## THE STATE OF ARIZONA

## CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIRTUAL DEBATE WORK GROUP MEETING

Phoenix, Arizona April 13, 2023 10:02 a.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

1	2		-
1 2 3	DEBATE WORK GROUP MEETING OF THE CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION, convened at 10:02 a.m. on April 13, 2023.	1	3 P R O C E E D I N G
4 5	ATTENDEES:		
5	ATTENDEES:	3	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Call to order the April 13th
6	Commissioner Mark Kimble, Chairman	4	meeting of the Candidate Debates Workgroup is called to
7	Thomas Collins, CCEC, Executive Director Gina Roberts, CCEC, Voter Education Director	5	order.
'	Avery Xola, CCEC, Voter Education Manager	6	Before we get started, I just want to go through a
8	Mike Becker, CCEC, Policy Director	7	little bit of an introduction; I know we have some people
9	Paula Thomas, CCEC, Executive Officer Alec Shaffer, CCEC, Web Content Manager	8	here today who were unable to make it last week.
	Cathy Herring, Staff	9	I'm Mark Kimble, one of one of five appointed
10	Morgan Dick Renaldo Fowler	-	members of the Arizona Citizens Clean Elections Commission;
11	Karl Gentles	10	
40	Tara Jackson	11	and I want to thank each one of you for sharing your very
12	Christine Jones Chris Kline	12	valuable time in a service that I know will directly impact
13	Jodi Liggett	13	Arizona voters.
14	Rodd McLeod Lee Miller	14	As I think most of you know, the Commission is
	Anusha Natarajan	15	entrusted by the voters with providing non-partisan and
15	Constantin Querard	16	factual voting information to the entire state. We take
16	Bradley Reece Bob Robson	17	that mission very seriously, and as part of that mission,
	Paul Senseman	18	the Commission organizes and sponsors debates among
17	Lisa Simpson Pinny Sheoran		
18	May Tiwamangkala	19	candidates running for the legislature and for all statewide
19	Jim Torgeson Kathy Tulemello	20	offices.
19	Bob Karp	21	We have convened this working group to identify
20	Nathan Madden	22	opportunities for improvements in our debate process. We
21		23	will respect the importance voters placed on debates when
22		24	they passed the Clean Elections Act and we will continue the
23 24		25	tradition of sponsoring Arizona's official debates in a
25			Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		
	4		5
1	meaningful and impactful manner.	1	for a voter and for a candidate to the Candidates Debate
2	Thank you very much for taking part in this	2	Workgroup Official Report.
2 3	Thank you very much for taking part in this process.	2 3	Workgroup Official Report. At our last meeting in March, the group discussed
3	process.	3	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed
3 4	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion	3 4	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a
3 4 5	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for	3 4 5	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider
3 4 5 6 7	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to	3 4 5 6 7	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official
3 4 5 6 7 8	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes?	3 4 5 6 7 8	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye."	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.)	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed? (No audible response.)	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed. Is there any member who would like to make a motion
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed. Is there any member who would like to make a motion to refer these recommendations to the Candidates Debates
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed? (No audible response.)	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed. Is there any member who would like to make a motion
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Meeting the minutes are	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed. Is there any member who would like to make a motion to refer these recommendations to the Candidates Debates
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Meeting the minutes are approved.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed. Is there any member who would like to make a motion to refer these recommendations to the Candidates Debates Working Group Official Report?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Meeting the minutes are approved. Item III, discussion and possible action on	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed. Is there any member who would like to make a motion to refer these recommendations to the Candidates Debates Working Group Official Report? MEMBER ROBSON: So moved.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	process. And with that we'll move on to Item II, discussion and possible action on meeting minutes for March 29th, 2023. I think all of you received the meeting minutes for the last meeting. Would any member like to make a motion to approve the minutes? MEMBER ROBSON: Mr. Chairman, I move that the minutes be approved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Bob. Is there a second? MEMBER MCLEOD: Second. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor of approving the minutes from the March 29th Candidate Debates Workgroup meeting say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Meeting the minutes are approved. Item III, discussion and possible action on referring recommendations for what makes a successful debate	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	At our last meeting in March, the group discussed what makes a successful debate for a voter and for a candidate. In your packet you received a list of the key points the group made. This agenda item is to consider referring these points for inclusion in the group's official report of any recommendations. Would any member like to discuss any of the items on the list? Feel free to raise your hand electronically or wave in the screen or anything you would like to do to get my attention. (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No comments at all on the on the recommendations? MEMBER ROBSON: Other than you captured everything we talked about. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, I can't take credit for that, but I think Gina did a very good job of capturing everything that that we discussed. Is there any member who would like to make a motion to refer these recommendations to the Candidates Debates Working Group Official Report? MEMBER ROBSON: So moved. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Is there a second?

	6		7
1	MEMBER GENTLES: Second.	1	while I share my screen.
2	MEMBER MCLEOD: Second.	2	Okay. So unless I hear otherwise, I will assume
3	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: It's been moved and seconded that	3	that you can see my screen. And I just two have slides to
4	we refer these recommendations to the Candidate Debates	4	share with you.
5	Workgroup Official Report.	5	So in 2022 the way we scheduled our debates and
6	All those in favor say "aye."	6	we made reference to this in the last meeting where our
7	(Chorus of ayes.)	7	debates kick off after we know for sure which candidates
8	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: All those opposed say "nay."	8	have qualified for the ballot and the challenge period has
9	(No audible response.)	9	occurred. And then we try to conclude those debates before
10	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: The motion is approved.	10	the start of early voting, that way once a voter has their
11	Item IV, presentation from the Clean Elections	11	ballot in their hand, they have access to all of the
12	Commission staff on the format and rules for debates for	12	debates.
13	debates used in the 2022 debate cycle.	13	We schedule our events one event per evening.
14	I want to turn this over to Gina Roberts, our Voter	14	That's just sort of the capacity that we have to operate
15	Education Director.	15	with with our staff and our vendors, so we schedule one
16	MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Chairman Kimble. Good	16	event per evening.
17	morning, members.	17	We do not and try we do not schedule events
18	This presentation is to help provide background and	18	on religious holidays. So we we take effort to look at
19	set you up for the next few agenda items where you will be	19	the calendar to make sure we are not scheduling events on
20	discussing the format, including the structure of the	20	religious holidays that could prevent a voter from
21	debates, but also potentially rules of engagement for the	21	participating in the debate. And we also do not schedule
22	candidates, things to that point. So, I would like to share	22	them on Saturdays or Sundays. We prefer not to schedule on
23	with you all what we did in the 2022 debate cycle for for	23	Fridays if possible, but sometimes we we have to because
24	candidates.	24	we just simply don't have any other date or time available.
25	I do have some slides to share, so bear with me	25	The debates start at 6:00 p.m. We do ask the
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	8		9
1	candidates to log in at 5:30 and I am speaking here	1	about who is actually running against who, who the opponents
2	specifically to legislative debates; I should clarify. The	2	are; and the moderator takes extra care to ensure that
3	debates do begin at 6:00 p.m.	3	opponents have the opportunity to engage one another
4 5	And depending on how many candidates are	4 5	directly. So it really comes down to the moderator ensuring
	participating, if it's a single candidate, we allow a	5	that we have a true debate between the true opponents.
6 7	30-minute Q&A if it's more than one candidate, the debates	6	The questions come from the veters in advance and
'	will last at a minimum of one hour. At that point it's the	6	The questions come from the voters in advance and
8	will last at a minimum of one hour. At that point it's the	7	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated
8 9	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an	7 8	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or
9	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the	7 8 9	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along
9 10	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still	7 8 9 10	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make
9 10 11	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged?	7 8 9 10 11	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing
9 10 11 12	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is	7 8 9 10 11 12	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator
9 10 11 12 13	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate.
9 10 11 12 13 14	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all in the same discussion. So that means we do not separate by	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first thing that will occur at 6:00 p.m. will so it's through
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all in the same discussion. So that means we do not separate by party or by Chamber, so you would have both the Senate and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first thing that will occur at 6:00 p.m. will so it's through Zoom and we're live streaming through our YouTube channel
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all in the same discussion. So that means we do not separate by party or by Chamber, so you would have both the Senate and the House candidates and the Republicans and Democratic	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first thing that will occur at 6:00 p.m. will so it's through and we're live streaming through our YouTube channel and that's how voters can tune in. The moderator will kick
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all in the same discussion. So that means we do not separate by party or by Chamber, so you would have both the Senate and the House candidates and the Republicans and Democratic candidates and if there's Libertarian, they would all be	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first thing that will occur at 6:00 p.m. will so it's through Zoom and we're live streaming through our YouTube channel and that's how voters can tune in. The moderator will kick things off and they'll introduce the event, you know:
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all in the same discussion. So that means we do not separate by party or by Chamber, so you would have both the Senate and the House candidates and the Republicans and Democratic candidates and if there's Libertarian, they would all be speaking during that one event. It would be considered just	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first thing that will occur at 6:00 p.m. will so it's through Zoom and we're live streaming through our YouTube channel and that's how voters can tune in. The moderator will kick things off and they'll introduce the event, you know: Welcome everybody, here's the LD-1 event, and will give a
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all in the same discussion. So that means we do not separate by party or by Chamber, so you would have both the Senate and the House candidates and the Republicans and Democratic candidates and if there's Libertarian, they would all be speaking during that one event. It would be considered just a single debate with all of those candidates.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first thing that will occur at 6:00 p.m. will so it's through Zoom and we're live streaming through our YouTube channel and that's how voters can tune in. The moderator will kick things off and they'll introduce the event, you know: Welcome everybody, here's the LD-1 event, and will give a few factual pieces of election information such as, you
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	moderator's discretion how they long they want to go past an hour, they sort of have to read the room: Are the candidates still engaged, are the voters/the audience still engaged? We do one event per district. And this is something that is an agenda item for for the group to discuss. So if it's a Legislative District 1 event, what that means is in the debate for that evening, so if LD-1 is scheduled for Tuesday at 6:00 p.m., that means Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. all candidates that are running in LD-1 that have a contested election are invited. And we include them all in the same discussion. So that means we do not separate by party or by Chamber, so you would have both the Senate and the House candidates and the Republicans and Democratic candidates and if there's Libertarian, they would all be speaking during that one event. It would be considered just a single debate with all of those candidates. To that end, our moderator does notify the audience	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	during the debate. During the debate we have a dedicated phone line and e-mail set up regards to call, text, or e-mail their questions in real time and we pass those along to the moderator. We do screen them, of course, to make sure there's no attacks on candidates or, you know, nothing inappropriate, and we send those over to the moderator throughout the debate. Prior to the debate, we do have stock standard questions prepared just in case maybe the audience, you know, for LD-1 is quiet; and we do share those with candidates in advance. So during the debate, how it occurs is the first thing that will occur at 6:00 p.m. will so it's through Zoom and we're live streaming through our YouTube channel and that's how voters can tune in. The moderator will kick things off and they'll introduce the event, you know: Welcome everybody, here's the LD-1 event, and will give a few factual pieces of election information such as, you know, ballots got out in the mail on this date or the voter

	10		11
1	registration deadline is this date. So introduction lasts	1	So that one to two minutes per responses to voter
2	maybe about two minutes.	2	questions, we do allow for rebuttals and even interruptions.
3	Then and the moderator will also explain to the	3	So the goal for 2022 was to have more of a conversation
4	voters, to the audience, what the rules for the evening are.	4	style, you know, not so formal and strict and rigid, but
5	Then we turn it over to the candidates and the	5	more we want the candidates to engage one another. We know
6	candidates have one minute for opening and closing	6	that voters have told us directly that is important; they
7	statements, and then we jump into the questions. And the	7	want to see the candidates engage directly.
8	so, I'm sorry, before we get to the questions.	8	So it's not a forum style where: Okay Candidate A
9	How we decide who speaks first among the	9	here's your question; and then we only hear Candidate A and
10	candidates, the order for opening statements, we just simply	10	then we move on to Candidate B; here's your question and we
11	go by alpha order by last name and we start with the Senate	11	only hear Candidate B. So it is a conversation; there is
12	and then the House candidates and then we reverse that for	12	engagement.
13	our closing statements.	13	The moderator again may limit or may limit
14	And then when the questions come in after, we go	14	responses for time-management purposes and again going with
15	through those opening statements, candidates have one to	15	that standard of we're trying to get near equal speaking
16	two minutes for their response. These are not hard limits	16	time for all candidates. So if we have a candidate who
17	as in the moderator is watching the clock, you know, they're	17	hasn't yet been heard from or there's two candidates that
18	watching the time, but we don't have any visual cues. We	18	are dominating the discussion, that the moderator will
19	don't have time, you know, indicators; we don't have a	19	then specifically call on the other candidate for their
20	timekeeper, and we don't mute candidates, you know, once	20	thoughts and make sure that they have the opportunity to
21	their time is up. It's simply up to the moderator to ensure	21	engage with their opponent.
22	the discussion progresses; and the goal of the moderator is	22	As I mentioned in the introduction, the moderator
23	to ensure that the candidates have near equal speaking time.	23	will make effort to ensure that the audience knows who the
24	So if a candidate starts monologging, you know, the	24	true opponents are and we also have that visually on our
25	monirator moderator will need to jump in and wrap it up.	25	slides. So when you're viewing it on YouTube, you can see
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	12		13
1	who the House candidates are and their party, and you can	1	people would like to see.
2	see who the Senate candidates are and their party. That way	2	Are there any questions from Gina at this point
3	voters know who, again, those opponents are.	3	about clarifying how it has worked up 'til this point?
4	And then we get to our closing statements and the	4	MEMBER KLINE: Mr. Chairman, Chris Kline from the
5	moderator will make closing remarks which lasts about a	5	Arizona Broadcasters Association, if I can ask a question.
6	minute.	6	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Sure, Chris.
7	So that's pretty much the structure and the rules	7	MEMBER KLINE: Gina, I'm curious how many
8	for our debates, if you will.	8	candidates since it is from both parties participate
9	I will say candidates have been we've never had	9	in these debates on average. Are we talking three people,
10	an instance where we've had any aggression or negativity	10	ten people, five people; or is it hard to quantify since
11	with candidates, you know, and decorum has also been	11	there's so many districts?
12	followed, and it's always been, you know, a respectful	12	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Kline, that is
13	environment. And so those are kind of some of the standard	13	an excellent question, and in preparing for this meeting, I
14	standards that we set for our debates and and thankfully	14	did pull up our invite list from 2022; and so it really does
15	we've never had an issue with them.	15	vary based off of the district and who has qualified to run
16	So with that, that kind of goes over basically what	16	and in what party.
17	our 2022 debate process was. As I mentioned this is	17	So when we're talking about a primary, you know
18	background information for how we get into our next few	18	so, for example, again, I'm just using LD-1 here, when I
19	agenda items for discussion.	19	look at who we invited in the primary election, we had one,
20	But with that, I'm happy to answer any questions in	20	two, three, four, five, six candidates who were eligible to
21	regards to the format that we used for the 2022 debate	21	participate in the debate, and two who were running in LD-1,
22	cycle.	22	but they did not have a contested election so they were not
23	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you, Gina. I think that	23	eligible to participate.
24	really gives us a good baseline to start talking about what	24	So one of the most candidates that we had in a
25	kind of changes might be advisable or what kind of changes	25	district I think was LD-11, and we ended up having 11
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	14		15
1	candidates 10 or 11 candidates that we invited to	1	As far as the traditional candidates go, it has
2	participate. Not everybody shows up or will RSVP yes. I	2	been my experience that when if we were to consider if
3	would say that we have anywhere from you know, we had	3	we were to look at anything in the form of a negative
4	maybe a small handful of 30-minute Q&As, maybe three two	4	consequence for not participating, what I have heard from
5	or three; but for the most part, we have anywhere from two	5	candidates is that they simply don't want their opponent to
6	to seven candidates participating in a debate event.	6	have that time. You know, that's why they participate
7	MEMBER KLINE: Thank you.	7	because they don't want the voters to simply see that
8	MEMBER TORGESON: You know, I'm going to ask a	8	candidate only and then they get, if you will, dinged
9	question because I missed the last meeting.	9	whether if the press is watching and they say, oh, so-and-so
10	But is there a way legally to incentivize, or in a	10	didn't show up, or they don't want that candidate to have
11	sense almost penalize people that aren't Clean Elections	11	that 100 percent uninterrupted time with the voters or
12	candidates that don't participate? I mean, what would an	12	anybody that would challenge them.
13	incentive be, look like, to make people that aren't even	13	That has sort of been the incentive that we have
14	Clean Elections candidates want to participate in that	14	seen that pushes candidates to participate, but in regards
15	debate?	15	to your question about the legalities if we have the
16	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, if I may?	16	authority to institute any type of fine over traditional
17	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yes. Yes, Gina.	17	candidates for not participating, you know, I would I
18	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Torgeson, that's	18	would I don't think that's possible. I would refer that
19	a great question. And so in our last meeting, we did	19	over to Tom Collins who is our Executive Director to talk
20	clarify, and I think you referenced to this, if you are a	20	about that.
21	participating Clean Elections candidate, if you do not	21	MEMBER TORGESON: To look more so as a and take
22	participate in your debate, there is a financial penalty,	22	this out of the box for a second, all right.
23	you are fined a \$500 fee for not participating; and I can't	23	You're running in whatever, LD-12, and two people
24	remember the last time we instituted that, that fee that	24	don't you know, two traditional candidates aren't going
25	fine because the participating candidates do participate.	25	to show up. Now looking at it, of course, that means that
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	16		17
1	the Clean Elections candidate has uninterrupted time, right,	1	really are not necessarily going anywhere? I don't know how
2	and that's sort of a bonus, right?	2	you define that but just a question.
3	But what if is there a way to maybe reward Clean	3	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Gentles, thank
4	Elections candidates if non-Clean Elections don't	4	you. The qualifications to be eligible to participate,
5	participate?	5	yes, you have to qualify for your name printed on that
6	You see, it's almost it's almost a reverse of a	6	election's ballot. So what that eliminates is write-in
7	penalty per se, but it would make it so that these people	7	candidates would not be eligible and then Independent
8	looked and went, wow, you know, so-and-so got \$500 because I	8	candidates would not be eligible for primary election
9	didn't show up.	9	debates. It focuses solely on the candidate's name that
10 11	You see what I'm see where I'm getting?	10	will appear on the ballot that the voter sees when
12	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Torgeson, yeah,	11 12	they're so when the voter sees their primary ballot and they see a name printed on there and there and they have
12	I I do understand your point. I I see what you mean by kind of like a reverse incentive.	12	a contested election, so they have to have opposition, so
14	I think that would be something that the group	14	more more candidates are running than the seats that are
15	could discuss and then I think staff would have to see if	15	open. Then there would ideally be a debate for that voter
16	that's something that we could do within our rules and our	16	to see.
17	authority, but I think that's definitely something that this	17	So by not having the write-ins, and that is in our
18	group could open up for discussion.	18	rule, that would potentially you know, not to say that
19	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone else have have any	19	write-ins aren't aren't viable candidates. We've seen
20	other questions here?	20	write-in candidates get elected before that is that is
21	MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chairman, this is Karl	21	the current criteria for for being invited.
22	Gentles. One question, so are there any other	22	We don't look at polling. Especially for our
23	qualifications other than making the ballot to participate?	23	statewide candidates. We do not take any consideration into
24	In other words, do you use any other screening so	24	polls that are out there either. If your name is on the
25	that we get good quality debates other than candidates that	25	ballot and you've got a contested election, you receive an
1	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
1	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	18		19
1	invite.	1	that just and a lot of that comes down to stage setup in
2	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you.	2	working with our broadcast partners. And then also we have
3	MEMBER SHEORAN: Chairman - Chairman Kimble, may I	3	had a long-standing rule for our candidates that props are
4	ask a question? This is Pinny with the League of Women	4	not allowed. And so, you know, sometimes it can be
5	Voters.	5	considered that that chair, an empty chair, can be
6		6	
7	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yes, of course.	7	considered a prop for the for the candidate as well, too.
	MEMBER SHEORAN: What happens do you have the		So to your answer your question directly, no, we
8	option do you hold any "empty chair" sort of debates	8 9	we do not have any visual indicators such as an "empty
9	where maybe it is a contested election but only one	-	chair" debate.
10 11	candidate accepts and shows up?	10	MEMBER SHEORAN: Chairman Kimble, may I ask a quick
	I didn't see maybe you mentioned it, forgive me	11	follow-up, a clarification?
12	if I didn't catch it. Can you define that, please?	12	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Of course. Of course.
13	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Sheoran, thank	13	MEMBER SHEORAN: When I meant "empty chair," I
14	you for that question.	14	didn't mean in terms of prop; it was a conceptual question.
15	So our legislative debates are done virtually, so	15	So the question is, if you three con three potential
16	we we do not have visual indicators that a candidate did	16	candidates for a race and only one accepts, you still will
17	not show up aside from their name not being on the screen.	17	conduct that debate; and then is it really a debate or is it
18	We do have we have some ability to in the	18	a campaign event?
19	moderator script in the introduction for the moderator to	19	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Thank you,
20	acknowledge, you know, in addition to the candidates that	20	Pinny.
21	are participating in tonight's debate, Candidate A and	21	At that point if one candidate, only one candidate,
22	Candidate B were also invited but declined to participate.	22	is participating, our rules dictate it is a 30-minute Q&A
23	We can also have that information visually on our slide and	23	session. So it will be that single candidate and the
24 25	in the description on the YouTube channel.	24 25	moderator, and the moderator would address that single
25	For our statewide debates, no, we do not have and	25	candidate for 30 minutes with questions that have come from
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	20		21
			21
1		1	needed to So that would come down to us working with our
1	the voter.	1	needed to. So that would come down to us working with our technical support to to be able to do that to mute their
2	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even	2	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their
2 3	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with		technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio.
2 3 4	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour.	2 3 4	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know,
2 3 4 5	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you.	2 3 4 5	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in
2 3 4	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you.	2 3 4	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know,
2 3 4 5 6	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had
2 3 4 5 6 7	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question.	2 3 4 5 6 7	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of procedures are available to the moderator to manage the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast partners support that? So we would have to work with them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of procedures are available to the moderator to manage the debate effectively.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast partners support that? So we would have to work with them to see if they have the ability to do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>the voter.     If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour.     MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you.     CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you.     I see that Paul Senseman has a question.     MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.     Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification,     audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator?     And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of procedures are available to the moderator to manage the debate effectively.     MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Senseman, thank </pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast partners support that? So we would have to work with them to see if they have the ability to do that. In our 2022 U.S. Senate debate, on set we did have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of procedures are available to the moderator to manage the debate effectively. MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Senseman, thank you. Great question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast partners support that? So we would have to work with them to see if they have the ability to do that. In our 2022 U.S. Senate debate, on set we did have some interns, there with visual cue markers to help guide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of procedures are available to the moderator to manage the debate effectively. MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Senseman, thank you. Great question. So we'll speak to two different types of debates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast partners support that? So we would have to work with them to see if they have the ability to do that. In our 2022 U.S. Senate debate, on set we did have some interns, there with visual cue markers to help guide the candidates along, letting them know, okay, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of procedures are available to the moderator to manage the debate effectively. MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Senseman, thank you. Great question. So we'll speak to two different types of debates here. For the legislative debates, as the host of the Zoom	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast partners support that? So we would have to work with them to see if they have the ability to do that. In our 2022 U.S. Senate debate, on set we did have some interns, there with visual cue markers to help guide the candidates along, letting them know, okay, you know, you're here at you're at the 30-second mark or, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the voter. If more than one candidate is participating, even if they are not opposing one another, we still proceed with a minimum of an hour. MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. I see that Paul Senseman has a question. MEMBER SENSEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Gina, can you speak to amplification, audio amplification during these processes? Do each of these debates have microphones or are the and are they controlled in any way by by Clean Elections and the moderator? And and then maybe you can just expound on your thoughts about, or experiences with, audible cues for timing or for interruptions if things were to were to ever get out of control or run so, if those if those kind of procedures are available to the moderator to manage the debate effectively. So we'll speak to two different types of debates here. For the legislative debates, as the host of the Zoom meeting, yes, we would be able to mute somebody's camera	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	technical support to to be able to do that, to mute their audio. In regards to the moderator having to, you know, help to kind of wrap things up, they the moderators in 2022 did not really have too many instances where they had to do that, you know, they will kind of: Please wrap it up, okay, or I'm going to give you another 30 seconds to finish your thought. That's that's sort of how they've done it. We've never real really had to, for our legislative debates, cut somebody off, if you will. So most candidates are pretty open to accepting those cues, those verbal cues, from from the moderator. But if we are talking about the technical ability to do so for our legislative debates, yes, we would have that ability. For the statewide, for the statewide that really is a question that really comes down to do our broadcast partners support that? So we would have to work with them to see if they have the ability to do that. In our 2022 U.S. Senate debate, on set we did have some interns, there with visual cue markers to help guide the candidates along, letting them know, okay, you know, you're here at you're at the 30-second mark or, you know, you've been speaking for a minute, to help the candidates

	22		23
1	their responses.	1	interruption; it's an actual device and an audible sound.
2	You know, that is possibly something that we could	2	So just a thought as we work through the technicals
3	do again with broadcast partners to have that visual cue on	3	of of how you'd like this to be set up.
4	set. As far as the technology goes, to be able to cut mics	4	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay, thank you.
5	during a live broadcast, or even prerecorded, that is	5	Chris, Chris Kline, I see you have a question.
6	something that I think that our broadcast partner	6	
7	potentially could have the ability to do, so we would just	7	MEMBER KLINE: Yeah, if I can, Chairman. Gina, as we talk about structure, are there
8		8	
9	really have to work and and identify all of the issues that go along with that.	9	feedback themes from either participating candidates in 2022 or the public that attended the debates that would be
10	I apologize, I hope I answered all all of your	10	helpful here to know?
11	questions.	11	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Kline, thank
12	MEMBER SENSEMAN: No, you very much did; I	12	you, that's a great question.
13	appreciate that.	13	Not really. As far as feedback goes, I would say
14	Mr. Chairman, just by if I may by way of	14	we've only received positive feedback from candidates after
15	follow-up, a suggestion Gina, the audible having some	15	the fact for, you know, thank you, like thank so much for
16	kind of audible sound to sort of cover over folks if they do	16	hosting that; it's a great opportunity for being able to
17	run on, to allow more questions perhaps.	17	connect with my voters in my district. And then the same
18	So just I know that's an additional tool and	18	with voters as well, you know, I think for and just I
19	burden probably for staff to have to to implement and	19	think they were very grateful from the acceptability
20	effectuate, but it does keep I've seen in some of these	20	standpoint.
20	national debates where there is a little more contention	20	I think, you know, when we hear about format and
22	and and other gubernatorial state's debates, some kind of	22	structure, the community feedback came in when we had the
23	audible device to control by the moderator that when you've	23	discussion of our potential gubernatorial event, that's
24	hit your mark, there's noise. So it interrupts you. It's	24	where we heard a lot of feedback and it was not I would
25	not it's not the moderator who has to make the	25	not I would say that we didn't have one particular
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	24		25
1	thought that, you know, was the top thought that kept coming	1	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Gina?
2	through. Like, there wasn't a sound consensus of what that	2	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, and I I apologize
3			
	structure should be.	3	here, I just want to confirm that with and I may ask Tom
4	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from	3 4	here, I just want to confirm that with and I may ask Tom here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open
4 5			, ,
	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from	4	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open
5	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not	4 5	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a
5 6	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders,	4 5 6	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure
5 6 7	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again,	4 5 6 7	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question
5 6 7 8	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our	4 5 6 7 8	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment.
5 6 7 8 9	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on	4 5 6 7 8 9	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes;
5 6 7 8 9 10	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you.	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question?	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation. Any other questions from from members?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Gina, I was wondering, because I know that this	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation. Any other questions from from members? (No audible response.)
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Gina, I was wondering, because I know that this Commission has had somewhat tenuous relations with the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation. Any other questions from from members? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I think that gives us a
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Gina, I was wondering, because I know that this Commission has had somewhat tenuous relations with the Cronkite School and Public Broadcasting Service over the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation. Any other questions from from members? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I think that gives us a good starting point to talk about changes. So Item V on the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Gina, I was wondering, because I know that this Commission has had somewhat tenuous relations with the Cronkite School and Public Broadcasting Service over the gubernatorial debate issue, so what has this Commission and	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment.</li> <li>MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions.</li> <li>MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation.</li> <li>Any other questions from from members? (No audible response.)</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I think that gives us a good starting point to talk about changes. So Item V on the agenda, working session, discussion on the formats for</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Gina, I was wondering, because I know that this Commission has had somewhat tenuous relations with the Cronkite School and Public Broadcasting Service over the gubernatorial debate issue, so what has this Commission and staff done to either repair that or look for other	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation. Any other questions from from members? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I think that gives us a good starting point to talk about changes. So Item V on the agenda, working session, discussion on the formats for debate format for debates, including possible structuring
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Gina, I was wondering, because I know that this Commission has had somewhat tenuous relations with the Cronkite School and Public Broadcasting Service over the gubernatorial debate issue, so what has this Commission and staff done to either repair that or look for other broadcasting partners?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation. Any other questions from from members? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I think that gives us a good starting point to talk about changes. So Item V on the agenda, working session, discussion on the formats for debate format for debates, including possible structuring of legislative debates by party and Chamber.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	So, again, I I think, you know, overall, from all of our statewides and our legislature ones, we have not really heard a lot of feedback from any of the stakeholders, whether candidate or voters on the structure. But, again, you know, when we did have the discussion about our gubernatorial event, that is where we heard from voters on what they felt that the format should be like and, as I said, there was not one particular sense of feedback that came through that that was, you know, a consensus or or, you know, most voters thought this, it was, you know, about about even on what that format or structure should be. MEMBER KLINE: Thank you. That's helpful. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Nathan Madden, you have a question? MR. MADDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Gina, I was wondering, because I know that this Commission has had somewhat tenuous relations with the Cronkite School and Public Broadcasting Service over the gubernatorial debate issue, so what has this Commission and staff done to either repair that or look for other	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	here just for the purposes of of the agenda and open meeting law, I just want to verify, Mr. Madden are you a member of the public? And if so, I just want to make sure that we are responding and handling your question accordingly for public comment. MR. MADDEN: I am a member of the public, yes; private citizen. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Mr. Madden, I'm sorry, could you just hold that question until our call to the audience. This is this is right now time for members of of this organization to to ask questions. MR. MADDEN: Understood, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Madden. I appreciate your cooperation. Any other questions from from members? (No audible response.) CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I think that gives us a good starting point to talk about changes. So Item V on the agenda, working session, discussion on the formats for debate format for debates, including possible structuring

	26		27
1	So this is we did this last time for those of	1	after the fact, so you will be able to to view those
2	you who were here; we're going to break out into two groups	2	breakout sessions as well.
3	and discuss the format for debates: Any changes that we	3	When we come back from breakout sessions, each
4	think should be done, should we break up legislative debates	4	group will report back to the entire group and that that
5	by party and Chamber, and some of the other matters that	5	portion will be live streamed.
6	have come up during our discussion today.	6	Before we join before we proceed to do our
7	So Gina, you want to tell us what we're going to do	7	breakout sessions, I wanted to provide some context for this
8	next?	8	first agenda item for this agenda item about the structure,
9	MS. ROBERTS: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	9	including possibly probably breaking out by Chamber and
10	Members and also members of the public, so for this	10	party for our primary debates.
11	particular breakout session, just like we did in our our	11	So this will be up for discussion for for the
12	March meeting, how this will occur is on the technical side	12	groups, and I just wanted to provide some background
13	of things, we will randomly assign members to two different	13	information on what our requirements would be, and this kind
14	breakout rooms, one will be staffed by Avery and Tom from	14	of goes along to what we just heard in the previous agenda
15	Clean Elections. I will be in the other one along with	15	item.
16	Chairman Kimble, and that's where the group will have time	16	So we would have the ability to do this depending
17	to discuss those particular agenda items; and both breakout	17	on what the group decides or how the group, you know,
18	sessions will be recorded.	18	decides to make a recommendation or how you you work
19	So for members of the public, if you are in the	19	it work through it. Our requirements would be we would
20	Zoom meeting, you will also be randomly assigned to a	20	still need to have one event per evening. So we would still
21	breakout session unless you notify us otherwise that you	21	have to have one event per evening. Ideally, that would
22	wish to stay in the main room.	22	be the timing would be from 6:00 start at 6:00 p.m.
23	If you are viewing as a member of the public the	23	still, it could run through, let's say, 8:30, so for the
24	YouTube stream, the breakout sessions will not be streamed,	24	group, if you have considerations, possibly consider if we
25	but they will be recorded and posted to our YouTube channel	25	break it apart, that we do it within the time period.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	28		29
1	So, for example, again, LD-1, Tuesday evening, runs	1	So with that kind of foundation, you know, I just
2	from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., you know maybe the first hour is	2	wanted to let you know, that while think that it is
3	Senate and then broken apart by the party, and in the second	3	something we could do from an administrative function from
4	hour is House broken out by the party.	4	Clean Elections and, again, those details were even if we
5	And we would likely only be able to have one	5	should do it in the first place are certainly up to the
6	moderator per event as well, too. So I know there was some	6	group to discuss.
7	previous discussion about, you know, only, you know, party	7	So I think at that point, Cathy, we're ready to go
8	candidate or a party moderator, a partisan moderator for	8	ahead and (simultaneous crosstalk) breakout session.
9	that particular party debate; I'm not sure that we would,	9	CHAIDMAN KIMPLE, Just and second. One second
10	that particular party debate, i'll not sure that we would,		CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Just one second. One second,
	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that.	10	Gina.
11	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration.	11	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we
11 12	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the	11 12	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions?
11 12 13	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you	11 12 13	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina.
11 12 13 14	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come	11 12 13 14	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time,
11 12 13 14 15	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay,	11 12 13 14 15	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you
11 12 13 14 15 16	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we	11 12 13 14 15 16	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to be the one to sort of create the programming for that event,	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so early voting starts 27 days before the election. So 27 days
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to be the one to sort of create the programming for that event, if you will.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so early voting starts 27 days before the election. So 27 days before the election is where we have to have those debates
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to be the one to sort of create the programming for that event, if you will. Again, assigning, you know, just these particular	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so early voting starts 27 days before the election. So 27 days before the election is where we have to have those debates ideally wrapped up by; and then when we work backwards to
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to be the one to sort of create the programming for that event, if you will. Again, assigning, you know, just these particular Senate Republican candidates to debate at this time and then	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so early voting starts 27 days before the election. So 27 days before the election is where we have to have those debates ideally wrapped up by; and then when we work backwards to the candidate filing period and the end of the challenge
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to be the one to sort of create the programming for that event, if you will. Again, assigning, you know, just these particular Senate Republican candidates to debate at this time and then we move into the House Democratic candidates at this time	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 24	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so early voting starts 27 days before the election. So 27 days before the election is where we have to have those debates ideally wrapped up by; and then when we work backwards to the candidate filing period and the end of the challenge period, so which occurs March/April, we've got about our
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to be the one to sort of create the programming for that event, if you will. Again, assigning, you know, just these particular Senate Republican candidates to debate at this time and then we move into the House Democratic candidates at this time during that one event.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so early voting starts 27 days before the election. So 27 days before the election is where we have to have those debates ideally wrapped up by; and then when we work backwards to the candidate filing period and the end of the challenge period, so which occurs March/April, we've got about our debates will likely kick off in at the very last week of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	just from an administrative standpoint, be able to do that. So I just wanted to throw that out there for consideration. And then please keep in mind, too, that the moderator again who is steering the ship during these, you know, this event, depending on the RSVPs and when those come in, because we have a very short time period between, okay, candidate filings done, candidate challenges are done, we know who to invite, we have to wait for the RSVPs, we have a very limited turnaround time from when we know who will be participating in that debate. So the moderator will have to be the one to sort of create the programming for that event, if you will. Again, assigning, you know, just these particular Senate Republican candidates to debate at this time and then we move into the House Democratic candidates at this time	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 21 22 23 24	Gina. I see Lisa Simpson. Do you have a question that we need to address before we go into breakout sessions? MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Gina. I just Gina, you're talking about limited time, Gina. Do you have a day, is it 28 days, 48 days? Do you know what that might be? Just as we look how you know, if there's, you know, 30 districts, what does that look like? MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, so early voting starts 27 days before the election. So 27 days before the election is where we have to have those debates ideally wrapped up by; and then when we work backwards to the candidate filing period and the end of the challenge period, so which occurs March/April, we've got about our

	30		31
1	April, run through May and June and the first week of July.	1	MEMBER SIMPSON: I just did quick math on that,
2	Now, I know that seems like a lot of time, but it's	2	that really only gives I mean if you look at Tuesday,
3	really not when we consider 30 legislative districts, no	3	Wednesday, Thursday, depending on how holidays fall, you're
4	weekends and no religious holidays, and and any other	4	only looking at 30 to 35 days of you know, and that pulls
5	holiday such as July 4th. So it's it's not a lot of	5	out Mondays and Fridays, right; but that's that's a lot
6	of programming time, if you will.	6	to get done in that time frame.
7	The other thing I will note, too, in the past with	7	MS. ROBERTS: And Mr. Chairman, Member Simpson, I
8	our RSVPs and the deadline that we ask, we always if a	8	will also add with that goes requests for schedule changes.
9	candidate misses the deadline to RSVP, it's okay; we always	9	Sometimes we will get a candidate who will say, I would love
10	still let them. A candidate can show up during in the	10	to join but I'm going to be out of town, can you reschedule
11	during the debate at five minutes after it's started and we	11	it; and we make every effort that we can, sometimes we have
12	will let them participate. We don't ever take the position	12	to move, you know, events around to accommodate schedules.
13	of excluding an eligible candidate because at the end of the	13	So we we try very hard to work with that.
14	day, it's still about the voter being able to hear from that	14	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay.
15	candidate directly.	15	MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Gina.
16	So, you know, sometimes we do have candidates that	16	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Bob, do you want to ask a
17	we don't get an RSVP from and we will be calling them ten	17	question before we go into breakout?
18	times and we finally get, you know, an hour before, Oh,	18	MEMBER ROBSON: I do. One is, has the calendar
19	yeah, sure, I'll I'll participate. That's fantastic,	19	already been established? I mean, we know there are
20	we'll take you, you know, we'd love to have you. But it	20	30 districts; we know there's going to be going to be
21	just means from an administrative standpoint and managing	21	you know what the holidays are going to be coming up, so the
22	the time flow, the moderator has to make adjustments.	22	calendar should already it should be published already,
23	So that's kind of the time period we work with,	22	quite candidly.
23	Lisa, and again, you know, just keeping in mind our	23 24	MS. ROBERTS: Chair
25	calendaring restrictions that we have.	25	MEMBER ROBSON: And the other is, with technology,
23	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	23	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	32		33
1	you know, being out of town no longer works. I mean, you	1	in advance; we still ultimately get candidates who who
2	can be anywhere we are.	2	request schedule changes.
3	So it's some some of the old problems don't	3	So I guess that is a consideration for this group
4	exist anymore, quite quite candidly. The moderator	4	is how much flexibility do we offer candidates when it comes
5	situation, you don't have somebody showing up anymore; you	5	to RSVPs and to rescheduling? That that is something up
6	don't have to change tables or clean out a theatre. You've	6	for discussion.
7	got it where you're coming on to a basically going on to	7	As far as creating the calendars now, we can't
8	the next screen onto onto the next event on the same day.	8	begin work with our vendors until we have a purchase order
9	So some of the things that you've gone over lend	9	in place and they're and we get into the procurement
10	itself to, okay, I can understand if you are renting a	10	issue. So we can internally create a schedule, but we can't
11	facility and you had to change change things over and	11	finalize it until we know our vendors are are available
12	everything else, but now we just hit a button and we're	12	or our broadcast partners and what their programming looks
13	here.	13	like.
14	So technol technology is changing everything.	14	So we typically try to get those purchase orders
15	Literally. And so I just I just want to put that put	15	issued at the beginning of the year for that debate year,
16	that out in the perspective as we talk about this, so.	16	and then we work pretty quickly from there to get the
17	But, yeah, I I would I don't know if you have	17	scheduling done, and then send out those save the dates to
18	a calendar already ready, you know. You should the	18	the candidates and also to the public. We share it with the
19	Governor's debate should already be set, the Senate, you	19	public as well, too, so that we try to get on everybody's
20	know, whoever is running at this time period, should the	20	calendar and hopefully we don't have to do any rescheduling.
21	date should already be done before the petitions are even	21	That that would be our goal is to not have to do any for
22	filed: You're going to have a debate on this day.	22	rescheduling.
23	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, Member Robson, when	23	Thank you.
24	we we do create the schedule as early as possible and we	24	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. I think we need to move
25	send them as save the dates. So we do publicize them well	25	into the working session.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	34		35
1	Gina, do you know about how much time we're going	1	working session, we're our discussion for the format for
2	to have for this?	2	debates including possible structuring of legislative
3		3	debates by party and Chamber.
	MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, if we	4	
4	could for the for the first working session, if we could		So I think at this point you have the context that
5	go ahead and schedule that for let's do 30 minutes and I	5	we provided previously and I think you're welcome to open it
6	think that should be 30 minutes for each breakout session	6	up to discussion. Again, it it's the overall format. So
7	will give us enough time to make sure we wrap by noon.	7	you can definitely consider should we break apart our events
8	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay.	8	and structure them so that we are only having debates
9	Okay.	9	between the partisan candidates and their opponents and by
10	MS. HERRING: Okay, we will split into our two	10	Chamber, or if there's any other format discussion items
11	groups.	11	that you'd like to discuss, this is the time to do it.
12		12	MEMBER ROBSON: Want me to start in at this again?
13	* * *	13	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Whoever wants to wants to
14	(BREAKOUT GROUP A - 10:45 A.M.)	14	start, go ahead.
15	MS. ROBERTS: All right. Thank you. I apologize	15	MEMBER ROBSON: Oh. If you don't mind,
16	for that technical difficulty.	16	Mr. Chairman, I'll start I guess because
17	Okay. So first first action item for the group	17	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Sure, Bob.
18	is to elect a spokesperson. This person will	18	MEMBER ROBSON: I've always been supportive of
19	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We we did that in your	19	the fact that you break up the House and the Senate. Having
20	absence, Gina.	20	run several times in my lifetime, I can tell you that
21	MS. ROBERTS: You guys are amazing.	21	debates would be more robust, you would have you would
22	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Chris stepped up and agreed to do	22	hear more from the candidates because of the the amount
23	it.	23	of candidates that you just basically put up put up on a
24	MS. ROBERTS: Fantastic.	24	dais and ask seven questions so then your debate is done
25	Okay, so then for this particular agenda item, this	25	even in an hour.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	36		37
			57
1	And I think you basically I think the benefit,	1	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party
1 2		1 2	
_	And I think you basically I think the benefit,		party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party
2	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned	2	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until
2 3	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties	2 3	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're
2 3 4	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with	2 3 4	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other
2 3 4 5	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and	2 3 4 5	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct
2 3 4 5 6	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I	2 3 4 5 6	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether
2 3 4 5 6 7	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day.	2 3 4 5 6 7	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House and one debate for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the House, and one debate for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the House, and one debate for the Republicans running for the Senate and one debate for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Republicans running for the Senate?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time who are running for a distinctly separate office; Senate is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate? MEMBER ROBSON: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time who are running for a distinctly separate office; Senate is different from the House and the House is different from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate? MEMBER ROBSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So four debates where we have one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time who are running for a distinctly separate office; Senate is different from the House and the House is different from the Senate. And otherwise you can put the Superintendent of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate? MEMBER ROBSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So four debates where we have one now?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time who are running for a distinctly separate office; Senate is different from the House and the House is different from the Senate. And otherwise you can put the Superintendent of Public Instruction in with the with the Governor's race,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Republicans running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate? MEMBER ROBSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So four debates where we have one now? MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, I believe that that's a great	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time who are running for a distinctly separate office; Senate is different from the House and the House is different from the Senate. And otherwise you can put the Superintendent of Public Instruction in with the with the Governor's race, I mean if that's if that's the case, it's a statewide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House and one debate for the Democrats running for the House, and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate? MEMBER ROBSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So four debates where we have one now? MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, I believe that that's a great idea because it 'til the 'til you come together for a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time who are running for a distinctly separate office; Senate is different from the House and the House is different from the Senate. And otherwise you can put the Superintendent of Public Instruction in with the with the Governor's race, I mean if that's if that's the case, it's a statewide race and just consider it that way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And I think you basically I think the benefit, and obviously the party situation, as Constantin mentioned last time, I think is a great idea of having the parties really deal in the primary side of it with their with their candidates. You know, I was thinking of the ups and downs on this, but I think it will be more responsible, so I liked that idea the other the other day. But I definitely believe there is a need to distinguish the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the Senate and the House and the difference between the candidates and the issues. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I just want to clarify, do you think there ought to be let's talk just about the primary first. MEMBER ROBSON: Sure. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Should there be one debate for the Republicans running for the House and one debate for the Democrats running for the House, and one debate for the Republicans running for the Senate and one debate for the Democrats running for the Senate? MEMBER ROBSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So four debates where we have one now? MEMBER ROBSON: Yesh, I believe that that's a great idea because it 'til the 'til you come together for a general election, you're running in an election for your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	party's nomination. So it's more party it's more party issues in many respects than overall general issues until you get there. And then when your party then when you're your party's nominee and you're running against the other party nominee, there you are obviously distinct distinctively in the offices that you're running for whether it's the House or the Senate. It's not it's just not the same. And you get you really don't get to know the candidates that well in that short period of time that they get to say one or two things, and it tends to the party gangs up on the other things and it just takes the time away. No matter how well it's moderated, it takes time away to get down to some of the real issues that the public would really want to know because there are distinct differences obviously between candidates, parties and other things; we know that. But you got people don't really have enough time who are running for a distinctly separate office; Senate is different from the House and the House is different from the Senate. And otherwise you can put the Superintendent of Public Instruction in with the with the Governor's race, I mean if that's if that's the case, it's a statewide race and just consider it that way. You have to and I think it would make it more

	20		20
1	38	1	39 time, the the mention we made in terms of having parties
2	meaningful for the candidate and more meaningful for the debate structure overall.	2	
			involved really was just for primary debates, and it had to
3	I I don't want to take up all the time.	3	do with the parties themselves since the primary debates are
4	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Tara, you don't need to	4	restricted to partisan candidates, helping provide
5	raise your hand, we'll be a lot less formal here in these	5	moderators as a way to eliminating charges or accusations of
6	breakout sessions.	6	bias and to ensure the content is is better geared
7	MEMBER JACKSON: Thank you.	7	towards that party's voters.
8	I can appreciate wanting more time for the	8	As far as splitting them up, if if the schedule
9	candidates, I'm just wandering as I heard Gina talk about	9	makes it to where you can't have four separate ones, at the
10	the structure and the schedule how feasible that really is	10	minimum, you need to separate Republican primaries from
11	to have, say, four different scheduled debates versus	11	Democratic primaries because the topics are so very
12	breaking it up within the same evening.	12	different and the interests of the audience are so very
13	And and then also if you're as a voter going to	13	different that, you know, you you may not have time to
14	four different debates or attending them versus one item I	14	separate State House from State Senate, okay, fine, if you
15	can take out of my schedule, I would guess, but Gina would	15	can't; you can't. If it's a question of, well, we don't
16	know this better or certainly all of you would than I would,	16	have time for twice as many meetings, then or debates,
17	that having one big block of time would rather be more	17	then make them twice as long and have twice as many of them.
18	appealing in marketing and communications and getting people	18	You still haven't denied candidates time they
19	to attend the debate. So I just wanted to raise that as an	19	wouldn't get anyway. If ten candidates have to split an
20	issue for those are in the throes of doing this all the time	20	hour compared to five candidates splitting half an hour,
21	and ask what the reality is on that.	21	it's the same for the candidates; but it will you'll
22	MEMBER QUERARD: I can't I can't find my button	22	provide content that is far more applicable and interesting
23	to raise my hand. So, good good thing we're not good	23	to the audience.
24	thing we're not requiring it.	24	Republicans don't tend to watch Democrat primaries
25	For a quick for those who weren't here last	25	debates for president or governor or anything like that.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	40		41
1	We'll all watch the generals. Democrats tend not to watch	1	out; but the point of going down the line and asking the
2	Republican primary debates for that for that very reason.	2	
	······································	~	same question of candidates, it has to change. 'Cause we're
3	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are;	3	same question of candidates, it has to change. 'Cause we're not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking
3 4			
	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are;	3	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking
4	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in.	3 4	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience
4 5	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is	3 4 5	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue.
4 5 6	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these,	3 4 5 6	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make
4 5 6 7	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm	3 4 5 6 7	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out
4 5 6 7 8	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so	3 4 5 6 7 8	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no
4 5 6 7 8 9	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not
4 5 7 8 9 10	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey,
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we create. You know, the rules that we currently operate under	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be an Independent, so if you have to watch two debates, then
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we create. You know, the rules that we currently operate under are the rules we currently operate under. You get you	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be an Independent, so if you have to watch two debates, then you watch two debates. That's that's your choice. Or
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we create. You know, the rules that we currently operate under are the rules we currently operate under. You get you need I think we need to change somewhat with the times.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be an Independent, so if you have to watch two debates, then you watch two debates. That's that's your choice. Or you or you become a member of the party and you watch
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we create. You know, the rules that we currently operate under are the rules we currently operate under. You get you need I think we need to change somewhat with the times. Look, I went through 14 how many? 7 7	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be an Independent, so if you have to watch two debates, then you watch two debates. That's that's your choice. Or you or you become a member of the party and you watch your party debate. I mean, that's kind of how it how it
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we create. You know, the rules that we currently operate under are the rules we currently operate under. You get you need I think we need to change somewhat with the times. Look, I went through 14 how many? 7 7 debates over my time with Clean Elections debates and how	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be an Independent, so if you have to watch two debates, then you watch two debates. That's that's your choice. Or you or you become a member of the party and you watch your party debate. I mean, that's kind of how it how it goes. I mean, are we shifting so far over to compensate for
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we create. You know, the rules that we currently operate under are the rules we currently operate under. You get you need I think we need to change somewhat with the times. Look, I went through 14 how many? 7 7 debates over my time with Clean Elections debates and how many that I went through on the City Council in Chandler.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be an Independent, so if you have to watch two debates, then you watch two debates. That's that's your choice. Or you or you become a member of the party and you watch your party debate. I mean, that's kind of how it how it goes. I mean, are we shifting so far over to compensate for that aspect of it? I mean, I know a lot of people that are
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MEMBER JACKSON: I don't know how informal we are; if I can just jump in. But from the last time, one of my big concerns is as a long-time Independent who needs to track all of these, when you have one debate and by the way, now I'm representing a huge number of people in this state and so I again, I just want to raise the awareness, for the large number of Independents, it's not just about Republicans and Democrats; we're trying to decide from both parties which race to vote in and who to vote for. I I just want to make sure that's part of the thought process. MEMBER SIMPSON: I think MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, and this next go around, you're going to have three parties. So, you know, you're going to have to figure it out. So I mean, it's you know, the time constraint is the time constraint that we create. You know, the rules that we currently operate under are the rules we currently operate under. You get you need I think we need to change somewhat with the times. Look, I went through 14 how many? 7 7 debates over my time with Clean Elections debates and how many that I went through on the City Council in Chandler. I'm all for debates and getting (technical disruption) thing	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not getting we're not getting to the average we're asking for. And if we're going to do things out of convenience and that's a whole nother that's a whole nother issue. Then I said the last time, you have to make these meaningful for me to want to show up to put myself out there to answer the questions. Otherwise, I can just say no like a lot of people do and you're not getting you're not getting the outcome as a Clean Elections organization. You're not getting the outcome you want. And believe it or not, a lot of them don't do it because they say: Oh, hey, I'm going to sit there for whatever; I'm going to answer four questions and, you know, I've spent I've spent an hour or two hours of my time just to answer four questions or getting banged up on. So that's why I liked in the primary dealing with the parties. And if you're an Independent, you choose to be an Independent, so if you have to watch two debates, then you watch two debates. That's that's your choice. Or you or you become a member of the party and you watch your party debate. I mean, that's kind of how it how it goes. I mean, are we shifting so far over to compensate for that aspect of it?

	42		43
1	Independents and they participate in what they participate	1	that serve all of Arizona then we should be looking at that.
2	in.	2	And it's not just general debates. Let me let
3	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Tara.	3	me address that. Most of the elections are determined in
4		4	
	MEMBER JACKSON: Is that Tara? Sorry, is that what		the primary debates and Independent voters are really taken
5	you said?	5	away from that and that's now the majority of Independent
6	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Yes. Yes, I said	6	voters.
7	MEMBER JACKSON: I'm just going to make another	7	So obviously I feel strongly about that for a
8	issue of consideration for having a debate that has all	8	reason and it's not just because I am an Independent
9	candidates.	9	voter but I want to make sure that's a consideration.
10	I don't think there should be extra burdens placed	10	When I go into these discussions with people who are in
11	on Independents when they're so many of us now. And I've	11	parties, Independents are not talked about and yet they're
12	been one for over 20 years actually 30, almost 30.	12	such a huge part of of the process now. And, no, primary
13	And here's the other thing, as part of the	13	debates are not just for partisan issues; they are for all
14	consideration, everyone is talking about the increased	14	of us.
15	polarization and uncivil dialogue that is happening in	15	So I'll leave it at that.
16	debates. If you have primaries where you have debates with	16	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, Tara, I just want to
17	all candidates, then the candidates are going to be	17	clarify your position. First of all let me also say I'm an
18	incentivized to not go to extreme polarized statements in	18	Independent and I've been an Independent for for a very
19	order to get those few people from their party to vote for	19	long time, as long as I can remember, and are you are you
20	them. They're going to be incentivized to appeal to the	20	saying that an Independent candidate running in Legislative
21	broader audience that's there.	21	District 1 should be able to take part in a primary debate?
22	So again I don't know how challenging it would be	22	Say they're running for the House in LD-1, an Independent
23	to change things, but this is the reality we're in. If	23	should be taking part in that?
24	if part of our goal is to reduce polarizations, get the best	24	Or are you focusing more on from the voter there
25	candidates, incentivize them to state and run on platforms	25	should be one debate among all House candidates so that you
23	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	25	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	44		45
	44		40
1	and I as Independent votors can look at all the candidates	1	
1	and I as Independent voters can look at all the candidates	1	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our
2	together and decide which primary we want to vote in?	2	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And
2 3	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really	2 3	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries.
2 3 4	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always	2 3 4	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for
2 3 4 5	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the	2 3 4 5	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided?
2 3 4 5 6	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone.	2 3 4 5 6	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I
2 3 4 5 6 7	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is	2 3 4 5 6 7	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them
2 3 4 5 6 7	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is	2 3 4 5 6 7	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions. So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions. So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions. So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at least important to have those in the back of our mind as we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've been I've been thinking about; I see both sides of this.</pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions. So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at least important to have those in the back of our mind as we look at these changes because that is that is where we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've been I've been thinking about; I see both sides of this. One of the things I'm struck by is what Gina shared with us
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions. So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at least important to have those in the back of our mind as we look at these changes because that is that is where we are now, where we're going in the future. Maybe we can't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've been I've been thinking about; I see both sides of this. One of the things I'm struck by is what Gina shared with us before we jumped into this call, which was what has the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions. So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at least important to have those in the back of our mind as we look at these changes because that is that is where we are now, where we're going in the future. Maybe we can't make all those changes right now, but that's the reality of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've been I've been thinking about; I see both sides of this. One of the things I'm struck by is what Gina shared with us before we jumped into this call, which was what has the feedback been from 2022 candidates and members of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	together and decide which primary we want to vote in? MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone. And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions. So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at least important to have those in the back of our mind as we look at these changes because that is that is where we are now, where we're going in the future. Maybe we can't make all those changes right now, but that's the reality of the future where we're at.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've been I've been thinking about; I see both sides of this. One of the things I'm struck by is what Gina shared with us before we jumped into this call, which was what has the feedback been from 2022 candidates and members of the public, and unless I misunderstood, I didn't get the sense
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>together and decide which primary we want to vote in?</li> <li>MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone.</li> <li>And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions.</li> <li>So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at least important to have those in the back of our mind as we look at these changes because that is that is where we are now, where we're going in the future. Maybe we can't make all those changes right now, but that's the reality of the future where we're at.</li> <li>I I look at it very big picture.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've been I've been thinking about; I see both sides of this. One of the things I'm struck by is what Gina shared with us before we jumped into this call, which was what has the feedback been from 2022 candidates and members of the public, and unless I misunderstood, I didn't get the sense that this has been a bubbling, large concern that has come
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>together and decide which primary we want to vote in?</li> <li>MEMBER JACKSON: My last comments were really directed towards the voter but, really, what I'm always thinking about is how can we create a better system for the state for everyone.</li> <li>And given what is happening and maybe this is not the realm for it, but it is where we are going in the future, should we be looking at and I would certainly argue for it a system where Independent candidates are a part of a primary debate? I don't think that's exactly what we're talking about here at the moment, but the reality is we're disenfranchising or disincentivizing as well</li> <li>Independent voters, Independent candidates; and the system it's very clear is currently creating more polarization and division and not about solutions.</li> <li>So, yes, those are big major changes, I get that, but these are the changes in the works. And I think it's at least important to have those in the back of our mind as we look at these changes because that is that is where we are now, where we're going in the future. Maybe we can't make all those changes right now, but that's the reality of the future where we're at.</li> <li>I I look at it very big picture.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: For the ease of Chris who is</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	going to be taking notes and saying what our what our recommendation is, what what do most of you think? And let's focus, first of all, on primaries. Should should there be one primary election for all House candidates or should those be divided? MEMBER SIMPSON: I CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What's the consensus? MEMBER SIMPSON: I can see a benefit having them divided. The only pushback I have on that is if you're looking at a two-hour time block, you to publicize which debate starts and ends when because, you know, as a general voter, I'm not going to sit there and try to watch two hours if I only want to watch the the Republican debate or the Democratic debate. But I think in the primary, it makes sense to do by party, and in the general to do by House and Senate, that's that's my vote. MEMBER KLINE: Here's here's one piece that I've been I've been thinking about; I see both sides of this. One of the things I'm struck by is what Gina shared with us before we jumped into this call, which was what has the feedback been from 2022 candidates and members of the public, and unless I misunderstood, I didn't get the sense that this has been a bubbling, large concern that has come up from anyone that participated in 2022, and so I guess I'm

	46		47
1	just hesitant and cautious about going all in on supporting	1	definitely be part of the process.
2	a large change if this isn't something that has been loudly	2	But, yeah, we know that Democratic primary and
3	spoken to Clean Elections over the last cycle.	3	Republican primary are two different things to get to the
4	MEMBER QUERARD: There's a there's a bit of a	4	general.
5	polling bias too that the sample consists of people who	5	MEMBER QUERARD: I wonder, it will it will be an
6	participated.	6	easy question for Tara, Chris, and Gina, I'm trying to think
7	This is an issue to all the candidates who didn't	7	of how to mechanically fix this. If you had a, whatever, a
8	participate and wouldn't have been included in anecdotal	8	two-hour debate and everybody is you've got House and
9	feedback on how did you enjoy your debate.	9	Senate Republicans and Democrats are all in there and it's
10	MEMBER ROBSON: Yeah, I'm trying to tell you 'cause	10	one-stop shopping for all Independents, it's easy from a
11	I've been there; Constantin's been there. You know, all of	11	mechanical standpoint because you've got one thing on the
12	the other stuff is you you know, you're you're part of	12	schedule, it's a single Zoom.
13	the process and that's fine, but I'm the guy that's had to	13	Wouldn't it be fairly easy to modify that to where,
14	debate or decide not to debate or whatever, and I'm just	14	I don't know if it's two one-hour debates or four
15	saying I'm not trying to make it I'm not trying to	15	thirty-minutes debates, whatever, but it's still a single
16	make it difficult. I've said it over the years, you know,	16	Zoom session.
17	you need to make some of these changes.	17	Like, we can all be on the screen; all the
18	And that's why you don't have participation. I	18	candidates can be there if you want to; it's just the only
19	mean, you're looking for participation.	19	ones who are speaking for the first half hour are the
20	And Tara, you and I are in agreement; I don't have	20	Republicans running for the House or the candidates. In
21	a problem with with Independents getting involved.	21	other words, it's still a physical logistically it's one
22	It's but that would be in the general election because	22	single event, from a marketing standpoint you may schedule
23	they don't have anybody there to debate unless they have	23	so we know who gets what hour or what half hour, for the
24	two I don't know if there would be two Independents	24	Independents they're still sitting there for a single
25	running. But, yeah, they should be part should	25	session that lasts the exact same amount of time. It's just
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
1	48 kind of like we have these breakouts, the first "X" amount	1	49 So any other possible changes to the format?
2	of time is this race; the next amount of time is this race.	2	Kathy seems like you want to (technical
3	No one has to log on or off; it's a single thing.	3	disruption).
4	And that might address the technical requirements,	4	MEMBER TULEMELLO: Hey there. I had a quick
5	the broadcaster's needs; it's still just a single moderator.	5	question. There is a separate debate for House and a
6	The Independents only tune in once, but you've packaged it	6	separate debate for Senate, correct?
7	in content that voters can get what they want without having	7	Or is it all LD-5 or LD-12?
8	to stick around for all the stuff they don't want.	8	MEMBER ROBSON: Everybody is lumped together
9	MEMBER KLINE: I think that's interesting.	9	currently.
10	MEMBER ROBSON: I think that makes sense.	10	MEMBER TULEMELLO: I wonder
11	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Before we run out of time, are	11	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So are we talking about primary
12	there other changes that we want to talk about?	12	or general? And you're you're talking about legislature
13	There's been some discussion about moderators.	13	not not congress?
14	Gina spelled out the format of debates, should we make it	14	MEMBER TULEMELLO: Correct.
15	less; one minute here, two minutes here; more of a	15	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Gina, do you want to
16	conversational thing.	16	address that?
17	Any other changes that come to mind?	17	MS. ROBERTS: Yes. Mr. Chairman, Member Tulemello,
18	MS. ROBERTS: Mr Chairman and members, just a	18	that is so currently in 2022 our current process we
19	heads up, I do anticipate a future agenda item will be	19	have we lump it all together. So LD-1 House, Senate,
20	specifically devoted to moderators. So just letting you	20	Republicans, and Democrats all together; that's one event,
21	know. You're certainly still welcome to talk about it now	21	one debate.
22	because it is part of the format, I just wanted to let you	22	The discussion right now is should we break it out,
23	know that we will have that discussion in the future as	23	should we separate by party or by Chamber?
24	well.	24	MEMBER TULEMELLO: Right. I I like the idea of
25	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you.	25	separating by Chamber and for one reason, you know, just
1	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	50		51
1	searchability for people watching. You know, if you are	1	Chamber. In the last seat, you know, you know have you know
2	trying to decide who to vote for.	2	House and Senate all in the same debate. We don't vote that
3	If you, you know, you're going to have to vote for	3	way, we vote by Chamber; and I think it would be valuable to
4	House members and Senate members, so you know in searching	4	hear from the candidates based upon, you know, their Chamber
5	for that information if you're not watching the debate live,	5	representation.
6	it would be a lot cleaner, you know, I can look look for	6	That the one thing that concerns me, Bob you can
7	LD-12 Senate or LD-12 House.	7	talk to this, you you've done multiple of these directly,
8	I like the idea of separating the races. I don't	8	is the time factor if we put on so many debates. So if we
9	know where people might come down on that, I'll defer to	9	break it up, that means we're doubling the the debates
10	everybody else on whether you want to combine, you know, the	10	that are aired. Now, from a production standpoint, that's
11	parties in the same debate. I was just you know, as a	11	pretty significant, from a viewer standpoint, you're opting
12	voter, people sit at their kitchen table and try to figure	12	in to whichever one you want so it doesn't make a
13	out: Okay, this race, this race, this race, and, you know,	13	difference, but it might make it easier to decide which one
14	they're searching; they might be able to discern a little	14	you are going to watch.
15	better information about who is running in a particular race	15	And I think that to Constantin is that how you
16	if the events were separated.	16	pronounce your name? Constantin's point of some time ago,
17	MEMBER ROBSON: The other is it also you stand	17	you know, Republicans watch Republicans; Democrats watch
18	out if you don't show up if there's only two people running	18	Democrats. It's just the way it goes.
19	for the Senate. So the public gets to know whether or not	19	So I think there is a lot more to think about, but
20	you're hiding from them or not, as opposed to putting 'em in	20	I do think there is real opportunity to really narrow it
21	at one time, you go Joe Blow couldn't make it tonight in the	21	down for the for the person watching and give them a
22	beginning, and then nobody knows why Joe Blow wasn't there	22	better option of what makes you know, what's more
23	at that point.	23	interesting to them.
24	MEMBER GENTLES: Yeah, this is Karl Gentles again.	24	MEMBER ROBSON: I agree.
25	I agree with Cathy; I do like breaking it out by	25	MEMBER TULEMELLO: Yeah, and while I agree
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	52		53
1	Republicans will watch Republicans and Democrats will watch	1	moderator-specific question, maybe we can mark it down to
1 2		1 2	moderator-specific question, maybe we can mark it down to raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one
	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together.		raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one
2	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That	2	
2 3	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we	2 3	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are
2 3 4	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the	2 3 4	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats
2 3 4 5	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we	2 3 4 5	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it
2 3 4 5 6	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely	2 3 4 5 6	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions
2 3 4 5 6 7	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely	2 3 4 5 6 7	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate. So I think we kid ourselves and we say Republicans	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here because we've got two minutes remaining, can I summarize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate. So I think we kid ourselves and we say Republicans want Democrats to come and Democrats want Republicans to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here because we've got two minutes remaining, can I summarize what I'm hearing and and get some feedback if this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate. So I think we kid ourselves and we say Republicans want Democrats to come and Democrats want Republicans to come. That wasn't the point I was going to make, though,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here because we've got two minutes remaining, can I summarize what I'm hearing and and get some feedback if this is missing something real quick?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate. So I think we kid ourselves and we say Republicans want Democrats to come and Democrats want Republicans to come. That wasn't the point I was going to make, though, Mr. Chairman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here because we've got two minutes remaining, can I summarize what I'm hearing and and get some feedback if this is missing something real quick? So what what I what I'm planning to say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate. So I think we kid ourselves and we say Republicans want Democrats to come and Democrats want Republicans to come. That wasn't the point I was going to make, though, Mr. Chairman. I want us to not lose sight of Mr. Robson's comment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here because we've got two minutes remaining, can I summarize what I'm hearing and and get some feedback if this is missing something real quick? So what what I what I'm planning to say representing us is that clearly there's a lot of varying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate. So I think we kid ourselves and we say Republicans want Democrats to come and Democrats want Republicans to come. That wasn't the point I was going to make, though, Mr. Chairman. I want us to not lose sight of Mr. Robson's comment from last month and Gina, forgive me if this is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here because we've got two minutes remaining, can I summarize what I'm hearing and and get some feedback if this is missing something real quick? So what what I what I'm planning to say representing us is that clearly there's a lot of varying thoughts and opinions, both in support of moving to party-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Democrats, it is much better if we all watch together. MEMBER GENTLES: Oh, I agree. I agree. That yeah, I probably shouldn't have said it that way, but we know what the reality is. In fact, I like watching all the debates, but I'm just talking generally from that instance. MEMBER TULEMELLO: Oh, sure. I I completely agree with you as well. MEMBER JONES: I remember showing up to one Democratic debate, and it think it might have been the State Democratic Party Convention, and Marco Lopez, and forgive me for not remembering who he was running against in that cycle was debating, and I liked thinking that, you know, one of those people is going to be on the on the ballot; it's good to know what they're both going to say. And I think every media outlet including the Arizona Republic and the YellowSheet and the Capitol Times covered the mere fact that I went into the room to watch that debate. So I think we kid ourselves and we say Republicans want Democrats to come and Democrats want Republicans to come. That wasn't the point I was going to make, though, Mr. Chairman. I want us to not lose sight of Mr. Robson's comment	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	raise whenever that agenda item is appropriate. But one thing Bob mentioned last time is if you have people who are subject-matter experts who are engaging candidates, it matters a lot less whether they're Republicans and Democrats or Independents and whether you mix House and Senate. It makes the information shared much more relevant and much more interesting and much more helpful to inform decisions by voters. So I just want us to keep that in mind as we think about format changes and and that sort of thing. The I can't I think it might have been Chris Kline who said let's don't break something that's not broken. It's probable that what we're doing now isn't broken; it's just that that we need people who are more thoughtful to engage with the candidates. Not so much as referees but more as policy, subject matter, knowledgeable experts. MEMBER KLINE: So in the spirit of time here because we've got two minutes remaining, can I summarize what I'm hearing and and get some feedback if this is missing something real quick? So what what I what I'm planning to say representing us is that clearly there's a lot of varying

	54		55
1	based debates and Chamber-based debates and opposition to	1	MEMBER KLINE: And we have 24 seconds to spare.
2	change. On the one hand we talked about the fact that the	2	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Wow.
3	topics of conversation are different by party and Chamber,	3	MEMBER QUERARD: All in favor of Chris doing this
4	and that we could get more robust conversations if we make	4	every time raise your hand.
5	them separate. We also talked about the fact that we could	5	MEMBER KLINE: No.
6	lose engagement from voters including Independents that want	6	What I'm really fascinated to see is if the other
7		7	
8	to see everybody at once.	8	group comes back with the same thing as us or if we see
	But in total, while there isn't a single idea that	9	something totally different because I have a feeling that
9	it seems like everyone here rallies behind, one of the ideas	10	opinions are very varied over there, too.
10 11	that seem to spark a lot of engagement was the idea of	11	* * *
	supporting a primary debate that's split between parties but	12	
12	remains a single event and has candidates speaking based		
13	upon party and Chamber at different times.	13	(BREAKOUT GROUP B - 10:45 A.M.)
14	MEMBER GENTLES: Sounds good.	14	MR. XOLA: Here we are. Good morning, everyone.
15	MEMBER ROBSON: Sounded good.	15	Thank you, members, for your time.
16	MEMBER KLINE: Okay.	16	Let's jump right in; the time moves quickly, so
17	MEMBER SIMPSON: Yep.	17	let's jump right in. And basically what I'll do is I'll
18	MEMBER QUERARD: So that's clear that they they	18	post some topics or issues to you, and then you all can just
19	really are broken out within that time. It's not that they	19	kind of talk about it and give your opinions
20	just speak at different times, but debates within the	20	So the first thing we're going to talk about is
21	debate.	21	the oh. Let me you know what, let me let me hit
22	MEMBER KLINE: Debate I can	22	record. I always forget to do that.
23	MEMBER QUERARD: They are clearly segmented.	23	MR. COLLINS: I'm sorry, I was supposed to do that
24	MEMBER KLINE: Okay.	24	and I failed.
25	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Very well done, Chris.	25	MR. XOLA: Oh, no. It's okay.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	56		57
1	Oh. It says "please ask host to give you	1	everybody has the swagger.
2	permission to record," so. All right.	2	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that
2 3	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All	2 3	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word.
2 3 4	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right.	2 3 4	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that?
2 3 4 5	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is	2 3 4 5	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery?
2 3 4 5 6	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if	2 3 4 5 6	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong moderator, it works to have the soft time limits. But if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the issues, whatever format if it's soft debate or hard type of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong moderator, it works to have the soft time limits. But if the moderator is not strong, you need to have that clock,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the issues, whatever format if it's soft debate or hard type of time, that's my biggest concern is I would love to see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong moderator, it works to have the soft time limits. But if the moderator is not strong, you need to have that clock, 'cause if you don't, then the dominant personality dominates	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the issues, whatever format if it's soft debate or hard type of time, that's my biggest concern is I would love to see candidates truly talking about issues in detail rather than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong moderator, it works to have the soft time limits. But if the moderator is not strong, you need to have that clock, 'cause if you don't, then the dominant personality dominates and the viewers don't get a real accurate reflection of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the issues, whatever format if it's soft debate or hard type of time, that's my biggest concern is I would love to see candidates truly talking about issues in detail rather than cliche because I see a lot of cliche.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong moderator, it works to have the soft time limits. But if the moderator is not strong, you need to have that clock, 'cause if you don't, then the dominant personality dominates and the viewers don't get a real accurate reflection of what's going on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the issues, whatever format if it's soft debate or hard type of time, that's my biggest concern is I would love to see candidates truly talking about issues in detail rather than cliche because I see a lot of cliche. And so whatever format that we create that we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong moderator, it works to have the soft time limits. But if the moderator is not strong, you need to have that clock, 'cause if you don't, then the dominant personality dominates and the viewers don't get a real accurate reflection of what's going on. I've seen Brahm Resnik do it quite well, but not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the issues, whatever format if it's soft debate or hard type of time, that's my biggest concern is I would love to see candidates truly talking about issues in detail rather than cliche because I see a lot of cliche. And so whatever format that we create that we're able to do that, that's what is important to me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	permission to record," so. All right. Oh. It says "recording." I hope it is. All right. THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, Avery. This is Angela. I'm recording on my end if nothing else, if anything fails. MR. XOLA: Oh, okay. I appreciate you. Thank you. Thank you, Angela. All right. So the first issue would be time limits. So the time limits for each candidate to speak during the debate, should it be hard time limits or soft time limits? Pros and cons, hard time limit, of course you're going to be on schedule; you're going to save time. Soft it gives the candidate some time to kind of fill out their their idea or their comment, but I'm interested to hear what you all have to say. MEMBER MCLEOD: I've noticed that with a strong moderator, it works to have the soft time limits. But if the moderator is not strong, you need to have that clock, 'cause if you don't, then the dominant personality dominates and the viewers don't get a real accurate reflection of what's going on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. XOLA: All right. I like it. I like that word. Anybody else want to chime in on that? MEMBER FOWLER: Avery? MR. XOLA: Yes. MEMBER FOWLER: This is Renaldo. MR. XOLA: Yeah. MEMBER FOWLER: I think as we talk about format, my biggest my biggest thing is making sure during the debates that the information that's out there we talk about a soft debate, if you're having a great conversation that's really addressing the issue, then a soft a soft time would be good, right. But if you have these individuals who are just going off in right field and left field and that is not being controlled, that's my biggest particular issue. My issue with these debates is is making sure that we have candidates that are are addressing the issues, whatever format if it's soft debate or hard type of time, that's my biggest concern is I would love to see candidates truly talking about issues in detail rather than cliche because I see a lot of cliche. And so whatever format that we create that we're

	58		59
1	MR. XOLA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Member	1	For the next, and let's move into rebuttal
2	Fowler. Appreciate anybody else before we move on to	2	MEMBER LIGGETT: Hold on. Hold on.
3	that, I think we got pretty good comments out of that.	3	MEMBER SHEORAN: Hold on. Yeah, a couple of us
4	MEMBER MCLEOD: I would just say, like, I've done a	4	have comments.
5	lot of these and one thing that can be a problem sometimes	5	MEMBER LIGGETT: A couple of us have questions.
6	is that, like, the rules can get really complicated. Like,	6	MR. XOLA: Okay. I don't want to I don't want
7	you have 2 minutes to answer the question, but then if you	7	to skip anyone. All right.
8	want to rebut you've got 45 seconds, and if you're going to	8	MEMBER LIGGETT: That's okay.
9	rebut the rebuttal, you've got only 30 seconds. And so it	9	MR. XOLA: Member Liggett, go ahead.
10	makes it really hard for the candidate first of all, it's	10	MEMBER LIGGETT: Thanks, Avery.
11	hard to begin with, like, "Explain how school funding should	11	I want to ask more experienced people or people
12	work in two minutes." Wow, that's complicated. But to try	12	with more time, I want to press on that moderator issue
13	to learn to speak in, like, three different time blocks is	13	'cause I agree, right, in in an ideal setting, you would
14	really complicated.	14	have a strong moderator who does that. I'm skeptical about
15	So I would say if you're going to have hard limits,	15	how consistently we're able to do that with moderators. I
16	you know, try to make it as, like, simple as possible and	16	invite pushback on that, but I think if we can't do it
17	not make people try to formulate their thoughts in different	17	consistently, then we ought to lean, you know, back on some
18	chunk sizes if that makes sense.	18	time limits.
19	MR. XOLA: Yeah. It does. And I think this speaks	19	I want us to be more careful with this decision
20	to having a strong moderator, I and we, we always deal	20	'cause I hear us going, like, "Yeah, strong moderator."
21	with that, and that's something that's very important to	21	Only if we can deliver a strong moderator.
22	each of the debates is having a strong moderator who can	22	Okay. That's all I have to say.
23	kind of navigate that and know when to push back and know	23	Pinny.
24	when to, you know, make that hard time limit to Member	24	MEMBER SHEORAN: Yeah, thank
25	Fowler's point.	25	MR. XOLA: Okay, Member Sheoran.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	60		61
1	MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you so much, Avery.	1	if the moderator also doesn't have very strict rules and
2	That augmenting what Jodi had said is, I think	2	guidance, 'cause it will go downhill.
3	depending on a moderator really does not speak to the issue	3	And so that's sort of where I I would add to the
4	of equity, and if we are going to be balanced and fair, then	4	caution Jodi said and also the caution Renaldo said about
5	the strict timing does allow that no matter, you know no	5	
6		5	trying to avoid cliches. So both of the responsibility are
0	matter how interesting, if you will, the conversation is.	6	trying to avoid cliches. So both of the responsibility are ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations
7	matter how interesting, if you will, the conversation is. If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct		
7 8		6	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations
	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct	6 7	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make.
8	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all	6 7 8	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and
8 9	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one.	6 7 8 9	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you
8 9 10	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses.
8 9 10 11	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates	6 7 8 9 10 11	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this?
8 9 10 11 12 13	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to	6 7 9 10 11 12 13	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?"
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they going to do?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?" They all will tell you, right? They all will tell you,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they going to do? So, you know, those are two responsibilities. So	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?" They all will tell you yes, right? They all will tell you, "Oh, we support disabilities," right? But when you get into
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they going to do? So, you know, those are two responsibilities. So as Jodi said, hang on here, you know, before we say it's a	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?" They all will tell you yes, right? They all will tell you, "Oh, we support disabilities," right? But when you get into the conversation with them, "Do you support increase in
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they going to do? So, you know, those are two responsibilities. So as Jodi said, hang on here, you know, before we say it's a good thing. We should keep a conversation and depending on	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?" They all will tell you yes, right? They all will tell you, "Oh, we support disabilities," right? But when you get into the conversation with them, "Do you support increase in special education services?" When you start asking
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they going to do? So, you know, those are two responsibilities. So as Jodi said, hang on here, you know, before we say it's a good thing. We should keep a conversation and depending on a moderator, you know, we as the League, we've done this	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?" They all will tell you yes, right? They all will tell you, "Oh, we support disabilities," right? But when you get into the conversation with them, "Do you support increase in special education services?" When you start asking specifically about a particular topic, that's where I
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they going to do? So, you know, those are two responsibilities. So as Jodi said, hang on here, you know, before we say it's a good thing. We should keep a conversation and depending on a moderator, you know, we as the League, we've done this for years and years, and you cannot depend on the moderator	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?" They all will tell you yes, right? They all will tell you, "Oh, we support disabilities," right? But when you get into the conversation with them, "Do you support increase in special education services?" When you start asking specifically about a particular topic, that's where I whatever format we set up, that we can get that information
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	If you call it a debate, then give each person the correct amount of time from an equity perspective because they all should have the same amount of exposure. That's one. Second point I would like to make is Renaldo's point about cliche, you know, it behooves these candidates to come well prepared, which then puts the onus on us to be prepared with the kinds of framing the questions for the broad issues in a way that targets that particular election or race or that that those candidates from being able to actually effect a change. The challenge with these cliches is they hide behind cliches, but then when they have to do the presentation and work at the legislature, what are they going to do? So, you know, those are two responsibilities. So as Jodi said, hang on here, you know, before we say it's a good thing. We should keep a conversation and depending on a moderator, you know, we as the League, we've done this	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ours as the Clean Election Commission or the recommendations we make. Tight timelines; don't depend on the moderator; and frame your questions so they are razor sharp in how you elicit the responses. MR. XOLA: Okay, okay. Is there anyone else that wants to chime in on this? I see Member Fowler, you have your hand raised. MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, I think this has to do with our conversation in our first meeting; we had a lot of discussion about should we provide the questions to the candidates prior to debate. I'm going to give you a good example is, if you ask the candidate, "Do you support issues around disabilities?" They all will tell you yes, right? They all will tell you, "Oh, we support disabilities," right? But when you get into the conversation with them, "Do you support increase in special education services?" When you start asking specifically about a particular topic, that's where I

16 of 52 sheets

	62		63
1	from them.	1	concern is when we have these debates and you you go to
2	Because as I mentioned earlier: "Of course we	2	give people equal time, if someone kind of goes off the
3	support women's rights; of course we support disabilities."	3	rail, how do you control that? I know we keep talking about
4	But how do you get that candidate to specifically address	4	a moderator.
5	issues within that?	5	Like, a person made just on absurd allegation or do
6	And so that that's kind of my my concerns	6	whatever they say, do the moderator jump in and kind of
7	with the debate is whatever format we set up, strict	7	fact-check that person, because we've talked about that a
8	timelines/not timelines, how do we get in the answer real	8	little bit
9	questions and get to the meat of what issues are.	9	MR. XOLA: Yes.
10	MR. XOLA: Okay. Thank you, thank you.	10	MEMBER FOWLER: because once I think from now on
11	MEMBER MCLEOD: I think the answer to that is just	11	based on the patterns of what I see out there in terms of
12	follow-up questions from a strong moderator; otherwise, you	12	political world, if that's a tune that they use, they throw
13	give people two minutes, they can just say whatever they	13	it out there. It might be a lie; it might be something, but
14	want, the clock runs out, you go to the next person.	14	how do we check them immediately rather than let it linger?
15	MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. Okay.	15	That's what I would like to see in these debates is that we
16	MR. XOLA: And that kind of moves us into our next	16	keep people we talked about fact checking, how do we do
17	topic is rebuttals. So when the moderator is asking so	17	that in debates in this whole process, rebuttals and
18	should the candidate be able to just interrupt and give a	18	different type of things?
19	rebuttal, or should the moderator have a "go down the line	19	So that that's kind of my question.
20	and give each candidate a chance to rebuttal a pacific	20	MR. XOLA: Okay. And what I will say is the we
21	(verbatim) argument" or should it just be between two, you	21	don't have a fact check per se, but the moderators that
22	know, if two candidates arguing, how should rebuttals look	22	sort of goes back to having a moderator that's knowledgeable
23	like in you-all's opinion?	23	and understands the, you know, political landscape and the
24	Member Fowler, go ahead.	24	issues, they can push back or challenge a candidate when
25	MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. So, so I guess my biggest	25	they say something that may be incorrect or ask for
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	64		65
1	clarification.	1	moderators, having two moderators. So this is kind of,
2	But yeah, but that's something to consider as	2	while we're having this workgroup, what do you all think
3	well, a type of fact checker.	3	about having two moderators? Is that something that you
4	Does anyone else have any comments about rebuttals,	4	think would benefit the voters and the candidates or
5	the way rebuttals are ran? MEMBER SENSEMAN: Avery? Avery, yeah, this is Paul	5 6	MEMBER TORGESON: I think it would help both of them.
7	Senseman, I do I do have perhaps a thought or suggestion	7	MR. XOLA: And is that two moderators from
8	and you can tell me it's not possible, but with the with	8	political parties or two like just
9	the sort of the conditions of our politics presently and	9	MEMBER TORGESON: Yeah, I mean and I'm not sure
10	and the fact that, though talented, the individual and solo	10	if I'm being heard. Am I being heard by everybody?
11	members of media are probably not trusted by one side or the	11	MR. XOLA: Yeah, we can all hear you.
12	other, what about the consideration of having and I guess	12	MEMBER TORGESON: 'Kay. Yes because, I mean, let's
13	this applies not just to rebuttals but other things as well,	13	face it, you can skew something either way if you want, and
14	what about having two moderators to participate in debates?	14	there's things that people say are fake news and they're not
15	And and I guess I would associate with comments	15	fake news, it's biased and you find out later it's biased
16	here that have been made by Jodi and others, and that strong	16	and they're saying it's not.
17	moderators as well as strong rules I think result in in	17	Having at least two people, yeah, that would
18	strong debates, outcomes, and for voters to really get a	18	balance that out, but at the same time, has there ever been
19	full feel of what of what these candidates are about.	19	an issue in the past that needs this addressing?
20	So, any consideration for more than one moderator,	20	MR. XOLA: Tom, do you want to speak to that?
21	having a couple from each side of pretty obvious and	21	MEMBER LIGGETT: I'll I'll jump in here. Sorry,
22	distinct political spectrums?	22	I was muted.
23	MR. XOLA: I see Member Jo Member Liggett has a	23	I honestly don't know how I feel. I'm of two minds
24	question and wants to add in.	24	about two moderators. I'm worried that we are giving into
		25	والمانية ومناع مناجر ومروم والمتعاط ومام والمتعاط والمتعادية والمتعادية
25	This is the perfect opportunity to talk about two	25	division and the idea that there's none of us in the middle
25	This is the perfect opportunity to talk about two Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com	25	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	66		67
1	or there's nobody can ever be objective, so I'm struggling	1	just the reality.
2	with that. I hear what you're saying, Paul, and I see how	2	(Technical disruption) done studies that show an
3	what you're suggesting, you know, two moderators addresses	3	absolute (technical disruption) of where culture (technical
4	a or might address a problem; but I'm worried about just	4	disruption). So that's just a (technical disruption)
5	what that says in terms of a larger narrative as we all try	5	unfortunately.
6	and move forward together in Arizona, however the future is	6	They mitigate that in (technical disruption), and
7	going to look. So that's one thing.	7	to Jodi's point about rebuttal, yeah, hereto or prior to the
8	And then what I was going to say earlier is, you	8	last election cycle, Commission's if we had a point of
9	know, let's put some of this back on the candidates. You	9	view was that it was the candidate's obligation
10	know, a rebuttal can function as a fact check. I think	10	(technical disruption). Beginning with the post-2020, folks
11	maybe it's the candidate's responsibility, you know, to	11	started to tell us it's our job to do the rebuttal, we were
12	monitor what each other are saying and correct it if they	12	at (technical disruption) to to coin a phrase
13	think it's wrong. So if we allow time for that, you know,	13	"platforming views that were not appropriately prepared."
14	maybe that's less of the moderator's responsibility other	14	We had previously and this is part of the
15	than civility.	15	discussion (technical disruption) and that it would be the
16	So with that, those things being said, I'll be	16	candidate's job as to rebut (technical disruption), and the
17	quiet now.	17	statement that they thought ought not (technical disruption)
18	MR. COLLINS: Avery, did you still want me to	18	fair or was incorrect, whatever that is.
19	MR. XOLA: Oh, yeah. Sure, if you'd like to.	19	That's something that's part of this process we're
20	MR. COLLINS: Just for context, we have had a time	20	wrestling with really, the core of it is and I apologize
21	objection over political view. Reality is that the way that	21	for going on so long, it's just how I (technical
22	political rumors are now incentivized and obligated by	22	disruption).
23	publications to have individual (technical disruption)	23	You know, it is whose obligation is that to put it
24	reporting is sort of a nowhere gone by the wayside, so it's	24	in your (technical disruption) train of thought and that's a
25	a little bit harder to (technical disruption), and that's	25	real real hopefully we'll (technical disruption).
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
1	68 MR. XOLA: All right. Thank you, Tom, for that, to	1	69 about informative or, you know, regular-style, true debates
2	clarify that.	2	what about the voter, what do you think the voter would like
3	We can go to let's go to talk about so we can	3	to see? Do you think the voter would be more interested in
4	have a true debate style or what do you guys think about	4	seeing a true debate with those time limits in place, or do
5	for versus a forum style? So there's, you know, the	5	you think just having kind of a forum-style informal debate
6	true debate is more stringent; it has more rules in place,	6	is better for viewership?
7	you know, there's time limits. Where a forum style is kind	7	Or how do you balance that? How do you, you
8	of more of a discussion where there is some, you know, the	8	know
9	other candidates can challenge each other.	9	MEMBER FOWLER: Avery, I have a question for you.
10	What do you think about about those two formats?	10	MR. XOLA: Yes.
11	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if our goal is to,	11	MEMBER FOWLER: So for those who who experience
12	you know, have entertaining, informative debates getting	12	and participate in these debates, which of these formats
13	more interaction between the candidates is is good.	13	have we have any data on which of these formats give us
14	And I guess I would just say that I've watched a	14	the results that we want in terms of a debate? You talk
15	few of these not a ton and I have seen more than one	15	about the two different approaches.
16	moderator, but they don't seem to be like a left moderator	16	I guess my again, as my thing is whatever
17	and a right moderator, they're like two different	17	process that we can get these politicians to to answer
18	journalists who have their own perspectives and I think	18	questions to address those particular issues; and also to
19	that's and sometimes they fact-check stuff 'cause they,	19	make sure we have a process where we can, either the
20	they know what's up because they're covering the races,	20	candidate or the moderator, checks in terms of facts check
21	which I think it's really appropriate and and great.	21	that that facts checks the process.
22	I think we should try to make candidates kind of	22	And so I I guess Rodd, you said you've been
	respond to each other and and, you know, the moderator	23	on debates or you've stayed (phonetic) some of these
23		0.4	dahataa
24	should try to get people talking to each other.	24 25	debates?
	should try to get people talking to each other. MR. XOLA: And just to to add to that question	24 25	MEMBER MCLEOD: I've watched some
24	should try to get people talking to each other.		

	70		71
1	MEMBER FOWLER: Okay.	1	creative.
2	MEMBER MCLEOD: with candidates that I was	2	Go ahead.
3	interested in.	3	MR. XOLA: Tom, you have something. Go ahead, Tom.
4	MEMBER FOWLER: Okay.	4	You're on mute, though, yeah.
5	MEMBER MCLEOD: I've never participated myself.	5	MR. COLLINS: For the purpose of answering that
6	MEMBER FOWLER: Okay.	6	question Renaldo just asked, one way that the, you know,
7	MEMBER MCLEOD: I wouldn't subject the electorate	7	Presidential Commission type the (technical disruption) this
8	to that.	8	year or next year, they do the fact-checking post hoc,
9	MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. I you know, like I	9	right. So, so and part of that stems from, you know,
10	said Jodi, do you have any questions about that?	10	it's all of 2012, because most of us on this call are of
11	I'm just real curious. My thing is, how at the end	11	enough of an age that, remember 2012, that, you know, Candy
12	of the day, how do we get candidates, how do we control the	12	Crowley sort of stepped into the middle of the debate
13	environment with with the moderator, either the candidate	13	(technical disruption), and that itself had an effect on
14	fact-checks him or the moderator or we have two different	14	that whole process. It's certainly among Republicans I
15	individuals there asking questions and maybe the second	15	think, and Paul or Jim or (technical disruption) who is an
16	person is maybe a fact fact-check type of a more of a	16	actual (technical disruption) that was a moment in time that
17	fact-check type of person, follow-up type of person because	17	really thought that moderator overstepped.
18	that that's my my concern.	18	But watch CNN or any other station after one of
19	So I think having two people, the second person	19	usually (technical disruption).
20	either more of a fact-check type of person and the first	20	So Renaldo, my point being talking about how we are
21	person asks the questions and and I guess the second	21	going to do this, maybe what do you think about the idea if
22	person more the "sergeant at arms" type of person where they	22	we had some (technical disruption) show (technical
23	are just when a person says something crazy, that person	23	disruption).
24	will step in immediate and say "wait," you know.	24	MEMBER TORGESON: I'm missing every third word.
25	I that's just some ideas. I'm just trying to be	25	MR. COLLINS: Well, my voice is shot.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	72		73
1	MEMBER TORGESON: I just didn't know if that was	1	And as I recall, there was staff available for some fact
2	your connection or mine.	2	checking that they were able to redirect as part of the
3	MR. COLLINS: It's it's my voice.	3	redirect questions.
4	MEMBER TORGESON: Okay. Sorry.	4	So it might be worth considering that as you as
5	Here, let me just interject this thought for a	5 6	we as the group makes recommendations.
6 7	moment. I mean has there's going to be questions here:	_	I mean, I want to go back to an earlier statement,
8	One, have we had this problem in the past; two, fact checking is still going to be dependent upon what somebody	7 8	I think Rodd we made this about we want it to be entertaining and informative. Well, if our purpose is to
9	interprets the fact to be. And as you just said, that lends	9	educate I mean, this this is a long, philosophical
10	itself to "after the fact."	10	conversation which we don't need to have today, but it
11	The the fact that they've got the questions in	11	it's my observation that this last election cycle the
12	advance almost doesn't really make it a debate; it just	12	debates lent more to entertainment and rating and therefore,
13	makes it for three minutes of pontificating on a subject.	13	I think, caused some harm to the perceptions of how balanced
14	So I'm going back to the original premise of what what	14	they were and we need to avoid that.
15	kind of debate is that? If they've got if they've got	15	So maybe if we take entertainment off the table,
16	the questions in advance, I mean, is it just the forum of	16	make it informative, you know, that might be something for
17	some sort?	17	us to guide us as we move forward.
18	MR. XOLA: Good point. That's a good point.	18	The second point I want to make is these are people
19	I see Member Sheoran, go ahead.	19	who have to debate on the floor under the job they hold, and
20	MEMBER SHEORAN: Thank you, Avery.	20	if they cannot debate and come prepared to the floor as
21	In the League we have debated this question of	21	we have seen elected folks not reading and, you know, not
22	forum versus debate for over two decades and, you know, we	22	checking what bill they're voting on or whatever I think
23	have not you know, the Presidential Commission was the	23	that's a tell right there for the public and for everybody.
24	Elections Commission was mentioned, I think Tom you did, but	24	So giving them the questions in advance, I don't see an
25	they have been not conducting the debates for a long time.	25	issue with that because they get the bills in advance; they
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	1	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	74		75
1	have to do the research. They have to be we're we're	1	participation. And that was at the highest level that was
2	looking not just for their representation but their ability	2	not we didn't witness that in the last cycle, that was
3	to be mindful, thoughtful, and reflect the needs of their	3	a that was a challenge.
4	constituents and their communities.	4	And so if we focus if we focus our efforts on
5	So, you know, our our preference has always been	5	format and and moderators, that then that then will
6	to give the questions in advance, make sure the questions	6	drive that participation period, I think you're going to
7	were tight and razor sharp and focused on what the community	7	find I think we may find that some of these other
8	cares about, the voters care about; and then more	8	concerns will will work out a little bit, a little bit
9	importantly that the moderator had help with fact checking	9	better overall, maybe not be quite so quite so difficult
10	to have rebuttal questions. 'Cause, you know, rebuttal	10	or challenging.
11	between the candidates, but there can be follow-up questions	11	So just that just that thought that kind of the
12	by the moderator, too, which puts sheds a light on	12	foundation is we really need we need them all to show up
13	alternate facts if you will.	13	or there's there's no there is debate for 'em or
14	That that's sort of something for us to be	14	anything else.
15	thinking about.	15	MR. XOLA: That is true.
16	MR. XOLA: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.	16	MEMBER SENSEMAN: And that and that's built by
17	And Member Senseman, I see you have your hand up.	17	confidence in the system, understanding rules, knowing that,
18	MEMBER SENSEMAN: Avery, thank you.	18	you know, if it's journalists that are there it's just I
19	I, just a lot of great quest comments here by	19	mean, the journalists are generally viewed as one-sided
20	the by the committee. I'm it's really impressive,	20	politically now. The pure research and others sort of back
21	thanks for assembling this.	21	that up as well, it's decidedly one party. So having
22	I would I don't think I disagree with many	22	picking moderators I think might help drive that balance,
23	with any of them, really. But I did want to make a quick	23 24	get a diverse, you know, array of question that that are
24 25	point, that I think the first and foremost goal here is to	24 25	interested issues for more than, you know, one side of
25	get this to is to drive attendance; we want Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	25	voters. Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	76		77
1	And then I I must agree with Jodi, my concerns	1	MR. XOLA: Great, that's the cognitive friction
2	are similar that we want to we do want to think about and	2	that we all need when we're watching a debate.
3	drive questions as a Commission I think that are going to	3	We're almost out of here. Thank you, everybody.
4	attract and and push folks to more thoughtful agreement	4	This is super fruitful debate or workgroup breakout
5	points and unification points. So so I think you want to	5	session. Thank you.
6	do that in terms of the solution sets and the discussion	6	
7	overall on policy.	7	* * *
8	But but we we just have to drive more more	8	
9	trust and faith in the system to get it to to get it to	9	(GENERAL SESSION - 11:15 a.m.)
10	wherever want it to be, so participation.	10	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So I think is everyone back
11	Thanks, Avery.	11	together now?
12	MR. XOLA: Yeah, thank you for your comment.	12	There's a lot of people here; I hadn't counted
13	Member Fowler, you can take us out of here, we've	13	but
14	got 50 seconds.	14	Okay. Why don't we start with with Group A
15	Do you have a comment?	15	which I think, Gina that was the group you and I were in,
16	MEMBER FOWLER: Yeah, so so I think you know,	16	wasn't it?
17	I think we should provide them the questions, if not the	17	(No audible response.)
18	questions, the topics that you'd like for them to cover	18	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So Chris Kline was our spokesman.
19	because I think it's important for them to come prepared.	19	Chris, you want to report on what we decided?
20	Like they mentioned earlier about funding education, "Yeah,	20	MEMBER KLINE: Yeah. So we had a lot of varying
21	I support it," but the details of those questions to them	21	thoughts and opinions, both in support of moving to
22	will force them to really answer some of the questions.	22	party-based debates or Chamber-based debates, as well as
23	So that's really kind of my my main thing is	23	opposition to any change whatsoever and we spent a lot of
24	getting them to answer the questions and not just a	24	time fleshing out both sides.
25	performance.	25	We talked about the fact that on the one hand, the
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	78		79
1	topics of conversation are different by party; they're	1	if you choose, if you wish.
2	different by Chamber. And that we could get more robust	2	MR. XOLA: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Member
3	conversations if we made them separate, but we also talked	3	Sheoran.
4	about how that could create fragmentation. That we might	4	MEMBER SHEORAN: So our our top level topics
5	lose engagement from voters, especially Independents that	5	were on the time allocated for the candidate, should it be
6	wanted to see everyone all together, as well as	6	hard or soft. That was our top level discussion. It seemed
7	conversations about what that looked like logistically.	7	that the majority was in the opinion that it ought to be a
8	So in total we couldn't really get everyone to	8	hard stop.
9	rally behind a single idea, however, we got the most support	9	Second was not having an overall overreach into
10	around supporting a primary debate that is split between	10	the number of moderators or selection of moderators
11	parties but that remains a single event and has, in essence,	11	influencing where there should be a hard stop, you know the
12	debates within the debate so that candidates could speak	12	amount of time allocated to the debates.
13	based upon party or Chamber, but those that wanted to	13	The third was the notion of should the debate
14	continue to see everyone could continue to participate and	14	should the candidates get the questions in advance, and we
15	watch the entire event over the course of that hour or	15	did not come to a consensus on that I believe. If I'm
16	two-hour event.	16	wrong, Rodd, Jodi, anyone else please correct me. We seem
17	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you, Chris.	17	to be equally split in terms of we should send it ahead or
18	What about the spokesman for Group B, who is that?	18	we shouldn't.
19	MR. XOLA: Mr. Chairman, I we are Group B. Who	19	The other area for somewhat lengthy discussion was,
20	was our spokesperson? Who would like to speak?	20	is it a debate or a forum. The whole area of timing, equity
21	(No audible response.)	21	of making sure candidates have time, and also managing the
22	MR. XOLA: I think Member Fowler or Member	22	questions and thinking about the questions so that the
23	Senseman, Member Sheoran, Member Liggett, any anyone,	23	opportunity for the candidates doesn't become one of
24	please.	24	pontification and posturing but really answering in a
25	MEMBER SHEORAN: I'm happy to speak on our behalf	25	thoughtful manner the questions that voters care about so
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	80		
1	voters are making informed decisions.	1	into our breakout sessions. And, again, that will be Avery
2	I think I captured all of it. Avery, did I?	2	facilitating one and I'll be in the other with with
3	MR. XOLA: Yes. You did a fantastic job.	3	Chairman Kimble and both will be recorded and available on
4	MEMBER SHEORAN: Okay. Thank you.	4	our YouTube channel after the fact.
5	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you very much. Some	5	
6	crossover but some each of the groups focused on somewhat	6	* * *
7	different topics.	7	
8	And we're going to do this again on the rules for	8	(BREAKOUT SESSION GROUP A - 11:21 a.m.)
9	debate events. Gina, you want to talk about what we're	9	MS. ROBERTS: All right. Okay. So first first
10	going to discuss in our next breakout sessions?	10	action item is to select a spokesperson.
11	MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, members, yes. So	11	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Anyone want to be volunteered to
12	just just to confirm, we are on the agenda item is	12	do this?
13	that VI for discussion?	13	MEMBER SENSEMAN: I'd like to nominate Karl Gentles
14	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: VI, VI.	14	to be my spokesman.
15	MS. ROBERTS: Yep, okay. Working session,	15	MEMBER GENTLES: You know what, I swear I knew you
16	discussion on the rules for debate events.	16	were going to say that.
17	So we will break out into our groups again. This	17	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Are you willing, Karl?
18	will be randomly assigned, and here's where we will have	18	MEMBER GENTLES: Sure.
19	discussion about when the event is occurring, what rules	19	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay.
20	will be followed by the candidates, the moderator. To that	20	MEMBER GENTLES: Whatever whatever Paul Senseman
21	extent, Avery and I do have some questions to help each	21	says, I'll do.
22	group get started to help facilitate the discussion, but	22	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. That that's a good
23	this would be the time to discuss things such as time	23	start.
24	limits, you know, things like that, hard stops.	24	Okay.
25	So Cathy, if you want to go ahead and separate us	25	MS. ROBERTS: All right.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com	1	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	20		
	82		83
1	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What part of the go ahead,	1	Oh. I'm sorry, Jim or Member Torgeson, I know
2	Gina.	2	you are on the phone, so I'll just read through these.
3	MS. ROBERTS: Sure. So we have some some	3	Time limits, hard or soft; rebuttals, should we
4	questions for you all to consider. Again, it's whatever you	4	allow rebuttals for all candidates, and if we do rebuttals,
5	wish to discuss that has to do with the rules, the overall	5	is it just whoever wants to speak up or do we have to go
6	rules for how the debates are are conducted.	6	down the line; do we mute mics; again, forum style or true
7	I will start by saying that some of the standards	7	debate, you know, back-and-forth; are interruptions allowed,
8	that we have for all of our debates are, you know, the	8	if so must they be "to the point," "to that point," just as
9	obvious ones: Proper decorum, respect, no attacks on	9	our legislature; what do we do if a candidate doesn't answer
10	candidates, near equal speaking time for all candidates	10	the question, if they get asked a very specific question and
11	as as much as we can manage, and a neutral moderator.	11	their response is something entirely different; must the
12	And what we'll do here is I will drop into the	12	candidate stick to that topic to their question; do we,
13	chat just some bullet points that we have that you can, you	13	again, allow opening and closing statements; should we
14	know, if anything stands out to you that you want to	14	change up the speaking order ahead of time; do we identify
15	discuss, these will be here for your consideration.	15	the topics to be discussed and allocate specific time
16	But, again, we can time limits, should we have	16	sections for those topics.
17	those, should they be hard or soft whereas, you know, the	17	So if, you know, the candidates and the
18	moderator will kind of even encourage you to wrap up your	18	stakeholders said, Okay, we want to talk about education,
19	thought, okay, you get 15 more seconds; or is it just a hard	19	health healthcare and water, does that mean that, you
20	stop; should we cut mics; should we have that true debate	20	know, we schedule 15 minutes for each topic or and
21	style or more of a forum; you know, should we allow opening	21	then so, again, the standard as we said that the
22	and closing statements even, and and the time lengths	22	moderators are neutral, but may the moderators, while not
23	that we allocate for that.	23	engaging and debating the candidate, is the moderator
24	So there's a a few things there in the chat to	24	per permitted to provide context on a question?
25	get you started.	25	So, for example, if, you know, the moderator is
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
1	84	1	85
2	subject-matter expert and they get a question in about water, can the, you know, moderator provide a little bit	2	limits, let's start let's start there. Does anybody have a so whether we're talking about legislative or
3	more background and context on it to further allow for the	3	statewide, you know both can be obviously are different
4	candidate to to respond; or and do we allow going back	4	circumstances and and formats, but how do you all feel
5	to the interruptions and the back-and-forth, must speakers	5	about time limits? Should we be monitoring those very
6	be acknowledged by the moderator before speaking? Do we	6	strictly; should we have a hard time limit?
7	make it a little bit more formal?	7	MEMBER TORGESON: I would actually say be soft on
8	So those are just some of the bullet points that we	8	it but fair and if somebody deserves to have because
9	have to help facilitate this discussion. Again, whatever	9	somebody ran over 20 seconds should the his opponent be
10	you all feel is important and relevant to what you think the	10	allowed to respond with an extra 20 seconds per se.
11	rules of engagement for the candidate should be and how the	11	MEMBER QUERARD: You have a time limit, I mean, you
12	moderator should flow the debate, control the debate, those	12	have to have some structure and some basic guidance and
13	are all for for you to discuss.	13	rules. If you've told the candidates we're not going to be
14	Thank you.	14	militant about it but, you know, two minutes means two
15	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: And I just wanted to mention one	15	minutes it might be a minute 45 or 2.15, but two minutes
16	thing that Gina mentioned in our last session, we're going	16	doesn't mean three minutes.
17	to have a a discussion solely on moderators, so we won't	17	At the same time, if we are always over, we are
18	want to get too much into that.	18	tracking your overall time, we're going to let candidates
19	I assume, Gina, that discussion will be focused on	19	even this up so, be prepared to get I mean, if you keep
20	how we can choose them, who the moderators ought to be, not	20	giving me 2.15 instead of 2, for your last question you
21	so much their role during the debate?	21	might be down to 30 seconds 'cause you used up all your
22	Am I right, Gina?	22	extras because we're going to be fair and make sure
23	MS. ROBERTS: That is correct.	23	everybody has a fair chance.
24	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay.	24	If you clear if you're clear in advance, that's
25	MS. ROBERTS: Well, what do we all think about time	25	perfectly fine.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	86		87
1	MEMBER TORGESON: I agree with CQ.	1	to say "It's still his time, but let me come to you and get
2	MS. ROBERTS: How do you feel about	2	that just as soon as we're done here," and then get back.
3	MEMBER TORGESON: Am I still part of the session;	3	If the candidates know they're going to have a
4	is anybody there?	4	chance to make their point, you know, they don't have to
5	MS. ROBERTS: Yes, we still hear you.	5	force their way into the conversation.
6	MEMBER TORGESON: Okay. No, it just went dead	6	MEMBER TORGESON: Agreed.
7	quiet.	7	MEMBER SENSEMAN: Gina, this is Paul Senseman. I'm
8	MS. ROBERTS: How do you all feel about	8	going to find myself in a rare moment of perhaps slightly
9	interruptions? So if a candidate is responding to a	9	disagreeing with with Mr. Querard there.
10	question, moderator asks them a question that came in from a	10	I think for I think we want to build confidence
11	voter, candidate is responding and, you know, they're about	11	in what we're going to get at a forum and that that will
12	a minute into their response and their opponent jumps in and	12	help. If we if we confidence build, it will help drive
13	interrupts them, should the moderator allow that	13	more consistent turnout of the candidates, that are
14	interruption and then circle back to the candidate that has	14	participation of the candidates; and so having rules that
15	interrupted or say, Okay, hold off; I'll come to you when so	15	are that are complied with I think are important.
16	and so has finished their thought?	16	I will also say, though, that that shouldn't be
17	What do we think about interruptions and allowing	17	just left to the moderator or moderators, then you start
18	for that kind of interaction between the candidates?	18	getting into a position where the those individuals, be
19	MEMBER QUERARD: The latter is probably better just	19	they journalists or some other professional that are
20	so it doesn't turn into a total food fight. You don't want	20	hosting, end up interjecting themselves far greater than
21	to be so militant. I mean, to a certain degree, how a	21	they should be involved. And so you have if you have
22	candidate conducts themselves in a in a debate tells the	22	rules, then you need devices to to enforce them, not
23	voters an awful lot about them, not just what they say but	23	having the moderator themselves having to perform that
24	how they say it and how they behave, so. You know, you	24	function. It's just it just doesn't work as well.
25	interrupt sort of aggressively, it's fine for the moderator	25	But sound devices, audible sounds, those sort of
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	88		89
1	things. You're never going to get down to the second but	1	prevent interruptions, again show them how to use the "raise
2	they but they do they do help folks comply, and I	2	your hand" button that I can't find, you know, where if
3	think they create some conditions for candidates and and	3	you're muted and I ask you a question and I unmute you; and
4	for the people that are advising them to to have	4	then around that two-minute mark, I'm going to say, Hey,
5	confidence that this is this is roughly how it's going to	5	we're we're about out of time here, we, you know, need to
6	work out, and how your expectations can be then met at the	6	wrap it up," somebody who wants to cut in who has raised
7	end of the at the end of the event. And then that will	7	their hand I can go to that person and unmute. But if
8	build more participation, which ultimately is what we're	8	you're muted, doing all this stuff on the screen but like
9	looking for for voters to get the maximum exposure to	9	nobody can hear what you're saying.
10	candidates that they can.	10	Or is it better to kind of leave them unmuted
11	MEMBER TORGESON: Well, at the risk of sounding	11	and and let the moderator, you know, referee referee
12	like I didn't get it, I think the point was if a candidate	12	the fight?
13	is interrupting the other candidate, that the moderator	13	I don't know, Paul, would it be better if we
14	which one of the, I would say a synonym of moderator is	14	just when it's your turn, we unmute you?
15	referee, would step in and say, "Hey, we will hear you after	15	MEMBER SENSEMAN: That that's I think that
16	they finish talking. Not allowing it to start to spin out	16	drives more consistency and more confidence so that
17		17	there's the expectations are met by candidates across the
12	of control because when it spins out of control, you lose	18	board. They know what's coming and it's not quite we
18	confidence in the system.	40	doubt out these states in the second se
19	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point.	19 20	don't get these these concerns in debates about whether
19 20	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point. MEMBER QUERARD: I think it's also okay if the	20	or not somebody was treated fairly or not by a by a
19 20 21	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point. MEMBER QUERARD: I think it's also okay if the moderator uses the mute button. Now, we could	20 21	or not somebody was treated fairly or not by a by a human. We it's it's just it's more it's more
19 20 21 22	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point. MEMBER QUERARD: I think it's also okay if the moderator uses the mute button. Now, we could MEMBER TORGESON: Yeah.	20 21 22	or not somebody was treated fairly or not by a by a human. We it's it's just it's more it's more driven by structure. The more structure you have, the
19 20 21 22 23	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point. MEMBER QUERARD: I think it's also okay if the moderator uses the mute button. Now, we could MEMBER TORGESON: Yeah. MEMBER QUERARD: and I don't know, maybe	20 21 22 23	or not somebody was treated fairly or not by a by a human. We it's it's just it's more it's more driven by structure. The more structure you have, the more I think the more confidence that you get, the
19 20 21 22 23 24	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point. MEMBER QUERARD: I think it's also okay if the moderator uses the mute button. Now, we could MEMBER TORGESON: Yeah. MEMBER QUERARD: and I don't know, maybe everybody is muted. And then I ask because if we would	20 21 22 23 24	or not somebody was treated fairly or not by a by a human. We it's it's just it's more it's more driven by structure. The more structure you have, the more I think the more confidence that you get, the turnout is driven then significantly.
19 20 21 22 23	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point. MEMBER QUERARD: I think it's also okay if the moderator uses the mute button. Now, we could MEMBER TORGESON: Yeah. MEMBER QUERARD: and I don't know, maybe everybody is muted. And then I ask because if we would stop so if we want to do Paul's idea where we kind of	20 21 22 23	or not somebody was treated fairly or not by a by a human. We it's it's just it's more it's more driven by structure. The more structure you have, the more I think the more confidence that you get, the turnout is driven then significantly. MEMBER QUERARD: It can get boring, but it would be
19 20 21 22 23 24	confidence in the system. So I think CQ is dead on point. MEMBER QUERARD: I think it's also okay if the moderator uses the mute button. Now, we could MEMBER TORGESON: Yeah. MEMBER QUERARD: and I don't know, maybe everybody is muted. And then I ask because if we would	20 21 22 23 24	or not somebody was treated fairly or not by a by a human. We it's it's just it's more it's more driven by structure. The more structure you have, the more I think the more confidence that you get, the turnout is driven then significantly.

	90		91
1	predictable and stable and you eliminate concerns over	1	not online. There is interruption, and you kind of get
2	moderator bias to a certain degree because your time was	2	get all that flare.
3	your time and, you know, he didn't let it get out of control	3	So if you guys want one that that's very
4	kind of a thing.	4	structured where literally everybody is on mute until it's
5	MEMBER SENSEMAN: Yeah, and I'm envisioning a	5	your turn to speak, that's fine. You're not setting a
6	couple of moderators and not one. So you have folks that,	6	standard for all debates, that's just how the Clean
7	you know, equal spectrum, political spectrum represented,	7	Elections debate will be. And if you're different because
8	too, Constantin.	8	you're extra civilized and it's never a food fight, that
9	So, yeah, I think we just we're we're setting	9	that may not be a bad thing.
10	up folks that are that are not objective or independent	10	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: What about the the questions
11	to be to be stuck in the middle of a food fight and I	11	themselves? Should the candidates how much should
12	just I feel badly for them. Nobody can do that; it's	12	candidates be told in advance? Should they say should
13	really impossibly difficult to be a referee in these kind of	13	the candidates be told we're going to spend 10 minutes on
14	situations. And so I I think if you have a little more	14	education, 10 minutes on water, et cetera?
15	structure, you set them you set these up for success.	15	Or they should say should the candidates be told
16	MEMBER QUERARD: The other thing I would add, and	16	these are the questions that are going be asked?
17	then I'll stop talking here. The Clean Elections debates	17	Is there is there any benefit to doing it one
18	are good, but it's just one debate. If you're running for a	18	way or the other?
19	primary debate for something, you're probably going to be in	19	MEMBER QUERARD: There's there's benefits to
20	a half a dozen of these things, most of which are live	20	each. If the point of the interview is to kind of make it
21	action sitting in the same room where it is kind of more the	21	as informative as possible for the viewer and you give the
22	food fight. So if you guys want to be a little more	22	candidates all the questions in advance, they have time to
23	restrictive with yours, that's fine. I mean, you in	23	come up with the best possible answers, to really practice,
24	essence, you will be providing some variety in the schedule	24	to write it all out and to give you as a viewer, like, their
25	because most debates are everybody in the same room; they're	25	best possible answer. If you're looking to actually measure
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	92		20
	92		93
1	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good	1	93 MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to
1 2		1 2	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between
	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good		MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to
2	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written	2	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between
2 3	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual	2 3	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal
2 3 4	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact	2 3 4	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the
2 3 4 5	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual	2 3 4 5	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal
2 3 4 5 6	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just	2 3 4 5 6	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions
2 3 4 5 6 7	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't	2 3 4 5 6 7	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: One thing one thing that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about allow having a portion of it, so okay here are five
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: One thing one thing that you just said Constantin kind of struck a bell with me, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about allow having a portion of it, so okay here are five topics and then you each get to submit a question you want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: One thing one thing that you just said Constantin kind of struck a bell with me, you called it an interview. Do we want this to be an interview	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about allow having a portion of it, so okay here are five topics and then you each get to submit a question you want us to ask?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: One thing one thing that you just said Constantin kind of struck a bell with me, you called it an interview. Do we want this to be an interview or do we want it to be more of a back-and-forth debate with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about allow having a portion of it, so okay here are five topics and then you each get to submit a question you want us to ask? Now obviously candidates will submit questions that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: One thing one thing that you just said Constantin kind of struck a bell with me, you called it an interview. Do we want this to be an interview or do we want it to be more of a back-and-forth debate with the candidates engaging in each other?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about allow having a portion of it, so okay here are five topics and then you each get to submit a question you want us to ask? Now obviously candidates will submit questions that put their opponents in an odd spot that contrasts well in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: One thing one thing that you just said Constantin kind of struck a bell with me, you called it an interview. Do we want this to be an interview or do we want it to be more of a back-and-forth debate with the candidates engaging in each other? What which which is best for the voters?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about allow having a portion of it, so okay here are five topics and then you each get to submit a question you want us to ask? Now obviously candidates will submit questions that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the mental capacity of your candidates which is also a good idea, and you just don't want whatever answers were written for them, not knowing the questions in advance even if you may know the topics, but if you don't know the exact question, will give us an idea of the the intellectual capability of the candidate because if they give you just the only answer that they wrote down, even if it doesn't really fit the question, you know you're dealing with somebody who doesn't really know what they're talking about. So you guys might have to decide what what the goal is. If it's supposed to be both, you know, informative like like you also want to disclose is this guy just reading, you know, or does he actually have any idea what he's talking about, then don't give them the the answers or the questions; you can give them the topics, but you may not want to give them the actual question. On the other hand, if you don't mind that they're really, really prepared, you know, you can give them the questions. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: One thing one thing that you just said Constantin kind of struck a bell with me, you called it an interview. Do we want this to be an interview or do we want it to be more of a back-and-forth debate with the candidates engaging in each other?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MEMBER MCLEOD: Well, I think if you're trying to drive viewership, then you want back-and-forth between the the candidates. I think strong moderators do this well. You know, they allow they control the flow, the conversation, and make sure everybody gets a chance to deal with the questions and they can ask follow-up questions which, you know, you see sometimes in other countries like in England, you know, you see an American go on English TV and they kind of get blown out of the water because, you know, the interviewer will ask a follow-up question and and push them, and it's much more revealing for the the viewers. So I think moderators and follow-up questions make sense. On the question of the questions, giving them in advance, I think it might make sense to give topics in advance but then allow the moderator to figure out how to word the questions. MEMBER QUERARD: Rodd, what do you think about allow having a portion of it, so okay here are five topics and then you each get to submit a question you want us to ask? Now obviously candidates will submit questions that put their opponents in an odd spot that contrasts well in

		1	
	94		95
1	election is supposed to be, I'm contrasting me to you, you	1	Like, I mean, somebody who can take that and run
2	to me. Does it does it discourage participation 'cause	2	with it and show me they speak on their feet. They can
3	I'm afraid of that tough question; does it encourage it	3	handle themselves without getting over the top, that would
4	because I get to ask my tough question?	4	be that's a fantastic to reason to have have them
5	Like, what do you think about because that will	5	interject a question that they want is the answer. The
6	create healthy friction.	6	answer they get is going to be the most telling of all
7	MEMBER MCLEOD: Yeah, I think I think healthy	7	without creating a circus.
8	friction is is good. I I think it's I think it's	8	MEMBER MCLEOD: Fair point.
9	better for the moderators to kind of formulate these	9	MEMBER QUERARD: If you have a candidate that
10	questions. But, you know it just feels it gets into	10	doesn't want to participate because they're afraid of a
11	the game show situation when, like, you know, I get to ask	11	tough question, I don't know, I'm not I'm not sure that's
12	you: Well Mr. Querard, how come, you know, you were	12	a candidate you necessarily should be catering to when
13	arrested for DUI in 2018?" Obviously I have no idea if	13	you're designing your debate rules.
14	Mr. Querard even drinks. I'm just saying you know	14	MEMBER SENSEMAN: No. In fact, that's one thing
15	MEMBER QUERARD: Not professionally.	15	you want, if they're going to cower from that, you got to
16	MEMBER SENSEMAN: I think I think that's a great	16	make the point that they refused to participate and that's
17	example of why it should be there, 'cause one thing I want	17	kind of pathetic.
18	is somebody to represent me that can think on their feet and	18	I mean obviously it's got to be not like: Do you
19	answer a question like that appropriately, can come back and	19	still molest your children? I mean, you can't have, you
20	say "what in the world are you talking about?" You know,	20	know, something crazy, but (technical disruption) factually.
21	somebody that's not thrown off, that's not overly offended	21	MEMBER GENTLES: Isn't that what we're talking
22	by a stupid question, that can sit there and go, Wow, you	22	about when you have the candidates submit a question?
23	took you took that opportunity to ask that question?	23	You know that that just opens up for, you know,
24	Well, here's your answer; why didn't you ask a better	24	the questions just to go completely off the rails, right?
25	question?	25	You know, off (simultaneous crosstalk) kind of questions
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	96		
			97
1	where	1	If it's something that's decidedly personal or
2	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance	2	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your
2 3	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what		If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a
2 3 4	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of	2 3 4	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put
2 3	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them	2 3	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to
2 3 4 5 6	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you	2 3 4 5 6	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to
2 3 4 5 6 7	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not	2 3 4 5 6 7	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way out of line.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way out of line. MEMBER GENTLES: So that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way out of line. MEMBER GENTLES: So that's MEMBER SENSEMAN: (Simultaneous crosstalk.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way out of line. MEMBER GENTLES: So that's MEMBER GENTLES: So that's MEMBER GENTLES: it's incumbent on the moderator	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way out of line. MEMBER GENTLES: So that's MEMBER SENSEMAN: (Simultaneous crosstalk.) MEMBER GENTLES: it's incumbent on the moderator then to to be very judicious about the question that gets	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something that's personally scandalous in your official capacity,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something that's personally scandalous in your official capacity, you're doing something at, you know, at the legislature on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something that's personally scandalous in your official capacity, you're doing something at, you know, at the legislature on property that you're not supposed to be doing or something,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way out of line. MEMBER GENTLES: So that's MEMBER SENSEMAN: (Simultaneous crosstalk.) MEMBER GENTLES: it's incumbent on the moderator then to to be very judicious about the question that gets through. MEMBER QUERARD: So you get to submit three questions and we'll pick one or something. MEMBER GENTLES: Right. MEMBER QUERARD: 'Cause what I'm anticipating is: Explain your vote on HB whatever whatever, the this bill, I want to know why you voted yes when you told us in your last campaign you're going to be a no. I mean, that's the kind of question I'm anticipating to create contrast, put you on the spot a</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something that's personally scandalous in your official capacity, you're doing something at, you know, at the legislature on property that you're not supposed to be doing or something, ah, maybe that's a question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something that's personally scandalous in your official capacity, you're doing something at, you know, at the legislature on property that you're not supposed to be doing or something, ah, maybe that's a question. Frankly, if you don't allow it as a question, I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>where MEMBER SENSEMAN: The fact that they're in advance wouldn't you think that somebody would go, you know what I mean a moderator or whoever goes: This is so far out of line. I mean, if they're a little out of line, let them hang themselves; but if they go up and say: Hey, do you still molest children? Well, you know, seriously, we're not going to let you ask that question because that's just way out of line. MEMBER GENTLES: So that's MEMBER GENTLES: So that's MEMBER GENTLES: it's incumbent on the moderator then to to be very judicious about the question that gets through. MEMBER QUERARD: So you get to submit three questions and we'll pick one or something. MEMBER QUERARD: 'Cause what I'm anticipating is: Explain your vote on HB whatever whatever, the this bill, I want to know why you voted yes when you told us in your last campaign you're going to be a no. I mean, that's the kind of question I'm anticipating to create contrast, put you on the spot a little bit, make me look good. You're going to have your own question back to me for something else.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something that's personally scandalous in your official capacity, you're doing something at, you know, at the legislature on property that you're not supposed to be doing or something, ah, maybe that's a question. Frankly, if you don't allow it as a question, I can still work it into one of my answers. Like, it's not like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>where</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	If it's something that's decidedly personal or something, I mean you can just say, Hey, you know, your question cannot include, whatever, attacks or mentions of a candidate's family, blah, blah, blah. You can probably put some limitations on it. But we want you as a candidate to know that the issues that you're campaigning on are going to be a part of this debate. They are not likely to be the entirety of this debate; there are certain general themes that every voter cares about, but we also want you to know that this time you're spending here is going to be worth something for you, that you're going to get a chance to talk about the thing you want to talk about. That that's one option we could do, and the question is how do you how do you get that one thing? Give me give me three questions and I'll pick one? You know. Unless they're also terrible enough to come back and say, guy, you know, every one of those violates our our rules on attacking a candidate's family or personal or whatever, you know. If you've done something that's personally scandalous in your official capacity, you're doing something at, you know, at the legislature on property that you're not supposed to be doing or something, ah, maybe that's a question. Frankly, if you don't allow it as a question, I can

	98		99
1	you're not going to stop us from from bringing it up and	1	about let's get to that substantive policy discussion here.
2	talking about it; but most most questions will be policy	2	So I just wanted to provide provide
3	based, the question is do you want to offer candidates the	3	clarification on what we do right now.
4	chance to submit a question as an incentive to participate	4	MEMBER QUERARD: Great.
5	in the debates, and then does it make the debate more	5	I would imagine some of these public comments are
6	interesting?	6	being are being submitted by people on behalf of the
7	Sorry.	7	campaigns. So to a certain degree just asking them in
8	MS. ROBERTS: No, my apologies; I just wanted to	8	advance for, Hey, what question do you want, might eliminate
9	provide some background on what we do, just what we do as	9	some of those public submissions that, you know
10	staff. When we sometimes we do get questions that are	10	MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman can, I do a cross
11	very inappropriate and we don't even share those with the	11	cross question to another member?
12	moderator. So we fil we screen those here at Clean	12	MEMBER MCLEOD: I don't think that's allowed by the
13	Elections as staff, anything that is vulgar, you know, we	13	rules of the debate.
14	withhold those and we don't even share them with the	14	MEMBER JONES: Clearly, we need for staff
15	moderator to get to let those pass through. So I just	15	(simultaneous crosstalk).
16	wanted to provide clarification that the moderator is	16	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Sure, Christine. Mr
17	actually removed from that process if it is that extreme.	17	MEMBER JONES: I am curious because CQ manages so
18	And then if it comes to the point where the	18	many legislative candidates that are germane to this
19	question is worded in such a way that you know is trying to	19	discussion. I mean, on the statewide races our debates and
20	be like a gotcha or something, but there's you can still	20	forum tend to be one or the other, it's a subject matter
21	tell there's clearly a substantive discussion there, a	21	debate or it's an all-in debate and typically a candidate's
22	policy discussion or why did you vote that way, then, yes,	22	staff is submitting things.
23	obviously we will still give it to the moderator; and then	23	But CQ, can you help us understand, how active
24	at that point, you know, the moderator may reframe it so	24	would you be, would you be submitting things on behalf of
25	it's not coming off as an attack on the candidate, but more	25	your candidate? I'm not suggesting anything nefarious here
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	100		101
1	just, you know, on the up and up, if you had the opportunity	1	of questions, I think that would be an incentive.
2	to say as an incentive, we're going to let candidates and	2	You know, if you've got a candidate who's got a
3	their committees engage in the question asking, is that	3	particular area of weakness and you don't want that
4	something that incentivizes you or is that helpful?	4	question, that's the decision you're going to have to make
5	I'm just I'm just kind of, you know, as a	5	but, frankly, your opponent is probably smart enough to
6	practical matter, how does how does that hit you?	6	bring it up anyway, so. I don't see it as a reason to avoid
7	MEMBER QUERARD: More often than not, it's likely	7	a debate, but it might be an additional reason to
8	to incentivize because you the whole point of the debate	8	participate.
9	is, you know, I want to contrast myself with the other	9	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So we're down
10	person, and I want to win that contrast.	10	MEMBER JONES: Well, just so to your earlier
11	And some of these debates, frankly, can be	11	point sorry, just real quick.
12	really we had two two, so 2018, it was a Republican	12	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Sure.
13	primary debate, it was like an hour long, I swear they must	13	MEMBER JONES: To your earlier point, if they don't
14	have spent 50 minutes talking ability K12 issues. K12 is	14	get asked, they're going to work it into an answer anyway,
15	big; it's half the budget, but it's not 50 out of 60 minutes	15	right?
16	for Republican primary voter. But it's what the moderator's	16	MEMBER QUERARD: But it might be cleaner and neater
17	interest was. And you do those and you're like, Okay, we	17	if it's in the form of an actual question.
18	should never do this again. Whereas if you know that in	18	MEMBER SENSEMAN: And it takes away some of the
19	advance we're going to hit these five issues, that's already	19	circus atmosphere, which
20	some relief; if you get the opportunity to say, Hey, can we	20	MEMBER QUERARD: The question also kind of
21	at least talk about this issue, if I can't submit the	21	encourages the opponent to have to answer. 'Cause I can
22	question, can I at least make sure this issue is being	22	work it in as a side shot, but it can be brushed off and,
23	discussed because it gives me a chance to pivot to the thing	23	"Okay, and our next question is," and it never comes back
24	I want to say? Even that would be something.	24	up, whereas if it's an actual question-question, your
25	If we've got a chance to actually submit a couple	25	opponent kind of has to answer or at least has to respond.
1	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	1	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	102		103
1	They can dance sideways if they want to, but if there's	1	on that too much
2	something that is of interest if there's something that	2	MEMBER MCLEOD: Yeah, we never got to that question
3	makes a difference between the candidates or that you think	3	in Group B.
4	this is the thing voters should know between me and you to	4	MS. ROBERTS: Right.
5	help them decide, then that's probably going to be a value	5	MEMBER MCLEOD: My sense is that it should be
6	to your viewers.	6	separated by Chamber. I thought Bob Robson made a fair
7	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: So	7	point about that, you know.
8	MEMBER QUERARD: And so the question is, how do we	8	And I don't think it should be separated by party.
9	get there?	9	And I I know the Independents won't even be in the
10	MS. ROBERTS: And I'm sorry, I have to jump in. I	10	primaries, but I just think if you're trying to drive
11	know we have just a few minutes left and I know we typically	11	participation, if you're trying to drive viewership, if
12	reserve the last minute for the spokesperson to recap; but	12	that's what our goal is is to get more people to pay
13	before we do that, the and I think this may just be for	13	attention, then having an open forum with all the candidates
14	Rodd only, and I know you've turned your camera off so I'm	14	for a particular office is is useful. That might be a
15	not sure if you're still at your okay. Perfect.	15	statute problem, the way your statute is written; I have no
16	MEMBER MCLEOD: Just dealing with dog issues.	16	idea.
17	MS. ROBERTS: Oh. So the last group, the last	17	But I would say you know.
18	breakout session, they sort of went out of order on the	18	MEMBER QUERARD: You mean, that's for a primary
19	agenda, and so I needed to touch base here and allow anybody	19	debate?
20	that was in the previous group, so who wasn't with me and	20	MEMBER MCLEOD: Yeah.
21	I think here that would just be you Rodd to have the	21	MEMBER QUERARD: Primary you have the Democrats and
22	opportunity if you wanted to weigh in any opinions on	22	Republicans answering questions at the same time?
23	separating our debates in the primary by party and by	23	MEMBER MCLEOD: Yeah, and it's an hour and you
24	Chamber.	24	know, 'cause I think then the viewer gets a real sense about
25	So, again, the last group they didn't really focus	25	what the parties care about and and how the members of
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	104		105
1	one party will deal with another party.	1	(BREAKOUT SESSION GROUP B - 11:21 a.m.)
2	I mean, I've I've seen these cattle calls, you	2	MR. XOLA: Here we go. All right, thank you,
3	know, where like you got 13 people on the stage and, you	3	everybody. So it appears we have got it backwards, that's
4 5	know, it's actually interesting to see what, you know, for	4	my fault. I'm sorry.
6	people in one party to see people in the other party and	5	So right now we're going to discuss the format of
7		6	the debate, including the structure of the legislative
	kind of get a sense of what they care about and what they	6 7	the debate, including the structure of the legislative
	want to talk about. That's my two cents.	7	debates by party and Chamber.
8	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.	7 8	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior
8 9	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you	7 8 9	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some
8 9 10	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report	7 8 9 10	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little
8 9 10 11	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back?	7 8 9 10 11	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery
8 9 10 11 12	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got	7 8 9 10 11 12	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes.
8 9 10 11	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything.	7 8 9 10 11	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like
8 9 10 11 12 13	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<pre>want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything. MS. ROBERTS: Okay.</pre>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything. MS. ROBERTS: Okay. MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything. MS. ROBERTS: Okay. MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly accurately.</pre>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything. MS. ROBERTS: Okay. MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly accurately. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	want to talk about. That's my two cents. MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back? MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything. MS. ROBERTS: Okay. MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly accurately. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did. MEMBER GENTLES: We'll see.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there? There's 12 of us in here. It looks
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>want to talk about. That's my two cents.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.</li> <li>I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you</li> <li>have any clarification you need from the group to report</li> <li>back?</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got</li> <li>everything.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Okay.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly</li> <li>accurately.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: We'll see.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We'll see, yes.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there? There's 12 of us in here. It looks MR. XOLA: Three.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>want to talk about. That's my two cents.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.</li> <li>I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you</li> <li>have any clarification you need from the group to report</li> <li>back?</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got</li> <li>everything.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Okay.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly</li> <li>accurately.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: We'll see.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We'll see, yes.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, everybody.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there? There's 12 of us in here. It looks MR. XOLA: Three. MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it looks like Renaldo, Jodi,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>want to talk about. That's my two cents.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.</li> <li>I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you</li> <li>have any clarification you need from the group to report</li> <li>back?</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got</li> <li>everything.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Okay.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly</li> <li>accurately.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: We'll see.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We'll see, yes.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, everybody.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there? There's 12 of us in here. It looks MR. XOLA: Three. MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it looks like Renaldo, Jodi, Pinny no. Sorry about this, I think it will be easier to
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>want to talk about. That's my two cents.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.</li> <li>I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back?</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Okay.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly accurately.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: We'll see.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We'll see, yes.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, everybody.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there? There's 12 of us in here. It looks MR. XOLA: Three. MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it looks like Renaldo, Jodi, Pinny no. Sorry about this, I think it will be easier to deal with if (technical disruption).
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>want to talk about. That's my two cents.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.</li> <li>I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back?</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Okay.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly accurately.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: We'll see.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We'll see, yes.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, everybody.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there? There's 12 of us in here. It looks MR. XOLA: Three. MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it looks like Renaldo, Jodi, Pinny no. Sorry about this, I think it will be easier to deal with if (technical disruption). So Jodi, Pinny, and Renaldo were in the last group.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>want to talk about. That's my two cents.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.</li> <li>I know we have just a few seconds left, Karl if you have any clarification you need from the group to report back?</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: No. I I think I got everything.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Okay.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: Hopefully I captured it fairly accurately.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I have no doubt you did.</li> <li>MEMBER GENTLES: We'll see.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: We'll see, yes.</li> <li>MS. ROBERTS: Thank you, everybody.</li> <li>CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ul>	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	debates by party and Chamber. MR. COLLINS: So some of you were in the prior workgroup and are now in this one, so there may be some redundancy. We're going to have to try to capture a little bit of both, Avery MR. XOLA: Yes. MR. COLLINS: make everybody feel like they're we're getting all those, all those voices. And so I'm trying to get a brief kind of a head count here as I'm reading. We've got how many of us how many are there? There's 12 of us in here. It looks MR. XOLA: Three. MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it looks like Renaldo, Jodi, Pinny no. Sorry about this, I think it will be easier to deal with if (technical disruption). So Jodi, Pinny, and Renaldo were in the last group. So I don't and then and then everybody else was in the

	106		107
1	So Avery, how does this sound, can we can we do,	1	Democratic Senate primary debate as opposed to (technical
2	as you said, a quick take from the three folks here who	2	disruption) the last at least the last at least the
3	haven't talked about the partisan breakdown stuff, if they	3	(technical disruption), you know, everybody in a in a
4	have thoughts on that, and then and then move on to the	4	(technical disruption).
5	(technical disruption).	5	MR. XOLA: All right. I don't no one is feeling
6	MR. XOLA: That's good.	6	the
7	MR. COLLINS: That work?	7	MR. COLLINS: Okay. Well, let's move on to the
8	MR. XOLA: Yeah. Yeah, that's a good idea.	8	rules I think.
9	So let's yeah, that's a good idea. So let's go	9	MR. XOLA: All right, yeah. So we will move on.
10	ahead and start off with the members from the last group,	10	So we've already kind of covered this in our group,
11	from my group, how do you feel about the primary debates?	11	but I'm interested to hear what you all from the other
12	Do you think they should be separated by party and Chamber?	12	group, from Gina's group thought about, did you the rules
13	What are your thoughts on that?	13	for the debate, so how do you feel about time limits? Do
14	(No audible response.)	14	you believe a time limit a hard time limit is beneficial,
15	MR. XOLA: Or do you think they shouldn't be	15	or do you think a soft time limit is beneficial; and also is
16	separated? Any comments on that?	16	it beneficial for the candidate and the voter or which one
17	MR. COLLINS: So just to put this in context a	17	or both?
18	little bit and maybe prompt some thought, and I don't know	18	If anyone wants to jump in there.
19	if (technical disruption).	19	MEMBER SIMPSON: I think my my preference is
20	One of the things that we've heard over the years	20	there's a there is a hard deadline given with where there
21	from from corners is that and, you know, assuming our	21	are some sort of visual clues. Having moderated events in
22	current primary system, right, so we definitely (technical	22	the past, it's helpful as a moderator I mean, if you
23	disruption) the law that we have, in the primaries are, you	23	still have the discretion to let it continue, but if you
24	know, things (technical disruption) pros and cons of of	24	have a candidate that's getting out of hand or you're having
25	having, you know, Senate Republican primary debate and a	25	trouble cutting off, the ability to fall back on a hard time
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	108		109
1	limit is very, very helpful.	1	something that was brought up, and I think someone made a
2	You can still I think you can still drive	2	comment, I think it was Member Liggett perhaps, made a
3	conversation and have rebuttal time, but the problem is you	3	comment that the rebuttals or Tom, it may have been
4	can get stuck on one one issue and not have the ability	4	you said the rebuttals it wasn't Tom, okay. That said
5	to cover other issues, especially in this current in this	5	the rebuttals were the moment, that was the time that the
6	current climate where things get very contentious and it	6	candidates can do fact checking 'cause the opposition
7	just it just feels like, you know, I know last year	7	candidate could always use his or her rebuttal to
8	having been involved with some of the conversations about	8	fact-check, right.
9	debates, makes candidates not wanting to participate because	9	But what what does everyone think about
10	they felt that that open format was setting them up to be	10 11	rebuttals and how should those be handled by the moderator?
11 12	beaten up. So I I'm I kind of support that harder	12	MEMBER KLINE: Speaking just as a broadcaster that
12	deadline, the rule.	12	has participated in these debates over the years, structure has always worked best on our side. So whether we're
14	MR. XOLA: Interesting insight. Thank you. Thank	14	talking about time limits or we're talking rebuttal, having
15	you for that.	15	clearly defined rules and guidelines ensures equity and
16	Does anyone have any comments about this? Time	16	prevents any one candidate from dominating the discussion.
17	limit, hard or soft? Who does it benefit?	17	So in that vein, you know my my voice would be
18	(No audible response.)	18	to support structure with how rebuttals are built, time
19	MR. XOLA: No? All right, I will move on to	19	limits for those rebuttals, in the same way we talk about
20	rebuttals. How do you feel about rebuttals for all	20	previous structure on time limits in general.
21	candidates, is it down the line with rebuttals or should a	21	MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah, and I mean typically debates
22	candidate be able to interject when they feel that it is	22	you get one to two minutes to answer the question, and then
23	necessary?	23	whoever wants to rebut the comment gets a minute; and I
24	And then we also in the last group, I should	24	think you just go down the line with whoever is
25	preface it, we talked about fact checking a lot and that was	25	participating and they get their one minute. 'Cause not
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
1	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	110		111
1	everybody may want to they want to rebut something.	1	making a case, even though I don't like things to be this
2	MR. XOLA: That's true. That's true.	2	rigid, I think with some of the things we have going on now,
3	And then what about, what if so what if someone	3	it does call for stronger guardrails, more, you know,
4	doesn't want to be cut off, are you do you try to cut	4	tightly enforced rules.
5	them off, the moderator cuts them off and they just keep	5	MR. XOLA: Okay. And so is that is that muted
6	going, should mics be muted or how should the moderator	6	mics, is that that would be a tool that you would say
7	handle that?	7	okay.
8	MEMBER SIMPSON: I'm I think there should be the	8	MEMBER FOWLER: Avery.
9	ability, if a candidate gets out of control, to mute them.	9	MR. XOLA: Yes.
10	MR. XOLA: So you believe in muting mics? Does	10	MEMBER FOWLER: I clearly I clearly as Jodi
11	everyone agree with that, think that oh. Member Liggett	11	mentioned in these times is we need to control the debates.
12	has her hand raised.	12	If that means that we need to cut the mic off, because we
13	Yes.	13	don't want showmanship, we want people to answer the
14	MEMBER LIGGETT: Hi. Just to that point, it just	14	questions within the rules that we have; but also create an
15	occurred to me, just something to keep in the back of our	15	environment where people can answer questions.
16	minds, like we're talking about hard and soft rules. Though	16	But clearly, I think some people may come in with a
17	when you relax rules I think that's when norms come into	17	strong personalty thinking "I'm in control of this no matter
18	play, right, and people really differ in in their ability	18	what." But if you set the stage where, you know, here's
19	or their desire, right, to maintain or obey norms; and I	19	what the behavior is expected from you, I think that's
20	think that's where we get into problems is, you know,	20	really clear. Because I look at some of the behaviors of
21	removing some of the rules and expecting you know, we	21	the politicians today, it is outrageous.
22	have norms in our head and we just expect that people will	22	And so this is not a plat this a serious
23	obey those.	23	platform; it's not an entertainment platform. It's debate;
24	, But you have really bellicose or really aggressive	24	you're here to serve the people of Arizona, and that's how
25	folks that can just derail the whole thing. So I guess I'm	25	it's going to be. So if we need to cut your mic off, we'll
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	112		113
1	cut your mic off, okay; you're not in control of the debate.	1	piece of this as well; and ensuring even no perception of
2	And so that whoever I think that's important	2	bias is is I think critical, and when you get into muting
3	that that's established: You're not in control of the	3	mics, you're going to inflame the situation, but that may be
4	debate; you're a participant of the debate. But you're not	4	the right solution.
5	in control of this debate.	5	And so making sure if that is a decision that is
6	So, whatever whatever again, whatever format	6	made, that that is communicated in the debate publicly, that
7	we create, understand here is what the rules are and we	7	it is explained when it happens during the debate because
8	convey that information to the candidates.	8	I'm also protective of the Clean Elections' reputation, and
9	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you.	9	I don't want any change in the rules to come across or get
10	MEMBER SIMPSON: I think it speaks to equity within	10	spun as anything more than a way to ensure equitable, fair
11	there if we follow that same rigid rule, no matter who	11	debates.
12	the moderator is, it makes it hard to call partisanship	12	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you for that comment.
13	where, oh, I let, you know, this moderator leans left or	13	And what about so I think we covered as far as
14	right and they let that guy ramble and they cut this guy	14	muting mics. So what about is do you all prefer a
15	off. If it's just at two minutes, your mic is cut off,	15	forum-style debate or a true debate? Do you want it to lean
16	it it takes the it kind of takes some of that piece of	16	more to like a, you know, a typical debate, a textbook
17	it out of there.	17	debate, or more of like a discussion?
18	And I think part of this Gina has mentioned, I	18	And and I should, I should back up a little bit.
19	don't know if it's in this environment or a different one, I	19	How do you think what do you think the voter would like
20	think moderator choice is going to be really key to success	20	to see? Like, do you think put your voter hat on. How
21		21	would a voter react to a discussion debate or a true debate,
	in next year's debate.		
22	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you for that.	22	and how do you think a candidate will perform in a
23	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you for that. MEMBER KLINE: In that in that same vein,	23	and how do you think a candidate will perform in a discussion debate versus a true debate?
23 24	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you for that. MEMBER KLINE: In that in that same vein, transparency will be is really important in whatever	23 24	and how do you think a candidate will perform in a discussion debate versus a true debate? Any thoughts on that?
23	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you for that. MEMBER KLINE: In that in that same vein, transparency will be is really important in whatever rules are established because public perception is a big	23	and how do you think a candidate will perform in a discussion debate versus a true debate? Any thoughts on that? MEMBER SIMPSON: I think talking about the
23 24	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you for that. MEMBER KLINE: In that in that same vein, transparency will be is really important in whatever	23 24	and how do you think a candidate will perform in a discussion debate versus a true debate? Any thoughts on that?

	114		115
1	structure we're looking at, I think it I would lean	1	MEMBER LIGGETT: And they have an opportunity to
2	toward true debate. You know, and that's in the our	2	rebut, so. Right? I think they can just make a mental
3	legislative districts, you know, if you look at the	3	note.
4	statewide debates that might be a different conversation	4	MR. XOLA: Okay.
5	when you get down to general or you're you're talking	5	MEMBER LIGGETT: Right?
6	about Senate or whatever, but I think in a district, I think	6	MEMBER FOWLER: So so I have a question for you.
7	a true debate is probably preferable. As a voter that's	7	What if someone during the debate, just for conversational
8	what I prefer.	8	purpose, makes a personal personal comment, outrageous
9	MR. XOLA: Okay. Anyone else want to add on to	9	about the person, could be personal, could be about their
10	that?	10	mom, their dad? Do they wait 'til the debate to the
11	(No audible response.)	11	rebuttal to respond to it?
12	MR. XOLA: All right, let's move on to the next.	12	So, you know, it's like like Chris said, it's
13	So I what I think we've already discussed this,	13	the format, but what if somebody during that debate just
14	but interruptions. So, you know, are interruptions	14	says "I saw your wife walking down the street" or something
15	permitted at what at any point? How how do we feel	15	in jest, how do you handle that situation? Because I I
16	about interruptions?	16	see that happening in in the future.
17	Like "to that point." Can there be any "to that	17	So what's your thoughts on that? I guess, you
18	point" interruptions in the debate or how does that how	18	know, Chris, you talk about a strict debate, how do you deal
19	do you all feel about that?	19	with that when someone just says something so outrageous,
20	, MEMBER KLINE: To me it goes back to the structure	20	that jest, you know, the person can't wait?
21	piece of the puzzle here. If we're going to give each	21	So how do you handle that? I mean
22	candidate let's say a minute and a half or two minutes to	22	MEMBER SHEORAN: Avery?
23	speak, then it's that candidate's two minutes to speak; and	23	MEMBER FOWLER: how do you handle that question?
24	if the other candidate interrupts, that would not be	24	MEMBER SHEORAN: Yeah, Renaldo, Avery, if I might
25	appropriate with the protocols that we've set.	25	just weigh in. As a League we have a standing policy on
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	116		117
1	this 'cause it happens	1	So regardless, Renaldo, if the interruption is in a
1 2	this 'cause it happens MR. XOLA: Okay.	1 2	So regardless, Renaldo, if the interruption is in a personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any
2	MR. XOLA: Okay.	2	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any
2 3	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new.	2 3	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you
2 3 4	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay.	2 3 4	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of	2 3 4 5	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a lot of their thinking as to, you know, that original	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to them that they can respond when it's their turn; but I guess
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a lot of their thinking as to, you know, that original thinking. So you might want to check on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to them that they can respond when it's their turn; but I guess there's this careful balance between, we're going to have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a lot of their thinking as to, you know, that original thinking. So you might want to check on that. But a penalty mechanism then allows the moderator	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to them that they can respond when it's their turn; but I guess there's this careful balance between, we're going to have guides and we're going to allow people to still be people.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a lot of their thinking as to, you know, that original thinking. So you might want to check on that. But a penalty mechanism then allows the moderator to manage those kind of interruptions. So if you interrupt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to them that they can respond when it's their turn; but I guess there's this careful balance between, we're going to have guides and we're going to allow people to still be people. I also would say, though, that if if we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a lot of their thinking as to, you know, that original thinking. So you might want to check on that. But a penalty mechanism then allows the moderator to manage those kind of interruptions. So if you interrupt again, and we saw that in the presidential supposed debates,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to them that they can respond when it's their turn; but I guess there's this careful balance between, we're going to have guides and we're going to allow people to still be people. I also would say, though, that if if we're living in a world where, especially since most of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a lot of their thinking as to, you know, that original thinking. So you might want to check on that. But a penalty mechanism then allows the moderator to manage those kind of interruptions. So if you interrupt again, and we saw that in the presidential supposed debates, and we've seen that in ours.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to them that they can respond when it's their turn; but I guess there's this careful balance between, we're going to have guides and we're going to allow people to still be people. I also would say, though, that if if we're living in a world where, especially since most of these debates are on Zoom right now for the primaries and I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. XOLA: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: it's not necessarily new. MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. MEMBER SHEORAN: Our policy always has been that if someone interrupts, it takes away from the time that they're allocated. There's a penalty involved for that kind of misbehavior, and we have exercised it, unfortunately, more frequently than we would like to. So you take away their time on the next question, they get less time or they do not get time for a rebuttal on the next question? And I think it would be wise for the group to be thinking about what might that penalty look like it. The way we do it is "X" amount of time is removed, you know, until you have no time to be rebutting at all. And I believe that was in the original presidential debate guidelines that were set and the League was instrumental in creating that commission, so we take from a lot of their thinking as to, you know, that original thinking. So you might want to check on that. But a penalty mechanism then allows the moderator to manage those kind of interruptions. So if you interrupt again, and we saw that in the presidential supposed debates,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	personal nature or not, if you are consistent in saying any interruptions other than when you're called on to speak, you know, there is a penalty involved. That's kind of how we approach it, you know. That's just a reco suggestion. MEMBER KLINE: I would add that to to Renaldo, your point, one of the reasons we're even having to have this conversation is because no matter what rules we set, right, people are going to be people. MEMBER FOWLER: Mm-hm. MEMBER KLINE: And in some respects that's that's okay, because we live in a free society and we're not going to tell people what they can and can't do, but we're going to set guidelines. So the way we have always treated it in the past is that, you know, if somebody chimes in because they feel like something has gone off the rails and they're not supposed to chime in at that point, right, they may make their point in a couple of seconds, and the moderator is going to say to them that they can respond when it's their turn; but I guess there's this careful balance between, we're going to have guides and we're going to allow people to still be people. I also would say, though, that if if we're living in a world where, especially since most of these

	118		119
1	think that's changing, Avery, right, is to the best of your	1	the candidates know prior to them coming to this platform:
2	knowledge, that if if one candidate has got a buck-thirty	2	Here's what's expected of you; it's designed to be a debate
3	to speak, my gut is that the standard protocol is going to	3	but, however, you're not going to be in control.
4	be to mute everybody on Zoom except for that candidate; and	4	And so I think you let everyone knows the rules and
5	so, theoretically, nobody else is even going to be able to	5	I think that's a good point a good point to start from,
6	speak.	6	and then cut people off if they need to cut them off. I
7	MR. XOLA: That's a good point.	7	think that's important.
8	MEMBER LIGGETT: To that point, and I think that's	8	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you for all your
9	an excellent point, and inappropriate personal or otherwise	9	your feedback.
10	attacks could occur in an interruption or in someone's	10	I want to ask Member Tulemello or Member Miller if
11	remarks. And I just wanted to make the point I I know	11	they had any comments they would like to weigh in on this;
12	the discerning sometimes, you know, there are gray areas in	12	I'm interested to hear what your feedback or insight would
13	people's conduct, but there's always a lot of really	13	be.
14	Black-and-white crap that happens; and I think we empower	14	MEMBER MILLER: Nothing further to that nothing
15	our moderators to, like, cut it off. We're not doing that	15	further to add. You know, the group has captured I think
16	here; this is not a forum for that.	16	the array of of alternatives.
17	I think I think we need to do that as as the	17	That the I guess the the one comment I would
18	guardians of this process. And, frankly, I also think we	18	offer at the 50,000-foot level is the the debate that is
19	are educating the public about acceptable and unacceptable	19	most interesting, most valuable to a voter and a viewer is
20	behavior. I think they should have learned that at home,	20	not the debate that is probably not the debate that is
21	but a lot of us haven't, and I I just I would love	21	that a candidate is going to be most enthusiastic about.
22	this group to play a role in bringing back that kind of	22	And so if the goal is to maximize candidate participation,
23	civility and care for one another.	23	we probably need to lean one direction; if the goal is to
24	MEMBER FOWLER: And and like I said, my main	24	maximize voter interest, we probably will have to lean
25	thing is to make sure the moderator is in control. We let	25	another way knowing that there are tradeoffs in leaning one
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	120		121
1	direction or the other.	1	they are, not guaranteed, but they are unlikely to get
2	MR. COLLINS: And Lee, if you don't mind, which	2	steamrolled, to get to get dominated. If, you know
3	direction do you think is more candidate than the (technical	3	MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
4	disruption). I have a general sense of what it is.	4	MEMBER MILLER: candidates will have a good
5	MEMBER MILLER: I think I think the voter	5	sense. By the time the Clean Elections debate rolls around,
6	would would benefit most from maximizing participation,	6	candidates know who they're running against; and and if
7	crafting a crafting a process that incentivizes all those	7	their perception is, you know, I'm running against somebody
8	non-participating candidates to show up, show their face,	8	who is who is, you know, just insists on dominating
9	you know, get their words recorded for posterity and but	9	the the discussion, no matter what format and forum we're
10	that, you know, that the format and the process that	10	in, they're like, eh, you know, I I'll go talk to my own
11 12	that will facilitate that, you know, might very well, from	11 12	people, you know. But but, yeah, I think, you know, candidates
13	the perspective of TV, may be very boring. But but I think if I were in your shoes, I'd	12	want a level of confidence that they're going to get a fair
14	want to I'd want to be presenting as many candidates as	14	shake, and having a structure and sticking to that structure
15	possible to the voters and and, you know, let them draw	15	will go far towards building a level of confidence
16	whatever conclusions they want to draw.	16	candidates are going to get a fair shake.
17	MR. COLLINS: So I guess my question I want to ask	17	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you, Member Miller.
18	is within the we've talked a lot about in the last	18	Member Tulemello, would you like to to add to
19	minutes about, you know, (technical disruption) rigidity to	19	that for your own comment?
20	the rule. Your sense would be more that the candidates will	20	MEMBER TULEMELLO: Just some real high-level
21	(technical disruption) context or the candidate would	21	preferences, I guess.
22	would (technical disruption)?	22	Really like the idea of dividing the debate in
23	MEMBER MILLER: I I think I think most	23	terms of here's the House candidates and here's the Senate
24	candidates I think most candidates would would prefer	24	candidates; I think for voter clarity that's really
25	structure and having a level of confidence that they're	25	important. We talked about that in the other call.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

	122		123
1	I also think it's important, and Chris mentioned it	1	know, communication to voters is to make sure that, Hey,
2	and several others, transparency on what the rules are and	2	this is these are the new rules. This is what we're
3	getting people, you know, in their agreement to participate	3	following; this is what you can expect to see. So so the
	to agree to certain rules of decorum in terms of how the		
4	5	4	voters are you don't get any, any bad comments back from
5	debate will play out. And that at that point, they would	5	the public in general that you we were mean to somebody.
6	have an understanding if they don't abide by the agreed-upon	6	MR. XOLA: Fair enough. That make yeah, that
7	rules, they'll be cut off during the debate. That might	7	makes sense.
8	give some comfort to those who worry about being sandbagged	8	Let's we have time for one more question, I'm
9	in a debate.	9	going to ask that. So how do you all feel about moderators
10	And, you know, I really like the debate for	10	engaging candidates in discussion?
11	format as a voter because you get a little back-and-forth	11	So should they should the moderators, like, push
12	rather than talking points. You know, it's unwatchable	12	back on a candidate or should they just provide context to
13	to except for maybe the candidate's family to listen	13	the question and just let the candidate answer how they feel
14	to them kind of tick off talking points. So those would	14	that they need to?
15	be my, just my quick points.	15	And this kind of goes back to, I guess, to the
16	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you, I appreciate	16	fact-checking thing that we all talked about. Do you
17	that.	17	will you all want the moderator to be the one to do the fact
18	Does anyone else want to add to this to anything	18	check as a pushback or should the moderator just set up the
19	that's been said?	19	question in a way that the context is there and the facts
20	MEMBER SIMPSON: I think I just want to add that as	20	are there, and the candidate answers how they you know,
21	we talk about we need to make the the rules clear to the	21	how they wish to answer if that makes sense.
22	candidates, I think it's important for Clean Elections to	22	MEMBER KLINE: I think this one is really hard
23	make their rules clear to voters, so that if they tune in,	23	because you're never going to please everybody and there's
24	they understand why the format is the way that it is.	24	going to be strong opinions with this one on both sides, but
25	So I think maybe, you know, Tom as we look at, you	25	I do think it underscores the importance and value of
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
1		1	125
2	figuring out who the right moderators are that can walk that line.	2	asks kind of a clarification versus, you know, implied about something; but then again, you want to make sure that that
3	Because there's there is a middle ground here	3	moderator is not being biased and so.
4	where a moderator without coming across as heavy-handed or	4	But I think a follow-up clarification is fine, but
5	even the appearance of bias can raise a question back to a	5	you just got to have somebody who is trained and has the
6	candidate if there is something that is, right, to use the	6	skills and ability to do that without coming across
7	line from earlier "over the line" or just "Black and white,"	7	coming across as a biased person, so. That's just kind of
8	and then there are other moments where things might be a	8	my perspective.
9	little less clear where a moderator may in the moment make	9	MR. XOLA: Thank you. Thank you.
10	the decision that they're not going to touch that because	10	All right, we have about like 25 seconds. Who
11	that's what the voters make their own decision on.	11	wants to be the spokesperson for the team?
12	MR. XOLA: All right. Yeah, yeah, in my personal	12	Do not raise your hands all at once.
13	experience, me watching debates, I prefer when the	13	Anybody?
14	moderators ask clarifying questions as to not say: Hey,	14	MEMBER FOWLER: Can I draft Chris?
15	well, you're wrong on this or actually, like, not that,	15	MEMBER JACKSON: I was going to say, he did such a
16	but just kind of ask clarifying so the voter can get a real	16	good job for our group last time; I vote for it.
17	perception of what the candidate is answering or what their	17	MEMBER FOWLER: Okay. Okay.
18	comments are pertaining to.	18	
19	But yeah, thank you for that comment. I appreciate	19	* * *
20	that.	20	
21	Does anyone else have any comment about the	21	(GENERAL SESSION - 11:51 a.m.)
22	moderators and if they should engage in a discussion for the	22	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: I think we're all back together
23	candidates?	23	now. We'll first go to the spokesperson for Group A, Karl,
24	MEMBER FOWLER: Avery, I kind of believe as Chris	24	what are your what did your group talk about?
25	mentions, it's a fine line, but I think if the moderator	25	MEMBER GENTLES: Sure. We we had several topics
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

		1	
	126		127
1	that we discussed, but it came down to, based on time just a	1	complied with was really important. And some there was
2	few here.	2	some discussion about whether or not that should be left to
3	One was on time limits, if we should have them. I	3	the moderator or not because that puts them in a position of
4	think the group consensus was that we should be soft on	4	potentially being you know, being too far injected into
5	those time limits but fair, but we still need us some	5	the conversations. So there's also conversation about using
6	structure on some basic rules, some basic ground rules; and	6	some devices to help control the conversation, like some
7	then moderator could use their discretion in terms of the	7	sound or audio devices, maybe a mute button that would be
8	time that each candidate has to give each other each a	8	used. So there was a little bit of conversation about that.
9	fair chance, but be very clear up front about what those	9	But overall (speaker interruption) overall so
10	rules were.	10	but there was really a conversation about really being
11	A lot of discussion around interruptions, should	11	driven by structure 'cause that is I heard from the
12	the moderator allow interruptions, what the protocol is	12	conversation would produce more confidence in the debate,
13	around that. I think the consensus was that we want to have	13	more turnout. Might be a little bit less exciting but does
14	some the decorum that would allow that would basically	14	institute a little bit more control and structure.
15	avoid an all out "food fight." I think that was the	15	And then finally about questions in the debate, how
16	technical political term that was used.	16	should those be handled, should they be provided up front or
17	So more structured; allow some injection, but we	17	only at the events. I think the general consensus was that
18	really need to institute some civility, but ensure some	18	give the topic up front but leave it up to the moderator to
19	civility around how those injections occur.	19	ask the specific question. And that would help I think
20	But we want to be not too melted (phonetic) on	20	that would help really gauge the candidate on how they're
21	enforcing the rule; it really comes down to the moderator	21	able to handle the question, if they're able to think on
22	controlling interruptions and indicating to the interrupter	22	their feet, their mental acuity, et cetera.
23	that they would come back to allow them a few seconds to	23	So I think hopefully that captures the general
24	respond.	24	conversation.
25	But overall having rules that are that are	25	At the end Rodd McLeod was asked about the previous
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
	128		129
1	question about the breaking-out sessions whether by party	1	denity to both the condidates throughout the debate but
	question about the breaking-out sessions whether by party		clarity to both the candidates throughout the debate but
2	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed	2	equally as important to the voters that are watching or
2	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed	2	equally as important to the voters that are watching or
2 3	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by	2 3	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating.
2 3 4	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party.	2 3 4	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a
2 3 4 5	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has	2 3 4 5	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's
2 3 4 5 6	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up.	2 3 4 5 6	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come
2 3 4 5 6 7	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good	2 3 4 5 6 7	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were important, that those time limits should apply to both a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the answer might be to ask clarifying question instead of to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were important, that those time limits should apply to both a candidate speaking as well as to rebuttal opportunities, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the answer might be to ask clarifying question instead of to simply try to rebut something that was said.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were important, that those time limits should apply to both a candidate speaking as well as to rebuttal opportunities, and that because of that, interruptions by candidates need to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the answer might be to ask clarifying question instead of to simply try to rebut something that was said. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Two two very good
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were important, that those time limits should apply to both a candidate speaking as well as to rebuttal opportunities, and that because of that, interruptions by candidates need to be minimized.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the answer might be to ask clarifying question instead of to simply try to rebut something that was said. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Two two very good discussions. Very good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were important, that those time limits should apply to both a candidate speaking as well as to rebuttal opportunities, and that because of that, interruptions by candidates need to be minimized. We spoke extensively as Group A did about how key	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the answer might be to ask clarifying question instead of to simply try to rebut something that was said. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Two two very good discussions. Very good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were important, that those time limits should apply to both a candidate speaking as well as to rebuttal opportunities, and that because of that, interruptions by candidates need to be minimized. We spoke extensively as Group A did about how key the moderator is for these debates; not just to literally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the answer might be to ask clarifying question instead of to simply try to rebut something that was said. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Two two very good discussions. Very good. With that, I want to move on to Item VII, public comment. This is the time for consideration of comments and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	or or by let's see, party or by Chamber, and he seemed to think that separating by Chamber makes sense but not by party. So hopefully that captured it. If anybody has anything else to add, please speak up. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: No, I think you did a very good job, Karl. Who is the spokesman for Group B? MEMBER KLINE: It is me. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: You again, Chris. MEMBER KLINE: It is it is me, yes, drafted at the last minute but we're going to make it work. Our our theme I think of conversation was rallying around the idea that structure is important to ensure a fair and robust debate, and so we talked a lot about time limits. And it seemed like one of the one of the points we rallied behind was the time limits were important, that those time limits should apply to both a candidate speaking as well as to rebuttal opportunities, and that because of that, interruptions by candidates need to be minimized. We spoke extensively as Group A did about how key the moderator is for these debates; not just to literally moderating the debate but also to ensure transparency and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	equally as important to the voters that are watching or participating. We talked about the fact that these debates are a reflection on Clean Elections, and because of that, there's nothing more sacrosanct than making sure these debates come across as equitable and fair and nonbiased, and that is going to, no matter what format we proceed with, be dependent upon very strong moderators who can act in the interest of the voters without coming across as biased to one candidate or the other. We we also talked a little bit about whether it was appropriate for moderators to push back on a candidate if something inflammatory or black-and-white factually incorrect was said, and I think we we all seem to again rally behind the idea that it's a very fine line and a difficult line, but one of them one of the points that perhaps most well spokenly described this was to say the answer might be to ask clarifying question instead of to simply try to rebut something that was said. CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Two two very good discussions. Very good. With that, I want to move on to Item VII, public comment. This is the time for consideration of comments and suggestions from the public. Action taken as a result of

1	public comment will be limited to directing staff to study	1	breakout session?
2	the matter or rescheduling the matter for further	2	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Okay.
3	consideration and decision at a later date or responding to	3	MR. MADDEN: I just want to say that it was said
4	criticism.	4	multiple times that the there was an unwillingness to
5	Are there any members of the public who wish to	5	divide by party in the primary debates. If you do not
6	make a comment? You can use the Zoom feature to raise your	6	divide by partisan basis, then all you are doing is creating
7	hand, come off mute, or do something else to get my	7	a second general debate with more candidates; that's all
8	attention.	8	that does.
9	Nathan Madden.	9	So I would I would definitely recommend that
10	MR. MADDEN: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. I I will	10	this Commission stay away from that line of thinking because
11	repeat my previous question and then I also have a comment	11	the primaries are for the partisan discussions.
12	from the breakout session.	12	Thank you.
13	The my previous comment was that I know that	13	MS. ROBERTS: You're on mute, Chairman.
14	this Commission has had a somewhat tenuous relationship with	14	MEMBER MCLEOD: Mark, you're on mute.
15	the Cronkite School, the Public Broadcasting System of	15	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Thank you. Thank you.
16	Arizona, what has the Commission and staff done to either	16	Eventually I'll learn how to operate Zoom.
17	repair this or move forward with a different broadcasting	17	Item VIII, adjournment. Our next meeting will be
18	partner?	18	one week from today, April 20th, at 10:00 a.m.
19	CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Well, as I as I was saying	19	If there are no objections, we will adjourn. We
20		20	will adjourn.
	just a minute ago, we're not in a position to to respond	20	•
21 22	directly to that, but we'll get into discussing broad	21	(No audible response.)
	broadcast partners and other partners and moderators in		CHAIRMAN KIMBLE: Seeing no objections, we are
23 24	future sessions.	23 24	adjourned.
	MR. MADDEN: Okay. And then if if I may, I have		Thank you very much for your time.
25	one more comment referring to what I witnessed in the	25	(Meeting concludes at 12:00 p.m.)
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com 132		www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com
1	CERTIFICATE		
2	CERTIFICATE		
2 3 4 5	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA )		
2 3 4	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA )		
2 3 4 5 6 7	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter		
2 3 4 5 6	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability;		
2 3 4 5 6 7	<u>CERTIFICATE</u> STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.		
2 3 4 5 6 7	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction. I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction. I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction. I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction. I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction. I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CERTIFICATE STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA ) BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction. I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CERTIFICATE   STATE OF ARIZONA )   ) SS.   COUNTY OF MARICOPA )   BIT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were faken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction. I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the foregoing before more and I in any way interested in the outcome factor. I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the foregoing model. Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, RB, CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127). * * * *		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LitChfield park. Arizona this 18th of April, 2023.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LitChfield park. Arizona this 18th of April, 2023.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CERTIFICATE         STATE OF ARIZONA ) ) ss.         COUNTY OF MARICOPA )         BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.         I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.         I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)         * * *         I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 18th of April, 2023.         Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		

131

\$	4	access [1] - 7:11	25:4, 25:23, 26:17,	amplification [2] -
Ψ		accommodate [1] -	27:8, 27:14, 34:25,	20:9, 20:10
<b>\$500</b> [2] - 14:23, 16:8	<b>45</b> [2] - 58:8, 85:15	31:12	48:19, 53:2, 80:12,	anecdotal [1] - 46:8
	<b>48</b> [1] - 29:15	accordingly [1] - 25:8	102:19	Angela [2] - 56:6, 56:9
	4th [1] - 30:5	accurate [1] - 56:23	aggression [1] - 12:10	answer [27] - 12:20,
		accurately [1] -	aggressive [1] -	19:7, 41:8, 41:13,
<b>'em</b> [2] - 50:20, 75:13	5	104:16	110:24	41:15, 58:7, 62:8,
· · ·		accusations [1] - 39:5	aggressively [1] -	62:11, 69:17, 76:22,
1	<b>50</b> [3] - 76:14, 100:14,	acknowledge [1] -	86:25	76:24, 83:9, 91:25,
<b>1</b> [2] - 8:14, 43:21	100:15	18:20	ago [2] - 51:16, 130:20	92:7, 94:19, 94:24,
<b>1</b> [2] - 0.14, 43.21 <b>10</b> [3] - 14:1, 91:13,	50,000-foot [1] -	acknowledged [1] -	<b>agree</b> [11] - 50:25,	95:5, 95:6, 101:14,
91:14 91:14	119:18	84:6	51:24, 51:25, 52:3,	101:21, 101:25,
<b>100</b> [1] - 15:11	<b>5:30</b> [1] - 8:1	act [1] - 129:9	52:8, 59:13, 76:1,	109:22, 111:13, 111:15, 123:13,
<b>10:00</b> [1] - 131:18	C	Act [1] - 3:24	86:1, 110:11, 122:4 agreed [3] - 34:22,	123:21, 129:19
<b>10:45</b> [2] - 34:14,	6	action [6] - 4:5, 4:24,	87:6, 122:6	answered [1] - 22:10
55:13	<b>60</b> [1] - 100:15	34:17, 81:10, 90:21,	agreed-upon [1] -	answering [4] - 71:5,
<b>11</b> [2] - 13:25, 14:1	<b>6:00</b> [8] - 7:25, 8:3,	129:25 <b>active</b> [1] - 99:23	122:6	79:24, 103:22,
<b>11:15</b> [1] - 77:9	8:16, 8:17, 9:19,	actual [5] - 23:1,	agreement [3] - 46:20,	124:17
<b>11:21</b> [2] - 81:8, 105:1	27:22, 28:2	71:16, 92:16,	76:4, 122:3	answers [5] - 91:23,
<b>11:51</b> [1] - 125:21		101:17, 101:24	ahead [13] - 29:8,	92:2, 92:15, 97:25,
<b>12</b> [1] - 105:18	7	acuity [1] - 127:22	34:5, 35:14, 59:9,	123:20
<b>12:00</b> [1] - 131:25		add [12] - 31:8, 61:3,	62:24, 71:2, 71:3,	anticipate [1] - 48:19
<b>13</b> [1] - 104:3	<b>7</b> [2] - 40:22	64:24, 68:25, 90:16,	72:19, 79:17, 80:25,	anticipating [2] -
13th [1] - 3:3		114:9, 117:6,	82:1, 83:14, 106:10	96:18, 96:23
<b>14</b> [1] - 40:22	8	119:15, 121:18,	aired [1] - 51:10	anyway [3] - 39:19,
<b>15</b> [2] - 82:19, 83:20	<b>8:00</b> [1] - 28:2	122:18, 122:20,	<b>all's</b> [1] - 62:23	101:6, 101:14
-	<b>8:30</b> [1] - 27:23	128:6	all-in [1] - 99:21	apart [3] - 27:25, 28:3,
2		addition [1] - 18:20	allegation [1] - 63:5	35:7
<b>2</b> [2] - 58:7, 85:20	А	additional [2] - 22:18,	allocate [2] - 82:23, 83:15	apologies [1] - 98:8 apologize [4] - 22:10,
<b>2.15</b> [2] - 85:15, 85:20		101:7 address [8] - 19:24,	allocated [3] - 79:5,	25:2, 34:15, 67:20
<b>20</b> [3] - 42:12, 85:9,	<b>A.M</b> [2] - 34:14, 55:13	29:12, 43:3, 48:4,	79:12, 116:7	appeal [1] - 42:20
85:10	<b>a.m</b> [5] - 77:9, 81:8,	49:16, 62:4, 66:4,	allow [21] - 8:5, 11:2,	appealing [1] - 38:18
<b>2012</b> [2] - 71:10, 71:11	105:1, 125:21,	69:18	22:17, 60:5, 66:13,	appear [1] - 17:10
<b>2018</b> [2] - 94:13,	131:18	addresses [1] - 66:3	82:21, 83:4, 83:13,	appearance [1] -
100:12	abide [1] - 122:6	addressing [3] -	84:3, 84:4, 86:13,	124:5
<b>2022</b> [13] - 6:13, 6:23,	<b>ability</b> [13] - 18:18, 21:14, 21:15, 21:19,	57:13, 57:19, 65:19	93:4, 93:17, 93:20,	applicable [1] - 39:22
7:5, 11:3, 12:17,	22:7, 27:16, 74:2,	adjourn [2] - 131:19,	97:24, 102:19,	applies [1] - 64:13
12:21, 13:14, 21:6,	100:14, 107:25,	131:20	117:22, 126:12,	apply [1] - 128:19
21:20, 23:8, 45:22,	108:4, 110:9,	adjourned [1] - 131:23	126:14, 126:17,	appointed [1] - 3:9
45:25, 49:18	110:18, 125:6	adjournment [1] -	126:23	appreciate [7] - 22:13,
<b>2023</b> [1] - 4:5 <b>20th</b> [1] - 131:18	able [19] - 20:24, 21:2,	131:17	allowed [4] - 19:4, 83:7, 85:10, 99:12	25:18, 38:8, 56:8, 58:2, 122:16, 124:10
<b>24</b> [1] - 55:1	22:4, 23:16, 27:1,	adjustments [1] -	allowing [2] - 86:17,	58:2, 122:16, 124:19 approach [1] - 117:5
<b>25</b> [1] - 125:10	28:5, 28:10, 30:14,	30:22 administrative [3] -	88:16	approaches [1] - 117.5
<b>27</b> [2] - 29:20	43:21, 50:14, 57:25,	28:10, 29:3, 30:21	allows [1] - 116:22	69:15
<b>28</b> [1] - 29:15	59:15, 60:15, 62:18,	advance [18] - 9:6,	almost [6] - 14:11,	appropriate [4] - 53:2,
<b>29th</b> [2] - 4:5, 4:17	73:2, 108:22, 118:5, 127:21	9:17, 33:1, 72:12,	16:6, 42:12, 72:12,	68:21, 114:25,
	absence [1] - 34:20	72:16, 73:24, 73:25,	77:3	129:13
3	absolute [1] - 67:3	74:6, 79:14, 85:24,	alpha [1] - 10:11	appropriately [2] -
<b>20</b> Hay 40:05 04 0	absurd [1] - 63:5	91:12, 91:22, 92:3,	alternate [1] - 74:13	67:13, 94:19
<b>30</b> [12] - 19:25, 21:8, 29:18, 30:3, 31:4,	acceptability [1] -	93:16, 93:17, 96:2,	alternatives [1] -	approve [2] - 4:8, 4:15
31:20, 34:5, 34:6,	23:19	99:8, 100:19	119:16	approved [3] - 4:10,
42:12, 58:9, 85:21	acceptable [1] -	advisable [1] - 12:25 advising [1] - 88:4	amazing [1] - 34:21 American [1] - 93:8	4:23, 6:10 approving [1] - 4:16
<b>30-minute</b> [3] - 8:6,	118:19	afraid [2] - 94:3, 95:10	amount [8] - 35:22,	<b>April</b> [3] - 3:3, 30:1,
14:4, 19:22	accepting [1] - 21:12	age [1] - 71:11	47:25, 48:1, 48:2,	131:18
30-second [1] - 21:23	accepts [2] - 18:10,	<b>agenda</b> [15] - 5:6,	60:8, 60:9, 79:12,	area [3] - 79:19, 79:20,
<b>35</b> [1] - 31:4	19:16	6:19, 8:13, 12:19,	116:15	101:3
				4

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

	_			
areas [1] - 118:12	Avery [22] - 26:14,	behind [5] - 54:9,	<b>Bob</b> [6] - 4:11, 31:16,	building [1] - 121:15
	56:5, 57:5, 59:10,	•• •		-
argue [1] - 44:10		60:18, 78:9, 128:18,	35:17, 51:6, 53:3,	<b>built</b> [2] - 75:16,
arguing [1] - 62:22	60:1, 64:6, 66:18,	129:16	103:6	109:18
argument [1] - 62:21	69:9, 72:20, 74:18,	behooves [1] - 60:11	<b>bonus</b> [1] - 16:2	<b>bullet</b> [2] - 82:13, 84:8
Arizona [8] - 3:10,	76:11, 80:2, 80:21,	<b>bell</b> [1] - 92:21	<b>boring</b> [2] - 89:25,	burden [1] - 22:19
3:13, 13:5, 43:1,	81:1, 105:11, 106:1,	bellicose [1] - 110:24	120:12	burdens [1] - 42:10
52:17, 66:6, 111:24,	111:8, 115:22,	beneficial [3] -	<b>box</b> [1] - 15:22	<b>but</b> [1] - 77:13
130:16	115:24, 118:1,	107:14, 107:15,	Brahm [1] - 56:25	button [5] - 32:12,
Arizona's [1] - 3:25	124:24	107:16	break [9] - 26:2, 26:4,	38:22, 88:21, 89:2,
arms [1] - 70:22	avoid [4] - 61:5, 73:14,	benefit [6] - 36:1,	27:25, 35:7, 35:19,	127:7
array [2] - 75:23,	101:6, 126:15	45:8, 65:4, 91:17,	49:22, 51:9, 53:13,	
119:16	awareness [1] - 40:9	108:17, 120:6	80:17	С
arrested [1] - 94:13	awful [1] - 86:23	benefits [1] - 91:19	breakdown [1] - 106:3	
aside [1] - 18:17	<b>aye</b> [2] - 4:18, 6:6	best [6] - 42:24, 91:23,	breaking [4] - 27:9,	calendar [5] - 7:19,
aspect [1] - 41:24	ayes [2] - 4:19, 6:7	91:25, 92:25,	38:12, 50:25, 128:1	31:18, 31:22, 32:18,
assembling [1] -		109:13, 118:1	breaking-out [1] -	33:20
74:21	В	better [13] - 38:16,	128:1	calendaring [1] -
assign [1] - 26:13		39:6, 44:5, 50:15,	breakout [19] - 26:11,	30:25
assigned [2] - 26:20,	back-and-forth [5] -	51:22, 52:2, 69:6,	26:14, 26:17, 26:21,	calendars [1] - 33:7
80:18	83:7, 84:5, 92:23,	75:9, 86:19, 89:10,	26:24, 27:2, 27:3,	camera [2] - 20:24,
assigning [1] - 28:22	93:2, 122:11	89:13, 94:9, 94:24	27:7, 29:8, 29:12,	102:14
associate [1] - 64:15	background [5] -	between [16] - 9:5,	31:17, 34:6, 38:6,	campaign [2] - 19:18,
Association [1] - 13:5	6:18, 12:18, 27:12,	28:15, 35:9, 36:9,	77:4, 80:10, 81:1,	96:21
assume [2] - 7:2,	84:3, 98:9	36:10, 37:16, 54:11,	102:18, 130:12,	campaigning [1] -
84:19	backwards [2] -	62:21, 68:13, 74:11,	131:1	97:6
assuming [1] - 106:21	29:22, 105:3	78:10, 86:18, 93:2,	BREAKOUT [4] -	campaigns [1] - 99:7
atmosphere [1] -	bad [2] - 91:9, 123:4	102:3, 102:4, 117:21	34:14, 55:13, 81:8,	Candidate [9] - 3:4,
101:19	badly [1] - 90:12	bias [5] - 39:6, 46:5,	105:1	4:17, 6:4, 11:8, 11:9,
attack [1] - 98:25	balance [4] - 65:18,	90:2, 113:2, 124:5	breakouts [1] - 48:1	11:10, 11:11, 18:21,
attacking [1] - 97:18	69:7, 75:22, 117:21	biased [5] - 65:15,	brief [1] - 105:15	18:22
attacks [4] - 9:11,	balanced [2] - 60:4,	125:3, 125:7, 129:10	bring [1] - 101:6	candidate [85] - 5:1,
82:9, 97:3, 118:10	73:13	<b>big</b> [6] - 38:17, 40:5,	bringing [2] - 98:1,	5:5, 8:5, 8:6, 10:24,
attend [1] - 38:19	ballot [8] - 7:8, 7:11,	44:17, 44:24,	118:22	11:16, 11:19, 14:21,
attendance [1] - 74:25	16:23, 17:6, 17:10,	100:15, 112:25	broad [2] - 60:14,	15:8, 15:10, 16:1,
attended [1] - 23:9	17:11, 17:25, 52:14	biggest [5] - 57:10,	130:21	18:10, 18:16, 19:6,
attending [1] - 38:14	ballots [1] - 9:25	57:16, 57:21, 62:25	broadcast [7] - 19:2,	19:21, 19:23, 19:25,
attention [3] - 5:12,	banged [1] - 41:16	<b>bill</b> [2] - 73:22, 96:19	21:17, 22:3, 22:5,	20:2, 24:7, 28:8,
103:13, 130:8	base [1] - 102:19	bills [1] - 73:25	22:6, 33:12, 130:22	28:16, 29:23, 30:9,
attract [1] - 76:4	based [11] - 13:15,	<b>bit</b> [16] - 3:7, 46:4,	broadcaster [1] -	30:10, 30:13, 30:15,
	51:4, 54:1, 54:12,	63:8, 66:25, 75:8,	109:11	31:9, 38:1, 43:20,
audible [16] - 4:21,	63:11, 77:22, 78:13,	84:2, 84:7, 96:24,	broadcaster's [1] -	56:11, 56:16, 58:10,
5:13, 6:9, 20:15, 22:15, 22:16, 22:23	98:3, 126:1	105:11, 106:18,	48:5	61:19, 62:4, 62:18,
22:15, 22:16, 22:23,	baseline [1] - 12:24	113:18, 127:8,	Broadcasters [1] -	62:20, 63:24, 69:20,
23:1, 25:20, 77:17, 78:21, 87:25,	basic [3] - 85:12,	127:13, 127:14,	13:5	70:13, 79:5, 83:9,
106:14, 108:18,	126:6	129:12	Broadcasting [2] -	83:12, 83:23, 84:4,
114:11, 131:21	basis [1] - 131:6	Black [2] - 118:14,	24:22, 130:15	84:11, 86:9, 86:11,
audience [9] - 8:10,	bear [1] - 6:25	124:7	broadcasting [2] -	86:14, 86:22, 88:12,
8:25, 9:15, 10:4,	beaten [1] - 108:11	black [1] - 129:14	24:25, 130:17	88:13, 92:6, 95:9,
11:23, 25:14, 39:12,	become [2] - 41:21,	Black-and-white [1] -	broader [1] - 42:21	95:12, 97:5, 98:25,
39:23, 42:21	79:23	118:14	broken [5] - 28:3,	99:25, 101:2,
<b>audio</b> [3] - 20:10,	begin [3] - 8:3, 33:8,	black-and-white [1] -	28:4, 53:14, 53:15,	107:16, 107:24,
21:3, 127:7	58:11	129:14	54:19	108:22, 109:7,
augmenting [1] - 60:2	beginning [3] - 33:15,	blah [3] - 97:4	brought [1] - 109:1	109:16, 110:9,
	50:22, 67:10	block [2] - 38:17,	brushed [1] - 101:22	113:22, 114:22,
authority [2] - 15:16,	<b>behalf</b> [3] - 78:25,	45:10	bubbling [1] - 45:24	114:24, 118:2,
16:17	99:6, 99:24	blocks [1] - 58:13	<b>buck</b> [1] - 118:2	118:4, 119:21,
available [5] - 7:24,	behave [1] - 86:24	<b>Blow</b> [2] - 50:21,	buck-thirty [1] - 118:2	119:22, 120:3,
20:18, 33:11, 73:1,	behavior [2] - 111:19,	50:22	budget [1] - 100:15	120:21, 123:12,
81:3	118:20	blown [1] - 93:9	<b>build</b> [3] - 87:10,	123:13, 123:20,
average [2] - 13:9,	behaviors [1] - 111:20	board [1] - 89:18	87:12, 88:8	124:6, 124:17,
41:3			57.12, 00.0	

126:8, 127:20,	121:24, 122:22,	36:15, 36:21, 38:4,	33:2, 44:17, 44:18,	clarifying [4] - 13:3,
128:20, 129:11,	123:10, 124:23,	42:3, 42:6, 43:16,	44:20, 44:22, 46:17,	124:14, 124:16,
129:13	128:21, 129:1, 131:7	44:25, 45:7, 48:11,	48:12, 48:17, 49:1,	129:19
candidate's [9] - 17:9,	Candidates [2] - 5:1,	48:25, 49:11, 49:15,	53:11	
66:11, 67:9, 67:16,	5:22	54:25, 55:2, 77:10,		clarity [2] - 121:24,
		77:18, 78:17, 80:5,	changing [2] - 32:14,	129:1
97:4, 97:18, 99:21,	candidly [2] - 31:23,		118:1	clean [1] - 32:6
114:23, 122:13	32:4	80:14, 81:11, 81:17,	<b>channel</b> [4] - 9:20,	<b>Clean</b> [23] - 3:10, 3:24,
candidates [165] -	Candy [1] - 71:11	81:19, 81:22, 82:1,	18:24, 26:25, 81:4	6:11, 14:11, 14:14,
3:19, 6:22, 6:24, 7:7,	<b>cannot</b> [3] - 60:25,	84:15, 84:24, 91:10,	charges [1] - 39:5	14:21, 16:1, 16:3,
8:1, 8:4, 8:10, 8:17,	73:20, 97:3	92:20, 99:16, 101:9,	chat [2] - 82:13, 82:24	16:4, 20:12, 26:15,
8:21, 8:22, 8:24,	capability [1] - 92:6	101:12, 102:7,	<b>check</b> [12] - 63:7,	29:4, 40:23, 41:10,
9:11, 9:17, 10:5,	capacity [3] - 7:14,	104:17, 104:19,	63:14, 63:21, 66:10,	46:3, 61:6, 90:17,
10:6, 10:10, 10:12,	92:1, 97:20	104:21, 125:22,	68:19, 69:20, 70:16,	91:6, 98:12, 113:8,
10:15, 10:20, 10:23,	Capitol [1] - 52:17	128:7, 128:11,	70:17, 70:20, 109:8,	121:5, 122:22, 129:5
11:5, 11:7, 11:16,	capture [1] - 105:10	129:21, 130:19,	116:21, 123:18	<b>cleaner</b> [2] - 50:6,
11:17, 12:1, 12:2,	captured [5] - 5:16,	131:2, 131:15,	checker [1] - 64:3	101:16
12:9, 12:11, 13:8,	80:2, 104:15,	131:22	checking [9] - 63:16,	<b>clear</b> [9] - 44:15,
13:20, 13:24, 14:1,	119:15, 128:5	<b>Chairman</b> [40] - 4:9,	71:8, 72:8, 73:2,	54:18, 85:24,
14:6, 14:12, 14:14,	captures [1] - 127:23	6:16, 13:4, 13:12,	73:22, 74:9, 108:25,	111:20, 122:21,
14:25, 15:1, 15:5,	capturing [1] - 5:19	14:16, 14:18, 16:11,	109:6, 123:16	122:23, 124:9, 126:9
15:14, 15:17, 15:24,	care [6] - 9:2, 74:8,	16:21, 17:3, 18:3,	checks [3] - 69:20,	clearly [8] - 53:24,
16:4, 16:25, 17:7,	79:25, 103:25,	18:13, 19:10, 19:19,	69:21, 70:14	54:23, 98:21, 99:14,
17:8, 17:14, 17:19,	104:6, 118:23	20:8, 20:9, 20:20,	children [2] - 95:19,	109:15, 111:10,
17:20, 17:23, 18:20,	careful [2] - 59:19,	22:14, 23:6, 23:11,	96:7	111:16
19:3, 19:16, 21:11,	117:21	24:19, 25:2, 25:16,	chime [3] - 57:4,	cliche [3] - 57:23,
21:22, 21:24, 23:8,	cares [2] - 74:8, 97:9	26:9, 26:16, 29:13,	61:12, 117:18	60:11
23:14, 28:23, 28:24,	case [3] - 9:15, 37:23,	29:19, 31:7, 32:23,	chimes [1] - 117:16	cliches [3] - 60:17,
30:16, 33:1, 33:4,	111:1	34:3, 35:16, 48:18,	choice [2] - 41:20,	60:18, 61:5
33:18, 35:9, 35:22,	catch [1] - 18:12	49:17, 52:23, 78:19,	112:20	climate [1] - 108:6
35:23, 36:5, 36:10,	catering [1] - 95:12	80:11, 81:3, 99:10,	choose [3] - 41:18,	<b>clock</b> [3] - 10:17,
37:10, 37:16, 38:9,	<b>Cathy</b> [3] - 29:7,	130:10, 131:13	79:1, 84:20	56:21, 62:14
39:4, 39:18, 39:19,	50:25, 80:25	challenge [7] - 7:8,	Chorus [2] - 4:19, 6:7	closing [6] - 10:6,
39:20, 39:21, 41:2,	cattle [1] - 104:2	15:12, 29:23, 60:17,	<b>Chris</b> [19] - 13:4, 13:6,	10:13, 12:4, 12:5,
42:9, 42:17, 42:25,	caused [1] - 73:13	63:24, 68:9, 75:3	23:5, 34:22, 44:25,	82:22, 83:13
43:25, 44:1, 44:10,	caution [2] - 61:4	challenges [1] - 28:16	47:6, 53:12, 54:25,	clues [1] - 107:21
44:14, 45:5, 45:22,	cautious [1] - 46:1	challenging [2] -	55:3, 77:18, 77:19,	<b>CNN</b> [1] - 71:18
46:7, 47:18, 47:20,	cents [1] - 104:7	42:22, 75:10	78:17, 115:12,	cognitive [1] - 77:1
51:4, 53:4, 53:16,	certain [5] - 86:21,	Chamber [23] - 8:20,	115:18, 122:1,	coin [1] - 67:12
54:12, 57:19, 57:22,	,	25:25, 26:5, 27:9,	124:24, 125:14,	<b>COLLINS</b> [15] - 55:23,
60:11, 60:15, 61:17,	90:2, 97:8, 99:7,	35:3, 35:10, 49:23,	128:11	66:18, 66:20, 71:5,
62:22, 64:19, 65:4,	122:4	49:25, 51:1, 51:3,	Christine [1] - 99:16	71:25, 72:3, 105:8,
66:9, 68:9, 68:13,	certainly [5] - 29:5,	51:4, 54:1, 54:3,	chunk [1] - 58:18	105:13, 105:20,
68:22, 70:2, 70:12,	38:16, 44:9, 48:21,	54:13, 77:22, 78:2,	circle [1] - 86:14	106:7, 106:17,
74:11, 78:12, 79:14,	71:14	78:13, 102:24,	circumstances [1] -	107:7, 120:2,
79:21, 79:23, 80:20,	cetera [2] - 91:14,	103:6, 105:7,	85:4	120:17, 121:3
82:10, 83:4, 83:17,	127:22	106:12, 128:2, 128:3	<b>circus</b> [2] - 95:7,	<b>Collins</b> [1] - 15:19
85:13, 85:18, 86:18,	Chair [1] - 31:24	Chamber-based [2] -	101:19	combine [1] - 50:10
87:3, 87:13, 87:14,	<b>chair</b> [5] - 18:8, 19:5,	54:1, 77:22	citizen [1] - 25:10	comfort [1] - 122:8
88:3, 88:10, 89:17,	19:9, 19:13	chance [9] - 62:20,	Citizens [1] - 3:10	coming [10] - 24:1,
91:11, 91:12, 91:13,	CHAIRMAN [78] - 3:3,	85:23, 87:4, 93:5,	<b>City</b> [1] - 40:24	31:21, 32:7, 89:18,
91:15, 91:22, 92:1,	4:11, 4:14, 4:20,	97:11, 98:4, 100:23,	<b>civility</b> [4] - 66:15,	98:25, 119:1, 124:4,
92:24, 93:3, 93:23,	4:22, 5:14, 5:18,	100:25, 126:9	• • • •	125:6, 125:7, 129:10
95:22, 98:3, 99:18,	5:25, 6:3, 6:8, 6:10,	Chandler [1] - 40:24	118:23, 126:18, 126:19	comment [20] - 25:8,
100:2, 102:3,	12:23, 13:6, 14:17,	change [12] - 32:6,	126:19	52:24, 56:17, 76:12,
103:13, 108:9,	16:19, 18:2, 18:6,	32:11, 40:21, 41:2,	civilized [1] - 91:8	76:15, 109:2, 109:3,
108:21, 109:6,	19:12, 20:6, 23:4,	42:23, 46:2, 54:2,	clarification [7] -	109:23, 113:12,
112:8, 119:1, 120:8,	24:17, 25:1, 25:12,	60:16, 77:23, 83:14,	19:11, 64:1, 98:16,	109.23, 113.12, 115:8, 119:17,
120:14, 120:20,	25:17, 25:21, 29:9,	113:9	99:3, 104:10, 125:1,	121:19, 124:19,
120:24, 121:4,	31:14, 31:16, 33:24,	changes [15] - 12:25,	125:4	124:21, 129:24,
121:6, 121:12,	34:8, 34:19, 34:22,	25:22, 26:3, 31:8,	clarify [5] - 8:2, 14:20,	130:1, 130:6,
121:16, 121:23,	35:13, 35:17, 36:11,		36:11, 43:17, 68:2	100.1, 100.0,

130:11, 130:13, 130:25 comments [14] - 5:14, 44:3, 58:3, 59:4, 64:4, 64:15, 74:19, 99:5, 106:16, 108:16, 119:11, 123:4, 124:18, 129:24 commission [1] -116:19 Commission [14] -3:10, 3:14, 3:18, 6:12, 24:21, 24:23, 61:6, 71:7, 72:23, 72:24, 76:3, 130:14, 130:16, 131:10 Commission's [1] -67.8 committee [1] - 74:20 committees [1] -100.3communicated [1] -113:6 communication [1] -123.1communications [1] -38:18 communities [1] -74:4 community [2] -23:22, 74:7 compared [1] - 39:20 compensate [1] -41:23 completely [2] - 52:7, 95:24 complicated [3] -58:6, 58:12, 58:14 complied [2] - 87:15, 127:1 comply [1] - 88:2 con [1] - 19:15 conceptual [1] - 19:14 concern [4] - 45:24, 57:21, 63:1, 70:18 concerns [7] - 40:5, 51:6, 62:6, 75:8, 76:1, 89:19, 90:1 conclude [1] - 7:9 concludes [1] -131:25 conclusions [1] -120:16 conditions [2] - 64:9, 88:3 conduct [2] - 19:17, 118:13 conducted [1] - 82:6 conducting [1] - 72:25

conducts [1] - 86:22 confidence [11] -75:17, 87:10, 87:12, 88:5, 88:18, 89:16, 89:23, 120:25, 121:13, 121:15, 127:12 confirm [2] - 25:3, 80:12 congress [1] - 49:13 connect [1] - 23:17 connection [1] - 72:2 cons [2] - 56:14, 106:24 consensus [7] - 24:2, 24:12, 45:7, 79:15, 126:4, 126:13, 127:17 consequence [1] -15:4 consider [8] - 5:6, 15:2, 27:24, 30:3, 35:7, 37:24, 64:2, 82:4 consideration [11] -17:23, 28:11, 33:3, 42:8, 42:14, 43:9, 64:12, 64:20, 82:15, 129:24, 130:3 considerations [1] -27:24 considered [3] - 8:23, 19:5, 19:6 considering [1] - 73:4 consistency [1] -89:16 consistent [2] - 87:13, 117:2 consistently [2] -59:15, 59:17 consists [1] - 46:5 Constantin [4] - 36:2, 51:15, 90:8, 92:21 Constantin's [2] -46:11, 51:16 constituents [1] - 74:4 constraint [2] - 40:18 content [3] - 39:6, 39:22, 48:7 contention [1] - 22:21 contentious [1] -108:6 contested [5] - 8:18, 13:22, 17:13, 17:25, 18:9 context [9] - 27:7, 35:4, 66:20, 83:24, 84:3, 106:17, 120:21, 123:12, 123:19

continue [4] - 3:24, 78:14, 107:23 contrast [3] - 96:23, 100:9, 100:10 contrasting [1] - 94:1 contrasts [1] - 93:24 control [19] - 20:17, 22:23, 63:3, 70:12, 84:12, 88:17, 90:3, 93:4, 110:9, 111:11, 111:17, 112:1, 112:3, 112:5, 118:25, 119:3, 127:6, 127:14 controlled [2] - 20:12, 57:16 controlling [1] -126:22 convened [1] - 3:21 convenience [1] -41.4 Convention [1] -52:11 conversation [22] -11:3, 11:11, 54:3, 57:12, 60:6, 60:23, 61:15, 61:22, 73:10, 78:1, 87:5, 93:5, 108:3, 114:4, 117:8, 127:5. 127:6. 127:8. 127:10, 127:12, 127:24, 128:14 conversational [2] -48:16, 115:7 conversations [5] -54:4, 78:3, 78:7, 108:8, 127:5 convey [1] - 112:8 cooperation [1] -25:18 core [1] - 67:20 corners [1] - 106:21 correct [6] - 49:6, 49:14, 60:7, 66:12, 79:16, 84:23 Council [1] - 40:24 count [1] - 105:16 counted [1] - 77:12 countries [1] - 93:7 couple [6] - 59:3, 59:5, 64:21, 90:6, 100:25, 117:19 course [9] - 9:10, 15:25, 18:6, 19:12, 56:14, 62:2, 62:3, 78:15 COURT [1] - 56:5 cover [3] - 22:16, 76:18, 108:5 covered [3] - 52:18,

107:10, 113:13 covering [1] - 68:20 cower [1] - 95:15 **CQ** [4] - 86:1, 88:19, 99:17, 99:23 crafting [2] - 120:7 crap [1] - 118:14 crazy [2] - 70:23, 95:20 create [12] - 28:20, 32:24, 33:10, 40:19, 44:5, 57:24, 78:4. 88:3, 94:6, 96:23, 111:14, 112:7 creating [5] - 33:7, 44:15, 95:7, 116:19, 131:6 creative [1] - 71:1 credit [1] - 5:18 criteria [1] - 17:21 critical [1] - 113:2 criticism [1] - 130:4 Cronkite [2] - 24:22, 130:15 cross [2] - 99:10, 99:11 crossover [1] - 80:6 crosstalk [3] - 29:8, 95:25, 96:11 crosstalk) [1] - 99:15 Crowley [1] - 71:12 cue [2] - 21:21, 22:3 cues [4] - 10:18, 20:15, 21:12 culture [1] - 67:3 curious [3] - 13:7, 70:11, 99:17 current [5] - 17:21, 49:18, 106:22, 108:5, 108:6 cut [15] - 21:11, 22:4, 82:20, 89:6, 110:4, 111:12, 111:25, 112:1, 112:14, 112:15, 118:15, 119:6, 122:7 cuts [1] - 110:5 cutting [1] - 107:25 cycle [8] - 6:13, 6:23, 12:22, 46:3, 52:12, 67:8, 73:11, 75:2 D

dad [1] - 115:10 dais [1] - 35:24 dance [1] - 102:1 data [1] - 69:13 date [5] - 7:24, 9:25, 10:1, 32:21, 130:3

dates [2] - 32:25, 33:17 days [5] - 29:15, 29:20, 31:4 dead [2] - 86:6, 88:19 deadline [5] - 10:1, 30:8, 30:9, 107:20, 108:13 deal [6] - 36:4, 58:20, 93:5, 104:1, 105:22, 115:18 dealing [3] - 41:17, 92:8, 102:16 debate [159] - 3:22, 4:25, 5:4, 6:13, 6:23, 7:21, 8:15, 8:24, 9:5, 9:7, 9:13, 9:14, 9:18, 12:17, 12:21, 13:21, 14:6, 14:15, 14:22, 17:15, 18:21, 19:9, 19:17, 20:19, 21:20, 24:23, 25:24, 28:9, 28:19, 28:23, 30:11, 32:19, 32:22, 33:15, 35:24, 36:15, 36:16, 36:17, 36:18, 38:2, 38:19, 40:7, 41:22, 42:8, 43:21, 43:25, 44:11, 45:11, 45:13, 45:14, 46:9, 46:14, 46:23, 47:8, 49:5, 49:6, 49:21, 50:5, 50:11, 51:2, 52:10, 52:19, 54:11, 54:21, 54:22, 56:12, 57:12, 57:20, 60:7, 61:17, 62:7, 68:4, 68:6, 69:4, 69:5, 69:14, 71:12, 72:12, 72:15, 72:22, 73:19, 73:20, 75:13, 77:2, 77:4, 78:10, 78:12, 79:13, 79:20, 80:9, 80:16, 82:20, 83:7, 84:12, 84:21, 86:22, 90:18, 90:19, 91:7, 92:23, 95:13, 97:7, 97:8, 98:5, 99:13, 99:21, 100:8. 100:13. 101:7, 103:19, 105:6, 106:25, 107:1, 107:13, 111:23, 112:1, 112:4, 112:5, 112:21, 113:6, 113:7, 113:15, 113:16, 113:17, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7,

114:18, 115:7,

115:10, 115:13,	97:1	26:13, 37:20, 38:11,	127:2	down 1041 0:4 10:1
115:18, 116:18,	decides [2] - 27:17,	38:14, 39:12, 39:13,	discussions [3] -	<b>down</b> [21] - 9:4, 19:1, 21:1, 21:17, 37:14,
119:2, 119:18,	27:18	47:3, 54:3, 54:13,		41:1, 50:9, 51:21,
119:20, 121:5,	decision [6] - 59:19,	54:20, 55:8, 58:13,	43:10, 129:22, 131:11	53:1, 62:19, 83:6,
121:22, 122:5,	.,	58:17, 63:18, 68:17,		
122:7, 122:9,	101:4, 113:5,	69:15, 70:14, 78:1,	disenfranchising [1] - 44:13	85:21, 88:1, 92:7, 101:9, 108:21,
122:10, 127:12,	124:10, 124:11, 130:3	78:2, 80:7, 83:11,		109:24, 114:5,
127:15, 128:16,	decisions [2] - 53:8,	85:3, 91:7, 112:19,	disincentivizing [1] - 44:13	115:14, 126:1,
128:25, 129:1, 131:7	80:1	114:4, 130:17	disruption [25] -	126:21
<b>Debate</b> [1] - 5:1	declined [1] - 18:22	difficult [4] - 46:16,	40:25, 66:23, 66:25,	downhill [1] - 61:2
debated [1] - 72:21	decorum [4] - 12:11,	75:9, 90:13, 129:17	40.23, 00.23, 00.23, 67:2, 67:3, 67:4,	downs [1] - 36:6
<b>Debates</b> [4] - 3:4,	82:9, 122:4, 126:14	difficulty [1] - 34:16	67:6, 67:12, 67:15,	dozen [1] - 90:20
4:17, 5:22, 6:4	dedicated [1] - 9:7	dinged [1] - 15:8	67:16, 67:17, 67:24,	draft [1] - 125:14
<b>debates</b> [112] - 3:18,	defer [1] - 50:9	directed [1] - 44:4	71:7, 71:13, 71:15,	drafted [1] - 128:12
3:23, 3:25, 6:12,	define [2] - 17:2,	directing [1] - 130:1	71:16, 71:22, 95:20,	draw [2] - 120:15,
6:13, 6:21, 7:5, 7:7,	18:12	direction [3] - 119:23,	106:23, 106:24,	120:16
7:9, 7:12, 7:25, 8:2,		120:1, 120:3	107:2, 107:3,	drinks [1] - 94:14
8:3, 8:6, 12:8, 12:14,	defined [1] - 109:15 definitely [6] - 16:17,	directly [8] - 3:12, 9:4,	120:19, 120:21,	drive [10] - 74:25,
13:9, 16:25, 17:9,	35:7, 36:8, 47:1,	11:6, 11:7, 19:7,	120:22	75:6, 75:22, 76:3,
18:8, 18:15, 18:25,	106:22, 131:9	30:15, 51:7, 130:21	disruption) [12] - 49:3,	76:8, 87:12, 93:2,
20:11, 20:22, 20:23,	degree [3] - 86:21,	<b>Director</b> [2] - 6:15,	67:4, 67:10, 67:22,	103:10, 103:11,
21:11, 21:14, 22:21,	90:2, 99:7	15:19	67:25, 71:19, 71:23,	108:2
22:22, 23:9, 25:24,	deliver [1] - 59:21	disabilities [3] -	105:22, 106:5,	driven [3] - 89:22,
25:25, 26:3, 26:4,	Democrat [1] - 39:24	61:19, 61:21, 62:3	106:19, 107:4, 120:4	89:24, 127:11
27:10, 29:21, 29:25,	Democratic [8] - 8:21,	disagree [1] - 74:22	distinct [3] - 37:5,	drives [1] - 89:16
35:2, 35:3, 35:8,	28:24, 39:11, 45:14,	disagreeing [1] - 87:9	37:15, 64:22	drop [1] - 82:12
35:21, 36:21, 38:11,	47:2, 52:10, 52:11,	discern [1] - 50:14	distinctively [1] - 37:6	<b>DUI</b> [1] - 94:13
38:14, 39:2, 39:3,	107:1	discerning [1] -	distinctly [1] - 37:19	during [18] - 8:23, 9:7,
39:16, 39:25, 40:2,	Democrats [14] -	118:12	distinguish [1] - 36:9	9:18, 20:10, 22:5,
40:23, 40:25, 41:19,	36:17, 36:19, 40:1,	disclose [1] - 92:12	district [5] - 8:12,	26:6, 28:13, 28:25,
41:20, 42:16, 43:2,	40:11, 47:9, 49:20,	discourage [1] - 94:2	13:15, 13:25, 23:17,	30:10, 30:11, 56:12,
43:4, 43:13, 47:14,	51:17, 51:18, 52:1,	discretion [3] - 8:8,	114:6	57:10, 84:21, 113:7,
47:15, 48:14, 51:8,	52:2, 52:21, 53:5,	107:23, 126:7	District [2] - 8:14,	115:7, 115:13, 122:7
51:9, 52:6, 54:1,	103:21	discuss [13] - 5:9,	43:21	
54:20, 57:11, 57:18,	denied [1] - 39:18	8:14, 16:15, 26:3,	districts [5] - 13:11,	E
58:22, 63:1, 63:15,	dependent [2] - 72:8,	26:17, 29:6, 35:11,	29:18, 30:3, 31:20,	
63:17, 64:14, 64:18,	129:9	80:10, 80:23, 82:5,	114:3	<b>e-mail</b> [2] - 9:8, 9:9
68:12, 69:1, 69:12,	derail [1] - 110:25	82:15, 84:13, 105:5	diverse [1] - 75:23	early [3] - 7:10, 29:20,
69:23, 69:24, 72:25,	described [1] - 129:18	discussed [6] - 5:3,	divide [2] - 131:5,	32:24
73:12, 77:22, 78:12,	description [1] - 18:24	5:20, 83:15, 100:23,	131:6	ease [1] - 44:25
79:12, 82:6, 82:8,	deserves [1] - 85:8	114:13, 126:1	divided [2] - 45:5,	easier [2] - 51:13,
89:19, 90:17, 90:25, 91:6, 98:5, 99:19,	designed [1] - 119:2	discussing [2] - 6:20,	45:9	105:21
100:11, 102:23,	designing [1] - 95:13	120.01		
	designing [1] - 95.15	130:21	dividing [1] - 121:22	easy [3] - 47:6, 47:10,
	desire [1] - 110:19	discussion [46] - 4:4,	division [2] - 44:16,	47:13
105:7, 106:11,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22	<b>discussion</b> [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4,	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21	<b>discussion</b> [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23,
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23,	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1	<b>discussion</b> [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] -	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16,
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22,	<b>discussion</b> [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] - 11:18, 109:16, 121:8	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22, 87:25, 127:6, 127:7	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] - 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done [18] - 18:15,	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13 effectively [1] - 20:19
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5 <b>debating</b> [2] - 52:13,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22, 87:25, 127:6, 127:7 devoted [1] - 48:20	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6, 79:19, 80:13, 80:16,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] - 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done [18] - 18:15, 21:9, 24:24, 26:4,	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13 effectively [1] - 20:19 effectuate [1] - 22:20
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5 <b>debating</b> [2] - 52:13, 83:23	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22, 87:25, 127:6, 127:7 devoted [1] - 48:20 dialogue [1] - 42:15	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6, 79:19, 80:13, 80:16, 80:19, 80:22, 84:9,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] - 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done [18] - 18:15, 21:9, 24:24, 26:4, 28:16, 31:6, 32:21,	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13 effectively [1] - 20:19 effectuate [1] - 22:20 effort [3] - 7:18, 11:23,
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5 <b>debating</b> [2] - 52:13, 83:23 <b>decades</b> [1] - 72:22	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22, 87:25, 127:6, 127:7 devoted [1] - 48:20 dialogue [1] - 42:15 dictate [1] - 19:22	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6, 79:19, 80:13, 80:16, 80:19, 80:22, 84:9, 84:17, 84:19, 98:21,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] - 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done [18] - 18:15, 21:9, 24:24, 26:4, 28:16, 31:6, 32:21, 33:17, 35:24, 51:7,	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13 effectively [1] - 20:19 effectuate [1] - 22:20 effort [3] - 7:18, 11:23, 31:11
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5 <b>debating</b> [2] - 52:13, 83:23 <b>decades</b> [1] - 72:22 <b>decide</b> [8] - 10:9, 40:11, 44:2, 46:14, 50:2, 51:13, 92:10,	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22, 87:25, 127:6, 127:7 devoted [1] - 48:20 dialogue [1] - 42:15 dictate [1] - 19:22 differ [1] - 110:18	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6, 79:19, 80:13, 80:16, 80:19, 80:22, 84:9, 84:17, 84:19, 98:21, 98:22, 99:1, 99:19,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] - 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done [18] - 18:15, 21:9, 24:24, 26:4, 28:16, 31:6, 32:21, 33:17, 35:24, 51:7, 54:25, 58:4, 60:24,	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13 effectively [1] - 20:19 effectuate [1] - 22:20 effort [3] - 7:18, 11:23, 31:11 efforts [1] - 75:4
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5 <b>debating</b> [2] - 52:13, 83:23 <b>decades</b> [1] - 72:22 <b>decide</b> [8] - 10:9, 40:11, 44:2, 46:14, 50:2, 51:13, 92:10, 102:5	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22, 87:25, 127:6, 127:7 devoted [1] - 48:20 dialogue [1] - 42:15 dictate [1] - 19:22 differ [1] - 110:18 difference [4] - 36:9,	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6, 79:19, 80:13, 80:16, 80:19, 80:22, 84:9, 84:17, 84:19, 98:21, 98:22, 99:1, 99:19, 109:16, 113:17,	division $[2] - 44:16$ , 65:25 dog $[1] - 102:16$ dominant $[1] - 56:22$ dominated $[1] - 121:2$ dominates $[1] - 56:22$ dominating $[3] -$ 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done $[18] - 18:15$ , 21:9, 24:24, 26:4, 28:16, 31:6, 32:21, 33:17, 35:24, 51:7, 54:25, 58:4, 60:24, 67:2, 87:2, 97:19,	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13 effectively [1] - 20:19 effectuate [1] - 22:20 effort [3] - 7:18, 11:23, 31:11 efforts [1] - 75:4 either [8] - 17:24,
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5 <b>debating</b> [2] - 52:13, 83:23 <b>decades</b> [1] - 72:22 <b>decide</b> [8] - 10:9, 40:11, 44:2, 46:14, 50:2, 51:13, 92:10, 102:5 <b>decided</b> [1] - 77:19	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{desire} [1] - 110:19\\ \textbf{detail} [1] - 57:22\\ \textbf{details} [2] - 29:4,\\ 76:21\\ \textbf{determined} [1] - 43:3\\ \textbf{device} [2] - 22:23,\\ 23:1\\ \textbf{devices} [4] - 87:22,\\ 87:25, 127:6, 127:7\\ \textbf{devoted} [1] - 48:20\\ \textbf{dialogue} [1] - 42:15\\ \textbf{dictate} [1] - 19:22\\ \textbf{differ} [1] - 110:18\\ \textbf{difference} [4] - 36:9,\\ 36:10, 51:13, 102:3\\ \end{array}$	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6, 79:19, 80:13, 80:16, 80:19, 80:22, 84:9, 84:17, 84:19, 98:21, 98:22, 99:1, 99:19, 109:16, 113:17, 113:21, 113:23,	division [2] - 44:16, 65:25 dog [1] - 102:16 dominant [1] - 56:22 dominated [1] - 121:2 dominates [1] - 56:22 dominating [3] - 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done [18] - 18:15, 21:9, 24:24, 26:4, 28:16, 31:6, 32:21, 33:17, 35:24, 51:7, 54:25, 58:4, 60:24, 67:2, 87:2, 97:19, 130:16	$\begin{array}{c} 47:13\\ \textbf{educate} [1] - 73:9\\ \textbf{educating} [1] - 118:19\\ \textbf{education} [4] - 61:23,\\ 76:20, 83:18, 91:14\\ \textbf{Education} [1] - 6:15\\ \textbf{effect} [2] - 60:16,\\ 71:13\\ \textbf{effectively} [1] - 20:19\\ \textbf{effectuate} [1] - 22:20\\ \textbf{effort} [3] - 7:18, 11:23,\\ 31:11\\ \textbf{efforts} [1] - 75:4\\ \textbf{either} [8] - 17:24,\\ 23:8, 24:24, 65:13,\\ \end{array}$
105:7, 106:11, 108:9, 109:12, 109:21, 111:11, 113:11, 114:4, 116:24, 117:25, 124:13, 128:24, 129:4, 129:6, 131:5 <b>debating</b> [2] - 52:13, 83:23 <b>decades</b> [1] - 72:22 <b>decide</b> [8] - 10:9, 40:11, 44:2, 46:14, 50:2, 51:13, 92:10, 102:5	desire [1] - 110:19 detail [1] - 57:22 details [2] - 29:4, 76:21 determined [1] - 43:3 device [2] - 22:23, 23:1 devices [4] - 87:22, 87:25, 127:6, 127:7 devoted [1] - 48:20 dialogue [1] - 42:15 dictate [1] - 19:22 differ [1] - 110:18 difference [4] - 36:9,	discussion [46] - 4:4, 4:24, 8:19, 10:22, 11:18, 12:19, 16:18, 23:23, 24:8, 25:23, 26:6, 27:11, 28:7, 33:6, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 48:13, 48:23, 49:22, 61:16, 67:15, 68:8, 76:6, 79:6, 79:19, 80:13, 80:16, 80:19, 80:22, 84:9, 84:17, 84:19, 98:21, 98:22, 99:1, 99:19, 109:16, 113:17,	division $[2] - 44:16$ , 65:25 dog $[1] - 102:16$ dominant $[1] - 56:22$ dominated $[1] - 121:2$ dominates $[1] - 56:22$ dominating $[3] -$ 11:18, 109:16, 121:8 done $[18] - 18:15$ , 21:9, 24:24, 26:4, 28:16, 31:6, 32:21, 33:17, 35:24, 51:7, 54:25, 58:4, 60:24, 67:2, 87:2, 97:19,	47:13 educate [1] - 73:9 educating [1] - 118:19 education [4] - 61:23, 76:20, 83:18, 91:14 Education [1] - 6:15 effect [2] - 60:16, 71:13 effectively [1] - 20:19 effectuate [1] - 22:20 effort [3] - 7:18, 11:23, 31:11 efforts [1] - 75:4 either [8] - 17:24,

elect [1] - 34:18	aniov (4) 46:0	exect (0) 47:25 02:4	72:9, 72:10, 72:11,	field [2] - 57:15, 57:16
elected [2] - 17:20,	enjoy [1] - 46:9 ensure [9] - 9:2,	exact [2] - 47:25, 92:4	73:1, 74:9, 77:25,	fight [6] - 86:20,
73:21	•••	exactly [1] - 44:11 example [5] - 13:18,	81:4, 95:14, 96:2,	89:12, 90:11, 90:22,
	10:21, 10:23, 11:23, 39:6, 113:10,		108:25, 109:6,	91:8, 126:15
election [18] - 8:18, 9:24, 13:19, 13:22,	126:18, 128:16,	28:1, 61:18, 83:25, 94:17	109:8, 123:16,	<b>figure</b> [3] - 40:17,
9.24, 13.19, 13.22, 17:8, 17:13, 17:25,	128:25		123:17, 129:4	50:12, 93:17
18:9, 29:20, 29:21,	ensures [1] - 109:15	excellent [2] - 13:13, 118:9	fact-check [6] - 63:7,	
36:25, 45:4, 46:22,	ensuring [2] - 9:4,		68:19, 70:16, 70:17,	figuring [1] - 124:1 fil [1] - 98:12
60:14, 67:8, 73:11,	113:1 113:1	except [2] - 118:4, 122:13	70:20, 109:8	filed [1] - 32:22
94:1	entertaining [2] -	exciting [1] - 127:13	fact-checking [2] -	filing [1] - 29:23
Election [1] - 61:6	68:12, 73:8	excluding [1] - 30:13	71:8, 123:16	-
election's [1] - 17:6	entertainment [3] -	Executive [1] - 15:19	fact-checks [1] -	filings [1] - 28:16 fill [1] - 56:16
Elections [22] - 3:10,	73:12, 73:15, 111:23	exercised [1] - 116:8	70:14	finalize [1] - 33:11
3:24, 6:11, 14:11,	enthusiastic [1] -	exist [1] - 32:4	factor [1] - 51:8	finally [2] - 30:18,
14:14, 14:21, 16:1,	119:21	expect [2] - 110:22,	facts [4] - 69:20,	127:15
16:4, 20:12, 26:15,	entire [3] - 3:16, 27:4,	123:3	69:21, 74:13, 123:19	financial [1] - 14:22
29:4, 40:23, 41:10,	78:15	expectations [2] -	factual [2] - 3:16, 9:24	fine [11] - 14:25,
46:3, 72:24, 90:17,	entirely [1] - 83:11	88:6, 89:17	factually [2] - 95:20,	15:16, 39:14, 46:13,
91:7, 98:13, 121:5,	entirety [1] - 97:8	expected [2] - 111:19,	129:14	85:25, 86:25, 90:23,
122:22, 129:5	entrusted [1] - 3:15	119:2	failed [1] - 55:24	91:5, 124:25, 125:4,
elections [1] - 43:3	environment [4] -	expecting [1] - 110:21	fails [1] - 56:7	129:16
Elections' [1] - 113:8	12:13, 70:13,	experience [3] - 15:2,	fair [15] - 60:4, 67:18,	fined [1] - 14:23
electorate [1] - 70:7	111:15, 112:19	69:11, 124:13	85:8, 85:22, 85:23,	finish [2] - 21:8, 88:16
electronically [1] -	envisioning [1] - 90:5	experienced [1] -	95:8, 103:6, 113:10,	finished [1] - 86:16
5:10	equal [5] - 10:23,	59:11	121:13, 121:16,	first [23] - 9:18, 10:9,
elicit [1] - 61:10	11:15, 63:2, 82:10,	experiences [1] -	123:6, 126:5, 126:9,	27:8, 28:2, 29:5,
eligible [6] - 13:20,	90:7	20:15	128:16, 129:7	30:1, 34:4, 34:17,
13:23, 17:4, 17:7,	equally [2] - 79:17,	expert [1] - 84:1	fairly [3] - 47:13,	36:13, 43:17, 45:3,
17:8, 30:13	129:2	experts [2] - 53:4,	89:20, 104:15	47:19, 48:1, 55:20,
eliminate [2] - 90:1,	equitable [2] - 113:10,	53:18	faith [1] - 76:9	56:10, 58:10, 61:15,
99:8	129:7	Explain [1] - 58:11	fake [2] - 65:14, 65:15	70:20, 74:24, 81:9,
eliminates [1] - 17:6	equity [5] - 60:4, 60:8,	explain [2] - 10:3,	fall [2] - 31:3, 107:25	125:23
eliminating [1] - 39:5	79:20, 109:15,	96:19	family [3] - 97:4,	fit [1] - 92:8
empower [1] - 118:14	112:10	explained [1] - 113:7	97:18, 122:13	five [7] - 3:9, 13:10,
empty [4] - 18:8, 19:5,	especially [4] - 17:22,	exposure [2] - 60:9,	fantastic [4] - 30:19,	13:20, 30:11, 39:20,
19:8, 19:13	78:5, 108:5, 117:24	88:9	34:24, 80:3, 95:4	93:20, 100:19
encourage [2] - 82:18,	essence [2] - 78:11,	expound [1] - 20:14	far [12] - 15:1, 22:4,	fix [1] - 47:7
94:3	90:24	extensively [1] -	00.40 00.7 00.0	
encourages [1] -			23:13, 33:7, 39:8,	flare [1] - 91:2
_	established [3] -	128:23	39:22, 41:23, 87:20,	fleshing [1] - 77:24
101:21	established [3] - 31:19, 112:3, 112:25	-	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13,	
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22	128:23	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10,	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6,	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18,	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10 feature [1] - 130:6	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 <b>F</b>	$\begin{array}{c} 39{:}22,41{:}23,87{:}20,\\ 96{:}4,113{:}13,\\ 121{:}15,127{:}4\\ \textbf{fascinated}[1]-55{:}6\\ \textbf{fault}[1]-105{:}4\\ \textbf{favor}[4]-4{:}16,6{:}6,\\ 55{:}3,93{:}25\\ \textbf{feasible}[1]-38{:}10\\ \textbf{feature}[1]-130{:}6\\ \textbf{fee}[2]-14{:}23,14{:}24\\ \end{array}$	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10 feature [1] - 130:6 fee [2] - 14:23, 14:24 feedback [12] - 23:8,	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22,	$\begin{array}{c} 39:22,41:23,87:20,\\ 96:4,113:13,\\ 121:15,127:4\\ \textbf{fascinated}[1]-55:6\\ \textbf{fault}[1]-105:4\\ \textbf{favor}[4]-4:16,6:6,\\ 55:3,93:25\\ \textbf{feasible}[1]-38:10\\ \textbf{feature}[1]-130:6\\ \textbf{fee}[2]-14:23,14:24\\ \textbf{feedback}[12]-23:8,\\ 23:13,23:14,23:22, \end{array}$	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10 feature [1] - 130:6 fee [2] - 14:23, 14:24 feedback [12] - 23:8, 23:13, 23:14, 23:22, 23:24, 24:6, 24:11,	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10 feature [1] - 130:6 fee [2] - 14:23, 14:24 feedback [12] - 23:8, 23:13, 23:14, 23:22, 23:24, 24:6, 24:11, 45:22, 46:9, 53:21,	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10, 8:11	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20, 54:12, 78:11, 78:15,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 <b>F</b> face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2 facility [1] - 32:11	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10 feature [1] - 130:6 fee [2] - 14:23, 14:24 feedback [12] - 23:8, 23:13, 23:14, 23:22, 23:24, 24:6, 24:11, 45:22, 46:9, 53:21, 119:9, 119:12	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10, 106:2, 110:25
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10, 8:11 engagement [6] -	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20, 54:12, 78:11, 78:15, 78:16, 80:19, 88:7	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2 facility [1] - 32:11 fact [36] - 23:15, 27:1,	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10 feature [1] - 130:6 fee [2] - 14:23, 14:24 feedback [12] - 23:8, 23:13, 23:14, 23:22, 23:24, 24:6, 24:11, 45:22, 46:9, 53:21, 119:9, 119:12 feet [3] - 94:18, 95:2,	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10, 106:2, 110:25 follow [10] - 19:11,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10, 8:11 engagement [6] - 6:21, 11:12, 54:6,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20, 54:12, 78:11, 78:15, 78:16, 80:19, 88:7 events [10] - 7:13,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2 facility [1] - 32:11 fact [36] - 23:15, 27:1, 35:19, 52:5, 52:18,	$\begin{array}{c} 39:22,41:23,87:20,\\ 96:4,113:13,\\ 121:15,127:4\\ \textbf{fascinated}[1]-55:6\\ \textbf{fault}[1]-105:4\\ \textbf{favor}[4]-4:16,6:6,\\ 55:3,93:25\\ \textbf{feasible}[1]-38:10\\ \textbf{feature}[1]-130:6\\ \textbf{fee}[2]-14:23,14:24\\ \textbf{feedback}[12]-23:8,\\ 23:13,23:14,23:22,\\ 23:24,24:6,24:11,\\ 45:22,46:9,53:21,\\ 119:9,119:12\\ \textbf{feet}[3]-94:18,95:2,\\ 127:22\\ \end{array}$	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10, 106:2, 110:25 follow [10] - 19:11, 22:15, 62:12, 70:17,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10, 8:11 engagement [6] - 6:21, 11:12, 54:6, 54:10, 78:5, 84:11	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20, 54:12, 78:11, 78:15, 78:16, 80:19, 88:7 events [10] - 7:13, 7:17, 7:19, 31:12,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2 facility [1] - 32:11 fact [36] - 23:15, 27:1, 35:19, 52:5, 52:18, 54:2, 54:5, 63:7,	39:22, 41:23, 87:20, 96:4, 113:13, 121:15, 127:4 fascinated [1] - 55:6 fault [1] - 105:4 favor [4] - 4:16, 6:6, 55:3, 93:25 feasible [1] - 38:10 feature [1] - 130:6 fee [2] - 14:23, 14:24 feedback [12] - 23:8, 23:13, 23:14, 23:22, 23:24, 24:6, 24:11, 45:22, 46:9, 53:21, 119:9, 119:12 feet [3] - 94:18, 95:2, 127:22 felt [2] - 24:10, 108:10	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10, 106:2, 110:25 follow [10] - 19:11, 22:15, 62:12, 70:17, 74:11, 93:6, 93:10,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10, 8:11 engagement [6] - 6:21, 11:12, 54:6, 54:10, 78:5, 84:11 engaging [4] - 53:4,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20, 54:12, 78:11, 78:15, 78:16, 80:19, 88:7 events [10] - 7:13,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2 facility [1] - 32:11 fact [36] - 23:15, 27:1, 35:19, 52:5, 52:18, 54:2, 54:5, 63:7, 63:16, 63:21, 64:3,	$\begin{array}{c} 39:22,41:23,87:20,\\ 96:4,113:13,\\ 121:15,127:4\\ \textbf{fascinated}[1]-55:6\\ \textbf{fault}[1]-105:4\\ \textbf{favor}[4]-4:16,6:6,\\ 55:3,93:25\\ \textbf{feasible}[1]-38:10\\ \textbf{feature}[1]-130:6\\ \textbf{fee}[2]-14:23,14:24\\ \textbf{feedback}[12]-23:8,\\ 23:13,23:14,23:22,\\ 23:24,24:6,24:11,\\ 45:22,46:9,53:21,\\ 119:9,119:12\\ \textbf{feet}[3]-94:18,95:2,\\ 127:22\\ \textbf{felt}[2]-24:10,108:10\\ \textbf{few}[10]-6:19,9:24,\\ \end{array}$	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10, 106:2, 110:25 follow [10] - 19:11, 22:15, 62:12, 70:17, 74:11, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 112:11, 125:4
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10, 8:11 engagement [6] - 6:21, 11:12, 54:6, 54:10, 78:5, 84:11 engaging [4] - 53:4, 83:23, 92:24, 123:10	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20, 54:12, 78:11, 78:15, 78:16, 80:19, 88:7 events [10] - 7:13, 7:17, 7:19, 31:12, 35:7, 50:16, 80:9,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2 facility [1] - 32:11 fact [36] - 23:15, 27:1, 35:19, 52:5, 52:18, 54:2, 54:5, 63:7, 63:16, 63:21, 64:3, 64:10, 66:10, 68:19,	$\begin{array}{c} 39:22,41:23,87:20,\\ 96:4,113:13,\\ 121:15,127:4\\ \textbf{fascinated}[1]-55:6\\ \textbf{fault}[1]-105:4\\ \textbf{favor}[4]-4:16,6:6,\\ 55:3,93:25\\ \textbf{feasible}[1]-38:10\\ \textbf{feature}[1]-130:6\\ \textbf{fee}[2]-14:23,14:24\\ \textbf{feedback}[12]-23:8,\\ 23:13,23:14,23:22,\\ 23:24,24:6,24:11,\\ 45:22,46:9,53:21,\\ 119:9,119:12\\ \textbf{feet}[3]-94:18,95:2,\\ 127:22\\ \textbf{felt}[2]-24:10,108:10\\ \textbf{few}[10]-6:19,9:24,\\ 12:18,42:19,68:15,\\ \end{array}$	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10, 106:2, 110:25 follow [10] - 19:11, 22:15, 62:12, 70:17, 74:11, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 112:11, 125:4 follow-up [9] - 19:11,
end [9] - 8:25, 29:23, 30:13, 56:6, 70:11, 87:20, 88:7, 127:25 ended [1] - 13:25 ends [1] - 45:11 enforce [1] - 87:22 enforced [1] - 111:4 enforcing [1] - 126:21 engage [7] - 9:3, 11:5, 11:7, 11:21, 53:16, 100:3, 124:22 engaged [2] - 8:10, 8:11 engagement [6] - 6:21, 11:12, 54:6, 54:10, 78:5, 84:11 engaging [4] - 53:4,	31:19, 112:3, 112:25 et [2] - 91:14, 127:22 evening [8] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:15, 10:4, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 38:12 event [26] - 7:13, 7:16, 8:12, 8:14, 8:23, 9:22, 9:23, 14:6, 19:18, 23:23, 24:9, 27:20, 27:21, 28:6, 28:14, 28:20, 28:25, 32:8, 47:22, 49:20, 54:12, 78:11, 78:15, 78:16, 80:19, 88:7 events [10] - 7:13, 7:17, 7:19, 31:12, 35:7, 50:16, 80:9, 80:16, 107:21,	128:23 extent [1] - 80:21 extra [4] - 9:2, 42:10, 85:10, 91:8 extras [1] - 85:22 extreme [2] - 42:18, 98:17 F face [2] - 65:13, 120:8 facilitate [3] - 80:22, 84:9, 120:11 facilitating [1] - 81:2 facility [1] - 32:11 fact [36] - 23:15, 27:1, 35:19, 52:5, 52:18, 54:2, 54:5, 63:7, 63:16, 63:21, 64:3,	$\begin{array}{c} 39:22,41:23,87:20,\\ 96:4,113:13,\\ 121:15,127:4\\ \textbf{fascinated}[1]-55:6\\ \textbf{fault}[1]-105:4\\ \textbf{favor}[4]-4:16,6:6,\\ 55:3,93:25\\ \textbf{feasible}[1]-38:10\\ \textbf{feature}[1]-130:6\\ \textbf{fee}[2]-14:23,14:24\\ \textbf{feedback}[12]-23:8,\\ 23:13,23:14,23:22,\\ 23:24,24:6,24:11,\\ 45:22,46:9,53:21,\\ 119:9,119:12\\ \textbf{feet}[3]-94:18,95:2,\\ 127:22\\ \textbf{felt}[2]-24:10,108:10\\ \textbf{few}[10]-6:19,9:24,\\ \end{array}$	fleshing [1] - 77:24 flexibility [1] - 33:4 floor [2] - 73:19, 73:20 flow [3] - 30:22, 84:12, 93:4 focus [4] - 45:3, 75:4, 102:25 focused [3] - 74:7, 80:6, 84:19 focuses [1] - 17:9 focusing [1] - 43:24 folks [9] - 22:16, 67:10, 73:21, 76:4, 88:2, 90:6, 90:10, 106:2, 110:25 follow [10] - 19:11, 22:15, 62:12, 70:17, 74:11, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 112:11, 125:4

93:13, 125:4	125:17	12:23, 13:2, 13:7,	gubernatorial [4] -	108:12
followed [2] - 12:12,	<b>Fowler</b> [5] - 58:2,	14:17, 20:9, 22:15,	22:22, 23:23, 24:9,	harm [1] - 73:13
80:20	61:13, 62:24, 76:13,	23:7, 24:20, 25:1,	24:23	hat [1] - 113:20
	78:22	26:7, 29:10, 29:13,	<b>guess</b> [18] - 33:3,	
following [1] - 123:3		29:14, 29:15, 31:15,		HB [1] - 96:19
food [5] - 86:20,	Fowler's [1] - 58:25	34:1, 34:20, 38:9,	35:16, 38:15, 45:25,	head [2] - 105:15,
90:11, 90:22, 91:8,	fragmentation [1] -	38:15, 45:20, 47:6,	62:25, 64:12, 64:15,	110:22
126:15	78:4	48:14, 49:15, 52:25,	68:14, 69:16, 69:22,	heads [1] - 48:19
force [2] - 76:22, 87:5	frame [2] - 31:6, 61:9	77:15, 80:9, 82:2,	70:21, 110:25, 115:17, 117:20,	health [1] - 83:19
foremost [1] - 74:24	framing [1] - 60:13	84:16, 84:19, 84:22,	119:17, 120:17,	healthcare [1] - 83:19
forget [1] - 55:22	frankly [4] - 97:24,	87:7, 112:18	121:21, 123:15	healthy [2] - 94:6, 94:7
forgive [3] - 18:11,	100:11, 101:5,	Gina's [1] - 107:12		hear [16] - 7:2, 11:9,
52:11, 52:25	118:18	given [2] - 44:7,	guidance [2] - 61:2, 85:12	11:11, 23:21, 30:14,
form [2] - 15:3, 101:17	free [2] - 5:10, 117:12	107:20		35:22, 51:4, 56:18,
formal [3] - 11:4, 38:5,	frequently [1] - 116:9	<b>goal</b> [10] - 10:22, 11:3,	guide [2] - 21:21, 73:17	59:20, 65:11, 66:2,
84:7	friction [3] - 77:1,	33:21, 42:24, 68:11,		86:5, 88:15, 89:9,
format [30] - 6:12,	94:6, 94:8	74:24, 92:11,	guidelines [3] -	107:11, 119:12
6:20, 12:21, 23:21,	Fridays [2] - 7:23,	103:12, 119:22,	109:15, 116:18, 117:14	heard [11] - 11:17,
24:10, 24:14, 25:24,	31:5	103.12, 119.22, 119.22, 119:23		15:4, 23:24, 24:6,
26:3, 35:1, 35:6,	front [3] - 126:9,	gotcha [1] - 98:20	guides [1] - 117:22	24:9, 27:14, 38:9,
35:10, 48:14, 48:22,	127:16, 127:18	governor [1] - 39:25	gut [1] - 118:3	65:10, 106:20,
49:1, 53:11, 57:9,	fruitful [1] - 77:4	Governor [1] - 39.25 Governor's [2] -	<b>guy</b> [5] - 46:13, 92:12,	127:11
57:20, 57:24, 61:25,	full [1] - 64:19	32:19, 37:22	97:17, 112:14	hearing [1] - 53:21
62:7, 75:5, 105:5,	function [3] - 29:3,		<b>guys</b> [5] - 34:21, 68:4,	heavy [1] - 124:4
108:10, 112:6,	66:10, 87:24	grateful [1] - 23:19	90:22, 91:3, 92:10	heavy-handed [1] -
115:13, 120:10,	funding [2] - 58:11,	gray [1] - 118:12		124:4
121:9, 122:11,	76:20	great [12] - 14:19,	Н	help [19] - 6:18, 21:5,
122:24, 129:8	future [8] - 44:9,	20:21, 23:12, 23:16, 36:3, 36:23, 57:12,	half [6] - 39:20, 47:19,	21:21, 21:24, 21:25,
formats [5] - 25:23,	44:21, 44:23, 48:19,	68:21, 74:19, 77:1,	47:23, 90:20,	65:5, 74:9, 75:22,
68:10, 69:12, 69:13, 85:4	48:23, 66:6, 115:16,	94:16, 99:4	100:15, 114:22	80:21, 80:22, 84:9,
	130:23			87:12, 88:2, 99:23,
formulate rat 58.17		areater [1] - 87.20	hand [15] - 5.10 / 11	100.5 107.6
formulate [2] - 58:17,	•	greater [1] - 87:20	hand [15] - 5:10, 7:11, 38:5-38:23-54:2	102:5, 127:6, 127:10, 127:20
94:9	G	ground [2] - 124:3,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2,	127:19, 127:20
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5,		<b>ground</b> [2] - 124:3, 126:6	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17,	127:19, 127:20 <b>helpful</b> [6] - 23:10,
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11	game [1] - 94:11	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7,	127:19, 127:20 <b>helpful</b> [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4,
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24,	127:19, 127:20 <b>helpful</b> [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20	<b>ground</b> [2] - 124:3, 126:6 <b>Group</b> [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6	<b>ground</b> [2] - 124:3, 126:6 <b>Group</b> [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3,	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15,	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3,	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15, 115:21, 115:23, 127:21	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15, 115:21, 115:23,	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15, 115:21, 115:23, 127:21 handled [2] - 109:10,	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15, 115:21, 115:23, 127:21 handled [2] - 109:10, 127:16 handling [1] - 25:7	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highest [1] - 75:1
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15, 115:21, 115:23, 127:21 handled [2] - 109:10, 127:16 handling [1] - 25:7 hands [1] - 125:12	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highest [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12,
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15, 115:21, 115:23, 127:21 handled [2] - 109:10, 127:16 handling [1] - 25:7 hands [1] - 125:12 hang [2] - 60:22, 96:6	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highest [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10,	38:5, 38:23, 54:2, 55:4, 61:13, 74:17, 77:25, 89:2, 89:7, 92:17, 107:24, 110:12, 130:7 handed [1] - 124:4 handful [1] - 14:4 handle [6] - 95:3, 110:7, 115:15, 115:21, 115:23, 127:21 handled [2] - 109:10, 127:16 handling [1] - 25:7 hands [1] - 125:12	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highset [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10,	$\begin{array}{c} 38:5, \ 38:23, \ 54:2, \\ 55:4, \ 61:13, \ 74:17, \\ 77:25, \ 89:2, \ 89:7, \\ 92:17, \ 107:24, \\ 110:12, \ 130:7 \\ \textbf{handed} \ [1] - 124:4 \\ \textbf{handful} \ [1] - 124:4 \\ \textbf{handful} \ [1] - 14:4 \\ \textbf{handle} \ [6] - 95:3, \\ 110:7, \ 115:15, \\ 115:21, \ 115:23, \\ 127:21 \\ \textbf{handled} \ [2] - 109:10, \\ 127:16 \\ \textbf{handling} \ [1] - 25:7 \\ \textbf{hands} \ [1] - 125:12 \\ \textbf{handg} \ [2] - 60:22, \ 96:6 \\ \textbf{happy} \ [2] - 12:20, \\ 78:25 \\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highset [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 106:11, 107:10,	$38:5, 38:23, 54:2, \\55:4, 61:13, 74:17, \\77:25, 89:2, 89:7, \\92:17, 107:24, \\110:12, 130:7 \\handed [1] - 124:4 \\handful [1] - 124:4 \\handfe [6] - 95:3, \\110:7, 115:15, \\115:21, 115:23, \\127:21 \\handled [2] - 109:10, \\127:16 \\handling [1] - 25:7 \\hands [1] - 125:12 \\hang [2] - 60:22, 96:6 \\happy [2] - 12:20, \\78:25 \\hard [25] - 10:16, \\\end{bmatrix}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highset [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13,
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 106:11, 107:10, 107:12, 108:24,	$\begin{array}{c} 38:5, \ 38:23, \ 54:2, \\ 55:4, \ 61:13, \ 74:17, \\ 77:25, \ 89:2, \ 89:7, \\ 92:17, \ 107:24, \\ 110:12, \ 130:7 \\ \textbf{handed} \ [1] - 124:4 \\ \textbf{handful} \ [1] - 124:4 \\ \textbf{handful} \ [1] - 14:4 \\ \textbf{handle} \ [6] - 95:3, \\ 110:7, \ 115:15, \\ 115:21, \ 115:23, \\ 127:21 \\ \textbf{handled} \ [2] - 109:10, \\ 127:16 \\ \textbf{handling} \ [1] - 25:7 \\ \textbf{hands} \ [1] - 125:12 \\ \textbf{handg} \ [2] - 60:22, \ 96:6 \\ \textbf{happy} \ [2] - 12:20, \\ 78:25 \\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highest [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19,
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 106:11, 107:10, 107:12, 108:24, 116:13, 118:22,	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, \ 38:23, \ 54:2, \\ 55:4, \ 61:13, \ 74:17, \\ 77:25, \ 89:2, \ 89:7, \\ 92:17, \ 107:24, \\ 110:12, \ 130:7 \\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4} \\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4} \\ \textbf{handful [1] - 14:4} \\ \textbf{handle [6] - 95:3, \\ 110:7, \ 115:15, \\ 115:21, \ 115:23, \\ 127:21 \\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10, \\ 127:16 \\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7} \\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12} \\ \textbf{hang [2] - 60:22, \ 96:6} \\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20, \\ 78:25 \\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16, \\ 13:10, \ 31:13, \ 56:12, \\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highest [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14, 62:15, 62:25, 63:10,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18, 81:20, 95:21, 96:10,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:11, 107:10, 107:12, 108:24, 116:13, 118:22, 119:15, 125:16,	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, \ 38:23, \ 54:2, \\ 55:4, \ 61:13, \ 74:17, \\ 77:25, \ 89:2, \ 89:7, \\ 92:17, \ 107:24, \\ 110:12, \ 130:7 \\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4} \\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4} \\ \textbf{handful [1] - 14:4} \\ \textbf{handle [6] - 95:3, \\ 110:7, \ 115:15, \\ 115:21, \ 115:23, \\ 127:21 \\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10, \\ 127:16 \\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7} \\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12} \\ \textbf{hang [2] - 60:22, \ 96:6} \\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20, \\ 78:25 \\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16, \\ 13:10, \ 31:13, \ 56:12, \\ 56:14, \ 57:20, \ 58:10, \\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highest [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15 holiday [1] - 30:5
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18, 81:20, 95:21, 96:10, 96:12, 96:17,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 106:11, 107:10, 107:12, 108:24, 116:13, 118:22, 119:15, 125:16, 125:24, 126:4	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, 38:23, 54:2,\\ 55:4, 61:13, 74:17,\\ 77:25, 89:2, 89:7,\\ 92:17, 107:24,\\ 110:12, 130:7\\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 14:4}\\ \textbf{handle [6] - 95:3,}\\ 110:7, 115:15,\\ 115:21, 115:23,\\ 127:21\\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10,}\\ 127:16\\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7}\\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12}\\ \textbf{hang [2] - 60:22, 96:6}\\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20,}\\ 78:25\\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16,}\\ 13:10, 31:13, 56:12,\\ 56:14, 57:20, 58:10,\\ 58:11, 58:15, 58:24,\\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highest [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15 holidays [5] - 7:18,
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14, 62:15, 62:25, 63:10, 69:9, 69:11, 70:1,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18, 81:20, 95:21, 96:10, 96:12, 96:17, 104:12, 104:15,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 106:11, 107:10, 106:11, 107:10, 107:12, 108:24, 116:13, 118:22, 119:15, 125:16, 125:24, 126:4 group's [1] - 5:7	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, 38:23, 54:2,\\ 55:4, 61:13, 74:17,\\ 77:25, 89:2, 89:7,\\ 92:17, 107:24,\\ 110:12, 130:7\\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [6] - 95:3,}\\ 110:7, 115:15,\\ 115:21, 115:23,\\ 127:21\\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10,}\\ 127:16\\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7}\\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12}\\ \textbf{hands [2] - 60:22, 96:6}\\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20,}\\ 78:25\\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16,}\\ 13:10, 31:13, 56:12,\\ 56:14, 57:20, 58:10,\\ 58:11, 58:15, 58:24,\\ 79:6, 79:8, 79:11,\\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 $helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1$ $helping [1] - 39:4$ $hereto [1] - 67:7$ $HERRING [1] - 34:10$ $hesitant [1] - 46:1$ $hi [1] - 110:14$ $hide [1] - 60:17$ $hiding [1] - 50:20$ $high [1] - 121:20$ $high-level [1] - 121:20$ $highest [1] - 75:1$ $hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19$ $hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10$ $hoc [1] - 71:8$ $hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15$ $holiday [1] - 30:5$ $holidays [5] - 7:18, 7:20, 30:4, 31:3,$
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14, 62:15, 62:25, 63:10, 69:9, 69:11, 70:1, 70:4, 70:6, 70:9,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18, 81:20, 95:21, 96:10, 96:12, 96:17, 104:12, 104:15, 104:18, 125:25	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:11, 107:10, 107:12, 108:24, 116:13, 118:22, 119:15, 125:16, 125:24, 126:4 group's [1] - 5:7 groups [5] - 26:2,	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, 38:23, 54:2,\\ 55:4, 61:13, 74:17,\\ 77:25, 89:2, 89:7,\\ 92:17, 107:24,\\ 110:12, 130:7\\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [0] - 95:3,\\ 110:7, 115:15,\\ 115:21, 115:23,\\ 127:21\\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10,}\\ 127:16\\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7}\\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12}\\ \textbf{hang [2] - 60:22, 96:6}\\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20,}\\ 78:25\\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16,}\\ 13:10, 31:13, 56:12,\\ 56:14, 57:20, 58:10,\\ 58:11, 58:15, 58:24,\\ 79:6, 79:8, 79:11,\\ 80:24, 82:17, 82:19,\\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highst [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15 holidays [5] - 7:18, 7:20, 30:4, 31:3, 31:21
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14, 62:15, 62:25, 63:10, 69:9, 69:11, 70:1, 70:4, 70:6, 70:9, 76:16, 111:8,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18, 81:20, 95:21, 96:10, 96:12, 96:17, 104:12, 104:15, 104:18, 125:25 Gentles [4] - 16:22,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 106:11, 107:10, 105:23, 106:10, 106:11, 107:10, 107:12, 108:24, 116:13, 118:22, 119:15, 125:16, 125:24, 126:4 group's [1] - 5:7 groups [5] - 26:2, 27:12, 34:11, 80:6,	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, 38:23, 54:2,\\ 55:4, 61:13, 74:17,\\ 77:25, 89:2, 89:7,\\ 92:17, 107:24,\\ 110:12, 130:7\\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 14:4}\\ \textbf{handle [6] - 95:3,\\ 110:7, 115:15,\\ 115:21, 115:23,\\ 127:21\\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10,}\\ 127:16\\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7}\\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12}\\ \textbf{hang [2] - 60:22, 96:6}\\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20,}\\ 78:25\\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16,}\\ 13:10, 31:13, 56:12,\\ 56:14, 57:20, 58:10,\\ 58:11, 58:15, 58:24,\\ 79:6, 79:8, 79:11,\\ 80:24, 82:17, 82:19,\\ 83:3, 85:6, 107:14,\\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highst [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15 holidays [5] - 7:18, 7:20, 30:4, 31:3, 31:21 home [1] - 118:20
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14, 62:15, 62:25, 63:10, 69:9, 69:11, 70:1, 70:4, 70:6, 70:9, 76:16, 111:8, 111:10, 115:6,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18, 81:20, 95:21, 96:10, 96:12, 96:17, 104:12, 104:15, 104:18, 125:25 Gentles [4] - 16:22, 17:3, 50:24, 81:13	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:24, 125:16, 125:24, 125:16, 125:24, 126:4 group's [1] - 5:7 groups [5] - 26:2, 27:12, 34:11, 80:6, 80:17	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, 38:23, 54:2,\\ 55:4, 61:13, 74:17,\\ 77:25, 89:2, 89:7,\\ 92:17, 107:24,\\ 110:12, 130:7\\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 14:4}\\ \textbf{handle [6] - 95:3,}\\ 110:7, 115:15,\\ 115:21, 115:23,\\ 127:21\\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10,}\\ 127:16\\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7}\\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12}\\ \textbf{hang [2] - 60:22, 96:6}\\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20,}\\ 78:25\\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16,}\\ 13:10, 31:13, 56:12,\\ 56:14, 57:20, 58:10,\\ 58:11, 58:15, 58:24,\\ 79:6, 79:8, 79:11,\\ 80:24, 82:17, 82:19,\\ 83:3, 85:6, 107:14,\\ 107:20, 107:25,\\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highst [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15 holidays [5] - 7:18, 7:20, 30:4, 31:3, 31:21 home [1] - 118:20 honestly [1] - 65:23
94:9 forth [5] - 83:7, 84:5, 92:23, 93:2, 122:11 forum [15] - 11:8, 68:5, 68:7, 69:5, 72:16, 72:22, 79:20, 82:21, 83:6, 87:11, 99:20, 103:13, 113:15, 118:16, 121:9 forum-style [2] - 69:5, 113:15 forward [3] - 66:6, 73:17, 130:17 foundation [2] - 29:1, 75:12 four [8] - 13:20, 36:21, 38:11, 38:14, 39:9, 41:14, 41:15, 47:14 FOWLER [24] - 57:5, 57:7, 57:9, 61:14, 62:15, 62:25, 63:10, 69:9, 69:11, 70:1, 70:4, 70:6, 70:9, 76:16, 111:8, 111:10, 115:6, 115:23, 116:4,	game [1] - 94:11 gangs [1] - 37:12 gauge [1] - 127:20 geared [1] - 39:6 GENERAL [2] - 77:9, 125:21 general [16] - 36:25, 37:2, 43:2, 45:11, 45:16, 46:22, 47:4, 49:12, 97:8, 109:20, 114:5, 120:4, 123:5, 127:17, 127:23, 131:7 generally [2] - 52:6, 75:19 generals [1] - 40:1 GENTLES [16] - 6:1, 16:21, 50:24, 52:3, 54:14, 81:15, 81:18, 81:20, 95:21, 96:10, 96:12, 96:17, 104:12, 104:15, 104:18, 125:25 Gentles [4] - 16:22,	ground [2] - 124:3, 126:6 Group [8] - 5:23, 77:14, 78:18, 78:19, 103:3, 125:23, 128:9, 128:23 GROUP [4] - 34:14, 55:13, 81:8, 105:1 group [36] - 3:21, 5:3, 5:6, 8:13, 16:14, 16:18, 26:16, 27:4, 27:17, 27:24, 29:6, 33:3, 34:17, 55:7, 73:5, 77:15, 80:22, 102:17, 102:20, 102:25, 104:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:23, 106:10, 105:24, 125:16, 125:24, 126:4 group's [1] - 5:7 groups [5] - 26:2, 27:12, 34:11, 80:6, 80:17 guaranteed [1] - 121:1	$\begin{array}{l} 38:5, 38:23, 54:2,\\ 55:4, 61:13, 74:17,\\ 77:25, 89:2, 89:7,\\ 92:17, 107:24,\\ 110:12, 130:7\\ \textbf{handed [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [1] - 124:4}\\ \textbf{handful [6] - 95:3,}\\ 110:7, 115:15,\\ 115:21, 115:23,\\ 127:21\\ \textbf{handled [2] - 109:10,}\\ 127:16\\ \textbf{handling [1] - 25:7}\\ \textbf{hands [1] - 125:12}\\ \textbf{hang [2] - 60:22, 96:6}\\ \textbf{happy [2] - 12:20,}\\ 78:25\\ \textbf{hard [25] - 10:16,}\\ 13:10, 31:13, 56:12,\\ 56:14, 57:20, 58:10,\\ 58:11, 58:15, 58:24,\\ 79:6, 79:8, 79:11,\\ 80:24, 82:17, 82:19,\\ 83:3, 85:6, 107:14,\\ 107:20, 107:25,\\ 108:17, 110:16,\\ \end{array}$	127:19, 127:20 helpful [6] - 23:10, 24:16, 53:8, 100:4, 107:22, 108:1 helping [1] - 39:4 hereto [1] - 67:7 HERRING [1] - 34:10 hesitant [1] - 46:1 hi [1] - 110:14 hide [1] - 60:17 hiding [1] - 50:20 high [1] - 121:20 high-level [1] - 121:20 highst [1] - 75:1 hit [5] - 22:24, 32:12, 55:21, 100:6, 100:19 hm [2] - 62:15, 117:10 hoc [1] - 71:8 hold [7] - 18:8, 25:13, 59:2, 59:3, 73:19, 86:15 holidays [5] - 7:18, 7:20, 30:4, 31:3, 31:21 home [1] - 118:20

67:25, 104:15, 122:1, 122:22, 3:16, 9:24, 12:18, 116:23, 117:3, 125:16, 128:8 127:23, 128:5 127:1, 128:15, 18:23, 27:13, 50:5, 126:11, 126:12, Jodi [10] - 60:2, 60:22, host [2] - 20:23, 56:1 128:19, 129:2 50:15, 53:7, 57:11, 126:22, 128:21 61:4, 64:16, 70:10, importantly [1] - 74:9 61:25, 112:8 hosting [2] - 23:16, interrupts [4] - 22:24, 76:1, 79:16, 105:20, 87:20 impossibly [1] - 90:13 informative [6] -86:13, 114:24, 116:6 105:23, 111:10 Jodi's [1] - 67:7 68:12, 69:1, 73:8, interview [3] - 91:20, hour [20] - 8:7, 8:9, impressive [1] - 74:20 73:16, 91:21, 92:11 20:4, 28:2, 28:4, 92.22 improvements [1] -**Joe** [2] - 50:21, 50:22 30:18, 35:25, 39:20, informed [1] - 80:1 interviewer [1] - 93:10 3:22 join [2] - 27:6, 31:10 41:15, 45:10, 47:8, inappropriate [3] injected [1] - 127:4 introduce [1] - 9:22 JONES [6] - 52:9, 47:14, 47:19, 47:23, 9:12, 98:11, 118:9 injection [1] - 126:17 introduction [4] - 3:7, 99:10, 99:14, 99:17, 78:15, 78:16, injections [1] - 126:19 101:10, 101:13 incentive [6] - 14:13, 10:1, 11:22, 18:19 100:13, 103:23 15:13, 16:13, 98:4, insight [2] - 108:14, invite [4] - 13:14, 18:1, journalists [4] - 68:18, hours [2] - 41:15, 100:2, 101:1 119.12 28:17, 59:16 75:18, 75:19, 87:19 45:12 incentivize [3] - 14:10, insists [1] - 121:8 invited [5] - 8:18, judicious [1] - 96:13 House [26] - 8:21, 42:25, 100:8 instance [2] - 12:10, 13:19, 14:1, 17:21, July [2] - 30:1, 30:5 10:12, 12:1, 28:4, incentivized [3] -52:6 18:22 jump [9] - 10:7, 10:25, 28:24, 35:19, 36:9, 42:18, 42:20, 66:22 instances [1] - 21:6 involved [6] - 39:2, 40:4, 55:16, 55:17, 36:16, 36:17, 37:7, incentivizes [2] -46:21, 87:21, 108:8, instead [2] - 85:20, 63:6, 65:21, 102:10, 37:20, 39:14, 43:22, 116:7, 117:4 100:4, 120:7 129:19 107:18 43:25, 45:5, 45:16, include [2] - 8:18, institute [3] - 15:16, issue [18] - 12:15, jumped [1] - 45:21 47:8, 47:20, 49:5, 24:23, 33:10, 38:20, 97:3 126:18, 127:14 jumps [1] - 86:12 49:19, 50:4, 50:7, 41:5, 42:8, 46:7, included [1] - 46:8 instituted [1] - 14:24 June [1] - 30:1 51:2, 53:6, 121:23 56:10, 57:13, 57:17, including [7] - 6:20, Instruction [1] - 37:22 just.. [1] - 65:8 huge [2] - 40:8, 43:12 57:18, 59:12, 60:3, 25:24, 27:9, 35:2, instrumental [1] human [1] - 89:21 65:19, 73:25, 52:16, 54:6, 105:6 116:19 Κ 100:21, 100:22, inclusion [1] - 5:7 intellectual [1] - 92:5 L 108:4 K12 [2] - 100:14 incorrect [3] - 63:25, interaction [2] - 68:13, issued [1] - 33:15 Karl [7] - 16:21, 50:24, 67:18, 129:15 86.18 idea [22] - 36:3, 36:7, issues [21] - 22:8, 81:13, 81:17, 104:9, increase [1] - 61:22 interest [4] - 100:17, 36:24, 49:24, 50:8, 36:10. 37:2. 37:14. 125:23. 128:8 increased [1] - 42:14 102:2, 119:24, 54:8, 54:10, 56:17, 43:13, 55:18, 57:20, Kathy [1] - 49:2 incumbent [1] - 96:12 129:10 65:25, 71:21, 78:9, 57:22, 60:14, 61:19, interested [6] - 56:17, keep [10] - 21:25, Independent [15] -88:25, 92:2, 92:5, 62:5, 62:9, 63:24, 22:20, 28:12, 53:10, 17:7, 40:6, 41:18, 69:3, 70:3, 75:24, 92:13, 94:13, 69:18, 75:24, 97:6, 41:19, 43:4, 43:5, 60:23, 63:3, 63:16, 107:11, 119:12 103:16, 106:8, 100:14, 100:19, 43:8, 43:18, 43:20, interesting [9] - 39:22, 85:19, 110:5, 110:15 106:9, 121:22, 102:16, 108:5 43:22, 44:1, 44:10, 48:9, 51:23, 53:8, keeping [1] - 30:24 128:15, 129:16 Item [6] - 4:4, 4:24, 44:14 60:6, 98:6, 104:4, kept [1] - 24:1 ideal [1] - 59:13 6:11, 25:22, 129:23, key [3] - 5:5, 112:20, independent [1] -108:14, 119:19 ideally [3] - 17:15, 131:17 90:10 interests [1] - 39:12 128:23 27:21, 29:22 item [12] - 5:6, 8:13, Independents [13] interject [3] - 72:5, kick [3] - 7:7, 9:21, ideas [2] - 54:9, 70:25 27:8, 27:15, 34:17, 29:25 40:10, 42:1, 42:11, 95:5, 108:22 identify [3] - 3:21, 34:25, 38:14, 48:19, kid [1] - 52:20 43:11, 46:21, 46:24, interjecting [1] - 87:20 22:8, 83:14 53:2, 80:12, 81:10 **KIMBLE** [78] - 3:3, 47:10.47:24.48:6. internally [1] - 33:10 **II** [1] - 4:4 items [5] - 5:9, 6:19, 53:6, 54:6, 78:5, 4:11, 4:14, 4:20, interns [1] - 21:21 III [1] - 4:24 12:19, 26:17, 35:10 103:9 4:22, 5:14, 5:18, interprets [1] - 72:9 imagine [1] - 99:5 itself [3] - 32:10, indicating [1] - 126:22 5:25, 6:3, 6:8, 6:10, interrupt [3] - 62:18, immediate [1] - 70:24 71:13, 72:10 indicators [3] - 10:19, 12:23, 13:6, 14:17, 86:25, 116:23 immediately [1] -IV [1] - 6:11 16:19, 18:2, 18:6, 18:16, 19:8 interrupted [1] - 86:15 63:14 individual [2] - 64:10, 19:12, 20:6, 23:4, interrupter [1] impact [1] - 3:12 J 24:17, 25:1, 25:12, 66:23 126:22 impactful [1] - 4:1 25:17, 25:21, 29:9, individuals [3] interrupting [1] -**JACKSON** [6] - 38:7, implement [1] - 22:19 31:14, 31:16, 33:24, 57:15, 70:15, 87:18 88.13 40:3, 42:4, 42:7, implied [1] - 125:1 34:8, 34:19, 34:22, inflame [1] - 113:3 interruption [6] - 23:1, 44:3, 125:15 importance [2] - 3:23, 35:13, 35:17, 36:11, inflammatory [1] -86:14, 91:1, 117:1, jest [2] - 115:15, 123:25 36:15, 36:21, 38:4, 129:14 118:10, 127:9 115:20 important [17] - 11:6, 42:3, 42:6, 43:16, influencing [1] - 79:11 interruptions [17] -Jim [2] - 71:15, 83:1 44:19, 57:25, 58:21, 44:25, 45:7, 48:11, inform [1] - 53:8 11:2, 20:16, 83:7, 76:19, 84:10, 87:15, **Jo** [1] - 64:23 48:25, 49:11, 49:15, informal [2] - 40:3, 84:5, 86:9, 86:17, job [7] - 5:19, 67:11, 54:25, 55:2, 77:10, 112:2, 112:24, 69:5 89:1, 114:14, 119:7, 121:25, 67:16, 73:19, 80:3, 77:18, 78:17, 80:5, information [11] -114:16, 114:18,

80:14, 81:11, 81:17,	<b>knows</b> [3] - 11:23,	21:14, 25:25, 26:4,	linger [1] - 63:14	11:14
			_	
81:19, 81:22, 82:1,	50:22, 119:4	30:3, 35:2, 85:2,	Lisa [2] - 29:11, 30:24	manages [1] - 99:17
84:15, 84:24, 91:10,		99:18, 105:6, 114:3	list [3] - 5:5, 5:10,	managing [2] - 30:21,
92:20, 99:16, 101:9,	L	Legislative [2] - 8:14,	13:14	79:21
101:12, 102:7,		43:20	listen [1] - 122:13	manner [2] - 4:1,
104:17, 104:19,	landscape [1] - 63:23	legislature [6] - 3:19,	literally [3] - 32:15,	79:25
104:21, 125:22,	large [3] - 40:10,	24:5, 49:12, 60:19,	91:4, 128:24	March [4] - 4:5, 4:17,
128:7, 128:11,	45:24, 46:2	83:9, 97:21	live [6] - 9:20, 22:5,	5:3, 26:12
129:21, 130:19,	larger [1] - 66:5	lend [1] - 32:9	27:5, 50:5, 90:20,	March/April [1] -
131:2, 131:15,	last [39] - 3:8, 4:7, 5:3,	lends [1] - 72:9	117:12	29:24
131:22	7:6, 8:7, 10:11, 14:9,	lengths [1] - 82:22	living [1] - 117:24	Marco [1] - 52:11
Kimble [6] - 3:9, 6:16,	14:19, 14:24, 26:1,	lengthy [1] - 79:19	log [2] - 8:1, 48:3	mark [4] - 21:23,
18:3, 19:10, 26:16,	29:25, 36:3, 38:25,	lent [1] - 73:12	logistically [2] -	22:24, 53:1, 89:4
81:3	40:5, 41:6, 44:3,	less [7] - 38:5, 48:15,	47:21, 78:7	Mark [2] - 3:9, 131:14
kind [63] - 12:13,	46:3, 51:1, 52:25,	53:5, 66:14, 116:11,	long-standing [1] -	markers [1] - 21:21
12:16, 12:25, 16:13,	53:3, 67:8, 73:11,	124:9, 127:13	19:3	marketing [2] - 38:18,
20:17, 21:5, 21:7,	75:2, 84:16, 85:20,	letting [2] - 21:22,	long-time [1] - 40:6	47:22
22:16, 22:22, 27:13,	96:20, 102:12,	48:20		
29:1, 30:23, 41:22,	102:17, 102:25,		look [23] - 7:18, 13:19,	math [1] - 31:1
48:1, 55:19, 56:16,	105:23, 106:10,	<b>level</b> [8] - 75:1, 79:4,	14:13, 15:3, 15:21,	matter [15] - 37:13,
58:23, 62:6, 62:16,	107:2, 108:7,	79:6, 119:18,	17:22, 24:24, 29:17,	53:4, 53:17, 60:5,
63:2, 63:6, 63:19,	108:24, 120:18,	120:25, 121:13,	29:18, 31:2, 40:22,	60:6, 84:1, 99:20,
65:1, 68:7, 68:22,	125:16, 128:13	121:15, 121:20	44:1, 44:20, 44:24,	100:6, 111:17,
69:5, 72:15, 75:11,	,	Libertarian [1] - 8:22	50:6, 62:22, 66:7,	112:11, 117:8,
, , ,	lasts [3] - 10:1, 12:5,	lie [1] - 63:13	96:24, 111:20,	121:9, 129:8, 130:2
76:23, 82:18, 86:18,	47:25	lifetime [1] - 35:20	114:3, 116:14,	matters [2] - 26:5,
88:25, 89:10, 90:4,	latter [1] - 86:19	LIGGETT [9] - 59:2,	122:25	53:5
90:13, 90:21, 91:1,	law [2] - 25:5, 106:23	59:5, 59:8, 59:10,	looked [2] - 16:8, 78:7	maximize [2] - 119:22,
91:20, 92:21, 93:9,	<b>LD-1</b> [9] - 8:15, 8:17,	65:21, 110:14,	looking [10] - 15:25,	119:24
94:9, 95:17, 95:25,	9:16, 9:23, 13:18,	115:1, 115:5, 118:8	31:4, 43:1, 44:9,	maximizing [1] -
96:22, 100:5,	13:21, 28:1, 43:22,	Liggett [5] - 59:9,	45:10, 46:19, 74:2,	120:6
101:20, 101:25,	49:19	64:23, 78:23, 109:2,	88:9, 91:25, 114:1	maximum [1] - 88:9
104:6, 105:15,	LD-11 [1] - 13:25	110:11	looks [3] - 33:12,	MCLEOD [20] - 4:13,
107:10, 108:12,	LD-12 [4] - 15:23,	light [1] - 74:12	105:18, 105:20	6:2, 56:19, 58:4,
112:16, 116:7,	49:7, 50:7	likely [4] - 28:5, 29:25,	Lopez [1] - 52:11	62:11, 68:11, 69:25,
116:23, 117:4,	LD-5 [1] - 49:7	97:7, 100:7	lose [4] - 52:24, 54:6,	70:2, 70:5, 70:7,
118:22, 122:14,	League [5] - 18:4,	limit [11] - 11:13,	78:5, 88:17	93:1, 94:7, 95:8,
123:15, 124:16,	60:24, 72:21,	56:14, 58:24, 85:6,	loudly [1] - 46:2	99:12, 102:16,
124:24, 125:1, 125:7	115:25, 116:18	85:11, 107:14,	love [4] - 30:20, 31:9,	103:2, 103:5,
kinds [1] - 60:13	lean [5] - 59:17,	107:15, 108:1,	57:21, 118:21	103:20, 103:23,
kitchen [1] - 50:12	113:15, 114:1,			131:14
<b>KLINE</b> [22] - 13:4,	119:23, 119:24	108:17	lump [1] - 49:19	
13:7, 14:7, 23:6,	leaning [1] - 119:25	limitations [1] - 97:5	lumped [1] - 49:8	McLeod [1] - 127:25
24:16, 45:18, 48:9,	leans [1] - 112:13	limited [3] - 28:18,		mean [40] - 14:12,
53:19, 54:16, 54:22,	learn [2] - 58:13,	29:14, 130:1	Μ	16:12, 19:14, 31:2,
54:24, 55:1, 55:5,		limits [24] - 10:16,	Maddar - 01 10	31:19, 32:1, 37:23,
77:20, 109:11,	131:16	56:11, 56:12, 56:13,	Madden [5] - 24:18,	40:17, 41:22, 41:23,
112:23, 114:20,	learned [1] - 118:20	56:20, 58:15, 59:18,	25:5, 25:12, 25:17,	41:25, 46:19, 65:9,
117:6, 117:11,	least [7] - 44:19,	68:7, 69:4, 80:24,	130:9	65:12, 72:6, 72:16,
123:22, 128:10,	65:17, 100:21,	82:16, 83:3, 85:1,	<b>MADDEN</b> [6] - 24:19,	73:6, 73:9, 75:19,
128:12	100:22, 101:25,	85:5, 107:13,	25:9, 25:16, 130:10,	83:19, 85:11, 85:16,
<b>Kline</b> [6] - 13:4, 13:12,	107:2	109:14, 109:19,	130:24, 131:3	85:19, 86:21, 90:23,
23:5, 23:11, 53:13,	leave [3] - 43:15,	109:20, 126:3,	mail [3] - 9:8, 9:9, 9:25	93:25, 95:1, 95:18,
	89:10, 127:18	126:5, 128:17,	main [3] - 26:22,	95:19, 96:4, 96:5,
77:18	Lee [1] - 120:2	128:18, 128:19	76:23, 118:24	96:22, 97:2, 99:19,
<b>know</b> [3] - 69:8,	left [7] - 57:15, 68:16,	line [16] - 9:8, 41:1,	maintain [1] - 110:19	103:18, 104:2,
94:14, 99:9	87:17, 102:11,	62:19, 83:6, 96:5,	major [1] - 44:17	107:22, 109:21,
<b>knowing</b> [3] - 75:17,	104:9, 112:13, 127:2	96:9, 108:21,	majority [2] - 43:5,	115:21, 123:5
92:3, 119:25	legalities [1] - 15:15	109:24, 124:2,	79:7	meaningful [4] - 4:1,
knowledge [1] - 118:2	legally [1] - 14:10	124:7, 124:25,	manage [3] - 20:18,	38:1, 41:7
knowledgeable [2] -	legislative [13] - 8:2,	129:16, 129:17,	82:11, 116:23	means [8] - 8:15, 8:16,
53:17, 63:22	18:15, 20:23, 21:10,	131:10	management [1] -	8:19, 15:25, 30:21,

51:9, 85:14, 111:12	56:19, 57:5, 57:7,	55:15, 64:11, 80:11,	minute [13] - 10:6,	86:25, 87:17, 87:23,
meant [1] - 19:13	57:9, 58:4, 59:2,	103:25, 106:10,	12:6, 21:24, 48:15,	88:13, 88:14, 88:21,
	59:3, 59:5, 59:8,	130:5		89:11, 90:2, 93:17,
measure [1] - 91:25			85:15, 86:12, 89:4,	
meat [1] - 62:9	59:10, 59:24, 60:1,	mental [3] - 92:1,	102:12, 109:23,	96:4, 96:12, 98:12,
mechanical [1] -	61:14, 62:11, 62:15,	115:2, 127:22	109:25, 114:22,	98:15, 98:16, 98:23,
47:11	62:25, 63:10, 64:6,	mention [2] - 39:1,	128:13, 130:20	98:24, 107:22,
mechanically [1] -	65:5, 65:9, 65:12,	84:15	minutes [36] - 4:5, 4:6,	109:10, 110:5,
47:7	65:21, 68:11, 69:9,	mentioned [12] -	4:8, 4:10, 4:15, 4:16,	110:6, 112:12,
mechanism [1] -	69:11, 69:25, 70:1,	11:22, 12:17, 18:11,	4:22, 10:2, 10:16,	112:13, 112:20,
	70:2, 70:4, 70:5,	36:2, 53:3, 62:2,	11:1, 19:25, 30:11,	116:22, 117:19,
116:22	70:6, 70:7, 70:9,	72:24, 76:20, 84:16,	34:5, 34:6, 47:15,	118:25, 123:17,
media [2] - 52:16,				
64:11	71:24, 72:1, 72:4,	111:11, 112:18,	48:15, 53:20, 58:7,	123:18, 124:4,
meeting [17] - 3:4, 4:5,	72:20, 74:18, 75:16,	122:1	58:12, 62:13, 72:13,	124:9, 124:25,
4:6, 4:7, 4:17, 4:22,	76:16, 77:20, 78:25,	mentions [2] - 97:3,	83:20, 85:14, 85:15,	125:3, 126:7,
5:3, 7:6, 13:13, 14:9,	79:4, 80:4, 81:13,	124:25	85:16, 91:13, 91:14,	126:12, 126:21,
14:19, 20:24, 25:5,	81:15, 81:18, 81:20,	mere [1] - 52:18	100:14, 100:15,	127:3, 127:18,
26:12, 26:20, 61:15,	85:7, 85:11, 86:1,	met [2] - 88:6, 89:17	102:11, 109:22,	128:24
131:17	86:3, 86:6, 86:19,	<b>mic</b> [4] - 111:12,	112:15, 114:22,	moderator's [3] - 8:8,
	87:6, 87:7, 88:11,		114:23, 120:19	66:14, 100:16
Meeting [1] - 131:25		111:25, 112:1,	-	
meetings [1] - 39:16	88:20, 88:22, 88:23,	112:15	misbehavior [1] -	moderator-specific
melted [1] - 126:20	89:15, 89:25, 90:5,	microphone [1] -	116:8	[1] - 53:1
member [8] - 4:7, 5:9,	90:16, 91:19, 93:1,	20:25	missed [1] - 14:9	moderators [36] -
5:21, 25:6, 25:9,	93:19, 94:7, 94:15,	microphones [1] -	misses [1] - 30:9	21:5, 39:5, 48:13,
26:23, 41:21, 99:11	94:16, 95:8, 95:9,	20:11	missing [2] - 53:22,	48:20, 59:15, 63:21,
Member [34] - 13:12,	95:14, 95:21, 96:2,	mics [8] - 22:4, 82:20,	71:24	64:14, 64:17, 65:1,
•••	96:10, 96:11, 96:12,	83:6, 110:6, 110:10,	mission [2] - 3:17	65:3, 65:7, 65:24,
14:18, 16:11, 17:3,	96:15, 96:17, 96:18,		misunderstood [1] -	66:3, 75:5, 75:22,
18:13, 20:20, 23:11,	99:4, 99:10, 99:12,	111:6, 113:3, 113:14		79:10, 83:22, 84:17,
29:19, 31:7, 32:23,		middle [4] - 65:25,	45:23	
49:17, 58:1, 58:24,	99:14, 99:17, 100:7,	71:12, 90:11, 124:3	mitigate [1] - 67:6	84:20, 87:17, 90:6,
59:9, 59:25, 61:13,	101:10, 101:13,	might [32] - 12:25,	<b>mix</b> [1] - 53:6	93:3, 93:13, 94:9,
62:24, 64:23, 72:19,	101:16, 101:18,	29:16, 48:4, 50:9,	mm-hm [2] - 62:15,	118:15, 123:9,
74:17, 76:13, 78:22,	101:20, 102:8,	50:14, 51:13, 52:10,	117:10	123:11, 124:1,
78:23, 79:2, 83:1,	102:16, 103:2,	53:12, 63:13, 66:4,	moderated [2] - 37:13,	124:14, 124:22,
109:2, 110:11,	103:5, 103:18,	73:4, 73:16, 75:22,	107:21	129:9, 129:13,
	103:20, 103:21,	78:4, 85:15, 85:21,		130:22
119:10, 121:17,	103:23, 104:12,		moderating [1] -	modify [1] - 47:13
121:18	104:15, 104:18,	92:10, 93:16, 99:8,	128:25	molest [2] - 95:19,
<b>MEMBER</b> [215] - 4:9,	107:19, 109:11,	101:7, 101:16,	moderator [112] -	
4:13, 5:16, 5:24, 6:1,		103:14, 114:4,	8:25, 9:2, 9:4, 9:10,	96:7
6:2, 13:4, 13:7, 14:7,	109:21, 110:8,	115:24, 116:14,	9:12, 9:21, 10:3,	<b>mom</b> [1] - 115:10
14:8, 15:21, 16:21,	110:14, 111:8,	116:21, 120:11,	10:17, 10:21, 10:22,	moment [6] - 44:12,
18:3, 18:7, 19:10,	111:10, 112:10,	122:7, 124:8,	10:25, 11:13, 11:18,	71:16, 72:6, 87:8,
19:13, 20:5, 20:8,	112:23, 113:25,	127:13, 129:19	11:22, 12:5, 18:19,	109:5, 124:9
22:12, 23:6, 24:16,	114:20, 115:1,	militant [2] - 85:14,	19:24, 20:13, 20:18,	moments [1] - 124:8
	115:5, 115:6,	86:21	21:4, 21:13, 22:23,	Mondays [1] - 31:5
29:13, 31:1, 31:15,	115:22, 115:23,			monirator [1] - 10:25
31:18, 31:25, 35:12,	115:24, 116:3,	<b>Miller</b> [2] - 119:10,	22:25, 28:6, 28:8,	
35:15, 35:18, 36:14,	116:4, 116:5, 117:6,	121:17	28:13, 28:19, 30:22,	monitor [1] - 66:12
36:20, 36:23, 38:7,		<b>MILLER</b> [4] - 119:14,	32:4, 48:5, 53:1,	monitoring [1] - 85:5
38:22, 40:3, 40:14,	117:10, 117:11,	120:5, 120:23, 121:4	56:20, 56:21, 58:20,	monologging [1] -
40:15, 42:4, 42:7,	118:8, 118:24,	mind [8] - 28:12,	58:22, 59:12, 59:14,	10:24
44:3, 45:6, 45:8,	119:14, 120:5,	30:24, 35:15, 44:19,	59:20, 59:21, 60:3,	month [1] - 52:25
45:18, 46:4, 46:10,	120:23, 121:4,	48:17, 53:10, 92:17,	60:24, 60:25, 61:1,	morning [2] - 6:17,
47:5, 48:9, 48:10,	121:20, 122:20,	120:2	61:8, 62:12, 62:17,	55:14
49:4, 49:8, 49:10,	123:22, 124:24,		62:19, 63:4, 63:6,	
	125:14, 125:15,	mindful [1] - 74:3		<b>most</b> [22] - 3:14,
49:14, 49:24, 50:17,	125:17, 125:25,	minds [2] - 65:23,	63:22, 64:20, 68:16,	13:24, 14:5, 21:11,
50:24, 51:24, 51:25,	128:10, 128:12,	110:16	68:17, 68:23, 69:20,	24:13, 43:3, 45:2,
52:3, 52:7, 52:9,		mine [1] - 72:2	70:13, 70:14, 71:17,	71:10, 78:9, 90:20,
53:19, 54:14, 54:15,	131:14	minimized [1] -	74:9, 74:12, 80:20,	90:25, 95:6, 98:2,
54:16, 54:17, 54:18,	members [18] - 3:10,	128:22	82:11, 82:18, 83:23,	117:24, 119:19,
54:22, 54:23, 54:24,	6:17, 25:14, 25:19,	<b>minimum</b> [3] - 8:7,	83:25, 84:2, 84:6,	119:21, 120:6,
55:1, 55:3, 55:5,	26:10, 26:13, 26:19,	20:4, 39:10	84:12, 86:10, 86:13,	120:23, 120:24,
, , . <del></del> ,	45:22, 48:18, 50:4,	20.7, 00.10	, , <b> ,</b>	·, · <b></b> ,

129:18 motion [3] - 4:7, 5:21, 6:10 move [17] - 4:4, 4:9, 11:10, 28:24, 31:12, 33:24, 58:2, 59:1, 66:6, 73:17, 106:4, 107:7, 107:9, 108:19, 114:12, 129:23, 130:17 moved [3] - 4:14, 5:24, 6:3 moves [2] - 55:16, 62:16 moving [2] - 53:25, 77:21 MR [83] - 24:19, 25:9, 25:16, 55:14, 55:23, 55:25, 56:8, 57:2, 57:6, 57:8, 58:1, 58:19, 59:6, 59:9, 59:25, 61:11, 62:10, 62:16, 63:9, 63:20, 64:23, 65:7, 65:11, 65:20, 66:18, 66:19, 66:20, 68:1, 68:25, 69:10, 71:3, 71:5, 71:25, 72:3, 72:18, 74:16, 75:15, 76:12, 77:1, 78:19, 78:22, 79:2, 80:3, 105:2, 105:8, 105:12, 105:13, 105:19, 105:20, 106:6, 106:7, 106:8, 106:15, 106:17, 107:5, 107:7, 107:9, 108:14, 108:19, 110:2, 110:10, 111:5, 111:9, 112:9, 112:22, 113:12, 114:9, 114:12, 115:4, 116:2, 118:7, 119:8, 120:2, 120:17, 121:3, 121:17, 122:16, 123:6, 124:12, 125:9, 130:10, 130:24, 131:3 **MS** [42] - 6:16, 13:12, 14:16, 14:18, 16:11, 17:3, 18:13, 19:19, 20:20, 23:11, 25:2, 25:11, 26:9, 29:19, 31:7, 31:24, 32:23, 34:3, 34:10, 34:15, 34:21, 34:24, 48:18, 49:17, 80:11, 80:15, 81:9, 81:25, 82:3, 84:23, 84:25, 86:2,

86:5, 86:8, 98:8, 102:10, 102:17, 103:4, 104:8, 104:14, 104:20, 131:13 multiple [2] - 51:7, 131:4 must [5] - 76:1, 83:8, 83:11, 84:5, 100:13 mute [14] - 10:20, 20:24, 20:25, 21:2, 71:4, 83:6, 88:21, 91:4, 110:9, 118:4, 127:7, 130:7, 131:13, 131:14 muted [6] - 65:22, 88:24, 89:3, 89:8, 110:6, 111:5 muting [3] - 110:10, 113:2, 113:14 Ν name [7] - 10:11, 17:5, 17:9, 17:12, 17:24, 18:17, 51:16 narrative [1] - 66:5 narrow [1] - 51:20 Nathan [2] - 24:18, 130:9 national [1] - 22:21 nature [1] - 117:2 navigate [1] - 58:23 nay [1] - 6:8 near [3] - 10:23, 11:15, 82:10 neater [1] - 101:16 necessarily [3] - 17:1, 95:12, 116:3 necessary [1] - 108:23 need [32] - 10:25, 27:20, 29:12, 33:24, 36:8, 38:4, 39:10, 40:21, 46:17, 53:15, 56:21, 73:10, 73:14, 75:12, 77:2, 87:22, 89:5, 99:14, 104:10, 111:11, 111:12, 111:25, 118:17, 119:6, 119:23, 122:21, 123:14, 126:5, 126:18, 128:21 needed [2] - 21:1, 102:19 needs [4] - 40:6, 48:5, 65:19, 74:3 nefarious [1] - 99:25 negative [1] - 15:3 negativity [1] - 12:10

neutral [2] - 82:11, 83:22 never [10] - 12:9, 12:15, 21:10, 70:5, 88:1, 91:8, 100:18, 101:23, 103:2, 123:23 new [2] - 116:3, 123:2 news [2] - 65:14, 65:15 next [18] - 6:19, 12:18, 26:8, 32:8, 40:15, 48:2, 59:1, 62:14, 62:16, 71:8, 80:10, 101:23, 112:21, 114:12, 116:10, 116:12, 131:17 nobody [5] - 50:22, 66:1, 89:9, 90:12, 118:5 noise [1] - 22:24 nominate [1] - 81:13 nomination [1] - 37:1 nominee [2] - 37:4, 37:5 non [3] - 3:15, 16:4, 120:8 non-Clean [1] - 16:4 non-participating [1] -120:8 non-partisan [1] -3:15 nonbiased [1] - 129:7 none [1] - 65:25 noon [1] - 34:7 norms [3] - 110:17, 110:19, 110:22 note [2] - 30:7, 115:3 notes [1] - 45:1 nother [2] - 41:5 nothing [5] - 9:11, 56:6, 119:14, 129:6 noticed [1] - 56:19 notify [2] - 8:25, 26:21 notion [1] - 79:13 nowhere [1] - 66:24 number [3] - 40:8, 40:10, 79:10 0 **obey** [2] - 110:19, 110:23 objection [1] - 66:21 objections [2] -131:19, 131:22 objective [2] - 66:1, 90:10 obligated [1] - 66:22 obligation [2] - 67:9,

67:23 observation [1] -73:11 obvious [2] - 64:21, 82:9 obviously [9] - 36:2, 37:5, 37:16, 43:7, 85:3, 93:23, 94:13, 95:18, 98:23 occur [4] - 9:19, 26:12, 118:10, 126:19 occurred [2] - 7:9, 110:15 occurring [1] - 80:19 occurs [2] - 9:18, 29:24 odd [1] - 93:24 offended [1] - 94:21 offer [3] - 33:4, 98:3, 119:18 office [2] - 37:19, 103:14 offices [2] - 3:20, 37:6 official [3] - 3:25, 5:7, 97:20 Official [3] - 5:2, 5:23, 6:5 often [1] - 100:7 old [1] - 32:3 once [6] - 7:10, 10:20, 48:6, 54:7, 63:10, 125:12 one [130] - 3:9, 3:11, 7:13, 7:15, 8:6, 8:7, 8:12, 8:23, 9:3, 10:6, 10:15, 11:1, 11:5, 13:19, 13:24, 16:22, 18:9, 19:16, 19:21, 20:2, 20:3, 23:25, 24:11, 26:14, 26:15, 27:20, 27:21, 28:5, 28:20, 28:25, 29:9, 31:18, 36:15, 36:16, 36:17, 36:18, 36:21, 37:11, 38:14, 38:17, 40:5, 40:7, 42:12, 43:25, 45:4, 45:18, 45:20, 47:10, 47:11, 47:14, 47:21, 48:3, 48:15, 49:20, 49:21, 49:25, 50:21, 51:6, 51:12, 51:13, 52:9, 52:13, 53:2, 54:2, 54:9, 58:5, 60:9, 64:11, 64:20, 66:7, 68:15, 71:6, 71:18, 72:7, 75:19, 75:21, 75:24. 77:25. 79:23. 81:2, 84:15, 88:14,

90:6, 90:18, 91:3, 91:17, 92:20, 94:17, 95:14, 96:16, 97:13, 97:14, 97:16, 97:17, 97:25, 99:20, 104:1, 104:5, 105:9, 106:20, 107:5, 107:16, 108:4, 109:16, 109:22, 109:25, 112:19, 117:7, 118:2, 118:23, 119:17, 119:23, 119:25, 123:8, 123:17, 123:22, 123:24, 126:3, 128:17, 129:11, 129:17, 130:25, 131:18 one-hour [1] - 47:14 one-sided [1] - 75:19 one-stop [1] - 47:10 ones [4] - 24:5, 39:9, 47:19, 82:9 online [1] - 91:1 onus [1] - 60:12 open [7] - 16:18, 17:15, 21:12, 25:4, 35:5, 103:13, 108:10 opening [5] - 10:6, 10:10, 10:15, 82:21, 83:13 opens [1] - 95:23 operate [4] - 7:14, 40:19, 40:20, 131:16 opinion [2] - 62:23, 79.7 opinions [6] - 53:25, 55:9, 55:19, 77:21, 102:22, 123:24 opponent [7] - 11:21, 15:5, 85:9, 86:12, 101:5, 101:21, 101:25 opponents [7] - 9:1, 9:3, 9:5, 11:24, 12:3, 35:9, 93:24 opportunities [2] -3:22, 128:20 opportunity [11] - 9:3, 11:20, 23:16, 51:20, 64:25, 79:23, 94:23, 100:1, 100:20, 102:22, 115:1 opposed [4] - 4:20, 6:8, 50:20, 107:1 opposing [1] - 20:3 opposition [4] - 17:13, 54:1, 77:23, 109:6 opting [1] - 51:11 option [3] - 18:8,

45 of 52 sheets

51:22, 97:13	18:22, 30:12, 30:19,	37:4, 39:7	28:15, 29:23, 29:24,	19:21, 25:22, 29:7,
or [1] - 65:4	42:1, 46:8, 64:14,	party-based [1] -	30:23, 32:20, 37:10,	35:4, 41:1, 50:23,
	42.1, 40.8, 04.14, 69:12, 78:14, 95:10,	• •	75:6	51:16, 52:22, 58:25,
order [8] - 3:3, 3:5,		77:22		
10:10, 10:11, 33:8,	95:16, 98:4, 101:8,	pass [2] - 9:9, 98:15	permission [1] - 56:2	60:10, 60:11, 67:7,
42:19, 83:14, 102:18	108:9, 122:3	passed [1] - 3:24	permitted [2] - 83:24,	67:8, 71:20, 72:18,
orders [1] - 33:14	participated [4] -	past [6] - 8:8, 30:7,	114:15	73:18, 74:24, 83:8,
organization [2] -	45:25, 46:6, 70:5,	65:19, 72:7, 107:22,	person [21] - 34:18,	87:4, 88:12, 88:19,
25:15, 41:10	109:12	117:15	51:21, 60:7, 62:14,	91:20, 95:8, 95:16,
organizes [1] - 3:18	participating [16] -	pathetic [1] - 95:17	63:5, 63:7, 70:16,	98:18, 98:24, 100:8,
original [3] - 72:14,	7:21, 8:5, 14:6,	patterns [1] - 63:11	70:17, 70:19, 70:20,	101:11, 101:13,
116:17, 116:20	14:21, 14:23, 14:25,	Paul [7] - 20:7, 64:6,	70:21, 70:22, 70:23,	103:7, 110:14,
otherwise [6] - 7:2,	15:4, 15:17, 18:21,	66:2, 71:15, 81:20,	89:7, 100:10, 115:9,	114:15, 114:17,
26:21, 37:21, 41:8,	19:22, 20:2, 23:8,	87:7, 89:13	115:20, 125:7	114:18, 117:7,
62:12, 118:9	28:19, 109:25,	Paul's [1] - 88:25	personal [8] - 97:1,	117:18, 118:7,
ought [5] - 36:12,	120:8, 129:3	pay [1] - 103:12	97:19, 115:8, 115:9,	118:8, 118:9,
59:17, 67:17, 79:7,	participation [11] -	penalize [1] - 14:11	117:2, 118:9, 124:12	118:11, 119:5, 122:5
84:20	46:18, 46:19, 75:1,	penalty [6] - 14:22,	personality [1] - 56:22	points [11] - 5:6, 5:7,
ourselves [1] - 52:20	75:6, 76:10, 87:14,	16:7, 116:7, 116:14,	personally [1] - 97:20	76:5, 82:13, 84:8,
outcome [2] - 41:10,	88:8, 94:2, 103:11,	116:22, 117:4	personalty [1] -	122:12, 122:14,
41:11	119:22, 120:6	<b>people</b> [56] - 3:7, 13:1,	111:17	122:15, 128:18,
outcomes [1] - 64:18	particular [14] - 23:25,	13:9, 13:10, 14:11,	perspective [4] -	129:17
outlet [1] - 52:16	24:11, 26:11, 26:17,	14:13, 15:23, 16:7,	32:16, 60:8, 120:12,	polarization [2] -
	28:9, 28:22, 34:25,		125:8	42:15, 44:16
outrageous [3] -	50:15, 57:17, 60:14,	37:18, 38:18, 40:8,	perspectives [1] -	polarizations [1] -
111:21, 115:8,	61:24, 69:18, 101:3,	41:9, 41:25, 42:19,	68:18	42:24
115:19	103:14	43:10, 46:5, 50:1,		polarized [1] - 42:18
overall [12] - 24:4,	parties [14] - 13:8,	50:9, 50:12, 50:18,	pertaining [1] - 124:18	<b>policy</b> [7] - 53:17,
35:6, 37:2, 38:2,	36:3, 37:16, 39:1,	52:14, 53:3, 53:15,	petitions [1] - 32:21	76:7, 98:2, 98:22,
75:9, 76:7, 79:9,	39:3, 40:12, 40:16,	58:17, 59:11, 62:13,	philosophical [1] -	99:1, 115:25, 116:5
82:5, 85:18, 126:25,		63:2, 63:16, 65:14,	73:9	<b>political</b> [8] - 63:12,
127:9	41:18, 43:11, 50:11,	65:17, 68:24, 70:19,	phone [2] - 9:8, 83:2	
overly [1] - 94:21	54:11, 65:8, 78:11, 103:25	73:18, 77:12, 88:4,	phonetic [2] - 69:23,	63:23, 64:22, 65:8,
overreach [1] - 79:9		99:6, 103:12, 104:3,	126:20	66:21, 66:22, 90:7,
overstepped [1] -	partisan [8] - 3:15,	104:5, 110:18,	phrase [1] - 67:12	126:16
71:17	28:8, 35:9, 39:4,	110:22, 111:13,	physical [1] - 47:21	politically [1] - 75:20
own [5] - 68:18, 96:25,	43:13, 106:3, 131:6,	111:15, 111:16,	<b>pick</b> [2] - 96:16, 97:15	politicians [2] - 69:17,
121:10, 121:19,	131:11	111:24, 117:9,	picking [1] - 75:22	111:21
124:11	partisanship [1] -	117:13, 117:22,	picture [1] - 44:24	politics [1] - 64:9
	112:12	119:6, 121:11, 122:3	<b>piece</b> [4] - 45:18,	polling [2] - 17:22,
Р	partner [2] - 22:6,	people's [1] - 118:13	112:16, 113:1,	46:5
	130:18	<b>per</b> [11] - 7:13, 7:16,	114:21	polls [1] - 17:24
<b>p.m</b> [8] - 7:25, 8:3,	partners [7] - 19:2,	8:12, 11:1, 16:7,	pieces [1] - 9:24	pontificating [1] -
8:16, 8:17, 9:19,	21:18, 22:3, 24:25,	27:20, 27:21, 28:6,	<b>Pinny</b> [5] - 18:4,	72:13
27:22, 28:2, 131:25	33:12, 130:22	63:21, 83:24, 85:10	19:20, 59:23,	pontification [1] -
pacific [1] - 62:20	party [43] - 8:20, 12:1,	percent [1] - 15:11	105:21, 105:23	79:24
packaged [1] - 48:6	12:2, 13:16, 25:25,	perception [4] -	<b>pivot</b> [1] - 100:23	portion [2] - 27:5,
packet [1] - 5:5	26:5, 27:10, 28:3,	112:25, 113:1,	<b>place</b> [4] - 29:5, 33:9,	93:20
part [22] - 3:17, 4:2,	28:4, 28:7, 28:8,	121:7, 124:17	68:6, 69:4	position [5] - 30:12,
14:5, 40:13, 42:13,	28:9, 35:3, 36:2,	perceptions [1] -	placed [2] - 3:23,	43:17, 87:18, 127:3,
42:24, 43:12, 43:21,	37:1, 37:3, 37:5,	73:13	42:10	130:20
43:23, 44:11, 46:12,	37:11, 41:21, 41:22,	perfect [2] - 64:25,	planning [1] - 53:23	positive [1] - 23:14
46:25, 47:1, 48:22,	42:19, 45:16, 49:23,	102:15	plat [1] - 111:22	possible [14] - 4:5,
67:14, 67:19, 71:9,	53:25, 54:3, 54:13,	perfectly [1] - 85:25	-	4:24, 7:23, 15:18,
73:2, 82:1, 86:3,	75:21, 77:22, 78:1,	perform [2] - 87:23,	platform [3] - 111:23,	25:24, 32:24, 35:2,
97:7, 112:18	78:13, 102:23,	113:22	119:1	49:1, 58:16, 64:8,
participant [1] - 112:4	103:8, 104:1, 104:5,	performance [1] -	platforming [1] -	91:21, 91:23, 91:25,
participate [28] - 13:8,	105:7, 106:12,	76:25	67:13	120:15
13:21, 13:23, 14:2,	128:1, 128:2, 128:4,	perhaps [5] - 22:17,	platforms [1] - 42:25	possibly [3] - 22:2,
14:12, 14:14, 14:22,	131:5	64:7, 87:8, 109:2,	<b>play</b> [3] - 110:18,	27:9, 27:24
14:12, 14:14, 14:22, 14:25, 15:6, 15:14,	Party [1] - 52:11	129:18	118:22, 122:5	<b>post</b> [2] - 55:18, 71:8
16:5, 16:23, 17:4,	party's [3] - 37:1,	period [9] - 7:8, 27:25,	<b>point</b> [51] - 6:22, 8:7,	post-2020 [1] - 67:10
10.0, 10.20, 11.7,		portou [8] - 1.0, 21.20,	13:2, 13:3, 16:12,	
-	-			

posted [1] - 26:25 posterity [1] - 120:9 posturing [1] - 79:24 potential [2] - 19:15, 23:23 potentially [4] - 6:21, 17:18, 22:7, 127:4 practical [1] - 100:6 practice [1] - 91:23 predictable [1] - 90:1 preface [1] - 108:25 prefer [5] - 7:22, 113:14, 114:8, 120:24, 124:13 preferable [1] - 114:7 preference [2] - 74:5, 107:19 preferences [1] -121:21 premise [1] - 72:14 prepared [8] - 9:15, 60:12, 60:13, 67:13, 73:20, 76:19, 85:19, 92:18 preparing [1] - 13:13 prerecorded [1] - 22:5 presentation [3] -6:11, 6:18, 60:19 presenting [1] -120:14 presently [1] - 64:9 president [1] - 39:25 Presidential [2] - 71:7, 72:23 presidential [2] -116:17, 116:24 press [2] - 15:9, 59:12 pretty [6] - 12:7, 21:12, 33:16, 51:11, 58:3, 64:21 prevent [2] - 7:20, 89:1 prevents [1] - 109:16 previous [7] - 27:14, 28:7, 102:20, 109:20, 127:25, 130:11, 130:13 previously [2] - 35:5, 67:14 primaries [9] - 39:10, 39:11, 39:24, 42:16, 45:3, 103:10, 106:23, 117:25, 131:11 primary [34] - 13:17, 13:19, 17:8, 17:11, 27:10, 36:4, 36:12, 39:2, 39:3, 40:2, 41:17, 43:4, 43:12, 43:21, 44:2, 44:11,

45:4, 45:15, 47:2, 47:3, 49:11, 54:11, 78:10, 90:19, 100:13, 100:16, 102:23, 103:18, 103:21, 106:11, 106:22, 106:25, 107:1, 131:5 printed [2] - 17:5, 17:12 private [1] - 25:10 probable [1] - 53:14 problem [6] - 46:21, 58:5, 66:4, 72:7, 103:15, 108:3 problems [2] - 32:3, 110:20 procedures [1] - 20:18 proceed [3] - 20:3, 27:6, 129:8 process [18] - 3:22, 4:3, 12:17, 40:13, 43:12, 46:13, 47:1, 49:18, 63:17, 67:19, 69:17, 69:19, 69:21, 71:14, 98:17, 118:18, 120:7, 120:10 processes [1] - 20:10 procurement [1] -33:9 produce [1] - 127:12 production [1] - 51:10 professional [1] -87:19 professionally [1] -94:15 programming [3] -28:20, 30:6, 33:12 progresses [1] - 10:22 prompt [1] - 106:18 pronounce [1] - 51:16 prop [2] - 19:6, 19:14 proper [1] - 82:9 property [1] - 97:22 props [1] - 19:3 pros [2] - 56:14, 106:24 protective [1] - 113:8 protocol [2] - 118:3, 126:12 protocols [1] - 114:25 provide [14] - 6:18, 27:7, 27:12, 39:4, 39:22, 61:16, 76:17, 83:24, 84:2, 98:9, 98:16, 99:2, 123:12 provided [2] - 35:5, 127.16 providing [2] - 3:15,

90:24 public [22] - 23:9, 25:6, 25:8, 25:9, 26:10, 26:19, 26:23, 33:18, 33:19, 37:14, 45:23, 50:19, 73:23, 99:5, 99:9, 112:25, 118:19, 123:5, 129:23, 129:25, 130:1, 130:5 Public [3] - 24:22, 37:22, 130:15 publications [1] -66:23 publicize [2] - 32:25, 45:10 publicly [1] - 113:6 published [1] - 31:22 pull [1] - 13:14 pulls [1] - 31:4 purchase [2] - 33:8, 33:14 pure [1] - 75:20 purpose [3] - 71:5, 73:8, 115:8 purposes [2] - 11:14, 25.4push [6] - 58:23, 63:24, 76:4, 93:11, 123:11, 129:13 pushback [3] - 45:9, 59:16, 123:18 pushes [1] - 15:14 put [14] - 32:15, 35:23, 37:21, 41:7, 51:8, 66:9, 67:23, 93:24, 96:23, 97:4, 106:17, 113:20 puts [3] - 60:12, 74:12, 127:3 putting [1] - 50:20 puzzle [1] - 114:21 Q Q&A [2] - 8:6, 19:22 Q&As [1] - 14:4 qualifications [2] -16:23, 17:4 qualified [2] - 7:8, 13:15 qualify [1] - 17:5 quality [1] - 16:25 quantify [1] - 13:10 QUERARD [25] -38:22, 46:4, 47:5, 54:18, 54:23, 55:3, 85:11, 86:19, 88:20, 88:23, 89:25, 90:16, 91:19, 93:19, 94:15,

95:9, 96:15, 96:18, 99:4, 100:7, 101:16, 101:20, 102:8, 103:18, 103:21 Querard [3] - 87:9, 94:12, 94:14 quest [1] - 74:19 question-question [1] - 101:24 questions [75] - 9:6, 9:9, 9:15, 10:7, 10:8, 10:14, 11:2, 12:20, 13:2, 16:20, 19:25, 22:11, 22:17, 25:15, 25:19, 35:24, 41:8, 41:14, 41:15, 59:5, 60:13, 61:9, 61:16, 62:9, 62:12, 69:18, 70:10, 70:15, 70:21, 72:6, 72:11, 72:16, 73:3, 73:24, 74:6, 74:10, 74:11, 76:3, 76:17, 76:18, 76:21, 76:22, 76:24, 79:14, 79:22, 79:25, 80:21, 82:4, 91:10, 91:16, 91:22, 92:3, 92:15, 92:19, 93:6, 93:13, 93:15, 93:18, 93:23, 94:10, 95:24, 95:25, 96:16, 97:15, 98:2, 98:10, 101:1, 103:22, 111:14, 111:15, 124:14, 127:15 quick [9] - 19:10, 31:1, 38:25, 49:4, 53:22, 74:23, 101:11, 106:2, 122:15 quickly [2] - 33:16, 55:16 quiet [3] - 9:16, 66:17, 86.7 quite [7] - 31:23, 32:4, 56:25, 75:9, 89:18 R race [11] - 19:16, 37:22, 37:24, 40:12, 48:2. 50:13. 50:15. 60:15 races [3] - 50:8, 68:20, 99:19 rail [1] - 63:3 rails [2] - 95:24, 117:17 raise [11] - 5:10, 38:5, 38:19, 38:23, 40:9, 53:2, 55:4, 89:1,

124:5, 125:12, 130:6 raised [3] - 61:13, 89:6, 110:12 rallied [1] - 128:18 rallies [1] - 54:9 rally [2] - 78:9, 129:16 rallying [1] - 128:15 ramble [1] - 112:14 ran [2] - 64:5, 85:9 randomly [3] - 26:13, 26:20, 80:18 rare [1] - 87:8 rather [4] - 38:17, 57:22, 63:14, 122:12 rating [1] - 73:12 razor [2] - 61:9, 74:7 react [1] - 113:21 read [2] - 8:9, 83:2 reading [3] - 73:21, 92:13, 105:16 ready [2] - 29:7, 32:18 real [14] - 9:9, 21:10, 37:14, 51:20, 53:22, 56:23, 62:8, 67:25, 70:11, 101:11, 103:24, 121:20, 124:16 reality [7] - 38:21, 42:23, 44:12, 44:22, 52:5, 66:21, 67:1 really [68] - 9:4, 12:24, 13:14, 17:1, 19:17, 21:6, 21:10, 21:16, 21:17, 22:8, 23:13, 24:6, 30:3, 31:2, 36:4, 37:9, 37:15, 37:18, 38:10, 39:2, 43:4, 44:3, 44:4, 51:20, 54:19, 55:6, 57:13, 58:6, 58:10, 58:14, 60:3, 64:18, 67:20, 68:21, 71:17, 72:12, 74:20, 74:23, 75:12, 76:22, 76:23, 78:8, 79:24, 90:13, 91:23, 92:8, 92:9, 92:18, 100:12, 102:25, 110:18, 110:24, 111:20, 112:20, 112:24, 118:13, 121:22, 121:24, 122:10, 123:22, 126:18, 126:21, 127:1, 127:10, 127:20 realm [1] - 44:8 reason [6] - 40:2, 43:8, 49:25, 95:4, 101:6, 101:7 reasons [1] - 117:7

rebut [7] - 58:8, 58:9, 67:16, 109:23, 110:1, 115:2, 129:20 relationship [1] rebuttal [15] - 58:9, 130:14 59:1, 62:19, 62:20, relax [1] - 110:17 66:10, 67:7, 67:11, 74:10, 108:3, 109:7, 84:10 109:14, 115:11, relief [1] - 100:20 116:11. 128:20 rebuttals [19] - 11:2, 7:20, 30:4 62:17, 62:22, 63:17, 64:4, 64:5, 64:13, 83:3, 83:4, 108:20, 78:11 108:21, 109:3, 109:4, 109:5, 118:11 109:10, 109:18, 109:19 rebutting [1] - 116:16 recap [1] - 102:12 52:12 receive [1] - 17:25 received [3] - 4:6, 5:5, 116:15 23:14 reco [1] - 117:5 recommend [1] -131.9recommendation [2] -27:18, 45:2 recommendations [7] - 4:25, 5:8, 5:15, repair [2] - 24:24, 5:22, 6:4, 61:6, 73:5 130:17 record [2] - 55:22, 56.2 recorded [4] - 26:18, 77:19, 104:10 26:25, 81:3, 120:9 recording [2] - 56:3, 6:5 56:6 redirect [2] - 73:2, 73:3 reduce [1] - 42:24 redundancy [1] -51:5, 74:2 105:10 refer [3] - 5:22, 6:4, representing [2] -15:18 40:8, 53:24 referee [4] - 88:15, 89:11, 90:13 Republican [8] referees [1] - 53:17 **reference** [1] - 7:6 referenced [1] - 14:20 referring [3] - 4:25, 5:7, 130:25 reflect [1] - 74:3 reflection [2] - 56:23, 129:5 reframe [1] - 98:24 refused [1] - 95:16 regardless [1] - 117:1 request [1] - 33:2 regards [4] - 9:8, 12:21, 15:14, 21:4 registration [1] - 10:1 regular [1] - 69:1

regular-style [1] - 69:1 relations [1] - 24:21 relevant [2] - 53:7, religious [3] - 7:18, remaining [1] - 53:20 remains [2] - 54:12, remarks [2] - 12:5, remember [4] - 14:24, 43:19, 52:9, 71:11 remembering [1] removed [2] - 98:17, removing [1] - 110:21 Renaldo [9] - 57:7, 61:4, 71:6, 71:20, 105:20, 105:23, 115:24, 117:1, 117:6 **Renaldo's** [1] - 60:10 renting [1] - 32:10 repeat [1] - 130:11 report [4] - 5:8, 27:4, Report [3] - 5:2, 5:23, **REPORTER** [1] - 56:5 reporting [1] - 66:24 represent [1] - 94:18 representation [2] represented [1] - 90:7 Republic [1] - 52:17 28:23, 39:10, 40:2, 45:13, 47:3, 100:12, 100:16, 106:25 Republicans [17] -8:21, 36:16, 36:18, 39:24, 40:11, 47:9, 47:20, 49:20, 51:17, 52:1, 52:20, 52:21, 53:5, 71:14, 103:22 reputation [1] - 113:8 requests [1] - 31:8 requirements [3] -27:13, 27:19, 48:4 requiring [1] - 38:24

reschedule [1] - 31:10 rescheduling [4] -33:5, 33:20, 33:22, 130:2 research [2] - 74:1, 75:20 reserve [1] - 102:12 Resnik [1] - 56:25 respect [2] - 3:23, 82:9 respectful [1] - 12:12 respects [2] - 37:2, 117:11 respond [8] - 68:23, 84:4, 85:10, 101:25, 115:11, 117:20, 126:24, 130:20 responding [4] - 25:7, 86:9, 86:11, 130:3 response [13] - 4:21, 5:13, 6:9, 10:16, 25:20, 77:17, 78:21, 83:11, 86:12, 106:14, 108:18, 114:11, 131:21 responses [4] - 11:1, 11:14, 22:1, 61:10 responsibilities [1] -60:21 responsibility [3] -61:5, 66:11, 66:14 responsible [1] - 36:6 restricted [1] - 39:4 restrictions [1] - 30:25 restrictive [1] - 90:23 result [2] - 64:17, 129:25 results [1] - 69:14 revealing [1] - 93:11 reverse [3] - 10:12, 16:6, 16:13 reward [1] - 16:3 rights [1] - 62:3 rigid [3] - 11:4, 111:2, 112:11 rigidity [1] - 120:19 risk [1] - 88:11 Roberts [1] - 6:14 **ROBERTS** [41] - 6:16, 13:12, 14:16, 14:18, 16:11, 17:3, 18:13, 19:19, 20:20, 23:11, 25:2, 25:11, 26:9, 29:19, 31:7, 31:24, 32:23. 34:3. 34:15. 34:21, 34:24, 48:18, 49:17, 80:11, 80:15, 81:9, 81:25, 82:3, 84:23, 84:25, 86:2, 86:5, 86:8, 98:8,

102:10, 102:17, 103:4, 104:8, 104:14, 104:20, 131:13 **ROBSON** [18] - 4:9, 5:16, 5:24, 31:18, 31:25, 35:12, 35:15, 35:18, 36:14, 36:20, 36:23, 40:15, 46:10, 48:10, 49:8, 50:17, 51:24, 54:15 Robson [2] - 32:23, 103:6 Robson's [1] - 52:24 robust [4] - 35:21, 54:4, 78:2, 128:16 rodd [1] - 93:19 Rodd [6] - 69:22, 73:7, 79:16, 102:14, 102:21, 127:25 role [2] - 84:21, 118:22 rolls [1] - 121:5 room [5] - 8:9, 26:22, 52:18, 90:21, 90:25 rooms [1] - 26:14 roughly [1] - 88:5 **RSVP** [3] - 14:2, 30:9, 30:17 **RSVPs** [4] - 28:14, 28:17, 30:8, 33:5 rule [6] - 17:18, 19:3, 108:13, 112:11, 120:20, 126:21 rules [48] - 6:12, 6:21, 10:4, 12:7, 16:16, 19:22. 40:19. 40:20. 58:6, 61:1, 64:17, 68:6, 75:17, 80:8, 80:16, 80:19, 82:5, 82:6, 84:11, 85:13, 87:14, 87:22, 95:13, 97:18, 99:13, 107:8, 107:12, 109:15, 110:16, 110:17, 110:21, 111:4, 111:14, 112:7, 112:25, 113:9, 117:8, 119:4, 122:2, 122:4, 122:7, 122:21, 122:23, 123:2, 126:6, 126:10, 126:25 rumors [1] - 66:22 run [9] - 13:15, 20:17, 22:17, 27:23, 30:1, 35:20, 42:25, 48:11, 95·1 running [25] - 3:19, 8:17, 9:1, 13:21,

15:23, 17:14, 32:20, 36:16, 36:17, 36:18, 36:19, 36:25, 37:4, 37:6, 37:19, 43:20, 43:22, 46:25, 47:20, 50:15, 50:18, 52:12, 90:18, 121:6, 121:7 runs [2] - 28:1, 62:14

## S

sacrosanct [1] - 129:6 sample [1] - 46:5 sandbagged [1] -122:8 Saturdays [1] - 7:22 save [3] - 32:25, 33:17, 56:15 saw [2] - 115:14, 116:24 scandalous [1] -97:20 schedule [18] - 7:13, 7:15, 7:17, 7:21, 7:22. 31:8. 32:24. 33:2, 33:10, 34:5, 38:10, 38:15, 39:8, 47:12, 47:22, 56:15, 83:20, 90:24 scheduled [3] - 7:5, 8:16, 38:11 schedules [1] - 31:12 scheduling [2] - 7:19, 33:17 school [1] - 58:11 School [2] - 24:22, 130.15screen [9] - 5:11, 7:1, 7:3, 9:10, 18:17, 32:8, 47:17, 89:8, 98:12 screening [1] - 16:24 script [1] - 18:19 se [3] - 16:7, 63:21, 85:10 searchability [1] -50:1 searching [2] - 50:4, 50:14 seat [1] - 51:1 seats [1] - 17:14 second [16] - 4:12, 5:25, 6:1, 6:2, 15:22, 28:3, 29:9, 60:10, 70:15, 70:19, 70:21, 73:18, 79:9, 88:1, 131:7 Second [1] - 4:13 seconded [2] - 4:14, 6:3

cocondo (40) - 21:9	96:11, 101:18	20:5, 59:3, 59:24,	50:12, 94:22	106:1, 127:7
<b>seconds</b> [13] - 21:8,		60:1, 72:20, 78:25,		
55:1, 58:8, 58:9,	separate [11] - 8:19,		sitting [2] - 47:24,	sounded [1] - 54:15
76:14, 82:19, 85:9,	37:19, 39:9, 39:10,	79:4, 80:4, 115:22,	90:21	sounding [1] - 88:11
85:10, 85:21, 104:9,	39:14, 49:5, 49:6,	115:24, 116:3, 116:5	situation [5] - 32:5,	<b>sounds</b> [2] - 54:14,
117:19, 125:10,	49:23, 54:5, 78:3,	<b>Sheoran</b> [5] - 18:13,	36:2, 94:11, 113:3,	87:25
126:23	80:25	59:25, 72:19, 78:23,	115:15	spare [1] - 55:1
sections [1] - 83:16	separated [5] - 50:16,	79:3	situations [1] - 90:14	<b>spark</b> [1] - 54:10
<b>see</b> [48] - 7:3, 11:7,	103:6, 103:8,	shifting [1] - 41:23	<b>six</b> [1] - 13:20	speaker [1] - 127:9
11:25, 12:2, 13:1,	106:12, 106:16	<b>ship</b> [1] - 28:13	<b>sizes</b> [1] - 58:18	speakers [1] - 84:5
15:7, 16:6, 16:10,	separating [4] - 49:25,	shoes [1] - 120:13	skeptical [1] - 59:14	speaking [12] - 8:1,
16:12, 16:15, 17:12,	50:8, 102:23, 128:3	shopping [1] - 47:10	skew [1] - 65:13	8:23, 10:23, 11:15,
17:16, 18:11, 20:7,	sergeant [1] - 70:22	<b>short</b> [2] - 28:15,	skills [1] - 125:6	21:24, 47:19, 54:12,
21:19, 21:25, 23:5,	serious [1] - 111:22	37:10	<b>skip</b> [1] - 59:7	82:10, 83:14, 84:6,
29:11, 45:8, 45:19,	seriously [2] - 3:17,	<b>shot</b> [2] - 71:25,	slide [1] - 18:23	109:11, 128:20
54:7, 55:6, 55:7,	96:7	101:22	slides [3] - 6:25, 7:3,	speaks [3] - 10:9,
57:21, 57:23, 61:13,	<b>serve</b> [2] - 43:1,	<b>show</b> [15] - 15:10,	11:25	58:19, 112:10
63:11, 63:15, 64:23,	111:24	15:25, 16:9, 18:17,	slightly [1] - 87:8	special [1] - 61:23
66:2, 69:3, 72:19,	Service [1] - 24:22	30:10, 41:7, 50:18,	small [1] - 14:4	specific [4] - 53:1,
73:24, 74:17, 78:6,	service [1] - 3:12	67:2, 71:22, 75:12,	smart [1] - 101:5	83:10, 83:15, 127:19
78:14, 93:7, 93:8,	services [1] - 61:23	89:1, 94:11, 95:2,	so-and-so [2] - 15:9,	<b>specifically</b> [5] - 8:2,
101:6, 104:4, 104:5,	<b>SESSION</b> [4] - 77:9,	120:8	16:8	11:19, 48:20, 61:24,
104:18, 104:19,	81:8, 105:1, 125:21	showing [2] - 32:5,	society [1] - 117:12	62:4
113:20, 115:16,	session [18] - 19:23,	52:9	<b>soft</b> [15] - 56:12,	spectrum [2] - 90:7
123:3, 128:2	25:23, 26:11, 26:21,	showmanship [1] -	56:15, 56:20, 57:12,	spectrums [1] - 64:22
seeing [2] - 69:4,	29:8, 33:25, 34:4,	111:13	57:13, 57:20, 79:6,	spelled [1] - 48:14
131:22	34:6, 35:1, 47:16,	shows [2] - 14:2,		spend [1] - 91:13
seem [4] - 54:10,	47:25, 77:5, 80:15,	18:10	82:17, 83:3, 85:7, 107:15, 108:17,	
68:16, 79:16, 129:15	84:16, 86:3, 102:18,	<b>side</b> [7] - 26:12, 36:4,		spending [1] - 97:10
sees [2] - 17:10, 17:11	130:12, 131:1	64:11, 64:21, 75:24,	110:16, 126:4	<b>spent</b> [4] - 41:14,
segmented [1] - 54:23	sessions [11] - 26:18,	101:22, 109:13	<b>solely</b> [2] - 17:9, 84:17	77:23, 100:14
select [1] - 81:10	26:24, 27:2, 27:3,	sided [1] - 75:19	<b>solo</b> [1] - 64:10	<b>spin</b> [1] - 88:16
selection [1] - 79:10	27:7, 29:12, 38:6,	sides [3] - 45:19,	<b>solution</b> [2] - 76:6,	spins [1] - 88:17
<b>Senate</b> [28] - 8:20,	80:10, 81:1, 128:1,	77:24, 123:24	113:4	spirit [1] - 53:19
10:11, 12:2, 21:20,	130:23	sideways [1] - 102:1	solutions [1] - 44:16	<b>split</b> [5] - 34:10, 39:19,
28:3, 28:23, 32:19,	set [17] - 6:19, 9:8,	sight [1] - 52:24	<b>someone</b> [6] - 63:2,	54:11, 78:10, 79:17
35:19, 36:9, 36:18,	12:14, 21:20, 22:4,	• • • •	109:1, 110:3, 115:7,	<b>splitting</b> [2] - 39:8,
36:19, 37:7, 37:19,		significant [1] - 51:11	115:19, 116:6	39:20
37:21, 39:14, 45:16,	23:3, 32:19, 61:25, 62:7, 90:15, 111:18,	significantly [1] -	sometimes [10] - 7:23,	<b>spoken</b> [1] - 46:3
47:9, 49:6, 49:19,	114:25, 116:18,	89:24	19:4, 30:16, 31:9,	spokenly [1] - 129:18
50:4, 50:7, 50:19,		similar [1] - 76:2	31:11, 58:5, 68:19,	spokesman [4] -
51:2, 53:6, 106:25,	117:8, 117:14,	simple [1] - 58:16	93:7, 98:10, 118:12	77:18, 78:18, 81:14,
107:1, 114:6, 121:23	123:18	<b>simply</b> [6] - 7:24,	somewhat [5] - 24:21,	128:9
send [4] - 9:12, 32:25,	sets [1] - 76:6	10:10, 10:21, 15:5,	40:21, 79:19, 80:6,	spokesperson [6] -
33:17, 79:17	<b>setting</b> [4] - 59:13,	15:7, 129:20	130:14	34:18, 78:20, 81:10,
	90:9, 91:5, 108:10	Simpson [3] - 29:11,	<b>soon</b> [1] - 87:2	102:12, 125:11,
sense [17] - 14:11, 24:11, 45:15, 45:23,	setup [1] - 19:1	29:19, 31:7	<b>sorry</b> [14] - 10:8,	125:23
	seven [2] - 14:6, 35:24	<b>SIMPSON</b> [13] - 29:13,	20:25, 25:12, 42:4,	sponsoring [1] - 3:25
48:10, 58:18, 93:14, 93:16, 103:5	several [3] - 35:20,	31:1, 31:15, 40:14,	55:23, 56:5, 65:21,	sponsors [1] - 3:18
93:16, 103:5, 102:24, 104:6	122:2, 125:25	45:6, 45:8, 54:17,	72:4, 83:1, 98:7,	spot [2] - 93:24, 96:23
103:24, 104:6,	<b>shake</b> [2] - 121:14,	107:19, 109:21,	101:11, 102:10,	<b>spun</b> [1] - 113:10
120:4, 120:20, 121:5, 123:7	121:16	110:8, 112:10,	105:4, 105:21	stable [1] - 90:1
121:5, 123:7,	share [8] - 6:22, 6:25,	113:25, 122:20	sort [21] - 7:14, 8:9,	staff [12] - 6:12, 7:15,
123:21, 128:3	7:1, 7:4, 9:16, 33:18,	simultaneous [4] -	15:13, 16:2, 18:8,	16:15, 22:19, 24:24,
Senseman [7] - 20:7,	98:11, 98:14	29:8, 95:25, 96:11,	21:9, 22:16, 28:20,	73:1, 98:10, 98:13,
20:20, 64:7, 74:17,	shared [2] - 45:20,	99:15	53:11, 61:3, 63:22,	99:14, 99:22, 130:1,
78:23, 81:20, 87:7	53:7	single [14] - 8:5, 8:24,	64:9, 66:24, 71:12,	130:16
SENSEMAN [14] -	sharing [1] - 3:11	19:23, 19:24, 47:12,	72:17, 74:14, 75:20,	staffed [1] - 26:14
20:8, 22:12, 64:6,	sharp [2] - 61:9, 74:7	47:15, 47:22, 47:24,	86:25, 87:25,	stage [3] - 19:1, 104:3,
74:18, 75:16, 81:13,	sheds [1] - 74:12	48:3, 48:5, 54:8,	102:18, 107:21	111:18
87:7, 89:15, 90:5,	SHEORAN [16] - 18:3,	54:12, 78:9, 78:11	sound [6] - 22:16,	
04 40 05 11 00 0		34.12, 70.3, 70.11	<b>Sound</b> [6] - 22.10,	stakeholders [2] -
94:16, 95:14, 96:2,	18:7, 19:10, 19:13,	sit [4] - 41:13, 45:12,	23:1, 24:2, 87:25,	stakeholders [2] - 24:6, 83:18

stand [1] - 50:17 standard [6] - 9:14, 11:15, 12:13, 83:21, 91:6, 118:3 standards [2] - 12:14, 82:7 standing [2] - 19:3, 115:25 standpoint [7] - 23:20, 28:10, 30:21, 47:11, 47:22, 51:10, 51:11 stands [1] - 82:14 start [18] - 7:10, 7:25, 10:11, 12:24, 27:22, 35:12, 35:14, 35:16, 61:23, 77:14, 81:23, 82:7, 85:1, 87:17, 88:16, 106:10, 119:5 started [5] - 3:6, 30:11, 67:11, 80:22, 82:25 starting [1] - 25:22 starts [3] - 10:24, 29:20, 45:11 State [3] - 39:14, 52:10 state [4] - 3:16, 40:8, 42:25, 44:6 state's [1] - 22:22 statement [2] - 67:17, 73:6 statements [8] - 10:7, 10:10, 10:13, 10:15, 12:4, 42:18, 82:22, 83:13 statewide [9] - 3:19, 17:23, 18:25, 21:16, 37:23, 85:3, 99:19, 114:4 statewides [1] - 24:5 station [1] - 71:18 statute [2] - 103:15 stay [2] - 26:22, 131:10 stayed [1] - 69:23 steamrolled [1] -121:2 steering [1] - 28:13 stems [1] - 71:9 step [2] - 70:24, 88:15 stepped [2] - 34:22, 71:12 stick [2] - 48:8, 83:12 sticking [1] - 121:14 still [32] - 8:10, 19:16, 20:3, 27:20, 27:23, 30:10, 30:14, 33:1, 39:18, 47:15, 47:21, 47:24, 48:5, 48:21, 66:18, 72:8, 86:3,

86:5, 87:1, 95:19, 96:7, 97:25, 98:20, 98:23, 102:15, 107:23, 108:2, 117:22, 126:5 stock [1] - 9:14 stop [7] - 47:10, 79:8, 79:11, 82:20, 88:25, 90:17, 98:1 stops [1] - 80:24 stream [1] - 26:24 streamed [2] - 26:24, 27:5 streaming [1] - 9:20 street [1] - 115:14 strict [5] - 11:4, 60:5, 61:1, 62:7, 115:18 strictly [1] - 85:6 stringent [1] - 68:6 strong [15] - 56:19, 56:21, 58:20, 58:22, 59:14, 59:20, 59:21, 62:12, 64:16, 64:17, 64:18, 93:3, 111:17, 123:24, 129:9 stronger [1] - 111:3 strongly [1] - 43:7 struck [2] - 45:20, 92:21 structure [28] - 6:20, 12:7, 23:7, 23:22, 24:3, 24:7, 24:14, 27:8, 35:8, 38:2, 38:10, 85:12, 89:22, 90:15, 105:6, 109:12, 109:18, 109:20. 114:1. 114:20, 120:25, 121:14, 126:6, 127:11, 127:14, 128:15 structured [2] - 91:4, 126:17 structuring [2] -25:24, 35:2 struggling [1] - 66:1 stuck [2] - 90:11, 108:4 studies [1] - 67:2 study [1] - 130:1 stuff [5] - 46:12, 48:8, 68:19, 89:8, 106:3 stupid [1] - 94:22 style [10] - 11:4, 11:8, 68:4, 68:5, 68:7, 69:1, 69:5, 82:21, 83:6, 113:15 subject [6] - 53:4, 53:17, 70:7, 72:13, 84:1, 99:20

subject-matter [2] -53:4, 84:1 submissions [1] -99:9 submit [7] - 93:21, 93:23, 95:22, 96:15, 98:4, 100:21, 100:25 submitted [1] - 99:6 submitting [2] - 99:22, 99:24 substantive [2] -98:21, 99:1 success [2] - 90:15, 112:20 successful [2] - 4:25, 5:4 suggesting [2] - 66:3, 99:25 suggestion [3] -22:15, 64:7, 117:5 suggestions [1] -129:25 summarize [1] - 53:20 Sundays [1] - 7:22 super [1] - 77:4 Superintendent [1] -37:21 support [13] - 21:2, 21:18, 53:25, 61:19, 61:21, 61:22, 62:3, 76:21, 77:21, 78:9, 108:12, 109:18 supporting [3] - 46:1, 54:11, 78:10 supportive [1] - 35:18 supposed [6] - 55:23, 92:11, 94:1, 97:22, 116:24, 117:17 swagger [1] - 57:1 swear [2] - 81:15, 100:13 synonym [1] - 88:14 System [1] - 130:15 system [7] - 44:5, 44:10, 44:15, 75:17, 76:9, 88:18, 106:22 т table [2] - 50:12, 73:15 tables [1] - 32:6 talented [1] - 64:10 Tara [6] - 38:4, 42:3, 42:4, 43:16, 46:20, 47:6 targets [1] - 60:14 team [1] - 125:11 technical [43] - 21:2, 21:14, 26:12, 34:16, 40:25, 48:4, 49:2,

66:23, 66:25, 67:2, 67:3, 67:4, 67:6, 67:10, 67:12, 67:15, 67:16, 67:17, 67:21, 67:24, 67:25, 71:7, 71:13, 71:15, 71:16, 71:19, 71:22, 95:20, 105:22, 106:5, 106:19, 106:22, 106:24, 107:1, 107:3, 107:4, 120:3, 120:19, 120:21, 120:22, 126:16 technicals [1] - 23:2 technol [1] - 32:14 technology [3] - 22:4, 31:25, 32:14 ten [3] - 13:10, 30:17, 39.19 tend [3] - 39:24, 40:1, 99:20 tends [1] - 37:11 tenuous [2] - 24:21, 130:14 term [1] - 126:16 terms [11] - 19:14, 39:1, 63:11, 66:5, 69:14, 69:20, 76:6, 79:17, 121:23, 122:4, 126:7 terrible [1] - 97:16 text [1] - 9:8 textbook [1] - 113:16 thankfully [1] - 12:14 THE [1] - 56:5 the.. [1] - 107:6 theatre [1] - 32:6 theme [1] - 128:14 themes [2] - 23:8, 97:8 themselves [7] - 39:3, 86:22, 87:20, 87:23, 91:11, 95:3, 96:6 theoretically [1] -118:5 therefore [1] - 73:12 they've [4] - 21:9, 72:11, 72:15 thinking [11] - 36:5, 44:5, 45:19, 52:13, 74:15, 79:22, 111:17, 116:14, 116:20, 116:21, 131:10 third [2] - 71:24, 79:13 thirty [2] - 47:15, 118:2 thirty-minutes [1] -47:15 thoughtful [4] - 53:16,

74:3, 76:4, 79:25 thoughts [9] - 11:20, 20:15, 53:25, 58:17, 77:21, 106:4, 106:13, 113:24, 115:17 three [14] - 13:9, 13:20, 14:4, 14:5, 19:15, 40:16, 58:13, 72:13, 85:16, 96:15, 97:15, 105:19, 106:2 throes [1] - 38:20 throughout [2] - 9:13, 129:1 throw [2] - 28:11, 63:12 thrown [1] - 94:21 Thursday [1] - 31:3 tick [1] - 122:14 tight [2] - 61:8, 74:7 tightly [1] - 111:4 time-management [1] - 11:14 timekeeper [1] - 10:20 timelines [2] - 61:8, 62.8 timelines/not [1] -62:8 timing [5] - 20:15, 21:25, 27:22, 60:5, 79:20 to.. [1] - 66:18 today [5] - 3:8, 26:6, 73:10, 111:21, 131:18 together [10] - 36:24, 44:2, 49:8, 49:19, 49:20, 52:2, 66:6, 77:11, 78:6, 125:22 Tom [11] - 15:19, 25:3, 26:14, 65:20, 68:1, 71:3, 72:24, 109:3, 109:4, 122:25 ton [1] - 68:15 tonight [1] - 50:21 tonight's [1] - 18:21 took [2] - 94:23 tool [2] - 22:18, 111:6 top [4] - 24:1, 79:4, 79:6, 95:3 topic [5] - 61:24, 62:17, 83:12, 83:20, 127:18 topics [14] - 39:11, 54:3, 55:18, 76:18, 78:1, 79:4, 80:7, 83:15, 83:16, 92:4, 92:15, 93:16, 93:21, 125:25 TORGESON [15] -

14:8, 15:21, 65:5,	Tulemello [3] - 49:17,	underscores [1] -	variety [1] - 90:24	119:24, 120:5,
65:9, 65:12, 71:24,	119:10, 121:18	123:25	variety [1] - 30.24 vary [1] - 13:15	121:24, 122:11,
72:1, 72:4, 85:7,	tune [4] - 9:21, 48:6,	understood [1] -	varying [2] - 53:24,	124:16
86:1, 86:3, 86:6,	63:12, 122:23	25:16	77:20	<b>Voter</b> [1] - 6:14
87:6, 88:11, 88:22	<b>turn</b> [6] - 6:14, 10:5,	unfortunately [2] -	<b>vein</b> [2] - 109:17,	voters [41] - 3:13,
<b>Torgeson</b> [3] - 14:18,	86:20, 89:14, 91:5,	67:5, 116:8		3:15, 3:23, 9:6, 9:21,
16:11, 83:1	117:20		112:23	10:4, 11:6, 12:3,
		unification [1] - 76:5	vendors [3] - 7:15,	
total [3] - 54:8, 78:8, 86:20	turnaround [1] - 28:18	uninterrupted [2] -	33:8, 33:11	15:7, 15:11, 23:17, 23:18, 24:7, 24:9,
	turned [1] - 102:14	15:11, 16:1	verbal [1] - 21:12	24:13, 39:7, 43:4,
totally [1] - 55:8	turnout [3] - 87:13,	unless [5] - 7:2, 26:21,	verbatim [1] - 62:21	
touch [2] - 102:19, 124:10	89:24, 127:13	45:23, 46:23, 97:16	<b>verify</b> [1] - 25:5	43:6, 44:1, 44:14, 48:7, 53:9, 54:6,
-	<b>TV</b> [2] - 93:8, 120:12	unlikely [1] - 121:1	<b>versus</b> [6] - 38:11,	48.7, 53.9, 54.0, 64:18, 65:4, 74:8,
tough [3] - 94:3, 94:4,	<b>twice</b> [3] - 39:16,	unmute [3] - 89:3,	38:14, 68:5, 72:22,	75:25, 78:5, 79:25,
95:11	39:17	89:7, 89:14	113:23, 125:1	80:1, 86:23, 88:9,
toward [1] - 114:2	<b>two</b> [65] - 7:3, 10:2,	unmuted [1] - 89:10	<b>VI</b> [3] - 80:13, 80:14	92:25, 102:4,
towards [3] - 39:7,	10:16, 11:1, 11:17,	unwatchable [1] -	viable [1] - 17:19	120:15, 122:23,
44:4, 121:15	13:20, 13:21, 14:4,	122:12	<b>view</b> [3] - 27:1, 66:21,	123:1, 123:4,
town [2] - 31:10, 32:1	14:5, 15:23, 15:24,	unwillingness [1] -	67:9	124:11, 129:2,
track [2] - 21:25, 40:6	20:22, 26:2, 26:13,	131:4	viewed [1] - 75:19	124.11, 129.2, 129:10
tracking [1] - 85:18	34:10, 37:11, 41:15,	<b>up</b> [86] - 6:19, 9:8,	viewer [5] - 51:11,	
tradeoffs [1] - 119:25	41:19, 41:20, 45:10,	10:21, 10:25, 13:3,	91:21, 91:24,	Voters [1] - 18:5 voters/the [1] - 8:10
tradition [1] - 3:25	45:12, 46:24, 47:3,	13:14, 13:25, 14:2,	103:24, 119:19	
traditional [3] - 15:1,	47:8, 47:14, 48:15,	15:10, 15:25, 16:9,	viewers [3] - 56:23,	<b>voting</b> [4] - 3:16, 7:10,
15:16, 15:24	50:18, 53:20, 58:12,	16:18, 18:10, 18:17,	93:12, 102:6	29:20, 73:22
train [1] - 67:24	60:21, 62:13, 62:21,	19:11, 21:5, 21:7,	viewership [3] - 69:6,	vulgar [1] - 98:13
trained [1] - 125:5	62:22, 64:14, 64:25,	22:15, 23:3, 26:4,	93:2, 103:11	14/
transparency [3] -	65:1, 65:3, 65:7,	26:6, 27:11, 29:5,	viewing [2] - 11:25,	W
112:24, 122:2,	65:8, 65:17, 65:23,	29:22, 30:10, 31:21,	26:23	wait [4] - 28:17, 70:24,
128:25	65:24, 66:3, 68:10,	32:5, 33:5, 34:22,	views [1] - 67:13	115:10, 115:20
treated [2] - 89:20,	68:17, 69:15, 70:14,	35:6, 35:19, 35:23,	<b>VII</b> [1] - 129:23	walk [1] - 124:1
117:15	70:19, 72:7, 72:22,	37:12, 38:3, 38:12,	<b>VIII</b> [1] - 131:17	walking [1] - 115:14
trouble [1] - 107:25	78:16, 85:14, 85:15,	39:8, 41:7, 41:16,	violatos (4) 07.17	
	00.4 100.10 104.7		violates [1] - 97:17	
true [17] - 9:5, 11:24,	89:4, 100:12, 104:7,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18,	virtually [1] - 18:15	wandering [1] - 38:9
68:4, 68:6, 69:1,	109:22, 112:15,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25,		wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20,	virtually [1] - 18:15	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 <b>types</b> [1] - 20:22	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] -	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 <b>types</b> [1] - 20:22 <b>typical</b> [1] - 113:16	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 <b>types</b> [1] - 20:22 <b>typical</b> [1] - 113:16 <b>typically</b> [4] - 33:14,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11 vote [12] - 40:12,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4,	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ \end{tabular}$	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 <b>types</b> [1] - 20:22 <b>typical</b> [1] - 113:16 <b>typically</b> [4] - 33:14,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16,	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14,} \\ voi$	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 <b>types</b> [1] - 20:22 <b>typical</b> [1] - 113:16 <b>typically</b> [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, \\ 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, \\ 125:16 \\ \mbox{voted [1] - 96:20} \\ \end{tabular}$	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 <b>ups</b> [1] - 36:5	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, \\ 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, \\ 125:16 \\ \mbox{vote [1] - 96:20} \\ \mbox{voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4,} \\ \end{tabular}$	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2,
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 <b>ups</b> [1] - 36:5 <b>useful</b> [1] - 103:14	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, \\ 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, \\ 125:16 \\ \mbox{voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4,} \\ 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4,} \\ 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volumeered [1] - } \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 10:15:14} \\ \mbox{visually [1] - 10:15:14} \\ $	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U U.S [1] - 21:20	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 <b>ups</b> [1] - 36:5	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] -} \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, \\ 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, \\ 125:16 \\ \mbox{voted [1] - 96:20} \\ \mbox{voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4,} \\ 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, \\ 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, \\ visual provided in the set of t$	<pre>wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9 wave [1] - 5:11</pre>
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U U.S [1] - 21:20 ultimately [2] - 33:1,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 ups [1] - 36:5 useful [1] - 103:14 uses [1] - 88:21	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, \\ 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, \\ 125:16 \\ \mbox{voted [1] - 96:20} \\ \mbox{voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4,} \\ 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, \\ 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, \\ 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, \\ visual product of the set of t$	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9 wave [1] - 5:11 wayside [1] - 66:24
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trust [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11, 105:15	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U U.S [1] - 21:20 ultimately [2] - 33:1, 88:8	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 <b>ups</b> [1] - 36:5 <b>useful</b> [1] - 103:14	$\label{eq:virtually [1] - 18:15} \\ \mbox{visual [6] - 10:18,} \\ 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, \\ 22:3, 107:21 \\ \mbox{visually [3] - 11:24,} \\ 18:23, 21:25 \\ \mbox{voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3,} \\ 109:17 \\ \mbox{voices [1] - 105:14} \\ \mbox{volunteered [1] - } \\ 81:11 \\ \mbox{vote [12] - 40:12,} \\ 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, \\ 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, \\ 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, \\ 125:16 \\ \mbox{voted [1] - 96:20} \\ \mbox{voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4,} \\ 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, \\ 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, \\ 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, \\ 38:13, 43:9, 43:24, \\ \end{tabular}$	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9 wave [1] - 5:11 wayside [1] - 66:24 weakness [1] - 101:3
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11, 105:15 Tuesday [4] - 8:16,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U U.S [1] - 21:20 ultimately [2] - 33:1, 88:8 unable [1] - 3:8	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 ups [1] - 36:5 useful [1] - 103:14 uses [1] - 88:21	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11 vote [12] - 40:12, 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, 125:16 voted [1] - 96:20 voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4, 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, 38:13, 43:9, 43:24, 44:4, 45:12, 50:12,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9 wave [1] - 5:11 wayside [1] - 66:24 weakness [1] - 101:3 Wednesday [1] - 31:3
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11, 105:15 Tuesday [4] - 8:16, 28:1, 31:2	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U U.S [1] - 21:20 ultimately [2] - 33:1, 88:8 unable [1] - 3:8 unacceptable [1] -	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 ups [1] - 36:5 useful [1] - 103:14 uses [1] - 88:21 V valuable [3] - 3:12,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11 vote [12] - 40:12, 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, 125:16 voted [1] - 96:20 voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4, 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, 38:13, 43:9, 43:24, 44:4, 45:12, 50:12, 69:2, 69:3, 86:11,	wandering [1] - $38:9$ wants [9] - $35:13$ , 61:12, $64:24$ , $83:5$ , 89:6, $107:18$ , 109:23, $125:11watch [17] - 39:24,40:1$ , $41:19$ , $41:20$ , 41:21, $45:12$ , $45:13$ , 51:14, $51:17$ , $52:1$ , 52:2, $52:18$ , $71:18$ , 78:15 watched [2] - $68:14$ , 69:25 watching [10] - $10:17$ , 10:18, $15:9$ , $50:1$ , 50:5, $51:21$ , $52:5$ , 77:2, $124:13$ , $129:2water [4] - 83:19, 84:2,91:14$ , $93:9wave [1] - 5:11wayside [1] - 66:24weakness [1] - 101:3Wednesday [1] - 31:3week [4] - 3:8, 29:25,$
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 truste [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11, 105:15 Tuesday [4] - 8:16, 28:1, 31:2 TULEMELLO [7] -	$109:22, 112:15, \\114:22, 114:23, \\129:21$ <b>two-hour</b> [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 <b>two-minute</b> [1] - 89:4 <b>type</b> [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 <b>types</b> [1] - 20:22 <b>typical</b> [1] - 113:16 <b>typically</b> [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 <b>U U U.S</b> [1] - 21:20 <b>ultimately</b> [2] - 33:1, 88:8 <b>unable</b> [1] - 3:8 <b>unacceptable</b> [1] - 118:19	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 ups [1] - 36:5 useful [1] - 103:14 uses [1] - 88:21 V valuable [3] - 3:12, 51:3, 119:19	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11 vote [12] - 40:12, 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, 125:16 voted [1] - 96:20 voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4, 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, 38:13, 43:9, 43:24, 44:4, 45:12, 50:12, 69:2, 69:3, 86:11, 97:9, 100:16,	wandering [1] - $38:9$ wants [9] - $35:13$ , 61:12, $64:24$ , $83:5$ , 89:6, $107:18$ , 109:23, $125:11watch [17] - 39:24,40:1$ , $41:19$ , $41:20$ , 41:21, $45:12$ , $45:13$ , 51:14, $51:17$ , $52:1$ , 52:2, $52:18$ , $71:18$ , 78:15 watched [2] - $68:14$ , 69:25 watching [10] - $10:17$ , 10:18, $15:9$ , $50:1$ , 50:5, $51:21$ , $52:5$ , 77:2, $124:13$ , $129:2water [4] - 83:19, 84:2,91:14$ , $93:9wave [1] - 5:11wayside [1] - 66:24weakness [1] - 101:3Wednesday [1] - 31:3week [4] - 3:8, 29:25,30:1$ , $131:18$
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 truste [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11, 105:15 Tuesday [4] - 8:16, 28:1, 31:2 TULEMELLO [7] - 49:4, 49:10, 49:14,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U U.S [1] - 21:20 ultimately [2] - 33:1, 88:8 unable [1] - 3:8 unacceptable [1] - 118:19 uncivil [1] - 42:15	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 ups [1] - 36:5 useful [1] - 103:14 uses [1] - 88:21 <b>V</b> valuable [3] - 3:12, 51:3, 119:19 value [2] - 102:5,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11 vote [12] - 40:12, 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, 125:16 voted [1] - 96:20 voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4, 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, 38:13, 43:9, 43:24, 44:4, 45:12, 50:12, 69:2, 69:3, 86:11, 97:9, 100:16, 107:16, 113:19,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9 wave [1] - $5:11$ wayside [1] - $66:24$ weakness [1] - $101:3$ Wednesday [1] - $31:3$ week [4] - $3:8, 29:25,$ 30:1, 131:18 weekends [1] - $30:4$
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 truste [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11, 105:15 Tuesday [4] - 8:16, 28:1, 31:2 TULEMELLO [7] - 49:4, 49:10, 49:14, 49:24, 51:25, 52:7,	$109:22, 112:15, \\114:22, 114:23, \\129:21$ two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 $U$ U.S [1] - 21:20 ultimately [2] - 33:1, 88:8 unable [1] - 3:8 unacceptable [1] - 118:19 uncivil [1] - 42:15 under [3] - 40:19,	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 ups [1] - 36:5 useful [1] - 103:14 uses [1] - 88:21 Valuable [3] - 3:12, 51:3, 119:19 value [2] - 102:5, 123:25	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11 vote [12] - 40:12, 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, 125:16 voted [1] - 96:20 voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4, 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, 38:13, 43:9, 43:24, 44:4, 45:12, 50:12, 69:2, 69:3, 86:11, 97:9, 100:16, 107:16, 113:19, 113:20, 113:21,	<pre>wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9 wave [1] - 5:11 wayside [1] - 66:24 weakness [1] - 101:3 Wednesday [1] - 31:3 week [4] - 3:8, 29:25, 30:1, 131:18 weekends [1] - 30:4 weigh [3] - 102:22,</pre>
68:4, 68:6, 69:1, 69:4, 75:15, 82:20, 83:6, 110:2, 113:15, 113:21, 113:23, 114:2, 114:7 truly [1] - 57:22 truste [1] - 76:9 trusted [1] - 64:11 try [16] - 7:9, 7:17, 31:13, 33:14, 33:19, 45:12, 50:12, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 66:5, 68:22, 68:24, 105:10, 110:4, 129:20 trying [14] - 11:15, 40:11, 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, 50:2, 61:5, 70:25, 93:1, 98:19, 103:10, 103:11, 105:15 Tuesday [4] - 8:16, 28:1, 31:2 TULEMELLO [7] - 49:4, 49:10, 49:14,	109:22, 112:15, 114:22, 114:23, 129:21 two-hour [3] - 45:10, 47:8, 78:16 two-minute [1] - 89:4 type [10] - 15:16, 57:20, 63:18, 64:3, 70:16, 70:17, 70:20, 70:22, 71:7 types [1] - 20:22 typical [1] - 113:16 typically [4] - 33:14, 99:21, 102:11, 109:21 U U.S [1] - 21:20 ultimately [2] - 33:1, 88:8 unable [1] - 3:8 unacceptable [1] - 118:19 uncivil [1] - 42:15	45:25, 48:19, 50:18, 51:9, 52:9, 61:25, 62:7, 62:12, 68:20, 70:17, 74:11, 74:17, 75:12, 75:21, 82:18, 83:5, 83:14, 85:19, 85:21, 87:20, 89:6, 90:10, 90:15, 91:23, 93:6, 93:10, 93:13, 95:23, 96:6, 98:1, 100:1, 101:6, 101:24, 108:10, 108:11, 109:1, 113:18, 120:8, 123:18, 125:4, 126:9, 127:16, 127:18, 128:6 ups [1] - 36:5 useful [1] - 103:14 uses [1] - 88:21 <b>V</b> valuable [3] - 3:12, 51:3, 119:19 value [2] - 102:5,	virtually [1] - 18:15 visual [6] - 10:18, 18:16, 19:8, 21:21, 22:3, 107:21 visually [3] - 11:24, 18:23, 21:25 voice [3] - 71:25, 72:3, 109:17 voices [1] - 105:14 volunteered [1] - 81:11 vote [12] - 40:12, 42:19, 44:2, 45:17, 50:2, 50:3, 51:2, 51:3, 96:19, 98:22, 125:16 voted [1] - 96:20 voter [34] - 5:1, 5:4, 7:10, 7:20, 9:25, 11:1, 17:10, 17:11, 17:15, 20:1, 30:14, 38:13, 43:9, 43:24, 44:4, 45:12, 50:12, 69:2, 69:3, 86:11, 97:9, 100:16, 107:16, 113:19,	wandering [1] - 38:9 wants [9] - 35:13, 61:12, 64:24, 83:5, 89:6, 107:18, 109:23, 125:11 watch [17] - 39:24, 40:1, 41:19, 41:20, 41:21, 45:12, 45:13, 51:14, 51:17, 52:1, 52:2, 52:18, 71:18, 78:15 watched [2] - 68:14, 69:25 watching [10] - 10:17, 10:18, 15:9, 50:1, 50:5, 51:21, 52:5, 77:2, 124:13, 129:2 water [4] - 83:19, 84:2, 91:14, 93:9 wave [1] - $5:11$ wayside [1] - $66:24$ weakness [1] - $101:3$ Wednesday [1] - $31:3$ week [4] - $3:8, 29:25,$ 30:1, 131:18 weekends [1] - $30:4$

welcome [3] - 9:23, 35:5, 48:21	X
whatsoever [1] -	<b>XOLA</b> [62] - 55:14,
77:23	55:25, 56:8, 57:2,
whereas [3] - 82:17,	57:6, 57:8, 58:1,
100:18, 101:24	58:19, 59:6, 59:9,
whichever [1] - 51:12	59:25, 61:11, 62:10,
white [3] - 118:14,	62:16, 63:9, 63:20,
124:7, 129:14	64:23, 65:7, 65:11,
whole [7] - 41:5,	65:20, 66:19, 68:1,
63:17, 71:14, 79:20,	68:25, 69:10, 71:3, 72:18, 74:16, 75:15,
100:8, 110:25 <b>wife</b> [1] - 115:14	72.18, 74.10, 75.15, 76:12, 77:1, 78:19,
willing [1] - 81:17	78:22, 79:2, 80:3,
winig [1] - 100:10	105:2, 105:12,
wise [1] - 116:13	105:19, 106:6,
wish [5] - 26:22, 79:1,	106:8, 106:15,
82:5, 123:21, 130:5	107:5, 107:9,
withhold [1] - 98:14	108:14, 108:19,
witness [1] - 75:2	110:2, 110:10,
witnessed [1] - 130:25	111:5, 111:9, 112:9,
Women [1] - 18:4	112:22, 113:12,
women's [1] - 62:3	114:9, 114:12,
wonder [2] - 47:5,	115:4, 116:2, 118:7,
49:10	119:8, 121:17,
wondering [1] - 24:20	122:16, 123:6,
word [3] - 57:3, 71:24,	124:12, 125:9
93:18	v
worded [1] - 98:19	ľ
words [3] - 16:24,	year [5] - 33:15, 71:8,
47:21, 120:9	108:7
workgroup [3] - 65:2,	
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9	108:7
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4,	108:7 <b>year's</b> [1] - 112:21
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5	108:7 <b>year's</b> [1] - 112:21 <b>years</b> [6] - 42:12,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] -
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Z
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Z Zoom [9] - 9:20,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup $[3] - 65:2,$ 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup $[4] - 3:4,$ 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works $[3] - 32:1,$ 44:18, 56:20 world $[3] - 63:12,$ 94:20, 117:24 worried $[2] - 65:24,$ 66:4 worry $[1] - 122:8$ worth $[2] - 73:4, 97:10$ Wow $[1] - 94:22$ wow $[3] - 16:8, 55:2,$ 58:12 wrap $[6] - 10:25, 21:5,$ 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped $[1] - 29:22$	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped [1] - 29:22 wrestling [1] - 67:20	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped [1] - 29:22 wrestling [1] - 67:20 write [5] - 17:6, 17:17,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped [1] - 29:22 wrestling [1] - 67:20 write [5] - 17:6, 17:17, 17:19, 17:20, 91:24	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped [1] - 29:22 wrestling [1] - 67:20 write [5] - 17:6, 17:17, 17:19, 17:20, 91:24 write-in [2] - 17:6,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup $[3] - 65:2,$ 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup $[4] - 3:4,$ 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works $[3] - 32:1,$ 44:18, 56:20 world $[3] - 63:12,$ 94:20, 117:24 worried $[2] - 65:24,$ 66:4 worry $[1] - 122:8$ worth $[2] - 73:4, 97:10$ Wow $[1] - 94:22$ wow $[3] - 16:8, 55:2,$ 58:12 wrap $[6] - 10:25, 21:5,$ 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped $[1] - 29:22$ wrestling $[1] - 67:20$ write $[5] - 17:6, 17:17,$ 17:19, 17:20, 91:24 write-in $[2] - 17:6,$ 17:20	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup $[3] - 65:2,$ 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup $[4] - 3:4,$ 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works $[3] - 32:1,$ 44:18, 56:20 world $[3] - 63:12,$ 94:20, 117:24 worried $[2] - 65:24,$ 66:4 worry $[1] - 122:8$ worth $[2] - 73:4, 97:10$ Wow $[1] - 94:22$ wow $[3] - 16:8, 55:2,$ 58:12 wrap $[6] - 10:25, 21:5,$ 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped $[1] - 29:22$ wrestling $[1] - 67:20$ write $[5] - 17:6, 17:17,$ 17:19, 17:20, 91:24 write-in $[2] - 17:17,$	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped [1] - 29:22 wrestling [1] - 67:20 write [5] - 17:6, 17:17, 17:19, 17:20, 91:24 write-ins [2] - 17:17, 17:19	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup $[3] - 65:2,$ 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup $[4] - 3:4,$ 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works $[3] - 32:1,$ 44:18, 56:20 world $[3] - 63:12,$ 94:20, 117:24 worried $[2] - 65:24,$ 66:4 worry $[1] - 122:8$ worth $[2] - 73:4, 97:10$ Wow $[1] - 94:22$ wow $[3] - 16:8, 55:2,$ 58:12 wrap $[6] - 10:25, 21:5,$ 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped $[1] - 29:22$ wrestling $[1] - 67:20$ write $[5] - 17:6, 17:17,$ 17:19, 17:20, 91:24 write-in $[2] - 17:17,$	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,
workgroup [3] - 65:2, 77:4, 105:9 Workgroup [4] - 3:4, 4:17, 5:2, 6:5 works [3] - 32:1, 44:18, 56:20 world [3] - 63:12, 94:20, 117:24 worried [2] - 65:24, 66:4 worry [1] - 122:8 worth [2] - 73:4, 97:10 Wow [1] - 94:22 wow [3] - 16:8, 55:2, 58:12 wrap [6] - 10:25, 21:5, 21:7, 34:7, 82:18, 89:6 wrapped [1] - 29:22 wrestling [1] - 67:20 write [5] - 17:6, 17:17, 17:19, 17:20, 91:24 write-ins [2] - 17:17, 17:19 writen [2] - 92:2,	108:7 year's [1] - 112:21 years [6] - 42:12, 46:16, 60:25, 106:20, 109:12 YellowSheet [1] - 52:17 you-all's [1] - 62:23 YouTube [6] - 9:20, 11:25, 18:24, 26:24, 26:25, 81:4 Zoom [9] - 9:20, 20:23, 26:20, 47:12, 47:16, 117:25,