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| public meeting before the citizens clean <br> ELECTIONS COMMISSION, convened at 9:34 a.m. on <br> January 19, 2017, at the State of Arizona, Clean <br> Elections Commission, 1616 West Adams, Conference Room, <br> Phoenix, Arizona, in the presence of the following Board <br> members: <br> Mr. Steve Titla, Chairperson <br> Mr. Mitchell C. Laird <br> Mr. Mark S. Kimble <br> Mr. Galen D. Paton <br> others present: <br> Thomas M. Collins, Executive Director Paula Thomas, Executive Officer <br> Sara Larsen, Financial Affairs Officer Gina Roberts, Voter Education Manager Mike Becker, Policy Director <br> Alec Shaffer, Executive Support Specialist Mary O'Grady, Osborn Maledon <br> Amy Jicha, Legal Admin and VE Intern Rivko Knox, LWV/AZ <br> Constantin Querard, Campaign Consultant <br> Andy Gaona, Coppersmith Brockelman <br> Jim Barton, Torres Law Group <br> Joel Edman, AZ Advisory Network <br> Gary Gilger, Self <br> Mirja Riester, Riester <br> Christina Caviglea, Riester <br> Christina Borrego, Riester | CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion carries <br> unanimously. <br> We'll go to Item III, discussion and <br> possible action on the executive director's report. <br> MR. COLLINS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, thank you. <br> I just wanted to let you know our live <br> stream is down for live streaming. The meeting will be <br> available as soon as we get -- as soon as we're done <br> and we get it up. So we were expecting live stream <br> today. It's not -- it's not functioning for some <br> reason, but it will be recorded and available on our <br> live stream website at livestream.com/cleanelections. <br> A couple of quick notes: Chairman Titla, <br> Gina Roberts and Alec Schaffer attended the Indian <br> Nations and Tribes Legislative Day at the Arizona <br> Legislature last week which I think was a great <br> opportunity for all three of them. <br> And today -- or this month, we reached -- <br> Paula Thomas has reached 25 years of working for the <br> 21 State, serving the State. She has -- she's been with <br> 22 this agency. She was the section employee hired by the <br> 23 Clean Elections Commission, and she was, I think, the <br> 24 second employee hired by the Arizona Department of <br> 25 Gaming as well. So she is an invaluable resource for |
| PROCEEDING <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: This is the regularly <br> scheduled Clean Elections Commission meeting. The date is Thursday, January 9 [sic], 2017, 9:30 a.m. <br> The Commission may go into executive <br> session, which will not be open to the public, for the <br> purpose of obtaining legal advice on any item listed on the agenda. <br> So why don't we call this meeting to order. <br> And Item Number I, discussion and possible action on <br> the Commission minutes for the December 15, 2016 <br> meeting. <br> Any question, Commissioners? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Do we have a motion to <br> approve the minutes? <br> COMMISSIONER LAIRD: I so move. <br> COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Second. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion by Commissioner <br> Laird, second by Commissioner Kimble. <br> All in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Opposed? <br> (No response.) | 1 us, and we just wanted to make sure that we <br> 2 congratulate her for that, that continued work. <br> 3 The -- there are elections coming up in <br> 4 March in Phoenix over in Goodyear specifically. The <br> 5 last date to register to vote is February 13. <br> I want to call your attention to a couple <br> of things. One, the legislative report that Mike <br> prepared -- Mike Becker prepared is Attachment 2 to the <br> 9 executive director's report. If you have any questions <br> about that, those -- and most of those I don't think <br> are moving. One has a hearing today, but it's not a <br> major concern to us. It's just -- it does touch on <br> some issues that we've worked on, but it's not a Clean <br> Elections bill per se. <br> I also want to just call your attention to <br> the Hank Stephenson's story in the "Capitol Times." <br> There are trigger reports that the legislature passed <br> when they increased the campaign finance limits. Those <br> were eliminated under 1516, and it appears that there's <br> not going to be any enforcement of those at all -- or <br> evaluation, for that matter. <br> It's kind of an interesting issue because <br> there was sort of a deal in 2593 back years ago. I <br> 24 think maybe very few of you were here then, but they <br> 25 raised the campaign finance limits. And we were going |

1 stood with voter registration for the general election,
2 the total registered voters for the state that were
3 eligible -- excuse me -- for the general election, we
4 had just under 3.6 million, and our overall turnout was
574.17 percent.

6 Just to give you a good visualization of
7 turnout for the general and the primary, you can see
8 obviously the trend is always that participation
9 increases. In the general election it's always lower.
10 In the primary, in particular, we did have a
11 presidential election, so that's why we saw a good 12 turnout this year.
13 I wanted to point out the turnout by
14 county. We saw a couple of interesting points here,
15 that Yavapai and Pima County were actually the two top
16 highest turnouts in our counties across the state. So
17 I wanted to share that information with you as well.
18 And to give you an idea of where Arizona
19 stood compared to the national level, you can see that
20 the turnout for the presidential election nationwide
21 was approximately 59.5 percent and then Arizona -- and
22 I'll explain why this number differs a little bit than
23 what I first showed you in that first slide. We're at
2456.2 percent. So this -- to give you a true

25 comparison, every state is different in the

So I wanted to mention that.
So, anyway, if you -- if you -- you know,
Mr. Titla and Mr. Meyer and Mr. Laird, if you can
persuade her to not go, now is the time, but -- but I
think it's a pretty impressive place to get into.
6 COMMISSIONER MEYER: Congratulations.
7 MS. JICHA: Thank you.
8 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Congratulations. William
and Mary is a good school.
MS. JICHA: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions on the executive director's report, Commissioners?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN TITLA: If not, why don't we go to
the next item on the agenda which is discussion and
possible action on voter education activities in the
2016 election and the 2017 voter education plan.
Gina?
MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, good morning.

Good morning. So today what we have for
you is a recap of our education activities for the
23 general election, and then we'll dive into what our
24 plans are for 2017.
25 So to give you an idea of where this state
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1 registration requirements and in turnout. So this is
2 actually based on the voting-eligible population, so
3 that's why that 56.2 percent number is a little bit
4 lower than the 74 percent that I mentioned earlier. So
5 just to give you an idea of where we stand nationally.
6 So what did we actually communicate to
7 voters? We continued with our vote informed theme, and
8 that mostly had to do with logistics to voting. So how
9 do I actually register to vote for this election? If I
10 want to vote early, how do I get my ballot? Can I vote
11 early in person? And how do I return that ballot? And
12 then, of course, election day information. How do I
13 find my polling place when the poll is open? And we
14 also communicated to voters about the tools that Clean
15 Elections provides such as our debates, our Voter
16 Education Guide, the app, the candidate compass, all
17 the information on our website.
18 And to get this message out to voters, we
19 used a broad variety of media tactics. And so we had
20 our traditional media tactics and we also did out of
21 home, such as our billboards and social media and
22 print. So we had a really strong, strong tactic plan
23 here.
24 You've seen most of this before, so I'm
25 going to go through it pretty quickly. Essentially,
what we did was we repurposed a lot of the creative
2 that we used in the primary for the general, just
3 updated it for the dates. So I'll go through those 4 pretty quickly.
5 One thing I did want to note, for our radio
rates -- and I know you can't see this, but we were
very specific. So to give you an example, for early
8 voting -- I'll just read that one very quickly.
9 Early voting for the general election
10 starts October 12th. Vote by mail or in person at
11 designated early voting sites. To learn more, visit
12 azcleanelections.gov/general. So we tried to be very
13 clear to voters about what the message we were
14 communicating, and then just really within that -- that
15 radio rate giving the information that they need.
16 So, again, I'll go through these pretty
17 quickly. Like I said, you've seen most of these
18 before. We had our banner ads. Our mobile ads were
19 the most successful, actually. Most people view the
20 internet on their phone lately, and we did search as
21 well. So if you're typing in, you know, "Arizona
22 ballot" in Google, then Clean Elections will pop up.
23 And this was actually the number one driver to our
24 website. So this was a very successful tactic for us,
25 and we'll continue to utilize this.

1 Our print and our social posts. We had an 2 increased presence on social media this past year, and
3 we saw that to be very successful for us in terms of 4 clicks and engagement. It was also very, I think,
5 beneficial to the voters because they could put
6 questions out there and within 24 hours our team was
responding to those and getting them the information
8 they need. Sometimes quicker. We had a very high
9 response rate with Facebook.
10 So overall between Facebook and Instagram,
11 we had 3.8 million impressions. So that was -- we're
12 pretty proud of that, that voters were presented with
13 the opportunity to get this information. And we also
14 had our infographics and, again, you've seen most of
15 these before. We repurposed a lot of the creative
16 again, but just basically it details the steps. You
17 know, it can be -- there's a lot of steps to
18 participate in an election, and so we wanted to break
19 those down for voters with our several infographics.
20 So we had how to participate but then also
21 what offices are up for election at the state level.
22 So we detailed what the responsibilities are for
23 someone who's running for Corporation Commission and
24 the state legislature.
25 And our billboards. So, again, very direct

1 information. We were -- we were pretty specific.
2 There's an election on November 8th. Vote informed and
3 you can go to this site to get the information you
4 need.
5 And we did increase our Native American
6 outreach, and in terms of our paid media, we did have
7 radio spots. We had prints and, again, we had our
8 billboards, and so we'll continue to work for
9 increasing that.
10 So everything that we communicated to
11 voters, it all drove them back to our website. And on
12 our website we essentially had everything someone would
13 need so they can understand, one, how can I participate
14 in this election? What is the election even about?
15 How do I get my ballot? Once I have my ballot, how do
16 I vote that ballot informed? How do I make an informed
17 decision? And how do I return it?
18 So our website really was -- I know you
19 hear the term "a one-stop shop" a lot, but in this case
20 it truly was because it could take the voter all the
21 way from the beginning of the process to the end. And
22 so, again, all of our media tactics, everything we had
23 out there drove the voter directly back to our website.
24 This year we had to send out a Voter
25 Education Guide, and so for the general election we had
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11.9 million pieces that were sent out, and then in

2 addition to that, we had 15,000 that we had in bulk
3 shipments. So those were delivered to the counties, to
4 libraries, community organizations across the state.
5 And we provide our guide in several different formats,
6 so English, Spanish, Navajo, and we also worked with
7 SunSounds which is a reading service. And we had
8 the -- in addition to the print version that we sent
9 out, we also had it available digitally.
10 And the content -- the information that we
11 had in the guide -- the pictures of the candidates,
12 their contact information, their statements -- all of
13 that content was able to be accessed by voters not
14 through just the guide but also through the app,
15 through our find my candidates tool and the candidate
16 compass tool. So it was integrated into all of the
17 tools that we could provide.
18 And if you'll recall, this year we actually
19 sent out district-specific pamphlets. So instead of
20 sending that big, thick guide to every voter, we made
21 it so, okay, LD1 voters are only going to get the LD1
22 candidates. LD9 voters will only get the LD9
23 candidates. And to give you an example of how that
24 proved to be efficient for us and for both the primary
25 and the general voter education guides, the cost to do
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this in the 2014 election was $\$ 2$ million and then in 2016 it ended up being just a little over a million.
So we had a 46 percent cost savings, and it was also,
and most importantly, a benefit to voters because they
didn't have to flip through all those additional pages.
6 In addition to the Voter Education Guide,
another core function of the Commission in our voter
education plan is debates. So we did have one
statewide office this year, the Corporation Commission,
and then our 30 legislative districts. 24 legislative
debates ended up being held, and we do contract with KT
to handle our statewide debates. So there's a picture
there of the candidates at the Horizon studio.
This chart here will show the viewership
for our legislative debates. Since Channel 8 actually
puts the statewide debates on for us, I don't have the
viewership for it just yet because they host it on
their website, but we'll see the increase in our
general election there.
And one of the things that we are doing
right now in preparation for 2018 is we are looking at the feedback that we received from voters already on our debates. So we -- at every single legislative debate we put out a debate -- a feedback form, an evaluation form. And Amy has been working on compiling
all that information together so we can hear from
voters directly on how we can improve this process.
And so we want to understand how did you know about
this debate? Where did you get the information from,
you know, so you could turn out?
And we'll see that the point there is the
highest point is for the candidates. Candidates are
the best source to get the information out there to
their constituents, to the voters, and so we'll be
10 working on ways that we can improve communicating to
1 voters when these debates will actually be held.
And then this will give you an idea of what
type of questions are being asked by voters. So at our
debates, voters can turn in questions specifically to
the candidates, and so we're tracking that to make sure
that in our preprepared questions that we're staying
relevant to what the issues are to voters.
And we had our app, and so that is still
available for iOS. And we are still working on Android
and our candidate compass tool. So, again, those
21 are -- so the four main tools that we provided for
22 voters for the general election.
23 And so at the end of the day, I wanted to
24 share some of the feedback we received with you. So
25 the election officials do a great job and it's really

1 nice to receive the information you send us. I'd be
2 lost without it and probably wouldn't be able to vote.
3 That's in regards to our pamphlet. These pamphlets are
4 invaluable in helping people come to grips with their
5 ballot. And then with regards to the debates, it's an
6 excellent forum to help show where candidates stand on
7 the issues and the best debate for local politicians.
8 Don't change it.
9 So this is coming directly from the voters.
10 These are just some snippets of the feedback we've
11 received. So it was -- it was positive reinforcement
12 about the tools that we're providing.
13 When we kicked off our education plan for
14 2016, the Commission did research because we wanted to
15 understand what is it that voters need, what is the
16 mindset of voters, what are the motivators and the
17 barriers to actually getting them to vote. And that
18 really was the driving force for all of our creative,
19 for our tactics. And so once this campaign wrapped up,
20 we did some post-election research, and I wanted to
21 share some of those findings with you.
22 Some of the key findings that we had were
23 that voters definitely and across the board agree that
24 voting is important; however, we do see the need that
25 we need to do more in communicating and educating
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1 voters about the impact of their vote, in particular in
2 local elections, which is why that's so important for
3 2017. We do have local elections this year.
4 One of the common feelings amongst voters
5 is that they just don't feel knowledgeable enough about
6 the issues, and that is specific to Millennials as
7 well. And debates are one of the highest-used tools
8 out there to help a voter shape their opinion about the
9 candidates. So they often look to debates for a great
10 resource to educate them about where candidates stand 11 on the issues.

And then -- and, again, going back to
3 Millennials, ultimately there's apathy there and -- you
14 know, especially about the candidates that are running
15 and voting, and they just don't feel that their vote
16 will matter, that it will make that difference. And so
17 that tells us we need to work on communicating to
18 people about just how impactful your vote can be, and
19 we've seen that in this election cycle as well. In the
20 primary we had the recount for the Congressional
21 District 5 race, and in the general there were several
22 races that were just so close that the press couldn't
23 call them right away.
24 So every -- every ballot really does make a
25 difference, and so that's -- that's one piece of

1 information that the Commission can look forward to 2 communicating and educating voters on.
3 One of the things that I wanted to share
4 with you is in $20-$ - or excuse me -- 2015 and 2016 with
5 our initial research, we wanted to understand
6 specifically from voters about how knowledgeable they
7 feel about the process. So, you know, do you know
8 where you need to go to vote? Do you know your
9 options: that you can vote in person, you can vote
10 early, you can vote by mail? What are the procedures:
11 you know, ID at the polls, things like that. Are you
12 actually eligible to register?
13 So we tracked all of that, and one -- one
14 thing I wanted to know was in the 2015 readout on the
15
6 all the way to the right, it says 87 percent. That's
where we landed in 2015. After the 2016 election, what we just wrapped up, that number is now at 95 percent.
So you can see the trend in every single one of those
categories, the number has gone up. So we can say we
contributed to that to help these people in their
confidence in all of these issues. So that was a
successful point we wanted to share with you.
Another key finding in the research that we
25 did was of all of the available resources and tools for

Page 19
voters, not just Clean Elections, but outside, one of
the -- the top tool that voters looked at was the Voter
Education Guide. So that was really good news to hear
and to see and in terms of what resource, what tool out
there do you consider an unbiased source of
information? So we do provide unbiased, nonpartisan
information. And so, again, of all of those resources,
the Voter Education Guide topped that.
9 So that was a pretty exciting piece of
news; however, there's still work to be done because --
especially with the last election, we definitely see a
mindset in the tone of voters about distrust. And so
we need to make sure that we're communicating that the
information that the Commission is putting out there is
unbiased, that it is nonpartisan.
Mr. Chairman, will there be any questions
about our 2016 activities before I jump into our plan for 2017?

CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions by the
commissioners?
(No response.)
22 MS. ROBERTS: Okay. Great. So just a
23 reminder, for the Clean Elections Act, this is our
24 preamble, and the pieces that I'd really like to point
25 out, especially in regard to our voter education plan,

1 was that ultimately with the act we will encourage
2 citizen participation in the political process and that
3 campaigns will become more issue-oriented. So those
4 are two key points that help drive the tools and
5 resources that we provide.
6 So under the Clean Elections Act, the
7 Commission has the authority to make expenditures for
8 voter and public education, and what you saw in
9 December in Sara's budget presentation, we do have a
10 cap on paid media, and our cap for this year is just a
11 little over $\$ 2$ million.
12 So to help us execute our education plan,
13 we contract with a vendor who is on the statewide
14 marketing contract. And the activities that we did in
152016 -- if you'll recall, we worked with R\&R Partners.
16 Due to some changes to the contract, the agency had to
17 select a new vendor. And so we're very excited about
18 the new opportunity that we have to work with Riester.
19 They are a full-service advertising agency and their
20 reputation is amazing.
21 So I won't try to say any more about that
22 because I don't think I can do them justice with their
23 background, but they are in our audience today. And so
24 they'll be working very closely with the Commission in
25 executing our education plan and really helping us
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1 understand the best media tactics for us to communicate
2 our message to voters.
3 COMMISSIONER MEYER: Excuse me. Is Riester 4 an Arizona company?
5 MS. ROBERTS: Yes. Yes, they are.
6 So what do we have for 2017? We have
7 consolidated election dates, and as of right now, we do
8 know there's a March election. Tom mentioned that in
9 the executive director's report. We have three cities.
10 And so we are already fast-approaching the voter
11 registration deadline and the start of early voting.
12 So we will be working to communicate information to
13 voters about -- specifically in those three cities
14 about their local election and again trying to express
15 the importance that local elections can have on voters.
16 The other key date for 2017 is August 1st.
17 That is the start of the qualifying period when
18 candidates can begin collecting their $\$ 5$ qualifying
19 contributions.
20 One of the things that we would like to see
21 going into 2017 is kicking off additional research. So
22 we did our post-campaign research. That was the
23 information I just shared with you about what we -- our
24 education plan for 2016, but seeing the impact of the
25 presidential election and the stories in the media and
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just hearing from voters directly, we really feel that 2 we need to go forward and learn more about the state of voters and what exactly is going through their minds right now, what are those additional motivators and 5 those barriers.
6 There's -- you know, we're hearing of
distrust in the system. We've heard of hacking of the
election, and so -- and ultimately it's still voter
apathy, but also the importance of actually getting out
10 there to vote. Once you cast your ballot, what happens
11 next? How does that, in the end, impact my life? So
12 we really want to kick off research again because what
13 we can understand from this will help shape our
14 education plan and ultimately how we communicate with 15 voters.
16 So what we'd like to do -- basically what
17 we did in 2015 is start off with some more quantitative
18 research, get surveys out there and then bring in some
19 focus groups and talk to voters directly.
20 For our paid media we'll typically be on
21 the same channels that we've used before, same tactics.
22 So, again, we'll likely increase our social media
23 presence because that is proving to be successful in
24 the reach that we can get but also the engagement,
25 helping us communicate directly with voters almost
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immediately. And we'll continue our vote informed
messaging specific, though, to local elections. Again,
we need to highlight that.
We'll communicate about voter registration,
what the requirements are, the process and then
ultimately education about the Clean Elections Act, and
at the end of the day, it's all about promoting
participation in the political -- political process.
One of the things that we'll be focusing on
in 2017 is taking our existing tools that we've built
and enhancing them. We did a lot of work in 2015 and
2016 to create these tools, to launch them, and so now
is the time where we can look at, take a step back and improve them. How do we enhance these for voters so we can create a customized voting experience so they can go to our website and get everything that they need but in a more user-friendly manner? So we will be taking a step back and looking at all of our tools and seeing how we can improve those.
We will continue our outreach and education
plan with Native American communities. That includes
continuing to work with the Intertribal Council of
Arizona and the Get Out to Vote coordinators. Our
24 staff will continue to attend community events and
25 then, additionally, a little bit more research specific
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1 to this group of voters understanding what are some of
2 the -- some of the key issues that impact them more so
3 than maybe other communities.
4 One of the things we saw in 2016 was we
5 learned that it's difficult sometimes for somebody who
6 lives on tribal land to get a mailing ballot, to get
7 access to their mailbox and also that there's an issue
8 with having proper ID for voting on election day. So a
9 solution exists, and that solution is to vote in person
10 early. And so we need to take a step back and look at
11 those things and understand more about what specific
12 barriers exist for voters who are on tribal land and
13 how we can educate them about the solutions that do
14 exist.
15 And if you'll recall, in 2015 the agency
16 hosted the 15 county recorders and election directors
17 and also the Secretary of State's office for our first
18 ever roundtable, and the goal there was to get all of
19 the election officials in the state together and
20 discuss what went well in 2014 and what can be improved
21 and ultimately how can Clean Elections help. We
22 received very wonderful feedback from the group and the
23 urge to continue to do that. So we'd like to host
24 another one in 2017. This time we would like to expand
25 it a little bit further to include our city and town
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1 clerks.
2 Our cities were great this year in sharing
3 and utilizing a lot of the assets, the materials that
4 the Commission produced for voters, and so we'd like to
5 include them in the process and then also include
6 community organizations that are out there.
7 So with that, I'd be happy to answer any
8 questions and I welcome your feedback.
9 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions from the
10 commissioners?
11 COMMISSIONER PATON: I have a couple of
12 things I'd like to say. First of all, an amazing
13 presentation. You guys do a great job and I was
14 totally impressed by all that.
15 I do have a couple of things that I'd be
16 interested in in the next year or two to go as far
17 as -- and I've spoken with you before. I really think
18 that -- like when I saw your graph about the debates
19 and how a lot of your feedback was the people got their
20 information about the debate from the candidates,
21 having experience being at some of these debates, I
22 know generally the people that are debating bring their
23 own friends, family, whoever. And it's kind of like
24 everybody has already decided by the time they're there
25 because they're with somebody, and that bothers me.

1 I mean, if we want to educate people, then
we need to bring in people that have no idea who these people are and be exposed to what they're saying. So
4 my idea -- and I've spoken to some people about having
5 debates at schools during school time. That would
6 bring kids that are apathetic, apparently, by your
7 research -- apathetic about the voting process and does
8 my vote count and all that kind of stuff.
9 If you had a debate, you could involve the
10 government teachers, social studies teachers. They
could get -- all the kids would be there, teachers,
administrators. Parents could come in, community
3 members. Many of these schools have big auditoriums
that a lot of times during the day are not used. I
5 taught school for 28 years, so I kind of understand a
16 little bit about that. And you're going to get people
17 actually asking them questions that they have -- they
18 don't know. They're actually asking questions, not to
19 gotcha somebody, but something they really want to be
20 involved and learn about.
21 Secondly, I think maybe since we have
22 people that are distrustful about the elections now and
23 so on about the voting hacking, I think this past time
24 I didn't even realize that you could track your ballot.
25 And so telling people that, okay, you don't just trust
this thing, then track your ballot. You can do this.
This is how you can do this, and maybe that will help
them decide that they do have some trust in the situation.
I don't know how extensive that thing goes,
if you can tell -- thing -- if you can see where your
people actually went up a notch or whatever, you know.
I don't know if that exists, but still those are two
things that I think may help in these things.
10 So, anyway, my main thing is debates at
schools, especially for the state legislators. You can
get a Central High School that -- say, like the Sierra
Vista area. You could go to Buena High School or you
can go to Wilcox or Safford or wherever and these
candidates are really going to have to speak to people,
and a lot of our budget in the State -- you know, the
State budget is involved with education, and so you've
got people saying we need to cut this, cut that.
They're going to have to face those kids right there
and say why are you cutting this and how -- why can't
we do this or whatever, you know, that kind of thing.
So, anyway, I've probably spoken too much.
MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
24 Paton, yes, absolutely. That's great feedback, and we
25 definitely have your notes from when we have spoken

1 before. So we will be working with our debate
2 coordinator and looking at how we can improve the
3 process in terms of location, even the hours that we
4 host the debates at. We did hear feedback from that,
5 but absolutely. We'll definitely be taking a look at
6 how we can improve the process.
7 And then additionally, with the tracking
8 your ballot, that -- a lot of people -- you are
9 correct. A lot of people are not aware that that tool
10 exists, and so we've seen personally when communicating
11 with voters, once we let them know this is available to
12 you and they see how it works, they do feel better
13 about the process. And we've heard thank you; I didn't
14 know that existed; you know, now, I know that the
15 county did in fact receive my ballot, that it was
16 counted. It will tell a voter if it did not count and
17 for whatever reason that may be.
18 So the tool is very useful, and we did have
19 that information on our site, but absolutely. We can
20 look at making sure we communicate that message more to
21 voters.
22 COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah, maybe promote it
23 a little bit.
24 MS. ROBERTS: Right.
25 COMMISSIONER PATON: Thank you.
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1 MS. ROBERTS: Absolutely. Thank you.
2 CHAIRMAN TITLA: More questions,

4 COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Mr. Chairman?
5 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Yes, Commissioner Kimble.
6 COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Gina, what exactly is
7 the Commission's role on local elections? There's
8 Tucson's election this coming fall. We don't get
9 involved financially, but do you target some kind of
10 communications to voters on local elections?
MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
Kimble, this year, yes, we will be. So historically, I
do not believe the Commission has done much in
off-election years outside of elections from statewide.
However, if you'll recall our preamble and the ultimate goal of promoting participation in the political
process, Staff -- we have the resources to do so and it
is an election. And what we've seen from our research,
it tells us that voters just don't quite, one, know the
information about those local elections and how they impact their life.

A local election like this could be more
23 impactful than voting for president. You feel it in
24 your everyday life. So voters -- we do need to educate
25 them about, you know, when you're voting for your city
council member, these are the people who are making the decisions on your trash and water services, you know, the things that affect -- your library services, that affect you every day.
5 And so in terms of what our role is, you
know, ultimately, I think that would be dependent upon
7 the Commission's direction here, but we do have the
resources. We do intend to provide education to voters
9 about the local elections this year in terms of, again,
10 the logistics. When are the important deadlines and,
11 you know, how do I get my ballot? We are working on
12 providing information on -- if it's a candidate
13 election, we do have our own tools right now, like the
14 app, where we can show candidate profiles on the 15 website.
16 On our website we have a district locator
17 tool, and so we've recently expanded that and added
18 lines where if someone puts in their address, they can
19 then see, okay, I'm in this congressional district,
20 this state legislative district, this county board of
21 supervisor district. And we do offer the city of
22 Phoenix and city of Mesa district lines where we don't
23 have the capability to provide local lines just yet
24 further. We can continue to work on that, but we can
25 show the candidate profiles at least as a whole and
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say, okay, city of Tucson, here are all the candidates that are running in your election. And we can provide that information on our site and in our app.
4
5 s
6
7
Kimble, debates, we have not had that conversation. I
think we would have to take a step back and confirm
with Tom if that's a possibility.
MR. COLLINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioner Kimble, I think -- I think from our
perspective right now, we know there's demand for
resources, for information about basic election
deadlines, the fact that you can register to vote,
those kinds of things. And once you're registered to
vote, that all ladders up to state elections and
ultimately, in most cases, federal elections. So
there's a nexus between our main goal in terms of the debates and the -- and the candidate statement pamphlet and trying to get everybody to understand that there is an overall election process they're participating in.

I suspect that cities and towns would be
24 less likely to want us to be involved in their debate
25 process, that kind of thing, if they -- if they even

1 set those things up. The League of Women Voters has a
2 role in that at the local level that they've fulfilled
3 for many years. I think -- so I think it's -- just to
4 put -- sort of recapitulate, our efforts at the local
5 level -- and by that I mean cities, towns and
6 counties -- are driven by demand of local election
7 officials who are lacking in resources either provided
8 by the state or otherwise to get basic information to
9 voters.
10 And so unless we see a demand for -- for
11 some other kind of action, we'd probably leave it there
12 because we do have to reserve the bulk of our resources
13 for our core state election year activities.
14 MS. ROBERTS: And if I could add to that,
15 Mr . Chairman, Commissioner Kimble, we do work with and
16 attend city clerk meetings. They have their AMCA
17 groups, and so we often present in front of them and
18 communicate to them about the Commission's activities.
19 And as Tom mentioned, the feedback, the demand is
20 there. Just as a county exists, you know, their core
21 function is to actually put the election on, and so
22 they look to us for additional research -- resources to
23 educate the voters.
24 And so -- and by that I do mean specifics
25 in terms of we need to let people know when that
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1 registration deadline is or that early voting is
2 starting, so more so the logistics of it. And that's
3 really where we help get involved and, again, that is
4 that direct feedback we did receive from the city and
5 town clerks.
COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Thank you.
7 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions,
Commissioners?
9 (No response.)
10 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Thank you, Gina, for your
1 good report. I know that voter in education you've
done a good job under the leadership of the director,
and I think that this year what I noticed -- what was
really helpful to me was the sticker, like the magnetic
sticker you pick up and put on your refrigerator with
the deadlines. That was most helpful to me because
they asked me at home when are the deadlines for
something. I said it's right there on the
refrigerator. So that was very helpful.
Thank you and continue the good work.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
We'll be sure that we update those for this year and
2018, and then if I could also as well just also thank
Alec and Amy for all their efforts on our voter
25 education plan. They have worked very hard during the

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| primary and general, and so I appreciate their efforts. <br> Thank you. <br> COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Nice job. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Thank you. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Thank you. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Why don't we go ahead with <br> the next item, discussion and possible action on final <br> audit approval for the following participating <br> candidates for the 2016 election cycle. <br> Sara? <br> MS. LARSEN: Good morning, Chairman, <br> Commissioners. I'd like to thank Amy. She helped me <br> compile the summary that you have before you. So <br> that's -- it's a lot of paperwork, so we try to get it <br> down into a succinct summary for you to review. <br> Real quick, an overview on how the audits <br> are conducted. In September we drew two statewide <br> candidates and 12 legislative candidates to have their <br> 19 bank accounts and their campaign finance reports <br> 20 reconciled by an independent auditing contractor who is <br> 21 Fester \& Chapman. That's who we utilized. And they <br> 22 matched their bank account records to documentation of <br> 23 the expenditures to the campaign finance reports to <br> 24 make sure that all the spending is appropriate and <br> 25 documented correctly and there are no unusual | 1 discrepancies either on the campaign finance reports or <br> 2 have additional documentation provided for the <br> 3 expenditures that they had. <br> 4 There are several audits here, and if you <br> 5 have questions about any one in particular, I'm happy <br> 6 to answer those. I do know that former Representative <br> 7 Chris Ackerley is -- is back here and he was subject <br> 8 to -- to the audit. And I think he had one finding <br> 9 that he needed to provide additional documentation for <br> 10 an expenditure. So his audit was very clean. <br> 11 Everything was properly reported, but he is here to <br> 12 answer questions if anybody has any or if he would like <br> 13 to speak to his audit, but his audit was very clean. <br> 14 There is one exception and it is <br> 15 Mr. Rubalcava who is Representative Rubalcava. There <br> 16 were several unusual transactions in the bank account <br> 17 that were not recorded on the campaign finance reports. <br> 18 He's on the last page of the summary. Because of the <br> 19 number of unusual disbursements and transactions in the <br> 20 bank account and my conversations with the auditor, I'm <br> 21 going to recommend that this individual is referred for <br> 22 an enforcement matter and that we do a comprehensive <br> 23 enforcement audit, and that would be a line-by-line, <br> 24 transaction-by-transaction audit of the bank account to <br> 25 the campaign finance reports. |
| 1 disbursements or contributions being received into the <br> 2 campaign bank account. <br> 3 Three of the candidates who were selected <br> 4 for random audit are also a part of an enforcement <br> 5 matter that is on the agenda today. So their audits <br> 6 were a little more in depth than the other candidates' <br> 7 audits. We asked the auditing agency to review all <br> 8 expenditures on the campaign finance reports that were <br> 9 subject to the complaint. So additional expenditures <br> 10 were audited. <br> 11 We typically choose five contributions <br> 12 going into the account for the primary election period <br> 13 and five expenditures. So we have -- we have a test <br> 14 sample of ten recorded transactions from the campaign <br> 15 finance reports that are matched to the -- to the bank <br> 16 statements. So it's not a comprehensive audit. It's <br> 17 more a sampling to see that things are appropriately <br> 18 reported. A comprehensive audit would just take a <br> 19 large amount of time and a large amount of resources. <br> 20 I'll say that for the candidates who were <br> 21 audited, I did not see anything that was unusual except <br> 22 we do have one exception to that who I will address. <br> 23 Most everything in here, everything was properly <br> 24 reported, properly documented, and if it wasn't, they <br> 25 were able to reconcile the differences and the | 1 We noted that there were transactions on <br> 2 the campaign finance reports that did not match the <br> 3 bank accounts and the bank accounts did not match the <br> 4 campaign finance reports, and without an enforcement <br> 5 audit, we won't be able to reconcile what happened in <br> 6 the account. So in my opinion, I would -- I would <br> 7 definitely recommend that -- that this goes to an <br> 8 enforcement audit, but right now all I'm asking the <br> 9 Commission to do is to approve the findings that the auditor found. <br> All the other findings have been <br> reconciled. Appropriate monies have been returned to <br> the Clean Elections Commission. Any findings or errors <br> have been corrected by the candidates. <br> So if anybody has questions, I'm happy to answer those. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner? <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman, I have a <br> question. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner Meyer. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: On -- it's Item H on <br> the John Fillmore audit, and Item Number 4 references a <br> 23 repayment of a loan. So that just -- the content of a <br> 24 loan from Clean Elections funding kind of made me raise <br> 25 my eye. I was curious what that was. |
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| MS. LARSEN: So, Chairman, Commissioner <br> Meyer, that is actually -- contributions are allowed to be loans. So the candidate received a loan to his <br> committee, and that is outstanding until he receives his Clean Elections funding and then he repays the loan. So he wasn't given a loan from his funding. COMMISSIONER MEYER: Okay. <br> MS. ROBERTS: He was receiving a loan in the form of contribution. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: And then he paid that <br> loan off with his funding? <br> MS. LARSEN: And then he paid it back late. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: I see. <br> MS. LARSEN: But it was paid. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Okay. Thank you for <br> that explanation. <br> MS. LARSEN: Yeah, yeah. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: That makes sense. <br> And then one other question I had. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: And this is on <br> Mr. Rubalcava's. It's Item 5 that looks like the funds <br> 23 were deposited into the personal account of the <br> 24 candidate and not into a campaign bank account. That <br> 25 troubled me. | dealing with. <br> MS. LARSEN: Right. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: So that shouldn't be <br> an issue. <br> MS. LARSEN: Right. So your campaign <br> finance account should be sole and separate from -- <br> from any personal activities because the Clean <br> Elections Act requires that only campaign activity can <br> come in and out of that account. So personal <br> disbursements cannot be made from the account. You <br> know, personal deposits cannot go into the account and <br> vice versa. So it is definitely troubling that it was <br> put into a personal account and then later transferred. <br> You know, it wasn't something that happened the same day. <br> He did state that it was something that, <br> you know, his campaign account and his personal <br> accounts were at the same bank and it was a bank error, <br> but there was no documentation to back that up that was <br> provided to the auditor. So that's definitely one <br> 21 reason why I think that it should go for an enforcement <br> 22 audit and do a line-by-line audit. <br> 23 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Mr. Chairman? <br> 24 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner Laird? <br> 25 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Following up on |
| 10:19:12-10:20:29 <br> 1 Is that -- is there a way that we can issue the funds to ensure that doesn't happen? <br> MS. LARSEN: Chairman, Commissioner Meyer, that's -- this is one of the things that we test for because the campaign finance -- or the Clean Elections Act and our rules specifically state that candidates are required to use a single campaign account and -and that all campaign finance activity has to be in and out of a single campaign account, bank account. So this was also a very troubling finding to me, and noting that the funds were deposited into a personal account and then transferred to a bank account but not transferred in their entirety was extremely disturbing and is one of the reasons why I want to refer the -refer this to an enforcement audit. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: And just so I <br> understand this, they were -- the funds were put into a personal account but they were reported as being put in the campaign account? <br> MS. LARSEN: Chairman, Commissioner, the <br> campaign finance reports don't -- don't indicate the <br> bank account in which they were deposited into. The campaign -- <br> 24 COMMISSIONER MEYER: And that makes sense <br> 25 because there should only be one account you're ever | 1 Commissioner Meyer's comment, would the check be made 2 out to Mr. Rubalcava personally as opposed to <br> 3 specifically being made out to his campaign account, or 4 how was he able to deposit it into his personal 5 account? <br> 6 MS. LARSEN: Chairman, Commissioner Laird, <br> 7 that's a very good question. So we -- we do not issue 8 the checks here at -- at the Commission. The general <br> 9 accounting office issues the checks for the candidates. <br> 10 The candidates have to fill out a vendor application <br> 11 with the State in order to be put into the system. <br> 12 They either have to utilize their Social Security <br> 13 number or a federal employer identification number. <br> 14 Some candidates choose to use an FEIN and that FEIN is <br> 15 used to open their bank account. <br> 16 So whatever application they used to submit <br> 17 to the State, we don't have any requirements in our <br> 18 rules that state you have to use an FEIN, that you <br> 19 can't use a personal Social Security number, but <br> 20 whichever one they do choose to utilize, it has to <br> 21 match the name exactly on record with the IRS. So -- <br> 22 and I don't know off the top of my head how <br> 23 Mr. Rubalcava's was made out. Some campaigns choose to <br> 24 use an FEIN that has their campaign name on it exactly <br> 25 and then those checks are cut exactly as the |
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| CHAIRMAN TITLA: Do we have a motion to <br> approve the audit report? <br> COMMISSIONER LAIRD: I move to approve. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion by Commissioner <br> Laird to approve. <br> Second? <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Second. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Second by Commissioner <br> Meyer. <br> All in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> MS. LARSEN: Thank you. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion passes unanimously. <br> COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Nice job, Sara. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: The next item here, Item <br> VI, discussion and possible action in the following <br> enforcement matters. <br> MR. COLLINS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, we <br> have -- we have four matters. The Arizona Legacy, <br> we're not -- we're not in a position to move forward <br> with today. So we've got $04,05,07$ and 08 in front of <br> you. I know there are a number of people here to <br> speak. Mr. Querard is here who is the complainant in | 1 pushed this preinvestigation matter as far as I think <br> 2 the Staff has ever pushed it before. And so -- and I <br> 3 think you may hear some complaints from that from some 4 of the respondents' attorneys, in fact. <br> 5 And so it is simply not the case that there <br> 6 was any sort of -- whatever rhetoric is used, and you <br> 7 will hear this outside of the Commission confines. <br> 8 There has been nothing other than an effort to try to, <br> 9 you know, get to the bottom of things as much as we can <br> 10 under the standard that we have which is, is there <br> 11 reason to believe a violation has occurred. <br> 12 Two other points I want to make very, very <br> 13 quickly. One, sense of proportionality. Some of the <br> 14 rhetoric around this issue has talked about the <br> 15 Democratic party being -- using Clean Elections as some <br> 16 kind of enormous subsidy. The handout I provided you <br> 17 at the beginning of this meeting shows that the <br> 18 Democratic party raised almost $\$ 2$ million in the last <br> 19 election cycle and that the total amount of MUR 05, for <br> 20 example, is something on the order of $\$ 66,000$. <br> 21 So the scale of the rhetoric and the scale <br> 22 of -- even if that was all donations, which it <br> 23 wasn't -- and we'll get to that in a second -- well, at <br> 24 least we don't have reason to believe it was -- the <br> 25 scale is out of proportion to the rhetoric just -- just |
| 104 and 05 . Mr. Barton is here who is the respondent's 2 attorney in 05 . Mr. Gaona is here. He's the <br> 3 respondent attorney in 04. So if we take those two 4 together. And then on 05, Mr. Gaona is here. I didn't, you know, sort of mandate that the attorneys for the House and Senate Victory PACs attend and they're not here, but, you know, and -- but we can talk about that when we get to that. <br> I don't want to belabor the executive director's note that I wrote on MUR 04, 05. I just want to simply say before we get into it, that, you know, I've talked -- we've heard both publicly and then I've heard privately from folks, some but not all oppose the Clean Elections Act in the first place who have -- you know, who's expressed their anger or, you know, varying degrees of frustration with -- with my recommendation in some terms more extreme than others. I want to make two points clear. <br> First, you heard Sara talk about <br> enforcement audits and there's the enforcement audits <br> and our random audits. When we selected the specific audits of the folks who have been selected for random <br> 23 audits that target specific transactions in those <br> 24 audits, that was akin to an enforcement audit and we <br> 25 did that without Commission authority. So the Staff | 10:32:29-10:33:54 <br> 1 based on the raw numbers. <br> 2 And finally, I want to call your attention <br> 3 to the other handout which is the rules that we're <br> 4 operating under, and Rule 702(B) says that, in fact, a <br> 5 participating candidate's payment from a campaign <br> 6 account to a political committee or civic organization <br> 7 is not a contribution if the payment is reasonable in <br> 8 relation to the value received. That's the rules. <br> 9 Now, there are two strings of conversation to be had <br> 10 here. One is should that be the rule? Ought we allow <br> 11 that to continue to be the case? <br> 12 You have to understand, though, that <br> 13 parties are political committees so understand how that <br> 14 rule works. That's one question and that's a question <br> 15 that's open to the Commission in all of my -- all of -- <br> 16 both the MUR memos and my note indicates that's a <br> 17 question for the Commission to ask on the go-forward <br> 18 basis, but -- but we are not at a place where we're <br> 19 able to say that there's reason to believe a violation <br> 20 occurred based on the findings and the memo. <br> 21 So I can go through those in some -- in <br> 22 more detail or less. I can, you know -- I don't really <br> 23 have a lot to add if you reviewed them. I know that <br> 24 Mr . Querard has, you know, a number of -- I mean -- I <br> 25 mean, has, I think, an additional case to make and |
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| would like to do that. I'm happy to -- I'm happy to turn the floor over to him if you -- if Mr. Chairman allows and then -- and go -- and go from there unless <br> you have specific questions about the recommendations, in which case I'm happy to answer those questions. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions by the <br> commissioners? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: With regard to MUR 16-004, <br> Corin Hammond, do we have any statement or action? <br> MR. COLLINS: I would simply say in that <br> respect we have two issues as we understand the <br> complaint, one having to do with failure to identify a <br> subvendor. The -- Ms. Hammond essentially paid a <br> person, gave money to another person to go out and buy <br> stuff. There is an obligation to report a subvendor. <br> You can see that we were communicating with her -- I <br> think if Exhibit F is the exhibit there -- more or less <br> simultaneously with the complaint being filed or <br> thereabouts -- pardon? <br> MS. LARSEN: Prior to. <br> MR. COLLINS: Prior to. Prior to the <br> complaint that hadn't been corrected yet by the time <br> the complaint came in. So that had been corrected. <br> 25 I think with respect to the -- so that's | 1 say you've got to use it for direct campaign purposes. <br> We say you can use it for payments to a -- to a <br> committee or civic organization and then we say what <br> you can't do. And so, you know, if you think about it <br> from that framework, you know -- you know, it's hard <br> for us looking at where we are to -- based on the <br> information we have, we just can't find reason to <br> believe that there's not reasonable value paid for the <br> services received. <br> And that's our conclusion as far as reason <br> to believe. So if that answers your question. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Do we need to take any <br> action on that? <br> MR. COLLINS: We would recommend -- we <br> would ask -- obviously, I think you'd want to allow <br> public comment, but we would ask that you -- that <br> you-all -- you could take no action, but I would ask <br> that we would -- we're looking for you to vote to find <br> no reason to believe so that we can close this matter. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any public comment on the <br> MUR 16-004, Corin Hammond? <br> Yes, sir. <br> MS. THOMAS: Please state your name for the <br> record, please. <br> 25 MR. QUERARD: Sure. It's Constantin |
| 1 why we find a reasonable to believe on the failure to itemize. With respect to the joint expenditures 3 issue -- and this cuts across both issues and, again, 4 this is my recommendation. Not everyone is going to 5 agree with it. There is a Facebook ad that says come 6 work for us and you get to work on our campaign and these federal candidate campaigns. And jumping off from that point was, I think, the assumption that, you know, I don't think at the time it was necessarily incorrect to say, hey, what's the -- what's the deal with this? This looks like a joint expenditure. <br> The response we got essentially said that didn't get off the ground; it never became a joint expenditure. If I'm mischaracterizing it, Andy will correct me, I'm sure, but essentially the response was that that's not in fact what happened; that that Facebook ad is not ultimately evidence of a joint expenditure because the joint expenditure didn't happen. And Ms. Hammond participated in an exchange with the Democratic party which, you know, we don't have reason to believe is -- was not of reasonable value. And so we don't have reason to believe that there's a -- that there is a violation. <br> 24 If you look at the handout, that 702 and $25703-702$ together -- 702(A), (B) and (C) together, we | 10:38:10-10:39:12 <br> 1 Querard. <br> 2 MR. COLLINS: With no E. <br> 3 MR. QUERARD: That's fine. We'll accept <br> 4 any spelling that gets close. <br> 5 The matter in this case is probably more a <br> 6 question of the specificity of reporting. When we as <br> 7 the public, whether we are involved in campaigns or <br> not, look at these reports and we see a $\$ 6,000$ payment <br> 9 made for a coordinated campaign and the response <br> indicated that this was not consulting or training but <br> rather specifically voter contact, as someone running <br> campaigns I'm wondering what they got for their money, <br> what they do with their money. <br> A payment six days before the primary for <br> $\$ 6,000$ for voter contact, you know, I want to make sure <br> they're not prepaying general expenses, which has <br> happened in years past. I want to make sure -- and <br> then the exact same $\$ 6,000$ payment for the general <br> election period was odd because you had an uncontested <br> primary and you spent the same on that as you did for a <br> contested general. But what is a coordinated campaign? <br> 22 I mean, do the public have a right -- whether they're <br> 23 interested in the race or not, do they have a right to <br> 24 know what that is? <br> 25 If Mr. Collins has looked at it and has |
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| 1 seen what they got for their money and says it's fine, it's legit, we're comfortable, then I'm comfortable, 3 although I still have no idea and I don't think anybody 4 else in this room has any idea what the Clean Elections 5 money was spent on. <br> 6 And so if there can be some level of detail <br> 7 provided in the reporting so the public knows what it <br> 8 was spent on and has an element of comfort, I think <br> 9 that might be the one improvement that could be made <br> 10 because a complaint like mine is actually reasonable <br> 11 given the information we have. <br> 12 The response basically said, oh, it wasn't <br> 13 consulting. It was just voter contact. And I do both <br> 14 consulting and voter contact, and $\$ 6,000$ even for voter <br> 15 contact with no information beyond that is an odd <br> 16 number. If I do -- and there should be detail <br> 17 available. If I do an autodialer and it's 850 bucks, I <br> 18 can tell you how many calls, on what date. I can give <br> 19 you a copy of the message. I can give you a copy of <br> 20 the list of phone numbers we called. It can be very, <br> 21 very specific. <br> 22 There's a danger if -- and I guess what I'm <br> 23 looking for in this, and particularly the follow-up <br> 24 complaint, is just to what kind of know what the rules <br> 25 of the game are. What do you guys want? Is it okay if | 1 issue works out in terms of going forward, you know, how we divide -- if the Commission reaches a point where it wants to get into those details, how those details play out. <br> 5 We don't know the answer to that question, <br> 6 but it's -- but I do want to make clear that -- that <br> 7 the purpose of the memo was to acknowledge the issue that you raised and then -- and try to distinguish that from some of the -- the political stuff that other folks may have -- may have raised. And if I conflated those two things, that's my responsibility, but -- but <br> 12 I do understand what you're saying. <br> 13 MR. QUERARD: Okay. I appreciate it. <br> 14 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions by the <br> 15 commissioners? <br> 16 COMMISSIONER PATON: Well, I don't know if <br> 17 I have a question or a statement or -- I think -- I'm <br> 18 sure I'm going to say this wrong. I don't have my <br> 19 glasses. Constantin -- I'm sorry about your last <br> 20 name -- I think he raises a good issue, just a blanket <br> 21 campaign or something like that. I think we should be <br> 22 transparent and say what it is and delineate it. I <br> 23 don't -- maybe that's a lot of effort on everybody's <br> 24 part, but this is the public's money. And with all <br> 25 these other audit things going on, you see some of |
| 1 my clients just write me a check for campaign, 6,000 <br> 2 bucks? Obviously campaigns is what we do. 6,000 <br> 3 bucks, campaign. If that's all you need in the memo <br> 4 line, then that's what I want to know so I can tell them that's all that they need. <br> 6 If you'd like more detail, then I'd like <br> 7 you to ask for it in this case so that those who are <br> 8 going to be looking at it can have some idea what was <br> 9 purchased for the money; otherwise, we're -- we're <br> 10 flying blind. So that -- that would be the one thing. <br> 11 If Mr. Collins says it's legit, I have no reason to <br> 12 doubt it. I just have no idea what it was. <br> 13 MR. COLLINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman, <br> just -- you know, just to address that point. I <br> think -- and as I said at the beginning, I think that <br> 16 based on the Facebook ad, the complaint -- you know, I <br> 17 mean, I understood the complaint and the purpose of the <br> 18 complaint when it came in. I mean, that was a -- <br> 19 that's probably the reason we sent it out and looked at <br> 20 it. And I do take -- and I think that -- just to <br> 21 separate the two strains here. <br> 22 I do think that you raised -- and just to <br> 23 make clear in my cover memo, to the extent that it left <br> 24 anything for interpretation, it was, you know, simply <br> 25 to say you've raised an issue. We don't know how that | these things that are, at the very least, troubling, <br> 2 then I think delineating something -- if that's true <br> 3 that's just \$6,000 to campaign, I would feel more <br> 4 comfortable if it was delineated out what that actually <br> 5 meant, what it was spent for, calls or for this company <br> 6 here or whatever. <br> 7 Secondly, since I am fairly new, I am kind <br> of uncomfortable with having these Clean Election <br> 9 things -- people being so involved with the party, <br> 10 paying the party to do whatever. I understand it's <br> 11 probably easy for them, but my idea is the party can <br> 12 kind of strongarm them and say, you know, you've got <br> 13 all this Clean Elections money; we can really use that, <br> 14 and if you don't go with us on this stuff and use us, <br> 15 then we're not going to really back you or something to <br> 16 that effect. <br> 17 So, anyway, that's just a statement I have. <br> 18 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Mr. Chairman? <br> 19 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner Laird. <br> 20 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: My view on this, <br> 21 Director Collins, legally in terms of whether or not <br> 22 it's -- if there's been a joint expenditure is a little <br> 23 different than yours. I understand that it requires an <br> 24 agreement, but in my view, there is an agreement. And <br> 25 let me tell you how I get there and I think it's fairly |

clear. And, you know, I think it's fairly clear that the Democratic party -- and the same as for the
Republican party -- I mean, they act on behalf of numerous candidates. They are, in effect, acting as an agent in the political process for those candidates.
6 So in my view, an agreement with the
Democratic party is the same as the agreement with
other candidates and, therefore, I think there is an agreement and, therefore, I think it is a joint expenditure. And I don't believe anything has gone wrong here, but I share the concern of my fellow commissioner and of the complainant, that not knowing what the 6,000 was for, whether it should have been split proportionately. I mean, it's hard to know that because I don't even know what it was for. I don't know the fair market value of what that might be. We certainly don't want funds going to the party in general.

And so in my mind, my questions aren't
answered at this point. I don't think there's reason
to find cause --
MR. COLLINS: Right.
23 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: -- reasonable cause
24 that there has been a violation, but I'm not sure I'm
25 comfortable voting that there -- that I know enough
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facts now to vote that there is no cause.
MR. COLLINS: And, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioner Laird, I think that's a fair point, and
I'll respond to that on two levels. On the joint
expenditure point, there are many candidates who share
consultants who would serve the same purpose as the
party here. The logic that you extend would mean that
every consultant who works with more than one candidate
is in a joint agreement with all of those candidates
and those are all joint expenditures. We haven't
followed that practice in the past.
I think Mr. Querard would stipulate that we
have not had a practice of if you represent more than
one Clean Elections candidate, you are joint -- all of
your expenditures on behalf of those candidates are
joint expenditures.
Correct?
MR. QUERARD: Correct.
MR. COLLINS: Yeah. So that would change
the dynamic of how we do things. Although, I see your
point in terms of once you have one agent.
COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Well, that's why I
think we need to know.
MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER LAIRD: I mean, I agree. It

1 may not be the case that they're an agent for this
2 purpose.
3 MR. COLLINS: Sure.
4 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: But it could be, and I
5 think our job --
6 MR. COLLINS: Sure.
7 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: -- as commissioners,
8 we should be tough in our analysis of ourselves to how
9 the money is spent. And we ought to be as scrupulous
10 as we possibly can and, therefore, I would feel more
11 comfortable if I knew what the 6,000 was for.
12 MR. COLLINS: Sure.
13 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: If there was no
14 relationship whatsoever that would -- that benefitted
15 any other candidate in any way, then, okay, maybe there
16 was no agency relationship as to that expenditure. But
17 if, in fact, other candidates benefitted, which may be
18 the case here -- I don't know what the 6,000 -- if it
19 was the get out to vote campaign or something, and I
20 think it would benefit multiple candidates. And,
21 therefore, in that case, I think there may be an agency
22 relationship and a joint expenditure.
23 MR. COLLINS: Well, that -- Mr. Chairman,
24 Commissioner Laird, I see that point. I do think that
25 the response that we have at exhibit Bates Number 14
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1 through 16 does provide the detail in response to the
2 complaint. In other words, the complaint was was this
3 shared between these two federal candidates? That's
4 denied.
5 We -- there's a -- if there's a
6 supplemental complaint to be brought around the
7 question of whether or not there's specificity, I mean,
8 I think -- I may be missing it, but I think that
9 Mr. Gaona can probably address, to some extent, that
10 there was an individual agreement with Ms. Hammond, if
1 he's comfortable doing that. He doesn't have to, but I
took the response to the complaint to be -- to be
focused on the complaint as opposed to necessarily some
of the policy issues that might be underlying your
concerns, which are fair and maybe more appropriately
raised in the MUR 05 which gets into a broader spectrum
of -- of issues.
And you might address that with Mr. -- but
I'd leave it to Andy if he wants to -- if he has any
further things that he'd like to add on this point. I
just want to -- I don't want to state Ms. Hammond's
position for her if I'm missing it, if I'm doing it
incorrectly.
MR. GAONA: Mr. Chairman --
MS. THOMAS: You want to state your name?
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1 MR. GAONA: I'm sorry. Andy Gaona with
2 Coppersmith Brockelman here on behalf of Corin Hammond, 3 the respondent in MUR 004.
4 First, Mr. Chairman, members of the
5 Commission, let me apologize for my voice. I
6 appreciate many of the things my one-year-old brings
7 home from daycare, the sickness du jour not being one
8 of them.
9 I want to make a couple of points, and let
10 me first directly address what -- the concern that's
11 been addressed by Commissioner Laird and Commissioner
12 Paton and that Mr. Collins hinted at what my response
13 would be. And I would say that I more or less agree
14 with what Mr. Collins said. The issue here is --
15 stemmed from a campaign finance reporting of $\$ 6,000$ for
16 services provided by the Democratic party's coordinated
17 campaign. Those were reported as consulting services
18 like any other consulting service would be reported.
19 That's how the campaign finance system allows you to
20 report those.
21 For example, if a candidate hired
22 Mr . Querard's consulting firm, Grassroots, they might
23 report a -- some amount. Pick the amount. \$2,000,
$24 \$ 3,000$ or $\$ 6,000$ for consulting services. What the
25 campaign finance system does not currently require is a
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line item specification as to what services were
provided there. So the same issue that's been
identified in terms of specificity and how public funds
were or were not spent exists with respect to both the
Democratic party acting as a vendor and to Grassroots
acting as a vendor or any other consultant acting as a vendor.
8 And that may be a problem -- a policy
problem that needs to be addressed either through rule
10 making or at the statutory level if the Commission is
1 concerned with increasing transparency in terms of how
public funds are spent, but given the regulations and
the laws as they existed at the time this report was
made, how it was reported was perfectly lawful. And
5 Ms. Hammond has gone above and beyond what was normally
16 required, as Mr. Collins' executive director's note
17 points out, in terms of providing information to
18 satisfy Commission Staff that this expenditure was
19 proper and was lawful.
20 In terms of what services were or were not
21 provided and Mr. Querard's speculation about what those
22 were, what the -- what Staff and what the Commission
23 has to consider is what the actual evidence is and what
24 has been provided to the Commission, and as Mr. Collins
25 pointed out, our response provides that evidence, the

1 denial. It provides an explanation of what services
2 were provided during the primary period and makes clear
3 that a separate payment was made for services to be
4 provided to Ms. Hammond's campaign by the coordinated
5 campaign during the general election period.
6 There's no question about that. And we've
7 been fully transparent in terms of responding to the
8 request that had been made of Ms. Hammond by Staff in
9 terms of processing this complaint, but I want to just
10 make one more point. And I'll defer on everything else
11 to our papers and to the executive director's report
12 with respect to this complaint which I think was very
13 thoroughly researched and very thoroughly done, and I'd
14 like to thank Mr. Collins and his staff for that.
15 How this complaint was processed raises a
16 structural issue that I want to just bring to the
17 Commission's attention, and it's a structural issue
18 that affects candidates. In the presentation that was
19 given by Staff earlier about all of the Commission's
20 outreach efforts, there was a focus on the preamble and
21 the real goal of this Commission to increase citizen --
22 or to increase public participation in the political
23 process. And I think that has two aspects. One is
24 voter -- is voter turnout, increasing voter turnout,
25 increasing voter engagement. The second part is
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1 encouraging people who want to run for office, to in
2 fact, run for office.
3 And the structure created by the Clean
4 Elections Act allows people to do that. What they
5 shouldn't have to do, though, is respond endlessly to
6 complaints and supplemental complaints, and again,
7 supplemental complaints that are -- that come in on the
8 day before a Clean Elections meeting that come in from
9 a serial complainant who is -- has partisan motivations
10 for bringing those. It requires candidates to divert
11 their attention from what they're supposed to be doing
12 which is getting their message out to voters and trying
13 to win office.
14 And there's a -- there's certainly an
15 element of transparency here, and as I stated earlier,
16 Ms . Hammond was fully transparent with respect to this
17 process and with respect to responding to the
18 complaint. It's another thing entirely to require her
19 to engage attorneys to review everything that comes in
20 for Mr. Querard here who -- I think there are four or
21 five separate documents that were filed with the
22 Commission that as a careful lawyer I don't want to
23 leave unanswered. I don't want there to be questions
24 in your mind, but that requires an expense that I think
25 is unnecessary, that I think is inconsistent with the
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purposes of the Clean Elections Act.
2 So this is more of another policy -- an
overarching policy issue that I think the Commission
needs to consider going forward which is, is there a
more efficient way to process complaints so that a
candidate who is operating under limited resources and
can use those resources for very limited purposes
8 doesn't have to spend both time and resources in
9 responding to these seriatim-style requests for
10 information that are really nothing more, as one of the
11 letters from Mr. Querard noted it, than this piqued my
12 interest or this sparked my curiosity?
The Commission should be concerned with
actual violations and not piquing the interest or -- or
forcing someone to satisfy the interest of a
complainant. And I think that's largely what this has
devolved into, and I think it's unfortunate.
There are certainly legitimate policy
19 concerns at issue here, and if -- again, if the
20 Commission wants to address those going forward with
21 new rule making, I think that would be the proper way
22 to do it, but with respect to the regulations as they
23 existed when this complaint came in and Ms. Hammond's
24 conduct and her payment of the Arizona Democratic party
25 as a vendor, each of those steps was allowed under the
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laws that existed at the time, and I think that it
would be perfectly appropriate to enter a finding of --
or to accept, rather, the recommendation of Staff that
4 there's no reason to believe that a violation of the
5 act has occurred here.
6 With that, I'd be happy to answer any
questions.
8 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioners, any
questions?
COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Yes. CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner Laird? COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Counselor, you'd agree
with me that my job as a commissioner and the job of
the Commission is not just to make sure reports are
filed but that the money that we administer is spent
properly, consistent with the statute and the
intentions of the statute.
MR. GAONA: I'd agree with that,
Commissioner.
COMMISSIONER LAIRD: And what evidence do I
have, given this general description -- and I'll give
you the minimum threshold has been met with respect to
filing. I'll give you that, but I honestly can't
determine whether or not the $\$ 6,000$-- you know, $\$ 6,000$
worth of fair market value was received and whether or

1 not other candidates benefitted equally and therefore
2 should have share proportionately in the expenses. And
3 so that's what I'm struggling with as a commissioner.
4 I understand what you're saying. It may
5 just be the subject of rules going forward, but as to
6 this specific complaint, I wish I knew more about what
7 the $\$ 6,000$ was for, more about what the fair market
8 value of that might be and whether or not other
9 candidates, because of the nature of the services,
10 benefitted from that. And I don't feel like I'm in a
11 position to make that decision today.
12 MR. GAONA: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
13 Laird, let me try to address your question. And I
14 think in part you have to view this matter under review
15 in tandem with the next one on the agenda because they
16 all relate to the Democratic coordinated campaign, and
17 as it turns out, given the needs of a particular
18 district or however it was -- it was done, different
19 candidates paid in different amounts.
20 You had, for example, a statewide race
21 where the buy-in to the coordinated campaign was
22 larger, as I believe Mr. Barton will address. That's a
23 statewide race. It's going to require more resources,
24 more time and more consulting as would be required for
25 a race of that scale. Our response -- and I don't have
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1 the Bates numbering that Mr. Collins was referring to,
2 but it's at -- it's Exhibit B, at the bottom of the
3 first page of the response really through the end
4 details the types of services that were provided here.
5 In addition, there was a sworn statement
6 that we obtained from the former executive director of
7 the Arizona Democratic party who attested to the fact
8 that services were provided by the coordinated campaign
9 to Ms. Hammond in proportion to what she paid into
10 this. That -- I'm not quite sure what else we need to
11 do at that point to justify the fact that the $\$ 6,000$
12 that was paid for the primary and the $\$ 6,000$ that was
13 paid for the general was in exchange for services
14 provided by a vendor who acted as a vendor like any
15 other in this case.
16 I have never seen the Commission delve into
17 what the fair market value of the services provided by
18 a vendor are. And I think those are judgments that
19 could be made if there were rules that specified really
20 how that related to the Democratic party acting as a
21 vendor versus Mr. Querard acting as a vendor because
22 what I believe to be the fair market value of
23 consulting services provided by Mr. Querard might
24 differ from his view or just here -- as here where he
25 seems to have questions about the Democratic party's

1 provision of vendor services, there may be entirely 2 different views about what it is.
3 And if that's a road that the Commission
wants to go down, again, I think that is best addressed
5 through the rule-making process and through requiring
6 line item specification as to what services were
provided if you report, for example, a payment of a
8 certain amount of money for consulting services because
9 that can mean a whole host of things.
10 And, again, I want to reiterate that that
level of specificity was not required of Ms. Hammond at
the time she made this reporting and is not currently
required under the rules as they exist today. And
that's a policy change that may have value and may be perfectly consistent with the purpose of the Clean
Elections Act. It may be perfectly consistent with
ensuring that public dollars get spent in a way that's consistent with the act.

I continue to believe that, based on the
20 response and the sworn statement that was provided by
21 Sheila Healy, that as the executive director's note
22 provides, that there is no reason to believe that a
23 violation has occurred here with respect to
24 Ms. Hammond, and that's all I'm asking that the
25 Commission do today.
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I understand that he needs some direction as to what he can do in future elections, and so I think that's part of it. I can kind of -- I understand that maybe you think he's doing a fishing expedition and maybe constantly complaining. I'm not -- I don't know that, but maybe that will help us with our rules in the future.

## COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Mr. Chairman?

 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner.COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: I think -- I'm
sympathetic to what Commissioner Laird says, particularly in regard to our rules, R2-20-702(B), that
24 says a participating candidate's payment from a
25 campaign account to a political committee or civic

1 organization is not a contribution if the payment is
2 reasonable in relation to the value received. I think
3 the point Commissioner Laird is making is we don't know
4 that we have enough information here to know if it was
5 reasonable in relation to the value received.
6 I don't know that we're asking for
7 additional information that was not required. I think
8 we're asking for information that will allow us to make
9 the determination that is in the rules. I don't think
10 we're asking for -- for something new.
11 MR. COLLINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman, 12 Commissioner Kimble, the one -- the one distinction I
13 would draw there is where we are in the process. And
14 the standard -- our evidentiary standard is reason to
15 believe a violation has occurred. And so once --
16 based -- and this is based on the framework we have in
17 place. Once the candidate comes forward with proof
18 that there was a direct campaign expenditure -- which
19 there's no debate that this was a direct campaign
20 expenditure. The only debate is about the detail --
21 the question of whether or not it's reasonable or not,
22 the burden then shifts to the Commission to say there's
23 reason to believe it was unreasonable.
24 And so I think that -- for lack of a better
25 way of putting it, that's the -- that's the procedural
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framework we're operating in. So part of the reason
2 the questions that you have are harder to answer in
3 this context as opposed to in a policy meeting context
4 is because the framework we have says once you show
5 that it's a direct campaign expenditure -- which
6 there's no dispute, I don't think, among the
7 commissioners or anyone that this is a direct campaign
8 expenditure.
9 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: I'm not --
10 MR. COLLINS: Wait. Maybe there is.
COMMISSIONER LAIRD: I'm not sure that I agree with that.

MR. COLLINS: Well, maybe you don't, but the more important point to -- to Commissioner Kimble's point is the burden -- the burden we have, if you will, 6 is, is there reason to believe? And so that means we 17 would have to have reason to believe that the value was
18 unreasonable, to put it another way. And so whether we
19 have enough information to conclude that there's reason
20 to believe it was reasonable is not the question. The
21 question is do we have reason to believe that it's
22 unreasonable? It's the inverse of the question I think
23 we're sort of focused on, if you follow.
24 MR. GAONA: And, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
25 Kimble and Commissioner Laird, to somewhat address that
point, I think there's an issue here of the burden, and I think this is really what Mr. Collins is referring to which is a complaint was filed that says -- essentially says I think that that sum is unreasonable and it seems to me that it might -- it seems to me that it might
have applied across the two different election periods, the general and the primary election period.
8 We were asked by Staff to respond to that complaint, and in so doing, we fully complied with -with the Commission rules in providing a response that explains what that money was used for and stating that there was no joint expenditure, it never happened, and I think fully responding to the complaint. As -procedurally, as this complaint was handled, we were 5 asked to provide additional information.

And, Mr. Collins, I didn't see it in the
packet that I received, but I assume that the
commissioners have the affidavit of Sheila Healy that we provided as a supplement at the request of Staff.

MR. COLLINS: They have -- there is -- if
it's the same as the one -- is it the same? Is there a different one versus --

MR. GAONA: It's -- I didn't see it in the
24 packet that you provided, but I know that there were --
25 there were separate affidavits or declarations that
were provided with respect to Matter 5.
MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
MR. GAONA: And there was one for 4 that was sent to you. I didn't get it in the packet that I received, but I didn't know if the Commission had a fuller set of materials.
MR. COLLINS: We may not. We may not have.
I mean, we will track it down if we don't.
9 MR. GAONA: That being the case, I
apologize for referring to a declaration that you've
never received a copy of.
MR. COLLINS: Well, that's my fault.
MR. GAONA: But -- is it in the --
MR. COLLINS: Oh, we had concluded it was
the same one that was in 5 . If it's different in some
substantial --
MR. GAONA: I think it was just specific to
Ms. Hammond versus the other -- the --
MR. COLLINS: Oh, okay. Then we may not
have -- there may not be one specific to Hammond, but
the substance of it we think is in --
MR. GAONA: Yes.
MR. COLLINS: -- in 5.
MR. GAONA: Yes.
MR. COLLINS: Okay.

1 MR. GAONA: So there are declarations that
2 were provided by Sheila Healy who is the former
3 executive director at the Arizona Democratic party with
4 respect to 5 . I can tell you that a similar document
5 was provided to Staff with respect to Matter 4 where
6 the former -- the former executive director of the
7 party who served as the vendor here states under oath
8 that services were provided to the -- to the
9 candidates, in this case Ms. Hammond, in proportion to
10 their pay-in and that -- and that the Democratic party,
11 in fact, acted as the vendor in those cases.
12 Given the posture that Mr. Collins alluded
13 to, I believe that a candidate in that circumstance has
14 carried its burden. And here the complainant has not
15 provided you with any additional information or
16 evidence to controvert that other than his sheer
17 speculation or questions that he may have about that
18 evidence. So what you have before you are
19 Mr . Querard's beliefs about the reasonableness of this
20 particular expenditure and the evidence provided to you
21 under oath both by the candidate and by the vendor in
22 this case that firmly, I believe, contradicts
23 everything that Mr. Querard is saying.
24 I understand that there may be a desire to
25 have additional evidence in future proceedings, and if
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1 that's going to be the case, again, that should be made
2 clear through rules -- what actually is the burden in
3 these cases and what does "reason to believe" actually
4 mean? -- so that somebody in the position of
5 Ms. Hammond is not left in the position that we may
6 find our ourselves in here now which is fully
7 responding to the complaint, providing additional
8 information from a vendor under oath about the services
9 that were provided but there still being serious
10 questions about that fact based, again, on the
11 speculation of the complainant.
12 So to try to answer the question that was
13 asked, again, to summarize that response, I believe
14 that Ms. Hammond has carried her burden with respect to
15 the procedural posture we're in now which is, is there
16 reason to believe that a violation of the act has
17 occurred? Based on Ms. Hammond's statements, based on
18 the statements of the vendor, there is no reason to
19 believe. And, again, I would ask that the Commission
20 make that finding today.
21 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions,
22 Commissioners?
23 (No response.)
24 CHAIRMAN TITLA: I think the -- Director
25 Collins, in this case the rule that we're looking at is

R2-20-701, right?
MR. COLLINS: 701 and 702. Correct, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN TITLA: Right. And 702, yeah, (A)
and what it says there is that a participating
candidate shall use funds in the candidate's current
campaign account to pay for goods and services for
direct campaign purposes only. Funds shall be
disbursed and reported in accordance with A.R.S.
10 Section 16-948(C) and (B).
I think that what Commissioner Laird is
addressing is that a participating candidate's payment
from a campaign account to a political committee or
civic organization is not a contribution if the
campaign is reasonable in relation to the value
received. I guess the question is whether the payment
is reasonable in relation to the question received.
Is that correct, Commissioner?
COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Correct.
CHAIRMAN TITLA: What is the wishes of the
21 Commission here? The director has requested a decision
22 by the Commission that there's no reason to believe
23 that a violation has occurred. If the Commission is
24 not prepared to do that, do you want to continue this
25 issue until the next meeting, or what are the options
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here?
2 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Mr. Chairman, if I
could, I tend to agree with our director and lorded counsel that just spoke to us. I'm not happy about it,
5 but I think I'm going to find based on the evidence we
6 have before us, there is no evidence that a violation
has occurred.
8 And so I'm going to vote in favor of the
recommendation, but I do want to express my concern on
10 the record that there is some real potential for abuse
11 here. And let's assume that the fair market value of
that $\$ 6,000$ payment was only $\$ 1,000$ and 5,000 is going
to the Democratic party in general. I feel the same way about the Republican party. I think that violates the purpose for which the funds are supposed to be used, and I just don't think we have enough information in front of us, based on our current rules, to make that determination.

So I'm concerned about that, and I suppose
20 from a policy standpoint that could be a rule-making
21 issue going forward, but I think for this specific case
22 today, based on the evidence before us, I don't see any
23 evidence that a violation has occurred.
24 COMMISSIONER PATON: And I would concur 25 with that. I mean, he put that kind of how I feel.

1 COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman, a couple 2 of points. I think there needs to be -- Tom talked
3 earlier about proportionality. I think there needs to
4 be a concept of proportionality applied here too.
5 We're talking about a $\$ 6,000$ expense and obviously --
6 or in my opinion, there's going to -- you're going to
7 need to be less descriptive or offer less information
8 to demonstrate a $\$ 6,000$ expense is reasonable in
9 relation to the value received than a $\$ 50,000$ expense,
10 and I think that -- that just makes sense to me.
11 And I think that Staff has applied those
12 standards and they're going to, you know, apply that
13 standard of how far do we dig into this or how much are
14 we going to require for a $\$ 6,000$ expense versus a
$15 \$ 50,000$ expense. So I'm going to trust -- you know, I
16 believe Staff has done their job here. I'm going to
17 vote to support the recommendation that no finding --
18 there's no reason to believe a violation occurred.
19 In addressing some of the comments from the
20 public here as far as, well, what do we have to do for
21 an expense of this nature, what do we have to do for an
22 expense of that nature, my response to that is just be
23 descriptive with what the services are providing. Let
24 us know so we can see, you know, what those expenses
25 are, meet that burden that it's reasonable in relation
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1 to the value received and all this can be avoided. So, you know, I think we can avoid all this by just taking care of this on the front end and being descriptive in what these -- what these contributions are for.
5 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner Meyer, there 6 are good comments.
7 Sir?
8 MR. QUERARD: If I could.
MR. COLLINS: We've got a whole -- we've
got a whole other one for you too.
MR. QUERARD: I was actually only -- I don't know if serial, but I have only been here once before and that was as a defendant. So just a couple of quick points.

I have no trouble with reason to believe or not to believe. I have no reason to believe at this point in time. I'm simply ignorant to the facts because I don't have them, like any member of the public. I simply have no details. I have no trouble
20 with the Democrat party acting as a consultant or as a
21 vendor. Again, they -- I think they probably have the
22 right to do that, but the defendant is incorrect in his
23 description of the reporting requirements. The
24 reporting requirement for consulting is its own
25 specific category.

1 Vendor product, voter contact has a whole bunch of subcategories because the Clean Elections
Commission over the years has refined the rules and
asked for a greater and greater detail. Hammond's response was unique among all of them because everyone else was specific to say it was not voter contact; it 7 was only consulting or training. Hammond's response 8 was unique because it was saying it was not consulting or training; it was only voter contact. And so what
10 I've been looking for is basically do you guys want detail or do we not want detail?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Detailing as far as what?

MR. QUERARD: As far as what -- because if the memo coordinated campaign is sufficient, tell me and that's what we'll use, but I don't think it is. Again, it should be fixed on the front end because the system requires an autodialer to be listed under telecommunications subcategory, you know, voter contact, telecommunications. There's all these drop-down menus and subcategories which weren't used. If they provided the details to the
23 Commission, does the public ever get to see them, okay?
24 In all of the exhibits you have, there's a couple of
25 receipts from the Democratic party saying we got paid.
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There are no invoices with the exception of one invoice in, I believe, Mr. Chapman's filing. We don't have any invoices from any -- from any of the vendors or from the vendor. We literally have no idea what the money was spent on.
I apologize for the amount of time that
Ms. Hammond and the others have spent in response to
this, but if Ms. Hammond had simply provided the
required detail at the beginning, I wouldn't have a
question. I asked a question about one candidate with
a suspicious expenditure. Her answer prompted me to
check several, and I found a pattern of behavior which
made up the following. It's not $\$ 6,000$. It's $\$ 12,000$.
The payment was repeated in the general election. It
was more than 30 percent of the money she received for
this vague category. So it may actually meet some sort of a threshold above that.

And, again, I'm not arguing for guilt. I'm advocating for disclosure. If we're okay here and she's done enough and that's the standard, okay, but then let that be the standard. If that's not the standard, then -- then you're not guilty. We have no reason to believe, but please fix your campaign finance
24 reports so the public knows what you spent your money 25 on, perhaps. So that's all. That's all. I'll stop.

1 COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Mr. Chairman, I agree
2 with everything Mr. Laird just said, and I think you've
3 raised some very interesting points. And I would be
4 interested going forward on your thoughts about any
5 changes we should make to the rules if you feel that's
6 necessary and some -- maybe some suggested wording from
7 you to try to get ahead of this problem next time so
8 that we don't go through this.
9 I do think it's a -- it could be a possible
10 problem in the future, and I don't want to make
11 people -- I don't want to micromanage everyone's
12 campaign, but if you can think of some language where
13 political parties -- how they should report it versus
14 how your consulting firm reports stuff, if there should
15 be more detail from you, I'd be interested in your
16 thoughts about this, not now but as we think about
17 whether there ought to be a change in the rules.
MR. QUERARD: I'd be happy to. And I think
19 the rule is actually probably sufficient in terms of
20 the level of detail required. It's just in this case
21 they simply weren't followed. Nobody here -- except
22 maybe documents provided by Mr. Collins. We have no
23 idea what the money was spent on even -- even -- I
24 don't even know if the five of you have any idea what
25 the money was actually spent on, and that is unique to
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1 this particular issue. You could look at any of your
2 other candidates, pull up their finance reports and see
3 how they spent their money. So I think the rules
actually are probably sufficient. It's just in this
case they weren't applied or followed.
Thanks.
CHAIRMAN TITLA: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER PATON: Could -- Mr. Chairman,
could we have Sara say something about this?
Since you're the one that deals with this.

## CHAIRMAN TITLA: Sara?

MS. LARSEN: Chairman, Commissioners, yes.
This is -- this is something that we do look for on campaign finance reports, looking for some indication
that expenditures are appropriate and -- and that they
are reported properly. The problem with the campaign
finance report is we don't -- you know, candidates
don't email us their invoices or their documentations
for every expenditure that they make. So what we have
20 provided to us is the campaign finance report and the
21 information there.
22 This is one that, you know, we don't know
23 most of the time whether it's -- you know, when
24 somebody makes an expenditure, is it for an invoice
25 that they've received for previous services that were
provided to them or is it for future services that are provided to them? So with respect to comments regarding the timing of the expenditure, it could have been for services that were previously provided, not for services that were going to be provided.
6 The campaign finance reports are really all
that we have from the candidates to indicate whether something is a direct campaign expenditure or not. The
reporting in this was not atypical of something that we
would see. The candidates pay numerous amounts for consulting services. They're ranged all across the board from all different types of consultants. So this was not an alarming amount to see be paid for a consulting service.

And if you have a specific question, I'm
happy to answer it, but I didn't see something that
was, like, alarming to me.
COMMISSIONER PATON: So how could we make
sure that -- you know, with Commissioner Laird's
comments about, you know, what this was used for and so
on and so we can give Mr. Constantin's -- answer his
questions so that he knows how to proceed and so he
won't -- he will have more faith in this whole
24 situation? I don't know. I just think that maybe we 25 all need some direction. there is a memo line on the -- on the campaign finance reports where even if the system won't allow you to indicate something more general than a professional service, it's typically a category and then you get to select, you know, was it photography, was it administrative, was it consulting? So consulting is a general service. Candidates can itemize on the memo line the service that they received. So if we can
10 direct candidates to more appropriately document in the memo line for all the services that they've received.

We can also, you know, direct candidates to
more efficiently maintain invoices, which they are required to do, but we really say documentation. So we do agree that an affidavit is a documentation. In some of our audits, candidates went back and received 17 affidavits to justify expenditures when they did not
18 have a sufficient documentation. So it is something
19 that we allow candidates to do, just any kind of
20 reasonable proof that there is -- a service was
21 rendered to them for the amount that they paid.
22 Additionally, we are going to be auditing
23 all statewide candidates in 20 -- going forward into
24 2018. So all of those candidates will have to provide 25 documentation and their expenditures are going to be

1 scrutinized. We did not make that for legislative
2 candidates, but that could also be an option where all
3 candidates will be audited if you participate in the
4 public financing program. That could be one remedy,
5 knowing that -- that they will have to maintain
6 appropriate documentation and that each candidate will
7 be more heavily scrutinized in their expenditures.
8 MR. COLLINS: I think -- if I may,
9 Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Paton, just to amplify what
10 Sara said, I mean, Sara reads more campaign finance
11 reports than anybody in the state. And the question is
12 unreasonable. And if nothing jumps out at her that
13 says that's unreasonable, you know, that's not a
14 weightless thing. We do require subvendor reporting.
15 When then there are subvendors, you have to kick out
16 who the subvendors are, and we do require specific
17 reports on that.
18 In this particular case, the sworn -- sworn
19 evidence is in both 4 and 5 -- and I know we're kind of
20 muddling 4 and 5 . So I want to make it clear we should
21 close out 4 to move to 5 but, you know, that the
22 Democratic party was the vendor and there was not a
23 subvendor to report further -- further that they
24 otherwise would have. You know, and the bottom line is
25 that, you know, campaign finance reports are not --
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1 they're not a science exactly.
2 I mean, they do give you a general idea,
3 but let's be -- if you want to be real honest about it,
4 whether it's a traditional candidate or a clean
5 candidate, you can garbage-in and garbage-out a data
6 entry system no matter what it is. And -- and we don't
7 think that's what happened here, but the reporting
8 system relies on the -- whether you're traditional or
9 clean relies on you inputting what you spent on certain
10 aspects of your campaign and the contributions you
1 received and that being true.
We have had egregious cases in the past in
13 which we've actually thrown folks out of office for
14 having an off-the-books campaign that we discovered
15 because they weren't being honest about where they were
16 spending their money. And so we have caught people in
17 more dramatic cases than that, to your point about, you
18 know, are we looking? And so it is a question, to
19 Commissioner Meyer's point, of degree in
20 proportionality, but it's also a question of -- of, you
21 know, I think there's fine-tuning we can certainly do.
22 And we'll look at it with Mr. Querard and
23 with the parties and with others, and Sara and I can
24 work on that and look forward to it but, you know, at
25 the end of the day, as long as you have a system that
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| 1 starts with data entry at the candidate level, the <br> 2 possibility for garbage in/garbage out is always going <br> 3 to be there unless -- you know, it's just -- that's the <br> 4 nature of the beast. If you don't have a -- you know, <br> 5 unless we -- and that's why we've expanded the audits <br> 6 to the statewide candidates, for example. <br> MS. LARSEN: And, Chairman, Commissioners, <br> we do ask for amendments to campaign finance reports. <br> Amy was the -- was the lucky one who was tasked with that, giving her some -- some real experience reviewing campaign finance reports, and trying to adhere them to the Commission's rules can be complicated and it can be hard. And every candidate reports differently unless -- unless I'm lucky and they get a treasurer and the treasurer does a bunch of candidates, then it's all uniform, but every candidate reports differently. <br> And it really is learning to read how they report and learning to understand how a vendor reports. <br> 19 So just because one person reports something in one <br> 20 manner does not necessarily mean that all candidates <br> 21 report something in a similar manner, though a lot of <br> 22 times I wish they would, but we are fairly small for <br> 23 the amount of campaign finance reports that we review <br> 24 and -- and it's a lot. But we do ask for amendments to <br> 25 those reports and we do ask candidates to correct them | COMMISSIONER MEYER: Second. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Second by Commissioner Meyer. <br> All in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion passes unanimously. <br> We go to VI B now, MUR 16-005, Querard <br> complaint against Democratic candidates. <br> MR. COLLINS: So, Mr. Chairman, this is <br> a -- <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: I'd like to interrupt, <br> Mr. Collins. I think our court reporter could use a <br> break here. <br> MR. COLLINS: Oh, yes. Let's do than then. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Let's take five <br> minutes. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Why don't we take five <br> minutes. <br> 21 (Whereupon, a recess was taken in the <br> proceedings.) <br> 23 CHAIRMAN TITLA: We are on item VI B, MUR <br> 24 16-005. <br> 25 Director Collins? |
| 11:25:12-11:26:16 <br> 1 when we do see something that either needs further <br> scrutinization and needs to have more detail provided to it. <br> We do try to provide that -- or ask for <br> that, and I have asked for documentation for <br> expenditures as well and asked candidates to provide <br> documentation for those expenditures just to make sure <br> that they are direct campaign expenditures, but our <br> audit process is probably one of the best ways to know <br> whether -- whether expenditures are direct campaign <br> expenditures and the money is truly going to its best <br> uses as the rules. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Thank you, ma'am, for your <br> report. I think that we've spent enough time on this <br> issue. <br> So is there any action to be taken by the <br> commissioners? <br> COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Mr. Chairman, I would <br> move in the case of 16-004, Corin Hammond, that we <br> affirm the finding of the executive director that <br> there's no reason to believe a violation of <br> R2-20-110(A)(4) has occurred. <br> 23 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion by Commissioner <br> Kimble. <br> 25 Is there a second? | 1 MR. COLLINS: Oh, yes. Great. As our <br> 2 wrap-up -- quick wrap-up meeting for the 2016 election <br> 3 continues, so MUR 16-05 is, as we've taken to calling <br> 4 it, the Querard complaint. And it basically -- <br> 5 Mr . Querard identified some transactions with about <br> 6 eight Democratic candidates related to the party. Some <br> 7 of these themes are going to be themes you've already <br> 8 heard about. They have a different attorney -- these <br> 9 clients do -- Jim Barton who is here with us today, as is Mr. Querard. <br> The issue there from my perspective is we <br> have outlined in a spreadsheet that Sara put together <br> 13 what the spending was for. We have affidavits that we <br> 14 think back those up, and then -- and this is where the <br> 15 audits come in. On specific transactions we went out <br> 16 and audited those transactions, which, again, I don't <br> 17 mean to try to pretend like you're -- in no way am I <br> 18 saying that the Commission's questions aren't valid. <br> 19 I'm just simply saying that Staff did try to drill down <br> 20 on this as much as we can, you know, to get to find a <br> 21 reason, if there was a reason to be found, to <br> 22 invalidate these things. <br> 23 We think that the same standard applies to <br> 24 MUR 005 as applied in MUR 004 and, therefore, we <br> 25 recommend a finding of no reason to believe and closing |
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| this case out. I don't know that I need to add <br> anything else at this point. I don't know if <br> Constantin or Jim -- or how you guys want to go or, <br> Mr. Chairman, frankly, up to you how you want to -- if <br> you want the complainant to go first or respondent to <br> go first and however you want to proceed or if you have questions for me. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioners, any <br> questions for the director? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Okay. We have the <br> complainant. <br> MR. QUERARD: I swear it's the last time <br> this year. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: We will hold you to that. <br> MR. COLLINS: The year is very young. <br> MR. QUERARD: Did I say cycle? Well, still <br> this -- there should be nothing else this year. I'm <br> addressing eight or nine complaints, so I'll talk fast. <br> And I do thank the Staff for drilling down and working <br> hard, and I hope that the details that they have found <br> will be available to the public. <br> 24 If whatever has happened was legal and <br> 25 permissible, you guys will decide today. I'm fine | 1 see with very little imagination required how it could <br> 2 be abused if it wasn't. And then you guys need to <br> 3 figure out how to -- how to prevent that from <br> 4 happening. <br> 5 What we just heard, which I hadn't known <br> 6 before, is that you can take an affidavit in place of <br> 7 an invoice, which I suppose maybe one day it will help <br> 8 one of my clients in one of these matters, but it <br> 9 sounds insane to me that -- you potentially open <br> 10 yourself to literally taking the word of the thief that <br> 11 he didn't steal from you, and that just strikes me as <br> 12 something that is rife to potential abuse. <br> 13 Just a few things that jumped out in the <br> 14 respondent's affidavit and the exhibits that were <br> 15 provided. Again, the original Hammond response was <br> 16 clear because Hammond said it was voter contact; it <br> 17 wasn't consulting or training. These folks have <br> 18 different attorneys and their responses were uniform <br> 19 and unambiguous that it was not product, okay? It was <br> 20 consulting and training. They all paid for consulting <br> 21 and training which made it kind of a different matter, <br> 22 not voter contact. <br> 23 So why they were all calling it the same <br> 24 coordinated campaign but one was getting an entirely <br> 25 different suite of benefits from it than the others |
| 11:37:55-11:38:58 <br> 1 with -- with either of them. This is a case where <br> 2 precedent is kind of my main issue because I run so <br> 3 many candidates, a lot of whom are unclean, that we <br> 4 want to know what the rules are. And so I wrote my <br> 5 complaint and my comment as somebody who runs a lot of <br> 6 campaigns, works with Clean Elections candidates. And <br> 7 I've done it for enough years that I understand what <br> 8 consultants do, what vendors do, kind of what they get <br> 9 for it and what candidates get out of it, et cetera. <br> 10 I agree with Mr. Collins that Clean <br> 11 Elections doesn't want to be in the business of price <br> 12 controls, setting prices for things. We don't -- we <br> 13 don't want that. That would be unhealthy and probably <br> 14 drive most candidates out of the system, but the Clean <br> 15 Elections Act was written with the assumption that <br> 16 anybody who goes through the trouble of collecting <br> 17 those 5 s and participating in the process does so for <br> 18 good reason and with good intentions, that, you know, <br> 19 it's an honorable pursuit, that they're going to get <br> 20 that money. They're going to go out there and <br> 21 campaign, spread their message, try to win an election. <br> 22 I don't think it anticipated that it could <br> 23 be or that it would be used for less legitimate <br> 24 purposes. I'm not saying it was, but we're going to <br> 25 look at a pattern of behavior where you will be able to | 11:40:12-11:41:04 <br> 1 were has never really been explained. I couldn't find <br> 2 the answer in those documents, but there are some <br> 3 potential pitfalls. <br> 4 Consulting is where I charge you for <br> 5 advice. You're going to pay me, but the money you pay <br> me that you could have spent on your campaign is money <br> well spent because I'll tell you how to spend your <br> money better, wiser, get you better prices, get you <br> better product, communicate your message better. It's <br> like hiring a retirement adviser. You're going to give <br> your retirement adviser money you wanted to put aside <br> for your retirement, okay, but you do that on the base <br> that he's going to teach you how to get more out of <br> your remaining money, and so ultimately it will put <br> money in your pocket. <br> So these respondents are paying money to <br> their consultants for advice for training, volunteer <br> training, field organization, media consulting. They <br> listed several types of training. <br> Focusing first on the legislative <br> 21 candidates because they all have basically the same <br> 22 rates, the same scale of rates, the districts. The <br> 23 number of residents were the same. In my -- in my <br> 24 company we charge all of our legislative candidates 275 <br> 25 bucks a month. It doesn't matter what district they're |
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| 1 sharing message. They're sharing strategy. They're <br> 2 sharing signs and mailers and all those sorts of <br> 3 things. They also have a consultant. They were using <br> 4 Strategies 360. <br> 5 Frankly, if you were going to train <br> 6 somebody on how to run for the Corporation Commission, <br> 7 Bill Mundell could probably teach the class. You have <br> 826 days to go in the primary. Mundell and Chabin each <br> 9 write a check for $\$ 25,000$ to the State Democratic party <br> 10 for training and consulting. I find that odd. <br> 11 Again, Mundell sought consulting and <br> 12 training on how to win the race that he had already run <br> 13 and won twice from a party which, you know, not to be <br> 14 mean partisan-wise, but doesn't have a great record of <br> 15 winning Corporation Commission races. I mean, they <br> 16 should be asking Mundell for advice on how to do it. <br> 17 In his note the executive director took <br> 18 note of my concern that the category of consulting is <br> 19 general enough that amount can be paid. The problem is <br> 20 that it's so vague it doesn't get much oversight. I <br> 21 didn't mean to politicize anything by raising the <br> 22 issue. I suspect if you had a $\$ 24,000$ candidate -- or <br> 23 campaign and they spent 3 grand on consulting, that <br> 24 would be fine. It wouldn't -- if you had a $\$ 24,000$ <br> 25 campaign and you spent $\$ 21,000$ on consulting, that | 1 and I think you're entitled to that documentation if you knock on my door and say I've got a question; we're here on behalf of the taxpayers; you spent some money; we need to make sure you spent it how you're supposed to spend it. Not, oh, trust me, we spent it. <br> So I'm still concerned that what went on was not proper. I don't have the investigative authority to go prove my point. I can only raise the issue and you guys decide if it's worth investigating or not. Is the level of spending that was provided sufficient? Okay. If it is, that's the precedent. <br> But I do worry that it's going to set a bad example because, particularly in a world where an affidavit counts as an invoice, forget the parties. <br> An unscrupulous consultant, of which I assure you there are several even in Arizona, can simply go get candidates to run, help them collect their 5 s , just pocket -- I mean, the system is so rife for abuse if the people engaged can do so for basically nefarious purposes and the Commission is satisfied as long as it's, I'll say, consulting. That's my concern. Whatever happened here you guys need to figure out, and that's fine. And if it's good enough 24 or whatever, that's fine, but I'm really concerned 25 about the potential for abuse because the level of |
| 1 would raise alarms. <br> 2 So the question is if you had 24,000 and <br> 3 you spent 12,000 on consulting, does anybody care about <br> 4 that? Is that -- is that okay or not? And why is that <br> 5 the same training for $\$ 2,500$, or $\$ 4,300$, or $\$ 6,000$, or <br> $6 \$ 12,000$ or $\$ 50,000$ when it's described word for word <br> 7 exactly the same? Are you simply taking from the <br> 8 candidates what they can afford given their chances -- <br> 9 because Brown had almost no chance of winning that <br> 10 race. So I guess she didn't need the money? I don't <br> 11 know how the pricing was turned up -- was provided <br> 12 because there, of course, no one in the world has any <br> 13 idea what they got for their money. <br> 14 The note also made a comparison to Al <br> 15 Melvin's campaign for Corporation Commission which I <br> 16 ran, citing a payment to me a $\$ 46,750$ for an radio and <br> 17 online advertising buy. In fairness, a specific <br> 18 payment to a media buyer for a specific amount of <br> 19 product on specific dates through specific channels in <br> 20 no way compares to just a blank, you know, here, <br> 21 consulting. <br> 22 On the contrary, if you want to know what <br> 23 that money is for, I can show you the ad. I can give <br> 24 you the stations it ran. I can give you the times the <br> 25 ads ran. I can document what the money was spent on, | 1 reporting that it was given in these cases, to my <br> 2 mind -- and theoretically, I would benefit from lax <br> 3 standards and loose scrutiny or loose regulation, but <br> 4 to my mind it is woefully inadequate and opens up, you <br> 5 know, potentially a great deal of abuse. <br> 6 That's my concern of a precedent. That's <br> 7 kind of why I'm just kind of bulldogging this thing. <br> 8 These races are over. Okay? I don't believe any of <br> 9 the candidates that are involved in this thing won. <br> 10 It's not a political thing. It's not a partisan thing. <br> 11 I've been a consultant who's run Clean Elections <br> 12 campaigns since the beginning -- well, near the <br> 13 beginning, and I'm one of the few consultants who <br> 14 actually believes in the Clean Elections process, and <br> 15 now I'm just -- I'm concerned. <br> 16 So that's my -- that's my screed. Thank <br> you for putting up with it. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions, <br> Commissioners? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Director, any <br> recommendation? <br> 23 MR. COLLINS: Well, no, I think -- I guess <br> 24 if Mr. Barton has some response to Mr. Querard, that <br> 25 would probably be helpful. |

1 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Respondent.
2 MS. THOMAS: Your name for the record, please.
4 MR. BARTON: Jim Barton with Torres
5 Consulting and Law Group. I'm here on behalf of the
6 Arizona Democratic party and the respondents to the 7 matter.
8 So first off, I want to talk about just
this matter. An affidavit is a document that is sworn
10 under penalty of perjury and always anywhere and
11 forever is more evidence than an invoice. You have on
12 the record before you a sworn affidavit that attests to
13 what this stuff was used for and it's not just
14 training. It was training and consulting on campaign
15 finance and on public relations and on how to deal with
16 a tax and that sort of thing.
17 So on this record, the preponderance of the
18 evidence is that there's no reason to believe because
19 we provided you with sworn affidavits under penalty of
20 perjury. And I think that the Commission Staff did a
21 good job and I think they did it right, and I want
22 to -- I want to point out that what we were responding
23 to was literally a list of eight names that said I
24 think these guys are doing something screwy. He didn't
25 say "screwy," but I mean, it literally was a list of
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names. Go after those guys.
So you can see that we responded and we
showed what it was used for and we identified it as
consulting. So I think on this case, I think it's a
pretty easy question. You have unrebutted evidence
6 that we provided under penalty of perjury about what it
was used for and, yes, they did all -- the category of
what it was was just consulting on how do you deal with
campaign finance? How do you respond to complaints?
10 How do you deal with the media?
11 There's a variety of services that the
12 Democratic party provided to these candidates, and
13 different candidates are more or less experienced and
14 different candidates have bigger and smaller races, and
15 that's why there's different prices and that's the way
16 the rules are now. So I think -- on this issue I think
17 there's -- I think the Commission Staff is absolutely
18 correct. There's no reason to believe here. The
19 preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that.
20 I do want to talk a little bit about the
21 policy stuff that's kind of been thrown around, and one
22 thing I'd like to say is on the issue of specificity:
23 The Federal Elections Commission actually puts out a
24 list of these are the types of identifiers you are
25 allowed to use for consulting and these are the types

1 that you're not, and they have a pretty specific list.
2 And I would tell you in our affidavit we complied with
3 the types of specifications that the Federal Election
4 Comission requires.
5 I think that's helpful, and I think that,
6 you know, if the Commission doesn't want to get into
7 price control, then I think they have to do the system
8 which we have which is that it has to be reasonable.
9 We have very experienced people reviewing these. Those
10 experienced Staff members looked at it. Nothing jumped
11 out at them. They asked for a little bit more
12 information. They said, okay, that makes sense and
13 that's kind of where you are.
14 And I think, you know, geez, we're in
15 Arizona, right? I mean, this is the free market
16 capital of the world as far as I understood. And we
17 kind of negotiate a price and that's -- and that's the
18 fair market price. Now, that's not the only way to set
19 fair market, right? For example, the Department of
20 Labor has a whole structure that it uses to determine
21 how much money should you pay somebody if you're going
22 to do work on federal projects, and they break it down
23 by plumber and electrician and sheet metal and
24 insulator.
25 And I've got to tell you, I'm a labor guy
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1 and I love it. If that's what we're going to start
2 doing, then we're going to start doing these very
3 expensive surveys and very complicated surveys and I'll
4 make even more money, but I don't -- I don't know that
5 that's a smart way to deal with Clean Elections. And I
6 think that -- I think that the advice to stay out of
7 price control and to -- leave reasonable to be what
8 reasonable is.
9 You have professionals who are reviewing
10 these, and those professionals can say this doesn't
11 seem reasonable and let you know this seems out of
12 whack; we should draw more evidence. And then they can
13 gather evidence on both sides of it. As it happens
14 right now, they asked us. We provided evidence under
5 penalty of perjury.
I've got to say one more thing on the flip
side of this which hasn't come up. If somebody is
18 underpaying -- if you underpay a political party,
19 that's not a problem because of the political party
20 exemption which is an interesting difference. So I'm
21 just going to use my own firm rather than pick on
22 Constantin. If Torres Consulting and Law Group -- we
23 have a consulting firm, right? If we have two
24 candidates and we undercharge this candidate, that's
25 illegal because that's an in-kind contribution.

1 That same situation does not occur if it's
the Democratic party because the Democratic party has a
political party exemption: Staff time to help this guy
4 get elected. It's exempt from the definition of
5 expenditure so -- or contribution. So that's -- it is
6 a little bit different, actually, when we're talking
7 about political parties. I want to make one more
8 policy comment before I make -- before I take your
9 questions.
10 In 2006, Executive Director Tod Lang
determined that primary money cannot be used on general
12 campaigns, and it was determined in an enforcement,
13 okay. And I represented one of the candidates and
14 there was a Republican who had a representative against
15 him, and they both had to pay fines and it was an
16 after-the-fact determination. And I know as much
17 because I happened to come across the memo from the
18 executive director when he was at the AG's office in
192004 where he said there was no basis for making that 20 claim.
21 That's just a weird triviality, but my
22 point is in 2006 we established, through enforcement, a
23 change in the rules, and that was bad news for people
24 who wanted to participate in Clean Elections. Then in
25 2010, the United States Supreme Court got rid of
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matching funds, and essentially that meant the Clean
Elections has been underfunded by two-thirds ever since then.
4 If we can have these sort of endless --
well, that's not quite enough information; that's an
affidavit, but it's whatever; oh, that's not -- if
we -- if we really start making it harder and harder
and harder for these candidates to participate, at some
point it really does -- you really do say, geez, you
10 know what, it's a third of the funding you need even by
11 definition. You never know. I mean, I can tell you
12 what these rules are, but you never know. You might
13 get some after-the-fact enforcement and then they might
bang you up again. You know what? I don't -- you know, it just becomes very difficult to participate.

And so I think it's important to know that
17 what you have now is you have sworn affidavits that are
18 supporting reporting that complies with the Federal
19 Election Comission standard. That's the feds. I don't
20 know. It's Arizona, but still nonetheless, we can look
21 at the feds a little bit, right, and what the Federal
22 Election Comission would require. So I think easily
23 there's no reason to believe here. I think that's -- I
24 think that's -- I think the Commission Staff is very
25 right.

1 And I would say if we're going to put more
2 burdens on people who are participating in Clean
3 Elections, I suggest you tread careful in that because
4 I really do think being so underfunded it quickly
5 becomes just a poor choice. That's not really for
6 today, I suppose. That's for a policy in the future,
7 and I'm happy to provide, you know, stuff about what
8 the FEC says about this. And they have some good
9 charts that might be helpful, but doing too much more
10 into like -- too much more reporting burden, it starts
11 to really -- really starts to make Clean Elections not
12 a good option.
13 I'm happy to answer questions.
14 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions by the 15 commissioners?
16 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Mr. Chairman.
17 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commission Laird.
18 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Counselor, I mean,
19 really price control has not been suggested by anybody
20 on this Commission or anybody on the Staff. That's
21 kind of silly. We certainly aren't in that business.
22 In terms of how much detail there is, I mean, the
23 detail provided on some of these descriptions
24 tantamount to me on my bill to my clients which I go
25 into great deal. You understand how much detail
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we're -- for this half hour, I draft a letter to
Mr. No-show regarding the subject of blah, blah, blah,
reviewed the letter, signed the letter. You know
how -- you can tell -- my client can tell what I did
with respect to the billing and why they owe me the
money that they owe me.
What you're suggesting in consulting work
is like me sending a bill that says "for services
9 rendered" or "worked on your case." I mean, here we
10 have a higher duty than in many places because we're
11 administering public funds. It's the taxpayers' money.
12 It's not just our money, and so I'm just uncomfortable
13 when I -- when I look at something and I can't tell you
14 what was done. I mean, I just -- I just can't tell.
15 And so in my view, the policy issue,
16 consistent with our responsibility to make sure these
17 funds are spent consistent with the act, would dictate
18 to me I at least have to have enough detail to know
19 what was done. And I just don't have that here, and so
20 that's -- that's my concern, Counselor.
21 MR. BARTON: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Laird,
22 price control, I was tipping off of something that the
23 complainant mentioned in his -- in his remarks.
24 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Okay.
25 MR. BARTON: That's where that came from.

COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Okay. Okay.
2 MR. BARTON: But I hear you, but with all
due respect, if we were required to report with the
kind of detail that we have for legal billing, I would
never recommend that a client take Clean Elections
funding. And now we know because -- you and I both
know that you -- we know the burden that is associated
with that and we're pretty well-compensated folks.
That's why we can tolerate that burden.
I think -- I think that's a great example.
I think it's an excellent example because you can --
you can go to attorneys' fees cases and you can say,
you know, what kind of -- you know, what sort of
justification. Certainly -- we didn't just say
"consultant," but certainly even using the FEC rule,
which is that you have to say what kind of consultant,
so in this case it would say public relations, media,
campaign financing and government relations consulting
or, whatever, it definitely would not satisfy the
standard of legal billing for sure.
And I guess -- so I don't think -- and I
don't think that's been the rule today, but I guess I
would say I would be very -- I would be very concerned
about moving to that standard.
25
COMMISSIONER LAIRD: I agree. That would
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probably be too tough a standard. I mean, our ethical rules are difficult than they ought to -- on that issue than they ought to be, but there ought to be some happy middle ground where I can look at what was done and it doesn't just say consulting services or some generic description like that where I just -- I just don't know what -- what was done. And so I'm obligated to know that did other candidates benefit so it was a joint expenditure? Did we get fair market value?

I can't really tell that based on the very
summary, general descriptions that we have before us today, but I agree there's no -- I'm going to vote in favor of the recommendation that we don't have evidence that there has been a violation.

CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any more questions, Commissioners?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN TITLA: Director Collins?
MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if I could make
20 one point about one point that Mr. Barton raised about
21 2006. One of the things that this Commission has
22 done -- and I -- and this is by way of change of --
23 change of practice. In 2014 you may recall we had an
24 issue, not all of you were here, about what primary
25 purpose meant in terms of political committees and

1 enforcement, and we made a decision to forego doing
2 anything on some groups that may have had some issues
3 with us because we decided we couldn't do -- we
4 couldn't do rule making by enforcement.
5 And that's sort of what I -- I will tell
6 you that that's basically the fundamental basis of my
7 recommendation here is you -- we ought not be in the
8 practice of making rules by enforcement. We identify a
9 rule if Mr. Querard identifies a rule problem, if Mr.
10 Barton identifies a rule problem which they have. I
11 mean, obviously the discussion is clearly rich on that
12 issue, but we have changed the culture of the
13 Commission on that specific point.
14 And I just wanted to give you all some
15 credit. And you may not realize this, but you have,
16 over the course of -- the course of the last five
17 years, changed the way the Commission does business in
18 terms of the rules are set before the game is played.
19 MR. BARTON: Thank you.
20 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any questions from the
21 commissioners?
22 COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman, one
23 comment I have and that's on the issue of precedence
24 setting here, and the way I view this is every
25 complaint is unique and every unique complaint is going
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1 to be investigated by Staff and facts are going to be
2 run down and an analysis is going to be made. I don't
3 see a decision made by the Commission as to an
4 individual complaint as a precedent-setting exercise.
5 Am I -- am I off on that, Tom, or --
6 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
7 Meyer, I don't think that we have a binding precedent
8 by any stretch of the imagination. We try to be
9 consistent case to case and be able to draw a like -- a
10 through line through the case. So to Mr. Querard's
11 point about whether or not, you know, he would -- you
12 know, naturally if a case came up that was similar and
13 we said this, he would say, look, you said this last
14 year; why are you changing your mind. And that would
15 be an appropriate thing for him to say. Whether or
16 not -- I don't believe that would be a legally binding
17 precedent.
18 What the better course of action would be,
19 if we want to create a legally binding thing, would be
20 to institute a change of policy and that becomes
21 legally binding. So certainly we've never discouraged
22 people from using prior cases as persuasive authority.
23 In fact, sometimes Sara and I, when we put together
24 recommendations, we'll look back and even cite to, you
25 know, in 2006 the Commission said X about Y and we will
12:03:32-12:05:01 Page 118
1 do that, but it's not legally binding. It's more of a
2 matter of institutional integrity, to give you a long
3 answer to a short question.
$4 \quad$ CHAIRMAN TITLA: Do you have a question?
$5 \quad$ COMMISSIONER PATON: If I may, when can we
6 address any rule changes or talk about, like, my idea
7 of -- I'm just uncomfortable with all this combining
8 with the parties and so on.
$9 \quad$ MR. COLLINS: Sure.
$10 \quad$ COMMISSIONER PATON: In my mind -- and, you
11 know, like I said before, I'm fairly new. I thought
12 this was -- you know, the Clean Elections was to make
13 these candidates more independent. I understand where
14 you want to have interactions with your party and so
15 on, but here's like eight people giving money directly
16 from public monies to the Democratic party. Whether it
17 was Republican or Independent or Green or anything. To
18 me, I just kind of -- it makes me uncomfortable in
19 that.
$20 \quad$ MR. COLLINS: If I may, Mr. Chairman --
$21 \quad$ COMMISSIONER PATON: I guess my point is
22 why couldn't they just go to Mr. Barton separately like
23
they did to Mr. Constantin. I don't know his -- I keep
24
25
25
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COMMISSIONER PATON: Yeah. So to me,
that -- I don't understand that and it does make me
uncomfortable. And maybe I shouldn't say anything about this --
MR. COLLINS: No, no.
COMMISSIONER PATON: -- in this context,
but it just -- it does worry me somewhat. And to what
he's saying, it could -- this could lead to a lot of
bad things with, you know, the parties saying you have
to deal with us or we're not back and we expect this
amount of money from you. And this is -- this is
supposed to be State money and that bothers me.
As far as this whole thing about this, I
think the rules are the rules. I feel like they
followed the rules, but there's a lot of gray area, and
that worries me as well because I think he's -- the
reason -- I mean, I'm a realtor. I taught, and the
realtor original contract was one page long. Now it's
ten pages long, and it's ten pages long because people
do nefarious things. And I can see where some of this
could get out of hand.
MR. COLLINS: Sure.
CHAIRMAN TITLA: Mr. Barton?
24 MR. BARTON: Do you need me to address --
25 just briefly, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Paton. You

1 know, I think many do use private consultants. I think
2 these candidates chose to use the party as their -- as
3 their consultant, and I think part of it is just, you
4 know, that they have -- that's why they made their
5 choices. I do -- I do want to point out that
6 candidates having control of their money is the source
7 of their independence, and the fact that they would
8 hire the party to do their -- their consulting work I
don't think interferes with their independence.
So I just think -- again, maybe this is
more for us to talk about in going forward if we're
going to consider future rules, but just as a
mechanical thing, I just -- I don't think that their
independence was hurt at all by the candidates'
decision to use the parties here.
COMMISSIONER PATON: But you can see my
point of -- of, you know, you're -- maybe you're --
you've never run before or anything and so these -- the
party bigwigs come to you and say, all right, we're
20 going to back you. You need to do Clean Elections.
21 This is how you do it and whatever and you're going to
22 pay us this amount of money and if you -- maybe not
23 saying it right out but maybe intimidating -- I mean,
24 intimating this is how you're going to have to do it or
25 you're not -- we're not going to support you. I mean,
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1 maybe I'm making a molehill. I don't know.
2 MR. BARTON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
3 Paton, I see -- intellectually, I understand -- I
4 understand the story you are painting. I think that's
5 just not the way -- that's just not the facts on the
6 ground, at least in Arizona, at least in my practice is
7 that I don't -- people aren't being bullied into doing
8 this. I think that they're doing this out of their
9 choice and the fact that they have control over the
10 money is what gives them the power.
11 And so I think the intention of the act
12 which is to remove the candidates from having to go get
13 money and, therefore, be beholden to the people who
14 they get money from, I think that that's still very
15 much in place here, but I do understand theoretically
16 how it could happen.
17 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Any recommendations from
18 the director in this case? I think we spent enough
19 time on this issue.
20 Director?
21 MR. COLLINS: Sara -- it looks like Sara
22 had something she wanted to add.
23 MS. LARSEN: Chairman, sorry. I just want
24 to make a couple of points. One about the candidates
25 making payments to the party, the candidates also
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 purchase access to the voter -- the parties' voter | that's -- and that's sort of part of the context for |
| 2 registration rules. And so really the rule in 702(B) | 2 |
| 3 really started by saying, look, the candidates can pay | 3 So, Mr. Chairman, you were me asking for my |
| 4 the party as long as they are receiving a good | 4 recommendation and -- do you need |
| 5 return. | 5 MR. QUERARD: Just a |
| 6 | 6 question for clarification. And perhaps Sara or |
| 7 purcha | 7 somebody could advise me. Again, |
| 8 registration rules if they want -- if they want that | 8 a rule problem. This is a disclosure problem, ok |
| 9 | 9 Salman amended her reports and has followed the rule |
| 10 So th | 10 I see no objection to her disclosing |
| $11$ | 11 paid for. You guys have the rules. It's just -- is it |
| 12 caution agains | 12 a complaint that actually should go to the Secretary of |
| 13 candidates can't make payments to the partie | 13 State's office for not adequate dis |
| 14 the candidates really do utilize -- when they | 14 this -- I don't know. Maybe this is not even the |
| 15 collectin | 15 appropriate venue |
| 16 collecting | 16 You guys have the rules |
| 17 do utilize th | 17 followed it. We've heard no explanation whatsoever |
| 18 utilize th | 18 so many people bought, word for word, the identi |
| 19 So there | 19 things but the prices were so wildly different. So the |
| 20 require all c | 20 public that looks to see what's going on can't answ |
| 21 consultin | 21 any of these questions. We don't -- we have no reason |
| 22 | 22 to believe that something bad went on. We just can |
| 23 the party. <br> 24 campaign | 23 tell anybody what went on, and I guess that's -- we as |
| 25 agree in 2014 that two Corporation Commission | 25 paid these amounts, but I don't know what they got for |
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| 1 candidates each paid \$145,000 to a consulting servi | 1 it. So th |
| 2 Do I think that that's what they should have done? I | 2 And as far as the VAN and paying for the |
| 3 don't know, but that's the candidate's option and | 3 databases, the amounts we talked about here today were |
| 4 that's the candidate's choice to utilize a vendor of | 4 separate. Those candidates paid for VAN separatel |
| 5 their choic | 5 thousands of dollars, in most cases, for access. |
| 6 I can see Commissioner Paton's point | 6 was just one kind of generic category under which |
| 7 you know, the Commission and payments being made to the | 7 wildly different amounts were paid for the identica |
| 8 party, but if there's a service rendered to them, we've | 8 product, and we just don't know what they got for them. |
| 9 generally accepted that in the past. And that's been | 9 So I guess if I have a concern is that we don't move |
| 10 | 10 because we need to fix the rule, but I believe you guys |
| 11 MR. COLLINS: | 11 already have the rule requiring disclosur |
| 12 add to that, I mean, our rules and our policies foc | 12 Salman amended to meet the requirement. |
| 13 on don't take because it's a limit on contributions and | 13 don't know if anybody else has or will have to, but |
| 14 | 14 then you guys maybe could point me in the right |
| 15 | 15 direction if I'm in the wrong venue. That's |
| 16 political party exception, our rules all say don | 16 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Okay, Commissioners |
| 17 take; buy. And so that's really what -- that's re | 17 Thank you for your comme |
| 18 the conflict here is that we're | 18 I think that the director is recommending |
| 19 that we have a "don't take; buy" | 19 to the Commission that they find no reason to believe |
| 20 talking about, well, do we need to, you know, augment | 20 violation occurred in MUR 16-005. |
| 21 what you | 21 Is there any action taken by the |
| 22 But the reason the rules are set up the way | 22 Commission? |
| 23 they are is because we're always encouraging peopl | 23 COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Mr. Chairman? |
| 24 don't get in trouble for ta | 24 CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner Kimble? |
| 25 contribution that you've already agreed to forego, and | 25 COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: I move that in the |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| case of MUR 16-005 that we affirm the director's <br> recommendation that there's no reason to believe a violation of R2-20-110(A)(4) occurred. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion by Commissioner Kimble. <br> Is there a second? <br> COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Second. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Second by Commissioner <br> Laird. <br> All in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Okay. All opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Abstain? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion passes. <br> Okay. Why don't we go to the next one, MUR <br> 16-007, Senate Victory PAC. <br> MR. COLLINS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, <br> Commissioners, we got a complaint -- 07 and 08 are sort <br> of related, I guess. They have different complainants. <br> 22 I think that those complainants are represented by the <br> 23 same folks, in some sense. They complained, I think, <br> 24 about one report not being filed -- one or two reports <br> 25 not being filed, and then we actually got -- I think we | 1 folks paid 5 percent of the total amount of fine that <br> 2 they were eligible for. Given the mitigation of no <br> 3 knowledge on the part of the respondent or its agents <br> 4 that was avowed here, we basically cut that percentage <br> 5 in half to give us the 2,500. And that's -- and that's <br> 6 the -- and that's the settlement that I agreed with the <br> 7 committees to recommend to you, and I do recommend it. <br> 8 I think that we got the reports ultimately <br> 9 not as timely as we would like. We have a fine which I <br> 10 think although they, you know, obviously maintain that <br> 11 they -- that we don't have authority, nevertheless, <br> 12 they have paid a fine and a fine is an admission of <br> 13 something. It's a fine. It's not a -- it's not a -- <br> 14 it's not a -- a fine is a fine is a fine. So I <br> 15 recommend that you accept the proposed conciliation <br> 16 agreements in your materials. Payment would be due -- <br> 17 we need to get a signature back from the respondents by <br> 18 the end of the week, and then payment would be due the <br> 19 31st. <br> 20 They're not here. I didn't ask them to be <br> 21 here because -- but Mr. Gaona is here. He may or may <br> 22 not have comments to add. He doesn't. So I would just <br> 23 ask -- you can either take them together or separate -- <br> 24 but that you approve me entering into the proposed <br> 25 conciliation agreements in your materials unless you |
| 12:15:10-12:16:38 <br> 1 got -- I believe we got additional filings from them, <br> 2 as I recall. We may not -- may not have put the <br> 3 complaint in the file. <br> 4 In any event, the complaint was a lack of <br> 5 filing the trigger reports. We've been talking about <br> 6 the issue we had with the solar group, the issue we've <br> 7 had with the -- with the Secretary of State not <br> 8 providing the appropriate log-in information for folks <br> 9 to file. In this particular case, the Senate Victory <br> 10 PAC -- in both cases, the Senate Victory PAC and the <br> 11 House Victory PAC conceded that they did not file their reports at all. They filed the reports later. <br> They skipped the reasonable cause finding <br> because there was nothing to reasonable cause. There was no dispute that there was no finding. We asked <br> them to stipulate that they had no knowledge of the report because the Secretary of State's office did not provide it in their CFRN system, nor did they receive any word from us. They avowed that in the -- in the -in the agreement. They maintain that they -- that they would argue that they -- that we don't have jurisdiction but we're willing to leave that go for <br> 23 another day and pay a fine of 2,500 each one, 2,500 for the house and 2,500 for the senate. <br> 25 We arrived at that number -- the solar | 12:18:09-12:18:52 <br> have other questions. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman? <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Commissioner Meyer. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: I move to approve the <br> two reconciliation agreements which are matters MUR <br> 16-007 as to the Senate Victory PAC and MUR 16-008 as <br> to the House Victory PAC. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion by Meyer to approve <br> the recommendation of the director. <br> Is there a second? <br> COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Second. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Second by Commissioner <br> Laird on MR -- MUR 16-007 and MUR 16-008. <br> All in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Abstain? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion carries <br> unanimously. <br> Let's go to the next one. The next one is <br> MUR 16-009. <br> 24 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, and that -- and, <br> Mr. Chairman, we were unable to complete that process. |
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Well, it's been an <br> honor to serve with each one of you guys. It really <br> is, a very integrous, fine group of men, and I've enjoyed it. Thank you. <br> MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, on <br> behalf of the entire staff, I'd just like to say that <br> we all found Mr. -- Mr. Laird's service as a <br> commissioner and as chairman to be -- to be remarkable. <br> It has improved our practices both in terms of our internal control, financials. He's brought his <br> knowledge and business background and improved our <br> practices. He's brought a keen legal eye to our <br> issues, and we all think as Staff members that we've <br> learned a great deal from having him on board and we're very, very happy about that. <br> COMMISSIONER LAIRD: Well, I should mention <br> we have stellar staff as well. I didn't want to overlook that. I've said that many times, but in <br> parting, I should say it one more time so I will. <br> And I'll miss you too, Mary. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Thank you. <br> Okay. The next item on the agenda is IX, public comment. <br> Do we have any public comment? Yes, ma'am. <br> MS. KNOX: I guess it's by now good | evaluations of the summit which was about half the <br> people submitted evaluations which, having been <br> involved with other activities in my both professional <br> and retirement life, I think is a very high return rate on evaluations. <br> She was one of the speakers that was listed <br> by more people as, you know, fabulous, Number 1, loved <br> what she said; her knowledge and enthusiasm and <br> information was outstanding. And I just wanted you all <br> to be aware of that. So thank you. And obviously the <br> league continues to look forward to working with the <br> Clean Elections Commission and Staff, and we're very <br> grateful for all the contributions. <br> Thank you. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Thank you, ma'am, for your <br> comments. We appreciate those. <br> Any other public comments? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: If not, Item X, <br> adjournment. <br> 21 Is there a motion to adjourn? <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mitch, you want to <br> make that? <br> 24 COMMISSIONER LAIRD: I'll move we adjourn <br> 25 one last time. |
| 12:25:09-12:26:32 <br> 1 afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, Staff. <br> I just wanted to one more time say how <br> grateful the League of Women Voters of Arizona is for <br> 5 the assistance and participation of the Clean Elections <br> 6 Commission Staff in planning and then presenting the <br> 7 voters' rights summit on January 7th. The Staff were <br> 8 part of our advisory committee, gave us phenomenal <br> 9 feedback on revising our agenda to improve. It gave -- <br> 10 provided tremendous suggestions for speakers, almost <br> 11 all of whom -- I think, or maybe all of whom agreed to <br> 12 speak and in many cases were approached first by Clean <br> 13 Elections Staff to kind of smooth the way. So when we asked them, they said yeah. <br> And, finally, I wanted to say that Gina <br> Roberts spoke on two different panels. By the way, we <br> had almost 300 people at the voters' rights summit out <br> at ASU West, and ASU West, by the way, was so impressed <br> with the summit that they have now asked the league <br> for -- to consider holding a follow-up event in a year <br> or two maybe during the semester to involve more <br> students and faculty. So it was very, very successful. <br> 23 I want to get back to Gina Roberts. Gina <br> 24 Roberts spoke on two different panels, and I just <br> 25 finished two days ago going through about 150 -some | CHAIRMAN TITLA: Motion by Commissioner <br> Laird to adjourn. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Second. <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: Second by <br> Commissioner Meyer. <br> All in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN TITLA: We are adjourned. Thank <br> you, Commissioners. <br> (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 12:27 p.m.) |



|  | account (32) 34:22; |  | 10 | amounts (6) 43:21; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | $35: 2,12 ; 36: 16,20,24$ | address (13) 30:18; <br> 35:22;55:14;61:9, | agency (8) 4:22;20:16, | $8: 19 ; 86: 10 ; 124: 25$ |
| \$1,000 (1) | 12,12,18,19,22,25; | 62:10;66:20;68:13,22; | 60.16, | amplify (1) 88:9 |
| \$12,000 (5) 83:13; | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 6,9,10,11,13,17 ; \\ & 41: 3,5,15 ; 42: 6 ; 49: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 10 ; 73: 25 ; 118: 6 \\ & 119: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { agenda (6) } 3: 9 ; 7: 15 ; \\ 35: 5 ; 68: 15 ; 134: 22 \end{array}$ | Amy (5) 6:21;14:25; $33: 24: 34: 12: 90: 9$ |
| \$145,000 (1) 123:1 | 71:25;78:7,13 | addressed (3) 62:11 | $135: 9$ | analysis (2) 60:8; |
| \$2 (3) 14:1;20:11; | accountant (1) 43:25 | $63: 9 ; 70: 4$ | agent (3) 58:5;59:21 | Android (1) 15:19 |
| $48: 18$ $\$ 2.000$ (2) 62.23 .98 .9 | accountants (1) 44:2 accounting (2) 41:9; | addressing (3) 78:12 80:19;94:20 | 60:1 <br> agents (1) 128:3 | Andy (3) 51:14;61:19; 62:1 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \$ 2,000(2) \\ \$ 2,300(1) ~ 98: 10 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accounting (2) } 41: 9 ; \\ & 42: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 80:19;94:20 <br> adequate (1) 124:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { agents (1) 128:3 } \\ & \text { ago (2) 5:23;135:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 1 \\ & \text { anger (1) 47:15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2,500(4) \\ & 103: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { accounts (6) } 34: 19 ; \\ 37: 3,3 ; 40: 18 ; 44: 10 \end{array}$ | adhere (1) 90:11 adherence (1) 131:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { agree }(16) 16: 23 ; 51: 5 ; \\ & 59: 25 ; 62: 13 ; 67: 12,18 \end{aligned}$ | answered (1) 58:20 <br> anticipate (1) 131:3 |
| \$2,826 (1) 99:2 |  | adjourn (3) 136:21 |  | anticipated (1) |
| \$21,000 (1) 102:25 | acknowledge |  | 84:1;87:15;95:10; | Anyways (1) 130:19 |
| \$24,000 (3) 100:21 | acknowledge (1) 56:7 across (7) 8:16;13:4; | adjourned (1) | 114:25;11 | apathetic (2) 26:6,7 |
| $102: 22,24$ $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 , 0 0 0}$ | across (7) $8: 16 ; 13: 4 ;$ 16:23;51:3;74:6;86:11; | adjustments (1) 130:20 | $128: 6 ; 135: 11$ | apologize (3) 62:5; |
| \$3,000 (1) 62:24 |  | administer (1) 67:15 | agreement (9) | 5:10;83:6 |
| \$3,500 (1) 99:20 | Act (18) 19:23;20:1,6; | administering (1) | 24;58:6,7,9;59:9; | app (5) 9:16;13:1 |
| \$3,615.50 (1) 9 | 23:6;39:6;40:8;47:14; | 113:11 | 0;127:20;1 | 15:18;30 |
| \$4,300 (2) 98:17;103:5 | 58:3;65:4;66:1;67:5; | administrative (1) 87:7 | agreements (3) 128:16 | apparently (1) 26:6 |
| \$4,900 (1) 98:17 | 133.25 | administrators (1) 26:12 | 25;129:5 |  |
| \$46,750 (1) 103:16 | 113:17;121:11;133:25 | admission (1) 128:12 ads (3) 10:18,18; | AG's (1) 110:18 ahead (3) 34:6:84:7. | appears (1) 5:19 <br> appendices (1) 132:6 |
| \$5 (2) $21: 18 ; 122: 15$ | acted (2) 69:14;76:11 <br> acting (7) 58:4;63:5,6 | ads (3) 10:18,18; 103:25 | ahead (3) 34:6;84:7; 101:7 | appendices (1) 132:6 Applause (1) 133:15 |
| 103:6 | $6 ; 69: 20,21 ; 81: 20$ | advance (1) 131:23 | akin (1) 47:2 | application (3) 41:10, |
| \$6,000 (20) 53:8,15,18; | action (15) 3:11;4:4 | advertising (2) 20:19 | AI (1) 103:14 | 16;42:1 |
| 54:14;57:3;62:15,24; | 6:3;7:16;32:11;34:7; $46: 18 ; 50: 10 ; 52: 13,17$ | 103:17 | alarming (2) 86:13,1 | applied (5) 74:6;80 <br> 11;85:5;93:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 67: 24,24 ; 68: 7 ; 69: 11, \\ & 12 ; 79: 12 ; 80: 5,8,14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:18;50:10;52:13,17; } \\ & 91: 16 ; 117: 18 ; 125: 21 ; \end{aligned}$ | advice (7) 3:8;44:7; 97:5,17;101:5;102:16; | alarms (1) 103:1 <br> Alec (2) 4:15;33:24 | 11;85:5;93:24 applies (1) 93:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & 83 \end{aligned}$ | $130: 6,11$ | 09:6 | allow (5) 49:10;52:15 | apply (1) 80:12 |
| \$600 (1) 99:1 | activities (8) 7:16,22; | advise (2) 124:7 | 72:8;87:3,19 | applying (1) 6:23 |
| \$66,000 (1) 48:20 | 7;20:14;32:13,18; | 130:16 | allowed (3) 38:2;66:25 | appreciate (4) 34: |
| [ | activity (2) 39:8;40:8 | $01:$ | allows (4) 50:3;62:19 | appreciation (2) 133: |
| [sic] (1) 3:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:10 } \\ & \text { actually (37) 8:15;9:2,6, } \end{aligned}$ | advocating (1) 83:19 <br> affect (2) $30: 3,4$ | alluded (1) 76:12 <br> almost (5) 22:25;48:18 | approached (1) 135:12 appropriate (9) 34:24; |
| A | 9;10:19,23;13:18; | af | 35:10, | :12; |
|  |  | affidavit (9) 74:18; | although (3) <br> 59:20.128. | 27: |
| abiding (1) 131:5 ability (1) $43: 1$ | $27: 7 ; 32: 21 ; 38: 2 ; 54: 10$ | 106:9,12;108:2;111:6 | always (7) 6:11;8:8,9 | appropriately (3) 35 |
| able (9) 13:13;16:2; | 57:4;77:2,3;81:11; | affidavits (7) 74:25; | 42:17;90:2;106:10 | 61:15;87:10 |
| $35: 25 ; 37: 5 ; 41: 4 ; 49: 19$ | 83:16;84:19,25;85:4 | 87:17;93:13;98:5; | 123:23 | approval (2) 34:8;45:23 |
| 95:25;117:9;130:2 | 89:13;99:20,24;100:1, | $99: 18 ; 106: 19 ; 111: 1$ | amazing (2) 20:20 | approve (12) 3:17; |
| above (2) 63:15;83:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 5,6 ; 105: 14 ; 107: 23 ; \\ & 110: 6 ; 124: 12 ; 126: 25 \end{aligned}$ | affirm (2) 91:20;126:1 afford (1) 103:8 | $25: 12$ <br> AMCA (1) $32 \cdot 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 9 ; 46: 2,3,5 ; 128: 24 ; \\ & 129: 4.8: 131: 8: 132: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { absolutely (5) } 27: 24 ; \\ 28: 5,19 ; 29: 1 ; 107: 17 \end{array}$ | ad (4) 51:5,17;55:16; | afford (1) 103:8 afternoon (1) 135:1 | AMCA (1) $32: 16$ <br> amended (2) 124:9; | 129:4,8;131:8;132:4, $13,15$ |
| Abstain (3) 126:14; | 103:23 | after-the-fact (2) | 125:12 | approximately (1) 8:21 |
| 129:18;132:24 | add (8) | 110:16;111:1 | amendment (1) 100:2 | April (2) 98:21;133:8 |
| abuse (5) 79:10;96:12; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:20;94:1;121:22; } \\ & \text { 123:12;128:22;131:12 } \end{aligned}$ | again (37) 10:16;11:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { amendments (3) 90:8, } \\ & 24 ; 99: 14 \end{aligned}$ | area (2) 27:13;119:15 <br> argue (1) 127:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 104: 19,25 ; 105: 5 \\ & \text { abused (1) } 96: 2 \end{aligned}$ | added (1) 30:17 | $17: 12 ; 19: 7 ; 21$ | 24;99:14 American (2) 12:5 | argue (1) arguing (1) $83: 18$ |
| accept (4) 43:10;53:3; | addition (7) 6:16,16 | 22:12,22;23:2;30:9 | 23:21 | Arizona (19) 4:16,2 |
| $67: 3 ; 128: 15$ | 13:2,8;14:6;69:5; | 33:3;51:3;65:6;66:19; | among (2) 73:6;82:5 | 8:18,21;10:21;21:4; |
| accepted (2) 123:9,15 | 101:20 <br> additional (14) 14:5; | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 4,10 ; 77: 1,10,13,19 \\ & 81: 21 ; 82: 17 ; 83: 18 \end{aligned}$ | amongst (1) 17:4 <br> amount (18) $35: 19,19$. | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 23 ; 46: 21 ; 66: 24 \\ & 69: 7 ; 76: 3 ; 101: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { access (4) } 24: 7 ; 122: 1, \\ & 7 ; 125: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { additional (14) 14:5; } \\ & \text { 21:21;22:4;32:22;35:9; } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 21 ; 82: 17 ; 83: 18 ; \\ & 93: 16 ; 96: 15 ; 98: 24 ; \end{aligned}$ | amount (18) 35:19,19; 48:19;62:23,23;70:8; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:7;76:3;101:21; } \\ & \text { 104:16;106:6;108:15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| accessed (1) | 36:2,9;49:25;72:7; | 99:17;100:13;101:13 | 83:6.86:13.87.21. | 111:20;121:6;133:8 |
| accomplishments (1) | 74:15;76:15,25;77:7; | 02:11;111:14;120:10; |  | 135:4 |
| 101:20 | 127:1 | 2 | 100:12;102:19;103:18; | nd (3) 48:14;61:6 |
| accordance (1) 78:9 | additionally (3) 23:25; | against (4) 92:10; | 119:11;120:22;128:1 | 107:21 |

arrived (1) 127:25
arrives (1) 132:2
ARS (1) 78:9
aside (1) 97:11
aspects (2) 64:23; 89:10
asserted (1) 131:20
assertions (1) 130:22
assessment (1) 71:5
assets (1) 25:3
assistance (1) 135:5
associated (1) 114:7
assume (2) 74:17;
79:11
assuming (1) 43:12
assumption (2) 51:8; 95:15
assure (1) 104:16
ASU (2) 135:18,18
Attachment (1) 5:8
attend (3) 23:24;32:16; 47:6
attended (1) 4:15
attention (5) 5:6,15; 49:2;64:17;65:11
attested (1) 69:7
attests (1) 106:12
attorney (3) 47:2,3;93:8
attorneys (4) 47:5;48:4; 65:19;96:18
attorneys' (1) 114:12
atypical (1) 86:9
audience (1) 20:23
audit (27) $34: 8 ; 35: 4,16$, 18;36:8,10,13,13,23, 24;37:5,8,22;39:15; 40:22,22;44:12,14,22, 24;45:17,23,24;46:2; 47:24;56:25;91:9
audited (4) 35:10,21; 88:3;93:16
auditing (4) $34: 20 ; 35: 7$; 45:12;87:22
auditor (3) 36:20; 37:10;40:20
auditoriums (1) 26:13 auditors (2) 44:13; 45:10
audits (16) 34:16;35:5, 7;36:4;43:18,22;45:11; 47:20,20,21,22,23,24; 87:16;90:5;93:15
augment (1) 123:20
August (4) 21:16;98:10, 11;131:1
authority (5) 20:7; 47:25;104:8;117:22; 128:11
autodialer (2) 54:17; 82:18
available (8) 4:9,12; 13:9;15:19;18:25; 28:11;54:17;94:23
avoid (1) 81:2
avoided (1) $81: 1$
avowed (2) 127:19; 128:4
aware (2) 28:9;136:10
awareness (1) 6:4
away (2) 6:2;17:23
awful (1) 98:15
aye (7) 3:22;46:10; 92:4;126:10;129:14; 132:20;137:6
ayes (7) 3:23;46:11; 92:5;126:11;129:15; 132:21;137:7
azcleanelectionsgov/general (1) 10:12
B
back (20) 5:23;12:11, 23;17:12;23:13,18; 24:10;31:9;36:7;38:12; 40:19;57:15;87:16; 93:14;98:10;117:24; 119:10;120:20;128:17; 135:23
background (2) 20:23; 134:11
bad (4) 104:12;110:23; 119:9;124:22
ballot (15) 9:10,11; 10:22;12:15,15,16; 16:5;17:24;22:10;24:6; 26:24;27:1;28:8,15; 30:11
bang (1) 111:14
bank (20) 34:19,22; 35:2,15;36:16,20,24; 37:3,3;38:24;39:9,12, 22;40:18,18;41:15; 42:6;45:7,9,14
banner (1) 10:18
barriers (3) 16:17;22:5; 24:12
Barton (16) 47:1;68:22; 93:9;105:24;106:4,4; 113:21,25;114:2; 115:20;116:10,19; 118:22;119:23,24; 121:2
base (1) 97:12
based (16) 9:2;49:1,20; 52:6;55:16;70:19; 72:16,16;77:10,17,17; 79:5,17,22;115:10; 131:4
basic (2) 31:14;32:8 basically (10) 11:16; 22:16;42:17;54:12; 82:10;93:4;97:21; 104:19;116:6;128:4
basis (4) 49:18;101:5; 110:19;116:6

Bates (2) 60:25;69:1
beast (1) 90:4
became (1) 51:13
Becker (1) 5:8
become (2) 6:21;20:3
becomes (4) 101:14;
111:15;112:5;117:20
begin (1) 21:18
beginning (6) 12:21; 48:17;55:15;83:9; 105:12,13
behalf (7) 58:3;59:15; 62:2;104:3;106:5; 133:9;134:6
behavior (2) 83:12; 95:25
beholden (1) 121:13
belabor (1) 47:9
beliefs (1) 76:19
believes (2) 105:14; 131:22
beneficial (1) 11:5
benefit (4) 14:4;60:20; 105:2;115:8
benefits (1) 96:25
benefitted (4) 60:14,17; 68:1,10
best (6) 15:8;16:7; 21:1;70:4;91:9,11
better (7) 28:12;72:24; 97:8,8,9,9;117:18
beyond (2) 54:15;63:15
big (2) 13:20;26:13
bigger (1) 107:14
bigwigs (1) 120:19
bill (5) 5:14;101:19; 102:7;112:24;113:8
billboards (3) 9:21; 11:25;12:8
billing (3) 113:5;114:4, 20
binding (5) 117:7,16, 19,21;118:1
bit (11) 8:22;9:3;23:25; 24:25;26:16;28:23; 107:20;108:11;110:6; 111:21;131:2
blah (3) 113:2,2,2
blank (1) 103:20
blanket (2) 56:20; 122:12
blind (1) 55:10
board (4) 16:23;30:20; 86:12;134:14
both (15) 13:24;47:12; 49:16;51:3;54:13;63:4; 66:8;76:21;88:19; 109:13;110:15;114:6; 127:10;134:9;136:3
bothers (2) 25:25; 119:12
bottom (3) 48:9;69:2; 88:24
bought (1) 124:18 break (3) 11:18;92:15; 108:22
briefly (1) 119:25
bring (5) 22:18;25:22; 26:2,6;64:16
bringing (1) 65:10
brings (1) 62:6
broad (2) 9:19;100:17
broader (1) 61:16
Brockelman (1) 62:2
brought (3) 61:6; 134:10,12
Brown (6) 100:19,20, 21;101:1,16;103:9
bucks (4) 54:17;55:2,3; 97:25
budget (3) 20:9;27:16, 17
Buena (1) 27:13
built (1) 23:10
bulk (2) 13:2;32:12
bulldogging (1) 105:7
bullied (1) 121:7
bunch (2) 82:2;90:15
burden (11) 72:22; 73:15,15;74:1;76:14; 77:2,14;80:25;112:10; 114:7,9
burdens (1) 112:2
business (4) 95:11; 112:21;116:17;134:11
buy (5) 50:15;103:17; 123:17,19,21
buyer (1) 103:18
buy-in (1) 68:21
C

C
call (5) 3:10;5:6,15; 17:23;49:2
called (1) 54:20
calling (3) 93:3;96:23; 118:24
calls (2) 54:18;57:5
came (6) 50:24;55:18; 66:23;98:10;113:25; 117:12
campaign (94) 5:18,25; 16:19;34:19,23;35:2,8, 14;36:1,17,25;37:2,4; 38:24;39:5,7,8,9,19,21, 23;40:5,8,17;41:3,24; 43:20;44:3,9,11,11; 45:15;49:5;51:6;52:1; 53:9,21;55:1,3;56:21; 57:3;60:19;62:15,17, 19,25;64:4,5;68:16,21; 69:8;71:25;72:18,19; 73:5,7;78:7,8,13,15; 82:15;83:23;84:12; 85:14,16,20;86:6,8; 87:2;88:10,25;89:10,

14;90:8,11,23;91:8,10; 95:21;96:24;97:6; 98:21;99:5,8,15,17; 100:19;102:23,25; 103:15;106:14;107:9; 114:18;122:24
campaigner (1) 101:18 campaigns (9) 20:3;

41:23;51:7;53:7,12; 55:2;95:6;105:12; 110:12
can (129) 7:3;8:7,19;
9:10;11:17;12:3,13,13;
15:1,2,10,14;17:18;
18:1,9,9,10,19,20;
20:22;21:15,18;22:13, 24;23:13,15,15,19; 24:13,20,21;27:1,2,6,6, 11,14;28:2,6,19;30:14, 18,24,24;31:2,15;39:1; 40:8;42:4,10,13,20,20; 43:3,4,10;44:5,5,8; 45:13;47:7;48:9;49:21, 22;50:17;52:2,19;54:6, 18,18,19,20;55:4,8; 57:11,13;60:10;61:9; 66:7;70:9;71:13,14; 76:4;80:24;81:1,2; 84:12;86:21;87:8,9,12; 89:5,21,23;90:12,12; 93:20;96:6;99:11; 102:19;103:8,23,23,24, 25;104:8,16,19;107:2; 109:10,12;111:4,11,20;
113:4,4;114:9,11,12,
12;115:4;118:5;
119:20;120:16;122:3;
123:6;128:23;131:8,19
candidate (30) 9:16;
13:15;15:20;30:12,14,
25;31:5,20;38:3,24;
51:7;59:8,14;60:15; 62:21;66:6;72:17;
76:13,21;78:6;83:10; 88:6;89:4,5;90:1,13, 16;101:19;102:22; 109:24
candidates (97) 13:11,
15,22,23;14:13;15:7,7,
15;16:6;17:9,10,14; 21:18;25:20;27:15; 31:1,6;34:9,18,18;35:3, 20;37:14;39:6;41:9,10, 14;43:14;58:4,5,8; 59:5,9,15;60:17,20; 61:3;64:18;65:10;68:1, 9,19;76:9;85:2,17; 86:7,10;87:8,10,12,16, 19,23,24;88:2,3;90:6, 15,20,25;91:6;92:10; 93:6;95:3,6,9,14;97:21, 24;101:15;103:8; 104:17;105:9;107:12,

13,14;109:24;110:13; 111:8;115:8;118:13; 120:2,6;121:12,24,25; 122:3,5,6,10,13,14,17, 20;123:1;124:16;125:4
candidates' (2) 35:6; 120:14
candidate's (6) 49:5; 71:24;78:6,12;123:3,4
cap (2) 20:10,10
capability (1) 30:23
capital (1) 108:16
Capitol (1) 5:16
care (2) 81:3;103:3
careful (3) 44:23;65:22; 112:3
cares (1) 133:1
carried (2) 76:14;77:14
carries (2) 4:1;129:20
case (33) 12:19;48:5; 49:11,25;50:5;53:5; 55:7;60:1,18,21;69:15; 75:9;76:9,22;77:1,25; 79:21;84:20;85:5;
88:18;91:19;94:1;95:1; 107:4;113:9;114:17; 117:9,9,10,12;121:18; 126:1;127:9
cases (12) 31:18;45:4; 76:11;77:3;89:12,17; 105:1;114:12;117:22; 125:5;127:10;135:12
Casillas (1) 98:7
cast (1) 22:10
catch-all (1) 100:17
categories (1) 18:20
category (6) 81:25; 83:16;87:5;102:18; 107:7;125:6
caught (2) 89:16;99:2
cause (5) 58:21,23;
59:1;127:13,14
caution (1) 122:12
Central (1) 27:12
certain (2) 70:8;89:9
certainly (8) 58:17; 65:14;66:18;89:21; 112:21;114:14,15; 117:21
cetera (1) 95:9
CFRN (1) 127:18
Chabin (3) 101:17,23; 102:8
Chair (1) 113:21
CHAIRMAN (170) 3:3, 16,20,24;4:1,5,14;6:5, 8,20;7:8,11,14,19; 19:16,19;25:9;27:23; 29:2,4,5,11;31:7,11; 32:15;33:7,10,21;34:4, 6,11;37:17,18,20;38:1, 20;39:3,20;40:23,24; 41:6;42:3,12,15;43:8,

13;44:4,15,16,25;45:1, 6,18,20;46:1,4,8,12,15, 17,20;50:2,6,9;52:12, 20;55:13;56:14;57:18, 19;59:2;60:23;61:24; 62:4;67:8,11;68:12; 71:1,3,19,20;72:11; 73:24;77:21,24;78:3,4, 20;79:2;80:1;81:5; 84:1;85:7,8,11,12; 87:1;88:9;90:7;91:13, 18,23;92:2,6,8,11,19, 23;94:4,8,11;105:18, 21;106:1;112:14,16, 17;115:15,18,19; 116:20,22;117:6; 118:4,20;119:23,25; 121:2,17,23;123:11; 124:3;125:16,23,24; 126:4,8,12,14,16,19; 129:2,3,8,12,16,18,20, 25;130:4,8;132:8,10, 14,18,22,24;133:1,14, 16,24;134:5,8,21; 135:1;136:15,19; 137:1,4,8
chance (1) 103:9
chances (1) 103:8 change (8) 16:8;59:19; 70:14;84:17;110:23; 115:22,23;117:20
changed (3) 116:12,17; 131:2
changes (3) 20:16; 84:5;118:6
changing (1) 117:14
Channel (1) $14: 15$
channels (2) 22:21; 103:19
Chapman (1) 34:21
Chapman's (1) 83:2
charge (3) 97:4,24;98:2
chart (1) 14:14
charts (1) 112:9
check (6) 41:1;42:5; 44:24;55:1;83:12; 102:9
checks (4) 41:8,9,25; 43:2
choice (4) 112:5;121:9; 123:4,5
choices (1) 120:5
choose (5) 35:11; 41:14,20,23;44:5
Chorus (7) 3:23;46:11; 92:5;126:11;129:15; 132:21;137:7
chose (2) 120:2;131:15 Chris (1) $36: 7$
circumstance (1) 76:13
cite (1) 117:24
cities (5) 21:9,13;25:2; 31:23;32:5
citing (1) 103:16 citizen (2) 20:2;64:21
Citizens (3) 133:5,7,10
city (7) 24:25;29:25;
30:21,22;31:1;32:16; 33:4
civic (4) 49:6;52:3;
71:25;78:14
claim (1) 110:20
clarification (1) 124:6
class (1) 102:7
Clean (52) 3:4;4:23;
5:13;6:16;9:14;10:22; 19:1,23;20:6;23:6; 24:21;36:10,13;37:13, 24;38:5;39:5;40:7; 42:19;47:14;48:15; 54:4;57:8,13;59:14; 65:3,8;66:1;70:15; 82:2;89:4,9;95:6,10, 14;105:11,14;109:5; 110:24;111:1;112:2, 11;114:5;118:12; 120:20;122:6;133:5,7, 10;135:5,12;136:12
clear (13) 10:13;44:8, 17;45:3;47:18;55:23; 56:6;58:1,1;64:2;77:2; 88:20;96:16
clearly (2) 99:12; 116:11
Clench's (1) 131:4
clerk (1) 32:16
clerks (2) 25:1;33:5
clicks (1) 11:4
client (2) 113:4;114:5
clients (4) 55:1;93:9; 96:8;112:24
close (4) 17:22;52:19; 53:4;88:21
closely (1) 20:24
closing (1) 93:25
collect (1) 104:17
collecting (4) 21:18; 95:16;122:15,16
COLLINS (69) 4:5; 6:20;31:11;42:15;43:3; 46:20;50:11,22;52:14; 53:2,25;55:11,13; 57:21;58:22;59:2,19, 24;60:3,6,12,23;62:12, 14;63:24;64:14;69:1; 72:11;73:10,13;74:2, 16,20;75:2,7,12,14,19, 23,25;76:12;77:25; 78:2;81:9;84:22;88:8; 92:11,14,16,25;93:1; 94:17;95:10;105:23; 115:18,19;117:6; 118:9,20;119:5,22; 121:21;123:11;126:19; 129:24;130:5,14; 132:12;134:5

Collins' (2) 63:16;71:5 combining (1) 118:7 comfort (1) 54:8 comfortable (6) 54:2,2; 57:4;58:25;60:11; 61:11
coming (4) 5:3;16:9; 29:8;131:22
Comission (3) 108:4; 111:19,22
commend (1) 6:13
comment (8) 41:1;
52:16,20;95:5;110:8; 116:23;134:23,24
comments (10) 80:19; 81:6;86:2,20;125:17; 128:22;131:4;133:16; 136:16,17
Commission (81) 3:4,6, 12;4:23;6:11,17;11:23; 14:7,9;16:14;18:1; 19:14;20:7,24;25:4; 29:13;37:9,13;41:8; 43:23;47:25;48:7; 49:15,17;56:2;62:5; 63:10,18,22,24;64:21; 65:22;66:3,13,20; 67:14;69:16;70:3,25; 72:22;74:10;75:5; 77:19;78:21,22,23; 82:3,23;101:15,21; 102:6,15;103:15; 104:20;106:20;107:17, 23;108:6;111:24; 112:17,20;115:21; 116:13,17;117:3,25; 122:23,25;123:7; 125:19,22;131:24; 132:9;133:3,5,7,10,17; 135:1,6;136:12
COMMISSIONER (174)
3:18,19,20,21;7:6; 21:3;25:11;27:23;
28:22,25;29:4,5,6,11; 31:4,7,12;32:15;33:6; 34:3,5;37:17,18,20,21; $38: 1,7,10,13,15,18,20$, 21;39:3,16,20,24;40:3, 23,24,25;41:1,6;42:3,9, 13,16,25;43:6,7,8,9,13, 24;44:15,16,17,25; 45:1,2,6;46:3,4,7,8,16; 56:16;57:18,19,20; 58:12,23;59:3,22,25; 60:4,7,13,24;62:11,11; 67:10,11,12,13,19,20; 68:3,12;71:2,3,4,19,20, 21,22;72:3,12;73:9,11, 14,24,25;78:11,18,19; 79:2,24;80:1;81:5; 82:12;84:1;85:8;86:18, 19;87:1;88:9;89:19; 91:18,23;92:1,2,13,17;

94:15;112:16,18; 113:21,24;114:1,25; 116:22;117:6;118:5, 10,21;119:1,6,25; 120:16;121:2;123:6; 125:23,24,25;126:4,7, 8;129:2,3,4,11,12; 131:18;132:10,13,14, 17,18;133:4,12,13,18, 20,21,23;134:1,8,16; 136:22,24;137:1,3,5

## Commissioners (29)

 3:14;7:12,19;19:20; 25:10;29:3;33:8;34:12; 45:18,23;50:7;56:15; 60:7;67:8;71:1;73:7; 74:18;77:22;85:12; 90:7;91:17;94:8; 105:19;112:15;115:16; 116:21;125:16;126:20; 137:9Commission's (7) 29:7; 30:7;32:18;64:17,19; 90:12;93:18
committee (6) 38:4; 49:6;52:3;71:25;78:13; 135:8
committees (3) 49:13; 115:25;128:7
common (1) 17:4
communicate (9) 9:6; 21:1,12;22:14,25;23:4; 28:20;32:18;97:9
communicated (2) 9:14; 12:10
communicating (8) 10:14;15:10;16:25; 17:17;18:2;19:13; 28:10;50:17
communications (1) 29:10
communities (2) 23:21; 24:3
community (4) 13:4; 23:24;25:6;26:12
company (3) 21:4;57:5; 97:24
compared (1) $8: 19$
compares (1) 103:20
comparison (2) 8:25; 103:14
compass (4) 9:16; 13:16;15:20;31:5
compile (1) $34: 13$
compiling (1) 14:25
complainant (9) 46:25; 58:12;65:9;66:16; 76:14;77:11;94:5,12; 113:23
complainants (2) 126:21,22
complained (1) 126:23 complaining (1) 71:16
complaint (36) 35:9; 50:13,19,23,24;54:10, 24;55:16,17,18;61:2,2, 6,12,13;64:9,12,15; 65:18;66:23;68:6;74:3, 9,13,14;77:7;92:10; 93:4;95:5;116:25,25; 117:4;124:12;126:20; 127:3,4
complaints (7) 48:3; 65:6,6,7;66:5;94:20; 107:9
complete (1) 129:25
completion (1) 132:5
complicated (2) 90:12; 109:3
complied (2) 74:9; 108:2
complies (1) 111:18
comprehensive (4) 35:16,18;36:22;45:21
conceded (1) 127:11
concept (1) 80:4
concern (10) 5:12; 58:11;62:10;79:9; 102:18;104:21;105:6; 113:20;125:1,9
concerned (7) 63:11; 66:13;79:19;104:6,24; 105:15;114:23
concerns (2) 61:15; 66:19
conciliation (2) 128:15, 25
conclude (1) 73:19
concluded (2) 75:14; 137:10
conclusion (1) 52:10
concur (1) 79:24
conduct (1) 66:24
conducted (1) 34:17
confidence (1) 18:22
confines (1) 48:7
confirm (1) $31: 9$
conflated (1) 56:10
conflict (1) 123:18
congratulate (2) 5:2;6:9
Congratulations (2) 7:6, 8
Congressional (2) 17:20;30:19
conjunction (1) 131:3
conservative (1) 101:16
consider (5) 19:5; 63:23;66:4;120:12; 135:20
consistent (7) 67:16; 70:15,16,18;113:16,17; 117:9
consolidated (1) 21:7
Constantin (5) 52:25; 56:19;94:3;109:22; 118:23

Constantin's (1) 86:21 constantly (1) 71:16 constituents (1) 15:9
consultant (12) 59:8; 63:6;81:20;99:19,22; 101:9;102:3;104:15; 105:11;114:15,16; 120:3
consultants (6) 59:6; 86:12;95:8;97:17; 105:13;120:1
consulting (49) 53:10; 54:13,14;62:17,18,22, 24;68:24;69:23;70:8; 81:24;82:7,8;84:14; 86:11,14;87:7,7;96:17, 20,20;97:4,18;99:12, 18;100:16;101:1,8; 102:10,11,18,23,25; 103:3,21;104:21; 106:5,14;107:4,8,25; 109:22,23;113:7; 114:18;115:5;120:8; 122:21;123:1
contact (14) 13:12; 53:11,15;54:13,14,15; 82:1,6,9,20;96:16,22; 99:9;100:9
content (3) 13:10,13; 37:23
contested (1) 53:21
context (4) 73:3,3; 119:6;124:1
continue (11) 10:25; 12:8;23:1,20,24;24:23; 30:24;33:20;49:11; 70:19;78:24
continued (2) 5:2;9:7 continues (2) 93:3; 136:11
continuing (1) 23:22 contract (5) 14:11; 20:13,14,16;119:18
contractor (1) 34:20
contradicts (1) 76:22
contrary (1) 103:22
contributed (1) 18:21
contribution (7) 38:9; 49:7;72:1;78:14; 109:25;110:5;123:25
contributions (9) 21:19; 35:1,11;38:2;81:4; 89:10;122:15;123:13; 136:13
control (7) 108:7;109:7; 112:19;113:22;120:6; 121:9;134:10
controls (1) 95:12
controvert (1) 76:16
conversation (2) 31:8; 49:9
conversations (1) 36:20 cool (1) 6:25
coordinated (9) 53:9, 21;62:16;64:4;68:16, 21;69:8;82:15;96:24
coordinator (1) 28:2
coordinators (1) 23:23
Coppersmith (1) 62:2
copy (3) 54:19,19; 75:11
core (3) 14:7;32:13,20
Corin (4) 50:10;52:21; 62:2;91:19
Corporation (8) 11:23; 14:9;101:15,21;102:6, 15;103:15;122:25
correctable (1) 43:19
corrected (3) 37:14; 50:23,24
correctly (1) 34:25
cost (4) 13:25;14:3; 98:8,8
costs (1) 98:2
Council (4) 23:22;30:1; 130:12;131:24
counsel (2) 79:4; 132:11
Counselor (3) 67:12; 112:18;113:20
count (2) 26:8;28:16
counted (1) 28:16
counties (3) 8:16;13:3; 32:6
counts (1) 104:14
county (6) $8: 14,15$; 24:16;28:15;30:20; 32:20
couple (12) 4:14;5:6; 6:11;8:14;25:11,15; 62:9;80:1;81:13;82:24; 121:24;124:5
course (8) 9:12;43:14, 20;103:12;116:16,16; 117:18;131:1
court (2) 92:14;110:25
cover (2) 55:23;130:24
CQ (1) 118:25
create (3) $23: 12,15$; 117:19
created (1) 65:3
creative (3) 10:1;11:15; 16:18
credit (2) 99:5;116:15
culture (1) 116:12
curiosity (1) 66:12
curious (1) 37:25
current (2) 78:6;79:17
currently (2) 62:25; 70:12
customized (1) 23:15
cut (4) 27:18,18;41:25; 128:4
cuts (1) $51: 3$
cutting (1) 27:20
cycle (4) 17:19;34:9;

48:19;94:18

## D

Damien (1) 133:11
danger (1) 54:22
data (2) 89:5;90:1
databases (1) 125:3
date (4) 3:4;5:5;21:16; 54:18
dates (3) 10:3;21:7; 103:19
Day (14) 4:16;9:12; 15:23;23:7;24:8;26:14; 30:4;40:15;65:8;89:25; 96:7;98:13;101:7; 127:23
daycare (1) 62:7
days (3) 53:14;102:8; 135:25
deadline (2) 21:11;33:1
deadlines (4) 30:10;
31:15;33:16,17
deal (12) 5:23;44:1;
51:10;71:6;105:5;
106:15;107:8,10;
109:5;112:25;119:10;
134:14
dealing (2) 40:1;99:3
deals (1) 85:10
Deanna (1) 98:9
debate (10) 14:24,24;
15:4;16:7;25:20;26:9;
28:1;31:24;72:19,20
debates (20) 9:15;14:8, 11,12,15,16,23;15:11, 14;16:5;17:7,9;25:18, 21;26:5;27:10;28:4; 31:6,8,20
debating (1) 25:22
December (3) 3:12; 20:9;131:1
decide (3) 27:3;94:25; 104:9
decided (2) 25:24; 116:3
decision (6) 12:17; 68:11;78:21;116:1; 117:3;120:15
decisions (1) 30:2
declaration (1) 75:10
declarations (2) 74:25; 76:1
dedication (1) 133:6
defendant (2) 81:13,22
defer (1) 64:10
definitely (10) 16:23; 19:11;27:25;28:5;37:7; 40:12,20;42:12,13; 114:19
definition (2) 110:4; 111:11
degree (1) 89:19
degrees (1) 47:16 deliberately (1) 100:16 delineate (1) 56:22 delineated (1) 57:4 delineating (1) 57:2 delivered (1) 13:3 delve (1) 69:16
demand (4) 31:13;32:6, 10,19
Democrat (1) 81:20
Democratic (25) 48:15,
18;51:20;58:2,7;62:16;
63:5;66:24;68:16;69:7,
20,25;76:3,10;79:13;
82:25;88:22;92:10;
93:6;102:9;106:6;
107:12;110:2,2;118:16
demonstrate (1) $80: 8$
demonstrates (1) 107:19
denial (1) 64:1
denied (1) 61:4
Department (2) 4:24; 108:19
dependent (1) 30:6 deposit (1) 41:4
deposited (4) 38:23; 39:11,22;44:9
deposits (1) 40:11
depth (1) 35:6
described (3) 98:4,20; 103:6
description (3) 67:21; 81:23;115:6
descriptions (2) 112:23; 115:11
descriptive (3) 80:7,23; 81:3
designated (1) 10:11
desire (1) 76:24
despite (1) 6:23
detail (18) 49:22;54:6, 16;55:6;61:1;72:20; 82:4,11,11;83:9;84:15, 20;91:2;112:22,23,25; 113:18;114:4
detailed (1) 11:22
Detailing (1) 82:12
details (7) 11:16;56:3, 4;69:4;81:19;82:22; 94:22
determination (3) 72:9; 79:18;110:16
determine (2) 67:24; 108:20
determined (2) 110:11, 12
developing (1) 42:4
devolved (1) 66:17
dictate (1) 113:17
differ (1) 69:24
difference (3) 17:16,25; 109:20
differences (1) 35:25
different (27) 8:25;13:5; 43:22;45:15;57:23; 68:18,19;70:2;74:6,22; 75:15;86:12;93:8;
96:18,21,25;98:3,18; 107:13,14,15;110:6; 124:19;125:7;126:21; 135:16,24
differently (2) 90:13,16
differs (1) 8:22
difficult (3) 24:5;
111:15;115:2
dig (1) 80:13
digitally (1) 13:9
direct (15) 11:25;33:4; 44:11;52:1;72:18,19; 73:5,7;78:8;86:8; 87:10,12;91:8,10; 100:9
direction (4) 30:7; 71:12;86:25;125:15
directions (1) 43:1 directly (8) 12:23;15:2; 16:9;22:1,19,25;62:10; 118:15
director (20) 33:12; 57:21;69:6;76:3,6; 77:24;78:21;79:3; 91:20;92:25;94:9; 102:17;105:21;110:10, 18;115:18;121:18,20; 125:18;129:9
directors (1) 24:16
director's (9) 4:4;5:9; 7:12;21:9;47:10;63:16; 64:11;70:21;126:1
disbursed (1) 78:9
disbursements (3) 35:1; 36:19;40:10
disclosing (1) 124:10
disclosure (4) 83:19; 124:8,13;125:11
discouraged (1) 117:21
discovered (1) 89:14
discrepancies (1) 36:1
discuss (3) 24:20; 131:17,17
discussing (1) 131:22
discussion (7) 3:11;4:3; 7:15;34:7;46:18; 116:11;130:10
dispute (2) 73:6;127:15
distinction (1) 72:12
distinguish (1) 56:8
District (10) 17:21; 30:16,19,20,21,22; 68:18;97:25;98:9; 100:24
districts (2) 14:10;97:22
district-specific (1) 13:19
distrust (2) 19:12;22:7
distrustful (1) 26:22
disturbing (1) $39: 13$
dive (1) 7:23
divert (1) 65:10
divide (1) 56:2
document (4) 76:4; 87:10;103:25;106:9
documentation (15) 34:22;36:2,9;40:19; 45:5,8,13;87:14,15,18, 25;88:6;91:5,7;104:1
documentations (1) 85:18
documented (2) 34:25; 35:24
documents (3) 65:21; 84:22;97:2
dollars (3) 70:17; 100:24;125:5
donations (1) 48:22
done (18) 4:9;6:14; 19:10;29:13;33:12; 45:11;64:13;68:18; 80:16;83:20;95:7; 113:14,19;115:4,7,22; 123:2;130:2
don'ts (1) 43:12
door (1) 104:2
dos (1) 43:11
doubt (1) 55:12
down (9) 4:8;11:19; 34:15;70:4;75:8;93:19; 94:21;108:22;117:2
draft (2) 113:1;130:23
dramatic (1) 89:17
draw (3) 72:13;109:12; 117:9
drew (1) 34:17
drill (1) 93:19
drilling (1) 94:21
drive (3) 20:4;95:14; 133:24
driven (1) 32:6
driver (1) 10:23
driving (1) 16:18
drop-down (1) 82:21
drove (2) 12:11,23
du (1) 62:7
Due (4) 20:16;114:3; 128:16,18
during (6) 26:5,14; 33:25;64:2,5;135:21
duty (1) 113:10
dynamic (1) 59:20

## E

earlier (4) 9:4;64:19; 65:15;80:3
early (9) 9:10,11;10:7, 9,11;18:10;21:11; 24:10;33:1
easily (1) 111:22
easy (2) $57: 11 ; 107: 5$ educate (5) 17:10; 24:13;26:1;29:24; 32:23
educating (2) 16:25; 18:2
education (23) 7:16,17, 22;9:16;12:25;13:25; 14:6,8;16:13;19:3,8, 25;20:8,12,25;21:24; 22:14;23:6,20;27:17; 30:8;33:11,25
effect (2) 57:16;58:4
efficiency (1) 131:7
efficient (2) 13:24;66:5
efficiently (1) 87:13
effort (2) 48:8;56:23
efforts (5) 6:23;32:4; 33:24;34:1;64:20
egregious (1) 89:12
eight (4) 93:6;94:20; 106:23;118:15
either (7) 32:7;36:1; 41:12;63:9;91:1;95:1; 128:23
elected (2) 101:21; 110:4
election (57) 7:17,23; 8:1,3,9,11,20;9:9,12; 10:9;11:18,21;12:2,14, 14,25;14:1,19;15:22, 25;17:19;18:17;19:11; 21:7,8,14,25;22:8;24:8, 16,19;29:8,18,22; 30:13;31:2,14,22;32:6, 13,21;34:9;35:12; 48:19;53:19;57:8;64:5; 74:6,7;83:14;93:2; 95:21;100:22,22; 108:3;111:19,22
Elections (61) 3:4;4:23; 5:3,14;6:16;9:15; 10:22;17:2,3;19:1,23; 20:6;21:15;23:2,6; 24:21;26:22;29:7,10, 14,20;30:9;31:17,18; 37:13,24;38:5;39:5; 40:8;47:14;48:15;54:4; 57:13;59:14;65:4,8; 66:1;70:16;71:13;82:2; 95:6,11,15;105:11,14; 107:23;109:5;110:24; 111:2;112:3,11;114:5; 118:12;120:20;122:6; 133:5,7,10;135:5,13; 136:12
electrician (1) 108:23
element (2) 54:8;65:15 eligible (3) 8:3;18:12; 128:2
eliminated (1) 5:19
else (8) 54:4;64:10;
69:10;82:6;94:2,19;

99:15;125:13
email (1) 85:18
employee (2) 4:22,24
employees (1) 6:14
employer (1) 41:13
encourage (1) 20:1
encouraging (2) 65:1; 123:23
end (10) 12:21;15:23; 22:11;23:7;69:3;81:3; 82:17;89:25;101:7; 128:18
ended (2) 14:2,11
endless (1) 111:4
endlessly (1) 65:5
enforcement (19) 5:20; 35:4;36:22,23;37:4,8; 39:15;40:21;45:24; 46:19;47:20,20,24; 110:12,22;111:13; 116:1,4,8
engage (1) $65: 19$
engaged (1) 104:19
engagement (3) 11:4; 22:24;64:25
English (1) 13:6
enhance (1) 23:14
enhancing (1) 23:11
enjoyed (1) 134:4
enormous (1) 48:16
enough (14) 17:5;45:7; 58:25;72:4;73:19; 79:16;83:20;91:14; 95:7;102:19;104:23; 111:5;113:18;121:18 ensure (4) 39:2;42:5,9, 10
ensuring (1) 70:17
enter (1) 67:2
entering (1) 128:24
enthusiasm (1) 136:8
entire (1) $134: 6$
entirely (5) 45:11; 65:18;70:1;96:24; 98:18
entirety (1) 39:13
entitled (1) 104:1
entry (2) 89:6;90:1
envision (1) 31:4
equally (1) $68: 1$
error (1) 40:18
errors (4) $37: 13 ; 43: 19$, 19;45:9
especially (4) $17: 14$; 19:11,25;27:11
Essentially (7) 9:25; 12:12;50:14;51:12,15; 74:3;111:1
established (1) 110:22
et (1) 95:9
ethical (1) 115:1
evaluation (2) 5:21; 14:25
evaluations (3) 136:1,2, 5
even (19) 12:14;26:24; 28:3;31:25;48:22;
54:14;58:15;84:23,23, 24;87:3;98:19;99:18; 104:16;109:4;111:10;
114:15;117:24;124:14
event (2) 127:4;135:20
events (1) 23:24
Everest (1) 99:21
everybody (3) 25:24; 31:21;99:15
everybody's (1) 56:23
everyday (1) 29:24
everyone (2) 51:4;82:5
everyone's (1) 84:11
evidence (21) 51:17; 63:23,25;67:20;76:16, 18,20,25;79:5,6,22,23; 88:19;106:11,18; 107:5,19;109:12,13,14; 115:13
evidentiary (1) $72: 14$
evolve (1) 71:9
exact (1) 53:18
exactly (7) 22:3;29:6; 41:21,24,25;89:1; 103:7
example (12) 10:7; 13:23;18:15;48:20; 62:21;68:20;70:7;90:6; 104:12;108:19;114:10, 11
excellent (2) 16:6; 114:11
except (2) 35:21;84:21
exception (5) 35:22; 36:14;83:1;123:15,16
exchange (2) 51:19; 69:13
excited (2) 6:25;20:17
exciting (1) 19:9
excuse (4) 8:3;18:4; 21:3;43:25
execute (1) 20:12
executing (1) $20: 25$
executive (16) 3:6;4:4; 5:9;7:12;21:9;47:9; 63:16;64:11;69:6; 70:21;76:3,6;91:20; 102:17;110:10,18
exempt (1) 110:4
exemption (2) 109:20; 110:3
exercise (1) 117:4
Exhibit (4) 50:18,18; 60:25;69:2
exhibits (2) 82:24; 96:14
exist (3) $24: 12,14$; 70:13
existed (4) 28:14;

63:13;66:23;67:1
existing (1) 23:10
exists (5) 24:9;27:8; 28:10;32:20;63:4
expand (1) $24: 24$
expanded (2) 30:17; 90:5
expect (1) 119:10
expecting (1) $4: 10$
expedition (1) $71: 15$
expenditure (24) 36:10;
51:11,14,18,18;57:22;
58:10;59:5;60:16,22;
63:18;72:18,20;73:5,8;
74:12;76:20;83:11; 85:19,24;86:3,8;110:5; 115:9
expenditures (21) 20:7; 34:23;35:8,9,13;36:3; 44:12;51:2;59:10,15, 16;85:15;87:17,25; 88:7;91:6,7,8,10,11; 123:14
expense (8) 65:24; 80:5,8,9,14,15,21,22
expenses (4) 53:16; 68:2;80:24;100:14
expensive (1) 109:3
experience (3) 23:15; 25:21;90:10
experienced (4) 101:18;107:13;108:9, 10
expertise (1) 101:24
explain (1) 8:22
explained (1) 97:1
explains (1) 74:11
explanation (5) 38:16; 45:9;64:1;98:7;124:17
explanations (1) 131:1
exposed (1) 26:3
express (2) 21:14;79:9
expressed (1) 47:15
extend (1) 59:7
extended (1) 131:25
extensive (1) $27: 5$
extensively (1) 43:12
extent (3) 42:4;55:23; 61:9
extreme (1) 47:17
extremely (1) 39:13
eye (3) $37: 25 ; 99: 2$; 134:12

| $\mathbf{F}$ | $105: 13$ <br> field (1) $97: 18$ <br> fieldwork (1) $100: 9$ |
| :---: | :--- |
| figure (2) $96: 3 ; 104: 23$ |  |
| fabulous (1) $136: 7$ | file (3) $127: 3,9,11$ |
| face (1) $27: 19$ | filed (7) $50: 19 ; 65: 21 ;$ |
| Facebook (6) $11: 9,10 ;$ | $67: 15 ; 74: 3 ; 126: 24,25 ;$ |
| $51: 5,17 ; 55: 16 ; 100: 4$ | $127: 12$ |
| fact (16) $28: 15 ; 31: 15 ;$ | filing (3) $67: 23 ; 83: 2 ;$ |
| $45: 14 ; 48: 4 ; 49: 4 ; 51: 16 ;$ |  |
| $60: 17 ; 65: 2 ; 69: 7,11 ;$ | $127: 5$ |

filings (1) $127: 1$
fill (1) 41:10
Fillmore (1) 37:22
final (2) 34:7;124:5
finally (2) 49:2;135:15
finance (36) 5:18,25;
34:19,23;35:8,15;36:1,
17,25;37:2,4;39:5,8,21; 40:6;44:3;45:15;62:15, 19,25;83:23;85:2,14, 17,20;86:6;87:2;88:10, 25;90:8,11,23;99:8; 106:15;107:9;122:24
financially (1) $29: 9$
financials (1) 134:10
financing (3) 42:19;
88:4;114:18
find (12) 9:13;13:15; 51:1;52:7,18;58:21; 77:6;79:5;93:20;97:1; 102:10;125:19
finding (10) 18:24;36:8; 39:10;67:2;77:20; 80:17;91:20;93:25; 127:13,15
findings (8) 16:21,22; 37:9,11,13;43:18; 44:12;49:20
fine (17) 53:3;54:1; 94:25;101:13;102:24; 104:23,24;127:23; 128:1,9,12,12,13,14,14, 14;134:3
fines (1) 110:15
fine-tuning (1) 89:21
finished (1) 135:25
firm (4) 62:22;84:14; 109:21,23
firmly (1) 76:22
first (17) 6:5;8:23,23; 24:17;25:12;47:14,19; 62:4,10;69:3;94:5,6; 97:20;99:1;106:8; 118:24;135:12
fiscal (1) 101:16
fishing (1) $71: 15$
five (7) $35: 11,13 ; 65: 21$;
84:24;92:17,19;116:16
fix (2) 83:23;125:10
fixed (1) $82: 17$
flip (2) 14:5;109:16
floor (1) 50:2
flying (1) 55:10
focus (3) $22: 19 ; 64: 20$; 123:12
focused (2) 61:13; 73:23
focusing (2) 23:9;97:20
folks (9) 47:13,22; 56:10;89:13;96:17; 114:8;126:23;127:8; 128:1
follow (1) 73:23
followed (6) 59:11; 84:21;85:5;119:15; 124:9,17
following (4) 34:8; 40:25;46:18;83:13
follow-up (2) 54:23; 135:20
force (1) $16: 18$
forcing (1) $66: 15$
forego (2) 116:1; 123:25
forever (1) 106:11
forget (2) 99:20;104:14
form (4) 14:24,25;38:9; 132:7
formats (1) 13:5
former (5) 36:6;69:6; 76:2,6,6
forum (1) 16:6
forward (14) 18:1;22:2; 46:22;56:1;66:4,20; 68:5;72:17;79:21;84:4; 87:23;89:24;120:11; 136:11
found (5) 37:10;83:12; 93:21;94:22;134:7
four (3) $15: 21 ; 46: 21$; 65:20
framework (4) 52:5; 72:16;73:1,4
frankly (2) 94:4;102:5
free (1) 108:15
friends (1) 25:23
front (6) 32:17;46:23; 79:17;81:3;82:17; 131:14
frustration (1) 47:16
fulfilled (1) 32:2
full (2) $44: 21 ; 45: 17$
fuller (1) 75:6
full-service (1) 20:19
fully (5) 64:7;65:16; 74:9,13;77:6
function (2) 14:7;32:21
functioning (1) 4:11
fundamental (1) 116:6
funded (1) 98:21
funding (7) 37:24;38:5, 6,11;100:20;111:10; 114:6
funds (15) 38:22;39:2, 11,17;44:9,11;58:17; 63:3,12;78:6,8;79:15; 111:1;113:11,17
further (6) $24: 25 ; 30: 24$; 61:20;88:23,23;91:1
future (7) $71: 13,18$; 76:25;84:10;86:1; 112:6;120:12

## G

Galen (1) 133:11
game (4) 54:25;71:8,8; 116:18
Gaming (1) 4:25
Gaona (18) 47:2,4;
61:9,24;62:1,1;67:18;
68:12;73:24;74:23;
75:3,9,13,17,22,24;
76:1;128:21
garbage (1) 90:2
garbage-in (1) 89:5
garbage-out (1) 89:5
gather (1) 109:13
gave (3) $50: 15 ; 135: 8,9$
geez (2) 108:14;111:9
general (34) 7:23;8:1,3,
7,9;10:2,9;12:25;
13:25;14:19;15:22;
17:21;34:1;41:8;42:1;
53:16,18,21;58:18; 64:5;67:21;69:13;74:7; 79:13;83:14;87:4,8; 89:2;100:22,22; 102:19;110:11;115:11; 122:21
generally (2) 25:22; 123:9
generic (2) 115:5;125:6
gets (2) $53: 4 ; 61: 16$
Gina (7) 4:15;7:18; 29:6;33:10;135:15,23, 23
given (11) 38:6;54:11; 63:12;64:19;67:21; 68:17;76:12;99:3; 103:8;105:1;128:2
gives (1) $121: 10$
giving (3) 10:15;90:10; 118:15
glasses (1) 56:19
goal (4) 24:18;29:16; 31:19;64:21
goes (3) 27:5;37:7; 95:16
go-forward (1) 49:17
good (26) 6:14,14;7:9, 20,21;8:6,11;19:3; 33:11,12,20;34:11; 41:7;45:21;56:20;81:6; 95:18,18;101:10; 104:23;106:21;112:8, 12;122:4,11;134:25
goods (1) 78:7
Goodyear (1) 5:4
Google (1) 10:22
go-round (1) 130:15
Gosh (1) 130:14
gotcha (1) 26:19
government (2) 26:10; 114:18
Governor's (1) 130:12
grand (1) 102:23
graph (1) $25: 18$
Grassroots (2) 62:22;

63:5
grateful (2) 135:4;
136:13
gray (1) 119:15
great (15) 4:17;15:25;
17:9;19:22;25:2,13;
27:24;93:1;101:7,23; 102:14;105:5;112:25;
114:10;134:14
greater (2) 82:4,4
Green (1) 118:17
grips (1) 16:4
ground (3) 51:13;
115:4;121:6
group (6) 24:1,22;
106:5;109:22;127:6; 134:3
groups (3) 22:19; 32:17;116:2
GRRC (3) 130:20; 131:13,19
guess (12) 54:22; 78:16;103:10;105:23; 114:21,22;118:21; 124:23;125:9;126:21; 132:4;134:25
guidance (1) 101:25
Guide (9) 9:16;12:25; 13:5,11,14,20;14:6; 19:3,8
guides (1) 13:25
guilt (1) $83: 18$
guilty (1) 83:22
guy (2) 108:25;110:3
guys (15) 25:13;54:25; 82:10;94:3,25;96:2; 104:9,22;106:24; 107:1;124:11,16; 125:10,14;134:2

## H

hacking (2) 22:7;26:23 half (5) 101:4,6;113:1; 128:5;136:1
Hammond (25) 50:10, 14;51:19;52:21;61:10; 62:2;63:15;64:8;65:16; 69:9;70:11,24;75:18, 20;76:9;77:5,14;83:7, 8;91:19;96:15,16; 99:15;100:4,6
Hammond's (6) 61:21; 64:4;66:23;77:17;82:4, 7
hand (2) 101:4;119:21
handle (1) 14:12
handled (1) 74:14
handout (3) 48:16; 49:3;51:24
Hank (1) 5:16
happen (4) 39:2;42:10; 51:19;121:16
happened (10) 37:5; 40:14;44:19;51:16; 53:17;74:12;89:7; 94:24;104:22;110:17
happening (1) 96:4
happens (2) 22:10; 109:13
happy (14) 25:7;36:5; 37:15;50:1,1,5;67:6; 79:4;84:18;86:16; 112:7,13;115:3;134:15
hard (6) 33:25;52:5; 58:14;90:13;94:22; 122:23
harder (4) 73:2;111:7, 7,8
head (1) 41:22
Healy (3) 70:21;74:18; 76:2
hear (7) 12:19;15:1; 19:3;28:4;48:3,7;114:2
heard (9) 22:7;28:13; 47:12,13,19;93:8;96:5; 124:17;130:19
hearing (3) 5:11;22:1,6
heavily (1) 88:7
held (2) $14: 11 ; 15: 11$
help (14) 16:6;17:8; 18:21;20:4,12;22:13; 24:21;27:2,9;33:3; 71:17;96:7;104:17; 110:3
helped (1) 34:12
helpful (7) 33:14,16,19; 101:25;105:25;108:5; 112:9
helping (3) 16:4;20:25; 22:25
here's (1) 118:15
hey (1) $51: 10$
high (4) 11:8;27:12,13; 136:4
higher (1) 113:10
highest (2) 8:16;15:7
highest-used (1) 17:7
highlight (1) 23:3
himself (1) 131:20
hinted (1) 62:12
hire (2) 44:6;120:8
hired (3) 4:22,24;62:21
hiring (1) 97:10
historically (1) 29:12
hold (1) 94:15
holding (1) 135:20
hole (1) 42:18
home (3) 9:21;33:17; 62:7
honest (2) 89:3,15
honestly (1) 67:23
honor (1) 134:2
honorable (1) 95:19
hope (3) 6:17;94:22; 99:15

Horizon (1) 14:13
host (4) 14:17;24:23; 28:4;70:9
hosted (1) 24:16 hour (1) 113:1
hourly (1) 100:15
hours (2) 11:6;28:3
House (5) 47:6;101:18; 127:11,24;129:7
hurt (1) 120:14

## I

IOS (1) 15:19
ID (2) 18:11;24:8
idea (18) $7: 25 ; 8: 18$;
9:5;15:12;26:2,4;54:3,
4;55:8,12;57:11;83:4;
84:23,24;89:2;99:16;
103:13;118:6
identical (2) 124:18; 125:7
identically (2) 98:4,20
identification (1) 41:13
identified (3) 63:3;93:5; 107:3
identifiers (1) 107:24
identifies (2) 116:9,10
identify (2) 50:13;116:8
ignorant (1) 81:17
III (1) $4: 3$
illegal (1) 109:25
imagination (2) 96:1; 117:8
immediately (1) 23:1
impact (5) 17:1;21:24;
22:11;24:2;29:21
impactful (2) 17:18; 29:23
importance (2) 21:15; 22:9
important (5) 16:24; 17:2;30:10;73:14; 111:16
importantly (1) 14:4
impressed (2) 25:14; 135:18
impressions (1) 11:11
impressive (1) 7:5
improve (7) 15:2,10;
23:14,19;28:2,6;135:9
improved (3) 24:20; 134:9,11
improvement (1) 54:9
in/garbage (1) 90:2
inadequate (1) 105:4
include (4) 24:25;25:5, 5;130:25
includes (1) 23:21
inconsistent (1) 65:25
incorporated (1) 130:22
incorrect (2) 51:10; 81:22
incorrectly (1) 61:23 increase (5) 12:5;

14:18;22:22;64:21,22
increased (2) 5:18;11:2
increases (1) 8:9
increasing (4) 12:9;
63:11;64:24,25
independence (3) 120:7,9,14
independent (5) 34:20; 45:12;118:13,17; 122:22
Indian (1) 4:15
indicate (3) 39:21;86:7; 87:4
indicated (1) 53:10
indicates (1) 49:16
indication (1) 85:14
individual (3) 36:21; 61:10;117:4
individually (1) 42:7
infographics (2) 11:14, 19
information (46) 8:17; 9:12,17;10:15;11:7,13; 12:1,3;13:10,12;15:1,4, 8;16:1;18:1;19:6,7,14; 21:12,23;25:20;28:19; 29:20;30:12;31:3,14; 32:8;52:7;54:11,15; 63:17;66:10;72:4,7,8; 73:19;74:15;76:15; 77:8;79:16;80:7;85:21; 108:12;111:5;127:8; 136:9
informed (5) 9:7;12:2, 16,16;23:1
initial (1) 18:5
in-kind (1) 109:25
inputting (1) 89:9
ins (1) 43:11
insane (1) 96:9
Instagram (1) 11:10
instead (2) 13:19; 100:25
institute (1) 117:20
institutional (1) 118:2
insulator (1) 108:24
integrated (1) 13:16
integrity (1) 118:2
integrous (1) 134:3
intellectually (1) 121:3
intend (1) $30: 8$
intention (1) 121:11
intentions (2) 67:17; 95:18
interactions (1) 118:14
interest (3) 66:12,14,15
interested (4) 25:16; 53:23;84:4,15
interesting (4) 5:22; 8:14;84:3;109:20
interferes (1) 120:9
intern (1) 6:21
internal (1) 134:10
internet (1) 10:20
interpretation (1) 55:24
interrupt (1) 92:13
Intertribal (1) 23:22
intimating (1) 120:24
intimidating (1) 120:23
into (37) 3:6;6:24;7:5,
23;13:16;19:17;21:21;
34:15;35:1,12;38:23,
24;39:11,17,22;40:11,
13;41:4,11;42:14,24;
44:9,22;47:11;56:3;
61:16;66:17;69:9,16;
80:13;87:23;108:6;
112:10,25;121:7;
128:24;130:23
invalidate (1) 93:22
invaluable (4) 4:25; 6:15,22;16:4
inverse (1) 73:22
investigated (1) 117:1 investigating (1) 104:9 investigative (1) 104:7
investment (1) 101:4
invitation (2) 131:25; 132:1
invoice (5) 83:1;85:24; 96:7;104:14;106:11 invoices (4) 83:1,3; 85:18;87:13
involve (2) 26:9;135:21
involved (9) 26:20; 27:17;29:9;31:24;33:3; 53:7;57:9;105:9;136:3
IRS (1) 41:21
issue (38) 5:22;24:7;
39:1;40:4;41:7;48:14;
51:3;55:25;56:1,7,20;
62:14;63:2;64:16,17;
66:3,19;74:1;78:25;
79:21;85:1;91:15;
93:11;95:2;101:14;
102:22;104:9;107:16,
22;113:15;115:2,24; 116:12,23;121:19; 123:18;127:6,6
issued (1) 43:2
issue-oriented (1) 20:3 issues (14) 5:13;15:17;

16:7;17:6,11;18:22;
24:2;41:9;50:12;51:3;
61:14,17;116:2;134:13
issuing (1) 42:18
item (18) 3:8,11;4:3;
7:15;34:7;37:21,22;
38:22;46:17,17;63:1;
70:6;92:23;130:8,10;
133:2;134:22;136:19
itemize (2) 51:2;87:8
IX (1) 134:22

| $\mathbf{J}$ |
| :---: |
| January (3) 3:5;133:8; | 135:7

Jicha (3) 6:21;7:7,10 Jim (3) 93:9;94:3;106:4 job (10) 15:25;25:13; 33:12;34:3;46:16;60:5;
67:13,13;80:16;106:21
Joe (1) 131:4
John (2) 37:22;131:13
joint (15) 51:2,11,13,17, 18;57:22;58:9;59:4,9, 10,14,16;60:22;74:12; 115:8
jour (1) 62:7
judgments (1) 69:18
jump (1) 19:17
jumped (2) 96:13; 108:10
jumping (1) $51: 7$
jumps (1) 88:12
jurisdiction (1) 127:22
justice (1) 20:22
justification (1) 114:14
justify (2) 69:11;87:17

## K

keen (1) 134:12
keep (2) 118:23;132:1
Keith (1) 99:20
kept (1) 45:10
key (5) 16:22;18:24;
20:4;21:16;24:2
kick (2) 22:12;88:15
kicked (1) 16:13
kicking (1) 21:21
kids (3) 26:6,11;27:19
Kimball (1) 133:11
KIMBLE (28) 3:19,21;
29:4,5,6,12;31:4,8,12;
32:15;33:6;44:25;45:2,
6;71:19,21;72:12;
73:25;84:1;91:18,24;
125:23,24,25;126:5;
131:18;132:17,19
Kimble's (1) 73:14
kind (35) 5:22;6:2; 25:23;26:8,15;27:21; 29:9;31:25;32:11; 37:24;48:16;54:24; 57:7,12;71:11,14; 79:25;87:19;88:19; 95:2,8;96:21;101:16; 105:7,7;107:21; 108:13,17;112:21; 114:4,13,16;118:18; 125:6;135:13
kinds (2) 31:16;132:6
knew (2) 60:11;68:6
knock (1) 104:2
knowing (2) 58:12;88:5 knowledge (4) 127:16; 128:3;134:11;136:8 knowledgeable (2) 17:5;18:6
known (1) 96:5
knows (3) 54:7;83:24; 86:22
KNOX (1) 134:25 KT (1) 14:11

## L

Labor (2) 108:20,25 lack (2) 72:24;127:4 lacking (1) 32:7 ladders (1) 31:17 LAIRD (62) 3:18,21; 7:3;34:3;40:23,24,25; 41:6;42:3,16,25;43:6; 46:3,5,16;57:18,19,20; 58:23;59:3,22,25;60:4, 7,13,24;62:11;67:10, 11,12,20;68:13;71:22; 72:3;73:9,11,25;78:11, 19;79:2;84:2;112:16, 17,18;113:21,24;114:1, 25;126:7,9;129:11,13; 133:3,4,9,13,20,23; 134:1,16;136:24;137:2
Laird's (2) 86:19;134:7
land (2) 24:6,12
landed (1) 18:17
Lang (1) 110:10
language (1) $84: 12$
large (3) $35: 19,19$; 43:21
largely (1) 66:16
larger (1) 68:22
LARSEN (21) 34:11;
38:1,12,14,17;39:3,20; 40:2,5;41:6;42:12; 43:13;44:4;45:6,25; 46:14;50:21;85:12; 87:1;90:7;121:23
Larsen's (1) 44:21
last (13) 4:17;5:5; 19:11;36:18;48:18; 56:19;94:13;99:20; 116:16;117:13;130:19; 131:12;136:25
late (1) $38: 12$
lately (1) 10:20
later (3) 40:13;45:24; 127:12
latest (1) 130:15 launch (1) 23:12 law (3) 6:23;106:5; 109:22
lawful (2) 63:14,19
laws (2) 63:13;67:1
lawyer (1) 65:22
lax (1) 105:2

LD1 (2) 13:21,21
LD9 (2) 13:22,22
lead (2) 119:8;131:21
leadership (2) 33:12; 133:22
League (4) 32:1;135:4, 19;136:11
learn (3) 10:11;22:2; 26:20
learned (2) 24:5; 134:14
learning (2) 90:17,18
least (8) 30:25;48:24; 57:1;113:18;121:6,6; 130:17,18
leave (5) $32: 11 ; 61: 19$; 65:23;109:7;127:22
left (2) 55:23;77:5
Legacy (1) 46:21
legal (6) 3:8;94:24; 101:13;114:4,20; 134:12
legally (5) 57:21; 117:16,19,21;118:1
Legislative (12) 4:16; 5:7;14:10,10,15,23; 30:20;34:18;88:1; 97:20,24;98:1
legislators (1) 27:11
Legislature (3) 4:17; 5:17;11:24
legit (2) 54:2;55:11
legitimate (3) 44:20; 66:18;95:23
less (8) 31:24;49:22; 50:18;62:13;80:7,7; 95:23;107:13
letter (4) 113:1,3,3; 130:24
letters (1) 66:11
level (11) 8:19;11:21; 32:2,5;54:6;63:10; 70:11;84:20;90:1; 104:10,25
levels (1) 59:4
libraries (1) 13:4
library (1) 30:3
life (4) 22:11;29:21,24; 136:4
likely (2) 22:22;31:24
limit (2) 123:13,14
limited (2) 66:6,7
limits (3) 5:18,25; 123:14
line (10) 55:4;63:1; 70:6;87:2,9,11;88:24; 99:9;100:11;117:10
line-by-line (3) 36:23; 40:22;44:14
lines (4) 30:18,22,23; 99:11
list (5) 54:20;106:23, 25;107:24;108:1
listed (4) 3:8;82:18; 97:19;136:6
literally (4) 83:4;96:10; 106:23,25
little (16) $8: 22 ; 9: 3 ; 14: 2$; 20:11;23:25;24:25; 26:16;28:23;35:6; 57:22;96:1;107:20; 108:11;110:6;111:21; 131:2
live (4) 4:7,8,10,13
lives (1) 24:6
livestreamcom/cleanelections (1) 4:13
Ioan (7) 37:23,24;38:3, 6,6,8,11
loans (1) $38: 3$
local (16) 16:7;17:2,3; 21:14,15;23:2;29:7,10, 20,22;30:9,23;31:5; 32:2,4,6
location (1) 28:3
locator (1) 30:16
logic (1) 59:7
log-in (1) 127:8
logistics (3) 9:8;30:10; 33:2
long (7) 89:25;104:21; 118:2;119:18,19,19; 122:4
look (27) 17:9;18:1; 23:13;24:10;28:5,20; 32:22;42:14,20;44:22; 51:24;53:8;85:1,13; 89:22,24;95:25;101:9, 16;111:20;113:13; 115:4;117:13,24; 122:3,23;136:11
looked (4) 19:2;53:25; 55:19;108:10
looking (12) 14:21; 23:18;28:2;52:6,18; 54:23;55:8;77:25; 82:10;85:14;89:18; 99:7
looks (4) 38:22;51:11; 121:21;124:20
loose (2) 105:3,3
lorded (1) 79:3
lost (1) 16:2
Iot (23) 10:1;11:15,17; 12:19;23:11;25:3,19; 26:14;27:16;28:8,9; 34:14;49:23;56:23; 90:21,24;95:3,5;98:11, 15;99:23;119:8,15
love (1) 109:1
loved (1) 136:7
lower (2) 8:9;9:4
lucky (2) 90:9,14

M
ma'am (3) 91:13;
134:24;136:15
magnetic (1) $33: 14$
mail (2) 10:10;18:10
mailbox (1) 24:7
mailers (1) 102:2
mailing (1) 24:6
main (4) 15:21;27:10; 31:19;95:2
maintain (4) 87:13; 88:5;127:20;128:10
major (1) 5:12
makes (7) 38:18;39:24; 64:2;80:10;85:24; 108:12;118:18
making (11) 28:20; 30:1;63:10;66:21;72:3; 110:19;111:7;116:4,8; 121:1,25
manage (1) 101:6
managing (2) 100:3,8
mandate (1) 47:5
manner (3) 23:17; 90:20,21
many (13) 6:17;26:13; 32:3;54:18;59:5;62:6; 95:3;113:10;120:1; 124:18;131:20;134:18; 135:12
March (2) 5:4;21:8
Mark (1) 133:11
market (10) 58:16; 67:25;68:7;69:17,22; 79:11;108:15,18,19; 115:9
marketing (1) 20:14
Mary (3) 6:24;7:9; 134:20
match (3) 37:2,3;41:21
matched (2) 34:22; 35:15
matching (1) 111:1
materials (5) 25:3; 43:15;75:6;128:16,25
matter (18) 5:21;17:16; 35:5;36:22;43:4,4; 48:1;52:19;53:5;68:14; 75:1;76:5;89:6;96:21; 97:25;106:7,9;118:2
matters (5) 46:19,21; 96:8;129:5;130:13
may (42) 3:6;6:21; 27:9;28:17;31:11; 42:15;45:12;48:3; 55:13;56:10,10;60:1, 17,21;61:8;63:8;68:4; 70:1,14,14,16;71:2; 72:11;75:7,7,19,20; 76:17,24;77:5;83:16; 88:8;115:23;116:2,15; 118:5,20;127:2,2; 128:21,21;134:5
maybe (28) 5:24;24:3;


| $8,1$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 105.13, |  |
| 7:21;109:16;110:7, | 07 |
| 3;115:20,20,21 | 20:5,2 |
| 116:22;119:18;121:24 | 121:8;1 |
| 4.5.125:6.126:17 | O |
| 24,24;127:23;129:22, | outreach (3) 12: |
| 22;130:2;131:13; | 23:20;64: |
| 134:2,19;135:3;136:6 | Outs (1) |
| 25 | outside (4) 19: |
| e-stop (1) 12:19 |  |
| -ye | outstanding (3) |
| ine (2) 43:15;103: | 133:6;136 |
| $y$ (14) 13.2122. | over (10) 5:4;14:2; |
| 39:25;40:8;72:20;78:8; | 20:11;50:2;82: |
| 79:12;81:11,12;82:7 | 05:8;116:16;12 |
| 101:1;104:8;108:18 | 30:25 |
| (5) 3:7:9:13; | overall |
| 96: | 31:22 |
| pens (1) 105:4 | overarching (1) 66:3 |
| rating (3) 49:4 | overlook (1) 13 |
| 6:6;73:1 | oversight (1) 102:20 |
| pinion (3) 17 | overview (1) 34:16 |
| 80:6 | owe (2) 113:5, |
| opportun | own (5) 25:23;30: |
| $11: 13 ; 20: 18 ; 13$ | $44: 5 ; 81: 24 ; 109$ |
|  |  |
| pposed (10) 3:24 |  |
| $126: 12$ |  |
| 129:16;132:22 | 127:10,10,1 |
| tion (3) 88:2;11 | package (4) 98 |
| 23:3 | 25;99 |
| ions (2) 18:9;78:25 | packet (3) |
| der (3) 3:10;41: | 75:4 |
| 48:20 | PACs (1) |
| ganization (6) | page (3) $36: 18$; |
| 49:6;52:3;72:1;78:14; | 119:18 |
| 97:18 | pages (3) |
| ganizations (2) 13:4; | 19 |
| 25:6 | paid (30) |
| ganiz | 22:20;3 |
| nal (2) 96:15 | 0:14;52:8;68:1 |
| 119:18 | 12,13;82:25;86 |
| hers (4) 47:18;83:7 | 87:21;96:20;98:3, |
| 89:23;96:25 | 9;99:20;101:1;102 |
| herwise (4) 6 | 123:1;124:11,25; |
| 32:8;55:9;88:24 | 125:4,7;128:1,12 |
| ught (7) 49:10;60 | painting (1) 121:4 |
| 84:17;115:2,3,3;116:7 | pamphlet (2) 16:3; |
| urselves (2) 60:8;77:6 | 31:20 |
| (66) $8: 13 ; 9: 18,20$; | pamphlets |
| 11:6;12:23,24;13:1,9, | 16:3 |
| 19;14:24;15:5,8;17:8; | nels (2) 135:16, |
| 19:4,14,25;22:9,18; | papers (1) 64:11 |
| 23:23;25:6;39:9;40:9; | paperwork (1) 34: |
| 41:2,3,10,23;42:6; | pardon (1) 50:20 |
| 45:10;48:25;50:15; | Parents (1) 26:12 |
| 4; | part (13) 6:22;35: |
| 60:19;63:17,25;65:12; | 42:21;44:1;56:24; |
| 68:17;88:12,15,21; | 64:25;68:14;71:14 |
| 89:13;90:2;93:15;94:1; | 73:1;120:3;124:1; |
| 95:9,14,20;96:3,13; | 128:3;135:8 |

8,13;99:1,2;100:19;
101:3;103:12;105:13;
107:21;109:16;110:7,
13;115:20,20,21
$22 ; 119: 18 ; 121: 24$
124:5;125:6;126:17,
24,24:127:23:129:22,
134:2,19;135:3;136:6,
25
one-stop (1) 12:19
year-old (1) $62: 6$
only (14) 13:21,22;
39:25;40:8;72:20;78:8;
79:12;81:11,12;82:7,9
101:1;104:8;108:18
pen (5) 3:7;9:13;
41:15;49:15;96:9
operating (3) 49:4;
66:6;73:1
inion (3) 17:8;37:6 opportunity (4) 4:18;
11:13;20:18;131:16
oppose (1) 47:14
Opposed (10) 3:24; 41:2;42:6;46:12;61:13; 73:3;92:6;126:12;

16;132:22
option (3) 88:2;112:12; 123:3
options (2) 18:9;78:25 48:20
organization (6) 6:15; 49:6;52:3;72:1;78:14
organizations (2) 13:4; 25:6
organizer (1) 100:3
119:18
others (4) 47:18;83:7;
89:23;96:25
32:8:55:9;88:24, Ought (7) 49:10;60:9; 84:17;115:2,3,3;116:7
ourselves (2) 60:8;77:6 out (66) 8:13;9:18,20; 11:6;12:23,24;13:1,9 14.24;15:5,8;17:8 19:32,25:6:39:9,40:9 41:2 3, 10, 23:42.6. 45:10;48:25;50:15; 55:19;56:1,4;57:4; 60:19;63:17,25;65:12; 7;88:12,15,21; 95:9,14,20;96:3,13;
97.13,99.25,100.10,

107:23;108:11;109:6, 11;119:21;120:5,23;
outlined (1) 93:12
outreach (3) 12:6;
23.20,64.20
outside (4) 19:1;29:14; 48:7;123:14
outstanding (3) 38:4; 6,136:9 20:11;50:2;82:3;101:4; 105:8;116:16;121:9; 130:25
verall (3) 8:4;11:10
overarching (1) 66:3
overlook (1) 134:18
oversight (1) 102:20
overview (1) $34: 16$
own (5) 25:23;30:13; 44:5;81:24;109:21

PAC (6) 126:18; 127:10,10,11;129:6,7 25;99:1
packet (3) 74:17,24;
PACs (1) 47:6
page (3) 36:18;69:3; 119:18 19
paid (30) 12:6;20:10; 2:20;38:10,12,14 12,13;82:25;86:13 87:21;96:20;98:3,6,7, 9;99:20;101:1;102:19 123:1;124:11,25; 125:4,7;128:1,12
painting (1) 121:4 pamphlet (2) 16:3;
pamphlets (2) 13:19; 16:3
panels (2) 135:16,24
papers (1) 64:11
paperwork (1) 34:14
pardon (1) 50:20
Parents (1) 26.12 42:21;44:1;56:24; 64:25;68:14;71:14 128:3;135:8
participate (7) 11:18, 20;12:13;88:3;110:24; 111:8,15
participated (1) 51:19
participating (8) 31:22; 34:8;49:5;71:24;78:5, 12;95:17;112:2
participation (6) 8:8; 20:2;23:8;29:16;64:22; 135:5
particular (8) 8:10;17:1; 36:5;68:17;76:20;85:1; 88:18;127:9
particularly (5) 54:23; 71:23;98:12;104:13; 130:21
parties (10) 49:13; 84:13;89:23;104:14; 110:7;118:8;119:9; 120:15;122:13,19
parties' (1) 122:1
parting (1) 134:19
partisan (2) 65:9; 105:10
partisan-wise (1) 102:14
partner (1) 101:23
Partners (1) 20:15
party (44) 48:15,18; 51:20;57:9,10,11;58:2, 3,7,17;59:7;63:5; 66:24;69:7,20;76:3,7, 10;79:13,14;81:20; 82:25;88:22;93:6; 102:9,13;106:6; 107:12;109:18,19; 110:2,2,3;118:14,16; 120:2,8,19;121:25; 122:4,7,23;123:8,16
party's (3) 62:16;69:25; 122:17
passed (1) 5:17
passes (3) 46:15;92:8; 126:16
past (7) 6:11;11:2; 26:23;53:17;59:11; 89:12;123:9
PATON (28) 25:11; 27:24;28:22,25;43:7,9, 14,24;56:16;62:12; 71:2,3,4;79:24;85:8; 86:18;87:1;88:9;118:5, 10,21;119:1,6,25; 120:16;121:3;133:11, 21
Paton's (1) 123:6 pattern (2) 83:12;95:25
Paula (2) 4:20;6:9
Pawlik (1) 98:6
pay (11) 42:17;78:7; 86:10;97:5,5;108:21; 110:15;120:22;122:3, 20;127:23
pay-in (1) 76:10
paying (9) 42:22;57:10;
97:16;98:16;99:17,24; 100:1,8;125:2
payment (18) 49:5,7;
53:8,14,18;64:3;66:24; 70:7;71:24;72:1;78:12, 16;79:12;83:14; 103:16,18;128:16,18
payments (4) 52:2; 121:25;122:13;123:7
peg (1) $42: 18$
penalty (4) 106:10,19; 107:6;109:15
people (45) 10:19; 16:4;17:18;18:21; 25:19,22;26:1,2,3,4,16, 22,25;27:7,15,18;28:8, 9;30:1;32:25;42:22; 43:9;44:3;45:4;46:24; 57:9;65:1,4;84:11; 89:16;98:3;104:19; 108:9;110:23;112:2; 117:22;118:15;119:19; 121:7,13;123:23; 124:18;135:17;136:2,7
per (1) 5:14
percent (10) $8: 5,21,24$; 9:3,4;14:3;18:16,18; 83:15;128:1
percentage (1) $128: 4$ perfectly (5) 44:20; 63:14;67:2;70:15,16
perhaps (2) 83:25; 124:6
period (7) 21:17;35:12; 53:19;64:2,5;74:7; 98:23
periods (1) 74:6
perjury (4) 106:10,20; 107:6;109:15
permissible (2) 94:25; 101:13
person (9) 9:11;10:10; 18:9;24:9;42:7;50:15, 15;90:19;122:22
personal (12) 38:23; 39:11,18;40:7,9,11,13, 17;41:4,19;44:9,10
personally (2) 28:10; 41:2
perspective (2) 31:13; 93:11
persuade (2) 6:23;7:4
persuasive (1) 117:22
petition (1) 122:16
phenomenal (1) 135:8
Phoenix (2) 5:4;30:22
phone (2) 10:20;54:20
photography (1) 87:6
pick (3) 33:15;62:23; 109:21
picture (1) 14:12
pictures (1) 13:11 piece (2) 17:25;19:9 pieces (2) 13:1;19:24
Pima (1) $8: 15$
piqued (1) 66:11
piquing (1) 66:14
pitfalls (1) 97:3
place (9) 7:5;9:13;
42:8;47:14;49:18;
72:17;96:6;100:6; 121:15
places (1) 113:10
plan (13) 7:17;9:22;
14:8;16:13;19:17,25;
20:12,25;21:24;22:14;
23:21;33:25;131:10
planning (1) $135: 6$
plans (1) 7:24
plaque (1) 133:4
play (1) $56: 4$
played (1) 116:18
Please (5) 52:23,24;
83:23;106:3;130:5
plumber (1) 108:23
pm (1) 137:11
pocket (2) 97:15; 104:18
point (38) 8:13;15:6,7; 18:23;19:24;51:8; 55:14;56:2;58:20;59:3, 5,21;60:24;61:20; 64:10;69:11;72:3; 73:14,15;74:1;81:17; 89:17,19;94:2;104:8; 106:22;110:22;111:9; 115:20,20;116:13; 117:11;118:21;120:5, 17;123:6;125:14; 131:12
pointed (1) 63:25
points (10) 8:14;20:4; 47:18;48:12;62:9; 63:17;80:2;81:14;84:3; 121:24
policies (1) 123:12
policy (13) 61:14;63:8; 66:2,3,18;70:14;73:3; 79:20;107:21;110:8; 112:6;113:15;117:20
political (19) 20:2;23:8, 8;29:16;49:6,13;56:9; 58:5;64:22;71:25; 78:13;84:13;105:10; 109:18,19;110:3,7; 115:25;123:16
politicians (1) 16:7
politicize (1) 102:21
poll (1) 9:13
polling (1) 9:13
polls (1) 18:11
poor (1) 112:5
pop (1) 10:22
population (1) 9:2
position (6) 44:21; 46:22;61:22;68:11; 77:4,5
positions (1) 131:21 positive (3) 6:16;16:11; 42:11
possibility (2) 31:10; 90:2
possible (7) 3:11;4:4; 7:16;34:7;46:18;84:9; 130:10
possibly (1) 60:10
post (1) 100:4
post-campaign (1) 21:22
posted (1) 132:1
post-election (1) 16:20
posts (1) 11:1
posture (2) 76:12;77:15
potential (4) 79:10;
96:12;97:3;104:25
potentially (2) 96:9; 105:5
power (1) 121:10
practice (5) 59:11,13; 115:23;116:8;121:6
practices (3) 43:17; 134:9,12
preamble (3) 19:24; 29:15;64:20
precedence (1) 116:23
precedent (7) 95:2; 101:14;104:11;105:6; 117:7,17;123:10
precedent-setting (1) 117:4
precious (1) 100:25
preinvestigation (1) 48:1
prejudge (1) 44:18
prejudging (1) 44:23
preparation (1) 14:21
prepared (3) 5:8,8; 78:24
prepaying (1) 53:16
preponderance (2) 106:17;107:19
preprepared (1) 15:16
presence (2) 11:2; 22:23
present (2) 32:17;133:4 presentation (3) 20:9; 25:13;64:18
presented (2) 11:12; 133:9
presenting (1) 135:6
president (2) 29:23; 100:23
presidential (3) 8:11, 20;21:25
press (1) 17:22
pretend (1) 93:17
pretty (14) 6:25;7:5;

9:25;10:4,16;11:12; 12:1;19:9;45:11; 100:23;101:10;107:5; 108:1;114:8
prevent (1) 96:3
previous (1) 85:25 previously (1) 86:4 price (7) 95:11;108:7, 17,18;109:7;112:19; 113:22
prices (4) 95:12;97:8; 107:15;124:19 pricing (1) 103:11
primary (19) 8:7,10; 10:2;13:24;17:20;34:1; 35:12;53:14,20;64:2; 69:12;74:7;98:12,13, 23;100:21;102:8; 110:11;115:24
print (3) $9: 22 ; 11: 1 ; 13: 8$
prints (1) 12:7
Prior (4) 50:21,22,22; 117:22
private (1) 120:1
privately (1) 47:13
probably (16) 16:2; 27:22;32:11;53:5; 55:19;57:11;61:9; 81:21;84:19;85:4;91:9; 95:13;101:25;102:7; 105:25;115:1
problem (12) 63:8,9; 84:7,10;85:16;102:19; 109:19;116:9,10; 122:21;124:8,8
procedural (2) 72:25; 77:15
procedurally (1) 74:14
procedures (3) 18:10; 42:5,8
proceed (2) 86:22;94:6
proceedings (3) 76:25; 92:22;137:10
process (25) 12:21; 15:2;18:7;20:2;23:5,8; 25:5;26:7;28:3,6,13; 29:17;31:22,25;58:5; 64:23;65:17;66:5;70:5; 72:13;91:9;95:17;99:6; 105:14;129:25
processed (1) 64:15
processing (1) 64:9
produced (1) 25:4
product (6) 82:1;96:19; 97:9;100:14;103:19; 125:8
professional (2) 87:4; 136:3
professionals (2) 109:9, 10
profiles (2) 30:14,25
program (4) 88:4; 100:4,5,8
projects (1) 108:22
promote (1) 28:22
promoting (2) 23:7; 29:16
prompted (1) 83:11
proof (2) 72:17;87:20
proofreading (2) 131:11;132:6
proper (4) 24:8;63:19; 66:21;104:7
properly (5) 35:23,24; 36:11;67:16;85:16 proportion (3) 48:25; 69:9;76:9
proportionality (4) 48:13;80:3,4;89:20
proportionately (2) 58:14;68:2
proposed (3) 43:24; 128:15,24
proud (1) 11:12
prove (1) 104:8
proved (1) 13:24
provide (16) 13:5,17; 19:6;20:5;30:8,23; 31:2;36:9;45:7;61:1; 74:15;87:24;91:4,6; 112:7;127:18
provided (49) 15:21; 32:7;36:2;40:20;45:4, 13;48:16;54:7;62:16; 63:2,21,24;64:2,4;69:4, 8,14,17,23;70:7,20; 74:19,24;75:1;76:2,5,8, 15,20;77:9;82:22;83:8; 84:22;85:20;86:1,2,4, 5;91:2;96:15;103:11; 104:10;106:19;107:6, 12;109:14;112:23; 130:23;135:10
provides (4) 9:15; 63:25;64:1;70:22 providing (7) 16:12; 30:12;63:17;74:10; 77:7;80:23;127:8 proving (1) 22:23 provision (1) 70:1 public (26) 3:7;20:8; 52:16,20;53:7,22;54:7; 63:3,12;64:22;70:17; 80:20;81:19;82:23; 83:24;88:4;94:23; 106:15;113:11;114:17; 118:16;124:20,24; 134:23,24;136:17
publicly (1) 47:12
public's (1) 56:24
pull (1) $85: 2$
pulling (1) 132:5
purchase (4) 122:1,5,7, 11
purchased (1) 55:9
purpose (8) 3:8;55:17;

56:7;59:6;60:2;70:15; 79:15;115:25
purposes (6) 52:1;66:1, 7;78:8;95:24;104:20
pursuit (1) 95:19
pushed (2) 48:1,2
put (19) 11:5;14:24;
32:4,21;33:15;39:17,
18;40:13;41:11;42:8;
73:18;79:25;93:12;
97:11,14;112:1;
117:23;127:2;131:20
puts (3) 14:16;30:18; 107:23
putting (3) 19:14;72:25; 105:17
$\mathbf{Q}$
qualify (1) 100:20
qualifying (3) 21:17,18; 122:15
quantitative (1) 22:17
Querard (28) 46:25; 49:24;52:25;53:1,3; 56:13;59:12,18;65:20; 66:11;69:21,23;76:23; 81:8,11;82:14;84:18; 89:22;92:9;93:4,5,10; 94:13,18;105:24; 116:9;118:25;124:5
Querard's (4) 62:22; 63:21;76:19;117:10
questioner (1) 131:21
quick (4) 4:14;34:16; 81:14;93:2
quicker (1) 11:8
quickly (7) 6:12;9:25; 10:4,8, 17; $48: 13 ; 112: 4$
quite (3) 29:19;69:10; 111:5

## R

R\&R (1) 20:15
R2-20-110A4 (2) 91:22;126:3
R2-20-701 (1) 78:1 R2-20-702B (1) 71:23 race (10) 17:21;53:23; 68:20,23,25;98:1; 101:10,11;102:12; 103:10
races (4) 17:22;102:15; 105:8;107:14
radio (4) 10:5,15;12:7; 103:16
raise (3) $37: 24 ; 103: 1$; 104:8
raised (9) 5:25;48:18; 55:22,25;56:8,10; 61:16;84:3;115:20
raises (3) 56:20;64:15;

101:12
raising (1) 102:21
ran (4) 100:10;103:16,
24,25
random (3) 35:4;47:21, 22
ranged (1) 86:11 rate (3) 10:15;11:9; 136:4
rates (3) 10:6;97:22,22
rather (3) 53:11;67:3;
109:21
raw (1) 49:1
reach (1) 22:24
reached (2) 4:19,20
reaches (1) 56:2
read (2) 10:8;90:17
reading (1) 13:7
readout (1) 18:14 reads (1) 88:10
Real (5) 34:16;64:21;
79:10;89:3;90:10
realize (2) 26:24; 116:15
really (43) 9:22;10:14; 12:18;15:25;16:18; 17:24;19:3,24;20:25; 22:1,12;25:17;26:19; 27:15;33:3,14;49:22; 57:13,15;66:10;69:3, 19;74:2;86:6;87:14; 90:17;97:1;104:24; 111:7,9,9;112:4,5,11, 11,19;115:10;122:2,3, 14;123:17,17;134:2
realtor (2) 119:17,18
reason (45) 4:12;
28:17;40:21;42:21; 48:11,24;49:19;51:21, 22;52:7,10,19;55:11, 19;58:20;67:4;70:22;
72:14,23;73:1,16,17, 19,21;77:3,16,18; 78:22;80:18;81:15,16; 83:23;91:21;93:21,21, 25;95:18;106:18; 107:18;111:23;119:17; 123:22;124:21;125:19; 126:2
reasonable (21) 49:7; 51:1,21;52:8;54:10; 58:23;72:2,5,21;73:20; 78:15,17;80:8,25; 87:20;108:8;109:7,8, 11;127:13,14
reasonableness (1) 76:19
reasons (1) 39:14
recall (6) 13:18;20:15; 24:15;29:15;115:23; 127:2
recap (1) 7:22
recapitulate (1) 32:4
receipts (1) 82:25
receive (4) 16:1;28:15; 33:4;127:18
received (26) 14:22; 15:24;16:11;24:22; 35:1;38:3;44:13;45:10; 49:8;52:9;67:25;72:2, 5;74:17;75:5,11;78:16, 17;80:9;81:1;83:15; 85:25;87:9,11,16; 89:11
receives (1) 38:4
receiving (2) 38:8; 122:4
recently (1) 30:17
recess (1) 92:21
recognition (1) 133:2
recommend (8) 36:21; 37:7;52:14;93:25; 114:5;128:7,7,15
recommendation (11) 47:17;51:4;67:3;79:9; 80:17;105:22;115:13; 116:7;124:4;126:2; 129:9
recommendations (3) 50:4;117:24;121:17 recommending (1) 125:18
reconcile (2) 35:25; 37:5
reconciled (2) 34:20; 37:12
reconciliation (1) 129:5
record (7) 41:21;52:24; 79:10;102:14;106:2, 12,17
recorded (3) 4:12; 35:14;36:17
recorders (1) 24:16
records (1) 34:22
recount (1) 17:20
refer (2) 39:14,15
references (1) 37:22
referred (1) 36:21
referring (4) 69:1;74:2; 75:10;100:5
refined (1) 82:3
refrigerator (2) 33:15,19
regard (3) 19:25;50:9; 71:23
regarding (3) 44:18; 86:3;113:2
regards (2) 16:3,5
register (4) 5:5;9:9; 18:12;31:15
registered (2) 8:2;31:16 registration (8) 8:1;9:1; 21:11;23:4;33:1; 100:10;122:2,8
regularly (1) $3: 3$
regulation (1) 105:3
regulations (2) 63:12;

66:22
Regulatory (1) 130:12
reinforcement (1) 16:11
reiterate (1) 70:10
relate (1) 68:16
related (4) 69:20;93:6; 126:21;130:12
relation (7) 49:8;72:2,5; 78:15,17;80:9,25
relations (3) 106:15; 114:17,18
relationship (4) 60:14, 16,22;131:23
relevant (1) 15:17
relies (2) 89:8,9
remaining (1) 97:14
remarkable (1) 134:8
remarks (1) 113:23
remedy (1) 88:4
reminder (1) 19:23
remove (1) 121:12
rendered (3) 87:21; 113:9;123:8
repayment (1) 37:23
repays (1) $38: 5$
repeated (1) 83:14
report (33) 4:4;5:7,9; 6:7;7:12;21:9;33:11; 45:21,21,23;46:2; 50:16;62:20,23;63:13; 64:11;70:7;84:13; 85:17,20;88:23;90:18, 21;91:14;114:3; 126:24;127:17;130:11, 21,23,24;132:3,15
reported (10) 35:18,24; 36:11;39:18;62:17,18; 63:14;78:9;85:16; 98:24
reporter (1) 92:14
reporting (14) 6:1,2; 53:6;54:7;62:15;70:12; 81:23,24;86:9;88:14; 89:7;105:1;111:18; 112:10
reports (39) 5:17;34:19, 23;35:8,15;36:1,17,25; 37:2,4;39:21;45:15; 53:8;67:14;83:24; 84:14;85:2,14;86:6; 87:3;88:11,17,25;90:8, 11,13,16,18,19,23,25; 99:8;122:24;124:9; 126:24;127:5,12,12; 128:8
represent (1) 59:13
Representative (3) 36:6,15;110:14
represented (2) 110:13; 126:22
Republican (4) 58:3; 79:14;110:14;118:17
repurposed (2) 10:1;

11:15
reputation (1) 20:20 request (3) 64:8;74:19; 131:7
requested (1) 78:21
requesting (1) 45:22
requests (2) 6:13;66:9
require (8) 62:25;
65:18;68:23;80:14;
88:14,16;111:22; 122:20
required (12) 39:7;
43:14;63:16;68:24;
70:11,13;72:7;83:9;
84:20;87:14;96:1; 114:3
requirement (2) 81:24; 125:12
requirements (4) 9:1; 23:5;41:17;81:23
requires (6) 40:8; 57:23;65:10,24;82:18; 108:4
requiring (2) 70:5; 125:11
research (12) 16:14,20; 18:5,24;21:21,22; 22:12,18;23:25;26:7; 29:18;32:22
researched (1) 64:13
reserve (1) $32: 12$
residents (1) 97:23
resource (4) 4:25;6:15; 17:10;19:4
resources (14) 18:25; 19:7;20:5;29:17;30:8; 31:14;32:7,12,22; 35:19;66:6,7,8;68:23 respect (18) 43:1;

50:12,25;51:2;63:4;
64:12;65:16,17;66:22; 67:22;70:23;75:1;76:4, 5;77:14;86:2;113:5; 114:3
respond (5) 45:3;59:4; 65:5;74:8;107:9
responded (4) 6:12; 45:4,7;107:2
respondent (5) 47:3; 62:3;94:5;106:1;128:3
respondents (3) 97:16; 106:6;128:17
respondents' (1) 48:4
respondent's (2) 47:1; 96:14
responding (7) 11:7; 64:7;65:17;66:9;74:13; 77:7;106:22
response (42) 3:15,25; 7:13;11:9;19:21;33:9; 45:19;46:13;50:8; 51:12,15;53:9;54:12; 60:25;61:1,12;62:12;

63:25;68:25;69:3;
70:20;74:10;77:13,23;
80:22;82:5,7;83:7;
92:7;94:10;96:15;
100:6;105:20,24;
115:17;126:13,15; 129:17,19;132:23,25; 136:18
responses (1) 96:18 responsibilities (1) 11:22
responsibility (2) 56:11; 113:16
responsible (1) 100:3
result (1) 99:6
retirement (4) 97:10,11, 12;136:4
return (4) 9:11;12:17; 122:5;136:4
returned (1) $37: 12$
review (9) 34:15;35:7; 43:16;65:19;68:14; 90:23;130:11,12; 132:15
reviewed (3) 49:23; 113:3;131:9
reviewing (3) 90:10; 108:9;109:9
revising (1) 135:9
revisions (1) 130:25
rhetoric (4) 48:6,14,21, 25
rich (1) 116:11
rid (1) 110:25
Riester (2) 20:18;21:3
rife (2) 96:12;104:18
right (32) 14:21;17:23; 18:15,16;21:7;22:4; 27:19;28:24;30:13; 31:13;33:18;37:8;40:2, 5;42:24;53:22,23; 58:22;78:1,4;81:22; 101:3;106:21;108:15, 19;109:14,23;111:21, 25;120:19,23;125:14
rights (2) 135:7,17
road (1) 70:3
Roberts (15) 4:15;7:19;
19:22;21:5;27:23; 28:24;29:1,11;31:7; 32:14;33:21;38:8; 135:16,23,24
role (3) 29:7;30:5;32:2
room (1) 54:4
Roth (1) 131:4
round (2) 42:18;99:3
roundtable (1) $24: 18$
route (1) 130:1
Rubalcava (4) 36:15, 15;41:2;44:19
Rubalcava's (2) 38:22; 41:23
Rule (20) 49:4,10,14;

63:9;66:21;77:25;
84:19;114:15,22;
116:4,9,9,10;118:6; 122:2,10,12;124:8; 125:10,11
rule-making (2) 70:5; 79:20
rules (44) 39:6;41:18; 42:5,8;44:7;49:3,8; 54:24;68:5;69:19; 70:13;71:7,17,23;72:9; 74:10;77:2;79:17;82:3; 84:5,17;85:3;90:12; 91:12;95:4;107:16; 110:23;111:12;115:2; 116:8,18;119:14,14,15; 120:12;122:2,8; 123:12,16,22;124:9,11, 16;130:25
run (10) 65:1,2;95:2; 101:19;102:6,12; 104:17;105:11;117:2; 120:18
running (6) 11:23; 17:14;31:2;53:11; 100:22;101:24
runs (1) 95:5

## S

Safford (1) 27:14
Salman (6) 98:21;99:5, 16;100:8;124:9;125:12
same (24) 22:21,21;
40:14,18;53:18,20;
58:2,7;59:6;63:2; 74:21,21;75:15;79:13; 93:23;96:23;97:21,22, 23;98:1;103:5,7;110:1; 126:23
sample (1) $35: 14$
sampling (1) $35: 17$
Sara (17) 34:10;45:2, 20,22;46:16;47:19; 85:9,11;88:10,10; 89:23;93:12;117:23; 121:21,21;124:6;131:4
Sara's (1) 20:9
satisfied (1) 104:20
satisfy (3) 63:18;66:15; 114:19
savings (1) 14:3
saw (6) $8: 11,14 ; 11: 3$; 20:8;24:4;25:18
saying (14) 26:3;27:18; 56:12;68:4;76:23;82:8, 25;93:18,19;95:24; 119:8,9;120:23;122:3
scale (5) 48:21,21,25; 68:25;97:22
Schaffer (1) 4:15
scheduled (1) 3:4
school (6) 6:23;7:9;

26:5,15;27:12,13 schools (3) 26:5,13; 27:11
science (1) $89: 1$
screed (1) 105:16
screwy (2) $106: 24,25$
scrupulous (1) 60:9
scrutinization (1) 91:2
scrutinized (2) 88:1,7
scrutiny (1) $105: 3$
se (1) 5:14
search (1) 10:20
Second (23) 3:19,21; 4:24;46:6,7,8;48:23; 64:25;91:25;92:1,2; 99:2;126:6,7,8;129:10, 11,12;132:16,17,18; 137:3,4
Secondly (2) 26:21; 57:7
Secretary (4) 24:17; 124:12;127:7,17
section (2) 4:22;78:10
Security (2) 41:12,19
seeing (2) $21: 24 ; 23: 18$
seem (1) 109:11
seemed (1) 99:3
seems (7) 42:3,11; 69:25;74:4,5;100:16; 109:11
select (2) 20:17;87:6
selected (3) 35:3; 47:21,22
semester (1) 135:21
Senate (7) 47:6; 100:23;126:18;127:9, 10,24;129:6
send (2) 12:24;16:1
sending (2) 13:20; 113:8
sense (6) 38:18;39:24; 48:13;80:10;108:12; 126:23
sent (5) 13:1,8,19; 55:19;75:4
separate (7) 40:6; 55:21;64:3;65:21; 74:25;125:4;128:23
separately (2) 118:22; 125:4
September (3) 34:17; 98:24,25
serial (2) 65:9;81:12
seriatim-style (1) 66:9
serious (1) 77:9
serve (2) 59:6;134:2
served (1) 76:7
service (16) 6:10;13:7; 62:18;86:14;87:5,8,9, 20;122:9,11,17;123:1, 8;133:3,6;134:7
services (33) 30:2,3; 52:9;62:16,17,24;63:1,

20;64:1,3;68:9;69:4,8, 13,17,23;70:1,6,8;76:8; 77:8;78:7;80:23;85:25; 86:1,4,5,11;87:11; 107:11;113:8;115:5; 122:19
serving (1) 4:21
session (1) 3:7
set (7) $32: 1 ; 42: 16$;
75:6;104:12;108:18; 116:18;123:22
setting (2) 95:12; 116:24
settlement (1) 128:6
several (9) 11:19;13:5;
17:21;36:4,16;83:12;
97:19;101:17;104:16
shall (2) 78:6,8
shape (2) 17:8;22:13
share (8) $8: 17 ; 15: 24$; 16:21;18:3,23;58:11; 59:5;68:2
shared (2) 21:23;61:3
sharing (4) 25:2;102:1, 1,2
sheer (1) 76:16
sheet (1) 108:23
Sheila (3) 70:21;74:18; 76:2
shifts (1) 72:22
shipments (1) 13:3
shoehorned (1) 42:24
shop (1) 12:19
short (1) 118:3
show (6) 14:14;16:6;
30:14,25;73:4;103:23
showed (2) 8:23;107:3
shows (1) 48:17
sickness (1) 62:7
side (1) 109:17
sides (1) 109:13
Sierra (1) 27:12
signature (2) 122:16; 128:17
signatures (1) 122:16
signed (1) 113:3
signs (1) 102:2
silly (1) 112:21
similar (3) 76:4;90:21; 117:12
Similarly (1) 100:12
simply (13) 6:3;47:11; 48:5;50:11;55:24; 81:17,19;83:8;84:21; 93:19;99:12;103:7; 104:17
simultaneously (1) 50:19
single (4) 14:23;18:19; 39:7,9
site (3) 12:3;28:19;31:3
sites (1) 10:11
situation (3) 27:4;

86:24;110:1
situational (1) 6:4
six (1) $53: 14$
skipped (1) 127:13
slide (1) 8:23
small (1) 90:22
smaller (1) 107:14
smart (1) 109:5
smile (1) 130:16
smooth (1) $135: 13$
snippets (1) 16:10
social (7) 9:21;11:1,2;
22:22;26:10;41:12,19
solar (2) 127:6,25
sole (1) 40:6
solely (1) 45:11
solution (2) 24:9,9
solutions (1) 24:13
somebody (11) 24:5;
25:25;26:19;77:4;
85:24;95:5;100:17;
102:6;108:21;109:17; 124:7
someone (5) 11:23; 12:12;30:18;53:11; 66:15
Sometimes (3) 11:8; 24:5;117:23
somewhat (2) 73:25; 119:7
soon (2) 4:9,9
sorry (4) 56:19;62:1; 118:24;121:23
sort (17) 5:23;6:3;32:4; 42:23,24;47:5;48:6; 73:23;83:16;99:14; 100:13;106:16;111:4; 114:13;116:5;124:1; 126:20
sorts (1) 102:2
sought (1) 102:11
sounds (3) 45:5;96:9; 101:9
source (3) 15:8;19:5; 120:6
space (1) 100:11
Spanish (1) 13:6
sparked (1) 66:12
speak (4) 27:15;36:13; 46:25;135:12
speakers (2) 135:10; 136:6
specific (28) 10:7;12:1; 17:6;23:2,25;24:11; 44:7;47:21,23;50:4; 54:21;68:6;71:7;75:17, 20;79:21;81:25;82:6; 86:15;88:16;93:15; 100:17;103:17,18,19, 19;108:1;116:13
specifically (7) 5:4; 15:14;18:6;21:13;39:6; 41:3;53:11
specification (2) 63:1; 70:6
specifications (1) 108:3
specificity (6) 53:6; 61:7;63:3;70:11;71:10; 107:22
specifics (1) $32: 24$
specified (1) 69:19
spectrum (1) 61:16
speculation (3) 63:21; 76:17;77:11
spelling (1) 53:4
spend (4) 66:8;97:7; 101:8;104:5
spending (5) 34:24; 89:16;93:13;101:17; 104:10
spent (31) 53:20;54:5, 8;57:5;60:9;63:4,12; 67:15;70:17;83:5,7,24; 84:23,25;85:3;89:9; 91:14;97:6,7;98:12; 99:11;101:17;102:23, 25;103:3,25;104:3,4,5; 113:17;121:18
split (1) $58: 14$
spoke (3) 79:4;135:16, 24
spoken (4) 25:17;26:4; 27:22,25
spots (1) $12: 7$
spread (1) 95:21
spreadsheet (1) 93:12
square (1) 42:18
Staff (34) 6:6;23:24; 29:17;45:10;47:25; 48:2;63:18,22;64:8,14, 19;67:3;74:8,19;76:5; 80:11,16;93:19;94:21; 106:20;107:17;108:10; 110:3;111:24;112:20; 117:1;134:6,13,17; 135:2,6,7,13;136:12
stand (3) 9:5;16:6; 17:10
standard (14) 43:16; 48:10;72:14,14;80:13; 83:20,21,22;93:23; 111:19;114:20,24; 115:1;123:19
standards (2) 80:12; 105:3
standpoint (1) 79:20
start (6) 21:11,17; 22:17;109:1,2;111:7
started (1) 122:3
starting (1) 33:2
starts (4) 10:10;90:1; 112:10,11
State (35) 4:21,21; 6:10;7:25;8:2,16,25; 11:21,24;13:4;22:2; 24:19;27:11,16,17;

30:20;31:17;32:8,13; 39:6;40:16;41:11,17, 18;42:16,23;52:23; 61:21,25;88:11; 101:18;102:9;119:12; 127:7;133:7
stated (1) 65:15
statement (6) 31:20;
50:10;56:17;57:17; 69:5;70:20
statements (5) 13:12;
35:16;45:8;77:17,18 states (2) 76:7:110:25 State's (3) 24:17;

124:13;127:17
statewide (10) 14:9,12,
16;20:13;29:14;34:17;
68:20,23;87:23;90:6
stating (1) $74: 11$
stations (1) 103:24
statute (2) 67:16,17
statutory (1) 63:10
stay (1) 109:6
staying (1) 15:16
stays (1) 6:17
steal (1) 96:11
stellar (1) 134:17
stemmed (1) 62:15
step (5) 23:13,18; 24:10;31:9;42:11
Stephenson's (1) 5:16 steps (3) 11:16,17; 66:25
Steve (1) 133:10
sticker (2) 33:14,15 still (12) 15:18,19; 19:10;22:8;27:8;54:3; 77:9;94:18;99:18; 104:6;111:20;121:14
stipulate (2) 59:12; 127:16
stood (2) 8:1,19
stop (1) 83:25
stories (1) 21:25
story (2) 5:16;121:4
strains (1) 55:21
stranger (1) 133:25
Strategies (1) 102:4
strategy (1) 102:1
stream (3) 4:8,10,13
streaming (1) $4: 8$
stretch (1) 117:8
strictly (1) 44:11
strikes (1) 96:11
strings (1) 49:9
strong (2) 9:22,22
strongarm (1) 57:12
structural (2) 64:16,17
structure (2) 65:3; 108:20
struggling (1) 68:3
students (1) 135:22
studies (1) 26:10
studio (1) 14:13
stuff (10) 26:8;45:3; 50:16;56:9;57:14; 84:14;106:13;107:21; 112:7;131:11
subcategories (2) 82:2, 21
subcategory (1) 82:19
subject (4) $35: 9 ; 36: 7$; 68:5;113:2
submit (2) 41:16; 131:10
submittal (1) 132:4
submitted (3) 42:1; 130:11;136:2
subsidy (1) $48: 16$
substance (1) 75:21
substantial (1) 75:16
substantially (1) 132:7
substantiated (1) 44:20
subvendor (4) 50:14, 16;88:14,23
subvendors (2) 88:15, 16
successful (6) 10:19, 24;11:3;18:23;22:23; 135:22
succinct (1) $34: 15$
sufficient (5) 82:15; 84:19;85:4;87:18; 104:11
suggest (1) 112:3
suggested (2) 84:6; 112:19
suggesting (1) 113:7
suggestions (1) 135:10
suggests (4) 100:14,14, 15,15
suite (1) 96:25
sum (1) $74: 4$
summarize (1) 77:13
summary (4) 34:13,15; 36:18;115:11
summit (4) 135:7,17,19; 136:1
SunSounds (1) 13:7
Sunt (3) 131:13,18,19
supervisor (1) 30:21
supplement (1) 74:19
supplemental (3) 61:6; 65:6,7
support (3) 44:21; 80:17;120:25
supporting (1) $111: 18$
suppose (3) 79:19; 96:7;112:6
supposed (5) 65:11; 79:15;104:4;119:12; 130:15
Supreme (1) 110:25
sure (26) $5: 1 ; 15: 15$; 19:13;28:20;33:22; 34:24;42:8;51:15;

52:25;53:15,17;56:18; 58:24;60:3,6,12;67:14; 69:10;73:11;86:19; 91:7;104:4;113:16; 114:20;118:9;119:22
surveys (3) 22:18; 109:3,3
suspect (3) 31:23;99:6; 102:22
suspicious (1) 83:11
swear (1) 94:13
sworn (10) 69:5;70:20; 88:18,18;98:4;99:17; 106:9,12,19;111:17
sympathetic (1) 71:22
system (16) 22:7;
41:11;42:16,22,23; 62:19,25;82:18;87:3; 89:6,8,25;95:14; 104:18;108:7;127:18

## T

table (1) 130:4
tabled (1) 130:8
tactic (2) 9:22;10:24
tactics (6) 9:19,20; 12:22;16:19;21:1; 22:21
talk (10) 22:19;43:3,5; 47:7,19;94:20;106:8; 107:20;118:6;120:11
talked (4) 47:12;48:14; 80:2;125:3
talking (4) 80:5;110:6; 123:20;127:5
talks (1) 99:9
tandem (1) 68:15
tantamount (1) 112:24
target (2) 29:9;47:23
tasked (1) 90:9
taught (2) 26:15;119:17
tax (1) 106:16
taxpayers (2) 99:25; 104:3
taxpayers' (1) 113:11
teach (2) 97:13;102:7
teachers (3) 26:10,10, 11
team (2) 11:6;101:24
telecommunications (2) 82:19,20
telling (1) 26:25
tells (2) 17:17;29:19
ten (3) $35: 14 ; 119: 19,19$
tend (1) 79:3
term (1) 12:19
terms (25) 11:3;12:6; 19:4;28:3;30:5,9; 31:19;32:25;42:18; 47:17;56:1;57:21; 59:21;63:3,11,17,20; 64:7,9;84:19;99:23;

112:22;115:25;116:18; 134:9
test (2) 35:13;39:4
Thanks (1) 85:6
theme (1) 9:7
themes (2) 93:7,7
theoretically (2) 105:2; 121:15
thereabouts (1) 50:20
therefore (7) 58:8,9;
60:10,21;68:1;93:24; 121:13
thereof (1) 131:2
thick (1) 13:20
thief (1) 96:10
third (1) 111:10
third-party (1) 122:22
Thomas (6) 4:20;6:9, 19;52:23;61:25;106:2
thoroughly (2) 64:13,13
though (7) 23:2;43:18; 49:12;65:5;90:21; 98:19;99:19
thought (1) 118:11
thoughts (2) 84:4,16
thousands (1) 125:5
three (4) 4:18;21:9,13; 35:3
threshold (2) 67:22; 83:17
thrown (2) 89:13; 107:21
Thursday (1) $3: 5$
timely (3) 6:1,1;128:9
Times (5) 5:16;26:14;
90:22;103:24;134:18
timing (1) $86: 3$
tipping (1) 113:22
TITLA (103) 3:3,16,20,
24;4:1,14;6:5,8;7:3,8,
11,14;19:19;25:9;29:2,
5;33:7,10;34:4,6;
37:17,20;38:20;40:24; 43:8;44:16;45:1,18,20; 46:1,4,8,12,15,17;50:6, 9;52:12,20;56:14; 57:19;67:8,11;71:1,3, 20;77:21,24;78:4,20; 81:5;85:7,11;91:13,23; 92:2,6,8,19,23;94:8,11; 105:18,21;106:1; 112:14,17;115:15,18; 116:20;118:4;119:23; 121:17;125:16,24; 126:4,8,12,14,16; 129:3,8,12,16,18,20; 130:4,8;132:8,14,18, 22,24;133:1,10,16,24; 134:21;136:15,19; 137:1,4,8
Tod (1) 110:10
today (21) 4:11,19;
5:11;7:21;20:23;35:5;

45:22;46:23;68:11;
70:13,25;77:20;79:22; 93:9;94:25;112:6;
114:22;115:12;125:3;
131:14,15
together (9) 15:1;
24:19;47:4;51:25,25;
93:12;117:23;128:23; 132:5
told (2) 43:11;44:7
tolerate (1) 114:9
Tom (7) 6:8;21:8;
31:10;32:19;80:2;
101:17;117:5
tone (1) 19:12
took (2) 61:12;102:17
tool (8) 13:15,16;15:20; 19:2,4;28:9,18;30:17
tools (11) 9:14;13:17; 15:21;16:12;17:7; 18:25;20:4;23:10,12, 18;30:13
top (3) $8: 15 ; 19: 2 ; 41: 22$
topped (1) $19: 8$
Torres (2) 106:4; 109:22
total (5) 8:2;48:19; 98:17;100:25;128:1
totally (1) $25: 14$
touch (1) 5:12
tough (4) 60:8;100:22, 23;115:1
town (2) 24:25;33:5
towns (2) 31:23;32:5
track (3) 26:24;27:1; 75:8
tracked (1) 18:13
tracking (2) 15:15;28:7
traditional (3) 9:20; 89:4,8
train (2) 102:5;130:17
trained (1) 43:10
training (25) 53:10; 82:7,9;96:17,20,21; 97:17,18,19;98:2,11, 12,15,18,22,24;99:13, 18;100:16;101:2; 102:10,12;103:5; 106:14,14
transaction-by-transaction (1) 36:24
transactions (8) 35:14; 36:16,19;37:1;47:23; 93:5,15,16
transferred (3) 39:12, 13;40:13
transparency (2) 63:11; 65:15
transparent (3) 56:22; 64:7;65:16
trash (1) 30:2
tread (1) 112:3
treasurer (4) 44:5,6;

90:14,15
tremendous (1) 135:10
trend (2) $8: 8 ; 18: 19$
tribal (2) 24:6,12
Tribes (1) 4:16
tried (1) 10:12
trigger (2) 5:17;127:5
triviality (1) 110:21
trouble (5) 71:6;81:15,
19;95:16;123:24
troubled (1) 38:25
troubling (3) 39:10; 40:12;57:1
true (3) 8:24;57:2; 89:11
truly (2) 12:20;91:11
trust (4) 26:25;27:3; 80:15;104:5
try (12) 20:21;34:14; 48:8;56:8;68:13;77:12; 84:7;91:4;93:17,19; 95:21;117:8
trying (8) 21:14;31:21; 65:12;90:11;101:10, 11;130:17,18
Tucson (1) 31:1
Tucson's (1) 29:8
turn (3) 15:5,14;50:2
turned (1) 103:11
turnout (8) 8:4,7,12,13, 20;9:1;64:24,24
turnouts (1) $8: 16$
turns (2) 68:17;101:17
twice (2) 101:21; 102:13
two (24) 8:15;20:4; 25:16;27:8;34:17;47:3, 18;48:12;49:9;50:12; 55:21;56:11;59:4;61:3; 64:23;74:6;109:23; 122:25;126:24;129:5; 135:16,21,24,25
two-thirds (1) 111:2
type (1) $15: 13$
types (6) 69:4;86:12;
97:19;107:24,25;108:3
typical (1) 43:19
typically (3) 22:20; 35:11;87:5
typing (1) 10:21

## U

ultimate (1) 29:15 ultimately (11) 17:13; 20:1;22:8,14;23:6; 24:21;30:6;31:18; 51:17;97:14;128:8 unable (1) 129:25 unambiguous (1) 96:19 unanimously (5) 4:2; 46:15;92:8;129:21; 133:1
unanswered (1) 65:23
unbiased (3) 19:5,6,15
unclean (1) 95:3
uncomfortable (5) 57:8; 113:12;118:7,18;119:3
uncontested (1) 53:19
under (20) 5:19;8:4;
20:6;33:12;48:10;49:4;
66:6,25;68:14;70:13;
71:7;76:7,21;77:8;
82:18;106:10,19;
107:6;109:14;125:6
undercharge (1) 109:24
underfunded (2) 111:2; 112:4
underlying (1) 61:14
underpay (1) 109:18
underpaying (1) 109:18
understood (2) 55:17; 108:16
unfortunate (1) 66:17
unhealthy (1) 95:13
uniform (2) 90:16;96:18
unique (5) 82:5,8; 84:25;116:25,25
United (1) 110:25
unless (8) 6:6;32:10; 50:3;90:3,5,14,14; 128:25
unnecessary (1) 65:25
unreasonable (6)
72:23;73:18,22;74:4; 88:12,13
unrebutted (1) 107:5
unscrupulous (1) 104:15
unusual (6) 34:25; 35:21;36:16,19;98:16; 99:3
up (27) 4:10;5:3;10:22; 11:21;14:2,11;16:19; 18:18,20;27:7;31:17; 32:1;33:15;40:19,25; 42:17;83:13;85:2; 93:14;94:4;103:11; 105:4,17;109:17; 111:14;117:12;123:22
update (1) 33:22
updated (4) 10:3;99:8; 100:12;130:24
upon (2) 30:6;132:4
urge (1) $24: 23$
use (19) $39: 7 ; 41: 14,18$, 19,24;52:1,2;57:13,14; 66:7;78:6;82:16;92:14; 107:25;109:21;118:25; 120:1,2,15
used (16) 9:19;10:2; 22:21;26:14;41:15,16; 48:6;74:11;79:16; 82:21;86:20;95:23; 106:13;107:3,7;110:11 useful (1) $28: 18$
user-friendly (1) 23:17 uses (3) 44:10;91:12; 108:20
using (4) 48:15;102:3; 114:15;117:22
utilize (7) 10:25;41:12, 20;122:14,17,18;123:4
utilized (1) $34: 21$
utilizing (1) $25: 3$

## V

vague (3) 83:16; 100:17;102:20
valid (1) 93:18
value (17) 49:8;51:22; 52:8;58:16;67:25;68:8; 69:17,22;70:14;72:2,5; 73:17;78:15;79:11; 80:9;81:1;115:9
VAN (2) 125:2,4
variety (2) 9:19;107:11
varying (1) 47:16
vendor (24) 20:13,17; 41:10;63:5,6,7;66:25; 69:14,14,18,21,21; 70:1;76:7,11,21;77:8, 18;81:21;82:1;83:4; 88:22;90:18;123:4
vendors (3) 42:17;83:3; 95:8
venue (2) $124: 15$; 125:15
versa (1) 40:12
version (1) 13:8
versus (6) 69:21;74:22; 75:18;80:14;84:13; 98:18
VI (3) 46:18;92:9,23
vice (1) $40: 12$
Victory (7) 47:6;126:18; 127:9,10,11;129:6,7
view (8) 10:19;57:20,
24;58:6;68:14;69:24;
113:15;116:24
viewership (2) 14:14,17
views (2) 70:2;131:23
VII (1) 130:10
VIII (1) 133:2
violates (1) 79:14
violation (16) 48:11; 49:19;51:23;58:24; 67:4;70:23;72:15; 77:16;78:23;79:6,23; 80:18;91:21;115:14; 125:20;126:3
violations (1) 66:14 visit (1) $10: 11$
Vista (1) 27:13 visualization (1) 8:6 voice (1) 62:5
volunteer (2) 97:17; 100:10
volunteers (1) 100:7 vote (31) 5:5;9:7,9,10, 10;10:10;12:2,16;16:2, 17;17:1,15,18;18:8,9,9, 10,15;22:10;23:1,23; 24:9;26:8;31:15,17; 52:18;59:1;60:19;79:8; 80:17;115:12
voter (43) 7:16,17;8:1; 9:15;12:20,23,24; 13:20,25;14:6,7;17:8; 19:2,8,25;20:8;21:10; 22:8;23:4;28:16;33:11, 24;53:11,15;54:13,14, 14;64:24,24,24,25; 82:1,6,9,19;96:16,22; 99:9;100:9,9;122:1,1,7
voters (55) 8:2;9:7,14,
18;10:13;11:5,12,19; 12:11;13:13,21,22; 14:4,22;15:2,9,11,13, 14,17,22;16:9,15,16, 23;17:1,4;18:2,6;19:1, 2,12;21:2,13,15;22:1,3, 15,19,25;23:14;24:1, 12;25:4;28:11,21; 29:10,19,24;30:8;32:1, 9,23;65:12;135:4
voters' (2) 135:7,17 voting (15) 9:8;10:8,9, 11;16:24;17:15;21:11; 23:15;24:8;26:7,23; 29:23,25;33:1;58:25 voting-eligible (1) 9:2
$\mathbf{W}$
wage (1) 100:15
Wait (1) 73:10
wants (5) 56:3;61:19; 66:20;70:4;131:17
water (1) 30:2
way (24) $12: 21 ; 18: 16$; 39:1;42:21;60:15;66:5, 21;70:17;72:25;73:18; 79:14;93:17;103:20; 107:15;108:18;109:5; 115:22;116:17,24; 121:5;123:22;135:13, 16,18
ways (4) 15:10;18:15; 91:9;131:20
website (11) 4:13;9:17; 10:24;12:11,12,18,23; 14:18;23:16;30:15,16
week (2) 4:17;128:18
Weichert (1) 98:6 weightless (1) $88: 14$ weird (1) 110:21
welcome (2) 6:5;25:8 well-compensated (1) 114:8
weren't (4) 82:21;

84:21;85:5;89:15
West (2) 135:18,18
whack (1) 109:12
what's (4) 44:19;51:10, 10;124:20
whatsoever (2) 60:14; 124:17
Whereupon (2) 92:21; 137:10
wherever (1) 27:14
whichever (1) 41:20
whole (10) 30:25;70:9; 71:6;81:9,10;82:1; 86:23;98:23;108:20; 119:13
who's (3) 11:23;47:15; 105:11
Wilcox (1) 27:14
wildly (3) 98:3;124:19; 125:7
William (2) 6:24;7:8
willing (1) 127:22
win (5) 65:13;95:21; 101:10,11;102:12
winning (2) 102:15; 103:9
wiser (1) 97:8
wish (2) 68:6;90:22
wishes (1) 78:20
within (2) 10:14;11:6
without (4) 16:2;37:4; 45:17;47:25
woefully (1) 105:4
Women (2) 32:1;135:4
won (2) 102:13;105:9
wonderful (1) $24: 22$
wondering (1) 53:12
word (11) 96:10;98:4,4, 20,20;103:6,6;124:18, 18;127:19;130:19
wording (2) 84:6;131:2
words (1) 61:2
work (19) 5:2;6:14,22; 12:8;17:17;19:10; 20:18;23:11,22;30:24; 32:15;33:20;44:2;51:6, 6;89:24;108:22;113:7; 120:8
worked (6) 5:13;6:12; 13:6;20:15;33:25; 113:9
working (10) 4:20; 14:25;15:10,19;20:24; 21:12;28:1;30:11; 94:21;136:11
works (5) 28:12;49:14; 56:1;59:8;95:6
world (3) 103:12; 104:13;108:16
worries (1) 119:16
worry (3) 101:5;104:12; 119:7
worth (3) 67:25;98:11;

104:9
wrapped (2) 16:19; 18:18
wrap-up (2) 93:2,2
write (2) 55:1;102:9
written (2) 71:8;95:15
wrong (3) 56:18;58:11; 125:15
wrote (2) 47:10;95:4

## Y

Yavapai (1) 8:15
year (19) 8:12;11:2;
12:24;13:18;14:9;17:3;
20:10;25:2,16;29:12; 30:9;32:13;33:13,22; 94:14,17,19;117:14; 135:20
years (12) 4:20;5:23; 6:10,11,18;26:15; 29:14;32:3;53:17;82:3; 95:7;116:17
yesterday (1) 99:7
you-all (1) 52:17
young (1) 94:17

## 0

004 (2) 62:3;93:24
005 (1) 93:24
04 (4) 46:23;47:1,3,10
05 (7) 46:23;47:1,2,4,
10;48:19;61:16
07 (2) 46:23;126:20
08 (2) 46:23;126:20

## 1

1 (1) 136:7
1.9 (1) 13:1

12 (2) 34:18;98:24
12,000 (1) 103:3
12:27 (1) 137:11
12th (1) $10: 10$
13 (1) 5:5
14 (1) $60: 25$
15 (2) 3:12;24:16
15,000 (1) 13:2
150-some (1) 135:25
1516 (1) 5:19
16 (1) 61:1
16-004 (3) 50:9;52:21; 91:19
16-005 (4) 92:9,24;
125:20;126:1
16-007 (3) 126:18; 129:6,13
16-008 (2) 129:6,13
16-009 (1) 129:23
16-05 (1) 93:3
16-948C (1) 78:10
19 (1) 98:10


