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 ago, we were in a position to be in as many places as we've Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
and I think it's worth talking about because it will be an ongoing issue, you know. Arizona Republic, there's a big long story about filings in Maricopa County particularly around campaign finance, how the failure to file system works, and so I think that's something that we will be keeping an eye on.

But I think that basically completes my -my -- my report and what I wanted to highlight.

And as I said, if we'll get more of -- soon as I get -- before the end of the meeting, if I -- if I have a better understanding of where the -- the -- and how the Toma v. Fontes breaks down on remand, I will let you know.

We did just want to make clear that we did put in the executive report we expected a decision at any time, and "any time" includes 9:30 on Thursday morning, so. Everybody had notice that we could talk about this.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Tom.
I think I speak for all Commissioners when I
say, is Captain Activate! going to be coming to any of our upcoming meetings?

Possibly?
Well, we don't need to do it right now, but it's something we can look forward to.

Are there any other questions --
COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a --
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been as staff members and representative commission as we've been just over the past month.

The -- we have an update on our participating
candidates. We now have 43 participating candidates; we've
funded 26. I think we're getting to a place now our numbers are on relative parity with what we've had in -- in the past couple of election cycles.

There's been a little bit of a lag as
candidates are more likely to be -- not file their application for certain until they file their -- their whole filing, so there's a lag now in terms of knowing what the number is; but I think that's good.

We have another advisory opinion request.
That was filed this week and then -- and then
I'd also want to highlight that we have a -- that we have a report that we worked on with Arizona State Senate for Independent and Sustainable Democracy that's attached that gets into the views and attitudes of younger voters, which we think is designed to provide some ballast to both election officials and -- and the public generally. But -- and policymakers on the administrative side, in terms of trying to understand where those voters are coming from.

So that's -- that's really the main -- the main issues I wanted to highlight.

You know, I think one other thing I will note, Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: -- or discussions --
COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a discussion -comments.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: -- from the -- Commissioner Paton.

COMMISSIONER PATON: So I got my Voter Election Guide [verbatim], and I noticed that there were one or two candidates that didn't fill anything out. I mean, what's the -- the reason for that?

They just don't think it matters or?
MR. COLLINS: You want to --
COMMISSIONER PATON: They're late or...
I mean, I find it very peculiar I guess.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, and it's not unique to
the voter's guide. In our debates last night in the U.S. Senate debate, two of the three candidates opted not to appear, so.

Gina.
MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, out of the entire, I think, approximately 200 candidates that were eligible to appear in the guide, we had maybe 6 I think off the top of my head that did not do a submission. We still do list their name and their details in there.

We do extensive outreach to try to connect with these candidates, and so these are the ones that we just
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get zero response from. So we don't actually know why they don't submit anything, but we do extensive outreach to connect with them, and they just did not complete the submission.

COMMISSIONER PATON: You would think that it would be to their detriment to not let somebody know what -what their -- their purpose is. And I find it just either "I don't care that -- about the voters," or "I'm so sure that I don't even have to do it."

I guess that's it, I don't know.
MS. ROBERTS: I -- I can -- Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I can tell you the voters do notice because we get inquires from the voters saying, "Where's this person's statement?" Or "Why didn't this person participate in the debate?"

So the voters do notice and they do reach out to us asking why.

COMMISSIONER PATON: Exactly. Well, I noticed.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And let me just say, I know Gina hammers these people to respond.

COMMISSIONER PATON: Oh, yeah. I would -- I would think so.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And if they don't, I think that speaks for their interest in -- in running and I don't
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incredible program.
Last night I had the opportunity to observe
the debate program at BitFire Studios, and I can say I was
greatly impressed. The technology, the facility, the
professionalism of our partners, the Arizona Media
Association, Riester; our moderators, Jim Nintzel, Steve Goldstein, Mary Rábago, and Richard Ruelas have brought this program to a new level.

We've heard remarkably positive feedback from candidates about their experiences.

I also was impressed that members of the Arizona media have set aside their natural competitive concerns to bring these debates to all the voters of Arizona. Should the voters be interested enough to tune in, it's very easy to -- to watch the debates.

Gina is going to update us on the progress of your voter education efforts.

Gina.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I do have some slides to share mostly to keep me on track.

If we can pull those up.
All right, if we can get to the first slide, please; thank you.

So as -- as the Chairman mentioned, our
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know what more we can do.
COMMISSIONER PATON: I mean, I don't -- I
don't think it's on our end or anything like that, other than maybe they think that we're doing something nefarious with their content, I don't know. But it's just -- and the parts that people don't debate that -- that bothers me as well. Like, if you're so sure about yourself or whatever, then tell everybody and let everybody hear it instead of being, you know, surreptitious about stuff; I don't know.

Just bothersome to me.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioners.
Are there any other discussion or questions
from the Commission on Tom's report?
(No audible response.)
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, thank you.
Item IV, discussion possible action on updates for the 2024 voter education efforts.

As Tom mentioned, this week, the Commission wrapped up our broadcast debate program for the primary election. Our legislative debates wrap up early next week and the voter education guide is hitting mailboxes around the state.

This -- this is crunch time for the Clean
Elections staff and I want to thank Gina, Alec, Paula, Avery, Mike, and Tom for the effort it takes to pull off this
debates, our broadcast debates, have wrapped up and we still
have some legislative debates that are occurring, and we will
get those wrapped up as well. And we are working on our general elections schedule now.

So essentially what we'll be doing is identifying the debates that we wish to host through our 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 measures bringing -- bringing those into the fold as well, too, for discussion. That way voters have access to the information.

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.

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 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 service.

We continue to get that type of feedback from
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the voters and from the candidates. The campaigns have been really amazing to work with as well, and so we do so -- we have seen a great effort from those candidates that have chosen to participate in them to be a part of this production.

So they, again, overwhelming praise from all of the parties that have been participating in the debate process.

And, again, as going back through the reach through this partnership with the Arizona Media Association, we still have to tally up our numbers, and, of course, keep track of -- of our data points so that we can measure success but, again, it has been unprecedented. So far we have seen everything from the, you know, the live broadcast from when we are actually conducting the debate live to it being reran over the weekend to we have had news stations where they have their 6 o'clock news, and they will cut to the live stream and say, "Hey, here is a clip of this debate" and then "Go watch it live now."

An amazing amount of media partners across the state who have been streaming it on their platforms, airing it on the radio, doing post-debate analysis shows on their programs about these. And then of course, too, the imagery from it. We have -- for every debate, we've had a pool photographer come in which essentially means we have a single Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
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.)
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photographer come in that does these professional photos throughout the debate, and then we make those available to all the candidates, the campaigns, the media outlets. And so they are getting used widely right now, which is great because part of this debate process and -- and for all of our voter education efforts, we know that it is important for voters to understand where this information is coming from in this day and age of misinformation. So we make sure that it's very clear that these are Clean Elections productions so that they know it's coming from a trusted brand.

And so far our primary election debates have been successful, and we will report back more thoroughly on -- on our metrics at the end of the year when we have that data available.

So we can move to the next slide.
Because of the success of our primary election debates, we have seen in the news that our presidential campaigns have put forth criteria that they wish to see in their debates that they would be willing to participate in, and we are very pleased to say that those criteria match the production and the format of our current debate program almost to a "T."

And so with the program that we have built, we're in a very unique position to offer the presidential candidates to come here to Arizona and debate with our
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(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
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"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 small snapshot of the work that we are doing.
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be able to fully do that, we have been working with the Secretary of State's Office on getting access to additional information on voters so that way when they come to the Clean Elections website, they can securely look up their information, confirm that they're a registered voter, confirm all of their districts, which when we have their district information, that gives us the ability to show them, here is all the candidates who are running and will be on your ballot. So essentially creating this sample ballot for them if you will.

And so we currently do that to some extent within our site as well, but having access to this data will just create a more -- a full -- create a fuller picture for the voters.

So we are working on testing that data now. We are updating our dashboard with all of the primary voting locations so we can be ready for the start of early voting and election day voting.

And our website is available to every
candidate in the State of Arizona, not just statewide and legislative and federal, but any candidate who is running to create a profile on our website. And this has been really great this year because we are seeing so many more local candidates wanting to utilizing this service. We're seeing city clerks contacting all of their candidates and sharing,
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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, but there will be no federal, statewide or legislative candidate -- no partisan candidates, I should say, on that ballot for them.

So when a voter who is registered with the No Labels Party right now, if they get their ballot in the mail
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or go to the polls, they will see one of two things. They will see either a completely blank ballot or they will see a ballot that only has local races on there if they happen to be in a jurisdiction that has a local nonpartisan race.

And so we're making sure that we are doing education to that for those voters. We're also making sure that they understand that the No Labels Party is a political party, and that you are not an Independent if you are registered as a No Labels voter.

So lots of education points around there, and where we are working with our counties to -- to do that.

And then we also have the opportunity, which I think this was something that I personally thought was pretty cool, we have worked with Coconino County specifically, but this is also for Navajo and Apache County to create additional ads in the Navajo language of Diné.

Coconino County has recognized that -- so when we talk about voter education, we know that we have to meet voters where they are, and that is different for -- you know, we're a diverse state in terms of geography and so we have to look at all of the methods that we utilize to reach voters.

There is a movie theater in Coconino County that is the single location that services voters from Apache, Coconino, and Navajo County and they have a high population of Navajo voters that visit that. So we through this
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ad.
And we can go to the next slide.
And this is my final slide that I wanted to leave. This is kind of a teaser, like a very exciting thing that -- we have a lot of exciting things we get to do in vote ed.

But one of the things that we have coming up in July is we have four cast members from Hamilton, which is currently playing right now at ASU, who have agreed to come in and talk to Clean Elections and talk about voting. So it's very exciting just given the history and the story of the Hamilton play and how it, you know, goes over the biography of Alexander Hamilton and talks about the early United States of America and in our political history.

We thought it would be a great opportunity to talk with voters through this creative idea and get those Hamilton cast members into studio and talk about, okay, let's talk about voting today and any connections and correlations to what you've seen in the play, talk about political discourse and, you know, apathy towards actually taking action and wanting to vote and participate. So this is something that we have that is on the horizon as well.

So these are, again, just some very -- you know, few highlights of what we have going on right now. Again, towards the end of the year, we will have a full wrap
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partnership with the counties, we created this ad which we will play for you, and it will air in English in this Harkins theater, but we are also utilizing our resources through digital targeting where any voter in the vicinity of this location will receive the ad in this Diné language as well, too.

So it's a great opportunity to reach voters where they are and give them voter education in the format that they are looking for in their native language.

So we can go to that -- we can actually play that video, please.
(Video played.)
MS. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, that phone number that you saw in there, that is a toll-free number that Clean Elections has set up for many years -thank you to Paula for helping us with this -- where it's actually an auto-attendant line. So any voter in those counties, they can call this phone number and then get, okay, press 1, you go to Apache County; 2, Navajo; 3, Coconino; and 4 Clean Elections.

When they go to the counties, they are automatically connected with their staff members there that speak Diné. So it's a service for them to be able to connect directly with the staff people who can help them in their
25
up for you. But with that, we can end with if there's any questions, Chairman and Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Gina. Let me just say that's -- that was a very impressive video you did of the tour of BitFire Studios; and kudos to you for standing outside the studio --

MS. ROBERTS: It was hot.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: -- in 115-degree heat and -and recording that.

But that was a very helpful video, and I hope the presidential candidates take us up on that.

Any comments or questions from Commissioners?
COMMISSIONER PATON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton.
COMMISSIONER PATON: I would just like to say
I went to some debates in the 1990s. I remember one in particular in Sierra Vista and there was like 12 people there, all family and friends of the people debating. So this has come, you know, a long way that you're inviting the presidential candidates to -- to come and debate. So very good job, and I'm proud of our whole situation that's developed out of all this.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Very well said Commissioner, thank you.

Any other comments or questions from
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advisory -- excuse me. Advisory opinion arising from a request by Star Spangled Media under the Voters Right to Know Act.

> | Commissioners, we have advisory opinion |
| :--- |
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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.
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request filed by Star Spangled Media. This question deals principally with how the media exception to Proposition 211 applies as well as whether a grant qualifies as business income under the law.

Tom, do you want to summarize the opinion draft?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I'm going to do my -- do
my best. I think -- I always feel like we've -- you guys -we've had the Commission eat dessert first when I...

COMMISSIONER PATON: This is the liver and onion?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
First, I want to thank Jon Berkon and his colleague Emma Anspach, if I'm pronouncing their name correctly, for their submission of the request. You know, Jon is here and I think that, you know, these requests we've been getting regularly I hope -- I hope the process is being effective. We certainly from -- from our end in analyzing these, think that they are helpful and we hope that -- you know, that so we hope to continue working on them.

So I was going to sort of summarize where --
where we are. This -- if we could -- Cathy, if we could go to the next slide.

One of the things that, you know, you know, we've talked about in analyzing statute and in addressing the
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The reason we have redrafted the questions 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 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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wouldn't say there is -- I should back up a second.
There are some more positive profiles than others, but the bottom line is that they're profiles of candidates and elected officials.

And "Is it owned or controlled by a party, committee, or candidate?" No, and we have no reason to believe otherwise.

So we can go to the next slide.
"Are the materials available to the general
public?" Again, yes, we think that they -- they are; it's on a website; you can look it up, you know.
"Comparable in form?" This is where we came
to the sort of nonconclusion that at this point it's --
it's -- we're not in a position to say whether or not this particular aspect would apply to Star Spangled Media.

We know some things for certain. The fact that it is a new website is not a factor. So -- so it's -so when doing the analysis, we're -- we're -- we're saying, you know, it is, in fact, you know, a relatively new website but that's not -- that's not really the -- the issue that we consider on its own terms, right? The fact it's new is not an issue.

And ideology is not a factor. In other words, you can -- the press exception does not require you to -- a news outlet to have its news coverage or its editorial
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in there as a watermark so everybody knows this is not generated by AI. The "Are the" -- and it's reproduced in the opinion in case anybody is worried about that.

Are the materials available to the general -so in $2 B$, these are subsidiary questions to $2 B$. Step 1, Step 2, Step 3, Step 4, Step 5. But they're nested, you know.

So are the materials available to the general public and are the materials comparable in form to those ordinarily issued by the press entity.

So that that -- you know, are the materials available to the general public we'll see is, we think, are pretty simple. The materials comparable in form we think is a somewhat more complicated question based on the circumstances and -- and -- of the entity.

So I guess can we go to the next one, Cathy; thank you.

So first question: "Is it a press entity?" We think the answer to that question is it is a press entity. The company, you know, regularly disseminates political and nonpolitical news stories, commentaries and editorials. And we reviewed the website and confirmed that, in fact, there are news stories on nonpolitical topics as well as other -other stories. Both positive and negative stor- -- I mean, there are both positive and negative stories. Or, I mean, I
policies be neutral in some kind of way or some kind of -some kind of, you know, Associated Press, you know, sort of approach to journalism.

And -- so but then the -- the real issue comes in for us now in terms of trying to gauge this is treatment of political and nonpolitical coverage, we concluded that we would need some more information and/or perhaps the site might in its -- in its -- in its correlated issue of boosting the coverage, we'd need more information.

So really what we're looking there to just boil it down as much as possible is, you know, the site's been available since at least -- at least March, and there's content dating until at least April. There is significant amount of candidate profile-type content. You know, there is less noncandidate or nonpolitical-type coverage.

And so on the record, we have, when you compare it to the FEC General Counsel's analysis to which the -- the company cites, we think it's not -- we're not really in a position to say if -- if that particular part of the test is met in a way that would -- you know, the idea of this opinion, right, this opinion is to create essentially a safe harbor for the folks who are -- who are asking for them. And -- and we don't think we have enough information to do that yet because the -- the baseline on the coverage in terms of the breakdown we think is -- is just not sort of developed
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well enough yet for us to make that determination.
That -- that could change, you know, obviously. And -- and -- you know, but...

So we want to be clear, though, that we're not saying that this organization is outside of -- of the press exception, right. So, so it's important to say that as much as we are saying we need more information that is not -we're not asking or -- or suggesting to the Commission in contemplating this issue we've issued the contrary conclusion. That's not -- not -- not the case.

So that's sort of the brass tacks of that issue because of -- yeah.

So, again, the business income question I think on this record is somewhat simpler. So why does this income matter? Going back to if you're a covered person engaged in campaign media spending, your business income is not -- does not make you a covered person.

So, for example, the sort of, you know, very obvious example of -- would be if Circle K Corporation, you know, sells sodas and then goes out and spend adver- -- buys advertising as Circle K Corporation, they're -- they would not be a covered person under the Act. And the notion behind that is that that regular commercial transactions that generate revenue for the company are not something that

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
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the company's own money.
So this is sort of the -- for -- for, you know, especially for Commissioner Chan and Commissioner Werther when you think about the -- the Halcyon days immediately after Citizens United came down when -- when, you know, this sort of perception that I think folks had, you know, who might have been outside of the intricacies of -- of the -- of campaign finances -- how campaigns are, in fact, financed, there was sort of a notion of, oh, okay, so corporation spending money.

Well if Coca-Cola goes out and spends money that it has from selling Coca-Cola or Cherry Coke Zero, you know that money there's -- there's no way to trace; there's no influence there. There's no corruption there; it's simply the company spending money, its own money. And so that's where the definition gets at.

If we can go to the next slide then.
So here we have a for-profit LLC that is receiving grants sort of that as I understand the request are looking at sort of underwriting the overall operations of Star Spangled Media. There's no -- there's nothing in the AOR that suggests that, you know, there's an exchange here in terms in the -- in the nature you might see in -- on a -- on a national public radio station where your, you know, your underwriting is actually advertising.
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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
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to -- try to provide an analytical framework for practitioners who are trying to advise their clients on navigating the -- both the media exception and the business income issues.

And, you know, so that -- that's sort of where we are -- where we end up.

So I guess I would -- I would leave it there, Commissioners. If you have questions -- and then when we do -- and I do have a correction to the -- to the -- that's on the -- on the supplement that I sent out last night to clarify the -- really does seek to make clear that particular box along the way regarding the ownership control was checked.

So that's -- that's sort of where we leave things. Like I said, Mr. Chairman, I -- Jon is here so I'm sure he -- well, I don't know, but he may want to -- he may have comments or observations on any number of things.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any questions or comments from members of the Commission?
(No audible response.)
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Tom, I -- let me see if I can explain my concerns on this.

MR. COLLINS: Sure.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: There are a number of -- of websites that purport to be news websites that have names
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New Republic or the National Review, right, those -- those 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,
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## kind of makes sense in the sense that if you read the

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
such -- you know, generic names that would lead you to believe that it was a news website. And they have primarily -- well, maybe not primarily, but they have a lot of political coverage about favored candidates, and they cloak some of this with other news not about those candidates, general news from other sources and stuff. But to even the casual reader, it is clear the purpose of the website is to support certain candidates or certain points of view.

If I'm right about the kind of websites I'm talking about and would -- would other -- would they be covered -- would they be exempt because they are cloaking their political views with some kind of canned news?

And I don't know if I've explained what I mean but...

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I think -- no, I mean, I think that's -- that's -- that's -- I think that's sort of -- I mean, that is an issue here in -- in -- in this general zone.

The -- the way that the FEC has analyzed that specific question takes some of the things that you're concerned about off the table. It takes off the table ideological predisposition from the -- from the content. In other words, if you're -- I mean, and that, you know, that

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
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and political news, what's their -- what's their general approach to this, and are they operating consistent with that?

And in that particular case based on, you know, sort of our reading of the General Counsel's FEC's report in that case versus this one, we don't know as much now about where this group is at, at least in our perspective, because we -- as we counted it, you know, we have, you know, somewhere around ten general interest stories in different categories and then somewhere -- a larger number of profiles of public officials and -- and -- and candidates.

So, so you know it's a little hard for us --
it's a little hard for us to gauge that exactly what you're talking about from a forum issue. But I think the most important takeaway is as much as someone might be concerned about ideology or the fact that a publication, you know, necessarily has an ideological interest, that's -- that's not, for First Amendment purposes and for regulatory purposes, that's just not the factor we're going to look at.

Does that make sense?
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It makes sense. I guess my
bottom -- bottom line concern is, are we potentially opening up a loophole that Proposition 211 was designed to close telling people that if you put some general other stuff around your political message, it therefore becomes media.
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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.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton. Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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MR. COLLINS: Well, I guess I wouldn't say that we are opening a loophole at all. That -- that rather what we're trying to deal with is the -- the outskirts of the media exception, right.

So there is -- there are a number of different theories on why there ought to be a media exception, most of them are grounded in some kind of way within the First Amendment's press protections.

So if you -- to go back to the example of National Review/New Republic, which I know dates me significantly in the current climate, but we know -- we know that those publications have different ideologies and definitely promote the issues of their -- their ideologies at a minimum, not the parties.

So -- so we're trying -- what we're trying to do is say, okay, there's still -- you know, is it -- is it a legitimate -- I mean, that's the words in the test -legitimate test function, so that we are trying to probe on the question of whether or not it's legitimate. But legitimacy, the framework of answering the question, is going to have to do with whether or not there's a norm established that -- that we can -- that, within the publication essentially, that -- that we can look to.

And here, right, so we get -- we have a ver --
we have limited facts and I understand there's some tension
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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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 whether the press exception applies." Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

|  | 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 -- 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. |
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| 1 | MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. | 1 | revisit as far as trying to look at what we might do to get |
| 2 | COMMISSIONER PATON: It's all about the | 2 | to a brighter line rule here and/or whether or not we would |
| 3 | language; it's all about how far can we stretch this or that | 3 | as a staff want to make a recommendation that that -- if we |
| 4 | or whatever. | 4 | are going to go that route, that it go through a different |
| 5 | MR. COLLINS: Right, right. | 5 | regulatory avenue, right, those are both real questions -- |
| 6 | COMMISSIONER PATON: So I think we -- I hate | 6 | COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. |
| 7 | to do this 'cause I don't like a bunch of rules. | 7 | MR. COLLINS: -- and we could come back to |
| 8 | MR. COLLINS: Right. | 8 | those in a subsequent meeting. |
| 9 | COMMISSIONER PATON: But I think if we said: | 9 | COMMISSIONER PATON: Maybe we could ask Kara, |
| 10 | All right, if it's 50 percent dog bite stories, then that's | 10 | is this something that -- that you see coming to us and that |
| 11 | enough -- a lot of filler, that's a lot of other stuff -- | 11 | we're going to be stewing about on -- |
| 12 | MR. COLLINS: Right. | 12 | MR. COLLINS: This is -- this is the Executive |
| 13 | COMMISSIONER PATON: -- then I -- then maybe | 13 | Director's role -- |
| 14 | they're okay. You know? | 14 | COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. |
| 15 | MR. COLLINS: I -- I mean, Mr. Chairman, | 15 | MR. COLLINS: -- it's not a Kara question. |
| 16 | Commissioner, I think -- I take -- I take all those points. | 16 | COMMISSIONER PATON: Okay. |
| 17 | I think that there's -- I think there's a case being made | 17 | MR. COLLINS: It's just not, I'm sorry. |
| 18 | there. I think if we -- if we -- just before we get to back | 18 | But the -- so -- so I take your point. And I |
| 19 | to Commissioner Kimble's other question, what I will say | 19 | think that if we want to work through that question, we would |
| 20 | about that is this, there's -- as much as I'm sure that -- | 20 | need some more time to talk to internally, come back with a |
| 21 | well, I'm not sure, but -- but as much as there is an | 21 | recommendation on two points. |
| 22 | incentive institutionally to get this voted on today and | 22 | Number one, whether or not we can in |
| 23 | produced and out, right, that's not -- that's not -- there's | 23 | reanalyzing the -- the -- reanalyzing this question, looking |
| 24 | nothing -- there's nothing that requires that. | 24 | for more -- a better, more black-and-white, definitive way |
| 25 | So if there's stuff we think we would want to | 25 | that provides more guidance and/or maybe reaches a conclusion |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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. | 6 | 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. |
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| 1 | So I do think it provides an objective test. | 1 | back with another advisory opinion, right, to provide the |
| 2 | I know it kind of takes a number of pages into the opinion to | 2 | information that's requested. But, obviously, it's not, you |
| 3 | get there just because I think it was necessary to explain | 3 | know. |
| 4 | why that might be the test, but I do think it actually sets | 4 | But setting us aside from the regulated |
| 5 | forth a test that practitioners in this space fundamentally | 5 | community, there are those that prefer to proceed without an |
| 6 | understand and are familiar with | 6 | advisory opinion, and I think they can look at this and have |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. So to summarize, you | 7 | an understanding of how in the case of an enforcement action, |
| 8 | are supportive of Mr. Collins' analysis and his | 8 | the Commission would deal with it. Those who prefer the |
| 9 | recommendation? | 9 | security of the advisory opinion, like my client, I think, |
| 10 | MR. BERKON: Yeah, I am. And, obviously, you | 10 | you know, would have to come back with -- with additional |
| 11 | know, we have our views about our particular -- our client, | 11 | facts. |
| 12 | but I understand the reservations given the newness of the | 12 | But I think the test articulated is -- is the |
| 13 | organization. And frankly, this is a bit of an iterative | 13 | right one, and I think that provides a helpful structure. |
| 14 | process I think we've seen with some of the other advisory | 14 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much, |
| 15 | opinions: There's a request, there's kind of a | 15 | Mr. Berkon. |
| 16 | back-and-forth. Because the regulative community doesn't | 16 | Are there any other questions or comments from |
| 17 | have a clear understanding necessarily of what all the | 17 | members of the Commission? |
| 18 | grounds rules are going to be, I think figuring out kind of | 18 | COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman. |
| 19 | the -- the factual presentation is necessary in order to get | 19 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther. |
| 20 | a firm answer of something we are all trying to figure out. | 20 | COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: So I also |
| 21 | So I think, you know, given the timeline here, | 21 | understand sort of the reasoning for why we'd like a |
| 22 | this provides us with a significant amount of guidance. | 22 | bright-line test; I think that always helps everyone. But in |
| 23 | I think, clearly, the Commission is not saying | 23 | this instance, we do have an existing test, and I think |
| 24 | yes or no such that if we wanted an advisory opinion to say | 24 | people are comfortable and the community is comfortable kind |
| 25 | "you have a shield from enforcement," we would have to come | 25 | of relying on what the FEC has already outlined, as well as |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | the fact that there is already case law to support it. |  | opinion or send it back for more work or whatever your |
| 2 | So I think from our perspective, while we | 2 | pleasure? |
| 3 | could create a rule that has a certain percentage or | 3 | COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Mr. Chairman. |
| 4 | something like that, we would sort of be charting new | 4 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Werther. |
| 5 | territory in a sense versus if something like this come | 5 | COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: I motion to |
| 6 | forward to us as a complaint, we actually have something else | 6 | approve the Advisory Opinion 2024-05. |
| 7 | we can look at and 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. | 8 | approve the advisory opinion. Is there a second? |
| 9 | So I'm hopeful that that will -- we won't get | 9 | COMMISSIONER PATON: I'll second. |
| 10 | too much in that situation, although I know that might occur. | 10 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner |
| 11 | But I think I would be more in favor of just relying on the | 11 | Paton. |
| 12 | analysis and sort of the test that's already existing. | 12 | It's been moved and seconded that we approve |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Commissioner. | 13 | the advisory opinion as written. I'll call the roll. |
| 14 | Any other comments from members of the | 14 | Commissioner Werther. |
| 15 | Commission? | 15 | COMMISSIONER ESTES-WERTHER: Aye. |
| 16 | (No audible response.) | 16 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other comments from | 17 | COMMISSIONER PATON: 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? | 21 | The motion is approved 4-to-nothing. |
| 22 | MR. BERKON: Nothing more from me, thank you. | 22 | Thank you very much, Tom. And thank you very |
| 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 <br> Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com | 25 | CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Item VI. This is the time Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com |
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| 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. |
| 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. | 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 |  |
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|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:1, } 9: 4,9: 14,10: 20, \\ & 10: 24,11: 11,11: 15, \\ & 25: 3,25: 8,25: 14, \\ & 25: 23,26: 3,26: 15, \\ & 26: 18,26: 20,38: 18, \\ & 38: 21,38: 24,42: 21, \\ & 44: 25,45: 12,50: 15, \\ & 52: 7,53: 14,53: 19, \\ & 54: 13,54: 17,54: 20, \\ & 54: 23,55: 4,55: 7, \\ & 55: 10,55: 16,55: 18, \\ & 55: 20,55: 25,56: 11, \\ & 56: 18,56: 20,56: 24, \\ & 57: 1,57: 3 \\ & \text { challenge }[1]-4: 18 \\ & \text { Chan }[4]-4: 4,35: 3, \\ & 55: 18,56: 22 \\ & \text { CHAN }[3]-4: 5,55: 19, \\ & 56: 23 \\ & \text { chance }[2]-4: 19,5: 8 \\ & \text { change }[2]-21: 6, \\ & 34: 2 \\ & \text { Chapter }[1]-18: 4 \\ & \text { charting }[1]-54: 4 \\ & \text { check }[1]-36: 25 \\ & \text { checked }[1]-38: 13 \\ & \text { Cherry }[1]-35: 12 \\ & \text { chose }[1]-20: 14 \\ & \text { chosen }[1]-14: 4 \\ & \text { Circle }[2]-34: 19, \\ & 34: 21 \\ & \text { circumstances }[1]- \\ & 31: 15 \\ & \text { cites }[1]-33: 18 \\ & \text { Citizens }[3]-35: 5, \\ & 40: 19,40: 20 \\ & \text { city }[2]-19: 25,20: 4 \\ & \text { clarify }[1]-38: 11 \\ & \text { clarity }[1]-36: 24 \\ & \text { Clean }[9]-11: 23, \\ & 15: 9,16: 15,18: 23, \\ & 19: 3,20: 1,23: 15, \\ & 23: 20,24: 10 \\ & \text { clear }[6]-8: 13,15: 9, \\ & 34: 4,38: 11,39: 7, \\ & 52: 17 \\ & \text { clearly }[3]-40: 2,40: 3, \\ & 52: 23 \\ & \text { clerks }[1]-19: 25 \\ & \text { client }[4]-51: 1,51: 22, \\ & 52: 11,53: 9 \\ & \text { clients }[1]-38: 2 \\ & \text { climate }[1]-43: 11 \\ & \text { clip }[1]-14: 18 \\ & \text { cloak }[1]-39: 5 \\ & \text { cloaking }[1]-39: 12 \\ & \text { close }[1]-42: 23 \\ & \text { closed }[1]-21: 13 \\ & \text { Coalition }[1]-6: 11 \\ & \text { Coca }[2]-35: 11, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 35:12 <br> Coca-Cola [2]-35:11, 35:12 <br> Coconino [5] - 22:14, 22:17, 22:22, 22:24, 23:19 <br> Coke [1] - 35:12 <br> Cola [2]-35:11, 35:12 <br> colleague [1]-27:14 <br> COLLINS $[33]$ - 4:15, <br> 5:6, 9:11, 27:7, <br> 27:12, 38:23, 39:16, <br> 43:1, 44:24, 45:3, <br> 46:3, 46:16, 46:23, <br> 47:1, 47:5, 47:8, <br> 47:11, 47:15, 47:18, <br> 47:21, 47:23, 48:1, <br> 48:5, 48:8, 48:12, <br> 48:15, 49:7, 49:12, <br> 49:15, 49:17, 50:7, <br> 50:9, 50:13 <br> Collins [1] - 50:20 <br> Collins' [1]-52:8 <br> comfortable [2] - <br> 53:24 <br> Comic [1]-6:13 <br> comic [1]-6:16 <br> Comic-Con [1] - 6:13 <br> coming [6] - 7:22, <br> 8:19, 15:7, 15:10, <br> 24:7, 49:10 <br> comment [4]-56:2, <br> 56:6, 56:8, 56:9 <br> commentaries [1] - <br> 31:21 <br> comments [13]-9:3, <br> 25:12, 25:25, 26:16, <br> 38:17, 38:18, 53:16, <br> 54:14, 54:17, 54:20, <br> 55:23, 56:1, 56:12 <br> commercial [1] - <br> 34:23 <br> Commission [19] - <br> 4:25, 5:17, 11:13, <br> 11:18, 27:9, 34:8, <br> 38:19, 45:15, 45:16, <br> 45:19, 45:24, 51:3, <br> 51:19, 52:23, 53:8, <br> 53:17, 54:15, 54:24, <br> 56:13 <br> commission [1]-7:1 <br> Commission's [2]- <br> 51:3, 51:5 <br> Commissioner [25] 4:4, 4:6, 4:8, 9:4, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 35:3, 44:25, 45:13, 46:4, 46:18, 48:16, 48:19, 53:19, 54:13, 55:4, 55:10, 55:14, | 55:16, 55:18, 56:22, 56:24, 57:1 <br> COMMISSIONER [54] <br> - 4:5, 4:7, 4:9, 5:5, <br> 8:25, 9:2, 9:6, 9:12, <br> 10:5, 10:18, 10:22, <br> 11:2, 25:13, 25:15, <br> 26:2, 26:4, 27:10, <br> 44:22, 45:1, 45:4, <br> 46:15, 46:21, 46:24, <br> 47:2, 47:6, 47:9, <br> 47:12, 47:16, 47:22, <br> 47:24, 48:2, 48:6, <br> 48:9, 48:13, 49:6, <br> 49:9, 49:14, 49:16, <br> 50:6, 50:8, 50:11, <br> 53:18, 53:20, 55:3, <br> 55:5, 55:9, 55:15, <br> 55:17, 55:19, 56:16, <br> 56:19, 56:23, 56:25, <br> 57:2 <br> Commissioners [14] 8:18, 9:19, 10:12, <br> 11:11, 12:20, 17:2, <br> 23:13, 25:2, 25:12, <br> 26:1, 26:15, 26:16, <br> 26:25, 38:8 <br> committee [2]-30:21, <br> 32:6 <br> communities [2] - <br> 18:4, 18:5 <br> community [9]-18:2, 18:9, 28:2, 29:4, 50:21, 51:1, 52:16, 53:5, 53:24 <br> company [8] - 31:20, 33:18, 34:24, 35:15, 36:10, 37:9, 41:7 <br> company's [2] - 35:1, 36:24 <br> comparable [4]-31:9, <br> 31:13, 32:12, 51:5 <br> compare [1] - 33:17 <br> compared [1] - 45:9 <br> comparison [1] - <br> 44:11 <br> compass [1]-20:9 <br> competitive [1] - <br> 12:12 <br> complaint [1] - 54:6 <br> complete [1]-10:3 <br> completely [2] - <br> 17:16, 22:2 <br> completes [1]-8:7 <br> complex [1] - 36:22 <br> complicated [2] - <br> 28:5, 31:14 <br> Con [1]-6:13 <br> concern [1] - 42:22 <br> concerned [2] - 39:22, | 42:15 concerns $[3]-12: 13$, $38: 22,40: 6$ conclude ${ }_{[2]}-45: 15$, 45:16 concluded $[3]-5: 11$, $33: 6,44: 17$ concludes $[1]-57: 5$ concluding $[1]-45: 20$ conclusion $[4]-$ $28: 19,34: 10,45: 24$, 49:25 conduct $[2]-51: 24$, $51: 25$ conducting $[1]-14: 15$ Conference $[1]-6: 11$ confirm $[2]-19: 5$ confirmed $[1]-31: 22$ conform $[1]-51: 24$ conforms $[1]-51: 24$ connect $[3]-9: 24$, $10: 3,23: 23$ connected $[1]-23: 22$ connections $[1]-$ $24: 18$ consequence $[1]-$ $36: 8$ consider $[1]-32: 21$ consideration $[4]-$ $50: 19,51: 11,56: 1$, $56: 4$ considerations $[2]-$ $40: 17,51: 19$ consistent $[1]-42: 2$ contacting $[1]-19: 25$ contacts $[1]-16: 13$ contain $[1]-29: 21$ contemplating $[1]-$ $34: 9$ content $[8]-6: 1,11: 5$, $30: 10,33: 13,33: 14$, $39: 23,44: 2,51: 16$ content-based $[1]-$ $51: 16$ context $[5]-28: 2$, $40: 15,41: 3,41: 6$, $44: 7$ continue $[3]-5: 13$, $13: 25,27: 20$ continued $[1]-6: 6$ continuing $[2]-17: 6$, $20: 23$ contrary $[1]-34: 9$ control $[1]-38: 12$ controlled $[3]-30: 20$, $32: 5$ convened $[1]-18: 22$ cool $[2]-6: 18,22: 14$ core Corporation $-46: 13$ $[2]-$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


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



| 32:22, 33:4, 33:8, 34:9, 34:12, 39:18, 40:7, 40:9, 40:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { knows }[1]-31: 1 \\ & \text { kudos }[1]-25: 5 \end{aligned}$ | lineup [1] - 17:3 <br> list $[2]$ - 9:23, 28:14 <br> literally [1] $-28: 9$ <br> litigation [1] - 21:18 <br> live [4]-14:14, 14:15, <br> 14:17, 14:19 <br> liver ${ }_{[1]}-27: 10$ <br> LLC ${ }_{[1]}-35: 18$ <br> local [5] - 19:23, 22:3, <br> 22:4, 26:8, 26:9 <br> location [2]-22:23, <br> 23:5 <br> locations [1] - 19:17 <br> Look [1] - 37:4 <br> look [14]-8:23, 19:4, <br> 20:19, 22:21, 32:11, <br> 40:6, 41:18, 41:23, <br> 42:19, 43:23, 49:1, <br> 53:6, 54:7 <br> looked [3]-40:15, <br> 41:8, $41: 9$ <br> looking [9] - 16:5, <br> 17:10, 18:9, 23:9, <br> 33:10, 35:20, 40:25, <br> 44:7, 49:23 <br> looks [1] - 4:23 <br> loophole [2]-42:23, <br> 43:2 <br> lose [1]-41:22 <br> love [1] - 46:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { meaning }[1]-51: 15 \\ & \text { means }[7]-14: 25 \text {, } \\ & \text { 16:1, 21:14, 21:17, } \\ & \text { 29:22, 36:2, 36:6 } \\ & \text { measure }[1]-14: 12 \\ & \text { measures }[1]-13: 10 \\ & \text { Media }[14]-12: 5, \\ & 14: 10,26: 23,27: 1, \\ & 28: 24,29: 23,32: 15, \\ & 35: 21,36: 7,36: 16, \\ & 41: 5,44: 20,45: 17, \\ & \text { 46:1 } \\ & \text { media }[23]-12: 12, \\ & 14: 20,15: 3,16: 3, \\ & 27: 2,28: 8,28: 25, \\ & 29: 19,30: 3,30: 8, \\ & 34: 16,36: 12,36: 20, \\ & 37: 10,38: 3,40: 2, \\ & 41: 22,42: 25,43: 4, \\ & 43: 6,45: 18,51: 5, \\ & 51: 22 \\ & \text { Media's }[1]-45: 22 \\ & \text { meet }[1]-22: 18 \\ & \text { meeting }[5]-4: 2,4: 3, \\ & 5: 3,8: 10,49: 8 \\ & \text { meetings }[1]-8: 20 \\ & \text { member }[1]-54: 24 \\ & \text { members }[9]-7: 1, \\ & 12: 11,23: 22,24: 8, \\ & 24: 17,38: 19,53: 17, \\ & 54: 14,54: 18 \\ & \text { memo }[2]-41: 9, \\ & 41: 19 \\ & \text { memos }[1]-41: 9 \\ & \text { mentioned }[3]-11: 18, \\ & 12: 25,17: 22 \\ & \text { message }[1]-42: 25 \\ & \text { met }[1]-33: 20 \\ & \text { method }[2]-13: 7, \\ & 13: 8 \\ & \text { methods }[1]-22: 21 \\ & \text { metrics }[2]-15: 13, \\ & \text { 18:18 } \\ & \text { might }[9]-29: 24, \\ & 33: 8,35: 7,35: 23, \\ & 36: 12,42: 15,49: 1, \\ & 52: 4,54: 10 \\ & \text { Mike }[1]-11: 25 \\ & \text { million }[1]-17: 20 \\ & \text { minds }[1]-45: 5 \\ & \text { minimum }[1]-43: 14 \\ & \text { minutes }[6]-4: 2, \\ & 4: 11,4: 15,4: 19,5: 8, \\ & 56: 7 \\ & \text { mirror }[1]-20: 12 \\ & \text { misinformation }[1]- \\ & 15: 8 \\ & \text { mission }[1]-5: 17 \\ & \text { mix }[1]-41: 25 \\ & \text { model }[1]-41: 8 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | moderators [1] - 12:6 money [8]-35:1, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| :15, 41:21, 42: |  |  |  | 36:10, 46 |
|  | ```Label [1] - 21:19 Labels [5] - 21:10, 21:16, 21:25, 22:7, 22:9 lag[2]-7:8, 7:11 language [5] - 22:16, 23:5, 23:9, 23:25, 48:3 large [1]-51:1 larger [1] - 42:10 last [7] - 4:2, 5:11, 6:11, 9:15, 12:2, 38:10, 47:19 late [1] - 9:12``` |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { issues }[11]-7: 24, \\ 28: 20,28: 21,2 \end{array}$ |  |  |  | morning ${ }_{[1]}-8: 15$ <br> most $[4]$ - 13:20, 26:9, |
| 15, 38:4, 43 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 10,26: 23,27: 1, \\ & 28: 24,29: 23,32: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { most }[4]-13: 20,26: 9, \\ & 42: 14,43: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 44:18, 46:13, 50:22 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 21,36: 7,36: 16, \\ & 41: 5,44: 20,45: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mostly }[1]-12: 20 \\ & \text { motion }[6]-54: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
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|  | :2, 53 | reached | ively [1] | 25:7, 26:1 |
|  | provides [6] - 37:1 | reaches [1]-49:25 | release [1] - 16: | ROGERS [1] - 23:13 |
|  | 49:25, 51:21, 52:1 52:22, 53:13 | reaching $[4]-6: 21$, | released [1] - 4:16 | role [1] - 49:13 |
|  | providing [1] - 37:2 | $\begin{gathered} 6: 22,17: 7,26: 8 \\ \text { read }[4]-4: 19,39: 25 \end{gathered}$ | 37: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { roll [3] - 4:4, } \\ & 56: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | public [12]-7:20 | 46:7, 47:19 | reliance [1]-37 | route [1] - 49:4 |
|  | 13:14, 29:2, $31: 9$ $31: 12,32: 10,35:$ | reader [1] - 39:7 <br> reading [3]-17:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relying }[3]-53: 25, \\ & 54: 8,54: 11 \end{aligned}$ | Ruelas [1] - 12:7 <br> rule [5] - 28:16, 4 |
|  | 11, 54:18, 56:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { eading }[3]- \\ & 18: 1,42: 5 \end{aligned}$ | remand [2]-4:23, | $50: 4,51: 9,54$ |
|  | 56:12 | ready ${ }_{[1]}-19$ | 8:1 | rules [4]-21:5, 48:7, |
|  | publication [6] | real [4]-33:4, 46:9 | remanded [1] - 4: | 51:17, 52:18 |
|  | 41:10, 41:12, 42:16, | 46:11, 49:5 | remarkably [1] - 12:9 | running [6]-10:25, |
|  | 43:22, 44:1 <br> ublications [1] | really [20] - 5:16, 5:18, | remember [1]-25:16 | 17:8, 19:8, 19:21, |
|  | 43:12 | $23,14: 2$ | report [9]-4:13, 7:16, | Rábago [1]-12:7 |
|  | publisher [2] - 41:10, | 23, 19:22, 26:7 | 8:8, 8:14, 11:13, |  |
|  | 41:1 | :10, 29:15, 30:9 | $15: 12,17: 23,36: 13$ | S |
|  | purport [1] -38:25 | 3:11, 46:1 | reports [2]-29:20 | [1] - 33:22 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { purpose }[5]-10: 7 \text {, } \\ & 39: 7,41: 11,41: 12, \end{aligned}$ | reanalyzing [2] | representative [1] - <br> $7 \cdot 1$ | sample [1] - 19:9 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 7,41: 11,41: 12, \\ & 41: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:23 } \\ & \text { reason [4]-9:9, 29: } \end{aligned}$ | 7:1 <br> reproduced [1] - 31:2 | satisfied [1] - 37:1 <br> save [1]-13:15 |
|  | purposes [2] - 42:18, | 29:12, 32:6 | Republic [3] - 8 | saw [1]-23:14 |
|  |  | reasoned [1] - 45:2 | $40: 1,43: 10$ | scenes [1] - 16:18 |
|  | put $[8]-8: 13,15: 18$ | reasoning [1]-53:21 | Republican [2]-21:9, | schedule [3]-13:4, |
|  | 18:12, 18:22, 30:17, | receive [1]-23:5 |  | 13:9, 13:13 |
|  | 30:25, 42:24, 45:21 | received [3]-5:16, | Republicans [1] - 40:8 | school [1]-20:4 |
|  | Q | receiving $[2]-18: 15$, $35: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:2, 26:23, 27:1, } \\ & \text { 27:15, 35:19, 52:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 1,55: 8,55: 9, \\ & 56: 18,56: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | qualifies $[1]-27: 3$ qualitative [1] - 46:19 | recently [1] - 21:1 <br> recognized [2]-21:8 | requested [1]-53:2 <br> requests [1]-27:16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { seconded }[3]-4: 1, \\ 55: 12,56: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | question/comment | 2 | require [1] - 32:24 | secondly [1] - 50:3 |
|  | 44:2 | recognizing [1] - 40:5 | requires [1] - 48:2 | Secretary [1] - 19:2 |
|  | questionnaire [1] 20:10 | recommendation [3] - | reran ${ }_{[1]}-14: 15$ rescheduling | securely [1] - 19:4 <br> security [1]-53:9 |
|  | questions [20]-5:22, | recommendations [1] | $56:$ | see [11] - 6:5, 15:18, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 25,6: 1,8: 24, \\ & \text { 11:12, 18:1, 20:11, } \end{aligned}$ | - 18:23 | research [1] - 50:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 1,22: 2,28: 17 \\ & 31: 12,35: 23,38: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 25:2, 25:12, 25:25, | 34:14, 44: | 52: | $45: 1,49: 10$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:1, 28:8, 29:1, } \\ & \text { 29:8, 29:13, 31:5, } \end{aligned}$ | Recorder's [1] - 6:8 | resource [1] - 18:10 | seeing [5] - 18:1, 18:9, |
|  | 38:8, 38:18, 49:5, | recording [1] - 25:9 | resources [1]-23 <br> respond [2]-10.2 | $19: 23,19: 24,56: 11$ $\text { seek }[1]-38: 11$ |
|  | , | records [1] - 41:16 <br> redrafted [1]-29:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { respond [2] - 10:2 } \\ & \text { 20:12 } \end{aligned}$ | seek [1] $-38: 11$ select $[1]-21: 14$ |
|  | $y[1]-20: 15$ | regarding [4] - 4:1 | responding $[1]-56:$ | selecting [1] - 21:12 |
|  | quite [2] - 41:11, | $38: 12,50: 24,51: 9$ | response [7]-10:1 | selling [1] - $35: 12$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |




