - 6:21\\ \textbf{broadcast} [6] - 5:12,\\ 5:15, 11:19, 13:1,\\ 13:7, 14:14\\ \textbf{broader} [3] - 29:2,\\ 29:3, 40:23\\ \textbf{broadly} [1] - 29:22\\ \textbf{brought} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 12:7\\ \textbf{built} [2] - 15:23, 16:7\\ \textbf{bulk} [1] - 18:2\\ \textbf{bullet} [1] - 20:16\\ \textbf{bunch} [1] - 48:7\\ \textbf{business} [7] - 27:3,\\ 34:13, 34:16, 36:4,\\ 37:8, 38:3, 41:8\\ \textbf{but.} [2] - 34:3, 39:15\\ \textbf{buys} [1] - 34:20\\ \hline \hline \hline \\ \hline$
4:11, 55:21 40-year [1] - 51:8 43 [1] - 7:4 45 [1] - 5:8 5 5 [1] - 31:6 50 [1] - 48:10 51 [1] - 45:8 6 6 [2] - 9:21, 14:17 6974 [1] - 4:24 9 9:30 [1] - 8:15 A a.m [1] - 57:5 ability [2] - 16:1, 19:7 able [3] - 19:1, 23:23, 23:25 access [3] - 13:11, 19:2, 19:12	Advisory $[2] - 26:22$ , 55:6 affiliates $[2] - 16:3$ affirmed $[1] - 4:21$ age $[1] - 15:8$ agenda $[1] - 5:10$ ago $[4] - 4:15$ , $4:19$ , 6:24, $6:25agreed [1] - 24:9Al [1] - 31:2air [1] - 23:2airing [1] - 14:21Alec [1] - 11:24Alexander [1] - 24:13allow [1] - 20:13almost [2] - 15:22,51:8amazing [2] - 14:2,14:20Amendment [4] -40:5$ , $40:15$ , $42:18$ , 46:13 Amendment's $[1] -$ 43:8 America $[1] - 24:14$ American $[1] - 18:4$ amount $[4] - 14:20$ ,	appreciate $[3] - 50:18$ , 50:23, $55:24approach [2] - 33:3,42:2approve [5] - 4:2,54:25$ , $55:6$ , $55:8$ , 55:12 approved $[2] - 4:11$ , 55:21 April $[1] - 33:13$ are/were $[1] - 18:15$ area $[3] - 28:14$ , $51:14$ , 51:17 arising $[1] - 26:22$ Arizona $[12] - 7:16$ , 8:2, $12:5$ , $12:12$ , 12:13, $14:10$ , $15:25$ , 16:2, $16:9$ , $19:20$ , 21:20, $45:23arriving [2] - 5:21,17:18articles [1] - 47:3articulated [1] - 53:12aside [2] - 12:12, 53:4aspect [1] - 33:2Association [2] - 12:6,$	52:16 balance [1] - 44:4 ball [1] - 45:1 ballast [1] - 7:19 ballot [11] - 13:9, 19:9, 21:12, 21:15, 21:20, 21:23, 21:25, 22:2, 22:3, 26:10 based [6] - 17:25, 28:6, 29:16, 31:14, 42:4, 51:16 baseline [3] - 5:22, 33:24, 44:11 becomes [2] - 29:9, 42:25 behind [3] - 16:18, 29:17, 34:22 benefit [2] - 41:12, 41:13 Berkon [4] - 27:13, 50:15, 53:15, 54:21 BERKON [4] - 50:17, 52:10, 54:22, 55:24 best [1] - 27:8 better [4] - 8:11, 20:6, 29:4, 49:24	53:22 bright-line [2] - 28:16, 53:22 brighter [1] - 49:2 bring [1] - 12:13 bringing [2] - 13:10 broad [1] - 6:21 broadcast [6] - 5:12, 5:15, 11:19, 13:1, 13:7, 14:14 broader [3] - 29:2, 29:3, 40:23 broadly [1] - 29:22 brought [1] - 12:7 built [2] - 15:23, 16:7 bulk [1] - 18:2 bullet [1] - 20:16 bunch [1] - 48:7 business [7] - 27:3, 34:13, 34:16, 36:4, 37:8, 38:3, 41:8 but. [2] - 34:3, 39:15 buys [1] - 34:20 C campaign [10] - 8:4,

36:12, 37:10, 45:18	9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20,	35:12	55:16, 55:18, 56:22,	42:15
campaigns [5] - 14:1,	10:24, 11:11, 11:15,	<b>Coca-Cola</b> [2] - 35:11,	56:24, 57:1	concerns [3] - 12:13,
15:3, 15:18, 16:14,	25:3, 25:8, 25:14,	35:12	COMMISSIONER [54]	38:22, 40:6
35:8	25:23, 26:3, 26:15,	<b>Coconino</b> [5] - 22:14,	- 4:5, 4:7, 4:9, 5:5,	<b>conclude</b> [2] - 45:15,
candidate [9] - 19:20,	26:18, 26:20, 38:18,	22:17, 22:22, 22:24,	8:25, 9:2, 9:6, 9:12,	45:16
19:21, 20:9, 20:18,	38:21, 38:24, 42:21,	23:19	10:5, 10:18, 10:22,	concluded [3] - 5:11,
20:19, 21:22, 30:21,	44:25, 45:12, 50:15,	<b>Coke</b> [1] - 35:12	11:2, 25:13, 25:15,	33:6, 44:17
32:6, 33:14	52:7, 53:14, 53:19,	<b>Cola</b> [2] - 35:11, 35:12	26:2, 26:4, 27:10,	concludes [1] - 57:5
candidates [37] - 7:4,	54:13, 54:17, 54:20,	colleague [1] - 27:14	44:22, 45:1, 45:4,	concluding [1] - 45:20
7:9, 9:8, 9:16, 9:20,	54:23, 55:4, 55:7,	COLLINS [33] - 4:15,	46:15, 46:21, 46:24,	conclusion [4] -
9:25, 12:10, 13:14,	55:10, 55:16, 55:18,	5:6, 9:11, 27:7,	47:2, 47:6, 47:9,	28:19, 34:10, 45:24,
13:19, 14:1, 14:3,	55:20, 55:25, 56:11,	27:12, 38:23, 39:16,	47:12, 47:16, 47:22,	49:25
15:3, 15:25, 16:8,	56:18, 56:20, 56:24,	43:1, 44:24, 45:3,	47:24, 48:2, 48:6,	conduct [2] - 51:24,
16:16, 16:23, 17:6,	57:1, 57:3	46:3, 46:16, 46:23,	48:9, 48:13, 49:6,	51:25
17:10, 17:12, 19:8,	challenge [1] - 4:18	47:1, 47:5, 47:8,	49:9, 49:14, 49:16,	conducting [1] - 14:15
19:24, 19:25, 20:3,	Chan [4] - 4:4, 35:3,	47:11, 47:15, 47:18,	50:6, 50:8, 50:11,	Conference [1] - 6:11
20:11, 20:13, 21:22,	55:18, 56:22	47:21, 47:23, 48:1,	53:18, 53:20, 55:3,	confirm [2] - 19:5
25:11, 25:20, 26:8,	CHAN [3] - 4:5, 55:19,	48:5, 48:8, 48:12,	55:5, 55:9, 55:15,	confirmed [1] - 31:22
32:4, 39:4, 39:6,	56:23	48:15, 49:7, 49:12,	55:17, 55:19, 56:16,	conform [1] - 51:24
39:8, 41:13, 42:11	chance [2] - 4:19, 5:8	49:15, 49:17, 50:7,	56:19, 56:23, 56:25,	conforms [1] - 51:24
canned [1] - 39:13	change [2] - 21:6,	50:9, 50:13	57:2	connect [3] - 9:24,
cannot [3] - 21:14,	34:2	Collins [1] - 50:20	Commissioners [14] -	10:3, 23:23
45:15, 45:16	Chapter [1] - 18:4	Collins' [1] - 52:8	8:18, 9:19, 10:12,	connected [1] - 23:22
cans [1] - 21:11	charting [1] - 54:4	comfortable [2] -	11:11, 12:20, 17:2,	connections [1] -
capable [1] - 13:7	check [1] - 36:25	53:24	23:13, 25:2, 25:12,	24:18
Captain [3] - 6:14,	checked [1] - 38:13	<b>Comic</b> [1] - 6:13	26:1, 26:15, 26:16,	consequence [1] -
6:16, 8:19	Cherry [1] - 35:12	comic [1] - 6:16	26:25, 38:8	36:8
care [1] - 10:8	chose [1] - 20:14	Comic-Con [1] - 6:13	<b>committee</b> [2] - 30:21,	consider [1] - 32:21
<b>case</b> [14] - 4:16, 31:3,	chosen [1] - 14:4	coming [6] - 7:22,	32:6	consideration [4] -
34:10, 40:18, 41:9,	<b>Circle</b> [2] - 34:19,	8:19, 15:7, 15:10,	communities [2] - 18:4, 18:5	50:19, 51:11, 56:1,
41:17, 42:4, 42:6,	34:21	24:7, 49:10	community [9] - 18:2,	56:4
44:17, 48:17, 53:7,	circumstances [1] -	<b>comment</b> [4] - 56:2,	18:9, 28:2, 29:4,	considerations [2] -
54:1	31:15	56:6, 56:8, 56:9	50:21, 51:1, 52:16,	40:17, 51:19
<b>cases</b> [3] - 4:17, 28:4, 54:7	cites [1] - 33:18	commentaries [1] -	53:5, 53:24	consistent [1] - 42:2
<b>cast</b> [2] - 24:8, 24:17	<b>Citizens</b> [3] - 35:5,	31:21	company [8] - 31:20,	contacting [1] - 19:25
casual [1] - 39:7	40:19, 40:20	comments [13] - 9:3, 25:12, 25:25, 26:16,	33:18, 34:24, 35:15,	contacts [1] - 16:13
categories [1] - 42:10	city [2] - 19:25, 20:4 clarify [1] - 38:11	25.12, 25.25, 26.16, 38:17, 38:18, 53:16,	36:10, 37:9, 41:7	contain [1] - 29:21
<b>Cathy</b> [3] - 27:22,	clarity [1] - 36:24	54:14, 54:17, 54:20,	company's [2] - 35:1,	contemplating [1] -
30:13, 31:16	• • •	55:23, 56:1, 56:12	36:24	34:9
ccec@	<b>Clean</b> [9] - 11:23, 15:9, 16:15, 18:23,	commercial [1] -	comparable [4] - 31:9,	<b>content</b> [8] - 6:1, 11:5,
arizonacleanelections		34:23	31:13, 32:12, 51:5	30:10, 33:13, 33:14,
.gov [1] - 56:13	23:20, 24:10	Commission [19] -	compare [1] - 33:17	39:23, 44:2, 51:16
central [1] - 18:24	<b>clear</b> [6] - 8:13, 15:9,	4:25, 5:17, 11:13,	compared [1] - 45:9	content-based [1] -
<b>certain</b> [7] - 5:1, 7:10,	34:4, 38:11, 39:7,	11:18, 27:9, 34:8,	comparison [1] -	51:16 context [5] - 28:2,
29:20, 32:16, 39:8,	52:17	38:19, 45:15, 45:16,	44:11	40:15, 41:3, 41:6,
54:3	<b>clearly</b> [3] - 40:2, 40:3,	45:19, 45:24, 51:3,	compass [1] - 20:9	40.15, 41.3, 41.0, 44:7
certainly [6] - 6:24,	52:23	51:19, 52:23, 53:8,	competitive [1] -	<b>continue</b> [3] - 5:13,
16:14, 17:19, 17:24,	clerks [1] - 19:25	53:17, 54:15, 54:24,	12:12	13:25, 27:20
18:14, 27:18	client [4] - 51:1, 51:22,	56:13	complaint [1] - 54:6	continued [1] - 6:6
Chair [3] - 4:10, 55:20,	52:11, 53:9	commission [1] - 7:1	complete [1] - 10:3	continuing [2] - 17:6,
57:3	clients [1] - 38:2	Commission's [2] -	completely [2] -	20:23
Chairman [16] - 9:19,	climate [1] - 43:11	51:3, 51:5	17:16, 22:2	contrary [1] - 34:9
10:11, 12:19, 12:25,	clip [1] - 14:18	Commissioner [25] -	completes [1] - 8:7	control [1] - 38:12
13:17, 17:2, 23:13,	cloak [1] - 39:5	4:4, 4:6, 4:8, 9:4,	complex [1] - 36:22	controlled [3] - 30:20,
25:2, 26:2, 26:19,	cloaking [1] - 39:12	25:14, 25:23, 26:3,	complicated [2] -	32:5
38:15, 39:16, 47:15,	close [1] - 42:23	35:3, 44:25, 45:13,	28:5, 31:14	convened [1] - 18:22
48:15, 53:18, 55:3	closed [1] - 21:13	46:4, 46:18, 48:16,	<b>Con</b> [1] - 6:13	<b>cool</b> [2] - 6:18, 22:14
CHAIRMAN [47] - 4:1,	Coalition [1] - 6:11	48:19, 53:19, 54:13,	concern [1] - 42:22	core [1] - 46:13
4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17,	<b>Coca</b> [2] - 35:11,	55:4, 55:10, 55:14,	concerned [2] - 39:22,	Corporation [2] -

34:19, 34:21	17:3, 43:11	detriment [1] - 10:6	editorial [2] - 32:25,	equally [1] - 45:19
corporation [1] -	cut [1] - 14:17	developed [2] - 25:22,	41:24	equivalent [1] - 6:13
35:10	cycles [1] - 7:7	33:25	editorials [1] - 31:21	
			Education [1] - 17:15	especially [2] - 29:10,
correct [1] - 44:15		different [13] - 6:7,		35:3
correction [1] - 38:9	D	6:21, 22:19, 37:12,	education [12] - 5:11,	essentially [10] - 6:23,
correctly [1] - 27:15	daabbaanduu 10.10	40:23, 40:24, 41:6,	5:20, 5:23, 11:17,	13:5, 14:25, 19:9,
correlated [1] - 33:8	dashboard [1] - 19:16	41:7, 41:24, 42:10,	11:21, 12:17, 15:6,	20:10, 33:21, 34:25,
correlations [1] -	data [5] - 14:12, 15:14,	43:5, 43:12, 49:4	22:6, 22:10, 22:18,	41:16, 43:23, 44:12
24:18	18:19, 19:12, 19:15	digest [1] - 5:8	23:8, 26:6	establish [1] - 44:11
corruption [1] - 35:14	date [1] - 56:5	digital [1] - 23:4	educators [1] - 18:7	established [1] -
council [1] - 20:4	dates [2] - 13:15,	Diné [3] - 22:16, 23:5,	effective [1] - 27:18	43:21
Counsel [2] - 44:16,	43:10	23:23	effort [3] - 11:25, 14:3,	ESTES [10] - 4:7, 26:2
44:17	dating [1] - 33:13	directing [1] - 56:3	16:15	26:4, 53:18, 53:20,
Counsel's [3] - 33:17,	days [2] - 17:19, 35:4	directly [1] - 23:24	efforts [4] - 5:11,	55:3, 55:5, 55:15,
40:12, 42:5	deal [2] - 43:3, 53:8	Director [1] - 17:23	11:17, 12:17, 15:6	56:16, 56:25
count [1] - 47:3	deals [1] - 27:1	Director's [2] - 4:13,	either [3] - 10:7,	ESTES-WERTHER
counted [1] - 42:8	dealt [2] - 41:6, 44:18	49:13	21:12, 22:2	[10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4,
counties [4] - 22:11,	<b>debate</b> [23] - 5:12,	discourse [1] - 24:20	elected [1] - 32:4	53:18, 53:20, 55:3,
	9:16, 10:15, 11:6,	discussed [1] - 40:11	<b>Election</b> [4] - 9:7,	55:5, 55:15, 56:16,
23:1, 23:18, 23:21	11:19, 12:3, 13:20,			56:25
<b>county</b> [2] - 17:5,	14:7, 14:15, 14:18,	discussion [5] - 4:12,	51:3, 51:5, 51:19	
20:24		9:2, 11:12, 11:16,	election [11] - 6:10,	etc [1] - 41:13
<b>County</b> [9] - 6:8, 8:3,	14:22, 14:24, 15:2,	13:11	7:7, 7:19, 11:20,	event [2] - 6:18, 37:9
21:2, 22:14, 22:15,	15:5, 15:21, 15:25,	discussions [1] - 9:1	13:17, 15:11, 15:16,	events [1] - 6:7
22:17, 22:22, 22:24,	16:9, 16:15, 16:19,	dispute [1] - 40:3	19:18, 21:3, 21:5,	exactly [4] - 10:18,
23:19	17:7, 20:20, 25:20	disseminates [1] -	40:22	41:3, 42:13, 44:8
couple [1] - 7:7	debates [22] - 5:12,	31:20	elections [2] - 13:4,	example [6] - 34:18,
courier [1] - 44:17	5:15, 9:15, 11:20,	distribution [1] -	21:6	34:19, 36:20, 40:17,
course [4] - 14:11,	12:13, 12:15, 13:1,	40:24	Elections [8] - 11:24,	41:8, 43:9
14:23, 20:17, 20:23	13:2, 13:6, 13:7,	district [1] - 19:6	15:9, 16:15, 19:4,	except [1] - 46:21
<b>Court</b> [5] - 4:16,	13:16, 15:11, 15:17,	districts [1] - 19:6	20:1, 23:15, 23:20,	exception [13] - 27:2,
40:15, 40:16, 40:18,	15:19, 16:22, 17:3,	dive [1] - 20:18	24:10	28:8, 30:6, 32:24,
40:25	17:4, 17:5, 25:16	diverse [1] - 22:20	Elections' [1] - 18:24	34:6, 36:20, 38:3,
court [1] - 21:18	debating [1] - 25:18	dog [3] - 45:8, 47:4,	eligible [1] - 9:21	41:22, 43:4, 43:6,
court's [1] - 4:21	decision [3] - 4:21,	48:10	Emma [2] - 5:7, 27:14	45:15, 45:25, 51:6
coverage [7] - 32:25,	8:14, 56:5	donation [1] - 34:25	emphasis [3] - 44:6,	exceptional [1] - 5:16
_	deeper [1] - 20:18		51:18	exchange [1] - 35:22
33:6, 33:9, 33:15,	defined [1] - 30:4	<b>done</b> [5] - 6:15, 17:3,	emphasizes [1] - 44:4	excited [3] - 18:10,
33:24, 39:4, 40:8	definitely [1] - 43:13	17:5, 18:3, 26:5	emphasizes [1] - 44.4 end [10] - 8:10, 11:3,	18:15, 23:25
<b>covered</b> [15] - 28:24,	definition [2] - 35:16,	donors [1] - 36:13	• •	exciting [4] - 5:9,
29:5, 29:18, 30:1,	37:8	doubt [1] - 6:14	15:13, 18:19, 24:25,	
34:15, 34:17, 34:22,		<b>down</b> [5] - 8:12, 30:14,	25:1, 26:10, 27:18,	24:4, 24:5, 24:11
36:7, 36:17, 37:10,	definitive [1] - 49:24	33:11, 35:5, 45:8	38:6, 46:19	excuse [1] - 26:22
37:19, 37:20, 37:22,	definitively [1] - 37:22	draft [7] - 27:6, 28:18,	endeavor [1] - 36:23	<b>Executive</b> [3] - 4:13,
39:12, 45:17	delegation [1] - 4:25	28:22, 30:17, 45:14,	enforcement [4] -	17:23, 49:12
<b>COVID</b> [1] - 6:24	delivered [3] - 5:21,	50:24	51:5, 51:9, 52:25,	executive [1] - 8:14
create [9] - 13:8,	17:16, 17:18	drafted [1] - 28:21	53:7	exempt [1] - 39:12
19:13, 19:22, 20:1,	Democracy [1] - 7:17	drive [1] - 16:12	engage [2] - 45:18,	exist [1] - 28:3
22:15, 23:25, 33:21,	Democratic [4] - 21:8,	due [1] - 29:20	51:16	existing [3] - 28:15,
54:3	21:12, 41:13, 41:20	during [2] - 6:24,	engaged [3] - 30:3,	53:23, 54:12
created [4] - 16:11,	Democrats [1] - 40:8	40:21	34:16, 36:25	expected [1] - 8:14
21:1, 21:20, 23:1	described [1] - 37:12	10.21	engaging [1] - 37:10	experiences [1] -
creates [1] - 20:6	designed [4] - 7:19,	E	English [2] - 18:13,	12:10
creating [3] - 19:9,	37:3, 37:18, 42:23	E	23:2	explain [3] - 20:14,
20:5, 29:3	dessert [1] - 27:9	e-mail [2] - 13:22,	enormously [1] - 51:7	38:22, 52:3
creative [1] - 24:16	details [2] - 6:1, 9:23	56:13	entertain [1] - 56:15	explained [1] - 39:14
	determination [2] -		entire [1] - 9:20	extending [1] - 16:10
criteria [2] - 15:18,	34:1, 36:18	early [4] - 11:20,		
15:20		17:19, 19:17, 24:13	entities [1] - 51:23	extensive [2] - 9:24,
criticism [1] - 56:5	determine [2] - 30:2,	easy [1] - 12:15	entity [8] - 29:23,	10:2
crunch [1] - 11:23	51:23	eat [1] - 27:9	29:24, 30:19, 30:20,	extent [1] - 19:11
currency [1] - 18:14	determining [1] -	echo [1] - 13:17	31:10, 31:15, 31:18,	<b>eye</b> [1] - 8:6
current [3] - 15:21,	29:25	<b>ed</b> [1] - 24:6	31:19	

	First [5] - 40:5, 40:15,	42:1, 42:9, 42:24	happy [2] - 29:11,	40:6, 42:16
F	42:18, 43:7, 46:13	General [5] - 33:17,	50:10	III [1] - 4:12
fooility (4) 12:4	<b>fishing</b> [1] - 45:11	40:12, 42:5, 44:16	harbor [1] - 33:22	
facility [1] - 12:4	••••			imagery [1] - 14:23
<b>fact</b> [14] - 6:3, 31:22,	fit [1] - 36:2	generally [2] - 7:20,	hard [4] - 42:12,	immediately [1] - 35:5
32:16, 32:19, 32:21,	fits [2] - 44:20	51:16	42:13, 51:12, 51:14	important [5] - 15:6,
35:8, 36:3, 37:1,	five [1] - 21:7	generate [1] - 34:24	harder [1] - 28:15	21:3, 34:6, 42:15,
41:6, 41:18, 42:16,	Flagstaff [1] - 6:11	generated [1] - 31:2	Harkins [1] - 23:2	45:19
44:1, 54:1	floor [1] - 50:16	generic [1] - 39:1	hashing [1] - 46:25	impressed [2] - 12:4,
factor [3] - 32:17,	flushed [1] - 50:22	geography [1] - 22:20	hate [1] - 48:6	12:11
32:23, 42:19	focus [1] - 30:9	Gina [11] - 5:9, 5:14,	head [1] - 9:22	impressive [2] - 25:4,
facts [3] - 43:25,	focused [1] - 51:20	6:8, 9:18, 10:21,	heads [1] - 5:4	26:20
45:21, 53:11	focuses [2] - 29:14,	11:24, 12:16, 12:18,	heads-up [1] - 5:4	incentive [1] - 48:22
factual [1] - 52:19	51:20	25:3, 26:5, 26:18	hear [2] - 11:8, 17:6	includes [1] - 8:15
failure [1] - 8:4	fold [1] - 13:10	given [3] - 24:11,	heard [2] - 12:9, 20:15	including [1] - 45:20
familiar [1] - 52:6	folks [8] - 5:23, 6:21,	52:12, 52:21	heat [1] - 25:8	income [7] - 27:4,
family [1] - 25:18	29:4, 29:9, 29:10,	goal [1] - 37:25	help [3] - 16:12, 23:24,	34:13, 34:15, 34:16,
Fan [1] - 6:12	30:18, 33:22, 35:6	gobbledygook [1] -	30:18	36:4, 37:8, 38:4
fantastic [1] - 26:5	follow [2] - 45:13, 51:3	47:17	helpful [8] - 25:10,	incredible [1] - 12:1
far [5] - 13:16, 14:13,	fontes [1] - 8:12	Goldstein [1] - 12:7	27:19, 29:3, 50:21,	Independent [4] -
15:11, 48:3, 49:1		government [1] - 26:9		7:17, 21:7, 21:11,
	Fontes [1] - 4:17	Governor's [1] - 18:22	50:25, 51:7, 51:10,	22:8
favor [1] - 54:11	for-profit [1] - 35:18		53:13	
favored [1] - 39:4	force [1] - 18:22	grant [4] - 27:3, 36:9,	helping [1] - 23:16	Independents [1] -
favorite [2] - 6:14,	form [4] - 31:9, 31:13,	36:11, 37:6	helps [1] - 53:22	21:14
6:15	32:12, 40:17	grants [3] - 35:19,	hesitant [1] - 46:9	individual [1] - 28:10
FEC [12] - 28:7, 33:17,	formal [2] - 13:15,	37:7, 37:11	<b>hi</b> [1] - 4:15	influence [1] - 35:14
39:20, 40:6, 40:13,	16:8	great [15] - 6:17, 6:18,	high [2] - 18:20, 22:24	infographic [1] - 21:1
41:5, 41:14, 41:16,	format [3] - 15:21,	13:23, 14:3, 15:4,	high-level [1] - 18:20	information [17] -
44:10, 46:7, 53:25,	16:4, 23:8	16:7, 16:13, 16:15,	highlight [5] - 6:8,	5:18, 13:12, 15:7,
54:8	forth [3] - 15:18, 52:5,	18:1, 18:11, 18:14,	7:15, 7:24, 8:8, 26:7	16:12, 17:24, 18:25,
FEC's [1] - 42:5	52:16	19:23, 23:7, 24:15,	highlights [1] - 24:24	19:3, 19:5, 19:7,
federal [3] - 17:3,	forum [3] - 42:14,	45:5	history [3] - 24:11,	20:7, 29:21, 33:7,
19:21, 21:21	51:18, 51:19	greatly [1] - 12:4	24:14, 51:8	33:9, 33:23, 34:7,
Federal [3] - 51:3,	forward [5] - 8:23,	Green [2] - 21:9, 21:13	hitch [1] - 18:16	44:9, 53:2
51:4, 51:19	17:10, 18:10, 44:12,	grounded [1] - 43:7	hitting [1] - 11:21	inquires [1] - 10:13
feedback [4] - 12:9,	54:6	grounds [2] - 4:18,	homes [1] - 17:18	inguiries [1] - 17:25
13:18, 13:25, 18:11	four [4] - 4:15, 4:19,	52:18	honestly [1] - 46:18	insofar [1] - 51:1
<b>few</b> [3] - 6:8, 17:19,	6:23, 24:8	group [2] - 40:18, 42:7		instance [1] - 53:23
24:24	framework [2] - 38:1,	groups [1] - 18:2	hope [9] - 16:19,	instead [1] - 11:8
<b>figure</b> [3] - 30:17,	43:20	guess [9] - 6:24, 9:13,	17:11, 25:10, 27:17,	institutionally [1] -
51:15, 52:20		10:10, 30:12, 31:16,	27:19, 27:20, 29:6,	48:22
	frankly [1] - 52:13		37:16	
<b>figuring</b> [1] - 52:18	free [1] - 23:14	38:7, 42:21, 43:1, 46:6	hopeful [1] - 54:9	intend [2] - 16:22, 45:18
file [3] - 7:9, 7:10, 8:4	friends [1] - 25:18	40.0 guidance [3] - 46:2,	hopefully [2] - 17:11,	
filed [2] - 7:14, 27:1	<b>full</b> [3] - 18:18, 19:13,		30:17	interest [4] - 10:25,
filing [1] - 7:11	24:25	49:25, 52:22	horizon [1] - 24:22	41:20, 42:9, 42:17
filings [1] - 8:3	fuller [1] - 19:13	Guide [2] - 9:7, 17:15	host [1] - 13:6	interested [3] - 12:14,
<b>fill</b> [1] - 9:8	fully [1] - 19:1	guide [7] - 5:20, 5:24,	hosting [1] - 13:8	18:7, 54:18
filler [1] - 48:11	function [2] - 30:22,	9:15, 9:21, 11:21,	hot [1] - 25:7	interesting [1] - 5:22
filming [1] - 16:17	43:18	18:11, 18:16	household [1] - 16:2	internal [1] - 45:22
final [1] - 24:3	fundamentally [1] -	guides [1] - 18:2	Houses [1] - 18:4	internally [1] - 49:20
finalized [1] - 13:13	52:5	<b>guys</b> [1] - 27:8		intersection [1] -
finance [2] - 8:4, 30:7	funded [1] - 7:5			46:13
financed [1] - 35:9	Fusion [1] - 6:12	Н	•	intricacies [1] - 35:7
finances [1] - 35:8			<b>I</b> [1] - 27:9	invitation [2] - 16:8,
fine [1] - 28:22	G	Halcyon [1] - 35:4	idea [2] - 24:16, 33:20	16:10
firm [2] - 50:20, 52:20	Ŭ,	hall [1] - 6:9	identifying [1] - 13:6	invitations [1] - 13:15
first [10] - 12:23,	gauge [2] - 33:5,	Hamilton [4] - 24:8,	ideological [2] -	inviting [1] - 25:19
18:12, 27:9, 27:13,	42:13	24:12, 24:13, 24:17	39:23, 42:17	involves [1] - 34:25
30:15, 31:18, 36:19,	general [10] - 13:4,	hammers [1] - 10:21	ideologies [2] - 43:12,	involving [1] - 40:18
46:6, 50:17, 51:2	31:4, 31:8, 31:12,	handful [1] - 17:17	43:13	<b>issue</b> [17] - 4:23, 8:2,
,,	32:9, 39:6, 39:19,	handled [1] - 54:8	ideology [3] - 32:23,	20:16, 30:11, 32:20,
	, ,,			,,

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

		40.0.50.00		
32:22, 33:4, 33:8,	knows [1] - 31:1	49:2, 53:22	meaning [1] - 51:15	moderators [1] - 12:6
34:9, 34:12, 39:18,	kudos [1] - 25:5	lineup [1] - 17:3	means [7] - 14:25,	<b>money</b> [8] - 35:1,
40:7, 40:9, 40:22,		list [2] - 9:23, 28:14	16:1, 21:14, 21:17,	35:10, 35:11, 35:13,
41:15, 41:21, 42:14	L	literally [1] - 28:9	29:22, 36:2, 36:6	35:15, 36:10, 46:17
issued [2] - 31:10,		litigation [1] - 21:18	measure [1] - 14:12	monitor [1] - 44:20
34:9	Label [1] - 21:19	live [4] - 14:14, 14:15,	measures [1] - 13:10	month [2] - 5:9, 7:2
issues [11] - 7:24,	Labels [5] - 21:10,	14:17, 14:19	Media [14] - 12:5,	morning [1] - 8:15
28:20, 28:21, 29:14,	21:16, 21:25, 22:7,	liver [1] - 27:10	14:10, 26:23, 27:1,	<b>most</b> [4] - 13:20, 26:9,
29:15, 38:4, 43:13,	22:9	LLC [1] - 35:18	28:24, 29:23, 32:15,	42:14, 43:6
44:18, 46:13, 50:22	lag [2] - 7:8, 7:11	local [5] - 19:23, 22:3,	35:21, 36:7, 36:16,	mostly [1] - 12:20
item [1] - 5:10	language [5] - 22:16,	22:4, 26:8, 26:9	41:5, 44:20, 45:17,	motion [6] - 54:25,
Item [5] - 4:12, 11:16,	23:5, 23:9, 23:25,	location [2] - 22:23,	46:1	••
26:21, 55:25, 56:14	48:3	.,	media [23] - 12:12,	55:5, 55:7, 55:21,
		23:5		56:15, 56:16
items [1] - 13:9	large [1] - 51:1	locations [1] - 19:17	14:20, 15:3, 16:3,	<b>move</b> [1] - 15:15
iterative [1] - 52:13	larger [1] - 42:10	Look [1] - 37:4	27:2, 28:8, 28:25,	moved [3] - 4:1,
itself [3] - 29:24,	last [7] - 4:2, 5:11,	look [14] - 8:23, 19:4,	29:19, 30:3, 30:8,	55:12, 56:20
30:22, 51:7	6:11, 9:15, 12:2,	20:19, 22:21, 32:11,	34:16, 36:12, 36:20,	<b>movie</b> [1] - 22:22
<b>IV</b> [1] - 11:16	38:10, 47:19	40:6, 41:18, 41:23,	37:10, 38:3, 40:2,	moving [1] - 26:21
	late [1] - 9:12	42:19, 43:23, 49:1,	41:22, 42:25, 43:4,	<b>MR</b> [38] - 4:15, 5:6,
J	launched [1] - 6:13	53:6, 54:7	43:6, 45:18, 51:5,	9:11, 27:7, 27:12,
_	launching [1] - 20:8	looked [3] - 40:15,	51:22	38:23, 39:16, 43:1,
<b>Jim</b> [1] - 12:6	law [5] - 27:4, 28:3,	41:8, 41:9	Media's [1] - 45:22	44:24, 45:3, 46:3,
job [2] - 25:21, 26:20	40:18, 51:14, 54:1	looking [9] - 16:5,	meet [1] - 22:18	46:16, 46:23, 47:1,
<b>Jon</b> [5] - 27:13, 27:16,	laws [1] - 30:7	17:10, 18:9, 23:9,	meeting [5] - 4:2, 4:3,	47:5, 47:8, 47:11,
38:15, 46:5, 55:23	lawyer [1] - 47:25	33:10, 35:20, 40:25,	5:3, 8:10, 49:8	47:15, 47:18, 47:19,
journalism [1] - 33:3	lawyers [1] - 47:24	44:7, 49:23	meetings [1] - 8:20	47:21, 47:23, 48:1,
judicial [1] - 51:4	lead [1] - 39:1		member [1] - 54:24	48:5, 48:8, 48:12,
<b>July</b> [2] - 17:20, 24:8		<b>looks</b> [1] - 4:23	members [9] - 7:1,	
	least [9] - 17:13,	loophole [2] - 42:23,	•••	48:15, 49:7, 49:12,
jurisdiction [1] - 22:4	26:11, 30:7, 30:18,	43:2	12:11, 23:22, 24:8,	49:15, 49:17, 50:7,
justice [1] - 20:5	33:12, 33:13, 36:3,	lose [1] - 41:22	24:17, 38:19, 53:17,	50:9, 50:13, 50:17,
	42:7	love [1] - 46:5	54:14, 54:18	52:10, 54:22, 55:24
К	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7,	love [1] - 46:5	<b>memo</b> [2] - 41:9,	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11,
		love [1] - 46:5	<b>memo</b> [2] - 41:9, 41:19	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13,
<b>Kara</b> [2] - 49:9, 49:15	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7,	M	<b>memo</b> [2] - 41:9, 41:19 <b>memos</b> [1] - 41:9	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19
<b>Kara</b> [2] - 49:9, 49:15 <b>keep</b> [2] - 12:20, 14:11	<b>leave</b> [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14		<b>memo</b> [2] - 41:9, 41:19	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13,
<b>Kara</b> [2] - 49:9, 49:15	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21	M	<b>memo</b> [2] - 41:9, 41:19 <b>memos</b> [1] - 41:9	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19
<b>Kara</b> [2] - 49:9, 49:15 <b>keep</b> [2] - 12:20, 14:11	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12,	<b>M</b> mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25,	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18,	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19 <b>MUR</b> [1] - 40:10
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21	<b>M</b> mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6,	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21 legitimacy [1] - 43:20	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22 message [1] - 42:25 met [1] - 33:20	<b>MS</b> [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19 <b>MUR</b> [1] - 40:10
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1,	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21 legitimacy [1] - 43:20 legitimate [4] - 30:22,	<b>M</b> mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22 message [1] - 42:25 met [1] - 33:20 method [2] - 13:7,	MS [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19 MUR [1] - 40:10 N
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15,	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21 legitimacy [1] - 43:20 legitimate [4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22 message [1] - 42:25 met [1] - 33:20 method [2] - 13:7, 13:8	MS [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19 MUR [1] - 40:10 N name [2] - 9:23, 27:14
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14,	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21 legitimacy [1] - 43:20 legitimate [4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 legitimately [1] -	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22 message [1] - 42:25 met [1] - 33:20 method [2] - 13:7, 13:8 methods [1] - 22:21	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15,	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21 legitimacy [1] - 43:20 legitimate [4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 legitimately [1] - 51:13	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22 message [1] - 42:25 met [1] - 33:20 method [2] - 13:7, 13:8 methods [1] - 22:21 metrics [2] - 15:13,	MS [7] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, 25:7, 26:19 MUR [1] - 40:10 N name [2] - 9:23, 27:14 names [2] - 38:25, 39:1 nation [1] - 16:2
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18,	leave [3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14 left [1] - 36:21 legislative [6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21 legitimacy [1] - 43:20 legitimate [4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 legitimately [1] - 51:13 less [1] - 33:15	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22 message [1] - 42:25 met [1] - 33:20 method [2] - 13:7, 13:8 methods [1] - 22:21 metrics [2] - 15:13, 18:18	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13 \\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] -	memo [2] - 41:9, 41:19 memos [1] - 41:9 mentioned [3] - 11:18, 12:25, 17:22 message [1] - 42:25 met [1] - 33:20 method [2] - 13:7, 13:8 methods [1] - 22:21 metrics [2] - 15:13, 18:18 might [9] - 29:24,	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13 \\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \textbf{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13 \\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \textbf{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ \end{array}$	$MS_{[7]} - 9:19, 10:11, \\ 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, \\ 25:7, 26:19 \\ MUR_{[1]} - 40:10 \\ \hline N \\ name_{[2]} - 9:23, 27:14 \\ names_{[2]} - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ nation_{[1]} - 16:2 \\ national_{[1]} - 35:24 \\ National_{[2]} - 40:1, \\ 43:10 \\ Native_{[1]} - 18:4 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13 \\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \textbf{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \\ \textbf{levels} [1] - 17:10 \\ \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \end{array}$	$MS_{[7]} - 9:19, 10:11, \\ 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, \\ 25:7, 26:19 \\ MUR_{[1]} - 40:10 \\ \hline N \\ name_{[2]} - 9:23, 27:14 \\ names_{[2]} - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ nation_{[1]} - 16:2 \\ national_{[1]} - 35:24 \\ National_{[2]} - 40:1, \\ 43:10 \\ Native_{[1]} - 18:4 \\ native_{[1]} - 23:9 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13 \\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \textbf{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \\ \textbf{levels} [1] - 17:10 \\ \textbf{Libertarian} [2] - 21:9, \\ \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13 \\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \textbf{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \\ \textbf{levels} [1] - 17:10 \\ \textbf{Libertarian} [2] - 21:9, \\ 21:13 \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 32:9	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \end{array}$	$MS_{[7]} - 9:19, 10:11, \\ 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, \\ 25:7, 26:19 \\ MUR_{[1]} - 40:10 \\ \hline N \\ name_{[2]} - 9:23, 27:14 \\ names_{[2]} - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ nation_{[1]} - 16:2 \\ national_{[1]} - 35:24 \\ National_{[2]} - 40:1, \\ 43:10 \\ Native_{[1]} - 18:4 \\ native_{[1]} - 18:4 \\ native_{[1]} - 23:9 \\ natural_{[1]} - 12:12 \\ nature_{[2]} - 16:6, \\ \hline \end{tabular}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13 \\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \textbf{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \\ \textbf{levels} [1] - 17:10 \\ \textbf{Libertarian} [2] - 21:9, \\ \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \textbf{minds} [1] - 45:5 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24,	$\begin{array}{c} \text{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \text{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \text{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \text{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \text{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \text{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \text{legitimate} [1] - 33:15 \\ \text{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \text{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \\ \text{levels} [1] - 17:10 \\ \text{Libertarian} [2] - 21:9, \\ 21:13 \\ \text{libraries} [1] - 18:3 \\ \text{Life} [2] - 40:19, 40:20 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \textbf{minds} [1] - 43:14 \\ \end{array}$	$MS [7] - 9:19, 10:11, \\ 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, \\ 25:7, 26:19 \\ MUR [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline N \\ name [2] - 9:23, 27:14 \\ names [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ nation [1] - 16:2 \\ national [1] - 35:24 \\ National [2] - 40:1, \\ 43:10 \\ Native [1] - 18:4 \\ native [1] - 23:9 \\ natural [1] - 12:12 \\ nature [2] - 16:6, \\ 35:23 \\ Navajo [6] - 6:10, \\ \hline \end{tabular}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14\\ \textbf{left} [1] - 36:21\\ \textbf{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21\\ \textbf{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20\\ \textbf{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19\\ \textbf{legitimately} [1] - \\ 51:13\\ \textbf{less} [1] - 33:15\\ \textbf{letter} [1] - 28:16\\ \textbf{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12\\ \textbf{levels} [1] - 17:10\\ \textbf{Libertarian} [2] - 21:9, \\ 21:13\\ \textbf{libraries} [1] - 18:3\\ \end{array}$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 32:9 matter [3] - 34:15,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \textbf{minds} [1] - 43:14 \\ \textbf{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ \end{array}$	$eq:spectral_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19	$\begin{array}{c} \text{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \text{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \text{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \text{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \text{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \text{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \text{legitimate} [1] - 33:15 \\ \text{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \text{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \\ \text{levels} [1] - 17:10 \\ \text{Libertarian} [2] - 21:9, \\ 21:13 \\ \text{libraries} [1] - 18:3 \\ \text{Life} [2] - 40:19, 40:20 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \textbf{minds} [1] - 43:14 \\ \end{array}$	$\label{eq:spectral_states} \begin{array}{l} \text{MS} [7] - 9:19, 10:11, \\ 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, \\ 25:7, 26:19 \\ \text{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{MUR} [2] - 9:23, 27:14 \\ \textbf{names} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{nation} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{nation} [1] - 16:2 \\ \textbf{national} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{national} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{national} [2] - 40:1, \\ 43:10 \\ \textbf{Native} [1] - 18:4 \\ \textbf{native} [1] - 23:9 \\ \textbf{natural} [1] - 12:12 \\ \textbf{nature} [2] - 16:6, \\ 35:23 \\ \textbf{Navajo} [6] - 6:10, \\ 22:15, 22:16, 22:24, \\ 22:25, 23:19 \\ \end{array}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19 kind [15] - 20:14, 24:4,	leave $[3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14$ left $[1] - 36:21$ legislative $[6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21$ legitimacy $[1] - 43:20$ legitimate $[4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19$ legitimately $[1] - 51:13$ less $[1] - 33:15$ letter $[1] - 28:16$ level $[3] - 12:8, 18:20, 26:12$ levels $[1] - 17:10$ Libertarian $[2] - 21:9, 21:13$ libraries $[1] - 18:3$ Life $[2] - 40:19, 40:20$ light $[1] - 37:17$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 32:9 matter [3] - 34:15, 56:3, 56:4 matters [1] - 9:10	$\label{eq:memo} \begin{array}{c} \text{[2] - 41:9,} \\ \text{41:19} \\ \text{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \text{memos} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \text{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \text{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \text{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \text{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \text{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \text{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \text{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \text{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \text{minds} [1] - 43:14 \\ \text{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ \end{array}$	$eq:spectral_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19 kind [15] - 20:14, 24:4, 29:13, 33:1, 33:2,	leave $[3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14$ left $[1] - 36:21$ legislative $[6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21$ legitimacy $[1] - 43:20$ legitimate $[4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19$ legitimately $[1] - 51:13$ less $[1] - 33:15$ letter $[1] - 28:16$ level $[3] - 12:8, 18:20, 26:12$ levels $[1] - 17:10$ Libertarian $[2] - 21:9, 21:13$ libraries $[1] - 18:3$ Life $[2] - 40:19, 40:20$ light $[1] - 37:17$ likely $[1] - 7:9$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 32:9 matter [3] - 34:15, 56:3, 56:4 matters [1] - 9:10 mayor [1] - 20:4	$\label{eq:memo} \begin{array}{c} \text{[2] - 41:9,} \\ \text{41:19} \\ \text{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \text{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \text{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \text{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \text{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \text{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \text{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \text{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \text{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \text{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \text{minds} [1] - 45:5 \\ \text{minimum} [1] - 43:14 \\ \text{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ 4:11, 4:15, 4:19, 5:8, \\ \end{array}$	$\label{eq:spectral_states} \begin{array}{l} \text{MS} [7] - 9:19, 10:11, \\ 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, \\ 25:7, 26:19 \\ \text{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{MUR} [2] - 9:23, 27:14 \\ \textbf{names} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{nation} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{nation} [1] - 16:2 \\ \textbf{national} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{national} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{national} [2] - 40:1, \\ 43:10 \\ \textbf{Native} [1] - 18:4 \\ \textbf{native} [1] - 23:9 \\ \textbf{natural} [1] - 12:12 \\ \textbf{nature} [2] - 16:6, \\ 35:23 \\ \textbf{Navajo} [6] - 6:10, \\ 22:15, 22:16, 22:24, \\ 22:25, 23:19 \\ \end{array}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19 kind [15] - 20:14, 24:4, 29:13, 33:1, 33:2, 39:10, 39:13, 39:25,	$\begin{array}{c} \text{leave} [3] - 24:4, 38:7, \\ 38:14 \\ \text{left} [1] - 36:21 \\ \text{legislative} [6] - 5:12, \\ 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, \\ 19:21, 21:21 \\ \text{legitimacy} [1] - 43:20 \\ \text{legitimate} [4] - 30:22, \\ 43:17, 43:18, 43:19 \\ \text{legitimately} [1] - 51:13 \\ \text{less} [1] - 33:15 \\ \text{letter} [1] - 28:16 \\ \text{level} [3] - 12:8, 18:20, \\ 26:12 \\ \text{levels} [1] - 17:10 \\ \text{Libertarian} [2] - 21:9, \\ 21:13 \\ \text{libraries} [1] - 18:3 \\ \text{Life} [2] - 40:19, 40:20 \\ \text{light} [1] - 7:9 \\ \text{likewise} [2] - 5:20, \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 45:5 \\ \textbf{minimum} [1] - 43:14 \\ \textbf{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ 4:11, 4:15, 4:19, 5:8, \\ 56:7 \\ \end{array}$	$\label{eq:spectral_states} \begin{split} &\textbf{MS}\left[7\right] - 9:19, \ 10:11, \\ 12:19, \ 17:2, \ 23:13, \\ 25:7, \ 26:19 \\ &\textbf{MUR}\left[1\right] - 40:10 \\ \hline & \textbf{N} \\ & \textbf{name}\left[2\right] - 9:23, \ 27:14 \\ & \textbf{names}\left[2\right] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ & \textbf{nation}\left[1\right] - 16:2 \\ & \textbf{national}\left[1\right] - 35:24 \\ & \textbf{National}\left[2\right] - 40:1, \\ & 43:10 \\ & \textbf{Native}\left[1\right] - 18:4 \\ & \textbf{native}\left[1\right] - 23:9 \\ & \textbf{natural}\left[1\right] - 12:12 \\ & \textbf{nature}\left[2\right] - 16:6, \\ & 35:23 \\ & \textbf{Navajo}\left[6\right] - 6:10, \\ & 22:15, \ 22:16, \ 22:24, \\ & 22:25, \ 23:19 \\ & \textbf{navigating}\left[1\right] - 38:3 \end{split}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19 kind [15] - 20:14, 24:4, 29:13, 33:1, 33:2, 39:10, 39:13, 39:25, 43:7, 51:15, 52:2,	leave $[3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14$ left $[1] - 36:21$ legislative $[6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21$ legitimacy $[1] - 43:20$ legitimate $[4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19$ legitimately $[1] - 51:13$ less $[1] - 33:15$ letter $[1] - 28:16$ level $[3] - 12:8, 18:20, 26:12$ levels $[1] - 17:10$ Libertarian $[2] - 21:9, 21:13$ libraries $[1] - 18:3$ Life $[2] - 40:19, 40:20$ light $[1] - 37:17$ likewise $[2] - 5:20, 37:6$ limit $[1] - 56:6$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 32:9 matter [3] - 34:15, 56:3, 56:4 matters [1] - 9:10 mayor [1] - 20:4 mean [21] - 5:18, 6:17, 6:23, 9:8, 9:13, 11:2,	$\label{eq:memo} \begin{array}{c} \text{[2] - 41:9,} \\ \text{41:19} \\ \text{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \text{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \text{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \text{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \text{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \text{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \text{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \text{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \text{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \text{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \text{minds} [1] - 45:5 \\ \text{minimum} [1] - 43:14 \\ \text{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ 4:11, 4:15, 4:19, 5:8, \\ 56:7 \\ \text{mirror} [1] - 20:12 \\ \end{array}$	$\label{eq:states} \begin{split} &\textbf{MS}\left[7\right]-9:19,\ 10:11, \\ 12:19,\ 17:2,\ 23:13, \\ 25:7,\ 26:19 \\ &\textbf{MUR}\left[1\right]-40:10 \\ \hline & \textbf{N} \\ &\textbf{name}\left[2\right]-9:23,\ 27:14 \\ &\textbf{names}\left[2\right]-38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ &\textbf{nation}\left[1\right]-16:2 \\ &\textbf{national}\left[1\right]-35:24 \\ &\textbf{National}\left[2\right]-40:1, \\ &43:10 \\ &\textbf{Native}\left[1\right]-18:4 \\ &\textbf{native}\left[1\right]-23:9 \\ &\textbf{natural}\left[1\right]-12:12 \\ &\textbf{nature}\left[2\right]-16:6, \\ &35:23 \\ &\textbf{Navajo}\left[6\right]-6:10, \\ &22:15,\ 22:16,\ 22:24, \\ &22:25,\ 23:19 \\ &\textbf{navigating}\left[1\right]-38:3 \\ &\textbf{necessarily}\left[3\right]- \end{split}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19 kind [15] - 20:14, 24:4, 29:13, 33:1, 33:2, 39:10, 39:13, 39:25, 43:7, 51:15, 52:2, 52:15, 52:18, 53:24	leave $[3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14$ left $[1] - 36:21$ legislative $[6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21$ legitimacy $[1] - 43:20$ legitimate $[4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19$ legitimately $[1] - 51:13$ less $[1] - 33:15$ letter $[1] - 28:16$ level $[3] - 12:8, 18:20, 26:12$ levels $[1] - 17:10$ Libertarian $[2] - 21:9, 21:13$ libraries $[1] - 18:3$ Life $[2] - 40:19, 40:20$ light $[1] - 37:17$ likewise $[2] - 5:20, 37:6$ limite $[2] - 43:25, 38:100$	M mail [3] - 13:22, 21:25, 56:13 mailboxes [1] - 11:21 main [3] - 4:23, 7:23, 7:24 March [1] - 33:12 Maricopa [2] - 6:8, 8:3 Mark [1] - 50:14 Mary [1] - 12:7 Massachusetts [2] - 40:19, 40:20 match [1] - 15:20 materials [6] - 31:4, 31:8, 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, 32:9 matter [3] - 34:15, 56:3, 56:4 matters [1] - 9:10 mayor [1] - 20:4 mean [21] - 5:18, 6:17, 6:23, 9:8, 9:13, 11:2, 31:24, 31:25, 36:5,	$\label{eq:memory_states} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{memos} [1] - 41:9, \\ \mbox{41:19} \\ \mbox{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \mbox{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ \mbox{12:25}, 17:22 \\ \mbox{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \mbox{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ \mbox{13:8} \\ \mbox{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \mbox{minds} [1] - 45:5 \\ \mbox{minimum} [1] - 43:14 \\ \mbox{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ \mbox{4:11}, 4:15, 4:19, 5:8, \\ \mbox{56:7} \\ \mbox{mirror} [1] - 20:12 \\ \mbox{misinformation} [1] - \\ \end{tabular}$	$\label{eq:spectral_states} \begin{array}{l} \text{MS} [7] - 9:19, 10:11, \\ 12:19, 17:2, 23:13, \\ 25:7, 26:19 \\ \text{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \text{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \text{MUR} [1] - 40:10 \\ \hline \\ \text{name} [2] - 9:23, 27:14 \\ \textbf{names} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{nation} [1] - 16:2 \\ \textbf{national} [2] - 38:25, \\ 39:1 \\ \textbf{national} [1] - 35:24 \\ \hline \\ \text{National} [2] - 40:1, \\ 43:10 \\ \hline \\ \text{Native} [1] - 18:4 \\ \textbf{native} [1] - 18:4 \\ \textbf{native} [1] - 12:12 \\ \textbf{nature} [2] - 16:6, \\ 35:23 \\ \hline \\ \textbf{Navajo} [6] - 6:10, \\ 22:15, 22:16, 22:24, \\ 22:25, 23:19 \\ \textbf{navigating} [1] - 38:3 \\ \textbf{necessarily} [3] - \\ 36:17, 42:17, 52:17 \\ \end{array}$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19 kind [15] - 20:14, 24:4, 29:13, 33:1, 33:2, 39:10, 39:13, 39:25, 43:7, 51:15, 52:2, 52:15, 52:18, 53:24 kinds [1] - 28:8	leave $[3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14$ left $[1] - 36:21$ legislative $[6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21$ legitimacy $[1] - 43:20$ legitimate $[4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19$ legitimately $[1] - 51:13$ less $[1] - 33:15$ letter $[1] - 28:16$ level $[3] - 12:8, 18:20, 26:12$ levels $[1] - 17:10$ Libertarian $[2] - 21:9, 21:13$ libraries $[1] - 18:3$ Life $[2] - 40:19, 40:20$ light $[1] - 37:17$ likewise $[2] - 5:20, 37:6$ limit $[1] - 56:6$ limited $[2] - 43:25, 56:3$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \textbf{minds} [1] - 43:14 \\ \textbf{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ 4:11, 4:15, 4:19, 5:8, \\ 56:7 \\ \textbf{misinformation} [1] - \\ 15:8 \\ \textbf{mission} [1] - 5:17 \\ \end{array}$	$eq:spectral_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set$
Kara [2] - 49:9, 49:15 keep [2] - 12:20, 14:11 keeping [1] - 8:6 KIMBLE [47] - 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:10, 8:17, 9:1, 9:4, 9:14, 10:20, 10:24, 11:11, 11:15, 25:3, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 26:15, 26:18, 26:20, 38:18, 38:21, 38:24, 42:21, 44:25, 45:12, 50:15, 52:7, 53:14, 53:19, 54:13, 54:17, 54:20, 54:23, 55:4, 55:7, 55:10, 55:16, 55:18, 55:20, 55:25, 56:11, 56:18, 56:20, 56:24, 57:1, 57:3 Kimble's [1] - 48:19 kind [15] - 20:14, 24:4, 29:13, 33:1, 33:2, 39:10, 39:13, 39:25, 43:7, 51:15, 52:2, 52:15, 52:18, 53:24	leave $[3] - 24:4, 38:7, 38:14$ left $[1] - 36:21$ legislative $[6] - 5:12, 11:20, 13:2, 17:4, 19:21, 21:21$ legitimacy $[1] - 43:20$ legitimate $[4] - 30:22, 43:17, 43:18, 43:19$ legitimately $[1] - 51:13$ less $[1] - 33:15$ letter $[1] - 28:16$ level $[3] - 12:8, 18:20, 26:12$ levels $[1] - 17:10$ Libertarian $[2] - 21:9, 21:13$ libraries $[1] - 18:3$ Life $[2] - 40:19, 40:20$ light $[1] - 37:17$ likewise $[2] - 5:20, 37:6$ limite $[2] - 43:25, 38:10$	$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{memo} [2] - 41:9, \\ 41:19 \\ \textbf{memos} [1] - 41:9 \\ \textbf{mentioned} [3] - 11:18, \\ 12:25, 17:22 \\ \textbf{message} [1] - 42:25 \\ \textbf{met} [1] - 33:20 \\ \textbf{method} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 13:7, \\ 13:8 \\ \textbf{methods} [1] - 22:21 \\ \textbf{metrics} [2] - 15:13, \\ 18:18 \\ \textbf{might} [9] - 29:24, \\ 33:8, 35:7, 35:23, \\ 36:12, 42:15, 49:1, \\ 52:4, 54:10 \\ \textbf{Mike} [1] - 11:25 \\ \textbf{million} [1] - 17:20 \\ \textbf{minds} [1] - 45:5 \\ \textbf{minimum} [1] - 43:14 \\ \textbf{minutes} [6] - 4:2, \\ 4:11, 4:15, 4:19, 5:8, \\ 56:7 \\ \textbf{mirror} [1] - 20:12 \\ \textbf{misinformation} [1] - \\ 15:8 \\ \end{array}$	$eq:spectral_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set_set$

49:20		orgonizationa	21:10, 21:13, 21:16,	pitch [3] - 16:15,
nefarious [1] - 11:4	0	organizations [1] - 40:2	21:10, 21:13, 21:10, 21:25, 22:7	16:22, 17:12
negative [2] - 31:24,	o'clock [1] - 14:17	otherwise [1] - 32:7	past [5] - 5:25, 6:2,	place [4] - 7:5, 16:5,
31:25	objective [1] - 52:1	ought [1] - 43:6	7:2, 7:6, 20:15	28:12, 40:25
nested [1] - 31:6	observations [1] -	ourselves [1] - 28:5	Paton [9] - 4:8, 9:5,	places [1] - 6:25
network [1] - 16:3	38:17	outlet [1] - 32:25	25:14, 44:25, 45:13,	platforms [1] - 14:21
neutral [1] - 33:1	observe [1] - 12:2	outlets [1] - 15:3	46:18, 55:11, 55:16,	play [5] - 16:24, 23:2,
new [6] - 12:8, 32:17,	obvious [1] - 34:19	outlined [1] - 53:25	57:1	23:10, 24:12, 24:19
32:19, 32:21, 44:1,	obviously [4] - 34:3,	outreach [3] - 9:24,	<b>PATON</b> [42] - 4:9, 5:5,	played [1] - 23:12
54:4	37:11, 52:10, 53:2	10:2, 18:3	8:25, 9:2, 9:6, 9:12,	playing [1] - 24:9
<b>New</b> [1] - 40:1	occur [1] - 54:10	outside [4] - 6:11,	10:5, 10:18, 10:22,	plays [1] - 16:25
newness [1] - 52:12	occurring [1] - 13:2	25:6, 34:5, 35:7	11:2, 25:13, 25:15,	pleased [1] - 15:20
news [18] - 14:16,	offer [2] - 15:24, 16:8	outskirts [1] - 43:3	27:10, 44:22, 45:1,	pleasure [1] - 55:2
14:17, 15:17, 30:6,	office [1] - 40:12	overall [3] - 5:17,	45:4, 46:15, 46:21,	point [7] - 32:13, 40:3,
30:10, 31:21, 31:23,	Office [2] - 6:9, 19:2	29:16, 35:20	46:24, 47:2, 47:6,	44:16, 44:21, 46:5,
32:25, 38:25, 39:2,	offices [1] - 20:5	overarching [1] -	47:9, 47:12, 47:16,	49:18, 51:8
39:5, 39:6, 39:13,	officials [3] - 7:20,	29:16	47:19, 47:22, 47:24,	pointed [1] - 41:5
41:4, 42:1, 45:22	32:4, 42:11	overwhelmed [1] -	48:2, 48:6, 48:9, 48:12, 40:6, 40:0	points [7] - 14:12,
newsletter [2] - 40:21,	on-site [1] - 6:6	13:21	48:13, 49:6, 49:9, 49:14, 49:16, 50:6,	18:19, 20:16, 22:10,
40:22	one [19] - 4:17, 6:15,	overwhelming [1] -	49.14, 49.10, 50.0, 50:8, 50:11, 55:9,	39:8, 48:16, 49:21
<b>next</b> [18] - 5:5, 5:8, 5:10, 5:13, 11:20,	7:25, 9:7, 16:20,	14:6	55:17, 56:19, 57:2	policies [1] - 33:1
5.10, 5.13, 11.20, 15:15, 17:14, 17:19,	18:23, 22:1, 24:7,	own [7] - 30:1, 32:21,	Paton's [1] - 46:4	policy [1] - 41:24
18:17, 20:22, 24:2,	25:16, 27:24, 28:6,	35:1, 35:15, 46:14,	Paula [2] - 11:24,	policymakers [1] -
27:23, 30:12, 30:24,	28:14, 30:11, 31:16,	50:24, 51:5 owned [1] - 32:5	23:16	7:21
31:16, 32:8, 35:17	41:18, 42:6, 49:22, 53:13	owner [2] - 30:20	peace [1] - 20:5	political [11] - 21:8, 22:7, 24:14, 24:19,
nice [1] - 26:11	ones [1] - 9:25	ownership [1] - 38:12	peculiar [1] - 9:13	31:20, 33:6, 39:4,
night [5] - 5:11, 9:15,	ongoing [1] - 8:2		people [8] - 10:21,	39:13, 42:1, 42:25,
12:2, 38:10, 47:19	onion [1] - 27:11	Р	11:6, 18:15, 23:24,	44:5
Nintzel [1] - 12:6	opening [2] - 42:22,	•	25:17, 25:18, 42:24,	politics [1] - 46:17
<b>non</b> [1] - 28:19	43:2	pages [1] - 52:2	53:24	polls [1] - 22:1
noncandidate [1] -	operates [1] - 5:1	pains [1] - 46:19	percent [2] - 45:8,	pool [1] - 14:24
33:15	operating [1] - 42:2	paradigm [1] - 40:17	48:10	population [1] - 22:24
nonconclusion [1] -	operation [1] - 45:22	parity [1] - 7:6	percentage [4] - 45:7, 46:8, 46:20, 54:3	position [6] - 6:25,
32:13	operations [1] - 35:20	part [19] - 4:20, 4:21,	perception [1] - 35:6	15:24, 16:7, 29:24,
nonpartisan [1] - 22:4 nonpolitical [6] -	<b>Opinion</b> [1] - 55:6	4:22, 5:12, 14:4,	perhaps [1] - 33:7	32:14, 33:19
31:21, 31:23, 33:6,	opinion [28] - 4:16,	15:5, 16:22, 18:21, 28:9, 28:10, 30:14,	person [16] - 6:17,	positive [5] - 12:9,
33:15, 41:25, 44:5	7:13, 26:21, 26:22,	30:15, 30:22, 33:19,	10:14, 28:24, 29:18,	13:18, 31:24, 31:25, 32:2
nonpolitical-type [1] -	26:25, 27:5, 29:5,	36:19, 51:12	30:1, 34:15, 34:17,	<b>possible</b> [3] - 4:12,
33:15	30:17, 31:3, 33:21, 36:14, 36:19, 37:16,	participate [7] - 10:14,	34:22, 36:7, 36:17,	11:16, 33:11
norm [1] - 43:21	40:11, 46:9, 50:19,	14:4, 15:19, 21:3,	37:10, 37:18, 37:19,	possibly [1] - 8:21
note [2] - 7:25, 36:25	50:24, 50:25, 51:20,	21:7, 21:11, 24:21	37:20, 37:22, 45:17	post [1] - 14:22
noted [1] - 50:20	52:2, 52:24, 53:1,	participating [3] - 7:3,	person's [1] - 10:13	post-debate [1] -
notes [1] - 51:2	53:6, 53:9, 55:1,	7:4, 14:7	personally [1] - 22:13	14:22
nothing [5] - 13:18,	55:8, 55:13	particular [7] - 25:17,	perspective [3] - 37:3,	Postal [2] - 17:16,
35:21, 48:24, 54:22	opinions [2] - 40:13,	29:21, 32:15, 33:19,	42:8, 54:2	18:5
<b>notice</b> [4] - 8:16,	52:15	38:11, 42:4, 52:11	Phoenix [1] - 6:12	potentially [3] - 13:9,
10:12, 10:16, 29:5	<b>oppo</b> [1] - 45:20	particularly [1] - 8:3	<b>Phoenix's</b> [1] - 6:13 <b>phone</b> [2] - 23:14,	37:14, 42:22
noticed [2] - 9:7,	<b>opportunity</b> [6] - 12:2,	parties [4] - 14:7,	23:18	powers' [1] - 4:18
10:19	22:12, 23:7, 24:15,	21:8, 43:14, 54:18	photographer [2] -	practically [1] - 36:5
<b>notion</b> [3] - 34:22, 35:9, 40:16	26:11, 26:13	partisan [1] - 21:22 partners [3] - 12:5,	14:25, 15:1	practitioners [2] -
nuances [1] - 37:13	opposite [1] - 45:21 opted [1] - 9:16	14:20, 20:24	photos [1] - 15:1	38:2, 52:5 praise [1] - 14:6
number [10] - 7:12,	or [1] - 9:12	partnership [2] -	pick [2] - 47:25, 50:5	precedence [1] - 51:4
23:14, 23:15, 23:18,	order [2] - 50:21,	14:10, 23:1	picture [2] - 19:13,	predisposition [1] -
38:17, 38:24, 42:10,	52:19	parts [2] - 11:5, 28:11	20:7	39:23
43:5, 49:22, 52:2	ordinarily [1] - 31:10	party [4] - 22:8, 30:21,	piece [2] - 18:14, 37:6	prefer [2] - 53:5, 53:8
numbers [2] - 7:5,	organization [2] -	32:5, 41:20	pieces [1] - 17:21	presence [2] - 26:12,
14:11	34:5, 52:13	Party [9] - 21:8, 21:9,	<b>Pima</b> [1] - 21:2	45:23

present [2] - 20:10, 29.13 presentation [1] -52:19 presented [5] - 28:20, 28:22, 29:2, 29:13, 36.15 presidential [8] -15:17, 15:24, 16:8, 16:16, 16:23, 17:12, 25:11, 25:20 Press [1] - 33:2 press [14] - 16:10, 23:19, 30:8, 30:20, 30:22, 31:10, 31:18, 31:19, 32:24, 34:5, 43:8, 45:15, 45:25, 46.14pretty [3] - 22:13, 28:5, 31:13 primaries [1] - 21:14 primarily [2] - 39:3 primary [10] - 5:12, 11:19, 13:16, 15:11, 15:16, 18:16, 19:16, 21:3, 21:6, 21:17 principally [1] - 27:2 principles [1] - 29:17 printed [1] - 40:24 probe [1] - 43:18 problem [1] - 46:11 proceed [1] - 53:5 Proceeding [1] - 57:5 process [7] - 6:10, 14:8, 15:5, 20:17, 27:17, 50:21, 52:14 produced [1] - 48:23 produces [1] - 30:10 production [5] - 14:5, 15:21, 16:6, 18:11, 40:23 productions [3] -15:9, 16:19, 16:21 professional [2] -13:20, 15:1 professionalism [2] -12:5, 16:21 profile [3] - 19:22, 20:2, 33:14 profile-type [1] - 33:14 profiles [4] - 20:5, 32:2, 32:3, 42:11 profit [1] - 35:18 program [6] - 11:19, 12:1, 12:3, 12:8, 15:21, 15:23 programs [1] - 14:23 progress [1] - 12:16 progression [1] -13:20

promote [2] - 41:20, 43.13 pronouncing [1] -27:14 Prop [1] - 4:17 proposing [1] - 45:6 **Proposition** [2] - 27:2, 42.23 protection [1] - 46:14 protections [1] - 43:8 proud [1] - 25:21 provide [6] - 5:17, 7:19, 36:23, 38:1, 46:2, 53:1 provides [6] - 37:16, 49:25, 51:21, 52:1, 52:22, 53:13 providing [1] - 37:21 public [12] - 7:20, 13:14, 29:2, 31:9, 31:12, 32:10, 35:24, 42:11, 54:18, 56:2, 56:12 publication [6] -41:10, 41:12, 42:16, 43:22, 44:1 publications [1] -43:12 publisher [2] - 41:10, 41:19 pull [2] - 11:25, 12:22 purport [1] - 38:25 purpose [5] - 10:7, 39:7, 41:11, 41:12, 41:19 purposes [2] - 42:18, 42:19 put [8] - 8:13, 15:18, 18:12. 18:22. 30:17. 30:25, 42:24, 45:21 Q qualifies [1] - 27:3 qualitative [1] - 46:19 question/comment [1] - 44:23 questionnaire [1] -20:10 questions [20] - 5:22, 5:25, 6:1, 8:24, 11:12, 18:1, 20:11, 25:2, 25:12, 25:25, 28:1, 28:8, 29:1, 29:8, 29:13, 31:5, 38:8, 38:18, 49:5, 53:16 quickly [1] - 20:15 quite [2] - 41:11, 46:18

R race [2] - 17:7, 22:4 races [1] - 22:3 radio [2] - 14:22, 35:24 raised [1] - 28:1 range [1] - 6:6 ranging [1] - 20:3 rather [2] - 41:22, 43:2 reach [7] - 10:16, 13:21, 14:9, 16:1, 22:21, 23:7, 45:24 reached [1] - 6:9 reaches [1] - 49:25 reaching [4] - 6:21, 6:22. 17:7. 26:8 read [4] - 4:19, 39:25, 46:7, 47:19 reader [1] - 39:7 reading [3] - 17:24, 18:1, 42:5 ready [1] - 19:17 real [4] - 33:4, 46:9, 46:11.49:5 really [20] - 5:16, 5:18, 5:19. 5:22. 6:2. 6:18. 6:20, 7:23, 14:2, 17:23, 19:22, 26:7, 26:10, 29:15, 30:9, 32:20, 33:10, 33:19, 38:11, 46:12 reanalyzing [2] -49:23 reason [4] - 9:9, 29:1, 29:12, 32:6 reasoned [1] - 45:24 reasoning [1] - 53:21 receive [1] - 23:5 received [3] - 5:16, 6:16, 13:18 receiving [2] - 18:15, 35:19 recently [1] - 21:1 recognized [2] - 21:8, 22:17 recognizing [1] - 40:5 recommendation [3] -49:3, 49:21, 52:9 recommendations [1] - 18:23 record [3] - 33:16, 34:14, 44:19 Recorder's [1] - 6:8 recording [1] - 25:9 records [1] - 41:16 redrafted [1] - 29:1 regarding [4] - 4:17, 38:12, 50:24, 51:9 registered [3] - 19:5,

21:24. 22:9 regular [1] - 34:23 regularly [3] - 27:17, 31:20, 40:21 regulated [8] - 28:1, 29:3, 29:6, 29:10, 50:21, 51:1, 51:16, 53:4 regulation [1] - 46:16 regulative [1] - 52:16 regulatory [2] - 42:18, 49:5 relative [1] - 7:6 relatively [1] - 32:19 release [1] - 16:10 released [1] - 4:16 relevant [2] - 29:7, 37:8 reliance [1] - 37:3 relying [3] - 53:25, 54:8, 54:11 remand [2] - 4:23, 8.12 remanded [1] - 4:22 **remarkably** [1] - 12:9 remember [1] - 25:16 reminder [1] - 20:9 report [9] - 4:13, 7:16, 8:8, 8:14, 11:13, 15:12, 17:23, 36:13, 42.6 reports [2] - 29:20 representative [1] -7:1 reproduced [1] - 31:2 **Republic** [3] - 8:2, 40:1, 43:10 Republican [2] - 21:9, 21:12 Republicans [1] - 40:8 request [7] - 7:13, 21:2, 26:23, 27:1, 27:15. 35:19. 52:15 requested [1] - 53:2 requests [1] - 27:16 require [1] - 32:24 requires [1] - 48:24 reran [1] - 14:15 rescheduling [1] -56:4 research [1] - 50:2 reservations [1] -52:12 resource [1] - 18:10 resources [1] - 23:3 respond [2] - 10:21, 20:12 responding [1] - 56:5 **response** [7] - 10:1, 11:14, 26:17, 38:20,

54:16, 54:19, 56:10 result [2] - 21:18, 56:2 revenue [1] - 34:24 reversed [1] - 4:22 Review [1] - 40:1 Review/New [1] -43.10 reviewed [1] - 31:22 revisit [1] - 49:1 Richard [1] - 12:7 Riester [1] - 12:6 **ROBERTS** [6] - 9:19, 10:11, 12:19, 17:2, 25:7, 26:19 **ROGERS** [1] - 23:13 role [1] - 49:13 roll [3] - 4:4, 55:13, 56:21 route [1] - 49:4 Ruelas [1] - 12:7 **rule** [5] - 28:16, 49:2, 50:4, 51:9, 54:3 rules [4] - 21:5, 48:7, 51:17, 52:18 running [6] - 10:25, 17:8, 19:8, 19:21, 41:24, 41:25 Rábago [1] - 12:7

## S

safe [1] - 33:22 sample [1] - 19:9 satisfied [1] - 37:1 save [1] - 13:15 saw [1] - 23:14 scenes [1] - 16:18 schedule [3] - 13:4, 13:9, 13:13 school [1] - 20:4 second [6] - 28:13, 32:1, 55:8, 55:9, 56:18, 56:19 seconded [3] - 4:1, 55:12.56:20 secondly [1] - 50:3 Secretary [1] - 19:2 securely [1] - 19:4 security [1] - 53:9 see [11] - 6:5, 15:18, 22:1, 22:2, 28:17, 31:12, 35:23, 38:21, 45:1, 49:10 seeing [5] - 18:1, 18:9, 19:23, 19:24, 56:11 seek [1] - 38:11 select [1] - 21:14 selecting [1] - 21:12 selling [1] - 35:12 sells [1] - 34:20

Senate [2] - 7:16, 9:16	social [1] - 18:14	19:20, 21:20	summarize [3] - 27:5,	thresholds [1] - 36:12
send [3] - 18:6, 55:1,	sodas [1] - 34:20	state [8] - 5:21, 6:22,	27:21, 52:7	throughout [1] - 15:2
56:12	someone [1] - 42:15	11:22, 14:21, 17:4,	summary [1] - 5:2	Thursday [1] - 8:15
sense [6] - 39:25,	somewhat [2] - 31:14,	18:25, 20:24, 22:20	supplement [1] -	ticked [1] - 28:13
42:20, 42:21, 50:22,	34:14	State's [1] - 19:2	38:10	timeline [1] - 52:21
54:5	somewhere [2] - 42:9,	statement [2] - 10:14,	support [3] - 16:12,	today [3] - 16:10,
sent [2] - 17:20, 38:10	42:10	20:19	39:8, 54:1	24:18, 48:22
sentence [1] - 20:13	<b>soon</b> [3] - 5:2, 8:9,	States [2] - 17:16,	supported [1] - 5:17	together [2] - 18:22,
separation [1] - 4:18	13:13	24:14	supportive [1] - 52:8	20:12
serve [1] - 18:5	sorry [1] - 49:17	statewide [2] - 19:20,	supposed [1] - 28:9	toll [1] - 23:14
service [3] - 13:24,	sort [26] - 16:18,	21:21	Supreme [4] - 40:14,	toll-free [1] - 23:14
19:24, 23:23	26:11, 27:21, 28:16,	station [1] - 35:24	40:16, 40:18, 40:25	<b>Tom</b> [10] - 4:14, 8:17,
services [1] - 22:23	28:18, 32:13, 33:2,	stations [1] - 14:16	surreptitious [1] -	11:18, 11:25, 17:22,
Services [2] - 17:16,	33:25, 34:11, 34:18,	statute [2] - 4:24,	11:9	27:5, 38:21, 45:12,
18:5	34:25, 35:2, 35:6,	27:25	Sustainable [1] - 7:17	47:3, 55:22
set [2] - 12:12, 23:15	35:9, 35:19, 35:20,	Step [5] - 31:5, 31:6	<b>system</b> [3] - 8:4, 16:1,	<b>Tom's</b> [1] - 11:13
sets [1] - 52:4	38:5, 38:14, 39:18,	steps [1] - 30:23	16:4	Toma [2] - 4:16, 8:11
setting [2] - 44:9, 53:4	41:17, 42:5, 44:10,	Steve [1] - 12:6	10.4	took [1] - 37:9
share [1] - 12:20	44:15, 53:21, 54:4,	stewing [1] - 49:11	Т	tool [2] - 20:9
sharing [1] - 19:25	54:12	sticker [2] - 18:12,	I	top [1] - 9:22
sheds [1] - 37:17	source [1] - 18:25	18:13	table [2] - 39:22	topics [1] - 31:23
shield [1] - 52:25	sources [1] - 39:6	still [6] - 9:23, 13:1,	tacks [1] - 34:11	touched [1] - 51:13
shipments [1] - 18:2	<b>space</b> [2] - 51:23, 52:5	14:11, 17:17, 43:16	takeaway [1] - 42:15	tour [1] - 25:5
show [1] - 19:7	<b>Spangled</b> [13] - 26:23,	stor [1] - 31:24	talks [4] - 4:24, 21:2,	
showcasing [1] -	27:1, 28:24, 29:23,	stories [8] - 31:21,	24:13, 40:12	towards [2] - 24:20, 24:25
16:20	32:15, 35:21, 36:7,	31:23, 31:24, 31:25,	tally [1] - 14:11	town [1] - 6:9
	36:16, 41:5, 44:20,	42:9, 45:9, 47:4,	target [1] - 47:10	
shows [1] - 14:22	45:17, 45:22, 46:1	48:10	targeting [1] - 23:4	trace [1] - 35:13
side [1] - 7:21 Sierra [1] - 25:17	Spanish [1] - 18:13	story [2] - 8:3, 24:11	task [1] - 18:22	track [2] - 12:21, 14:12 traction [1] - 6:4
significant [2] - 33:13,	speaking [1] - 29:22	stream [1] - 14:17	teachers [1] - 18:7	transactions [2] -
52:22	speaks [1] - 10:25	streaming [2] - 13:8,	teaser [1] - 24:4	34:23, 36:24
significantly [1] -	specific [4] - 5:25,	14:21	technology [1] - 12:4	treatment [1] - 33:5
43:11	18:23, 29:14, 39:21	stretch [1] - 48:3	tele [1] - 6:9	trial [1] - 4:21
similar [1] - 41:7	specifically [5] -	strike [1] - 45:2	tele-town [1] - 6:9	tried [2] - 30:14, 47:19
similarities [1] - 41:18	22:14, 36:19, 41:8,	structure [1] - 53:13	ten [1] - 42:9	trouble [1] - 51:14
simple [1] - 31:13	41:9, 50:3	struggled [1] - 44:13	tension [1] - 43:25	<b>Trump</b> [1] - 45:9
simpler [2] - 34:14,	speech [1] - 51:15	studio [2] - 24:17,	terms [8] - 7:11, 7:21,	trusted [1] - 15:10
37:24	spend [1] - 34:20	25:6	22:20, 30:4, 32:21,	try [10] - 5:1, 9:24,
simply [6] - 35:14,	spending [9] - 28:25,	Studios [2] - 12:3,	33:5, 33:24, 35:23	17:13, 30:17, 36:23,
36:8, 37:19, 37:20,	29:19, 30:3, 34:16,	25:5	territory [1] - 54:5	37:23, 37:25, 38:1,
44:3, 45:21	35:10, 35:15, 36:12,	study [1] - 56:3	test [21] - 28:10,	44:15, 51:15
single [2] - 14:25,	37:10, 45:18	stuff [6] - 6:20, 11:9,	28:16, 30:14, 30:15,	trying [12] - 7:21,
22:23	spends [1] - 35:11	39:6, 42:24, 48:11,	30:16, 30:18, 33:20,	29:13, 33:5, 38:2,
<b>sit</b> [1] - 45:8	spent [2] - 29:18,	48:25	43:17, 43:18, 51:4,	43:3, 43:15, 43:18,
site [3] - 6:6, 19:12,	36:10	subject [1] - 29:25	51:12, 51:21, 52:1,	44:10, 44:11, 49:1,
33:7	stacks [1] - 18:6	submission [3] - 9:22,	52:4, 52:5, 53:12,	52:20
site's [1] - 33:11	staff [8] - 7:1, 11:24,	10:4, 27:15	53:22, 53:23, 54:8,	tune [1] - 12:14
sites [1] - 41:4	23:22, 23:24, 28:7,	submit [1] - 10:2	54:12	turn [1] - 37:11
situation [2] - 25:21,	40:23, 49:3, 56:3	submitted [1] - 50:20	testing [1] - 19:15	turned [1] - 36:11
54:10	stand [1] - 20:16	subsequent [1] - 49:8	tests [2] - 28:3	<b>TV</b> [1] - 13:23
<b>six</b> [1] - 6:24	standard [1] - 51:21	subsidiary [2] - 30:2,	theater [2] - 22:22,	<b>two</b> [10] - 9:8, 9:16,
<b>slide</b> [12] - 12:23,	standing [1] - 25:5	31:5	23:3	20:14, 22:1, 28:9,
15:15, 17:14, 18:17,	Star [13] - 26:23, 27:1,	succeeded [1] - 37:24	theories [1] - 43:6	28:10, 28:11, 30:14,
20:22, 24:2, 24:3,	28:23, 29:23, 32:15,	success [2] - 14:12,	therefore [1] - 42:25	49:21, 56:6
27:23, 30:12, 30:24,	35:21, 36:7, 36:16,	15:16	they've [1] - 13:21	two-part [3] - 28:9,
32:8, 35:17	41:5, 44:20, 45:16,	successful [2] -	thinking [1] - 45:5	28:10, 30:14
slides [1] - 12:20	45:21, 46:1	15:12, 17:12	thoroughly [1] - 15:12	<b>type</b> [4] - 13:25, 33:14,
small [1] - 20:25	start [2] - 17:19, 19:17	suggesting [1] - 34:8	three [2] - 9:16, 30:15	33:15, 41:4
snapshot [1] - 20:25	started [2] - 5:3, 5:21	suggestions [1] - 56:1	three-part [1] - 30:15	typo [1] - 30:25
	State [4] - 7:16, 16:2,	suggests [1] - 35:22	threshold [1] - 29:19	

U	18:13, 18:16, 19:5,	<b>wish</b> [5] - 13:6, 15:18,
	21:11, 21:24, 22:9,	54:25, 56:8, 56:9
<b>U.S</b> [2] - 9:15, 30:8	22:18, 23:4, 23:8, 23:17, 26:6	words [4] - 32:23,
under [5] - 26:23,	voter's [1] - 9:15	37:2, 39:24, 43:17 works [4] - 8:5, 29:10,
27:4, 28:15, 34:22, 37:7	voters [32] - 5:18, 6:9,	30:18, 44:18
underwriting [2] -	7:18, 7:22, 10:8,	worried [1] - 31:3
35:20, 35:25	10:12, 10:13, 10:16,	worth [1] - 8:1
unique [2] - 9:14,	12:13, 12:14, 13:11,	wrap [2] - 11:20, 24:25
15:24	13:18, 13:22, 14:1,	wrapped [3] - 11:19,
United [3] - 17:16,	15:7, 17:10, 17:23,	13:1, 13:3
24:14, 35:5	18:25, 19:3, 19:14,	writing [1] - 5:23
universe [2] - 46:19,	20:7, 20:11, 20:15,	written [1] - 55:13
46:20	21:7, 21:19, 22:6,	wrote [1] - 41:10
unprecedented [1] -	22:19, 22:21, 22:23,	
14:13	22:25, 23:7, 24:16	Y
<b>up</b> [19] - 5:4, 11:19,	<b>Voters</b> [2] - 6:10, 26:23	15:12 19:10
11:20, 12:22, 13:1, 12:2, 14:11, 10:4	<b>votes</b> [3] - 4:10, 55:20,	<b>year</b> [5] - 15:13, 18:19, 19:23, 21:4, 24:25
13:3, 14:11, 19:4, 20:12, 23:15, 24:7,	57:3	19:23, 21:4, 24:25 years [3] - 6:24, 23:15
20.12, 23.15, 24.7, 25:1, 25:11, 32:1,	voting [6] - 17:19,	younger [1] - 7:18
32:11, 38:6, 42:23,	19:16, 19:17, 19:18,	yourself [1] - 11:7
45:13, 50:5	24:10, 24:18	Jeaneen [1] 11.7
upcoming [1] - 8:20		Z
update [3] - 7:3,	W	_
12:16, 20:21		Zero [1] - 35:12
updates [2] - 11:16,	walk [1] - 37:17	<b>zero</b> [1] - 10:1
18:20	wants [2] - 50:12, 50:14	<b>zone</b> [1] - 39:19
updating [1] - 19:16	watch [2] - 12:15,	<b>Zoom</b> [1] - 56:8
utilize [1] - 22:21	14:19	
utilizing [3] - 18:24,	watermark [1] - 31:1	
19:24, 23:3		
	ways [1] - 37:16	
V	ways [1] - 37:16 website [19] - 18:21,	
v		
<b>V</b> variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21	website [19] - 18:21,	
-	<b>website</b> [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6,	
variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21 ver [1] - 43:24 verbatim [1] - 9:7	<b>website</b> [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11,	
variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21 ver [1] - 43:24 verbatim [1] - 9:7 verklempt [1] - 5:19	<b>website</b> [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2,	
variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21 ver [1] - 43:24 verbatim [1] - 9:7 verklempt [1] - 5:19 versus [2] - 42:6, 54:5	<b>website</b> [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20	
variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21 ver [1] - 43:24 verbatim [1] - 9:7 verklempt [1] - 5:19 versus [2] - 42:6, 54:5 VI [1] - 55:25	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25,	
variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21 ver [1] - 43:24 verbatim [1] - 9:7 verklempt [1] - 5:19 versus [2] - 42:6, 54:5 VI [1] - 55:25 vicinity [1] - 23:4	<b>website</b> [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20	
variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21 ver [1] - 43:24 verbatim [1] - 9:7 verklempt [1] - 5:19 versus [2] - 42:6, 54:5 VI [1] - 55:25 vicinity [1] - 23:4 video [6] - 16:17,	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \texttt{variety} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{6:7}, \ \texttt{6:21} \\ \texttt{ver} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{43:24} \\ \texttt{verbatim} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{9:7} \\ \texttt{verbatim} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{5:19} \\ \texttt{versus} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{42:6}, \ \texttt{54:5} \\ \texttt{VI} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{55:25} \\ \texttt{vicinity} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{23:4} \\ \texttt{video} \ \texttt{[6]} - \texttt{16:17}, \\ \texttt{16:25}, \ \texttt{23:11}, \ \texttt{23:12}, \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11,	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{variety} \ \textbf{[2]} - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \textbf{ver} \ \textbf{[1]} - 43:24 \\ \textbf{verbatim} \ \textbf{[1]} - 9:7 \\ \textbf{verklempt} \ \textbf{[1]} - 5:19 \\ \textbf{versus} \ \textbf{[2]} - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \textbf{VI} \ \textbf{[1]} - 55:25 \\ \textbf{vicinity} \ \textbf{[1]} - 23:4 \\ \textbf{video} \ \textbf{[6]} - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \end{array}$	<pre>website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20</pre>	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \texttt{variety} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{6:7}, \ \texttt{6:21} \\ \texttt{ver} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{43:24} \\ \texttt{verbatim} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{9:7} \\ \texttt{verbatim} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{5:19} \\ \texttt{versus} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{42:6}, \ \texttt{54:5} \\ \texttt{VI} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{55:25} \\ \texttt{vicinity} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{23:4} \\ \texttt{video} \ \texttt{[6]} - \texttt{16:17}, \\ \texttt{16:25}, \ \texttt{23:11}, \ \texttt{23:12}, \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] -	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \texttt{variety} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{6:7}, \ \texttt{6:21} \\ \texttt{ver} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{43:24} \\ \texttt{verbatim} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{9:7} \\ \texttt{verklempt} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{5:19} \\ \texttt{versus} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{42:6}, \ \texttt{54:5} \\ \texttt{VI} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{55:25} \\ \texttt{vicinity} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{23:4} \\ \texttt{video} \ \texttt{[6]} - \texttt{16:17}, \\ \texttt{16:25}, \ \texttt{23:11}, \ \texttt{23:12}, \\ \texttt{25:4}, \ \texttt{25:10} \\ \texttt{view} \ \texttt{[3]} - \texttt{39:9}, \ \texttt{40:4}, \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \texttt{variety} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{6:7}, \ \texttt{6:21} \\ \texttt{ver} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{43:24} \\ \texttt{verbatim} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{9:7} \\ \texttt{verklempt} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{5:19} \\ \texttt{versus} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{42:6}, \ \texttt{54:5} \\ \texttt{VI} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{55:25} \\ \texttt{vicinity} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{23:4} \\ \texttt{video} \ \texttt{[6]} - \texttt{16:17}, \\ \texttt{16:25}, \ \texttt{23:11}, \ \texttt{23:12}, \\ \texttt{25:4}, \ \texttt{25:10} \\ \texttt{view} \ \texttt{[3]} - \texttt{39:9}, \ \texttt{40:4}, \\ \texttt{50:25} \end{array}$	<pre>website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6,</pre>	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \texttt{variety} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{6:7, 6:21} \\ \texttt{ver} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{43:24} \\ \texttt{verbatim} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{9:7} \\ \texttt{verklempt} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{5:19} \\ \texttt{versus} \ \texttt{[2]} - \texttt{42:6, 54:5} \\ \texttt{VI} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{55:25} \\ \texttt{vicinity} \ \texttt{[1]} - \texttt{23:4} \\ \texttt{video} \ \texttt{[6]} - \texttt{16:17,} \\ \texttt{16:25, 23:11, 23:12,} \\ \texttt{25:4, 25:10} \\ \texttt{view} \ \texttt{[3]} - \texttt{39:9, 40:4,} \\ \texttt{50:25} \\ \texttt{views} \ \texttt{[3]} - \texttt{7:18,} \end{array}$		
variety [2] - 6:7, 6:21 ver [1] - 43:24 verbatim [1] - 9:7 verklempt [1] - 5:19 versus [2] - 42:6, 54:5 VI [1] - 55:25 vicinity [1] - 23:4 video [6] - 16:17, 16:25, 23:11, 23:12, 25:4, 25:10 view [3] - 39:9, 40:4, 50:25 views [3] - 7:18, 39:13, 52:11 VII [1] - 56:14 visit [1] - 22:25		
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \text{variety} \ [2] - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \text{ver} \ [1] - 43:24 \\ \text{verbatim} \ [1] - 9:7 \\ \text{verklempt} \ [1] - 5:19 \\ \text{versus} \ [2] - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \text{VI} \ [1] - 55:25 \\ \text{vicinity} \ [1] - 23:4 \\ \text{video} \ [6] - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \text{view} \ [3] - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \text{views} \ [3] - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \text{VI} \ [1] - 56:14 \\ \text{visit} \ [1] - 22:25 \\ \text{Vista} \ [1] - 25:17 \\ \end{array}$	$\label{eq:website} [19] - 18:21, \\ 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, \\ 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, \\ 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, \\ 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, \\ 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, \\ 39:8, 41:20 \\ \mbox{websites} [3] - 38:25, \\ 39:10 \\ \mbox{week} [5] - 5:13, 6:11, \\ 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 \\ \mbox{weekend} [1] - 14:16 \\ \mbox{weekend} [1] - 5:13 \\ \mbox{well-received} [1] - 5:16 \\ \mbox{Werther} [7] - 4:6, \\ 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, \\ 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 \\ \mbox{WERTHER} [10] - 4:7, \\ \end tabular \end$	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \text{variety} \ \text{[2]} - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \text{ver} \ \text{[1]} - 43:24 \\ \text{verbatim} \ \text{[1]} - 9:7 \\ \text{verklempt} \ \text{[1]} - 5:19 \\ \text{versus} \ \text{[2]} - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \text{VI} \ \text{[1]} - 55:25 \\ \text{vicinity} \ \text{[1]} - 23:4 \\ \text{video} \ \text{[6]} - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \text{view} \ \text{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \text{views} \ \text{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \text{views} \ \text{[3]} - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \text{VII} \ \text{[1]} - 56:14 \\ \text{visit} \ \text{[1]} - 22:25 \\ \text{Vista} \ \text{[1]} - 25:17 \\ \text{vote} \ \text{[2]} - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18,	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \text{variety} \ \text{[2]} - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \text{ver} \ \text{[1]} - 43:24 \\ \text{verbatim} \ \text{[1]} - 9:7 \\ \text{verklempt} \ \text{[1]} - 5:19 \\ \text{versus} \ \text{[2]} - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \text{VI} \ \text{[1]} - 55:25 \\ \text{vicinity} \ \text{[1]} - 23:4 \\ \text{video} \ \text{[6]} - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \text{view} \ \text{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \text{views} \ \text{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \text{views} \ \text{[3]} - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \text{VII} \ \text{[1]} - 56:14 \\ \text{visit} \ \text{[1]} - 22:25 \\ \text{Vista} \ \text{[1]} - 25:17 \\ \text{vote} \ \text{[2]} - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \text{voted} \ \text{[2]} - 18:13, \\ \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18, 53:20, 55:3, 55:5,	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \text{variety} \ \text{[2]} - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \text{ver} \ \text{[1]} - 43:24 \\ \text{verbatim} \ \text{[1]} - 9:7 \\ \text{verklempt} \ \text{[1]} - 5:19 \\ \text{versus} \ \text{[2]} - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \text{video} \ \text{[6]} - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \text{view} \ \text{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \text{views} \ \text{[3]} - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \text{VII} \ \text{[1]} - 56:14 \\ \text{visit} \ \text{[1]} - 22:25 \\ \text{Vista} \ \text{[1]} - 25:17 \\ \text{vote} \ \text{[2]} - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \text{voted} \ \text{[2]} - 18:13, \\ \ 48:22 \\ \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18,	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{variety} \ \textbf{[2]} - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \textbf{ver} \ \textbf{[1]} - 43:24 \\ \textbf{verbatim} \ \textbf{[1]} - 9:7 \\ \textbf{verklempt} \ \textbf{[1]} - 5:19 \\ \textbf{versus} \ \textbf{[2]} - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \textbf{VI} \ \textbf{[1]} - 55:25 \\ \textbf{vicinity} \ \textbf{[1]} - 23:4 \\ \textbf{video} \ \textbf{[6]} - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \textbf{view} \ \textbf{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \textbf{views} \ \textbf{[3]} - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \textbf{VII} \ \textbf{[1]} - 56:14 \\ \textbf{visit} \ \textbf{[1]} - 22:25 \\ \textbf{Vista} \ \textbf{[1]} - 25:17 \\ \textbf{vote} \ \textbf{[2]} - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \textbf{voted} \ \textbf{[2]} - 18:13, \\ 48:22 \\ \textbf{Voter} \ \textbf{[3]} - 9:6, \ 17:15, \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18, 53:20, 55:3, 55:5, 55:15, 56:16, 56:25	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{variety} \ \textbf{[2]} - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \textbf{ver} \ \textbf{[1]} - 43:24 \\ \textbf{verbatim} \ \textbf{[1]} - 9:7 \\ \textbf{verklempt} \ \textbf{[1]} - 5:19 \\ \textbf{versus} \ \textbf{[2]} - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \textbf{VI} \ \textbf{[1]} - 55:25 \\ \textbf{vicinity} \ \textbf{[1]} - 23:4 \\ \textbf{video} \ \textbf{[6]} - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \textbf{view} \ \textbf{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \textbf{views} \ \textbf{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \textbf{views} \ \textbf{[3]} - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \textbf{VII} \ \textbf{[1]} - 56:14 \\ \textbf{visit} \ \textbf{[1]} - 25:25 \\ \textbf{Vista} \ \textbf{[1]} - 25:17 \\ \textbf{vote} \ \textbf{[2]} - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \textbf{voted} \ \textbf{[2]} - 18:13, \\ 48:22 \\ \textbf{Voter} \ \textbf{[3]} - 9:6, \ 17:15, \\ 29:17 \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18, 53:20, 55:3, 55:5, 55:15, 56:16, 56:25 white [2] - 41:11,	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \text{variety} \ [2] - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \text{ver} \ [1] - 43:24 \\ \text{verbatim} \ [1] - 9:7 \\ \text{verklempt} \ [1] - 5:19 \\ \text{versus} \ [2] - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \text{video} \ [6] - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \text{view} \ [3] - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \text{views} \ [3] - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \text{VII} \ [1] - 56:14 \\ \text{visit} \ [1] - 22:25 \\ \text{Vista} \ [1] - 25:17 \\ \text{vote} \ [2] - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \text{voted} \ [2] - 18:13, \\ 48:22 \\ \text{Voter} \ [3] - 9:6, \ 17:15, \\ 29:17 \\ \text{voter} \ [19] - 5:10, \ 5:20, \\ \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18, 53:20, 55:3, 55:5, 55:15, 56:16, 56:25 white [2] - 41:11, 49:24	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{variety} \ [2] - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \textbf{ver} \ [1] - 43:24 \\ \textbf{verbatim} \ [1] - 9:7 \\ \textbf{verklempt} \ [1] - 5:19 \\ \textbf{versus} \ [2] - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \textbf{VI} \ [1] - 55:25 \\ \textbf{vicinity} \ [1] - 23:4 \\ \textbf{video} \ [6] - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \textbf{view} \ [3] - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \textbf{views} \ [3] - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \textbf{views} \ [3] - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \textbf{VII} \ [1] - 56:14 \\ \textbf{visit} \ [1] - 22:25 \\ \textbf{Vista} \ [1] - 25:17 \\ \textbf{vote} \ [2] - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \textbf{voted} \ [2] - 18:13, \\ 48:22 \\ \textbf{Voter} \ [3] - 9:6, \ 17:15, \\ 29:17 \\ \textbf{voter} \ [19] - 5:10, \ 5:20, \\ 5:23, \ 11:17, \ 11:21, \\ \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18, 53:20, 55:3, 55:5, 55:15, 56:16, 56:25 white [2] - 41:11, 49:24 whole [2] - 7:10, 25:21	
$\label{eq:variety} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{variety} \ \textbf{[2]} - 6:7, \ 6:21 \\ \textbf{ver} \ \textbf{[1]} - 43:24 \\ \textbf{verbatim} \ \textbf{[1]} - 9:7 \\ \textbf{verklempt} \ \textbf{[1]} - 5:19 \\ \textbf{versus} \ \textbf{[2]} - 42:6, \ 54:5 \\ \textbf{Vi} \ \textbf{[1]} - 55:25 \\ \textbf{vicinity} \ \textbf{[1]} - 23:4 \\ \textbf{video} \ \textbf{[6]} - 16:17, \\ 16:25, \ 23:11, \ 23:12, \\ 25:4, \ 25:10 \\ \textbf{view} \ \textbf{[3]} - 39:9, \ 40:4, \\ 50:25 \\ \textbf{views} \ \textbf{[3]} - 7:18, \\ 39:13, \ 52:11 \\ \textbf{Vil} \ \textbf{[1]} - 56:14 \\ \textbf{visit} \ \textbf{[1]} - 22:25 \\ \textbf{Vista} \ \textbf{[1]} - 25:17 \\ \textbf{vote} \ \textbf{[2]} - 24:6, \ 24:21 \\ \textbf{voted} \ \textbf{[2]} - 18:13, \\ 48:22 \\ \textbf{Voter} \ \textbf{[3]} - 9:6, \ 17:15, \\ 29:17 \\ \textbf{voter} \ \textbf{[19]} - 5:10, \ 5:20, \\ \end{array}$	website [19] - 18:21, 18:24, 19:4, 19:19, 19:22, 20:1, 20:6, 20:21, 26:13, 30:6, 30:10, 31:22, 32:11, 32:17, 32:19, 39:2, 39:8, 41:20 websites [3] - 38:25, 39:10 week [5] - 5:13, 6:11, 7:14, 11:18, 11:20 weekend [1] - 14:16 weeks [1] - 5:13 well-received [1] - 5:16 Werther [7] - 4:6, 26:3, 35:4, 53:19, 55:4, 55:14, 56:24 WERTHER [10] - 4:7, 26:2, 26:4, 53:18, 53:20, 55:3, 55:5, 55:15, 56:16, 56:25 white [2] - 41:11, 49:24 whole [2] - 7:10, 25:21 widely [1] - 15:4	