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| PUBLIC MEETING BEFORE THE CITIZENS CLEAN <br> ELECTIONS COMMISSION convened at 9:30 a.m. on March 4, 2019, at the State of Arizona, Clean Elections <br> Commission, 1616 West Adams, Conference Room, Phoenix, <br> Arizona, in the presence of the following Board members: <br> Mr . Mark S. Kimble, Chairperson <br> Mr . Damien R. Meyer <br> Ms. Amy B. Chan Mr. Galen D. Paton (Telephonic) <br> OTHERS PRESENT: <br> Thomas M. Collins, Executive Director <br> Paula Thomas, Executive Officer <br> Mike Becker, Policy Director <br> Alec Shaffer, Web Content Manager <br> Fanessa Salazar, Administrative Assistant <br> Rivko Knox, AZ League of Women Voters <br> Joseph LaRue, Assistant Attorney General <br> Kirin Goff, Torres Law Group <br> Ryan Wheelock, RIESTER | motion? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The minutes are approved. <br> Item III, discussion and possible action on <br> Executive Director's report and legislative report. <br> Tom? <br> MR. COLLINS: Yes. Thank you, <br> Mr. Chairman, members. <br> Just as a -- as a quick, you know, update <br> on what's going on election wise around the -- around <br> the state about March 12th, which is -- March 12th are <br> the local elections happening in Maricopa and Navajo <br> County, specifically the city of Phoenix mayoral runoff <br> and then the primaries for the seats that the two <br> 20 candidates vacated. <br> 21 The mail back your early ballot was <br> recommended by March 6th for that. <br> 23 On the enforcement, we've got just -- we've <br> 24 got One Arizona, which is on this agenda for -- we've <br> 25 recommended conciliation. We'll talk about that when |
| ```09:29:53-09:30:48 \\ PROCEEDING \\ CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Good morning. I'm going to call to order the March 4th, 2019, meeting of the Citizens Clean Elections Commission. \\ Why don't we take roll call since we have one of our commissioners on the phone. \\ I dont' know who takes roll call. I guess I'll do it. \\ Commissioner Meyer? \\ COMMISSIONER MEYER: Here. \\ CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan? \\ COMMISSIONER CHAN: Here. \\ CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton? \\ COMMISSIONER PATON: Here. \\ CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And I am here, too. \\ 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``` | we get there. <br> 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 7 contribution limits on amount and from whom you can 8 take them. It, also, has a provision that talks <br> 9 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. <br> The other bill we've been -- a couple of bills we've been active on, obviously, you know we've been -- we've written a letter -- 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. <br> 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 <br> 25 floats the primary date, potentially, or it could be a |

VPA issue, but we don't have to get into that, but we've got a date where the candidates who have run clean don't think that the two-week change is going to be a significant impact on their ability to stretch their money, but that was helpful. It was nice to be invited and nice to be in a position to say yes to 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 is off from Mike's report. So this is all Mike's work
I'm stealing. We think, for the most part, the -well, nothing is over until it's over, but seemingly, the preliminary voter list, two consecutive primaries, I think that that has passed out of committee, but I don't know if it's left the -- I don't think it's left the Senate.

And, then, 1046, which was the early voting list mailing ballot, as far as we know, unless there's been an update that we're not aware of, there's just not 16 votes in the Senate right now to move that bill. You know, on the other hand, in the House there's some -- there's some bills that seem to have some pretty broad-based support on the -- on the -- on the election front.
25 We're still hopeful. We had some -- we had
a couple of positive meetings about trying to -- trying
to -- trying to make the judicial retention process, especially, more transparent to voters based on the feedback that we get from folks who call when they get 5 the -- when they get our candidate statement book or the JPR report from the Secretary's Office. We're still hopeful that may -- that may jump out. It may not, but we've worked on that in the past.
9 You know, JPR does what JPR does, but JPR doesn't -- it's not terribly user friendly, frankly, and I think a lot of people, both Democratic and Republican voters that we hear from, find that. And it doesn't give them the answers to the questions they actually want to know the answers to. I mean, you know -- I mean, I'll be blunt with you. They want to know the parties and the judges, and they want to know, you know, who appointed them. And that's not unfair. I mean, the fact that JPR obscures that information doesn't mean that it's not relevant, but we'll see if that gets anywhere.

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

1 know, going-home bills that they rush through, you
2 know. And oftentimes ours -- or a bill related to us
3 is on that list.
4 COMMISSIONER CHAN: Mr. Chairman?
5 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan.
6 COMMISSIONER CHAN: This may be a question
7 for Mike just as far as how -- how you're tracking
8 bills. And I don't need to do this during the
9 committee, but I should have asked before, if I thought
10 of it, can I just talk to you, maybe, after the meeting
11 about -- I know Tom has been referencing, kind of,
12 where the bills are, but it would help me, probably, if
13 I could just see where they are.
14 And, Tom, did you already say -- are they
15 done hearing -- no. Are they still processing bills
16 from the House of Origin, or are they -- are those
17 bills, kind of, dead now?
18 MR. COLLINS: The last date to hear
19 bills -- my understanding is this, for what it's worth.
20 The last two weeks -- was it last week? Last week was
21 the last week to hear bills in the committee.
22 COMMISSIONER CHAN: Okay.
23 MR. COLLINS: Except for probes.
24 COMMISSIONER CHAN: Except for rules and 25 probes?

1 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.
5 MR. BECKER: The 14th.
6 COMMISSIONER CHAN: Okay. So they're still
moving, potentially.
8 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.
9 Now, that passed out of elections. I don't
10 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
17 know, if other states have prohibitions on hiring folks
18 to go out and canvass to register to vote.
19 It seems to me that because that activity
20 is, at least, designated on a Campaign Finance Code,
21 it's non-partisan activity, you know, and it's an
22 exemption from the expenditures as defined in the
23 Campaign Finance Code. It's a little bit -- well,
24 it's, kind of, an odd -- that seems like an odd parody
25 to me, but we don't have a position on -- we haven't

1 taken a position on that bill nor are we -- nor have we
2 been asked to but -- you know, one way or the other.
3 And, you know, we stay in contact with
4 folks who are both for and against these bills as much
5 as we can, and so far I don't know that we've got a --
6 you know, that that would be to anybody's advantage.
7 So, anyways, I apologize for going on so
8 long, but that's -- that's, sort of -- that's where we
9 are.
10 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other questions for
11 Tom on the Executive Director's report or the 2 legislative report?
13 (No response.)
14 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.
15 Item IV, discussion and possible action on
16 final audit approval for the following 2018 general
17 election participating candidates. I'm not going to
18 read the names of all 22 candidates, but they are in
19 the agenda, which will be incorporated in the -- in the
20 minutes.
21 Tom, is there anything that you want to
22 point out about this?
23 MR. COLLINS: Well, I did want to say, you
24 know, this is the first year that we've done all
25 legislative and statewide participating candidates.
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1 The -- so we did -- so, by comparison, in 2016, we did
230 audits. In 2018, we will have done 74 audits, and
3 more than half have been completed. So, in other
4 words, basically, we're doing, roughly, twice as much
5 work with the auditors and achieving the same date, you
6 know, completion.
7 So, you know, Mike has taken that on and
8 Paula has helped coordinate with the auditors, and so
9 they've done a really good job of keeping them on track
10 as we increase the volume of folks that we're auditing.
11 You know, in many ways, the hardest folks who have most
12 the difficult time, which we understand, are folks who
13 are incumbents who won who won't get their general
14 audit until -- until later, but the fact of the matter
15 is that, you know, if they had been selected on the
16 random, they'd be in the same situation.
So we do try to make these as painless as
18 possible, and we have, thus far, not made significant
19 findings. The findings that we have made, we're
20 working on corrective actions that we don't anticipate
21 leading to enforcement actions at this point.
22 So with that, I guess -- and with
23 compliments to Mike and Paula -- I would just recommend
24 that you approve the audits as identified in the
25 memorandum, Item IV, and the backup material. So I
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| guess, basically, that you approve the written material <br> in Item IV as the audits for those candidates. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you. <br> Any questions about these audits? <br> COMMISSIONER CHAN: Mr. Chairman? <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan. <br> COMMISSIONER CHAN: I'm just really <br> impressed that now that we're auditing every <br> participating candidate, we haven't had any significant <br> findings. I think that speaks to both the dedication <br> of the people who are running with Clean Elections, as <br> well as maybe the training that the staff does for <br> them, and I -- I'm just -- it makes me very happy to <br> see that our system is working so well. <br> So thanks to the staff for this and, also, <br> to all of those participating candidates for their <br> dedication and making this work and working with us on <br> any of the insignificant findings there may have been. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yeah, I think you're <br> right. I think the training plays a huge role in this <br> because I've attended it once and it's very <br> comprehensive. And if you have problems, it's pretty <br> clearly your fault. <br> 24 Any other comments about the audits? <br> 25 (No response.) | who represents One Arizona is here. And, then, I've <br> had a fairly lengthy conversation with Mike Laverde, <br> who is the attorney for the complainants, and he's, <br> sort of, authorized me to give his views of the <br> conciliation. So -- which is a little bit of an <br> interest position to be in. <br> So here are the reasons why you shouldn't <br> adopt the recommendation. <br> COMMISSIONER CHAN: According to Mike <br> Laverde. <br> MR. COLLINS: Well, I mean, you know -COMMISSIONER CHAN: Not Tom. <br> MR. COLLINS: Well -- <br> COMMISSIONER CHAN: Obviously. <br> MR. COLLINS: I don't know where to start. <br> So the bottom line is that, I think, Mike's chief <br> criticism, if I would fairly characterize it, is that, <br> given the overall size of One Arizona, perhaps not the <br> specific spend or maybe inclusive of the specific spend <br> on these mailers, that the financial penalty here is <br> 21 not a sufficient deterrent. That's -- you know, and <br> 22 that's -- that's -- that's a reality that we face in <br> 23 many cases, you know. The overall spend, we believe, <br> 24 here was approximately -- in the complaint about <br> 25 materials was something like -- I had this in here -- |
| CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Does anyone want to make a motion? <br> COMMISSIONER CHAN: Mr. Chairman, I would move that we adopt the final audits as written. <br> Is that correct? <br> MR. COLLINS: Sure. That's fine. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second? <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: I'll second that <br> motion. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any discussion? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those in favor say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The audits are accepted <br> unanimously. <br> Item V, discussion and possible action on <br> MUR 18-07, One Arizona. <br> Tom? <br> MR. COLLINS: Yes. So, Commissioners, if <br> you look through your -- your materials on this, you'll <br> see the reason to believe memo that we did and then you <br> see a recommended conciliation agreement. Kirin Goff, | 1 well, it was something -- it's something around the nature of 84,000 , I think. <br> Does that sound right? <br> MS. GOFF: Can you repeat that? <br> MR. COLLINS: The amount of the spend in <br> the -- in the -- in the complaint. <br> MS. GOFF: I don't recall off the top of my head, Tom. <br> MR. COLLINS: Okay. Okay. Well, it's <br> about -- I think it's about 84. So what that means is <br> to -- just to -- just to go through how our fines work <br> for reporting -- <br> MS. THOMAS: Tom, can you speak into the <br> mic for her? <br> MR. COLLINS: Oh, sorry. Just to go over a <br> little bit about how our fines work for reporting, they <br> are per-day fine, and they max out at double the amount <br> of the expenditure. So to get to that place would take <br> something, like, another, I think, 300 to 400 days for <br> 20 One Arizona. You know what I mean? So -- you know, to <br> 21 max out. You know, we can't -- we can't -- you know, <br> 22 because it's -- the penalties as set forth in the Act <br> 23 for reporting are not proportional to the size of the <br> 24 organization, and they're not proportional to the size <br> 25 of the -- and they're not necessarily going to be |

proportional to the size of the overall expenditure 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 5 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
19 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
the -- whatever that we could -- whatever we could get,
we should try to get which, in a sense, that wouldn't
be -- in other words, what I didn't drill down on, I
guess, but I would -- I would certainly suspect is that
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
1 variety of goals when we enter into a public
2 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 automatically get to those kinds of numbers, especially
2 depending upon, you know, what are the consequences the
3 respondent faces and what the -- what could potential
4 litigation posture.
5 So every case is going to be different.
6 I'm comfortable with this number because I think it's
7 in line with other numbers we've -- we've -- we've
8 done. I also, honestly -- I mean, from an enforcement
9 perspective, you know, I think that -- I think my
10 experience here has said that the -- this is my
11 personal experience, and it is that the numbers aren't
12 really a deterrent. I mean -- you know, I mean, we
13 fined the Legacy Foundation Action Fund, you know,
14 95-odd thousand dollars, and we spent -- they've
15 spent -- I don't know how much -- I don't know offhand
16 how much we spent, but I guarantee you with their
17 lawyers lined back and forth across this country
18 filing, you know, all kinds of different motions, they
19 spent a heck of a lot more than $\$ 95,000$ on the case.
20 So it's not clear when we do -- you know,
21 are more aggressive with the finding that it has the --
22 it has a deterrent effect, but on the other hand,
23 it's -- it, at least, recognizes that there was a
24 penalty paid here and gets -- and gets the public the
25 information faster than it otherwise would have gotten.
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| I mean, we still don't have official reports from LFAF, <br> and it's been the governor's -- we've had the whole <br> gubernatorial election cycle since that complaint. <br> So -- so, you know, that's, kind of, how I <br> feel about it. I'm comfortable -- I'm very comfortable <br> recommending this conciliation agreement, and I think <br> that the -- you know, and I think -- I think Mike -- <br> Mr. Laverde is fully informed about it, doesn't agree <br> with it, but I don't -- I don't have any -- but <br> that's -- and for those reasons. So I just -- I would <br> just leave that for you to weigh and then, if you want <br> to hear from Ms. Goff, who represents One Arizona, <br> she's here. I don't know if you do or not. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We will. <br> Do any of the Commissioners have any <br> questions for Mr. Collins before we ask for the <br> respondent? <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman? <br> COMMISSIONER PATON: Actually -- this is <br> Commissioner Paton. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yes. <br> COMMISSIONER PATON: I do have a question. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton? <br> COMMISSIONER PATON: I'm reading here in a <br> letter, Number 2, where it says respondent disputes | 1 have about other potential enforcers -- you know, I <br> 2 personally -- my personal view is both with the VSA <br> 3 case and with this case is the IRS does not care what <br> 4 an agency in Arizona has to say about -- about whether <br> 5 or not some 501(c)(3) made a particular expenditure, <br> 6 but nevertheless, we've accommodated this in the past <br> 7 where we have -- where -- we've accommodated with <br> 8 Republican groups. <br> 9 We -- a couple of years ago, we approved -- <br> 10 just -- so just to make sure it's not a partisan issue. <br> 11 One Arizona is clearly, I guess -- I guess, it's <br> 12 non-partisan, but it's progressive. <br> 13 Fair? Okay. But, you know, we had the <br> 14 Republican senatorial action -- political action <br> 15 committee. You know, we included language that said <br> 16 they deny that the Commission has the authority to <br> 17 impose any fines, but then they stipulated to a fine, <br> 18 you know. So we're -- we've been flexible on -- on <br> 19 that, in part, because we don't know what other -- all <br> 20 the other complicating factors that a respondent might <br> 21 have and, in part, because sometimes the only way to <br> 22 get it done is to, you know, not -- you know, if they <br> 23 want to say they don't believe -- in the case of the <br> 24 Republican Senatorial Leadership PAC, in 2016, if they <br> 25 want to say that they don't believe Clean Elections can |
| 1 that its expenditures was subject to reporting <br> 2 requirements as set forth in A.R.S. 16-941(B) and 958. <br> 3 So have they not learned their lesson or -- <br> 4 MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, <br> 5 Commissioner Paton, that's a very good question, and we <br> 6 have accommodated this language in a couple of prior <br> 7 cases. We had a case with -- that we did jointly with <br> 8 the Arizona Attorney General's Office where one of the <br> 9 major issues was the tax and entity formation of the <br> 10 particular group. This is a case called Veterans for a <br> 11 Strong America or Stronger America. <br> 12 Because of those complications, it took us <br> 13 a couple of years to get that conciliated, but we <br> 14 ultimately, in order to close -- getting it conciliated <br> 15 because of issues -- existing issues they had with the <br> 16 IRS, we allowed them to say, you know, that they don't <br> 17 think this is -- that they didn't think what they did <br> was express advocacy. <br> 19 In this particular case, this is my view. <br> 20 Ms. Goff can speak to whatever One Arizona's view is. <br> 21 One Arizona is a 501(c)(3) and, as such, in theory, <br> 22 they're not supposed to -- or a 501(c)(3), in general, <br> 23 is not supposed to advocate for or against candidates. <br> 24 So to the extent that we find that under our law they <br> 25 did, but the -- but the group, because of concerns they | do this, I mean, we're not the thought police, you <br> 2 know. <br> 3 And, likewise, here, like the VSA case, <br> 4 which we worked with the AG on, this is about allowing <br> 5 this group to resolve the case, which is a benefit to <br> 6 our public without -- without having to say anything <br> 7 one way or the another, essentially, about -- well, <br> while being able to maintain with a straight face that <br> 9 if, for example, some other agency which has authority <br> 10 over the tax implications of this, they can say, well, <br> 11 we -- this is Arizona and they can say whatever they <br> 12 want, but they didn't want -- we would be unable to <br> 13 settle this case, I believe, without this stipulation <br> 14 and we would have to go all the way to through -- <br> 15 through the process. <br> 16 And I think that -- I just don't think that <br> 17 those -- I mean, my personal view -- again, this is my <br> 18 recommendation is that that will hinder our ability to <br> 19 resolve the matter for our voters at a -- at a cost <br> 20 that we've not charged -- you know, VSA was, you know, <br> 21 non-partisan but a conservative lenient group. You <br> 22 know, we've done the same thing for -- on an <br> 23 ideological balance basis. So I'm pretty comfortable <br> 24 with it but -- <br> 25 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. |
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| MR. COLLINS: Sorry. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Does that answer <br> your question, Commissioner Paton? <br> COMMISSIONER PATON: Yes. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I believe <br> Commissioner Meyer had a question. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman, I have <br> two questions. The first one is for Tom. <br> Do you know, did Mr. Laverde plan to attend our meeting last week, but we then had to move it? <br> MR. COLLINS: No. He was definitely not planning on attending last week's meeting. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: And, then, the other <br> question I had is regarding Commissioner Paton's <br> question on this language in paragraph 2. You know, <br> it's common in commercial litigation, when you settle a <br> case, that you have a clause in there that says neither <br> party is admitting liability or anything like that. <br> Is this, sort of, akin to that? <br> MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner <br> Meyer, yes. I mean, it's essentially -- they're <br> 22 admitting liability to us, which is important, but <br> 23 they're stipulating that liability is to us only and <br> 24 that they would -- they're hoping by this clause to <br> 25 reserve the right to contest that if it comes up, I | 1 conciliation. The amount of the proposed conciliation <br> 2 is more than sufficient and, as Mr. Collins mentioned, <br> 3 there was a similar case in 2015 with a Republican <br> 4 group, the Veterans for a Strong America. And they <br> 5 were -- they only ended up paying $\$ 2,000$ per that <br> 6 conciliation, which is significantly less than the <br> 7 amount that we're looking at here, even though, I <br> 8 think, that they had a stronger case against them <br> 9 because the candidate at issue was not an incumbent. <br> 10 So they were just running for office, and <br> 11 so there wasn't really a clear interpretation, other <br> 12 than express advocacy; whereas, here, because the <br> 13 candidates at issue were, in fact, in office and the <br> 14 text of the literature that we're talking about was <br> 15 simply asking people to call their representatives, <br> 16 there's a stronger case here for a reasonable <br> 17 interpretation, other than express advocacy, and that <br> standard comes from the Wisconsin Right to Life case. <br> So in light of that objective standard, you <br> know, we're not looking at what was their intent. <br> 21 We're looking at no reasonable -- no reasonable <br> 22 interpretation other than that intent. So in light of <br> 23 that standard and in light of this similar <br> 24 conciliation -- this case with a similar conciliation <br> 25 in 2015, we think that this is a fair conciliation in |
| 1 think. And, again, Ms. Goff can -- if you want to <br> 2 get -- I don't know if you can get into that. I'm <br> speculating, based on my -- I don't have inside <br> information about the -- about the operations of One <br> Arizona. I don't know if Ms. Goff can answer these <br> questions with, you know -- <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman, if I <br> could, one more comment. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Of course. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: And based upon the <br> answers provided and Tom's explanation, I'm prepared to <br> support this conciliation at this time. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Any other <br> questions for Mr. Collins before we ask the respondent <br> to -- if she wants to speak? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Do you wish to speak? <br> MS. GOFF: Yes. Thanks. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Could you identify <br> yourself for the record, please? <br> MS. GOFF: Kirin Goff, with the Torres Law <br> Group, on behalf of One Arizona. And I think that the <br> Commission addressed most of our concerns, but I wanted <br> to have an opportunity to make our position clear. <br> 25 We urge you to vote yes on this | this case. <br> And I would need to speak with the client <br> about it, but we're likely to appeal if this <br> conciliation doesn't move forward because we have a <br> strong argument and -- so, yeah, thanks for hearing our thoughts. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Mr. Chairman? <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Meyer. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: A point of <br> clarification. <br> Is One Arizona -- is it an LLC? Is it a <br> corporation? Is it -- what is the -- what is the <br> entity? <br> MS. GOFF: I apologize. I'm not the <br> attorney that originally worked this case. So I don't <br> have those details off the top of my head. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Do you know, Tom, <br> because -- <br> MS. GOFF: I believe -- <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: We can look at the <br> agreement. <br> MR. COLLINS: I think it's an LLC, but we <br> can -- I'm sure we can work on the amendment to <br> identify the -- <br> 25 MS. GOFF: Sure. |

1 COMMISSIONER MEYER: But it's not a substantive thing. I just thought it would be cleaner to --
MR. COLLINS: Sure, sure. No, I
understand. I'm almost 100 percent certain it's an 6 LLC.
7 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any other questions for Ms. Goff?
9 COMMISSIONER CHAN: I just have a comment, 0 but it's really not for Ms. Goff. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Paton, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER PATON: No. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Goff. MS. GOFF: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Commissioner Chan? COMMISSIONER CHAN: I wanted to share with the other commissioners I'm willing to support the conciliation agreement today. The only thing that bothers me about it is nothing to do, really, with the conciliation agreement itself, but it's the fact that groups like One Arizona and the other -- the veterans 24 group that was referenced, you know, they're dark money 25 groups. And they hide who their donors are for reasons
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I have no idea why.
2 And if you want to respond, you are welcome to. I didn't want to put you on the spot.
MS. GOFF: That's all right.
COMMISSIONER CHAN: My feeling is that,
yes, this language about they're not -- they're
disputing that their expenditure was subject to our
reporting requirements. I understand why that's in
9 there, and I -- as a lawyer, I can't disagree with
0 putting that in there on their behalf, but I feel like
1 these dark money groups cannot have it both ways. They
12 should not be able to have it both ways. If they're
13 going to incorporate under the IRS rules, then they
14 should not be playing in elections fast and loose and
15 advocating for or against candidates.
16 And I just wanted to get that on the record
17 because it's something that I have a real philosophical
18 problem with and I have since Citizens United, and I
19 think that I'm not the only person in America that
20 feels that way. So I didn't want to do that while
21 Ms . Goff was up there because it has nothing to do with
22 you or your client, in particular, but it's just
23 something that, obviously, is an issue that's very
24 important to me.
25 I would say that with regard to the $\$ 5,200$,

1 I don't have a problem with that amount. You know,
2 apparently, they spent 84,000 , which is a huge amount.
3 I would say that when considering what a penalty should
4 be -- and I don't know if there's statutory guidance
5 that prohibits this, but it would make sense to me that
6 if we had somebody or an organization that was,
7 quote/unquote, you know, playing in elections, spending
8 their money in elections, if they were somebody that
9 knew what they were doing, should have known what they
10 were doing, maybe has been before us before, I would
11 think that maybe we would try to go for a -- for a
12 penalty that would be a little bit more of a deterrent,
13 such as Mr. Laverde suggested, but I don't think we
14 need to do that in every case.
15 I feel like people need to get a fair shake
16 and people make mistakes. The cynic in me says, you
17 know, when you're represented by a lawyer, you should
18 be a little more careful and understand that this is
19 what you might be up for.
20 So I just wanted to make those comments. I
21 will support the conciliation agreement, but those are
22 my feelings on this matter. And I -- I know the
23 Commission does not have jurisdiction over -- over
24 whether or not people organize under the IRS as a 501
25 or not, but that really, really bothers me when people
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1 try to have it both ways. I think that's very
2 dishonest, intellectually dishonest. So -- but that's
3 where we are.
4 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you,
5 Commissioner Chan.
6 Any other comments? Did you want to
7 address any of that?
8 MS. GOFF: No. That's all right.
9 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.
10 Okay. Do we have a motion on whether to 1 accept the conciliation agreement involving MUR 18-07, One Arizona?

COMMISSIONER CHAN: I would move that we approve the conciliation agreement in the matter of One
Arizona and staff can make any --
MR. COLLINS: Sure.
COMMISSIONER CHAN: -- non-substantive
changes that they feel are necessary --
MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER CHAN: -- as mentioned
earlier.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER MEYER: I'll second the
24 motion.
25 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Any discussion?

| 10:10:27-10:11:23 Page 34 | 10:29:37-10:30:40 Page 36 |
| :---: | :---: |
| (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those in favor of <br> 3 approving the conciliation agreement say aye. <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The agreement is <br> approved. Thank you. <br> Item VI, discussion and possible action on <br> Executive Director compensation. The Commission may <br> vote to adjust the Executive Director's salary. The <br> Commission may vote to discuss this matter in executive <br> session pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431-03(A)(1). <br> Is there a motion to go into executive <br> session? <br> COMMISSIONER CHAN: I would move that we go <br> into executive session to discuss this item. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second? <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: Second. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those in favor of <br> going into executive session? <br> (Chorus of ayes.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. We'll go into <br> executive session. <br> /// | 1 CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone opposed? <br> (No response.) <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The motion is passed. <br> Item VII, public comment. Anyone want to <br> make comment? <br> Ms. Knox, thank you. We missed you last month. <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: We did miss you. <br> MS. KNOX: Yes. For the record, I'm Rivko <br> Knox. I'm representing the League of Women Voters of Arizona. And I don't really have that much to say, but <br> I did want to say missed you all. Because I am -well, actually, the lobbyist for the League at the <br> legislature and the judiciary committee meets on <br> Thursday mornings, which is when you usually meet, I've been there instead, but I do then go back and watch the videotape. <br> And I came up with, actually, one <br> recommendation, that Mr. Collins should speak more <br> 20 clearly into the mic because there were times I <br> 21 couldn't understand what he said, but -- and, then, I <br> 22 do report, give -- provide a summary of the meeting to <br> 23 the League of Women Voters of Arizona's board -- state <br> 24 board, and they can transmit it to all the members <br> 25 around the state so they know what's going on. |
| ```10:29:01-10:29:37 \\ (Whereupon, the Commission goes intoNone``` | 1 And the league has been -- I've been <br> 2 testifying on several bills, a number of which you saw <br> 3 on the list that Mr. Collins provided, and certainly <br> 4 the one that affected -- and we will continue to <br> monitor the one that affects Clean Elections. <br> So you're doing a great job. Whenever I <br> have an opportunity, I talk about the amazing voter <br> education work that Clean Elections does and wish that <br> more people were aware of it. So I keep spreading the <br> word wherever I go, and thank you for all you do. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, and <br> Mr. Collins is hereby directed to speak more clearly. <br> MR. COLLINS: I think all of you have known <br> me long enough to know that's a -- <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's probably not going <br> to happen. <br> MS. THOMAS: We have the minutes. <br> MR. COLLINS: I can -- the only thing I do <br> is muttering and ranting. That's really -- as I think <br> all of you know, and I don't think you want me to rant. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Which brings us to <br> adjournment. <br> Is there a motion to adjourn? <br> COMMISSIONER MEYER: So moved. <br> CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Second? |



|  |  | ```August (1) 5:21 authority (4) 5:9,18; 24:16;25:9 authorized (1) 16:4 automatically (1) 21:1 aware (2) 6:19;37:9 aye (4) 4:4;15:13;34:3; 35:24 ayes (6) 4:5;15:14; 34:4,22;35:25;38:3``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { can (24) 5:7;8:2;9:10; } \\ 10: 19 ; 12: 5 ; 17: 4,13 ; \\ 18: 3,14 ; 19: 23 ; 20: 25 ; \\ 23: 20 ; 24: 25 ; 25: 10,11 ; \\ 27: 1,2,5 ; 29: 20,23,23 ; \\ 33: 15 ; 36: 24 ; 37: 18 \\ \text { candidate }(3) 7: 5 ; 14: 9 ; \\ 28: 9 \\ \text { candidates }(13) 4: 20 ; \\ 5: 10,23 ; 6: 2 ; 12: 17,18 \\ 25 ; 14: 2,16 ; 19: 14 ; \\ 23: 23 ; 28: 13 ; 31: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Code (2) 11:20,23 } \\ & \text { COLLINS (41) 4:12; } \\ & 7: 21,24 ; 9: 18,23 ; 10: 1 \\ & \text { 10,13,15,19,23;12:23; } \\ & 15: 6,22 ; 16: 11,13,15 ; \\ & 17: 5,9,15 ; 18: 7,8,11,13 \\ & 18 ; 22: 16 ; 23: 4 ; 26: 1,11 \\ & 20 ; 27: 14 ; 28: 2 ; 29: 22 ; \\ & 30: 4 ; 33: 16,19 ; 36: 19 \\ & 37: 3,12,13,18 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ |  |  |  |  |
| \$ |  |  |  |  |
| \$2,000 (1) 28 |  |  |  |  |
| \$5,200 (3) 19:25;20:9; |  |  |  |  |
| :1 |  |  |  |  |
| \$95,000 (1) 21:19 |  |  |  |  |
| / |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Collins' (1) } 35: 16 \\ & \text { comfortable (4) } 21: 6 \text {; } \\ & 22: 5,5 ; 25: 23 \\ & \text { comment (4) } 27: 8 ; 30: 9 \text {; } \end{aligned}$ |
| /// (2) 34:25;38:10 | always (3) 7:25;8:14,15 <br> amazing (1) 37:7 <br> amendment (1) 29:23 <br> amendments (1) 19:18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { back (7) 4:21;8:5;20:5, } \\ 7 ; 21: 17 ; 35: 8 ; 36: 16 \\ \text { backup (1) } 13: 25 \end{gathered}$ | canvass (1) 11:18 <br> care (1) $24: 3$ <br> careful (1) $32: 18$ <br> case (22) 19:16;20:4; |  |
| A |  |  |  | comments (3) 14:24; |
| ability (2) 6:4;25:18 able (2) 25:8;31:12 accept (1) 33:11 accepted (1) 15:17 accommodated (3) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { America (4) } 23: 11,11 ; \\ & 28: 4 ; 31: 19 \end{aligned}$ | backup (1) 13:25 <br> balance (1) 25:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 5,19 ; 23: 7,10,19 \\ & 24: 3,3,23 ; 25: 3,5,13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 32:20;33:6 } \\ & \text { commercial (1) 26:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | amount (9) 5:7;17:5,17; <br> $19 \cdot 23 \cdot 20 \cdot 9 \cdot 28 \cdot 1.7$. |  | ,18 | Commission (10) |
|  | 19:23;20:9;28:1,7 $32: 1,2$ | $1 \cdot 1$ | 5 3 | 8.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| According (1) 16:9 | annual (1) 35 <br> anticipate (1) | basis (2) 5:11;25:23 <br> BECKER (1) 10:5 | certain (1) 30 certainly (2) | Commissioner (71) |
|  | anyways (1) $12: 7$ |  | $12,14,16,25: 4: 3,6,8.13$ | $10 \cdot 6,11,14,17,20 \cdot 14 \cdot 5$, |
| Act (2) 17:22;19:12 action (10) 3:17;4: | anyways (1) 12:7 <br> apologize (2) 12:7 | behalf (2) 27:22;31:10 <br> benefit (1) 25:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 12,14,16,25 ; 4: 3,6,8,13 ; \\ & 7: 21 ; 9: 4,5 ; 12: 10,14 \end{aligned}$ | 6,7;15:3,8;16:9,12,14 |
|  | $29: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bill (11) 5:5,14,17;6:8, } \\ & 20: 8: 3.5 .8 .10: 9: 2: 12: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 14:3,5,6,19; | 18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 13 ; 24: 14,14 ; 34 \\ & 35: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | bills (16) $5: 3,15 ; 6$ | $14 ; 22: 14,18,21,23$ | 13,14,20;27:7,10;29:7, |
| actions (2) 13:20,21 <br> active (1) 5:15 <br> activity (2) 11:19,21 <br> actually (5) 7:14;8:10; |  | , 8,12,15,17,19, | 5;26:2, | 8,9,17,20;30:1,9,11,13, |
|  | appointed (1) 7:17 <br> appropriate (1) $18: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 8,12,15 ; 11: 2 ; 12 \\ & 37: 2 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 17,18 ; 31: 5 ; 33: 5,13,17, \\ & 20.23: 34: 16.19: 35: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 37:2 <br> bipartisan | 29:7,8;30:7,11,14,17; $33: 4,9,22,25 ; 34: 2,5,7$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20,23;34:16,19;35:12, } \\ & 14,15,19 ; 36: 8 ; 37: 24 ; \end{aligned}$ |
|  | approval (1) 12:16 approve (3) 13:24; 14:1;33:14 | $\text { bit (4) } 11: 23 ; 16:$ 17:16:32:12 | $21.23: 36: 1.3: 37: 11$ | commissioners (4) 3.7. |
| added (1) 19:20 | approved (3) 4:8;24:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 17: 16 ; 32: 12 \\ & \text { bless (1) 5:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18,21,23;36:1,3;37:11, } \\ & \text { 15,21,25;38:2,4 } \end{aligned}$ | commissioners (4) 3:7; 15:22;22:15;30:19 |
| address <br> (1) $33: 7$ | 34:8 | blunt (1) 7:15 | Chan (32) 3:12,13,22; | Commission's (1) 5:9 |
| addressed (1) 27:23 | app app | board (3) 11:10 | 10:6 | Committee (8) 5:11,1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| djourned (1) 38:4 adjournment (1) 3 |  | both (7) 7:1 | 18;31:5;33:5,13,1 | common (1) 26:16 |
| dust (1) 34 | Arizona (18) 4:24; <br> $15 \cdot 20 \cdot 16 \cdot 1,18 \cdot 17 \cdot 20$ | $14: 10 ; 24: 2 ; 31: 11,12$ 33:1 | $20 ; 34: 16 ; 35: 19 ; 38: 1$ | compared (1) 8:13 comparison (1) 13.1 |
| adjust | $\begin{aligned} & : 20 ; 16: 1,18 ; 17: 20 ; \\ & : 12 ; 23: 8,21 ; 24: 4,11 \end{aligned}$ | bothers (2) 30:21;32:25 | change (1) 6:3 <br> changes (1) $33: 18$ | comparison (1) 13:1 compensation (2) |
| dministrative (2) | 22; | bottom (2) 16:16; | characterize (1) 16: | $34: 10 ; 35: 11$ |
| 1 | $30: 23 ; 33: 12,15 ; 36: 11$ <br> Arizona's (2) 23:20; | bound (1) 35:4 <br> brief (1) $5 \cdot 22$ | charged (1) 25:20 <br> chief (1) 16:16 | complainants (1) 16:3 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Arizona's (2) 23:20; } \\ & 36: 23 \end{aligned}$ | brief (1) 5:22 <br> brings (1) 37:21 | chief (1) 16:16 <br> Chorus (6) 4:5;15:1 | complainant's (1) 18:17 complaint (3) 16:24; |
| 16:8 | around (4) 4:15,15 <br> $17 \cdot 1 \cdot 36 \cdot 25$ | broad-based (1) 6:2 | $34: 4,22 ; 35: 25 ; 38$ | $17: 6 ; 22: 3$ |
| advantage (1) 12:6 <br> advocacy (3) 23:18; | ARS (2) 23:2;34:1 attend (1) 26:9 | budget (1) $8: 2$ | city | completion (1) 13:6 |
| 28:12,17advocate (1) 23.23 |  | 8: | ation (1) | (1) $24: 20$ |
|  | attend (1) 26:9 attended (1) 14:21 |  |  | (1) $23: 12$ |
| affected (1) 37:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { attending (2) } 26: 12 \text {; } \\ & 38: 6 \end{aligned}$ | C | $14: 11 ; 24: 25 ; 37: 5$ | comprehensive (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { affects (1) } 37: 5 \\ & \text { AG (1) } 25: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29: 15 \\ \text { audit (2) 12:16;13:14 } \end{gathered}$ | calendar (1) 8:22 | clear (4) 20:25;21:20 | compromise (1) 19: concerns (2) 23:25; |
| $27: 1$ | auditing (2) 13:10;14:8 auditors (2) 13:5,8 | 28:15 | clearly (4) 14:23;24:11; | nciliate (1) 19.5 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { against (5) } 12: 4 ; 19: 14 ; \\ 23: 23 ; 28: 8 ; 31: 15 \end{gathered}$ |  | cailed (2) $20: 4,23: 10$ came (1) 36:18 | :22 | (2) $23: 13$ |
|  |  | Campaign (2) 11:20,23 | close (1) 23:14 | conciliation (18) 4:25; |


| $\begin{aligned} & 15: 25 ; 16: 5 ; 22: 6 ; 27: 12 \\ & 28: 1,1,6,24,24,25 ; 29: 4 \\ & 30: 20,22 ; 32: 21 ; 33: 11 \\ & 14 ; 34: 3 \end{aligned}$ <br> concluded (1) 38:8 <br> confident (1) 8:18 consecutive (1) 6:13 consequences (1) 21:2 conservative (1) 25:21 considering (1) $32: 3$ consistent (1) 8:4 Constitution (1) 8:4 contact (1) $12: 3$ | ```directed (1) 37:12 Director (3) 34:10; 35:11,16 Director's (3) 4:10; 12:11;34:11 disagree (1) \(31: 9\) discrepancy (1) 19:17 discuss (2) 34:12,17 discussion (10) 3:17, 25;4:9;12:15;15:10,19; 33:25;34:9;35:10,21 dishonest (2) 33:2,2 disputes (1) 22:25``` | ```expand (1) 5:18 expenditure (4) 17:18; 18:1;24:5;31:7 expenditures (2) 11:22; 23:1 experience (2) 21:10, 11 explanation (1) 27:11 express (3) 23:18; 28:12,17 expressed (1) 18:19 extent (1) 23:24``` | ```formation (1) 23:9 forth (4) 17:22;20:7; 21:17;23:2 forward (1) 29:4 Foundation (1) 21:13 four (1) 8:7 framework (1) 18:21 frankly (1) 7:10 friendly (1) 7:10 front (1) 6:24 full (1) 19:9 fully (1) \(22: 8\) Fund (1) 21:13``` | hearing (2) 9:15;29:5 <br> heck (1) 21:19 <br> help (1) 9:12 <br> helped (1) 13:8 <br> helpful (1) $6: 5$ <br> hereby (1) $37: 12$ <br> hide (1) 30:25 <br> hinder (1) 25:18 <br> hiring (1) 11:17 <br> honestly (1) 21:8 <br> hopeful (2) 6:25;7:7 <br> hoping (1) 26:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | G | huge (2) 14:20;32:2 |
| CO | $16$ | faces (1) 2 |  | I |
| conversation (1) 16:2 <br> coordinate (1) 13:8 <br> corporation (1) 29:12 <br> corrections (1) 3:20 <br> corrective (1) 13:20 <br> cost (3) 20:21,21;25:19 <br> country (1) 21:17 | ```25:22 donors (1) 30:25 dont' (1) 3:8 double (2) 17:17;18:4 down (1) 19:3 drill (1) 19:3 during (1) 9:8``` | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 13 ; 30: 22 \\ & \text { factors (1) } 24: 20 \\ & \text { Fair (3) } 24: 13 ; 28: 25 \text {; } \\ & 32: 15 \\ & \text { fairly (2) } 16: 2,17 \\ & \text { fairs (1) } 8: 20 \\ & \text { far (4) } 6: 18 ; 9: 7 ; 12: 5 ; \end{aligned}$ | General's (1) 23:8 <br> gets (3) 7:20;21:24,24 <br> given (1) 16:18 <br> goal (1) 19:10 <br> goals (1) 19:11 <br> goes (1) $35: 1$ <br> Goff (20) 15:25;17:4,7; | idea (1) 31:1 <br> identified (1) 13:24 <br> identify (2) 27:19;29:24 <br> identifying (1) 19:14 <br> ideological (1) 25:23 <br> II (1) 3:17 <br> III (1) $4: 9$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { County (2) } 4: 18 ; 5: 19 \\ \text { couple (8) } 5: 2,2,3,14 ; \\ 7: 1 ; 23: 6,13 ; 24: 9 \end{gathered}$ | E | $\begin{gathered} 13: 18 \\ \text { fast (1) } 31: 14 \\ \text { faster (1) } 21: 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 12 ; 23: 20 ; 27: 1,5,18 \\ & 21,21 ; 29: 14,19,25 ; \\ & 30: 8,10,15,16 ; 31: 4,21 \end{aligned}$ | impact (1) 6:4 <br> implications (2) 20:16; $25: 10$ |
| course (1) 27:9 <br> cover (1) 35:4 <br> criticism (1) 16:17 <br> curiosity (1) $10: 21$ <br> cycle (1) $22: 3$ <br> cynic (1) $32: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { earlier (2) } 18: 10 ; 33: 21 \\ & \text { early (5) 4:21;5:6,6; } \\ & 6: 17 ; 8: 2 \\ & \text { easy (1) } 10: 23 \\ & \text { education (1) } 37: 8 \\ & \text { effect (1) } 21: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fault (1) } 14: 23 \\ & \text { favor (6) } 4: 3 ; 15: 12 ; \\ & 34: 2,20 ; 35: 23 ; 38: 2 \\ & \text { feedback (1) } 7: 4 \\ & \text { feel (4) } 22: 5 ; 31: 10 ; \\ & 32: 15 ; 33: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 33:8 going-home (1) 9:1 Good (3) 3:3;13:9;23:5 governor's (1) 22:2 Gowan (2) 5:20;6:7 grateful (1) 18:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { important (2) } 26: 22 ; \\ & \quad 31: 24 \\ & \text { impose (1) } 24: 17 \\ & \text { impressed (1) } 14: 8 \\ & \text { included (1) } 24: 15 \\ & \text { inclusive (1) } 16: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
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