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PROCEEDING

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: All right. It is 9:30 a.m., so we are ready to call the meeting to order. So I will go ahead and do that.

This is the open meeting of the Citizens Clean Elections Commission for Thursday, March 25th, 2021, and it is 9:30 a.m. I'll go ahead and for Item I on the agenda, call the meeting to order.

If I could ask any audience members -- oh, and I see Commissioner Titla has joined us. Excellent -- ask any audience members to please keep their microphones on mute.

And with that, I'll go ahead and take attendance.

Commissioners, please identify yourselves for the record. And, perhaps, we could start with Commissioner Titla.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: He's muted.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Yes. Commissioner Titla, you are muted. There you go.


CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you.

Commissioner Meyer, do you want to identify yourself?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Good morning. Damien Meyer.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you.

Commissioner Kimble?

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Commissioner Kimble.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. And I am Commissioner Amy Chan, and I am, also, here.

And with that, we can move on to Item II:

Discussion and possible action on Commission minutes for February 25th, 2021.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: I don't see any discussion. And, if not, do I have a motion to approve the minutes?

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: This is Commissioner Kimble.

COMMISSIONER TITLA: Move --

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: I move that we approve the minutes.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Commissioner Meyer, second.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. We have a motion to approve and a motion to second -- seconding. I'll go ahead and call the roll.

Commissioner Titla, how do you vote?


CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Commissioner Meyer, how do you vote?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Commissioner Paton?

COMMISSIONER PATON: Commissioner Paton is here.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. And I am Commissioner Amy Chan, and I am, also, here.

And with that, we can move on to Item III:

Discussion and possible action on Executive Director's report, enforcement and regulatory updates and legislative update, including election and administrative bills such as House Bill 2014 and House
The State of Arizona
Citizens Clean Elections Commission

Public Meeting
March 25, 2021

1 Bill 2110.
2 Mr. Collins: Yes, Madam Chair,
3 Commissioners, thank you very much. I will try to -- I
4 will try to hit the high points here just as quickly as
5 I can.
6 The -- I think the big -- hang on. I'm
7 having a -- I myself am having a technical difficulty
8 here. I apologize. Let me find my way here.
9 Well, I'll start by saying, obviously, you
10 can see there's a full calendar of -- of voter
11 education activities. In fact, today Gina, Alec and
12 Avery are at a -- are at a conference -- online
13 conference on social media effectiveness, which they've
14 done -- this is the second time, I believe, they've
15 attended that conference. And we've found it pretty --
16 pretty helpful in keeping us -- keeping the
17 Commission's voter education stuff in line with
18 industry -- with the developing -- still developing
19 industry.
20 You know, we are excited Gina and Avery
21 will be -- have been invited to participate in the
22 CE -- CE2 educator conference, which is an opportunity
23 to -- which will invite them -- which involves an
24 opportunity for them to meet with civics educators
25 around the state.
26 And -- and -- you know, and Avery has,
27 also, met, which I think is very -- with both the
28 Arizona State College Republicans and the Arizona State
29 College Democrats leadership. And Gina is
30 participating -- continuing to participate in the
31 Secretary of State's election security meetings.
32 A couple of things to check out on the
33 website, if you're interested, we have launched a
34 webpage with information on redistricting, specifically
35 to try to make sure that folks, if they're inclined to
36 follow the redistricting process, have an understanding
37 of what it means to voters, specifically, because, you
38 know, obviously, a lot of redistricting stuff can get
39 into the weeds.
40 A couple of quick highlights and then I
41 just -- I don't want to delay -- delay this -- or I
42 don't want to, you know, have this go too long. We're
43 still waiting for a decision in the Legacy -- Legacy
44 Foundation Action Fund case, which has been pending at
45 the Court of Appeals, we think, since December.
46 A couple of other things, we have two rule
47 amendments on the agenda. We've had the opportunity to
48 work with the Governor's office and with some of the
49 members -- or at least one of the members of the
50
51 1 you know, what that would mean in terms of recusal and
52 those kinds of things.
53 So we got -- the question was if a
54 Corporation Commission candidate wanted to add language
55 to their $5 form, which you can individualize under our
56 rules, you know, would that be an issue, and we've
57 concluded that would not be. It would be simply -- as
58 a matter of course, if someone adds information that's
59 not needed but is not wrong or misleading, our policy
60 would be to approve it, generally.
61 And if you have supplemental question, Mike
62 can speak to them, but as a general proposition, under
63 our rule, we're looking for making sure that the
64 material that has to be on the form is on the form, you
65 know, so that the form is valid. You know, we,
66 obviously, offer copies of the form. You can print out
67 the form, you know, the stock form for the $5
68 qualifying contributions, but you know, candidates are
69 allowed to make their own. So that's -- that's where
70 that is.
71 And, then, lastly, I know we have -- or I
72 anticipate we have one -- you should have received
73 today a complaint that I -- you may not have received
74 previously from Heather -- and I'm going to butcher her
75 name -- Mrowiec, I believe, who is a complainant
76
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Mrowiec. Thank you, Ms. Mrowiec. I would love to. I appreciate that. And I understand we can't go too into depth, but the essence of the complaint is that Facebook, in 2019, decided upon some political transparency rules. And so they started reporting exactly how much money they received from any political campaign in exchange for advertising.

So, in this case, the campaign of Dr. Ryan Starzyk spent, according to Facebook, $2,500 on advertising on Facebook. That was 50 ads over about an 18-month time period, includes before and after funding, and none of that expense appears on Dr. Starzyk's campaign finance reports. There's no payments, apparently, to Facebook.

So that discrepancy, either it's somewhere in the report and not readily available, in which it can be cleared up by him providing -- he can easily download a report that shows where all the payments came from. And that would be great, but if he missed logging those expenditures, because his reports balance.

Commissioner Chan, however you want to recognize her, I think -- Ryan for Arizona campaign, and I have provided all contributions. These are ads that say paid for by the non-campaign account, they would be considered in-kind advertising on Facebook. That was 50 ads over about an 18-month time period, includes before and after funding, and none of that expense appears on Dr. Starzyk's campaign finance reports. There's no payments, apparently, to Facebook.

So that discrepancy, either it's somewhere in the report and not readily available, in which it can be cleared up by him providing -- he can easily download a report that shows where all the payments came from. And that would be great, but if he missed logging those expenditures, because his reports balance.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Sure.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Tom. Kara, did you need to add anything to what you've said?

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Mrowiec. Thank you, Ms. Mrowiec.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Now, Ms. -- and I don't want to -- maybe you can tell me how to pronounce your name.

MS. MROWIEC: Actually, Director Collins was pretty close. We say Mrowiec.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Commissioner Chan, however you want to recognize her, I think -- Ryan for Arizona campaign, and I have provided all contributions. These are ads that say paid for by the non-campaign account, they would be considered in-kind advertising on Facebook. That was 50 ads over about an 18-month time period, includes before and after funding, and none of that expense appears on Dr. Starzyk's campaign finance reports. There's no payments, apparently, to Facebook.

So that discrepancy, either it's somewhere in the report and not readily available, in which it can be cleared up by him providing -- he can easily download a report that shows where all the payments came from. And that would be great, but if he missed logging those expenditures, because his reports balance.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Tom.

Counsel Chan, however you want to recognize her, I looks like Heather is on the line. So however -- So with that, that completes my report. It looks like Heather is on the line. So however --

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Tom.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Mrowiec. Thank you, Ms. Mrowiec.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Commissioner Chan, however you want to recognize her, I looks like Heather is on the line. So however --

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Tom.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Mrowiec. Thank you, Ms. Mrowiec.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Commissioner Chan, however you want to recognize her, I looks like Heather is on the line. So however --
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you. Commissioner Kimble, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Well, I guess, I do to Kara. So I don't understand what our limitations are here and what we should do about that. So if I ask Tom to respond to that, is that going to be a problem?

And since we don't have the other party here, I mean, how would you recommend we proceed on this?

MS. KARLSON: You can't take action in terms of -- in terms of, you know, finding a reason to believe, or something. You can ask Tom questions. He can respond to you. Ultimately, the decision is really up to you off, but like Tom said, we are trying to get the attention of the Commission earlier, it probably would have been a warning or a request to fix records or on the consequences? Because, in your response, a number of times you said if this had been brought to the attention of the Commission earlier, it probably would have been a warning or a request to fix records or other things.

MR. COLLINS: Madam Chair, Commissioner Kimble, I certainly can try. I would say this. I mean -- and I think that I -- just to -- you know, we -- when we looked at the complaint or as I evaluated the complaint, I focused -- and I think -- and I think I've expressed this to Heather, as well, but you know, I focused on the -- on the bottom line of the knowing violation of the limits.

That having been said -- and in the limits that sort of -- if you look at the way the complaint is structured, it's -- you know, this part is -- I found -- I mean, I think it is very clear the allegations say, you know, this person may have violated the personal contribution limit. They may have violated the primary spending limit and then, there's, obviously, a knowing violation of those as some of the consequences that -- that Heather mentioned.

That said, that -- that was the targeting or the way that the -- the way that it was put together. You know, I don't -- but as far as -- that's just how it was put together. I -- you know, I don't have any -- I don't have a position personally on sending this back to me to review -- or not review. I feel -- I mean, I don't know if I'm -- I guess I should -- assuming I can say that. I mean, I don't -- just don't.

I mean, I think that if that's the Commission's inclination, that's the Commission's inclination, and that's -- the rule is supposed to set up in order to facilitate this. This happens to be the first time we've had someone actually take advantage of this rule and the way it's supposed to work. So, you know, I -- you know, our explanation was, basically, based on focusing on those limits and how we thought that those limits worked in conjunction with some assumptions based on the facts presented by the complaint, but to the extent that -- you know, but like I say, I don't -- I recognize -- I mean, I'm not -- I'm not -- but we don't -- I don't know how to put this other than we don't have any private office associated with it. The goal here is to make sure we get the process right, and so I don't have any position on -- beyond that.

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Madam Chair, Tom, I just want to make sure I understand this. So do you understand Heather's point, which she made, also, in this complaint.

So could you address some of what she said this morning?

MR. COLLINS: Madam Chair, Commissioner Kimble, I certainly can try. I would say this. I mean -- and I think that I -- just to -- you know, we -- when we looked at the complaint or as I evaluated the complaint, I focused -- and I think -- and I think I've expressed this to Heather, as well, but you know, I focused on the -- on the bottom line of the knowing violation of the limits.

That having been said -- and in the limits that sort of -- if you look at the way the complaint is structured, it's -- you know, this part is -- I found -- I mean, I think it is very clear the allegations say, you know, this person may have violated the personal contribution limit. They may have violated the primary spending limit and then, there's, obviously, a knowing violation of those as some of the consequences that -- that Heather mentioned.

That said, that -- that was the targeting or the way that the -- the way that it was put together. You know, I don't -- but as far as -- that's and Heather have a difference of opinion on the facts or on the consequences? Because, in your response, a number of times you said if this had been brought to the attention of the Commission earlier, it probably would have been a warning or a request to fix records or other things.

So is there a factual disagreement with you or just what should be done about that?

MS. KARLSON: I think -- excuse me.

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Go ahead, Kara, if you need -- is it to that point or about the way we're going?

MS. KARLSON: I think that, you know, I'm sorry for cutting you off, but like Tom said, we are trying to get the process correct. So -- so that's really what we're trying to do here. So let's try to avoid that kind of questioning, and you know, to the extent you want that
1 explanation, we can try -- Staff can try to provide
2 some of that information if the Commission decides to
3 send it back.
4 COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Okay. That --
5 MS. KARLSON: Does that makes sense?
6 COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Yes, it does. Thank
7 you, Kara.
8 MR. COLLINS: And just to amplify that, I
9 mean, my view as a Staff member is, yeah, we're -- we
10 are in a position where we are here to -- if there's an
11 issue, the Commission has questions, absolutely, we
12 want to get those answers. So taking -- having it sent
13 back is -- like I said, we have no objection to that.
14 COMMISSIONER PATON: This is Commissioner
15 Paton.
16 CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Commissioner Paton, go
17 ahead, please.
18 COMMISSIONER PATON: I'm troubled by the
19 fact that the person that the complaint goes against
20 had -- isn't showing how those were paid for, those
21 ads, and some of this is -- it's hard to understand why
22 the complaint wasn't -- why it was closed to me. And
23 so for my -- for my reasoning, I think that I don't
24 really understand why it was closed in that respect.
25 If $2,500 were paid for by these -- for Facebook ads...

1 and it's not shown in his report how it was paid for,
2 that troubles me.
3 CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Commissioner
4 Paton.
5 I think what I'm hearing -- and I'm sorry,
6 Tom, if you would like to respond. I just --
7 MR. COLLINS: No. No, I have no interest
8 in responding.
9 CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. I just would like
10 to say that I think that's exactly, Commissioner Paton,
11 why Tom wrote us the email and wrote to Ms. Mrowiec, if
12 I -- I hope I am pronouncing that correctly, and please
13 forgive me if I didn't after you told me how to
14 pronounce it -- and that is precisely why he wrote the
15 email he did to explain why he was closing it and gave
16 us the opportunity to say to him whether we agree with
17 his decision or not.
18 And I -- and I think what I'm hearing --
19 and I know for myself -- I think what I'm hearing from
20 you and Commissioner Kimble may be what I'm feeling,
21 which is I think I would like him to -- I'd probably
22 like to send it back to him to reopen it and give it
23 back to us to consider, if that's the right way to
24 think about it.
25 And, Tom, would that be the right way to

1 think about it and do we need to vote on that or just
2 tell you or not if that's what we want?
3 MR. COLLINS: My understanding -- or when
4 we put together this particular rule to allow this kind
5 of closure with a -- with a postdoc -- or not a
6 postdoc -- with a -- you know, with the ability to
7 not -- you know, with this process, the goal was to get
8 direction. I have -- I think I have a pretty clear
9 consensus from those commissioners, and so I have -- I
10 don't believe there's a vote to be had. I think it's
11 simply a we will do that.
12 CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, and thank you
13 for your work.
14 And thank you, Ms. Mrowiec, for filing --
15 you know, for coming to the Commission with this. And,
16 you know, I think campaign finance is always fraught
17 with, you know, lots of facts and details and, frankly,
18 you know, it makes my eyes go across when I try to
19 think about all the numbers and, you know, the details
20 and things like that. So having it simplified by
21 people who file the complaints and Tom looking at it,
22 and things like that, is always very helpful. Even
23 when he's, you know, making a decision to close it,
24 presenting it to us helps boil it down.
25 So thank you to both of you for presenting...
Committee. We -- our own -- the two bills we've highlighted for Clean Elections purposes, 2014 and 2110, are out of committee. 2014 is sort of self-explanatory. 2110 is interesting, a couple of developments there that are worth noting.

6 One, the legislature, in an attempt to somehow make this a more -- I don't know -- palatable bill to someone, changed the work requirement sentence to a sentence of choice. I'm not sure that deals with the legal problem there in terms of when you're substituting work for the surcharge. You know, our big focus in this has been the fact that they're substituting work for the surcharge here, which is the functional equivalent of the same thing they're doing with respect to suspect, for example, the Prop 208 in terms of just saying, well, this was -- this was this, but we found a way to rewrite the law around this issue. We still think that's wrong.

19 The other thing the legislature has done, which I think will be a significant problem, is that there was a bill in the -- in the House to eliminate juvenile financial sanctions. Now, I don't pretend to have a -- I've never been a -- I've been a public defender. I've never been a juvenile public defender.

25 My -- the problem with -- so this edition sort of is designed to do two things. One, obviously, I assume it is to eliminate financial penalties for juveniles, which whether or not that's the -- how that's written and how that works under the Clean Elections Act and the VPA is one thing.

6 The essential effects of it, however, is that it makes it -- it makes our legal position look like it's harsh, right? So we will be in front of the Senate saying you're doing this illegally and, yes, notwithstanding the surcharge here, which is the legal problem there in terms of when you're going to pass to the extent -- because there's 16 to 14. The hard part about Clean Elections is that there's a committed group of Democrats who don't like it. That group is much larger in the House than it is in the Senate, you know. So our -- you know, our main goal, frankly, is to hope and to work to have this not get a three-quarter vote.

17 The House Rules attorney has provided the argument to the legislature as to why this does not violate the Voter Protection Act and does not yield an argument to the legislature as to why this does not.

MR. COLLINS: Well, it looks like it's going to pass.

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Yes. Tom, in relation to 2110, so does it look like it's going to pass?

MR. COLLINS: And the vast majority of these election bills have passed on a 16/14. The hard part about Clean Elections is that there's a committed group of Democrats who don't like it. That group is much larger in the House than it is in the Senate, you know. So our -- you know, our main goal, frankly, is to hope and to work to have this not get a three-quarter vote.

The House Rules attorney has provided the argument to the legislature as to why this does not violate the Voter Protection Act and does not yield an amendment that requires a three-quarter vote. We spent time with that analysis. We think the analysis is incorrect, and so we do think that keeping the vote under three-quarters is key.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Thank you so much, Tom.
COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Tom.
Anyone else have any comments, questions for Tom?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. All right. I always feel so defeated after we talk about legislation.
Okay. Thank you, though, very much, Tom, for the work you guys are doing for us over there -- Mike and Julian, too.
So, I think we can move on to Item IV, which is discussion and possible action on the following 2020 General Election candidate audits.
And we're going to have Mike make some general comments on this item, right?
MR. BECKER: That's correct. Thank you, Madam Chair, and Commissioners.
Good morning. Before you are General Election audits. As you're aware, the Commission audits all Clean Elections candidates, either in the Primary or the General. These audits, just as they were in the Primary, are very good audits. Our auditing firm that we work with, Fester & Chapman, and the candidates and their campaigns worked well together. We are very happy with the results.
As you -- as you've looked through them, there are some minor issues here and there, but they have been resolved or are getting resolved. Nothing has -- rises to any major -- major complaint or any major issue. So we're very happy with all of these audits. This is just the beginning. There will be more on the -- on the Commission meeting for April, and that should wrap it up.
And so, with that, like I said, they are very good audits. And I'm happy to answer any questions, and I ask that you to approve those audits.
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Comments or questions for Mike?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. Hearing none, is there any comments from the audience on this item?
And, if so, you can signal the moderator.
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay. All right.
COMMISSIONER PATON: Let me just say -- this is Commissioner Paton.
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.
COMMISSIONER PATON: Let me just say that I'm just glad that we're doing all these audits and...
So, please, Tom.

the rules, and Tom is going to give us details.

Elections Act. So we're amending the definitions of

with certain cross-referenced definitions in the Clean

the outcome of AZAN versus State, which was dealing

for a rulemaking related to this item. So we're going

to try to bring out definitions and rules in line with

the outcome of AZAN versus State, which was dealing

with certain cross-referenced definitions in the Clean

Elections Act. So we're amending the definitions of

the rules, and Tom is going to give us details.

So, please, Tom.
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Chairwoman Chan: We didn't roll this up in the last one, did we?

Mr. Collins: This has been -- R2-20-109 has been -- there's been -- it's been a lot of things.

It has been a topic of discussion for many years. So, basically, the upshot of the AZAN case -- so when the legislature passed Senate Bill 1516 and 2016, they drew a circle around IRS-recognized organizations, regardless of their nature, and said that they shall be treated unlike any other political spenders in state law and shall not ever be able to be a political committee.

We and AZAN and the Democratic minority and some unions all were involved in litigation brought by AZAN on this issue. On the cross-reference, we were not successful. So what this rule does is -- and what this amendment does is to say, look, we have a formula that we've developed with the Center For Competitive Politics and lawyers associated with them. So it's a -- which is to say it's a -- it's a formula developed with a group that is seen as a pro-free speech, a more bipartisan cross-ideological content, but we want to make -- and we think that's important because determining the primary purpose of any organization, even if it's accepted by the legislature, still, in Staff's view, requires something other than primary purpose means primary purpose because the primary purpose doesn't tell you when, doesn't tell you what, doesn't tell you time frame, any of those things. We have a formula for that.

So we believe and we've started the process of working with some of the GRRC counselors, including -- including -- I had a very wonderful email exchange with Council Member Sundt about making clear that putting aside what anybody thinks about political committees, this will not apply to those groups that are set aside by the legislature for different treatment.

So that's why the language of the amendment says -- where you get into the formula, it says, you know, subject to 16-901.43, which is the definition that says notwithstanding any other rule, there's no way you can't -- these IRS-enabled organizations are not subject to these parameters, and it, also, notwithstanding any rule that we have to the contrary. I don't believe there are any other rules to the contrary, but nevertheless, as we did with Prop 306, I think it's important to just say, look,
it's not just subject to, but if there's anything
inconsistent with that where somehow we're going to get
an IRS-involved person here.
Okay. So that's it. So, basically, the
bottom line is we would -- under this amendment, we
would never apply our formula for political committee
to an IRS-recognized group, which is what the
legislature wanted us to do when they passed 1516, and
that is the result of the AZAN case. One caveat, this
does not affect the Clean Elections Act so-called
trigger reports which have nothing to do with political
committee or IRS status. They apply to spending -- qua
spending.
So -- so that's it. So we believe that --
you know, obviously, again, we may get comments to say
go broader that -- you know, we may not, but at the
very least, this concisely says if you're in an IRS
category identified by the legislature, the rules --
the formula will not be applied to you because you are
just not subject to the rule.
So that's where that is. We think that
that -- again, it's better to -- it's better to simply
move on. And the fact that it doesn't touch the
trigger reports which, frankly, when it comes down to
trying to track real spending in real time are really
the only tool left in the State's toolbox for that kind
of disclosure, you know, this is -- this just seems
like, again, the best, cleanest way to proceed to get
public comment.
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Tom.
Any discussion or questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Oh, yes, Commissioner
Kimble.
COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Let me just say
despite reading this probably ten times, I remain
befuddled. Nonetheless, I would like to make a motion
that we open R2-20-109 for public comment.
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you for that
motion. Excellent.
Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER MEYER: Commissioner Meyer,
I'll second the motion.
CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Thank you, Commissioner
Meyer.
All right. I will take a roll call then.
Commissioner Titla, how do you vote?
COMMISSIONER TITLA: Aye.
Commissioner Kimble. Maybe you can give us a second.

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: I will second.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: All right. Thank you.

I'll call the roll again.

Commissioner Titla?

COMMISSIONER TITLA: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: All right. Commissioner Meyer?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: Commissioner Kimble?

COMMISSIONER KIMBLE: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: And Commissioner Paton?

COMMISSIONER PATON: Aye.

CHAIRWOMAN CHAN: And I vote aye.

And, with that, we are adjourned. Have a wonderful weekend, everybody. See you next month.

(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at 10:23 a.m.)
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DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 27th day of March, 2021.
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