THE STATE OF ARIZONA

## CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Phoenix, Arizona<br>March 29, 2023<br>$$
10: 04 \mathrm{a} . \mathrm{m} .
$$

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC PO Box 513, Litchfield Park, AZ 85340 (P) 623-975-7472 (F) 623-975-7462 www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

Reported By:
Angela Furniss Miller, RPR
Certified Reporter (AZ 50127)

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

DEBATE WORK GROUP MEETING OF THE CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION, convened at 10:04 a.m. on March 29, 2023.

ATTENDEES:
Commissioner Mark Kimble, Chairman
Gina Roberts, Clean Elections
Avery Xola, Clean Elections
Mike Becker, Clean Elections
Thomas Collins, Clean Elections
Alec Shaffer, Clean Elections
Cathy Herring, Staff
Paul Boyer
Representative Oscar De Los Santos
Morgan Dick
Renaldo Fowler
Karl Gentles
Gianna George
Tara Jackson
Chris Kline
Leah Landrum Taylor
Rodd McLeod
Lee Miller
Anusha Natarajan
Constantin Querard
Bradley Reece
Bob Robson
Paul Senseman
Lisa Simpson
Leezah Sun
Colleen Connor, State Elections Director
Michael Drozdowicz, Riester
Christina Stone, Riester
Kent Earle
Nicole Greason
Bob Karp

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

Gina.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Chairman Kimble, members.
Good morning.
I echo much of what Chairman Kimble has said, and we definitely appreciate your time and your expertise here today. So I do have a few housekeeping items to share with you. As you'll come to learn, I love slides, so I'm going to share my screen to keep me on track here to go through these housekeeping items and then we can get started with the rest of the meeting.

So let's see. Slide show. From a current slide.
As we've just heard Chairman Kimble, he -- he is a
Clean Elections Commissioner; he will facilitate all of our meetings as the Chair. So as we are operating these meetings under open meeting law, you know, we will follow, you know, to some extent, the Roberts Rules of Order. So as a member, if you wish to speak, you can do a few things. You know, you're welcome to address the Chair and ask to be recognized to speak; or I believe in Zoom we have the hand-raising button feature, if you're comfortable using that, that's another option. We just ask that if you wish to speak, to just go through the Chair.

Speaking of which I know when you received the member directory, we were very grateful to have a group as large as we do and, again, we felt that was necessary with
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## PR O C E E DING

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The March 29th meeting of the candidates -- candidate debate workgroup is called to order.

Good morning. I'm Mark Kimble, I'm one of five appointed commissioners serving on the Citizens Clean Elections Commission and I have the honor of chairing this debate working group.

First of all I want to thank all of you for sharing what I know is very valuable time with us in a service that I know will directly impact the voters of Arizona.

As you probably know, the Commission is entrusted by the voters with providing non-partisan and factual voting information to the entire state and that's a mission that we take very seriously.

We convened this workgroup to identify
opportunities for improvements in our debate process; and just as importantly, we tend to respect the importance that voters have placed on debates when they passed the Clean Elections Act, and we're going to continue the tradition of sponsoring Arizona's official debates in a meaningful and impactful manner.

Thank you all for being part of this process. I'll turn it back to Gina, Gina Roberts, our voter education director for some housekeeping items.
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everybody's background and expertise in all of the different stakeholders that are in the debate process to be truly representative of the state; and so we felt that having that many number of members was necessary, but we do feel we can manage that. Not everybody is able to join every meeting that we have scheduled, and that's okay. But we will make sure that as a member, that you will have your voice heard during meetings. So, rest assured, there will definitely be time for you to speak if you wish to speak.

As I mentioned the meetings are open to the public and you should have received notice on Zoom that these are being recorded. They are also being live streamed to the Commission's YouTube channel, if the public wishes to view, they can either view it through our YouTube channel or they can actually join the Zoom group altogether.

I did send out a member director and a link to everyone. Just due to the size of the group, we just simply won't have time to go around and do introductions. That would probably take the full two hours. So we shared that directory; hopefully you have time to take a look at it so you can be familiar with who the members are. Sounds like maybe a lot of you already know each other, which is fantastic; and that directory has -- has bios, and I think we still have a few updates that we need to do to it. So if your name is not in there, I promise we're going to get you
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1 in there, and that will be updated soon.

We do have a court reporter who is joining all of the meetings to capture the minutes for us. So that's very helpful, just as a reminder, you know, when speaking especially, due to this large size of group here, we ask that, you know, we don't speak over one another and that you, you know, speak clearly for the court reporter. This is also especially important when we get into our breakout groups.

And if you have any questions at all throughout this entire workgroup period, I will be your staff contact at Clean Elections. Feel free to e-mail me, you all should have my e-mail in your inboxes, and I'm happy to help you and support you throughout this process in any way. Again, we are very grateful for you, so we will do what we can to support you during your time as a group member.

And as far as technical support goes, we do have Cathy Herring who you can see is -- is on the meeting, she is operating the meeting for us, the logistics, the technical side of things. So if you need any technical support at all, that's Cathy's e-mail and you can also text or call her at -- at that cell phone number.

So that pretty much covers the housekeeping. Again, we understand with everybody's schedule, there may be times where maybe you have to leave a meeting early or might Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
through some slides.
And so during this process, during this
presentation, if you have any questions at all, it's a great time to interrupt. So, you know, don't feel the need to wait until the end; if you want to, that's fine. But as we go through each side, if you have any questions at all, just again, address the Chairman to be recognized or use your raise-hand feature.

So -- and, you know what, I'm so sorry, I wanted to clarify. Chairman Kimble, are we on the agenda item that's going over the goals or are we going over -- on the agenda item that's going over the debate process?

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I guess -- I guess I skipped over goals, but I think we need to do that; and then we'll get into the current debate rules and procedures.

MS. ROBERTS: Okay. Okay, thank you. So just for clarification then for -- for the group and for the minutes, we are on Agenda Item Number II, that's where we will be discussing the workgroup, our goals, and our timeline and schedule for the meeting. So we will jump into the debate process next, so thank you for that.

As when we first reached out to you all, we explained our thought process in assembling this workgroup together, you know, we are very much of the mindset that just because things have always been done this way doesn't Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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be joining late or you can't join every meeting, that's okay. I would say for the purposes of, you, know just for our court reporter, if you have to duck out early, maybe just drop a note in the chat so she can make note of that.

And that's -- that's all we have in terms of housekeeping.

So thank you, Chairman Kimble, that's all we have for housekeeping.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Gina.
Next I would like to ask Gina to give us a
presentation on current debate rules and procedures so we know where we're starting. In -- in looking at debates and -- and what kind of changes we may wish to consider.

Gina.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Chairman Kimble. Yes, to get everybody started, we wanted to do a very brief presentation on how the Commission currently conducts our debates, both statewide and legislative.

In your e-mails I had sent over along with the agenda excerpts from the Clean Elections Act and Rules Manual where you would be able to see our statutory authority for hosting debates, as well as the rules that we have adopted.

So I will -- that's -- that's really our
foundation, and so I'm going to share my screen again and go Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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9 mean that things need to continue being done that way. We felt it was a good opportunity to pause and take a look at how we are conducting these debates and see if there's ways for improvement. And the Commission operates in a very transparent manner, and so we felt that what better way to do this than gather the stakeholders and those who really have expertise in the area of elections or -- or policy or, you know, maybe it's public affairs and marketing, and -and of course represent voter advocacy groups to get together and review these process -- these processes.

So we've been doing this -- well, as you know, the Commission was created in 1998; I think our first statewide debate was in 2002. So we've been doing this for quite a while now and now is a great opportunity to, like I said, pause and see where we stand with our current process.

So our goal for the group is essentially to take a look at what we're currently doing, what is required by statute, what our rules currently say and see if we can find areas for updates or improvements that really, you know, further the intent of Clean Elections Act and honor the spirit of promoting that participation in the political process.

We are very much interested in, you know, do we expand our debates to other offices. Currently we do statewide and legislative and some federal debates, does
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this mean we extend them to counties; should, you know, we host a debate for, you know, county sheriff or county recorder; should we be hosting debates for city council races? We just had a Phoenix Council district race in District 6 and 8, and those were very important elections. And so our local elections are just as important as our -our statewide ones; so does it better serve Arizona and our voters to host those debates at the local level?

Should we take a look at the eligibility criteria for candidates who can participate? And I'll explain what that criteria currently is in our -- in our next agenda item.

But we can take a look, too, at how the Commission is conducting its voter outreach. It's one thing to host a debate, but unless we can tell the public and the voters and the candidates that this is occurring and get that candidate participation and get that voter participation, that's really where the value is. And so how do we improve our efforts to connect with voters and let them know about these debates?

You know, we can look at, you know, how do we format and structure the debates so that we have that substantive discussion where we can really pull out the policy platforms for the candidates? How do we do that fairly so that, you know, each candidate feels like they got Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
to confirm or edit and verify that we do want this included in the final report. And then at our final meeting, the group will make a final vote and confirm that, yes, this is our final report that we'd like to present to the Commission.

So that's how we intend it to operate. And, again, as I mentioned earlier, with the scheduling, we understand, maybe not everybody can join every meeting; that's perfectly okay. Since these meeting are being recorded, I will send the link to every group member along with the -- or every group member along with the minutes. That way you're welcome to see what happened and you can still be up to date.

So with that, are there any questions on our process or our -- our goals?

And Chairman Kimble, if there's none, then we're -we're --

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yeah, let's move on to Item IV on the agenda.

MS. ROBERTS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, group members.

So now we're going to jump into our current debate process. Before we get into that, I thought I'd share some information with you all about what our current electorate looks like. As you know, we have 15 counties, and we're Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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a fair shake in the process; and, you know, identify throughout that entire process are there any rules that the Commission needs to undertake during -- with our rule-making process to -- to be able to incorporate those recommendations.

So ultimately at -- at the end of our meeting, which as I mentioned will be in our e-mail communication, we to hope to have our meetings through May. Ideally what we'd like to produce is a final report with recommendations that we can bring to the entire Commission for them to review and potentially adopt, and also identify do we need to do a rule change for this to, again, improve the debate process?

So how are we going to produce that report? As I mentioned, we have a court reporter here who will be taking minutes, and so at the end of each meeting, after each meeting, staff will go back and we will take the key takeaways that the group has identified for those particular agenda items, and at the next meeting, we will present those to the group to confirm, okay, did staff captured everything correctly, is this something that the group would like to include in the final report for recommendations?

So essentially we will have our agenda and our topics that we have spaced out, and then at the conclusion of those meetings, staff will do a summary, and then we will present that to the group at the next meeting for the group Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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very grateful that we have folks here from both urban and rural areas of our state, and from information that I have from our voter registration statistics, at least from the January numbers I pulled, this gives you a look at the amount of registered voters that we have, we are just a little bit over 4 million. This slide does not have the new party that has been recently recognized addressed in here. So at the state level we currently have the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Libertarian Party and the No Labels Party.

So that will be relevant when we talk about, in a few slides later, about how we conduct our primary debates.

And then of course we see here, we have a large chunk of ads. Arizona's electorate is not affiliated with any recognized party, so those would be our Independent voters. Which is very important because Independent voters can vote in the primary election; so they would also be an audience member of our primary election debates.

How does our turnout look in 2022? The general election had a turnout rate of 62 and a half percent, which is pretty good in terms of midterm elections. You know on par a little bit. You can see in 2018, we had about 64 percent, and then 2014 that's where we saw -- we see a drop off down into the 40 s .

So I'd say, you know, we'd definitely want to see Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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those numbers continue to grow. This is standard to midterms where, you know, they're always going to be a lower turnout than our presidential election debates. On the primary we had almost 35 percent turnouts, which again is good; we want to continue to see those numbers rise. Historically, primary elections have a lower turnout rate than our general elections.

I'm sure we all have opinions on why that is.
As we just talked about, we have a large number of Independent voters in this state who maybe are not aware that they can vote in the primary or, again, whatever the reasons are that contribute to that; but, again, just to give you some background on where our electorate currently stands in numbers before we jump into the debate process.

So in the Citizens Clean Elections Act when the voters wrote the Act, this is our preamble:
"The people of Arizona declare our intent to create a clean elections system that will improve the integrity of Arizona state government by diminishing the influence of special-interest money, will encourage citizen participation in the political process, and will promote freedom of speech under the U.S. and Arizona Constitutions. Campaigns will be more issue-orientated and less negative because there will be no need to challenge the sources of campaign money.

So the areas I highlighted in red I think are very Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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In our statewide primary we had -- let's see -- all of our -- as you know, on the ballot, we had all of our statewides on the ballots, so we had all of our statewide debates for the gubernatorial office, we did have a Q\&A in the primary and then for -- for the Democratic race; and then we had 35 candidates total that participated in the statewide debates.

And then in the general for the statewides, there were 15 candidates total that were eligible to participate. All participated except in our gubernatorial where one declined.

And then our legislative primary, we had 207 candidates total that were eligible, 45 of those candidates declined to debate, and then we had several that were canceled perhaps because there just wasn't a contested election. We will talk about how a debate will be canceled shortly.

And then in our general election, we had 137 candidates that were eligible to participate, 30 declined, and we did have 10 canceled debates.

So what these numbers mean is over the years, we are seeing greater participation. So over the years that Clean Elections has held these debates, we are continuing to see the numbers rise of the candidates that are willing to participate in a debate, and we think that's great. We want Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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critical to our voter education and outreach plans including our debate process. So ultimately, you know, our debate process is a mechanism to connect candidates and voters on the issues and to encourage that participation in that upcoming election.

As I shared with you all, we have the authority in state statute to conduct debates. It's A.R.S. 16-956 where we sponsor debates among candidates in such manner as determined by the Commission.

I think that's very important. We will go back to that. Therein is where we get our rule process and also where we get into our format.

So we are required to host the debates. If we have a candidate who is -- who has opted in to the participating Clean Elections funding program, if they're a participating Clean candidate, they are required to participate in their debate. There is a mechanism where if they have a conflict, they can ask the Commission to -- to waive that requirement; or if they fail to -- to participate, they will incur a fee.
But our -- our participating Clean Elections candidates are required; and our traditional candidates, we absolutely invite them and encourage them to attend, and traditional candidates can certainly participate, too.

So what does this look like for us in the 2022 election cycle?
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to continue to see that number rise because the more candidates that participate, the more information there is out there for voters, which is ultimately, again, our goal of promoting that participation in the political process.

We have a quick video to share with you that recaps on -- on -- that recaps our debate process, so I will go ahead and play that for you now.
(Video played.)
MS. ROBERTS: So sorry. I accidently clicked a button and I interrupted your video, so I'm sorry. I was -let me see if I can redo that.

Apologies.
(Video continues play.)
MS. ROBERTS: Okay. So the reason why we wanted to share that video is because we feel like that it gives a really good behind the scene view of what the production looks like of a debate and the stakeholders that are involved in it.

So you can see there there was a lot of media that were in attendance. There -- you know, you can see the candidates that were involved, you can see, you know, press gavels that occurred, you can see the equipment that was involved from the production rooms to the cameras.

So there's -- there's a lot that goes into that process. You would see there we had some American Sign
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1 Language information there.

So there's just -- there's a lot that goes into it, and I wanted to give you that visual before we go into it because it's one thing to read the Clean Elections Act and look at numbers and the words, but it's another to actually see a little bit behind the scenes.

So let's jump into our debate process and candidate eligibility.

In order to be invited to a Clean Elections debate, the candidate must have their name printed on that election's ballot. So what that means is in a primary election, we only invite the candidates whose name is printed on the primary election ballot, which means that Independents would not be invited, also write-ins.
Write-ins are not invited because their names are not printed on the ballot.

An Independent is not invited in a primary debate because the Independent's election is actually the general election.

We get a lot of requests from those candidates sometimes to -- to participate, but since that's not their election and since their name is not on the ballot, that could create confusion for the voters to participate in the actual debate.

That's the first step. The next step is the voter Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
soon as the voter gets their ballot in hand, we want them to have access to that debate.

The length. Our rules state that if there is only one candidate participating in the debate event, the format is only a 30-minute Q\&A. That's very important; that got brought up in the 2022 gubernatorial election. We have had that rule for quite some time; we experience that with some of the legislative debates often. So if it's a single candidate, they get 30 minutes.

If there's multiple candidates at the legislative level, we host them for at least one hour. We are always willing to go longer, but that will be at the moderator's discretion. So if moderator feels like, Hey, this is a great discussion; the candidates are energetic still and the voter questions are still coming. We've got the voter/the audience attention, let's keep going, and then they can -you know, the moderator again can have that discretion and decide when to cut it.

At the statewide level, this really depends on -on our partners from a production standpoint. So we do broadcast our statewide debates. That's what we've done currently, and for our legislative ones, we stream those to our YouTube channel. For our broadcast debates, that's going to depend on the programming and our partner. So they could be anywhere from 30 minutes to -- to 60 minutes or, Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
must -- or the candidate must be in a contested election.
So if we have a candidate, let's see State Senate District 1 Republican, if he has no other opponents, he doesn't have a debate. So he's going to win his primary, he's going to go on to the general election so we do not host a debate in that instance.

As I mentioned before, if it's a candidate that is running with the Clean funding program, they are required to debate, and we absolutely encourage and invite traditional candidates as well; and in the event that a participating Clean Elections candidate does -- does not -- let's say they get excused for -- for whatever reason, a traditional candidate can still ask the -- the Commission to host a debate. Or if there's a district where there is no Clean Elections candidate, we will still host a debate for those traditional-only candidates.

So what does the format of these debates look like? So timing, we'll hear in our next agenda item from our State Election Director Colleen Connor who will explain what the candidate filing process looks like; and that's very important because our debates center around that timeline.

So once we know that a ballot is confirmed, we know who is qualified for the ballot, we will start our scheduling on it and send out those invites; and we try to wrap up the debates by the start of early voting. So as Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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you know, whatever, you know, the 57 and a half, you know. I'm not a TV person.

And going back to legislative, it's very important to note that we do -- currently do not break our debates out by Chamber. So we host, let's say, it's again Legislative District 1 , in that one 60-minute debate, you're going to see both -- both House candidates and Senate candidates. Now the reason why we do that currently is because how do we ask the voter and explain it to the voter, you know, maybe we give an hour here and then immediately after 30 minutes and you look at the timeline, these are typically done during the workweek in the evening time, so it's often done together; but also it's cost effective in terms of that, and being able to get the same production going.

But, again, that's just our current process. Who's to say that just because we've always done it that way, that we need to continue doing so?

But those are just some of the reasons why we've done it.

And I'll take --
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Gina, if I could just interrupt you for just a second, Bob Robson has a -- has a question.

MEMBER ROBSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. You were actually just hitting on some of this that I was going to bring it up.
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I've been -- I've been in both places, obviously, I've run for an office -- on the legislative side, I've run for the House and I've run for the Senate; and one of the things that I can tell you is a major problem, is that when you line up all the people that are running and they're not running for the same office, I've got to answer questions that would necessarily would not be coming into -- into my campaign, or issues that would not be coming into my campaign, but maybe on the legislative side but not on the Senate side. And when you're going head to head with an individual, you're not -- and you have two other people that are defending their issues or defending them or whatever, that's really -- that's really not an office I'm running for.

And so I've always felt that it was blatantly unfair each time to a line up all generic legislative candidates where it should be separate and it should be Senate candidates and it should be House candidates because they're running for two distinctly different offices.

So I just wanted to put it -- if I get to put my two cents into this, and right up front, I would say that's one area that truly needs to be fixed. And I think it could be easily accomplished by having the 30-minute debate before and having the -- you know if you have an hour, you know, whatever it is, 30 minutes for the Senate, 30 minutes for Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
off with the Senate with, depending on how many candidates, 30 minutes, and then immediately going into the House candidates. If -- you know, there's multiple, you know, there's more seats, maybe we're looking at an hour for that.

So I think we will need to really discuss how that would play out from a logistical standpoint and also what the, you know, benefits and maybe some of the challenges that that would present for both candidates and voters in viewing.

So, yep, absolutely, great point. Definitely something that this group has -- has the authority to -- to review and make recommendation on.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay.
MS. ROBERTS: So where do the questions -- oh.
Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, go ahead, Gina. I'm sorry.
MS. ROBERTS: All right. Where do the questions come from for the debate?

They come from voters. That's our goal, we want them to come from voters. And so leading up to the debate process, Clean Elections will do a public and voter education campaign soliciting questions from the public, asking them to send those into us so that we can, again, connect the candidate and the voter directly.

The Commission does prepare a draft set of Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
the House, that's fine.

And I think -- I think it would -- I think it would create a lot more of interests -- a lot more interest on the part of the public as opposed to having the generic candidate.

And I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob.
Gina, do you want to address that now or do you want to wait until later?

MS. ROBERTS: Sure, Mr. Chairman. Member -- Member Robson, a great point, absolutely, and that is definitely something that should be discussed in -- in this process.

We will have breakout sessions later that make this a successful debate for a candidate, and so I think that's a good opportunity to further explore that.

As I mentioned, that's not anything that is currently required by rule; it's a format change that the Commission has -- has just done, again, for probably administrative purposes, you know, in terms of producing these debates. So that is absolutely something that can be looked at, and if the group decides that that would be a final recommendation, that will be something that the Commission can -- can consider.

And I think you mentioned Member Robson, about, you know, how that would look. It's, you know, maybe starting Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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questions just in case, you know, for particular districts, maybe the voters, you know, we just didn't get that many to last through the whole debate, so we do have those prepared where we work with subject-matter experts or journalists to prepare those. So the Commission itself, we're not necessarily writing those. We do look at the experts that -- that can tackle the main issues that the State is currently facing, or issues that that particular district or that office is -- is facing to prepare those draft questions; and we do share those with the candidates in advance if -- if we're able to.

Moderators. I think this is very important just from my personal experience. I have this quote here: "A bad captain can make a ship sink. So it is with managers and leaders with their companies and organizations."

So no matter how much planning we do and how much effort we put into the production of the debate, if we don't have a moderator who has the skill sets necessary to pull off the debate and facilitate it in -- in the manner that we require, then it will very likely not be a successful debate. And so it is very difficult -- the Commission has found it very difficult sometimes to find moderators that have that skill set but also have the ability to -- to work with us.

So we've been very grateful the past few years
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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1 where we can work with local journalists in the state to serve as moderators. Prior to that we were contracting with professional speakers. The issue that we found with that is that unfortunately the professional speakers, while they are great at public speaking and facilitating meetings, they usually though do not have the knowledge about issues that were maybe happening down at the Capital, that the legislature was facing or -- or maybe the, you know, the State Treasurer was facing. So it was very difficult for that moderator to be able to draw out more substantive discussion from the candidates during the debate.

So we really need somebody who has an awareness of the issues, but also has the skill set to facilitate that discussion, you know, to promote a respectful environment and also manage the time, and also has, you know, some flair, who is personable and will keep the audience -- you know, the audience's attention.

And then very importantly, this is very important, that the moderator is perceived as neutral. Is neutral but also perceived as neutral. Because we want to make sure that the public and the candidates again feel that it was a very fair process, and there was no bias or leaning or favoritism. So that's a key component for our moderators.

As far as logistics go, we start preparing for our debates at least a year in advance. That goes through Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
learn how to do Zoom, because since the pandemic, our legislative debates have transitioned over to Zoom process instead of being in person; and we assign a Clean Elections staff member to attend every -- every debate; and then we have the follow up of the recorded links.

So continuing to educate the public about, Hey, tune in live or if you missed it, here's the link.

So going into the voters. We promote the debate schedule; we tell them how they can tune in. We let them know which candidates are participating in the debate, how to watch, how to submit questions; and then we take it a step further, we try to explain why the debates are important, why you should watch this.

Because let's say it's legislative, you know, District 4 and, you know, this is an issue that's impacting LD-4 and it's important for you to hear the candidates, you know, talk about this so you can learn their platforms and how it impacts you directly. Or, you know, if we extend this in to city council debates, you know, if -- if you care about your trash and water services, you know, or your library services or parks, we try to connect the election to the voter and then to discussing those issues that they care about through the debate.

Sometimes we fill educational videos with subject matter experts. I think in that preview video, we had a Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com them; we do technical training for them. If they need to Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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everything from the procurement process, because we are a state government agency, you know, in looking at the potential partners that we have to work with and vendors, to planning out the schedule; again, looking at that candidate filing period, making sure we don't host our debates on religious holidays; and again idetify -- identifying the partners that we need to execute the debate, whether that's a broadcast partner, securing the moderators, our meeting vendors and so on. So it takes quite a while to do this.

As far as the candidates go, when we get through that candidate filing period, we extend our official invitations; we send them an electronic invite. We work to get the RSVPs, we often have to go through rescheduling requests. We have a very limited time period, let's say, 45 days -- and not even a full 45 days, because we just -we try not to do them on the weekends, and we have over 200 candidates -- and so we're trying to manage their schedules to get them all to be able to commit to joining. So it's very difficult in terms of scheduling.

We prep the candidates as best and -- and we can make sure if we get one candidate something, all the candidates get it. So that includes information on who the moderator is, the format, any prepared questions that we may have; we send calendar appointment. We have reminders for
couple there where you could see we would talk about water policy maybe or we would talk about the State budget and education funding so we can give voters a baseline of -- of what's happening in regards to these top issues. Or we'll do research; we'll do public polls so the voters can identify what those issues are, and then we'll do film sneak peeks with moderators to say, Hey, guess what, you know, the LD-15 debate is happening next week; here's what we're going to talk about.

So looking ahead to 2024, we have our presidential preference election coming up, and of course we have our primary. There will be one statewide on the ballot; it will be the Corporation Commission; and then of course all of our legislative, all our congressional districts, and do have an open U.S. Senate seat; and of course in the general election, we will have the presidential electors and the judges and justices and so on.

So with that, hopefully I didn't take us too much off of schedule, time schedule but, Chairman Kimble, if there's any questions, I'm happy to answer those.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yes, Gina, there's a question from Tara Jackson that involves Independent voters, which is certainly an issue important to me since I'm the Independent on the -- on the Clean Elections Commission.

And Tara asked: Given the large rise of Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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Independent voters who can choose the primary to vote in and often doesn't realize this, has there been any thought to a primary debate with all of the candidates, including Independent candidates for some of the races?

MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Group Member Jackson, yeah, that's a great question.

So as we mentioned through our -- our rules we only invite the candidates whose name appears on that ballot. So if it's a primary, we don't have the Independent candidates on there, but in that particular legislative debate or statewide debate, all of the Party candidates are included and invited.

So for example, if we are looking at an LD-5 debate, currently -- and, of course, in this is up for discussion -- we will have the Senate and House candidates together, including the Republicans and the Democrats.

And so I should mention, too, our moderator and -and in our assets that we use in communicating with the public, we do identify the candidate's name, the Chamber, the seat that they're running for, and who is the opponent of whom. So we do identify that, okay, this is a primary so Senate Candidate A is not, you know, running against House Candidate B. So we do try to explain that, but we do see in our current debate process for LD-5, all party candidates are included in the debate except for Independents.
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has been an Independent for most of my voting life here in Arizona, is that Independents are now in many places the majority or close to the majority, and we know that they're not voting in the primaries; and one of the main reasons they don't vote in the primaries is because they don't know they can and they are not a part of all the -- as much, the communications and marketing that goes out there.

So how are Independents now in some places our largest group to know which primary to choose and the fact that they can vote in a primary if our primary debates don't allow for that?

I'm just kind of looking generally at the overall goals of this group. And I completely understand as a -- an attorney in recovery mode, how the laws were designed at the time 20 years ago, but those were designed when we didn't have more, quote, Independents or unaffiliated voters who now seem to be not included or disenfranchised in a large way.

So I to -- I think it was either you, Chairman, or Gina at beginning who -- who made the comment, that just because we've always done something a certain way doesn't mean we need to.

So thinking about if our goal is to empower and clear communication to all of our voters, what's the process now to do that when close or the majority are now
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So there's some thought there about do we invite a
candidate to participate in a debate that the voters will not be electing in that particular election? What does that mean from a cost perspective? What does that mean from a voter confusion perspective? Is that fair to the other candidates? It's definitely something that's up for this group to discuss.

So that's just the current process.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Gina.
And I think the takeaway that -- that I want people to -- to understand from what Gina is saying is, there are some broad rules and statutes about debates, but there's a lot that is up to the Commission and up to all of -- all of us to make a recommendation to the Commission on how best to do it, whether it's including Independent candidates, whether it's how we handle moderators, and the whole range of other questions that I hope will -- we'll get into as we're meeting.

Tara, I see you have your hand raised. Is there something else you wanted to ask?

MEMBER JACKSON: I just wanted to address that more generally. So as someone who's -- who looks at these issues and given what the call is is to represent all voters and to have clear communications, my biggest concern is someone not only involved in these areas around the State but also who Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
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Independents or unaffiliated? How do we make sure they are part of the primaries?

So that would, in general, anything that relates to that I -- I think should be open for discussion or analysis.

Thank you for the group.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. And -- and it is open for debate and analysis, and that's what I hope we'll be doing between now and May.

With that I'd like to move on to Item $V$ where we have a presentation from the State Election Director Colleen Connor.

Ms. Connor is serving under Secretary of State Adrian Fontes and was previously a Deputy Attorney General, Assisting County Attorney, as well as serving the Clean Elections Commission's very first executive director.

Ms. Connor is well versed in election law with more than 25 years of experience. We're honored to have her join us today to explain the candidate filing process and timelines, and as you heard earlier in Gina's presentation, our debate schedule is built upon key election debates.

Ms. Connor, thank you.
MS. CONNOR: Thank you, Mr. Kimble.
Good morning, everyone. Can you hear me okay?
(No response.)
MS. CONNOR: Yep? Great.
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## those -- those debates off.

So I just again want to point out that that timeline is critical for us because, again, we don't host our debates on really just holidays and historically we don't host them on the weekends. So just something for the group to consider as we go forward is the timing of our debates and when we host them.

Again, thank you Mr. Chairman; and thank you so much for your time, Colleen.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Gina.
Anything else before we move on?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Item VII, we will briefly hear from staff and Commission's advertising agency, Riester, on the 2022 voter education efforts for debates.

Gina.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Commissioner Kimble, group members.

So in order to communicate with the public about our debate schedule and to solicit those questions from them -- and as well as the rest of our Voter Education Plan, the Commission does partner with an advertising firm who is on statewide contract; we go through the procurement process to work with them. So we do have funds from our Voter Education Fund to focus on again letting voters know about Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com deadlines by which candidates for the primary election must file their nomination petition signatures.

And they have to do so by 120 days before the August 6th primary, so that date is April 8th. There is a window of 10 business days by which someone -- any qualified elector can challenge any of the candidates who have submitted their nomination petitions, so the deadline by which a challenge must be filed is April 22nd; and those challenges have to be heard and decided by the Superior Court within 10 days. The Court has some discretion to give a little latitude on that 10-day period, but they're really pretty fastidious about sticking to that 10-day window. There's also, following the Superior Court decision, a 5-day period to take an appeal directly to the Arizona Supreme Court.

So once those nomination petitions are all decided, which should be around early May, we will know exactly who will be on the primary election ballot.

And with the military and overseas voters, their ballots are mailed 45 days before the election. So with ballot printing deadlines, the ballots will usually go out the end of June.

And the same thing -- actually, then there's --

Well, I will quickly go through some of the
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called the certification, that canvas date will be
August 26th; and that will be point when we know who won --
officially won the primary elections and certificates of nomination will be issued, and then the candidates move on to the general election.

So that's pretty much a brief overview of the deadlines.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Ms. Connor.
Are there any questions of Ms. Connor?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON KIMBLE: Thank you very much, we
appreciate it.
MS. CONNOR: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Gina, did you have your hand up.
MS. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
And thank you, Colleen, and group members, I just
wanted to again reiterate, this is very important to our
debate process because, again, we -- we don't know who to invite or who is eligible until we know who is qualified for the ballot, so who has filed and who has made it through the challenge period; and then as -- as Colleen mentioned, you know, we have our military and overseas voters where those ballots go out. So we have a very short turnaround time to identify and get the ball rolling in -- in getting the
candidates their invitations and to actually kicking
the debate process; and so we've been very grateful to work with the firm Riester, who is a local Phoenix firm, to help us execute this plan and reach voters. And so we will have a brief presentation from Michael who is with Riester; he will show you what we've done in 2022.

You'll probably see a lot of a statistics and -and maybe some advertising terminology in there but, again, our goal is to share with you how we've reached voters; and -- and I think one of the questions I saw in -- in the chat earlier from -- from I think it was from Leah Landrum Taylor about voter participation in the debates. As I mentioned earlier, we do see candidate participation increasing and the same goes for voters, too. We're very grateful for voters to tune in and submit the questions to us. We are seeing engagement at an all-time high from voters.

So we share with you briefly about how we reach and connect with them.

So we will turn it over to Michael.
You should be able to share you screen if you have slides.

MR. DROZDOWICZ: Yep, awesome. Hi, everyone.
Great to meet everybody on this call.
And I'll share my screen in just one second.
Awesome. Can everyone see this okay?
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And then the ads also resulted in 8,200 clicks at Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
(No response.)
MR. DROZDOWICZ: Perfect.
So like was just mentioned, we will go over the debates performance from 2022.

So jumping in here. I wanted to provide a brief overview from the campaigns as well. So primarily most of the budget went to TV OTT. OTT is connected television, in this case it stands for "over the top." So things like Hulu and different connected TV programs like that.

And then we also -- radio at that is a very big awareness focus channel as well.

And then we also had some budget going through digital display and video, YouTube, paid social -- in this case that's Facebook and Instagram; out of home print and Google channels as well, so search.

So jumping in here. So this is for the first debates campaign from April 12 to 24. I have this slide program down by Google display, Google search, and YouTube. And where applicable, I try to compare to previous year's performance as well.

So starting with Google display, one hundred and one -- 1.14 million impressions; and then a click-through rate of .72 percent. So industry benchmark here is .1 percent, so very strong performance there.

Instagram. But overall we saw 1.8 million impressions with
a click-through rate of 3.83 percent, and a link
click-through rate of 3.79 percent.
So the difference between those two is click-through rate, that can mean that someone clicked through the landing page of like a Facebook or Instagram profile; link click specifically means they went to the link on the ad or the landing page on the website.

And then I wanted to compare performance to 2022 here -- or 2020 here as well. But basically we're seeing very strong improvements in both the click-through rates of 34 percent, cost per click down 64 percent, link click-through rate up 43 percent, and cost per click down 67 percent.

And kind of comparing why performance improved so much, the main thing that I can see is that we were running only video ads in 2022, compared to a mix of images and videos in 2020.

And then moving into the Senate congressional debates performance for YouTube specifically. So these ran from June until November 8th. And overall we did see better performance from these ads.

So 1.5 million impressions, very high average view rate of 60.14 percent. I called out here one more time that this does surpass the industry benchmark of 22 percent.
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172 cent cost per click. So very effective in driving traffic to the website.

In looking at YouTube ad performance as well, so 245,000 impressions, to go along with 101,000 video views. So a 41.41 percent view-through rate. So essentially how many people watched the entire video in these campaigns.

And then a common trend that we've seen just across the board with these campaigns is that typically we will see higher view rates from the Spanish campaigns. Definitely seen that with this one in particular, so 67.07 percent versus 33.03 for English.

And when comparing to the 2020 debate ads, we did see a decrease a bit. So from 48.77, but the industry benchmark here is 22 percent. So very strong performance regardless. Then the cost per view, how much we are paying for each view. So total spend divided by total views, remain consistent when comparing 2020 at 3 cents.

And then VEG and debates paid search campaign, so not a very high volume campaign in terms of search volume, but during this date range, we did see 335 impressions, 88 clicks, and 3 cent -- or $\$ 3$ cost per click.

Any questions here?
(No response.)
MR. DROZDOWICZ: Awesome. Moving into Facebook performance as well. So this includes both Facebook and Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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And then kind of the same trend here where we are seeing better performance in terms of the view-through rate in terms of the Spanish campaign in comparison to the English campaign. So 63.86 percent view-through rate versus 59.19 percent view-through rate.

And then looking at OTT and programmatic display specifically. So display in this case is those banner ads, and the OTT once again connected television, over 5.1 million impressions for OTT and had a viewability rate of 97 percent, so that view -- viewability rate is basically is -is the full ad in -- in view of the user on that web page or on that browser.

So that surpassed the industry benchmark of 80 percent.

And then programmatic display, so over 1.4 million impressions and click-through rate of .08 percent, industry benchmark here is .09 percent, so very close to that industry benchmark.

And then the 300-by-250 as to top ad sizes were the top performers. We typically do see those being the top performer just 'cause they can serve in the most placements on the Internet.

And then want to look at overall website
performance as well. So this includes both the English debate information page, the Spanish debate information Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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page, as well as all the subpages that users can click on and get to from those signing pages.

115,000 total page views throughout the year; 102,000 sessions, so a session being any kind of like individual person going onto the website; and then users, the difference between users and session in this case is one user can have multiple sessions if they've been on the website a few times.

And then you can see on the graph here kind of where we were running our main campaigns. So big spike in April debate session. Kind of see traffic coming in throughout the year as well.

And then --
MS. STONE: Thank you.
Good morning. This is Christina Stone, I'm a group account director at Riester and I'll be briefly going over some organic social.

So for Clean Elections the social presence really was used to give an audience a behind the scenes look at the debates. The way they accomplished that was by updating constantly throughout the platforms as well as live posting. So we did that through Instagram stories the day of the event or hosting like Twitter spaces or Facebook Live with our partners, on like PBS.

For our Twitter Space live events which took the Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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And with that I want to move on to Item VIII, the next item on the agenda, working session to discuss what makes a successful debate for a voter.

Gina is going to explain how this breakout session will work for all of the members and how the public can also watch.

Gina.
MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, thank you, group members. And -- and just to clarify for everybody, all of these slides from today's presentation will be made available to you all. We'll be sure to e-mail those out afterwards because I know this is a lot of information we're sharing with you today.

So as far as our breakout sessions will go, we are going to take a group and we will have two separate breakout sessions where we will randomly assign group members into those break -- breakout groups and we will have -- two of our Clean Elections staff members, Tom Collins who is our Executive Director and Avery Xola who is our Voter Education Manager, they will facilitate one group, and then I will be in our other group with along with our -- our Chairman and I will facilitate that discussion.

We will be discussing the same topics. So for this particular agenda item, what makes a successful debate for a voter; and we will continue to record those breakout
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audience behind the scenes with PBS, we had a total 912 total listeners which is really great, and we hosted a post-debate Facebook Live event which is really a debrief after the Senate debate with reporters and, again, another opportunity for us to educate our viewers and voters on how much work goes on behind the scenes.

All of the legislative debates were broadcasted live on YouTube giving voters the opportunity to rewatch all of those debates before election day, which garnered 6.8 million total views in 2022.

All the behind the scenes footage shared on Facebook and Instagram did lead to a 221 increase in engagements across both channels; and if you're looking at the graph above, this really shows a range of engagement throughout 2022. So you'll see that Facebook and Twitter audiences did have the highest number of engagements with peaks with the local elections and throughout the debate season.

MR. DROZDOWICZ: Awesome.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, both. Any questions? (No response.)
CHAIRPERSON KIMBLE: So I -- I hope that we've given you an overview of the how we do debates now, why we do what we do, and what areas we might want to tinker with to -- to make them even better.

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC<br>www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

sessions.
So when we get into those breakouts, you'll be asked to select a spokesperson for your group who can at the end of that breakout discussion, come back to the entire group and report on those key takeaways. So, again, Avery and $I$, we will help facilitate the discussion; we have some prompting questions for you, you know, if the group needs a little bit of help in getting the ball rolling.

And so as far as any public members who may be in the Zoom or may be watching the YouTube Live stream, how you can participate in this as a public member in observing is if you were in the Zoom, you can -- we can randomly assign you into a group as well, unless you let us know that you'd prefer not -- not to have that done; and we will not have the ability to live stream the breakout groups to our YouTube. So we will have a slide up that tells you how you may join the Zoom if you still want to follow along. Otherwise, as I mentioned, both breakout sessions will be recorded and those recordings will be available on the YouTube channel after the fact.

So members of the public, if you wish to continue to observe the breakout session, you will have to join the Zoom session.

So Avery and I will monitor the time. So we are now at 11:00; we are scheduled to go through noon. So we Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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1 will be in each breakout session for about 20-25 minutes and
then we will -- Cathy, our meeting facilitator, will bring us back into the main group. We will have a few minutes for each spokesperson to report those key takeaways, and then we will move on to the next agenda item.

So with that, Cathy I'll ask if you can give us instructions on how we join that breakout group or if you just randomly pull us in there? And Cathy, if you can make sure that Tom and Avery are in one group and then Chairman Kimble and I are in another, we will be good to go.

MS. HERRING: Yes. So just in one moment, you will be automatically assigned to one of the two breakout rooms. It will just be one moment here.

Okay. And we do have the timer set for 20 -- the rooms will automatically close in 25 minutes, but the setting also allows anyone to return to the main session at any time.

So if you have any questions or issues, you can always leave the breakout room and return to this main Zoom room or, you know, any technical issues or questions I can assist.

```
            * * *
///
```
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    timing, you know, when we host these in the evening, is it accessible to the voter?

So those are just a few topics for consideration, but with that, I will turn it over to you all to start sharing your opinions on again what you think makes a successful debate for a voter.

Oh. And before we do that, we will need a spokesperson. So do we have any volunteers for somebody who would like to, when we go back to the full group, to kind of highlight the key takeaways that the group has discussed?
(No response.)
MS. ROBERTS: No volunteers? Voluntold?
Okay. Great. Tara. Thank you so much, Tara.
Tara will be our spokesperson.
All right. Well, feel free to chat away. As I mentioned before, please try not to talk over each other as we are taking minutes.

MEMBER KLINE: Well, on Gina's point, I'm -- I'm
Chris Kline with the Arizona Broadcasters Association,
the -- I guess the first piece I think about is just it's
only going to be successful for the voter if they have awareness about the debate, if there's easy access to the debate, whether it's live or it's on demand. Some of that clearly plays into how we communicate and market that, but then also what means and platforms we make it available on. Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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(BREAKOUT GROUP A - 11:04 A.M.)
MEMBER QUERARD: All the cool kids in one room I see.

MS. ROBERTS: Absolutely.
Okay. All right. Sorry, I just wanted to set a quick reminder to Avery don't forget to record.

Okay, group. Thank you so much. So this is our breakout session. So the agenda topic is what makes a successful debate for a voter.

This is your time as members to just converse back and forth with each other. I'm not a member; I'm simply just staff, so I'll be helping to facilitate your discussion but I won't be offering. And I'm hear to answer questions as well, too, if you have those. And, again, great time for you all to discuss any ideas that you have.

And to get started, I'm happy to throw out, you know, a few prompting questions for you to consider.

So what makes a successful debate for a voter? I guess really one of the first questions is why did the voter tune in in the first place; what were they hoping to learn or take away from the debate? And, you know, what makes the debate successful from a legislative perspective or a statewide perspective; and then, you know, how does the moderator impact, you know, the debate for it being successful from the voter's perspective. Think of the
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'Cause clearly if you don't have -- if you don't know it's happening, you ain't going to have any benefit.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah, I agree with Chris. I think the number one thing is accessibility. You know, we talk about is evening the right time to do it, you know to do live. But -- but I think we need to do a good job of marketing the -- or remarketing the -- the recorded stream so that people can -- can view those on demand when it's available to them.

MEMBER LANDRUM TAYLOR: And I think that's a really good point because, you know, I know evenings are typically, you know, the best way to try and reach as many as you can, but if someone perhaps could only see it in the daytime depending on what their work shift may be, then if they are looking at a recorded portion, it would be nice to have some type of an option, where maybe if they had a question, they could still have their question go in, you know, and even -and someone to be able to answer their question.

Now, it may be difficult of course for the
candidate, but at least -- you know, if -- how we can go about doing that, that accessibility is really, really important.

And then I just think just in general keeping, you know, a good decorum throughout everything, which we typical -- you know typically that occurs, but that's something I
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1 feel like that, you know, the public, they want to -- they want to learn; they want to understand what each of these candidates are about.

MEMBER KLINE: There -- oh. Go ahead.
MR. KARP: Hi, I'm Bob Karp. I was a candidate twice for state legislature.

One of the things I think voters come in and they have an expectation of what the content is going to be, and obviously in many cases, you have no idea because the questions are skewed against what many voters would be interested in.

So I think if you advertised at least one topic that would be covered in a debate, you would get people who say, yes, I want to hear what the candidates think about that topic.

I've had people sit in on my debates and went, gee, we didn't hear anything that you really campaign on.

MEMBER KLINE: There may be no solution to this next point, but I think we all know we also live in a short attention span world, and there's a part of me that questions and wonders if there's a better format or a better way to allow folks to consume this content in some type of more bite-sized fashion.

I think it's a taller ask to convince the labelers to participate in an hour long or 30-minute debate, Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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security or school funding, like, there's a certain number of issues that are universal to every legislative race everywhere in the state. Some districts will be more focused on water; some folks will be more focused on ranching. Some folks may have some really specific issues particular in primaries where the differences between the candidates are a lot smaller 'cause they're Democrats or all Republicans, so the differences are more nuanced. If the candidates themselves also get to say, Hey, I want to talk about this because this is where there's some difference, that will make a more informative debate for the -- the people watching.

And then lastly as far as, you know, segmenting it you could, I suppose, bookmark in your -- in your videos, you know, each question so people can go there. It's also up to the candidates, frankly, in their campaigns to publicize it, to send out clips and to, you know, if there's good stuff in those debates, the candidates themselves will promote it for you.

So those -- that -- that's the input there.
MEMBER SIMPSON: I think one of the things that -and Gina touched on this in the -- the general session is moderator knowledge. So to make sure I guess when we're vetting out the moderators to make sure, you know, especially on the state legislative level that they're
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especially if they're watching digitally. But, you know, I say that and don't have a great solution that doesn't then start to edit and paraphrase what we're trying to allow the candidates to say.

MEMBER QUERARD: I'll comment just -- 'cause otherwise I'll end up with comments on ten previous comments and it will get confusing.

I do think that this is very available. It doesn't matter if you're available when it's happening live because you can -- you can watch recorded 2 o'clock in the morning laying in bed; you can watch whenever you want to. So you guys have done a good job in terms of making it available to voters who want it.

Making it available to voters who don't want it is a waste of time. They don't want it.

But you guys have done a good job of making it available to folks.

Making it entertaining, making it informative, I would encourage -- and it's actually a good way to eliminate moderator bias as well, probably agreement in advance that we're going to hit eight topics or ten topics that might be the same to every, let's say, legislative race; and then maybe you go to the participating candidates and you ask them to -- to pick one or two additional topics because
familiar with what's going on in their district that they're moderating for to -- because it's -- it's important to make sure that we're covering like Constantine said, the -- the topics that are -- are specific to that area.

And I wonder, too, when we do marketing, we can segment the marketing and maybe really speak to that district about these are the top three things that will be covered in that debate so that it may entice voters to interact better.

MEMBER KLINE: I think that also touches, the interaction touches on the discussion around decorum and free exchange of ideas and making sure that we have formats with rules and guidelines in place that best position the candidates to allow them to share their ideas without turning the debates into a discussion about the debates themselves, but keeping it focused on the issues.

And I -- I feel like like that is a challenge we have seen in the past that is worthy of some close review as we push forward into another election cycle to make sure that the rules and guidelines in place are the best ones --
I'm not saying they're not, but that is I feel like an ever-evolving line we've got to figure out how to navigate from not just an optics standpoint but also from a (technical disruption) point.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chris, if I could ask you to Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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elaborate a little bit on a couple things that -- that you and others have brought up.

What -- what about the format of debates? And also the decorum, which -- which you and other people have mentioned. Should the format do you think be very regimented as it kind of is now, like you have one minute, then you have two minutes, then you have -- you know, or should it be more free flowing?

And also should there be some changes to improve decorum, both of which I think are things that -- that voters are concerned about; and what can we do to make the debates more palatable and more acceptable to people and in terms of improving decorum and how questions are asked.

MEMBER KLINE: Well speaking first just for -- for broadcasters in the world I represent, you know, our goal much like Clean Elections Commission, is to make sure these debates focus on voter education. And I -- I know we support having very specific guidelines that ensure that the debate progresses forward because I think we've all watched and been a part of debates in the past where it's been so free flow that it hasn't allowed the conversation to touch on all the things that are necessary.

I think the other challenge with being super free flow is it creates the scen- -- it creates an easy scenario where a moderator can be perceived as bias even if -- biased
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1 workgroup has either differing opinions or solutions to that challenge because I think it is one that is difficult to navigate.

MEMBER QUERARD: Constantin here again. I don't know if it's necessarily a solution or maybe just good news, which is to perhaps relax and just let it happen. Because in a debate where a candidate is engaged in name calling, that will reveal to voters more than his answer to school funding or to public safety or to whatever; and how the other candidates respond to the name calling can often be very revealing to the voters as well.

So, you know, if you do have it regimented in terms of we're spending -- we're going to hit the eight topics and you know what they are and you each pick a topic and that's our total of 10 , and then so we've got three minutes per and here's the time per, that gave gives the moderator everything they need to be able to run the debate free of accusations of bias because the time is time and when we're out of time, we have to move on.

But what people say, how they say it, how they handle themselves personally, just let it -- let it go because that's -- that's often the most -- most important part of the debate.

MS. GREASON: Well, I'd -- I'd -- I would like to comment on that. This is Nicole Greason. Hello, Mark
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even if they're not, simply because they're trying to cut off a discussion or move to another topic. And if -- and if there aren't guidelines in place, that falls upon the moderator who, you know, again representing the folks who are trying to put this content out I'm protective of because as Gina mentioned it's not just whether or not they are biased and neutral, but it's also that perception; and perception is everything, we know that in the world we live in today.

So from that -- from my perspective, having very specific guides in place as we do now are super important; but the challenge from my perspective equally so, is that that hasn't prevented a degrading of basic decorum, and it -- it's created challenges as we know with previous election cycles, with ensuring that the topic -- the conversation stays on topic as opposed to personal attacks between candidates; and I think that is a giant challenge that is difficult to manage.

It's difficult to manage because, again, Clean Elections I know is -- and broadcasters who broadcasting these debates, do not want to get into the realm of trying to say what candidates are allowed to verbalize or not; and at the end of the day, right, the candidates should be able to speak for themselves.

And I'm -- I'm curious if anybody else on this Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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Kimble.
How -- how do you regulate people when they're strategy is to attack the other person personally? And you know they've -- and they go that way; and then they also start to run over the moderator who is trying to keep folks on track and, you know, keep them focused on -- on the issues, but they choose as a strategy to attack each other and also sometimes the moderator who they've perceived as being biased?

MEMBER JACKSON: I don't have the answer for that, but I was just wondering -- I don't know how much time we have left -- but what I've been doing is using the town hall recorder model and I have kind of a statement summarizing what everyone has said if you want me to read it out and comment on that?

Whoever is kind of in charge.
MS. ROBERTS: Sure. And just to clarify, we have about five minutes left.

MEMBER JACKSON: Would -- would you all like for me to read this out and see if this captures the discussion?
(No response.)
MEMBER JACKSON: Okay. To be successful a debate needs to be accessible to voters both in timing and the platform used. This might, for example, include recording the debate and remarketing it or making it available on
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www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com voters in a way that is respectful and informative.

Decorum is important as is having moderators who have knowledge of issues specific to the geographic region.

We should create environments that allow the voters to learn and that -- sorry, I'm trying to read my own handwriting.

That allows the voters to learn and -- and that tries to make it entertaining and informative.

Communication and advertising are important, including information about the topics that will be discussed. We should consider alternative formats that allow voters to participate or to receive information in smaller segments or bite-sized formats, while also being mindful that the debates need to focus on voter education.

It can be challenging to find the best balance that allows for an engaging discussion that also allows for the moderator to control decorum. Having clear rules ahead of time helps. Nonetheless it is a diff- -- it is a difficult challenge to keep candidates from making personal attacks while also ensuring that the moderator appears unbiased.

MEMBER QUERARD: Leah had a question or a comment earlier that is probably easily fixed in terms of how people who watch the debates later can get questions answered.

I don't recall if you guys do it already, but at Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
can't tell you how excited I am. Lots of great ideas and we can do a lot of this. So thank you because you all have made some great points.

But, again, you got about two more minutes if there's anything else you want to discuss of what makes this a successful debate from the voter's perspective.

MEMBER KLINE: Just from a thematics standpoint, I -- Constantin, I love the idea of the e-mail address at the end of these -- these videos or debates or some type of connection, because it gets us back to the core which is about connecting the voters directly with the candidates and removing as many middle tiers as possible, and what better way to do that than literally connect the two sides?

MEMBER LANDRUM TAYLOR: Yeah, I agree with that; and I think that's something really important. 'Cause even if you're live at the debate, you may think of something else. I mean, how do you honestly continue the engagement? And that will help people really, you know, just get more involved in general I feel if they can have that personal connect. So I think that's a really good idea with it.

Folks want questions; they want their questions answered; they want to know.

MEMBER KLINE: Well and -- and just one --one-party challenge I don't feel like we've fully touched on yet, but it also feels like we live in a society with an
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the end of the video, it would be very easy to have the contact information for each campaign just stay on the screen there for 60 seconds or something, so if you do have questions for the candidates that weren't answered tonight, you can reach the campaigns directly; and I guarantee the candidates will love to get those e-mails because it's a chance to get back to a voter who cares about something specifically. And so they would be -- they would be (technical disruption).

The other thing is after your -- because you've got a good digital crew and all that stuff, when you guys package these debates for reviewing, there's probably a way to bookmark to jump to, but maybe if you have three minutes on education, three minutes on border, three minutes on whatever, I don't know whether those three minutes could be packaged as individual videos. Because if you want something bite sized, you know, here's your candidates on K-12 funding; here's your candidates on water, here's the -you don't have to watch the whole video or jump to a bookmark, but you guys could probably have the whole video and chapters 1 through 10 or something like that.

MS. ROBERTS: Well, we have two minutes left so if there's anyone left that anyone else wants to comment on, now's the time to do it.

I'll just add personally, this was fantastic, I Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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electorate where skepticism is the name of the game no matter what you're talking about. And so anything that these debates can do to reduce skepticism and be open and transparent, which I know they are, but creative ideas that can further that process I feel like work in our favor as well.

## (BREAKOUT GROUP B-11:04 A.M.)

MR. COLLINS: I have fulfilled my role.
MR. XOLA: Here we go.
Okay. What makes a successful debate for a voter as far as the statewide and legislative debates? So what do you all think?

Oh. First, we should probably pick a spokesperson.
So after all this who -- who wants to take the lead and be the spokesperson and kind of digest all this information?

MEMBER BOYER: I'd like to nominate Bob.
MEMBER ROBSON: No.
MR. AVERY: Any other -- any other --
MEMBER ROBSON: I want to participate, Paul.
MR. AVERY: We going to have to draw straws?
MEMBER ROBSON: I didn't bring a pen.
MR. COLLINS: I will say -- I will say this, our Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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preference would be to have a -- somebody who is, you know, on the task force be the report-out person rather than Avery and I, but if it -- or I; however, if -- if -- if all of you think that will interfere with your participation in the discussion, then we'll -- we'll have -- we can do it that way.

MEMBER ROBSON: I think you would be great, Tom. MR. COLLINS: I'm sure you --
MEMBER ROBSON: Right, Paul? Right, Paul?
MEMBER BOYER: Sure.
MEMBER ROBSON: Without objection
MR. COLLINS: Fair enough.
MR. XOLA: All right, fair enough.
MR. COLLINS: I will take notes.
MR. XOLA: I'm taking notes as well
Okay. So let's -- let's go back to the question, the prompts: What makes a successful debate for a voter?

MEMBER MCLEOD: I'll open my big mouth. Hi, everybody. My name is Rodd.

I guess, you know, I've been -- I spent a lot of time in the last 20 years helping candidates prepare for debates, and one thing I've learned is that, you know, viewers are often sort of incredibly sharp about people even if they're not really informed about issues; and so I think one thing that people get from debates is just kind of like Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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out what you really want to hear from the candidate.
So separating the Senate and separating the House candidates -- and Paul has been in the House and he's been in the Senate, he can probably shake his head with me on these, I think it -- it -- it affects the candidate from the standpoint of why am I sitting here with people discussing things that aren't running for the same office I'm running for?

And it -- it also creates a situation where if you have a very strong candidate running, let's say, for the House and you're running for the Senate, you know, basically being able to monopolize the event itself.

So I -- I felt it -- I was always frustrated by the point when there was Senate candidates when I was running for the House that were in my debate. And I -- and I -because I wanted to truly have a dialogue with the people that I was running with and against; and it -- it just added two -- added two other people to the mix and it made it more challenging because it felt like they were running against me at the same time.

So I -- I didn't -- my experience -- my experience as a candidate wasn't -- was somewhat, I don't know, I won't say negative, but it created some negativity; and the experience from the public was they'd say, Hey, you only got to answer three questions; and here it is, Rodd, you've
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is they really get a read on a person through all kinds of nonverbal and body language and tone of voice and how they interact with others.

I think one -- one thing that is really useful about the debates is that you really kind of get to see how the person operates.

So that's sort of irrespective of, you know, what do they think the right education funding mechanism is; just how people, how candidates kind of behave, I think that's hugely important.

MEMBER ROBSON: I -- if I can? I -- I think as two -- two schools of thought here is debate and how successful for the public, and is it a debate and how it's successful to the candidate; and that's because if you want the candidates to participate, you got to give them some feeling that there's going to be some sort of success and they're not going to be driving off the cliff.

But as Rodd just said, yeah, the public is going to -- is going to get to see the candidate, the problem that I mentioned earlier is that if you don't separate the House and the Senate, you really don't get to see enough of the candidate. When you have -- let's say there's two running for the -- in each -- each party, that's four, six people and you only have a certain amount of time and you can have them in a line with the same question, you really don't draw Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
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prepared the guy for how long or whatever and he gets to answer three questions, it's like what's your favorite color and that you what -- what -- what's the easiest food to buy down at the Capitol?

So they really didn't get anything -- really didn't get anything -- the public didn't really get anything out of it and neither did the candidate.

So I think that you have to look at it from both perspectives: Is the public going to get a value; and is the candidate going to get a value if they show up?

And I -- I think by separating the two, you create the distinction that they are two separate offices that people are running for.

MR. XOLA: Good point.
MEMBER ROBSON: How about you, Paul?
MEMBER BOYER: Yeah, to add on to that I remember a debate pretty vividly, Luigi used to be at Cap Times was my interviewer or, you know, he was the debate person, and he said: Okay, what are your thoughts on immigration? You have one minute.

MEMBER ROBSON: Right.
MEMBER BOYER: And so I'm like how do I expound all of my views on this really complicated nuanced issue in one minute?

And so I -- I think if we could have the question
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1 and the time allotment relative to the -- the gravity of the question, that -- that would be very -- I think that would be helpful, especially for the public and also for the candidate as well.

MEMBER MCLEOD: I think Renaldo has his hand up.
MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think -- if I'm reading the
question right, I think really around issues and topics having really serious issues, sometimes I watch debates and some of the issues I guess Paul he gave an example, he gave a person one minute to answer a very complex question, but also making sure that we have key issues that impact the State. Sometimes I think there are stories out there that are very popular stories for the story itself, but they didn't really address the issues.

Give you an example, you know, Arizona has a water crisis. Was that discussion during the debate in terms of water -- a water policy? So those things I think are important.

And also I represent in terms of my role on this group is -- is voters with disabilities. There are -- I did a little research before this meeting today. There are 1,382,191 adults in Arizona with disabilities. When I look at these debates, I don't really see topics around persons with disabilities. That's 1 out of $20--1$ out of 5 people. So that's 25 percent of the population.

```
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the moderator is exceptionally important and somebody that is strong enough that can control the direction of the -- of the debate because last thing, you know, a candidate wants or even a voter wants is to watch a, you know, a basically a sidecar clown show that gets us nowhere but, you know, you know, all of the -- the ancillary conversations or topics are covered without actually focusing on the issues at hand.

So I think even though, you know, journalists tend to have a better understanding of the issues, you've got to have a journalist -- and it sounds like that's where you're leaning. You got to have somebody who has a very strong command of -- of the circumstances and ability to control the direction of -- of the debate.

MR. XOLA: Okay. Okay. I like that. Sounds good.
Representative De Los Santos, if you would like to speak.

MEMBER DE LOS SANTOS: Yes, thank you.
Okay. A couple -- a couple things, I suppose. The first is what I really liked in my debate was the questions that the -- that the reporter asked, that the moderator asked, were really tailored to Republicans and Democrats. So sometimes we got the same question, but I'm remembering really specifically on the question of abortion, it was tailored so that the Republican couldn't sort of squirm away with a sort of canned answer; and then when it was phrased Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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So my thing is make sure when we have topics, that they are serious topics and that we give representatives an opportunity to answer those questions but not tell stories. So it's a balance between answering questions and really addressing few key issues that affect Arizonans. That's kind of my -- my -- my insight into what makes it effective for a voter; really getting good information, not fluff, not avoiding questions but really, really good and issues that impact Arizonans.

MR. XOLA: Okay. Perfect. Thank you, thank you, Renaldo.

And I saw that Mr. Gentles had his hand raised. Do you want to speak; and then we'll get to you, Representative De Los Santos.

MEMBER GENTLES: Sure. Thank you, Avery.
I think the question what makes a successful debate for candidates is the one we're answering, right?

MR. XOLA: Yeah, right. For a voter.
MEMBER GENTLES: Oh. For a voter.
Well, I think my comment speaks to both the voter and the candidate, but in debates it's easy -- for things to go off the rails and go on to kind of the, you know, the cesspool pit of, you know, conversation that really doesn't address the issues. For instance, like Mr. Boyer said on immigration or one of the cases Renaldo saw, I think the -Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
for the Democratic candidates, it was phrased in such a way that the Democratic couldn't get away with a canned answer. It was really tailored to pin us down and -- and to speak clearly and not in sort of generalities, right, we were -we were getting down on the nitty-gritty policy.

And -- and so I thought that was very useful was to tailor the questions for different candidates of different ideologies in such ways that -- that don't allow us to simply get away with whatever we've put on our website or Twitter or what -- what have you.

So that's the first suggestion.
I think another interesting thing is I'm wondering if the -- the debates were very long, at least mine were. It was multiple candidates; it was multiple-hour-long affair, which is very great for me. I assume that not that many people stayed on for the whole thing, and I'm wondering if there's a way for -- if the Commission, to clip parts of the debate.

Now, obviously, that goes potentially into the -into the lines of editorializing what a candidate might -may have said, but I'm wondering if there's even ways to clip questions, right. And so it -- so you're taking a three-hour thing into maybe a 10-minute segment on particular issues, and if those -- clipping it that way and putting it on social media might make it more digestible
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for -- for a broader audience who may not have the time to sit for three hours and watch a debate.

MR. XOLA: That's a good idea. I like that.
Thank you, Representative.
Mr. Boyer, you have a question, and then we'll move on to the next question -- or you have a comment, go ahead.

MEMBER BOYER: Yeah, just really a -- yeah, just really a comment.

So to follow up on everything. Anecdotally, I do think the reporters make the best moderators just because they're used to, especially how we get candidates off their talking points and I think that's what's best for -- for voters because you want to know what the candidate is really going to be like and how they're going to vote when in office and not just whatever the canned responses are.

The questions really ought to be -- and this is not in disagreement with anybody who's said -- already talked, but just making sure that they're on point to whatever the office is that we actually have purview over. So while I was happy and I -- I mentioned the immigration issue, I was happy to speak to it, but Article 1 doesn't really give us the opportunity to have much purview, if really at all, on that particular topic or what -- or what are my thoughts on presidential tariffs; well, who cares?

I mean it's, like, I can answer that; I'm happy to Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
interested in that one particular question subject matter like election --

MR. XOLA: Right.
MEMBER SUN: -- or abortion or the integrity of it.
So that will work out really nicely. You guys can maybe even create a little portfolio of the questions and the clips of it and even go across districts with the questions that wasn't asked in mine particularly that may be interested for my platform and so forth. That's just a suggestion.

MR. XOLA: Okay. That's an excellent idea from -from both of you. Thank you.

So we have our voter hats on. As voters why would we tune in to a debate in the first place?

It's my district, these people are running, why -why would I tune in? What do you think will make a voter want to tune in to it?

MEMBER ROBSON: So you want me to start off again?
MR. XOLA: Go for it, yeah.
MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, I think you tune in because you want to get -- you tune in because you want to get information. Also you tune in because you want to see how the candidate you like is doing, quite candidly. A lot of -- you know, a lot of -- a lot of time you have a perception of a candidate and then you watch -- you watch a Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
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answer that, but at the end of the day, it's not disability issues or water or, you know, whatever else that we really actually have purview over and so, yeah, that -- that was pretty much it so far.

MR. XOLA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.
All right. Let's -- let's move on to the next question here. So --

MEMBER ROBSON: There's one more -- there's one more hand up I see, Avery. Leezah?

MR. AVERY: Yes. Leezah, do you want to quickly go over those so we can move on to the next question? Representative Sun.

MEMBER SUN: Yes, I just want to echo
Representative De Los Santos' comment about clipping them, that's actually very crucial because, you know, our audience is not very active. And when I was doing my debate, it was very few turnouts, you know, maybe two, you know, at the most, and it's only one party that always shows up because we're such a safe district so we don't get the two parties.

So the clipping is setting up that one question that we can put on our social media with ease and -- and, you know, just having that option --

MR. XOLA: Right.
MEMBER SUN: -- helps a lot because that will be readily spread because sometimes whoever shares it may be
forum or a debate and you go, Oh, wait a second --
MR. XOLA: Yeah.
MEMBER ROBSON: -- this person has really gone far afield.

Ultimately it's knowledge but at the same time it's maybe for your own partisan look to just check in and make sure that the person you -- you support is -- is going to be the person you want to vote for ultimately.

MR. XOLA: That's a good point. Thank you. Thank you, Member Robson.

Anusha, I see you have your hand up.
MEMBER NATARAJAN: Yes. Hi. Sorry I'm a little bit late, but I was just going to add, like, especially from someone coming from the younger side of the demographic spectrum, I just think it's really important to see, like, how they act, how they deal with hard questions and, like, how they will cater to, like, you know, the future leaders, like, what do they have to offer for support running for youth and all of that.

So that's really important for me personally, especially when we are talking about, like, wide-ranging topics of climate change and education, like kind of seeing their platforms of like someone previously mentioned as well, too, but I think honestly just how they connect with the people and their demeanor are very big.
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MR. XOLA: Yeah.
MEMBER ROBSON: We lost it.

*     *         * 

(GENERAL SESSION - 11:25 A.M.)
MR. XOLA: Thought we had a few more minutes. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah.
MEMBER ROBSON: We lost it.
MS. ROBERTS: And I'm sorry, just a quick technical question before Chairman Kimble pulls us back together.

Cathy, just to make sure, so we're still good with recording; and since we're back in the main session, are we live streaming to YouTube?

MS. HERRING: So when we are in breakout rooms, the main room continues to live stream. The breakout rooms are not included in the YouTube live stream.

MS. ROBERTS: Perfect. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.
So will the spokesperson for Group A please report
back to the entire group?
MR. COLLINS: Mr. --
MEMBER JACKSON: Were we Group A?
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: That's a group question. Were we Group A, Gina?
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moderator go back to, okay, but here's the idea, tell me why this idea is wrong or why you want to promote this idea.

MR. XOLA: Okay. Good. Thank you.
Thank you.
We got some other hands. Let's -- Representative Sun, if you'd like to speak to this issue.

MEMBER SUN: Thanks, Avery. I think that for -for my district, I'm only going to be speaking with my district. Again, it's a safe, you know, district and usually our race is in the primary, and you can be just as heated and aggressive to, say, as a general race.

So with that said, I recall that our moderator, the reporter, did encourage us to be forthcoming in our opinions and whatnot; but -- but to similar to what Mr. Boyer was saying, is that we still need to have a level of civility and conduct in terms of personal, you know, attacks. Like, we need to focus on the policy and the subject matter and really push for that, and I think that will make it more entertaining because the audience is there for information, you know, credible information on this debate.

So not discouraging to be contentious but just
based on the subject matter and the policies that we're addressing, not so with the personal attacks. I think that that kind of derails the purpose of -- I mean, it derails the (technical disruption).
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MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, we will be Group A now. We will go ahead and we can have Tara report back.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All right. Tara.
MEMBER JACKSON: All right, thank you.
To be successful a debate needs to be accessible to voters both in timing and the platforms used. This might, for example, include recording the debates and remarketing it or making it available on demand. The debate and the reformatted or on-demand versions should also allow interaction with voters in a way that is respectful and informative.

Decorum is important, as is having moderators who have knowledge of issues specific to the geographic regions represented. We should create environments that allow the voters to learn and that tries to make it entertaining and informative.

Communication and advertising are important, including information about the topics that will be discussed.

We should consider alternative formats that allow voters to receive -- to participate or receive information in smaller or bite-size formats, while also being mindful that the debates need to focus on voter education.

It can be challenging to find the balance that allows for an engaging discussion and that also allows the
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moderator to control decorum.
Having clear rules ahead of time helps.
Nonetheless it is a difficult challenge to keep candidates from making personal attacks while also ensuring that the moderator appears unbiased.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Tara.
That -- as a member of Group A, that was a very good summary of everything we discussed.

What about the Group B, would the spokesperson for Group B report on what you discussed?

MR. COLLINS: So Mr. -- Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time in our group I became the reporter notwithstanding I'm not supposed to be, so I beg your forgiveness for that.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I think we will -- that will be fine. Now we'll hear from Tom Collins who is the Executive Director from Clean Elections.

MR. COLLINS: I think that our group discussed many of the same points that Tara just talked about. I think a thing that we heard was -- from a couple of folks in the group was about how important it is to give folks an opportunity to see candidates interact, and this may be their only opportunity to get a read on who candidates are as leaders, how they interact with others.

You know, as far as -- you need something that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

And then -- and then the idea of how to increase participation by providing other ways of packaging these. Two of our members mentioned specifically how we might be able to take clips from debates, how to we might be able to make sure those get distributed more broadly in a way where a person who might not have the time to sit through a larger debate, a longer debate can get -- can get access to that information.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Tom.
A lot of -- a lot of good suggestions from both groups. Some of them were specific to one group and some that both groups brought up, so I -- I thought that went very well.

For Item Number IX, we're going to break out again following the same process we used for the previous breakout session, but this time we're going to talk about what makes a successful debate for a candidate. We talked last time what makes for a successful debate for the voter, but now we're going to focus on the candidate and what we can do to -- to make debates better for them.

So Cathy, is there anything we have to do to -- to break out again?

MS. HERRING: No. Just one question maybe for Gina, would you like me to set a timer for the second round of breakout rooms? I currently have it for 20 minutes, but Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
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should that be extended?
MS. ROBERTS: I -- I think 20 minutes will put us right on track, that way we can still get to our call to the public and adjournment and -- and have our wrap up, of course.

So, yes, if we can limit the next discussion for about 20 minutes. Then, again, keeping Tom and Avery together and myself and Chairman Kimble, that will be perfect.

MS. HERRING: Yes. Opening up the breakout rooms now.
(BREAKOUT GROUP A - 11:23 A.M.)
MS. ROBERTS: All right. Looks like we are -MEMBER ROBSON: We're different.
MS. ROBERTS: -- recording. Yep, we've got -- I mean, it's random, you know.

And we are recording so we are good to go. So just like our last discussion, this is the opportunity for the group members to go ahead and -- and give their thoughts and opinions on what makes a successful debate from a candidate perspective. So, you know, you might find some overlapping from -- from what you've discussed in the voter's
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perspective, but to help kick things off and help facilitate this discussion, you know, some things you might think about are: Why would a candidate choose to join the debate, what -- you know, how does it serve them; and then why would a candidate maybe decline to -- to debate, so; and when they do participate in the debate, how do they walk away from that debate feeling that, you know, it was a fair experience and that they were really able to communicate with the voters in their district, or if it's statewide, you know, what -- what made them feel good about participating in that debate; and, you know, of course leaving them with wanting to do it again if they run again.

So those are just a few discussions to -- to help you kick things off, but we'll turn it over to the group members.

So, Bob.
MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, first thing off, I think you should develop a Clean Elections toolkit for candidates -CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Excuse me. If I could interrupt. I think we need to pick a spokesperson.

MEMBER ROBSON: Oh.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I forgot about that.
Thank you, Chairman Kimble.
Well, Bob, you spoke first.
MEMBER ROBSON: No, no, no.
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

So it's just one of my thoughts.
MEMBER LANDRUM TAYLOR: That just kind of went along with one of the questions I asked earlier about what was the level of now participation from individuals that come in and view the various debates?

Because as a candidate, you know, number one, you know, the time is very valuable; so you want to sure that if you're going to be at any platform, you're reaching as many people as possible. So how the Commission can work hand in hand with that in order to garner the -- the amount of attendance that's needed. I know it's improved over time, especially, you know, early on. Because when you move further down the -- the ballot, you know, a lot of times folks of course will be there for, you know, Governor and congressional and all that, but as you move down the ballot to legislators, still want to make sure it's getting out there.

So, you know, on the lines of what you're saying, Bob -- and nice to see you again there -- but when -- when you're looking at how in the world can this conversation be maximized on those smaller levels, 'cause the local levels are very, very important in how can get it out there to -to people.

And the candidates want to make sure that it's going to be a robust experience. Also very organized, very
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MS. ROBERTS: By default or anybody else want to raise their hand and join?

MEMBER ROBSON: I didn't bring a pen, so. MEMBER QUERARD: I sat on my hands the first time, so I'll step up this time.

MS. ROBERTS: Perfect. Okay. Thank you, Constantin.

MEMBER QUERARD: Now -- now that I've seen how it's done.

MS. ROBERTS: Okay.
MEMBER ROBSON: But so, I mean, just if I can,
yeah, I -- I think we should -- Clean Elections should
develop a toolkit for candidates. In other words, there should be a marketing kit for them -- and, Gina, we did this one time with me if you remember, but putting together a -a package that you can send out letting your constituents and letting people know in your district that you're participating in a debate, and when the debate is, what the debate is about; and that you can send it out, if you want to do print media, it's up to the candidate, but you'll provide them the stuff: Print media, online-type advertising, advertising that they can send out to their constituent base. You know, I -- I think that's how you get people enthusiastic about the debate and get the candidate potentially to participate as well.
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succinct, nice and clear. Things like a toolkit, that
sounds really good so you know exactly what to expect, there are no surprises.

MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, I just wanted to mention when I did that I think we had 660 viewers that night.

MEMBER LANDRUM TAYLOR: That's good.
MEMBER ROBSON: Which was a great number.
MEMBER LANDRUM TAYLOR: Mm-hm.
MEMBER QUERARD: Could have been a record.
MEMBER LANDRUM TAYLOR: Could have been because you were debating too, Bob, but --

MEMBER ROBSON: Well, no, but I sent it out to a mass group, but it was a nice sharp, clean package, it was well done. Clean Elections gave it to me said who, what, when where, why's and how's. It wasn't anything, you know -- audit turned out a lot of people to watch.

MEMBER LANDRUM TAYLOR: Nice.
MS. ROBERTS: Yeah, I'll -- just to help facilitate the discussion and -- and again provide just informative information since I'm not speaking as a group member here, but to the point about showcasing what the reach is, right, time is valuable for these candidates, and I think that is something we did very successfully with our statewide debates and our partnership with the Arizona Broadcasters Association and the Arizona Newspaper Association, we were
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able to really show them the hard numbers of this is the reach we are bringing for your debate; and so I think that is something that we could extend as we look down to -- down the ballot to some of those other races.

MEMBER QUERARD: It might be so we -- we advise a lot of candidates and sometimes we advise them on, Hey, should I be -- should I debate in the debate or not; and it's not always a yes. So I'm trying to think through the circumstances where the answer is a no and why it is a no and how you guys could -- some of that has nothing to do with you, it's just the specifics of a race.

To a certain degree I think if you can let candidates know sort of how many viewers the average, like, legislative debate had or something, that's nice. Because if a candidate is sitting there saying, you know, 2,000 people see those things, well, that's a lot of people. And so you may -- you know, you may be -- that's -- that's more worth doing than something that 200 people are going to see.

So, for instance, if you have viewership numbers that's useful.

A candidate will participate in a debate if they think it's going to reach a lot of voters, if it's going to provide an opportunity to make their case, so the format is kind of important. The moderator is important 'cause you have to think you're going to have a fair shot at it. And I Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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on moderators?
MEMBER QUERARD: We've had problems in the past with basically bad moderators or moderators whose bias kind of -- you know, we did one it was probably two cycles ago, it was an hour long, we probably did 50 minutes on K-12 education because that's all the moderator wanted to talk about.

Well, okay, that's a big issue, it's half the State budget and even if you gave it 30 minutes that would be too much, but, I mean, at the end the candidates were so frustrated because they had so many things they wanted to talk about. And as I recall that was actually a primary debate, so it was a Republican primary debate that's spend 50 minutes -- and I may be wrong, but a lot of the time on K -12 education. If you've watched Republican primary debates, that's not where you would spend the bulk of your time.

We had a candidate -- we had a debate this last time we raised an objection to because, you know, it's a Republican primary where you had some of the people that were running were very heavily involved in, like, the -- the election audit and stuff like that and we had a debate. It was -- it was media personality who is -- whose Website talked about how, you know, we don't -- not every issue is -- I forget what they said, but basically not every issue is
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don't know, on all these agendas we'll get into moderators at some point in time and I've got -- I've got a number of thoughts there.

But letting the candidates help to pick some of the topics may also go a long way because a lot of these times these debates they don't get to talk about the things their campaigns are about or that they want to talk about, and so if the candidates have some input. Again, if there's here are six or eight topics that every legislative candidate is debating, plus two from you and two from your opponent, or one from each of the four of you or something like that so that you're going to get a chance to -- to get into your sweet spot.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We love -- we love topics that are questions that are native to that topic on the -especially in the area, too.

MEMBER QUERARD: Yeah. So -- so allowing the candidates to have some input into the topics; they don't get to write the questions, but at least they could pick the topic and that will give them the chance to give the answer they want.

Those -- those might always be some -- some things that would make it more attractive.

CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Constantin you mentioned you wanted to get into the moderators. What are your thoughts Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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equal and we don't put up with garbage, cough, election audit, cough. Like, that was literally on their -- their website and they were going to go run a debate for some lady who was a leader in the election audit like this, like this isn't going to be fair.

So, you know, candidates want to know they're going to have sort of a fair shot. And one of the things you could actually do for the primaries that would remove I think you guys from -- from any charges of bias would be to as Republican primaries and Democrat primaries, have the parties provide the moderators. You may not do that for the general election because the general election you may -you're open to Democrats, Independents, Republicans they're all on the same stage.

But if the Democrats are picking the Democrat moderators and the Republican pick the Republican moderators, they can't really accuse you of bias anymore.

MS. ROBERTS: Can I ask a question on that just from a logistical standpoint?

Do the parties though -- if that's, you know, an option to consider, do the parties themselves though endorse particular -- their candidates in the primary?

MEMBER ROBSON: Not in the primary.
MEMBER QUERARD: Not in the primaries, no.
MS. ROBERTS: Okay.
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MEMBER QUERARD: And it would be incumbent on them to find people you, you know -- you could use former lawmakers, you could use whatever; and obviously as the party you'd pick somebody who hasn't endorsed somebody in that race. Like, the party is going to be really careful about not wanting to look biased in a primary because they're going to hear from their activists and they're elected by their activists and the response of their activists. So the parties are really going to want to look like they picked somebody neutral.

The parties can also go to the candidates and say, Hey, we've got these three people. Like, if we turn it over to them, I'd also think that increases the chances that candidates participate because now you can't skip the debate on the basis of moderator bias. Like, oh, these moder- -these debates are all rigged. Well, you know, if your state party chairman, whatever, is picking the moderator, you can't -- you can't use that as -- I mean I suppose somebody could use but it looks bad, so.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Or integration.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I wanted to follow up both with
Bob and Chris from a media standpoint. Do you think moderators should be from the media?

And Bob, you were talking about predictability and there's some -- there was some suggestions that the Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

Because those are generally run by party groups, the parties themselves, Republican Women's Club of Mahai.

So there's probably actually a lot of experienced moderators out there that we don't even know about who are partisan but -- but may have -- may have experience.

MEMBER ROBSON: I guess it creates another challenge for Clean Elections 'cause in the primary don't you generally put both parties together?

MS. ROBERTS: That -- that would be something that would have to go hand in hand. If we were going to look at partisan moderators, we would have to -- I don't see another way around it, we would have to split up the debates but...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bifurcate. Bifurcate them, yeah.

MEMBER ROBSON: I think -- I think it's a great idea by the way to separate them, because it's truly what they're running for, they're running for the designation of their party at that point; come the general election, they're running for the office.

MEMBER QUERARD: Aren't they all -- aren't they already separate in the primary?

MEMBER ROBSON: No. The primary is not separate. They -- don't they keep them together?

MS. ROBERTS: We host debates by district. So Legislative District 15 you've got House and Senate Rs and Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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Ds all in the same one-hour debate.
MEMBER QUERARD: Well, that -- I definitely recommend splitting them.

MEMBER ROBSON: No, I'm -- I think -- I think that -- and that -- that would create a greater participation quite candidly amongst the par- -- the parties themselves; and then when it comes to a general election, they'd be looking more forward to a debate against each party.

MEMBER QUERARD: For the audience as well --
MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, that's what I'm saying.
MEMBER QUERARD: -- I mean, if I'm a voter, if I'm a Democratic primary voter, watching the Republican primary debate does me no good. Which I'm not even allowed -legally I can't even vote in that primary.

MEMBER ROBSON: Right.
MEMBER KLINE: But if I am an Independent voter it creates one-stop shopping for me to pick somebody, too.

MEMBER QUERARD: True.
MEMBER KLINE: Just to add the third wheel to the equation.

MEMBER QUERARD: Yeah.
MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and the issues are focused.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's four wheels with the parties now.
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MS. ROBERTS: We have just a few more seconds, but I thought that sounded great.

And, again, I'm very grateful for all of this.
(BREAKOUT GROUP B-11:23 A.M.)
MR. XOLA: We are back.
Still recording, okay. We're good.
Thank you, Tom, you did an excellent job on that, that was great.

MR. COLLINS: I don't know if we have the same folks in this as we had before, I can't quite tell.

MR. XOLA: Oh, yeah, no. We're a little mixed up with this one. Okay, that's fine. There's some different faces in here, some same ones.

Okay, well, we can get started. Again, I'm Avery Xola, the Voter Education Manager and, of course our Executive Director Tom Collins is also here with us.

We have a few questions but -- who's the
spokesperson? Are we -- are we keeping Tom or is someone else would like to step up to the plate?

MR. COLLINS: Well, now that Tara and I are on in Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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discussion, but that relative to the question and the nature of the topic that you're able to actually just expound your views.

MR. XOLA: Okay. Thank you.
Oh, did you freeze up there?
I think he froze up a little bit.
Mr. Fowler, Reynaldo, go ahead. I see you have your hand raised -- or no?

Ms. Jackson --
MEMBER FOWLER: Thanks, Avery. Okay. So I think someone had mentioned about some of the candidates have not shown up for debates, and I think if they're safe districts they don't show up; and also I think there are topics, I -I have gone to a couple debates around disability issues, and you can pretty much guarantee what party will show up for the debate because they thought the topic itself was biased.

And so how do you -- how do you -- how do you deal with that? And it specific, it was around disability-related issues. And so I think, you know, candidates need to understand that all issues have different a perspective and they are not owned by one political perspective; and I think it's helpful that they may give a different perspective that might necessarily -- might not be popular to that group, but I think it's important because I
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the same room now, so I think Tara has to do it.
MEMBER JACKSON: That's fine, whatever you want me to do. Is that like voluntold? Is that the word for that?

MEMBER SIMPSON: I was going to voluntold you; you did a great job last time.

MR. XOLA: Yeah, you did an excellent job.
MR. COLLINS: Whatever works. We only have a -Gina has us on a...

MR. XOLA: Okay, yeah. Okay, so our first -- first question to the group would be: Why would a candidate agree to a debate? Like what is some pros and cons to, I guess, agreeing to a debate?

MEMBER SIMPSON: I -- Paul has his hand up.
MR. XOLA: Oh. Yes. Go ahead, Paul. I'm sorry.
MEMBER BOYER: Yeah. So it's a struggled to get candidates there sometimes, so just to make sure that every candidate gets a fair shake, and so that way if candidates feel confident going in that they'll be able to get their opinions out there and not just an unfair moderator.

Somebody pointed out in the last session, that it typically tends to be one party that -- that shows up; and I've always thankfully showed up as far as I can recall, even though I was in the minority. So just making sure that, yeah, the moderator is fair.

And then, again -- and I mentioned this in the last Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
think it's pretty disrespectful that candidates just don't show up because of a specific topic or demographic of a person.

I've seen that happen too, where candidates don't show up because it might be a certain demographics and that demographics don't necessarily maybe vote for them, but I think we want to encourage candidates to even go into those settings where there's traditional settings that may not be a safe setting for them.

So that's kind of my -- of my two cents on this.
MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you.
MEMBER ROBSON: Have -- oh.
MR. XOLA: No, go ahead. Please.
MR. KARP: Having participated in a couple of these debates as a candidate, you won't get people/candidates to come unless they're forced to come if they're running Clean, or they're the minority party in an legislative district, unless you get everybody to participate and you do that by advertising and getting the information out of the debate results to more platforms.

People will decide to come when they think that everything is going to be out there all over. And I think particularly for down-ballot candidates like in a rural county where I am running for state legislature, we get very little press coverage and we got very little press coverage Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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from the Clean Elections debates. If the Commission can make more of an effort to get the information out, you may get all candidates to participate.

MR. XOLA: Thank you. That's a good point. Thank you.

Let's go to Member Jackson.
MEMBER JACKSON: I'm sorry, I'm busy writing your notes while I'm talking.

So but I -- I wanted to address the candidates not showing up and incentives for them to show up, and this -this kind of gets back to the comment I made when we are all together, especially as there's a rising number of Independents and thinking about the candidate debates for the primaries, is: How do you incentivize candidates to -to come to these debates?

Part of is if they think they need to appeal to a broader audience, and that's another reason perhaps to look at changes on who can be a part of the debates, and especially included unaffiliated or Independent voters or candidates makes it broader.

It also would address some of the opinions that someone brought up; I can't remember 'cause I was looking down writing the notes, that the candidates also need to come with the idea of learning from the debates. That that should be one of the goals, that it's also for them to Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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way that don't really allow you to wriggle out of -- of giving a direct answer and the moderator is good about following up to make sure that you're giving a clear, direct answer, I think potentially providing candidates questions in advance might be -- might be a good thing.

I also think, you know, it's sort of rare in my time in the legislature so far that you are speaking about an issue extemporaneously that you've never thought about. Like, typically you're speaking about something that you're actually quite well versed in -- or hopefully.

And so I think, like, this -- this skill set is not being able to come up with an answer on the fly but rather can you do your homework and come up with a thoughtful position to share with your public.

MR. XOLA: That's a good point. Great point. Thank you, Representative De Los Santos.

Member Simpson, if you would go ahead.
MEMBER SIMPSON: So two things, and just -- and I wonder, Tom may be able to speak to this, what are some of the reasons that candidates decline to participate?

I mean, we know the obvious one is the perceived bias of the moderator. I don't know if there's another reason to that.

MEMBER MILLER: Yeah, fundraising.
MR. COLLINS: Yeah, well, if I may Lisa and Avery, Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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learn. It's not just for the voters.

MR. XOLA: Excellent point. Thank you. Thank you. Let's move on to our next question so we don't run out of time here. So just to keep with the candidates, we have a lot about why they would agree to a debate, now what are some reasons why a candidate would reject a debate? Flat out say, I refuse to participate for whatever reason. In your experience, what do you think?

And let's go with Representative De Los Santos and then I will go to you Ms. Simpson.

MEMBER DE LOS SANTOS: Yeah, I think to an earlier speaker's point, they just don't think anybody is watching so you have nothing to lose; and the second thing is I think candidates are terrified of making mistakes, making a gaffe, right, appearing to look -- say the wrong thing.

And I think one thing that might help folks out, and I know this is sort of done, is actually having the questions in advance. Now I know that that could be controversial because it gives you more time to prepare a sort of canned answer; but on the other hand, I think it would, one, incentivize people to show up, it might actually promote more thorough, well-thought-out answers if you know what you're going to -- if you know what you are going to say.

And so long as the questions are phrased in such a Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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I think the two people that will be best to probably weigh in on that would be Rodd and Lee, and if Constantin, too.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Okay.
MR. COLLINS: But Rodd's got his hand up anyways,
but -- 'cause I -- I --- I mean, what we hear is in effect essentially some of the things that ave been captured by this already: Doesn't matter, not our crowd, there's nothing to gain.

But as far as how that gets evaluated, Rodd or if you -- or whoever wanted to take that, I think that's -that's the heart of the question, I really, I can't get beyond the official --

MEMBER SIMPSON: Okay. I didn't know who to address that to.

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, no, no, no. It's a good question.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah.
MEMBER MCLEOD: I think people have really nailed it. It's people don't do it because they either feel like the process is biased against them or as Representative De Los Santos said, no one wants to get up there and say the wrong thing being taped.

I -- I would say the way that you deal with this or the way we should think about dealing with it is just getting more people to watch. I mean, when you're -- when Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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going to reach in this particular debate at this particular time folks who I can convert to, you know, my -- to supporting my candidacy when it's time to vote?

And it -- it's -- the candidates that I work with, to be blunt, they don't regard the Clean Elections debate as anything special, it's just another opportunity; and if it's the best use of our time on that day we'll be there, if it's not, we'll be where we think we've got a better opportunity to reach our voters.

MR. KARP: I -- I'd like to follow up on that if I
can.
MR. XOLA: Yeah, sure Bob.
MR. KARP: I want to focus on candidates that are willing to be at the debate, and one of the problems that I had is you go to the debate and the topics suddenly are not even relevant to the campaign that you're running, that people have -- have been talking about in your district, and the -- the moderator goes off or they take audience questions that are just totally irrelevant to this -- to the level of if you're running for the state legislature you'll get something about federal abortion law or something, and there we are, we're now doing one minute each on that.

And if the -- we're talking about making it good for the candidates, and the candidates that show up should be respected enough to have a good experience and I think Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com


And the best use of my time is focused on doing
what I need to do to win. Are the -- are the people I'm Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
MR. XOLA: Thank you.
MEMBER SIMPSON: That's a good point, there's never enough advertising.

I had a second point, I'm sorry, Avery, to interrupt.

MR. XOLA: No, go ahead.
MEMBER SIMPSON: Is does it make sense to
Representative De Los Santos to his point earlier, would it be helpful to have a predebate meeting with the moderators where they're -- I don't know that you're going to ever get us to agree to give you the questions, but perhaps to give the topics and to talk through the format and to get people more comfortable with the moderator that's going to be asking the questions?

MR. XOLA: Thank you, Lisa. Thank you.
Member Miller, please, if you have any comments.
MEMBER MILLER: Sure. The -- the candidates that I've worked with through the past several years, the Clean Elections debate is one of, you know, an array, many, many opportunities that the candidate has to get in front of a group. And the Clean Elections debate, on the assumption I'm not a Clean Elections candidate, the question is simply is: Is this the best use of my time on this day?
one of the big problems is they're not having a good experience.

MR. XOLA: All right, thank you. Thank you.
I think we have time for, like, one more question.
Let's -- so what does a candidate need to prepare for in a debate? They decide to come to participate for Clean Elections debate, what do they need to be successful?

You can -- you can take this Bob since I have you already on right now.

MR. KARP: Okay. Take a lot of downers -- no.
Learn to speak to the issue and to be succinct and to not tell personal stories.

Pay attention to what has been going on in the press about issues and pay attention to the compass questionnaire, which I think we need to talk about integrating the compass questionnaire into debates more effectively. That's what I used.
(Member De Los Santos leaves at 11:47 a.m.)
MEMBER BOYER: I would say if you are running for the legislature the three biggest budget items are healthcare, public safety, and education; just be intimately familiar with all three.

MEMBER MCLEOD: I would say that the idea, I think it was from Lisa earlier, of not getting the questions but maybe giving the topics will -- is super helpful; and then I
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1 Elections debate, especially if they say the wrong thing and it's taped.

Candidates need to feel that they will get a fair shake with an impartial and fair moderator and that the debate will make a difference to their race.

We can address these issues by taking steps to get moderators who are from the geographical area and who are perceived as fair and impartial. We might also consider pairing the moderator with a journalist who can fact check during the debate.

We should create more incentive -- more incentives for candidates to attend, which could include marketing and communication so there's a broader audience for the debates.

Because candidates are often afraid that they'll say the wrong thing and then therefore choose not to attend, we should also consider providing questions or at least areas of questions in advance, and limiting the questions to those that are relevant to the office being sought, for example, not including federal questions that don't apply.

I had one more note to make -- oh. Last one. Here it is.

It is also important for candidates to realize that the purpose of the debate is also for them to learn.

Tom, I don't know if you have anything else you wanted to add from your notes.
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whole debate or here's, you know, the eight different topics broken out in a way that's more bite size and -- and palatable for today's social media.

Clean Elections -- there inviting candidates would be helped by letting view- -- letting candidates know how many previous viewers were watching older debates so candidates can have a sense of the value ahead of time.

Letting candidates know the topics in advance or at least a certain number of topics in advance helps candidates know that the topics they want to talk about will be discussed, which is another reason to participate.

We had some additional ideas. One would be to separate the Republican and Democratic primary debates, again, because viewers are generally looking at two entirely different races and it -- it helps them know that, you know, we can customize the topics to -- to the race, to the candidates, to the audience and produce a better product.

Reliable moderators. I guess you guys spent a lot of time on moderators, we also talked about the fact they need to be reliable as a way of encouraging participation, and one idea was to invite the political parties themselves to select the debate moderators for the primary debates because they'd be less likely to be biased or perceived as biased or to be attacked as biased. They also have a better sense for what issues are important to the viewers and the Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
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MR. COLLINS: Let's see.
MEMBER QUERARD: Expecting that up to my presentation.

MR. COLLINS: No, I think -- I think that's about it. I think that the -- I think that the -- we're just -where candidates are making choices about where they want to spend their time and then, you know, making and then trying to get some -- some check on it is important.

I don't think I have anything else to add.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.
And Constantin, you were the spokesperson for the other group.

MEMBER QUERARD: Yes. I was -- I was our group's Tara. She set the example the first time through.

So the goal was how to make this more rewarding for candidates. The goal should be to increase the number of viewers because that makes it more valuable, a debate with 20 people watching it isn't worth going to, a debate with 2,000 people obviously is.

So the questions were, could Clean Elections package promotional materials to the candidates in advance so that the candidates themselves could promote the debates to their audience; and could Clean Elections package the finished product in a way that candidate could share it, which comes back to the earlier things of, Hey, here's the Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
candidates in that party because it's -- it's their party.
That was it for -- that was it for Group B.
CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much.
Some interesting suggestions from both groups, some
overlap but also a lot of differing viewpoints.
Before we move on to public comment, Rodd McLeod
submitted a question on the chat box which through gross
incompetence on my part, I neglected to ask. He wanted to
ask Gina the total advertising budget.
Do I have that right, Rodd, for -- for Clean
Elections?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON KIMBLE: Gina?
MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, group members, so when
we are in a -- in an election year, we have for the past few
cycles had a budget of \$1.5 million specifically for the
voter education debates, but also our voter education guide.
That budges includes agency costs, so it's-- I would say
maybe and both for the primary and the general, so it's not
a full 1.5 million of media buys, I would say it's closer to
maybe $\$ 1.1$ million in media buys.
So that's historically what our budget specifically
for promoting -- and, again, that's both debates and our
voter guide in an election year.
MEMBER MCLEOD: And you said something like 95
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|  | ```15:22, 19:9, 19:12, 19:16, 101:8 traditional-only [1] - 19:16 traffic [2] - 39:2, 42:11 training [1] - 27:25 transitioned [2] - 28:2, 91:20 transparent [2] - 9:5, 61:4 trash [1] - 28:20 Treasurer [1] - 26:9 trend [2]-39:7, 41:1 tries [2] - 58:9, 77:15 trophy [1] - 74:18 true [2] - 93:19, 111:11 truly [4]-5:2, 22:22, 64:16, 92:16 truthful [1] - 111:14 try [8] - 19:24, 27:16, 28:12, 28:21, 30:23, 38:19, 48:16, 49:12 trying [15]-27:17, 51:3, 55:1, 55:5, 55:21, 57:5, 58:6, 86:8, 95:20, 96:5, 96:20, 106:1, 106:2, 115:7 tune [10]-28:7, 28:9, 37:14, 47:20, 72:14, 72:16, 72:17, 72:20, 72:21, 72:22 turn [5]-3:24, 37:19, 48:4, 82:14, 90:12 turnaround [1] - 35:23 turned [1] - 85:16 turning [1] - 53:15 turnout [5] - 13:19, 13:20, 14:3, 14:6, 106:23 turnouts [2]-14:4, 71:17 TV [3]-21:2, 38:7, 38:9 twice [1] - 50:6 Twitter [4] - 42:23, 42:25, 43:15, 69:10 two [36] - 5:19, 22:11, 22:19, 22:21, 40:4, 44:15, 44:17, 46:12, 51:24, 54:7, 59:22, 60:4, 60:13, 63:12, 63:22, 64:18, 65:11, 65:12, 71:17, 71:19, 74:4, 80:3, 87:10, 88:4, 95:2, 95:6, 96:18, 101:10, 104:18, 105:1, 111:3, 111:22,``` |  | ```updates [2]-5:24, 9:19 updating \({ }_{[1]}\) - 42:20 urban [1] - 13:1 useful [4]-63:4, 69:6, 86:20, 113:4 user [2]-41:11, 42:7 users [3] - 42:1, 42:5, 42:6 valuable [5]-3:10, 84:7, 85:22, 97:3, 115:17 value \([4]\) - 10:18, 65:9, 65:10, 116:7 vantage [1] - 91:6 various [1]-84:5 VEG [1] - 39:18 vendors [2]-27:3, 27:9 verbalize [1]-55:22 verify \([1]\) - 12:1 versed [2]-33:16, 104:10 versions [1] - 77:9 versus [2]-39:11, 41:4 vetted [1] - 94:25 vetting [1]-52:24 video [13]-17:5, 17:8, 17:10, 17:13, 17:15, 28:25, 38:13, 39:4, 39:6, 40:17, 59:1, 59:19, 59:20 videos [5] - 28:24, 40:18, 52:14, 59:16, 60:9 view [16] - 5:13, 5:14, 17:16, 39:5, 39:9, 39:15, 39:16, 40:23, 41:2, 41:4, 41:5, 41:10, 41:11, 49:8, 84:5, 116:5 view-through [4] - 39:5, 41:2, 41:4, 41:5 viewability [2]-41:9, 41:10 viewers [13]-43:5, 62:23, 85:5, 86:13, 96:24, 97:1, 97:6, 97:16, 97:25, 115:17, 116:6, 116:14, 116:25 viewership [1] - 86:19 viewing [1]-24:9 viewpoints [2] - 74:9, 117:5``` |  |
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