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1
P R O C E E D I N G
2
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Good morning. I'm going
to call to order the March 4th, 2019, meeting of the
Citizens Clean Elections Commission.
3
Why don't we take roll call since we have
one of our commissioners on the phone.
4
I don't know who takes roll call. I guess
I'll do it.
5
Commissioner Meyer?
6
COMMISSIONER MEYER: Here.
7
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan?
8
COMMISSIONER CHAN: Here.
9
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton?
10
COMMISSIONER PATON: Here.
11
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And I am here, too.
12
Item II, discussion and possible action on
Commission minutes for the January 31st, 2019 meeting.
We received the minutes.
Are there any corrections or additions to
the minutes?
COMMISSIONER CHAN: I would move that we
adopt the minutes as written.
COMMISSIONER MEYER: Second.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any discussion on the
motion?
No response.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those in favor say
aye.
Chorus of ayes.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone opposed?
No response.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The minutes are approved.
Item III, discussion and possible action on
Executive Director's report and legislative report.
Tom?
MR. COLLINS: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, members.
Just as a -- as a quick, you know, update
on what's going on election wise around the -- around
the state about March 12th, which is -- March 12th are
the local elections happening in Maricopa and Navajo
County, specifically the city of Phoenix mayoral runoff
and then the primaries for the seats that the two
candidates vacated.
The mail back your early ballot was
recommended by March 6th for that.
On the enforcement, we've got just -- we've
got One Arizona, which is on this agenda for -- we've
recommended conciliation. We'll talk about that when
we get there.
I wanted to call a couple of -- a couple
of -- bless you -- a couple of bills. We're not sure
whether or not there's time to get them out of the
House, but House Bill 2076 we did support. It adjusted
the early contribution limit but maintained the early
contribution limits on amount and from whom you can
take them. It, also, has a provision that talks
about -- that reiterates the Commission's authority
over traditional candidates. It passed on a bipartisan
basis out of the Election Committee, but that's not
necessarily an indication of where things -- where
things will be.
The other bill we've been -- a couple of
bills we've been active on, obviously, you know we've
written a letter to the committee on 2724, which is the bill to
expand GRRC's authority over us. We, also, have worked
with the County Recorders, Secretary of State's Office
and Senator Gowan on the primary day -- moving the
primary day to the first Tuesday in August.
We did a brief anecdotal survey of some of
the clean candidates because, obviously, what that does
is, because the way the statute seems to read, it
floats the primary date, potentially, or it could be a
1 VPA issue, but we don't have to get into that, but
2 we've got a date where the candidates who have run
3 clean don't think that the two-week change is going to
4 be a significant impact on their ability to stretch
5 their money, but that was helpful. It was nice to be
6 invited and nice to be in a position to say yes to
7 something that Senator Gowan is invested in, and so
8 that may end up getting wrapped up in some other bill.
9 Many of the -- and I'm reading off -- this
10 19 is off from Mike's report. So this is all Mike's work
11 I'm stealing. We think, for the most part, the --
12 well, nothing is over until it's over, but seemingly,
13 the preliminary voter list, two consecutive primaries,
14 I think that that has passed out of committee, but I
15 don't know if it's left the -- I don't think it's left
16 the Senate.
17 And, then, 1046, which was the early voting
18 list mailing ballot, as far as we know, unless there's
19 been an update that we're not aware of, there's just
20 not 16 votes in the Senate right now to move that bill.
21 You know, on the other hand, in the House there's
22 some -- there's some bills that seem to have some
23 pretty broad-based support on the -- on the -- on the
24 election front.
25 We're still hopeful. We had some -- we had

1 a couple of positive meetings about trying to -- trying
2 to -- trying to make the judicial retention process,
3 especially, more transparent to voters based on the
4 feedback that we get from folks who call when they get
5 the -- when they get our candidate statement book or
6 the JPR report from the Secretary's Office. We're
7 still hopeful that may -- that may jump out. It may
8 not, but we've worked on that in the past.
9 You know, JPR does what JPR does, but JPR
10 doesn't -- it's not terribly user friendly, frankly,
11 and I think a lot of people, both Democratic and
12 Republican voters that we hear from, find that. And it
13 doesn't give them the answers to the questions they
14 actually want to know the answers to. I mean, you
15 know -- I mean, I'll be blunt with you. They want to
16 know the parties and the judges, and they want to know,
17 you know, who appointed them. And that's not unfair.
18 I mean, the fact that JPR obscures that information
19 doesn't mean that it's not relevant, but we'll see if
20 that gets anywhere.
21 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Mr. Collins, in reference
22 to 2724, what's your feelings on if that's going to go
23 anywhere?
24 MR. COLLINS: Well, you know, I mean -- you
25 know, it could always -- I mean, look at -- every

1 session for the last -- I don't know -- as long as I
2 can remember at this point, there's been an early push
3 on a bill that targets the Commission in a way that's
4 not consistent with the Constitution. Sometimes then
5 those go on the back burner, and then the last bill
6 that the legislature has voted on for the past three
7 sessions -- maybe even four -- has been some anti-Clean
8 Elections bill.
9 And last year was the first year that they
10 actually managed to get through, but the last bill that
11 they voted was the HCR 2007 referendum. So the reality
12 is that, although our purview might be -- you know, is
13 narrow compared to, say, you know, what, like, DHS or
14 other people have to look at, we are always here at the
15 last -- we always are here when the legislature
16 suddenly dies because -- because that's when -- that's
17 when the -- you know, so it's really hard to get
18 confident about it.
19 I mean, it did pass out of regulatory -- it
20 passed the regulatory fairs party line vote, its past
21 rule. So it's ready for action, but I haven't seen it
22 on the floor calendar yet. So -- but I don't ever --
23 and we -- you know, sometimes these things will
24 submerge themselves and then -- you know, after they've
25 done the budget, what have you, they've got their, you
MR. COLLINS: Right. Right. So my understanding is that they've got last week and this week, and I think the deadline to pass is the 14th, I'm pretty sure. It's either the 7th or the 14th.

MR. BECKER: The 14th.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: Okay. So they're still moving, potentially.

So all of these bills were heard in the Committee of Origin -- or in the House of Origin?

MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: Oh, even the Democratic bills.

MR. COLLINS: Oh, no.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: No? Okay.

MR. COLLINS: Not the Democratic bills.

I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I was just -- okay.

But I'd love to just -- I'm sorry --

MR. COLLINS: No, we can --

COMMISSIONER CHAN: -- to use your work to just see where they are just for my own curiosity,

Mike. Thanks.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I think that's easy enough to do.

So those are the main -- those are the main issues. I think that of the, quote/unquote, controversial bills left -- I mean, one of them that there's been some -- is the payment -- there's a prohibition on anyone being paid or receiving anything of value for the registering to vote. I -- you know, that's a -- not something that necessarily has anything to do with us, but again, in the interest of trying to give you guys a broader picture.

Now, that passed out of elections. I don't think that's gone up on the board yet, but, you know, it's -- I mean, it's a continuation of, you know, some of the -- some of the restrictions on, you know, financial involvement between -- you know, between whether first, they did the ballot-collecting issue and this is another way. And one thing I don't know -- and so I can't answer -- is what other states do -- you know, if other states have prohibitions on hiring folks to go out and canvass to register to vote.

It seems to me that because that activity is, at least, designated on a Campaign Finance Code, it's non-partisan activity, you know, and it's an exemption from the expenditures as defined in the Campaign Finance Code. It's a little bit -- well, it's, kind of, an odd -- that seems like an odd parody to me, but we don't have a position on -- we haven't taken a position on that bill nor are we -- nor have we been asked to but -- you know, one way or the other. And, you know, we stay in contact with folks who are both for and against these bills as much as we can, and so far I don't know that we've got a -- you know, that that would be to anybody's advantage.

So, anyways, I apologize for going on so long, but that's -- that's, sort of -- that's where we are.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other questions for Tom on the Executive Director's report or the legislative report?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.

Item IV, discussion and possible action on final audit approval for the following 2018 general election participating candidates. I'm not going to read the names of all 22 candidates, but they are in the agenda, which will be incorporated in the -- in the minutes.

Tom, is there anything that you want to point out about this?

MR. COLLINS: Well, I did want to say, you know, this is the first year that we've done all legislative and statewide participating candidates.

The -- so we did -- so, by comparison, in 2016, we did 30 audits. In 2018, we will have done 74 audits, and more than half have been completed. So, in other words, basically, we're doing, roughly, twice as much work with the auditors and achieving the same date, you know, completion.

So, you know, Mike has taken that on and Paula has helped coordinate with the auditors, and so they've done a really good job of keeping them on track as we increase the volume of folks that we're auditing.

You know, in many ways, the hardest folks who have most of the difficult time, which we understand, are folks who are incumbents who won who won't get their general audit until -- until later, but the fact of the matter is that, you know, that that would be to anybody's advantage.

So we do try to make these as painless as possible, and we have, thus far, not made significant findings. The findings that we have made, we're working on corrective actions that we don't anticipate leading to enforcement actions at this point.

So with that, I guess -- and with compliments to Mike and Paula -- I would just recommend that you approve the audits as identified in the memorandum, Item IV, and the backup material. So I
guess, basically, that you approve the written material in Item IV as the audits for those candidates.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.

Any questions about these audits?

COMMISSIONER CHAN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I'm just really impressed that now that we're auditing every participating candidate, we haven't had any significant findings. I think that speaks to both the dedication of the people who are running with Clean Elections, as well as maybe the training that the staff does for them, and I -- I'm just -- it makes me very happy to see that our system is working so well.

So thanks to the staff for this and, also, to all of those participating candidates for their dedication and making this work and working with us on any of the insignificant findings there may have been.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yeah, I think you're right. I think the training plays a huge role in this because I've attended it once and it's very comprehensive. And if you have problems, it's pretty clearly your fault.

Any other comments about the audits?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Does anyone want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER CHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we adopt the final audits as written.

Is that correct?

MR. COLLINS: Sure. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: I'll second that.

MR. COLLINS: Sure. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The audits are accepted unanimously.

Item V, discussion and possible action on MUR 18-07, One Arizona.

Tom?

MR. COLLINS: Yes. So, Commissioners, if you look through your -- your materials on this, you'll see the reason to believe memo that we did and then you see a recommended conciliation agreement. Kirin Goff, who represents One Arizona is here. And, then, I've had a fairly lengthy conversation with Mike Laverde, who is the attorney for the complainants, and he's, sort of, authorized me to give his views on the conciliation. So -- which is a little bit of an interest position to be in.

So here are the reasons why you shouldn't adopt the recommendation.

COMMISSIONER CHAN: According to Mike Laverde.

MR. COLLINS: Well, I mean, you know -- COMMISSIONER CHAN: Not Tom.

MR. COLLINS: Well -- COMMISSIONER CHAN: Obviously.

MR. COLLINS: I don't know where to start.

So the bottom line is that, I think, Mike's chief criticism, if I would fairly characterize it, is that, given the overall size of One Arizona, perhaps not the specific spend or maybe inclusive of the specific spend on these mailers, that the financial penalty here is not a sufficient deterrent. That's -- you know, and that's -- that's -- that's a reality that we face in many cases, you know. The overall spend, we believe, here was approximately -- in the complaint about materials was something like -- I had this in here --

well, it was something -- it's something around the nature of 84,000, I think.

Does that sound right?

MS. GOFF: Can you repeat that?

Does that sound right?

MS. GOFF: I don't recall off the top of my head, Tom.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Okay. Well, it's about -- I think it's about 84. So what that means is to -- just to -- just to go through how our fines work for reporting --

MS. THOMAS: Tom, can you speak into the mic for her?

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Okay. Well, it's about -- I think it's about 84. So what that means is to -- just to -- just to go through how our fines work for reporting --

MR. COLLINS: Oh, sorry. Just to go over a little bit about how our fines work for reporting, they are per-day fine, and they max out at double the amount of the expenditure. So to get to that place would take something, like, another, I think, 300 to 400 days for One Arizona. You know what I mean? So -- you know, to max out. You know, we can't -- we can't -- you know, because it's -- the penalties as set forth in the Act for reporting are not proportional to the size of the organization, and they're not proportional to the size of the -- and they're not necessarily going to be
1 proportional to the size of the overall expenditure
2 because you have to get there day by day.
3 So, you know, although we can get up to
double, it still takes -- it would take a long time to
get there.
6 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Could I just interrupt?
7 So you are now speaking as Tom Collins --
8 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
9 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: -- rebutting the
10 statement earlier when you were speaking --
11 MR. COLLINS: Right.
12 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: -- as Mr. Laverde?
13 MR. COLLINS: Right, right.
14 COMMISSIONER CHAN: Mr. Chairman, can I ask
15 a quick question of Tom?
16 What does Mike think an appropriate penalty
17 would be from the complainant's perspective?
18 MR. COLLINS: Well, I think that his -- I
mean, first of all, I would say that he expressed he's
20 grateful and thanks for you all looking for his input
21 after I -- when I -- last month -- the framework I
22 proposed last month, and he did, also, say he's sorry
23 he couldn't be here. I -- I don't know that I got to
24 that level of detail. I think that -- I think his -- I
25 think his bottom line would be, you know, whatever

1 the -- whatever that we could -- whatever we could get,
2 we should try to get which, in a sense, that wouldn't
3 be -- in other words, what I didn't drill down on, I
4 guess, but I would -- I would certainly suspect is that
5 we wouldn't necessarily be in a position to conciliate
6 this now because we go through to get -- to get to a --
7 I mean, the whole nature of a compromise is that you're
8 not going to get what -- what you could get if you went
9 through the full process.
10 The goal here was to -- now, we have a
11 variety of goals when we enter into a public
12 administrative settlement, which the Act obligates us
13 to try to do. Here we will have reports filed
14 identifying the candidates against whom the spending
15 was made and for -- you know, therefore, for whom the
16 spending was done. We have reserved -- just in case
17 there's any discrepancy, we reserve the right to review
18 those filings and ask for amendments, if necessary,
19 which is not -- that's not standard. That's a --
20 that's something we added to this.
21 It has to do, in part, with how the -- how
22 the data that we received is, sort of, grouped and
23 whether or not we can get the maximum amount of -- of
24 transparency out of the reports that are filed. The
25 $5,200 number was -- from my perspective, it involves

1 some give and take. We started at $6,700. Why?
2 Because we took the percentage of penalty -- not
3 percentage of spend but the percentage of penalty that
4 we applied in a case called -- with the Solar
5 Industries PAC back in 2016. We applied the percentage
6 to this. We made some adjustments for some filing
7 issues and ended up with 6,700. We went back and forth
8 and ended up at 5,200.
9 Now, is $5,200 a deterrent amount? Well,
10 look, I mean, this is a five -- I think any finding is,
11 potentially, a deterrent. I think that -- I think the
12 fines are -- the administrative penalty process and
13 getting the information, I think, prioritizes
14 information over fines. We don't -- different cases
15 have different litigation post -- post-decision
16 litigation implications. And we think this is, you
17 know, roughly, in line with what we have done with some
18 similar -- similar cases.
19 So all in all, I mean, you know,
20 understanding, I think, that, you know, Mr. Laverde
21 thinks this is a cost -- this becomes a cost of doing
22 business and it's not going to be effective, I think
23 that that's -- I mean, I don't have -- I don't have --
24 I don't take issue with that argument. I simply -- I
25 simply see it as it's not clear that we can just
1 I mean, we still don't have official reports from LFAF, and it's been the governor's -- we've had the whole gubernatorial election cycle since that complaint.
2 So -- so, you know, that's, kind of, how I feel about it. I'm comfortable -- I'm very comfortable recommending this conciliation agreement, and I think that the -- you know, and I think I think Mike --
3 Mrs. Laverde is fully informed about it, doesn't agree with it, but I don't -- I don't have any -- but that's -- and for those reasons. So just I would just leave that for you to weigh and then, if you want to hear from Ms. Goff, who represents One Arizona, she's here. I don't know if you do or not.
4 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We will.
5 Do any of the Commissioners have any questions for Mr. Collins before we ask for the respondent?
6 COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman?
7 COMMISSIONER PATON: Actually this is Commissioner Paton.
8 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yes.
9 COMMISSIONER PATON: I do have a question.
10 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton?
11 COMMISSIONER PATON: I'm reading here in a letter, Number 2, where it says respondent disputes that its expenditures was subject to reporting requirements as set forth in A.R.S. 16-941(B) and 958.
12 So have they not learned their lesson or --
13 MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Paton, that's a very good question, and we have accommodated this language in a couple of prior cases. We had a case with -- that we did jointly with the Arizona Attorney General's Office where one of the major issues was the tax and entity formation of the particular group. This is a case called Veterans for a Strong America or Stronger America.
14 Because of those complications, it took us a couple of years to get that conciliated, but we ultimately, in order to close -- getting it conciliated because of issues -- existing issues they had with the IRS, we allowed them to say, you know, that they don't think this is -- that they didn't think what they did was express advocacy.
15 In this particular case, this is my view.
16 Ms. Goff can speak to whatever One Arizona's view is. One Arizona is a 501(c)(3) and, as such, in theory, they're not supposed to -- or a 501(c)(3), in general, is not supposed to advocate for or against candidates. So to the extent that we find that under our law they did, but the -- but the group, because of concerns they have and, in part, because sometimes the only way to get it done is to, you know, not -- you know, if they want, but they didn't want -- we would be unable to impose any fines, but then they stipulated to a fine, you know. So we're -- we've been flexible on -- on that, in part, because we don't know what other -- all the other complicating factors that a respondent might have and, in part, because sometimes the only way to get it done is to, you know, not -- you know, if they want to say they don't believe -- in the case of the Republican Senatorial Leadership PAC, in 2016, if they want to say that they don't believe Clean Elections can do this, we -- on an agency in Arizona has to say about -- about whether or not some 501(c)(3) made a particular expenditure, but nevertheless, we've accommodated this in the past where we have -- where we've accommodated with Republican groups.
17 We -- a couple of years ago, we approved just so just to make sure it's not a partisan issue. One Arizona is clearly, I guess I guess, it's non-partisan, but it's progressive.
18 Fair? Okay. But, you know, we had the Republican senatorial action -- political action committee. You know, we included language that said they deny that the Commission has the authority to impose any fines, but then they stipulated to a fine, you know. So we're -- we've been flexible on -- on that, in part, because we don't know what other -- all over the tax implications of this, they can say, well, we -- this is Arizona and they can say whatever they want, but they didn't want -- we would be unable to settle this case, I believe, without this stipulation that, in part, because sometimes the only way to get it done is to, you know, not -- you know, if they want to say they don't believe -- in the case of the Republican Senatorial Leadership PAC, in 2016, if they want to say that they don't believe Clean Elections can do this, we -- on an agency in Arizona has to say about -- about whether or not some 501(c)(3) made a particular expenditure, but nevertheless, we've accommodated this in the past where we have -- where we've accommodated with Republican groups.
19 We -- a couple of years ago, we approved just so just to make sure it's not a partisan issue. One Arizona is clearly, I guess -- I guess, it's non-partisan, but it's progressive.
20 Fair? Okay. But, you know, we had the Republican senatorial action -- political action committee. You know, we included language that said they deny that the Commission has the authority to impose any fines, but then they stipulated to a fine, you know. So we're -- we've been flexible on -- on that, in part, because we don't know what other -- all over the tax implications of this, they can say, well, we -- this is Arizona and they can say whatever they want, but they didn't want -- we would be unable to settle this case, I believe, without this stipulation that, in part, because sometimes the only way to get it done is to, you know, not -- you know, if they want to say they don't believe -- in the case of the Republican Senatorial Leadership PAC, in 2016, if they want to say that they don't believe Clean Elections can do this, we -- on an agency in Arizona has to say about -- about whether or not some 501(c)(3) made a particular expenditure, but nevertheless, we've accommodated this in the past where we have -- where we've accommodated with Republican groups.
21 We -- a couple of years ago, we approved just so just to make sure it's not a partisan issue. One Arizona is clearly, I guess -- I guess, it's non-partisan, but it's progressive.
22 Fair? Okay. But, you know, we had the Republican senatorial action -- political action committee. You know, we included language that said they deny that the Commission has the authority to impose any fines, but then they stipulated to a fine, you know. So we're -- we've been flexible on -- on that, in part, because we don't know what other -- all over the tax implications of this, they can say, well, we -- this is Arizona and they can say whatever they want, but they didn't want -- we would be unable to settle this case, I believe, without this stipulation that, in part, because sometimes the only way to get it done is to, you know, not -- you know, if they want to say they don't believe -- in the case of the Republican Senatorial Leadership PAC, in 2016, if they want to say that they don't believe Clean Elections can do this, we -- on an agency in Arizona has to say about -- about whether or not some 501(c)(3) made a particular expenditure, but nevertheless, we've accommodated this in the past where we have -- where we've accommodated with Republican groups.
23 We -- a couple of years ago, we approved just so just to make sure it's not a partisan issue. One Arizona is clearly, I guess -- I guess, it's non-partisan, but it's progressive.
24 Fair? Okay. But, you know, we had the Republican senatorial action -- political action committee. You know, we included language that said they deny that the Commission has the authority to impose any fines, but then they stipulated to a fine, you know. So we're -- we've been flexible on -- on that, in part, because we don't know what other -- all over the tax implications of this, they can say, well, we -- this is Arizona and they can say whatever they want, but they didn't want -- we would be unable to settle this case, I believe, without this stipulation that, in part, because sometimes the only way to get it done is to, you know, not -- you know, if they want to say they don't believe -- in the case of the Republican Senatorial Leadership PAC, in 2016, if they want to say that they don't believe Clean Elections can do this, we -- on an agency in Arizona has to say about -- about whether or not some 501(c)(3) made a particular expenditure, but nevertheless, we've accommodated this in the past where we have -- where we've accommodated with Republican groups.
25 We -- a couple of years ago, we approved just so just to make sure it's not a partisan issue. One Arizona is clearly, I guess -- I guess, it's non-partisan, but it's progressive.
MR. COLLINS: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Does that answer your question, Commissioner Paton?

COMMISSIONER PATON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I believe Commissioner Meyer had a question.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions. The first one is for Tom.

Do you know, did Mr. Laverde plan to attend our meeting last week, but we then had to move it?

MR. COLLINS: No. He was definitely not planning on attending last week's meeting.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: And, then, the other question I had is regarding Commissioner Paton's agreement.

It's common in commercial litigation, when you settle a case, that you have a clause in there that says neither party is admitting liability or anything like that.

Is this, sort of, akin to that?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Meyer, yes. I mean, it's essentially -- they're admitting liability to us, which is important, but they're stipulating that liability is to us only and that they would -- they're hoping by this clause to reserve the right to contest that if it comes up, I think. And, again, Ms. Goff can -- if you want to get -- I don't know if you can get into that. I'm speculating, based on my -- I don't have inside information about the -- about the operations of One Arizona. I don't know if Ms. Goff can answer these questions with, you know --

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman, if I could, one more comment.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Of course.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: And based upon the answers provided and Tom's explanation, I'm prepared to support this conciliation at this time.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Any other questions for Mr. Collins before we ask the respondent to -- if she wants to speak?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Do you wish to speak?

MS. GOFF: Yes. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Could you identify yourself for the record, please?

MS. GOFF: Kirin Goff, with the Torres Law Group, on behalf of One Arizona. And I think that the Commission addressed most of our concerns, but I wanted to have an opportunity to make our position clear.

We urge you to vote yes on this conciliation. The amount of the proposed conciliation is more than sufficient and, as Mr. Collins mentioned, there was a similar case in 2015 with a Republican group, the Veterans for a Strong America. And they were -- they only ended up paying $2,000 per that conciliation, which is significantly less than the amount that we're looking at here, even though, I think, that they had a stronger case against them because the candidate at issue was not an incumbent.

So they were just running for office, and so there wasn't really a clear interpretation, other than express advocacy; whereas, here, because the candidates at issue were, in fact, in office and the text of the literature that we're talking about was simply asking people to call their representatives, there's a stronger case here for a reasonable interpretation, other than express advocacy, and that standard comes from the Wisconsin Right to Life case.

So in light of that objective standard, you know, we're not looking at what was their intent. We're looking at no reasonable -- no reasonable interpretation other than that intent. So in light of that standard and in light of this similar conciliation -- this case with a similar conciliation in 2015, we think that this is a fair conciliation in this case.

And I would need to speak with the client about it, but we're likely to appeal if this conciliation doesn't move forward because we have a strong argument and -- so, yeah, thanks for hearing our thoughts.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Meyer.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: A point of clarification.

Is One Arizona -- is it an LLC? Is it a corporation? Is it -- what is the -- what is the entity?

MS. GOFF: I apologize. I'm not the attorney that originally worked this case. So I don't have those details off the top of my head.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Do you know, Tom, because --

MS. GOFF: I believe --

COMMISSIONER MEYER: We can look at the agreement.

MR. COLLINS: I think it's an LLC, but we can -- I'm sure we can work on the amendment to identify the --

MS. GOFF: Sure.
I would say that with regard to the $5,200, important to me. something that, obviously, is an issue that's very you or your client, in particular, but it's just Ms. Goff was up there because it has nothing to do with think that I'm not the only person in America that advocating for or against candidates. And I just wanted to get that on the record because it's something that I have a real philosophical problem with and I have since Citizens United, and I think that I'm not the only person in America that feels that way. So I didn't want to do that while Ms. Goff was up there because it has nothing to do with you or your client, in particular, but it's just something that, obviously, is an issue that's very important to me. I would say that with regard to the $5,200,
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those in favor say aye.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The motion is passed.

Item VII, public comment. Anyone want to make comment?

Ms. Knox, thank you. We missed you last month.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: We did miss you.

MS. KNOX: Yes. For the record, I'm Rivko Knox. I'm representing the League of Women Voters of Arizona. And I don't really have that much to say, but I did want to say missed you all. Because I am well, actually, the lobbyist for the League at the legislature and the judiciary committee meets on Thursday mornings, which is when you usually meet, I've been there instead, but I do then go back and watch the videotape.

And I came up with, actually, one recommendation, that Mr. Collins should speak more clearly into the mic because there were times I couldn't understand what he said, but -- and, then, I do report, give -- provide a summary of the meeting to the League of Women Voters of Arizona's board -- state board, and they can transmit it to all the members around the state so they know what's going on.

(Chorus of ayes.)

And the league has been -- I've been testifying on several bills, a number of which you saw on the list that Mr. Collins provided, and certainly the one that affected -- and we will continue to monitor the one that affects Clean Elections. So you're doing a great job. Whenever I have an opportunity, I talk about the amazing voter education work that Clean Elections does and wish that more people were aware of it. So I keep spreading the word wherever I go, and thank you for all you do.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, and we missed you.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: We did miss you.

MS. KNOX: Yes. For the record, I'm Rivko Knox. I'm representing the League of Women Voters of Arizona. And I don't really have that much to say, but I did want to say missed you all. Because I am well, actually, the lobbyist for the League at the legislature and the judiciary committee meets on Thursday mornings, which is when you usually meet, I've been there instead, but I do then go back and watch the videotape.

And I came up with, actually, one recommendation, that Mr. Collins should speak more clearly into the mic because there were times I couldn't understand what he said, but -- and, then, I do report, give -- provide a summary of the meeting to the League of Women Voters of Arizona's board -- state board, and they can transmit it to all the members around the state so they know what's going on.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone opposed?
COMMISSIONER CHAN: Seconded.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We are adjourned.
Thank you, Commissioner Paton, for attending by phone.
COMMISSIONER PATON: Sure.
(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 10:31 a.m.)

---
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