THE STATE OF ARIZONA

CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

## REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

Phoenix, Arizona September 11, 2014 9:42 a.m.

Reported By:

Angela Furniss Miller, RPR Certified Reporter (AZ 50127)

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

	2		
1	A PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE CITIZENS CLEAN		3
2 3	ELECTIONS COMMISSION, convened at 9:42 a.m. on September	1	PROCEEDING
4	11, 2014, at the State of Arizona, Clean Elections Commission, 1616 W. Adams, Conference Room, Phoenix,	2	
5	Arizona, in the presence of the following Board members:	3	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: We'll call the
6 7	Mr. Timothy Reckart, Chairperson	4	September 11th, 2014, Clean Elections Arizona Citizens
8	Mr. Louis Hoffman Mr. Thomas J. Koester	5	Clean Elections Commission meeting to order. Just to
	Mr. Steve Titla	6	note, this is a day for us to remember with with great
9	OTHERS PRESENT:	7	respect and sorrow for those that passed 13 years ago.
10	UTHERS FRESENT.	8	Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.02, notice is hereby
11	Thomas M. Collins, Executive Director Paula Thomas, Executive Assistant	9	given to the Commissioners notice is hereby given that
	Sara Larsen, Financial Affairs Coordinator	10	there will be this is a general public meeting of the
12	Gina Roberts, Voter Education Manager Christopher Munns, Solicitor General's office	11	Citizens Clean Elections Commission. We may vote to go
13	Steve Clawson, Moses Anshell	12	into executive session, which will not be open to the
14	Jason Torchinsky, LFAF (Telephonic) Brian Bergin, LFAF	13	public, for the purpose of obtaining legal advice on any
	Mike Liburdi, Snell & Wilmer	14	item listed on the agenda, pursuant to A.R.S.
15	Mary O'Grady, Osborn Maledon Joseph Kanefield, Ballard Spahr, LLP	15	4-38-431.03(A)(3).
16	Howie Fisher, Associated Press	16	The Commission reserves the right at its
17	Michael Becker, Governor's Office Nancy Read, Office of the Secretary of State	17	discretion to address the agenda matters in an order
10	Rob Ellman, Solicitor General's Office	18	different than outlined below in the agenda.
18	Paula Bickett, Solicitor General's Office Lisa Hauser, Gammage & Burnham	19	Okay. With that, let's get moving. I apologize
19	Dennis Wilenchik, Wilenchik & Bartness Patricia Koester, Citizen	20	for my tardiness and thank you for your indulgence. I
20	Thomas Ryan, Law office of Thomas M. Ryan	21	seem to always be overly optimistic on my ability to
21	Jeremy Duda, Capitol Times Steve Lemon, New Times	22	transverse the Tucson-Phoenix I-10 corridor.
	Steve Lemon, New Times	23	So with that, discussion and possible action on
22 23		24	the Commission minutes of the August 21st, 2014, meeting.
24		25	By the way, I note that Commissioner Laird is not
25	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	4		5
1	here. So, we have four, so we do have a quorum, but he	1	will be attended by all four candidates who are on the
2	will not be joining us either live or by telephone.	2	general election ballot. And we are also working with the
3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I move that we	3	O'Connor House on their "Debate Watch Arizona" effort to
4	approve the minutes of the August 21st, 2014 meeting.	4	encourage voters to participate watching the debate; and
5	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I have a motion for	5	then, of course, obviously, that's part of an effort that
6	approval of the minutes. Is there a second?	6	we have as an ongoing basis to educate voters for the
7	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, second.	7	purpose of having them participate in elections.
8			purpose of flaving them participate in elections.
9	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla, thank	8	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for,
	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla, thank you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on	8 9	
10			I also wanted to single out or, briefly for,
10 11	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on	9	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has
	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it.	9 10	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been
11	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes,	9 10 11	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the
11 12	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye."	9 10 11 12	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually
11 12 13	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye."	9 10 11 12 13	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last
11 12 13 14	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.)	9 10 11 12 13 14	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately
11 12 13 14 15	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm
11 12 13 14 15 16	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that,
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you. The discussion of the Executive Director's	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that, you know, she has taken on a great deal of responsibility,
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you. The discussion of the Executive Director's report. Mr. Collins, if you would, please.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that, you know, she has taken on a great deal of responsibility, has helped us to keep the Commission on track in terms of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you. The discussion of the Executive Director's report. Mr. Collins, if you would, please. MR. COLLINS: Chairman Reckart, Members, I don't	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that, you know, she has taken on a great deal of responsibility, has helped us to keep the Commission on track in terms of both campaign finance matters and our internal financial
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you. The discussion of the Executive Director's report. Mr. Collins, if you would, please. MR. COLLINS: Chairman Reckart, Members, I don't want to I know we have a lot of business on the agenda.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that, you know, she has taken on a great deal of responsibility, has helped us to keep the Commission on track in terms of both campaign finance matters and our internal financial matters. So, we're really thrilled about that.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you. The discussion of the Executive Director's report. Mr. Collins, if you would, please. MR. COLLINS: Chairman Reckart, Members, I don't want to I know we have a lot of business on the agenda. I do want to just note that our general election debates	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that, you know, she has taken on a great deal of responsibility, has helped us to keep the Commission on track in terms of both campaign finance matters and our internal financial matters. So, we're really thrilled about that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Congratulations,
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you. The discussion of the Executive Director's report. Mr. Collins, if you would, please. MR. COLLINS: Chairman Reckart, Members, I don't want to I know we have a lot of business on the agenda. I do want to just note that our general election debates have begun and that those are available on our YouTube	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that, you know, she has taken on a great deal of responsibility, has helped us to keep the Commission on track in terms of both campaign finance matters and our internal financial matters. So, we're really thrilled about that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Congratulations, Sara.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you. Mr. Hoffman, thank you. I will ask for a vote on it. All those in favor of approving the minutes, please indicate by saying "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It carries unanimously. Thank you. The discussion of the Executive Director's report. Mr. Collins, if you would, please. MR. COLLINS: Chairman Reckart, Members, I don't want to I know we have a lot of business on the agenda. I do want to just note that our general election debates have begun and that those are available on our YouTube channel. We are now providing closed captioning of videos	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I also wanted to single out or, briefly for, you know, that that Sara Larsen, who you-all know has been her title for the past several years has been campaign finance manager, but in recognition of the enhanced role and and that she has been she actually has been playing for the since for, really, the last year, we we finally have her promoted and appropriately titled as financial affairs coordinator. And we're I'm very pleased with that, and I think it recognizes that, you know, she has taken on a great deal of responsibility, has helped us to keep the Commission on track in terms of both campaign finance matters and our internal financial matters. So, we're really thrilled about that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Congratulations, Sara. MR. COLLINS: So, you can see the other

	6	1	7
1	enhance that to ensure that we're covering the other	1	MR. COLLINS: Yes, sir.
2	materials that are out there. One of the things that	2	COMMISSIONER TITLA: And I wonder if there was
	6	3	
3	we've talked about in the past is the fact that you have		any follow up on that. And I would like to recommend
4	multiple voter education opportunities throughout the	4	that, you know, we go to some radio stations in our area.
5	State. We have worked to ensure that the candidate	5	And maybe the rest of the Commissioners can do that within
6	statement pamphlet will include materials on how voters	6	their respective areas.
7	can find out about statewide ballot propositions and merit	7	MR. COLLINS: Sure.
8	selection, which are things that are contained in a	8	COMMISSIONER TITLA: But I'm from Eastern
9	separate pamphlet, but that corresponds with time and	9	Arizona, and I know that in Globe, Arizona, they have a
10	mailing. So, we're we've we think that that's an	10	radio station called KIKO, K-I-K-O. I don't know the
11	additional additional material that helps make the	11	numbers right offhand.
12	candidate statement pamphlet a a better tool for	12	But on that station, they have a program called
13	voters.	13	"Open Line," where different people appear for an hour, I
14	I don't want to I guess I won't go over	14	think, and the they're interviewed about certain areas
15	everything. That's that's the highlights. If anyone	15	of interest to the public and the State. And I think that
16	has any questions, I'm happy to take them.	16	would be a good time for you and maybe I or anybody else
17	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Any questions for	17	that wants to come, to appear on that program and let the
18	Mr. Collins?	18	people know in Eastern Arizona about our program, the
19	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Mr. Chairman?	19	Clean Elections Commission. Because I think that this is
20	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, Commissioner Titla.	20	very important information that should get out to the
21	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Yeah. I'd like to express	21	general public in all areas of the State.
22	congratulations to Sara Larsen. Good job.	22	And then I think that in Safford, Arizona, that
23	Mr. Collins, with regard to voter education	23	would be another good area to do it, in Safford, because
24	outreach, remember last month we had a meeting on language	24	it's way out in Eastern Arizona. They have a sizable
25	issue.	25	population over there of people, citizens, and I think it
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	8		
	0		9
1	o would be good for them to have this information.	1	9 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla.
1		1	
	would be good for them to have this information.		MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla.
2	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we	2	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on
2 3	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small	2 3	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it
2 3 4	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an	2 3 4	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd
2 3 4 5	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this	2 3 4 5	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys
2 3 4 5 6	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information.
2 3 4 5 6 7	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on. And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on. And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations. I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would be good for them to have this information. I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on. And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations. I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that in Window Rock, Arizona also. So, I think that if we work</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on those those particular issues and without getting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that in Window Rock, Arizona also. So, I think that if we work more on this, I think that we can reach more and more</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on those those particular issues and without getting beyond the what's actually in this report, I that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that in Window Rock, Arizona also. So, I think that if we work more on this, I think that we can reach more and more citizens.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on those those particular issues and without getting beyond the what's actually in this report, I that we'll do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that in Window Rock, Arizona also. So, I think that if we work more on this, I think that we can reach more and more citizens.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on those those particular issues and without getting beyond the what's actually in this report, I that we'll do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Great. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that in Window Rock, Arizona also. So, I think that if we work more on this, I think that we can reach more and more citizens.</li> <li>Although, I think you guys are doing a good job here, but we can I think there's room for improvement.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on those those particular issues and without getting beyond the what's actually in this report, I that we'll do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Great. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that in Window Rock, Arizona also. So, I think that if we work more on this, I think that we can reach more and more citizens.</li> <li>Although, I think you guys are doing a good job here, but we can I think there's room for improvement. Thank you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on those those particular issues and without getting beyond the what's actually in this report, I that we'll do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Great. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, would you copy all of us Commissioners?
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>would be good for them to have this information.</li> <li>I don't know with whether the information we have here reaches out there. It might appear in a small blurb in the news or in the paper, but but not to an extent where, you know, the citizens would know about this law and the area that we work on.</li> <li>And then maybe some of the Indian Reservations.</li> <li>I speak Apache also, which is my first language. I'm fluent in that language. So, we could we could go into the Apache stations. In San Carlos Apache Reservation, they have a station called KYAY, K-Y-A-Y which is an Apache word, by the way. And, you know, they have open line there also where Apache-speaking people plus and other people can appear and give information to to Native Americans, whatnot. Apache has that, too.</li> <li>And I know that one of the most population, the Native tribes in the state is Navajos, and they have that in Window Rock, Arizona also. So, I think that if we work more on this, I think that we can reach more and more citizens.</li> <li>Although, I think you guys are doing a good job here, but we can I think there's room for improvement. Thank you.</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Mr</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	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Titla. Gina can give you an update about the progress on precisely those issues. And I think there is some, but it probably would be better do it at another I think we'd probably do it at another another time that you guys can coordinate getting that information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And perhaps we Commissioner Titla, you could do it, I know because we're getting into the election season, I don't want to be waiting the month. I think the the issue here is the urgency of it to get things moving, in light of the election coming up in less than two months now. MR. COLLINS: And I think yeah. I think that I think Gina will be able to provide we can provide to the Commission in an after this meeting via e-mail or whatever, an update on where we are with progress progress is being made and and on those those particular issues and without getting beyond the what's actually in this report, I that we'll do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Great. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, would you copy all of us Commissioners? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Yes, that's no problem.

	10		11
1		1	
2	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. Any other questions for Mr. Collins?	2	The thought I had today was to essentially
3	Okay. There being none, let's go to item	3	have the the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> case having been decided, to look at the recommendation that
4	Agenda Item No. IV, discussion and possible action on MUR	4	we'd made, which I had previously indicated I believed
5	14-007, Legacy Foundation Action Fund. I understand that	5	that the under the legal standard, that this was
6	Mr. Torchinsky is on the phone. Sir, is that are you	6	express advocacy, evaluate that in view of the <u>CJF</u> case
7	still there?	7	and the supplemental materials that were provided by by
8	MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes, I'm still here.	8	Mr. Torchinsky and Mr. Bergin, and then and then decide
9	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you.	9	whether or not to move ahead with that.
10	MR. TORCHINSKY: Thank you again for letting me	10	That's so, that's the substance of the memo
11	appear by telephone.	11	that's in front of you, which is my assessment of the
12	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, our pleasure.	12	how the <u>CJF</u> case works within this framework, what it
13	Mr. Collins, if you would introduce it, please.	13	says, and whether or not that changes the prior
14	MR. COLLINS: Yes. Thank you, Commissioners.	14	recommendation that I made as far as express advocacy.
15	This is a follow-up on the last I guess want to say the	15	And then because in my view it does not, I would
16	last two agenda items. We have been working through a	16	recommend moving ahead to to a reason-to-believe stage.
17	complaint that was filed respecting an advertisement in	17	The thought I would well, I think that
18	the Republican gubernatorial primary. That matter has	18	that's that kind of leaves things.
19	has essentially two components, as the agenda indicates.	19	I will men I will mention I should
20	There is a the complaint and addressing whether or not	20	mention, late this week or maybe maybe it was well,
21	there is reason to believe a violation has occurred; and	21	not I guess we are late this week. Earlier this week
22	then there is a lawsuit that's been filed by the Legacy	22	we learned that that the Committee for Justice and
23	Foundation Action Fund, which Ms. O'Grady Ms. O'Grady	23	Fairness did, in fact, file a petition for review with the
24	is serving as counsel for essentially both purposes,	24	Arizona Supreme Court that I think I want to say was
25	she's here.	25	filed on Tuesday. I have a copy of it. You you should
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	12		
	12		13
1	be aware of that.	1	13 And that would then trigger an investigation into
1 2		1 2	
	be aware of that.		And that would then trigger an investigation into
2	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor	2	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then
2 3	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason	2 3	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with
2 3 4	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't	2 3 4 5 6	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you	2 3 4 5 6 7	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that's roughly correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive administrative action with respect to the the matter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that's roughly correct. And I think that I would just amplify in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive administrative action with respect to the the matter before us, MUR 14-007. What we are simply doing is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that's roughly correct. And I think that I would just amplify in that context that the rules that we have themselves say that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive administrative action with respect to the the matter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that's roughly correct. And I think that I would just amplify in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive administrative action with respect to the the matter before us, MUR 14-007. What we are simply doing is deciding whether or not, given the facts as you've put	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that's roughly correct. And I think that I would just amplify in that context that the rules that we have themselves say that that a reason to believe is not an appealable agency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive administrative action with respect to the the matter before us, MUR 14-007. What we are simply doing is deciding whether or not, given the facts as you've put them, if they are uncontroverted as you put them in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that's roughly correct. And I think that I would just amplify in that context that the rules that we have themselves say that that a reason to believe is not an appealable agency action. So, it's it's it's, in fact, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive administrative action with respect to the the matter before us, MUR 14-007. What we are simply doing is deciding whether or not, given the facts as you've put them, if they are uncontroverted as you put them in the report, Mr. Collins, if they are uncontroverted, does that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that's roughly correct. And I think that I would just amplify in that context that the rules that we have themselves say that that a reason to believe is not an appealable agency action. So, it's it's it's, in fact, the case that the rules, by their very terms, mean that this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	be aware of that. My own view is that that doesn't factor significantly in at this point because there's no reason to believe that the that the Supreme Court will take review on that, but but that is that is also information that I thought I would share. And I don't think I have anything else unless I mean, unless you want to talk about the express advocacy issue or jump into it, however you want to CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Just before Mr. Torchinsky is given the floor. Again, just where we are procedurally MR. COLLINS: Sure. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and I think this is relevant both here and for the Horne matter, is what we are looking at is a reason-to-believe standard. We we are not making finding of fact; we are not making conclusions of law; we are not doing any definitive administrative action with respect to the the matter before us, MUR 14-007. What we are simply doing is deciding whether or not, given the facts as you've put them, if they are uncontroverted as you put them in the report, Mr. Collins, if they are uncontroverted, does that give us a reason to believe that a violation of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And that would then trigger an investigation into further matters to do further fact finding that would then be presented to the Commission for its own decision with regard to whether or not what those facts are and what the violations are, but we are not at the point of making a final determination. Is that a fair statement? MR. COLLINS: I think I think the I think it depends. I mean, I would the only and I don't the only I think that's correct. I think the question of I think the word "uncontroverted" is not quite exactly what what we mean. I think the question is what's the evidentiary standard that's hit here. It's not an issue whether or not it's controverted; it's an issue whether or not there's a reason to believe. But that's a that's something that Mary is here to can advise on, and then subsequently Joe can advise on the evidentiary standard, but I believe that's I think that I would just amplify in that context that the rules that we have themselves say that that a reason to believe is not an appealable agency action. So, it's it's it's, in fact, the case that the rules, by their very terms, mean that this is not a final determination. And and so, you know, I

	14	1	15
1		1	
	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay.		So, I just I also want to make clear on the
2	MR. COLLINS: And I and Mary is available to	2	record, which is also in the all of the written materials
3	talk about the evidentiary standard, frankly, if if		that that have that have been presented thus far,
4	that's something that you would like more more detail	4	that the evidentiary issue is not the subjective intent of
5	on.	5	the people who who frame this ad.
6	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I think there's	6	COMMISSIONER RECKART: Okay.
7	MR. COLLINS: Or to correct me if I've stated it	7	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, Mr. Chair,
8	in any way that it is going to cause anything down the	8	Mr. Collins, you would be looking into such issues as
9	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Commissioner	9	whether the ad presented the candidate in a favorable or
10	Hoffman, you had a comment?	10	unfavorable light and
11	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah, I Mr. Chairman, I	11	MR. COLLINS: I think
12	was going to analogize it to an indictment stage. It may	12	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and how it was
13	be controverted, but if there's sufficient evidence to	13	targeted, and whether the what the placement and timing
14	proceed, then we continue with the investigation and have	14	was, and whether an what the content in the ad was?
15	a 14-day period to make a finding.	15	MR. COLLINS: We would be we would be
16	MR. COLLINS: If if I may can make	16	conducting that, but and and and then we and
17	one other observation here for the for the record. As	17	then ultimately what the amount of the purchase was and
18	is indicated in my in this in the administrative	18	and and where it ran. And other ads.
19	record for this matter, the question of what that	19	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you.
20	investigation is, that investigation is not an inquiry	20	MR. COLLINS: If there were other ads that
21	into the subjective intent of the people who put together	21	that that were along those lines. But but I think
22	this ad. Okay? So, I just want I want to be clear	22	that that's I think that that's fair.
23	about that. That not that what an investigation is	23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24	depends upon what the what the factual issues you need	24	Thank you, Mr. Collins.
25	to make the legal determination here.	25	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Commissioner Koester,
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	16		17
1	16 Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions?	1	
1 2		1 2	17
	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions?		17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where
2	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No.	2	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot
2 3	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay.	2 3	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct.
2 3 4	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something,	2 3 4	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point.
2 3 4 5	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir?	2 3 4 5	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I	2 3 4 5 6	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr
2 3 4 5 6 7	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins'	2 3 4 5 6 7	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. HOFFman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> .
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> . to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right.</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> .	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> . to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding factor or, an overwhelming factor in determining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court said: This can't be; the ad itself either has another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the Wisconsin Right to Life's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding factor or, an overwhelming factor in determining whether this ad, which didn't contain any words of express	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court said: This can't be; the ad itself either has another reasonable meaning other than to vote or for or against,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding factor or, an overwhelming factor in determining whether this ad, which didn't contain any words of express advocacy, constitutes express advocacy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court said: This can't be; the ad itself either has another reasonable meaning other than to vote or for or against, or it doesn't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding factor or, an overwhelming factor in determining whether this ad, which didn't contain any words of express advocacy, constitutes express advocacy. It's it's almost like exactly as Chief	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court said: This can't be; the ad itself either has another reasonable meaning other than to vote or for or against, or it doesn't. It can't possibly be that you need someone with a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding factor or, an overwhelming factor in determining whether this ad, which didn't contain any words of express advocacy, constitutes express advocacy. It's it's almost like exactly as Chief Justice Roberts said in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> , it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court said: This can't be; the ad itself either has another reasonable meaning other than to vote or for or against, or it doesn't. It can't possibly be that you need someone with a Ph.D. to come in and analyze, you know, how the ad
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding factor or, an overwhelming factor in determining whether this ad, which didn't contain any words of express advocacy, constitutes express advocacy. It's it's almost like exactly as Chief Justice Roberts said in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> , it's almost like Mr. Collins is suggesting here that the less	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court said: This can't be; the ad itself either has another reasonable meaning other than to vote or for or against, or it doesn't. It can't possibly be that you need someone with a Ph.D. to come in and analyze, you know, how the ad secretly urges someone to vote for or against a candidate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Commissioner Titla, do you have any questions? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No? Okay. Mr. Torchinsky, did you want to say something, sir? MR. TORCHINSKY: Yes. I think the only thing I would like to do is just briefly respond to Mr. Collins' recommendation here. I still think that Mr. Collins is misreading the <u>Committee for Justice and Fairness</u> decision from the Court. And I, again, point out to the Commission that this ad was aired more than 120 days out from the Republican primary, which takes it outside of the <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> 's mandatory bright-line time period; and it's well outside the time periods that the appeals court would review the <u>Committee for Justice and</u> <u>Fairness</u> , and I think that it has to be an overriding factor or, an overwhelming factor in determining whether this ad, which didn't contain any words of express advocacy, constitutes express advocacy. It's it's almost like exactly as Chief Justice Roberts said in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> , it's almost like Mr. Collins is suggesting here that the less the ad looks like an express advocacy ad, the more it must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	17 I point you back to Justice Roberts' quote where he says the "heads I win, tails you lose" argument cannot be correct. I think that's all I have to add at this point. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Yes, Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair. Mr. Torchinsky, could you explain that bit more clearly, the "heads I win, tails you lose" thing? MR. TORCHINSKY: Sure. The in <u>Wisconsin Right</u> to Life, the FEC was essentially arguing that the more the ad that they were adding they were arguing that the ad was so clever and so artfully avoided magic words, that it therefore had to be express advocacy, and they had expert testimony analyzing the ad. And the Supreme Court said: This can't be; the ad itself either has another reasonable meaning other than to vote or for or against, or it doesn't. It can't possibly be that you need someone with a Ph.D. to come in and analyze, you know, how the ad secretly urges someone to vote for or against a candidate in an election. And by the way, in this case, it is

	18		19
1	aired.	1	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'll come back to the
2	And Chief Justice Roberts said this standard just	2	MR. TORCHINSKY: Mr. Collins' analysis and
3	can't possibly be. In other words, Justice Roberts said,	3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'll come back to the
4	what the FEC is urging here is essentially something that	4	I'm going to come back to the timing I'm going to give
5	said: The less an ad looks like an express advocacy ad,	5	you a chance to talk about timing in a second.
6	the more it must be express advocacy, and Chief Justice	6	Just but how is Mr. Collins doing a, you know,
7	Roberts said that cannot stand.	7	heads-I-win-tails-you-lose kind of analysis here? That's
8	And I also, once again, want you to you know,	8	what I'm having trouble understanding.
9	even the standards that the Chief set out in Wisconsin	9	MR. TORCHINSKY: Because what he's saying is
10	Right to Life, he also said and this is subject to the	10	120 days out from the election, you couldn't have aired an
11	bright-line standard of the electioneering communications	11	ad that spoke to Mr. Smith's policy position in an
12	statute which is: Broadcast ads, 30 days before primary,	12	organization he was part of because he was mayor, that
13	and 60 days before general. And I point you back to the	13	that wouldn't be express advocacy because, depending on
14	fact that this ad was aired 120 days out from the election	14	because you criticized him, it must be express advocacy is
15	while Mr. Smith was still the incumbent mayor.	15	essentially what Mr. Collins is saying.
16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Torchinsky, I am going	16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: You think do you think
17	to ask you a question about the with the Chair's	17	he's saying that in ever for any ad in any time
18	permission, about the time period later. But how do you	18	period?
19	think Mr. Collins' analysis is parallel to what the FEC	19	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think he's coming pretty close
20	did?	20	to saying: Once someone is a candidate, if you air
21	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think Mr. Collins' analy I	21	advertisements criticizing them after they've declared
22	mean, first of all, the FEC ads were run close in time to	22	themselves a candidate, it's going to be really tough to
23	the election; this ad was not. And I think that is a	23	air an ad that doesn't meet the standard that Mr. Collins
24	signi probably the most significant distinction	24	has has laid out for express advocacy.
25	between	25	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Well, thank you.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	20		
	20		21
1	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean	1	21 COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So
2	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it.	2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened.
	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the	2 3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to
2 3 4	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the	2 3 4	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor?
2 3	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we	2 3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular	2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from	2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm saying that in an ad in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: 1'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: 1'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: 1'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered. There were no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm sorry. For ads that don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: 1'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered. There were no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm sorry. For ads that don't use magic words, express advocacy.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. TORCHINSKY: I mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. I appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered. There were no COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Considered as a factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: If we aired an ad in April that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm sorry. For ads that don't use magic words, express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah, you're that's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: 1'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered. There were no COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Considered as a factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: If we aired an ad in April that said: Defeat Mayor Smith in the upcoming election," I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm sorry. For ads that don't use magic words, express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah, you're that's the original comment that kind of confused me about it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: 1'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered. There were no COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Considered as a factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: If we aired an ad in April that said: Defeat Mayor Smith in the upcoming election," I have no doubt that outside the 30-/60-day windows, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm sorry. For ads that don't use magic words, express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah, you're that's the original comment that kind of confused me about it, because you're talking about this bright-line comment by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: 1'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered. There were no COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Considered as a factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: If we aired an ad in April that said: Defeat Mayor Smith in the upcoming election," I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm sorry. For ads that don't use magic words, express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah, you're that's the original comment that kind of confused me about it, because you're talking about this bright-line comment by the Supreme Court and then yet referring to this as a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. TORCHINSKY: 1 mean COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. 1 appreciate it. That's that's helpful in in analyzing the the issue that has to be raised. And I guess in the investigation, assuming we vote to proceed, you know, we can try to have Mr. Collins clarify the particular characteristics that make this ad different from permissible commentary ads. Let me ask you about the timing. Are you saying that the because the ad is longer than a certain period, it's it's like a bright-line thing, it can't be express advocacy? Or, are you saying that this is a factor that that we ought to consider? MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm saying that in an ad in an advertisement that doesn't contain express words or even identify somebody as a candidate, the the timing of the ad, how far out from the election, the fact that it identifies the issues, really needs to be considered. There were no COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Considered as a factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: If we aired an ad in April that said: Defeat Mayor Smith in the upcoming election," I have no doubt that outside the 30-/60-day windows, you could reasonably conclude that that was an express	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So MR. TORCHINSKY: That's not what happened. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, just just to clarify, you view it as a particularly important factor? MR. TORCHINSKY: Exactly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. MR. TORCHINSKY: I would point you to the language in footnote 7 in <u>Wisconsin Right to Life</u> where the Chief Justice said this is subject to the bright-line rule in Section 203 in BCRA, which was that it had to be broadcast ad within 30 days from the primary or 60 days from the general. So, the Court viewed it as kind of I mean, the Court viewed it as a bright-line rule. I'm telling you I think it's probably going to be a factor, but I'm telling you the Supreme Court said it's a bright-line rule for ads that don't include express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. You're MR. TORCHINSKY: I'm sorry. For ads that don't use magic words, express advocacy. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah, you're that's the original comment that kind of confused me about it, because you're talking about this bright-line comment by

	22		23
1	satisfied that it's a factor and you believe an important	1	you have the ad in front of you. And the Supreme Court
2	one?	2	said you're really supposed to look at the ad itself and
3	MR. TORCHINSKY: I would have to say yes,	3	not inquire as to the subjective intent.
4	incredibly important.	4	I mean, you know, a number of people were
5	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you,	5	probably involved in the production of that ad. Each
6	Mr. Torchinsky. Thank you, Mr. Chair.	6	person might have had a different thought in their head.
7	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Any other questions?	7	So, how do you get to one particular overriding intent?
8	Yes, Commissioner Koester.	8	don't know how you would do that without a massive
9	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: For Mr. Torchinsky again.	9	investigation that included depositions of everybody
10	If we take sort of your side, we'll say, and say it isn't	10	involved in producing the ad, financing the ad, editing
11	express advocacy but there was in an ad run in a time	11	the ad.
12	period, I guess what I would like to hear you say is what	12	I mean, you're you're asking me to tell you
13	was the purpose of the ad? Was it to remove him as mayor,	13	what the subjective intent is of what was probably a
14	although he was going to quit like a week later? Was it	14	quite a number of people, and I don't know that I'm in a
15	to criticize his stance as the president of the Mayors	15	position to do that or that you would have the authority
16	Conference, what happened eight or nine months previous?	16	to inquire.
17	I just want to understand, if it wasn't to	17	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: What is the to ask
18	degrade his efforts as running for Governor, what was the	18	Mr Mr. Koester's question a different way, Mr. Chair,
19	purpose of the ad? It's still unclear to me. Why was	19	Mr. Torchinsky, what would you say you would like us to
20	that ad run at all?	20	consider as the alternative meaning of the ad?
21	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the text of the ad	21	In other words, we have no reasonable mean no
22	speaks for itself; and I, again, point you back to	22	reasonable meaning other than to advocate election. What
23	Wisconsin Right to Life. You're again attempting to	23	are the reasonable meanings other that you would like us
24	engage in the subjective analysis of why you know,	24	to consider during the either the current hearing or
25	subjective analysis of intent as to why an ad was run when	25	the the investigation?
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	24		
			25
1	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was	1	Chairman's
2	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was	2	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them?
2 3	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National	2 3	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them.
2 3 4	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the	2 3 4	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it.
2 3 4 5	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the	2 3 4 5	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting,
2 3 4 5 6	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of	2 3 4 5 6	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad	2 3 4 5 6 7	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election. It's even it didn't even identify the mayor as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was just looking to see. Paula, did you catch that? Yeah?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election. It's even it didn't even identify the mayor as a Republican or Democrat.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was just looking to see. Paula, did you catch that? Yeah? Okay. Thanks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election. It's even it didn't even identify the mayor as a Republican or Democrat. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was just looking to see. Paula, did you catch that? Yeah? Okay. Thanks. MR. COLLINS: There's staff everywhere.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election. It's even it didn't even identify the mayor as a Republican or Democrat. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, sir. Mr. Titla.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was just looking to see. Paula, did you catch that? Yeah? Okay. Thanks. MR. COLLINS: There's staff everywhere. (Brief silence.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election. It's even it didn't even identify the mayor as a Republican or Democrat. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, sir. Mr. Titla. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I think that we watched the ads here on the screen a couple months ago. To refresh my memory, I wonder if we I would like to request that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was just looking to see. Paula, did you catch that? Yeah? Okay. Thanks. MR. COLLINS: There's staff everywhere. (Brief silence.) MR. TORCHINSKY: While we're waiting, can I ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election. It's even it didn't even identify the mayor as a Republican or Democrat. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, sir. Mr. Titla. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I think that we watched the ads here on the screen a couple months ago. To refresh my memory, I wonder if we I would like to request that we watch it again if possible.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was just looking to see. Paula, did you catch that? Yeah? Okay. Thanks. MR. COLLINS: There's staff everywhere. (Brief silence.) MR. TORCHINSKY: While we're waiting, can I ask to make one other can I ask to make one other point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. TORCHINSKY: I think the ad itself was calling I mean, the ad itself by its own terms was calling on Mayor Smith to adopt policies for the National Conference of Mayors that were more conservative than the positions that that he allowed to be adopted by the National Conference of Mayors during his tenure of president. I think that I think the text of the ad speaks for itself. And they were clearly I mean, the ad didn't refer to I mean, Mr. Collins' position here is that there is no other reasonable interpretation of the ad. The ad itself didn't reference the election, didn't mention that Mayor Smith was a candidate, didn't talk about you know, didn't talk about electoral voting. I mean, there was nothing in that ad that even suggested that anybody do anything with respect to the election. It's even it didn't even identify the mayor as a Republican or Democrat. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, sir. Mr. Titla. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I think that we watched the ads here on the screen a couple months ago. To refresh my memory, I wonder if we I would like to request that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Chairman's CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Do you have them? MR. COLLINS: We can yeah, we can get them. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's do it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: While we're waiting, Mr. Chair, I would like to re to request that staff send a copy of the Petition for Review that was filed on the <u>CJF</u> case, to circulate it to the Commissioners. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: You mean the Court of Appeals? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: The Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals' decision, yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't know I don't know if staff heard that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah, I was just I was just looking to see. Paula, did you catch that? Yeah? Okay. Thanks. MR. COLLINS: There's staff everywhere. (Brief silence.) MR. TORCHINSKY: While we're waiting, can I ask to make one other can I ask to make one other point? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Sure. Please. Go ahead.

	26		27
1	any ads that were done in compliance with the section in	1	Commissioner Titla, to look at it later.
2	-901 that requires reporting of independent expenditure	2	And and, again, I want to emphasize what we're
3	ads, and the Secretary of State's office concluded that	3	looking at here is a reason to believe whether or not an
4	this wasn't express advocacy.	4	investigation should commence. We aren't making a final
5		5	decision and
	So, you know, what we're really saying to	6	
6	anybody that if the Commission goes forward and says:	7	MR. COLLINS: Can I have one
7	This is express advocacy, what the Commission is really		CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Sure, Mr. Collins.
8	doing is setting up the situation where every ad to get	8	MR. COLLINS: I think there is just and I
9	there if somebody makes a complaint, is going to be	9	don't want to necessarily with the Commission's
10	subject to two independent determinations about whether an	10	indulgence, I just there are three legal points I think
11	ad was an express advocacy ad or not. And, you know, we	11	I need to briefly make in response to Mr. Torchinsky.
12	already have a case here where the Secretary of State's	12	First, the Wisconsin Right to Life case involves
13	office, you know, in with the Maricopa County sort of	13	an absolute ban on corporate communications that met
14	substituting for them, concluded that this was not an	14	that under under the BCRA. There is nothing in our
15	express advocacy ad, and ads that are done in compliance	15	statute that suggests that this is this is a disclosure
16	with the express advocacy, you know, rules and reporting	16	issue. So, the analogy of <u>WRL</u> on its face is simply
17	are not subject to disclosure with the with the	17	not it's not as persuasive as as as one would
18	Commission.	18	say.
19	MR. COLLINS: Mr Mr. Chairman?	19	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: As I recall from your memo,
20	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, sir.	20	what we're talking about is a very lower standard because
21	MR. COLLINS: I this is not going it's	21	it's disclosure, not one in which it's a ban on speech
22	on assuming the ad is still on YouTube, it's there.	22	altogether.
23	I'm not going to be able	23	MR. COLLINS: And then and then and then
24	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Let's not hold up	24	related to that, I think we've laid out the objective
25	the meeting more. We'll have a chance I'm sure,	25	factors, we've we've we've specifically cited what
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	28		29
1	28 Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an	1	29 So, I think that I think that taken together,
1 2		1 2	
	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an		So, I think that I think that taken together,
2	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to	2	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points.
2 3	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that.	2 3	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the
2 3 4	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the	2 3 4	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about
2 3 4 5	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky	2 3 4 5	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one
2 3 4 5 6	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed,	2 3 4 5 6	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a
2 3 4 5 6 7	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we	2 3 4 5 6 7	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other circumstances apply. But, you know, there's no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire of the Maricopa County officials who made a determination
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other circumstances apply. But, you know, there's no that's you know, that is a question of what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire of the Maricopa County officials who made a determination that it was not express advocacy and find out what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other circumstances apply. But, you know, there's no that's that's you know, that is a question of what the compliance is. And determining compliance with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire of the Maricopa County officials who made a determination that it was not express advocacy and find out what the stated reasoning was so that that can be taken into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other circumstances apply. But, you know, there's no that's you know, that is a question of what the compliance is. And determining compliance with 16-941(D) is always and has to be inherently, under the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire of the Maricopa County officials who made a determination that it was not express advocacy and find out what the stated reasoning was so that that can be taken into consideration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other circumstances apply. But, you know, there's no that's you know, that is a question of what the compliance is. And determining compliance with 16-941(D) is always and has to be inherently, under the Clean Elections Act, a question for the Clean Elections	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire of the Maricopa County officials who made a determination that it was not express advocacy and find out what the stated reasoning was so that that can be taken into consideration. MR. COLLINS: That's I don't see
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other circumstances apply. But, you know, there's no that's you know, that is a question of what the compliance is. And determining compliance with 16-941(D) is always and has to be inherently, under the Clean Elections Act, a question for the Clean Elections Commission to make. And I think that that that point,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire of the Maricopa County officials who made a determination that it was not express advocacy and find out what the stated reasoning was so that that can be taken into consideration. MR. COLLINS: That's I don't see Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hoffman, I don't see any reason
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Justice Roberts said about what was subject to an objective inter overview, and this is specific to that. And then lastly, you know, with respect to the last point that that that Mr. Torchinsky made. In the original recommendation I detailed, notwithstanding what Maricopa County Elections did, we don't know what the authority they did that under is. We don't and and we know that it was referred by the Secretary of State, but but there but I don't know what the authority for that referral was, so it's not clear to us what the basis for that decision was. And then the second point is that that 16-941(D), does in fact say that: Notwithstanding any other law, a person who makes independent expenditure over the threshold must make report unless some other circumstances apply. But, you know, there's no that's that's you know, that is a question of what the compliance is. And determining compliance with 16-941(D) is always and has to be inherently, under the Clean Elections Act, a question for the Clean Elections Commission to make. And I think that that that point, in effect, when the Commission previously determined it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, I think that I think that taken together, I would just make those three those three points. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think to second the last point is that I I mean, we've heard a lot about being subject to two masters with regard to this, one being the Secretary of State and the other being us in a lot of context, this being one. But I was just looking at the statute and, again, 16-941 was expressly within the Clean Elections statute, clearly within our jurisdiction. So, I'm not I'm not that concerned about there being a, quote, type of "double jeopardy" here on that. Yes, Mr Mr. Hoffman? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I I wanted to ask Mr. Collins if as part of the investigation, assuming again that we pass this motion, that he inquire of the Maricopa County officials who made a determination that it was not express advocacy and find out what the stated reasoning was so that that can be taken into consideration. MR. COLLINS: That's I don't see Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hoffman, I don't see any reason why I couldn't do that.

	30		31
1	I would like to invite a motion with regard to the	1	there being no further discussion, we'll call for a vote.
2	recommendation of the Executive Director.	2	All those in favor of the motion as seconded, please
3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I would like to move, in	3	indicate by saying "aye."
4	MUR 14-007, Legacy Foundation Action Fund, that we find	4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	reason to believe that a violation of statute or rule over	5	
6	which the Commission has jurisdiction has occurred and	6	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: The motion carries
7	that authorize Mr. Collins to conduct an administration	7	unanimously.
8	[sic] pursuant to our rules.	8	Thank you, Mr. Torchinsky. Thank you,
9	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second?	9	Mr. Collins.
10	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I second the	10	MR. TORCHINSKY: Thank you.
11	motion.	11	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Bye-bye.
12	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you,	12	Item (coughing) excuse me. I apologize for
13	Mr. Titla. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. It's been moved and	13	the coughs. I had a flu with a capital "F" and it has not
14	-	14	left me yet.
15	seconded. Is there any further discussion among the Commission?	15	-
16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I wanted to ask	-	Item V, discussion and possible action on
17	Mr. Collins, Mr. Chair, if we needed anything specific	16 17	independent expenditure reporting activities, political
		18	committees, and other entities. We will be looking at Rule R2-20-109 and related amendments.
18 19	with regard to a subpoena or is there	19	
20	MR. COLLINS: I think if that were necessary,	20	Mr. Collins, if you would, please introduce it.
	the way the rules are set up, is at this point it would be		MR. COLLINS: Yeah. And I will try to move
21	up to well, I think it would be up to my judgment	21	through this quickly, as quickly as I can. I know there's
22	whether or not anything would issue and with respect to	22	other other issues.
23	so, no additional language to the motion, no.	23	What I to to kick this off, we do have a
24	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you.	24	PowerPoint that we're going to try to get back now. But
25	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Then,	25	to just kind of give you a sense of what this is about.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	00		20
1	32	1	33
1	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has	1	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear
2	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure	2	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons"
2 3	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to	2 3	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations.
2 3 4	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I	2 3 4	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even
2 3 4 5	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is	2 3 4 5	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent
2 3 4 5 6	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of	2 3 4 5 6	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to
2 3 4 5 6 7	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues	2 3 4 5 6 7	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure reports, the current status enforcement, the Clean	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's office is both the Post Office and the enforcer, but for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure reports, the current status enforcement, the Clean Elections rules, and the recommendation that I made.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's office is both the Post Office and the enforcer, but for us they're the Post Office.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure reports, the current status enforcement, the Clean Elections rules, and the recommendation that I made. We're talking first about the Clean Elections Act	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's office is both the Post Office and the enforcer, but for us they're the Post Office. The the and it also exempted and it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	At our last meeting, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure reports, the current status enforcement, the Clean Elections rules, and the recommendation that I made. We're talking first about the Clean Elections Act reports, 16-941(D) and 16-958. These reports were added	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's office is both the Post Office and the enforcer, but for us they're the Post Office. The the and it also exempted and it's also important to make clear that this exempted internal
2 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, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure reports, the current status enforcement, the Clean Elections rules, and the recommendation that I made. We're talking first about the Clean Elections Act reports, 16-941(D) and 16-958. These reports were added by voters in 1998 in the Clean Elections Act and they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's office is both the Post Office and the enforcer, but for us they're the Post Office. The the and it also exempted and it's also important to make clear that this exempted internal communications that were expressly permitted by statute
2 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, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure reports, the current status enforcement, the Clean Elections rules, and the recommendation that I made. We're talking first about the Clean Elections Act reports, 16-941(D) and 16-958. These reports were added by voters in 1998 in the Clean Elections Act and they established more timely reporting of expenditures above a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's office is both the Post Office and the enforcer, but for us they're the Post Office. The the and it also exempted and it's also important to make clear that this exempted internal communications that were expressly permitted by statute but were not independent expenditures.
2 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, I described to you some of what has been occurring with respect to independent expenditure reporting in the State of Arizona with respect to corporate entities making filings. And what what I said that I would do would be what we needed to do is take a step back and look at where we were in view of precisely the issue well, not in view of the issues related to where the Secretary of State is to make sure that we move forward in a manner that's that's effective. That review, for the short term, resulted in the looking at the rules. I want to do the PowerPoint. I will try to move it through it just as quickly as humanly possible just to ground things a little bit, if that's okay. I'll try to move as quickly as CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes. Please, yes. MR. COLLINS: Okay. So we're going to talk a little bit about the history of independent expenditure reports, the current status enforcement, the Clean Elections rules, and the recommendation that I made. We're talking first about the Clean Elections Act reports, 16-941(D) and 16-958. These reports were added by voters in 1998 in the Clean Elections Act and they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reports of all persons, so the Commission rules made clear and the statute itself says this, but that "persons" included corporations and membership organizations. So, at that time and this is in 1998 even if no statute authorized corporate and Union independent expenditures, they would have had to have been reported to the Clean Elections Commission if they had been made. And there and and I should be very clear here. When we talk about reporting to the to whom the report is made, the report is always made to the Secretary of State's office. The issue is, who has the authority to tell you to file the report? And under Article II of Chapter 6, Title 16, it is the Clean Elections Commission that has the authority to order people to file reports. So, in that sense, the Secretary of State's office is the Post Office for purposes of the Clean Elections Act and we are the Clean Elections Commission. For purposes of other provisions of law, the Clean the Secretary of State's office is both the Post Office and the enforcer, but for us they're the Post Office. The the and it also exempted and it's also important to make clear that this exempted internal communications that were expressly permitted by statute

	34		35
1	now pretty familiar with and have heard about it, it was	1	that in in in 2788?
2	decided in January 2010. It said the corporation how	2	We have the impression, in my review of the
3	the corporation could not be prohibited from making	3	history of this, that legislators were told there was no
4	independent expenditures for or against candidates.	4	existing regulatory framework for these expenditures. And
5	And that's a typo in there. "Elections" should	5	I have a quote there from Secretary Bennett that something
6	be "expenditures." I should have caught that, but that's	6	had to be done immediately to report have these
7	what that means.	7	reported.
8	But the disclosure itself remains	8	And I and I simply would say that that's not
9	constitutionally appropriate.	9	that was not correct. There was an emergency clause in
10	We get to 2010, and the the and this is	10	that that this bill passed unanimously or virtually
11	brings us to the sort of the policy or, where the	11	unanimously. But the statement that something had to be
12	policy issues start to kick in. 2010, a bill called	12	done because <u>Citizens United</u> had created a world in which
13	which is called 2788 was passed. It's the Citizens United	13	there was not going to be reporting of these expenditures
14	Reaction Bill. And it created new disclosure reports for	14	was simply not true.
15	corporate and Union independent expenditures. There's a	15	One of the debates and this is then this is
16	higher threshold and they and they have less frequency	16	where we get into what's happening now with, as I
17		17	
	than than Clean Elections. That bill also purported to		understand what's happening now with enforcement on the
18 19	legalize these expenditures and/or to or to make them expressly permitted under 16-920.	18 19	Secretary of State's side was: What is a corporation and
		20	what is a political committee?
20	That statute previously did not include		And Mr. Bennett in the same testimony talked
21	independent expenditures but other matters. So, just to	21	about the fact that they had some desire to distinguish
22	really quickly click back through. When we started with	22	between those that were political committees who were
23	the Clean Elections Act that was passed by the voters,	23	subject to reporting requirements beyond the expenditures
24	those are very clearly included. And here we have an	24	themselves, and those that were corporations that were not
25	issue, the legal question is, what happens when you add	25	going to be, and a desire to distinguish between those two
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
4	36	1	37
1	things.		asked them to provide information about their
	And those statements reflect that And these are	2	expenditures. And I've tried to characterize in a summary
2	And those statements reflect that. And those are	2	expenditures. And I've tried to characterize in a summary
3	available for you to to to kind of think about.	3	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably
3 4	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This	3 4	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to
3 4 5	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent	3 4 5	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here.
3 4 5 6	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the	3 4 5 6	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of
3 4 5 6 7	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a	3 4 5 6 7	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying.
3 4 5 6 7 8	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies	3 4 5 6 7 8	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that that statute is the turn is the is essentially the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also presenting very different perspectives on what the law
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that that statute is the turn is the is essentially the subject of where the overall regime is in terms of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also presenting very different perspectives on what the law requires them to do and what they need to demonstrate in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that that statute is the turn is the is essentially the subject of where the overall regime is in terms of enforcement now. What does that statute mean and how will	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also presenting very different perspectives on what the law requires them to do and what they need to demonstrate in order to show that they're complying with 16-941.0(K) and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that that statute is the turn is the is essentially the subject of where the overall regime is in terms of enforcement now. What does that statute mean and how will it be enforced?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also presenting very different perspectives on what the law requires them to do and what they need to demonstrate in order to show that they're complying with 16-941.0(K) and that is creates, I think, what what the reason
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that that statute is the turn is the is essentially the subject of where the overall regime is in terms of enforcement now. What does that statute mean and how will it be enforced? So, earlier this year, as I reported in less	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also presenting very different perspectives on what the law requires them to do and what they need to demonstrate in order to show that they're complying with 16-941.0(K) and that is creates, I think, what what the reason they call it uncertainty in this part of of the regime.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that that statute is the turn is the is essentially the subject of where the overall regime is in terms of enforcement now. What does that statute mean and how will it be enforced? So, earlier this year, as I reported in less detail, the Secretary of State identified several	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also presenting very different perspectives on what the law requires them to do and what they need to demonstrate in order to show that they're complying with 16-941.0(K) and that is creates, I think, what what the reason they call it uncertainty in this part of of the regime. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Mr. Collins, can you just
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	available for you to to to kind of think about. We ended up with this language in statute. This statute says that: Any entity that makes an independent expenditure and that is organized primarily for the purpose of influence in an election and that is a combination of corporations, limited liability companies or labor organizations, or that is a corporation, limited liability company, or labor organization that accepts donations or contributions, shall file with the filing officer as a political committee as otherwise provided by law. That statute is the statute that is effectively and there are Mike Liburdi Mr. Liburdi, who, you know, is here, and Lisa Hauser, both whom represent corporations that make IE's are here, and they can correct me if I'm wrong on any of this stuff. But I think that that statute is the turn is the is essentially the subject of where the overall regime is in terms of enforcement now. What does that statute mean and how will it be enforced? So, earlier this year, as I reported in less	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	fashion with more and, you know you know, probably people would quibble about this, so I don't purport to represent the positions of the entities identified here. Only that I sort of this is the upshot, I think, of what they responded to the Secretary's office by saying. And there is a variety of responses, some of which, for example, involved saying we're you know, here is our why we're social wealth organization under -501(C)(4) and here are our I-90 forms, you can look them up if you want to. Some of which said: Here's all the spending we've been doing on a variety of topics; and then others that says: Here's what we're spending on this and not that. So what that indicates is that there are entities out there that are making expenditures that they may have different factual circumstances, but they're also presenting very different perspectives on what the law requires them to do and what they need to demonstrate in order to show that they're complying with 16-941.0(K) and that is creates, I think, what what the reason they call it uncertainty in this part of of the regime.

Miller Certified Reporting

S	o	
J	o	

	30		
1	MR. COLLINS: That that that is what	1	it's a complicated it's a complicated analysis.
2	creates uncertainty in this part of the regime.	2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have sympathy for them.
3	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: "That" is what?	3	MR. COLLINS: So, what happens then is there's a
4	MR. COLLINS: That is that there are multiple	4	reasonable cause finding made against the Arizona Free
5	corporate independent expenditure entities that have been	5	Enterprise Club, and so what that essentially says and
6	asked for this information and what they've been presented	6	we've now talked about roughly reasonable cause is in our
7	in terms of responses, demonstrates that they they all	7	context, and and what I think what I think the
8	see a different target that they need to hit in order to	8	upshot of that again, I don't I'm trying to summarize
9	determine whether or not they are meeting that very long	9	this, was we disagree or we don't believe what the Free
10	sentence that's in 19914.02(K).	10	Enterprise Club has said they are doing. And the reasons
11	And what I describe this as coming close to	11	for that I've reviewed the reasonable cause, it's not
12	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chairman?	12	entirely clear to me, nor is it entirely clear to me which
13	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Go ahead. Yes, please.	13	legal factors or any factors are applied to make
14	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Just a quick question, it	14	this determination within this reasonable cause.
15	is also true that they might be a political committee be-	15	So, you now have multiple corporate independent
16	for other reasons because the definition of political	16	expenditure groups who presented information to the
17	committee is not limited to what you just shared wrote,	17	Secretary's office and you have a reasonable cause finding
18	right?	18	that says some things, but it's hard to discern from what
19	MR. COLLINS: That is correct. That's correct.	19	it says on its face, what relating back to the statute
20	well, that's correct. I mean, the statute says itself	20	and the multiple interpretations that have come off of it,
21	"that is otherwise provided by law." So, I mean, you	21	which one of those is actually in operation. At least,
22	know so	22	it's hard for me to determine that.
23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, we have the definition	23	As a result, and my understanding is that the
24	in -901 and subsidiary definitions associated with it?	24	Free Enterprise Club has, you know, essentially questioned
25	MR. COLLINS: That's correct. So, it's a so	25	the authority of the Secretary to ask for this information
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	40		41
			71
1	in the first place. They've made an extensive public	1	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections'
1 2	in the first place. They've made an extensive public records request from the Secretary of State and there's	1 2	
			understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections'
2 3 4	records request from the Secretary of State and there's	2	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for
2 3	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation	2 3 4 5	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have
2 3 4	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney	2 3 4	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need
2 3 4 5 6 7	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look	2 3 4 5 6 7	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. 1, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules, because our rules have language in them that is related to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules, because our rules have language in them that is related to -914.02(K) that's in in my view, unnecessary and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, there are certain entities that sorry. There are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules, because our rules have language in them that is related to -914.02(K) that's in in my view, unnecessary and the actions of these nominal committees or, could-be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, there are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that that, in fact, don't have to file
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules, because our rules have language in them that is related to -914.02(K) that's in in my view, unnecessary and the actions of these nominal committees or, could-be committees, triggers a need to take immediate action to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports.</li> <li>We believed that that would avoid litigation.</li> <li>And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all.</li> <li>And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position.</li> <li>And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair?</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, there are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that that, in fact, don't make independent</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules, because our rules have language in them that is related to -914.02(K) that's in in my view, unnecessary and the actions of these nominal committees or, could-be committees, triggers a need to take immediate action to do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports.</li> <li>We believed that that would avoid litigation.</li> <li>And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all.</li> <li>And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position.</li> <li>And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act reports.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair?</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, there are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that that, in fact, don't have to file anywhere? In other words, if they don't make independent expenditures?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules, because our rules have language in them that is related to -914.02(K) that's in in my view, unnecessary and the actions of these nominal committees or, could-be committees, triggers a need to take immediate action to do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports. We believed that that would avoid litigation. And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all. And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position. And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act says that we get to decide if you need to file Clean Elections Act reports. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, there are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that that, in fact, don't have to file anywhere? In other words, if they don't make independent expenditures? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Yeah. That's right. Yeah,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	records request from the Secretary of State and there's been indications reported that there may be litigation ensuing. So so there's no enforcement at this with the Attorney General's office, which the Attorney General's office will be designating someone to to look at further, and then there's the possibility of litigation between Free Enterprise and someone. I, you know and, again, I don't mean again to over characterize what I understand from the available sort of media reports about Free Enterprise. Mike is here. If he wants to talk about that more specifically, he can. This is a long preface to say we have the the action of these various groups have created a situation in which we need to take some immediate action on our rules, because our rules have language in them that is related to -914.02(K) that's in in my view, unnecessary and the actions of these nominal committees or, could-be committees, triggers a need to take immediate action to do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>understood didn't understand what the Clean Elections' role plays with IE's; we provided an easy option for corporations, LLC's, and Unions who could not have violated -914.02, to stipulate that they would only need to file those reports.</li> <li>We believed that that would avoid litigation.</li> <li>And we also and we made this point I think I believe we made it on the record at the time, that this would avoid the situation where somebody says: I don't have to file anywhere at all.</li> <li>And that to, frankly, Mr. Torchinsky's point in the last go-around. That is Mr. Torchinsky's position.</li> <li>And our position is that that no matter what, the Clean Elections Act reports.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair?</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins, there are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that sorry. There are certain entities that that, in fact, don't have to file anywhere? In other words, if they don't make independent expenditures?</li> </ul>

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

	42		12
1		1	43
	MR. COLLINS: That's right. That's right.		some what I would call scrivener's problems that we want
2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Didn't want that to be a	2	to cleanup.
4	mis	4	And then the recommendation for an emergency is
5	MR. COLLINS: No, that's right. That's right.	4 5	based on the fact that under our statute if the actions of
	Under the assumption under the assumption. That's	6	a candidate or committee demand immediate action, we may
6 7	correct. That's correct.	_	take immediate action to make this revision. And we
	So so, here's where we end up with what I've	7	believe or, I believe that standard is satisfied here.
8	just already said. We we don't there's no reason	8	And I have and I haven't I think that's well
9	for this rule to be wrapped up in the Free Enterprise Club	_	So, back to just the recommendation. The
10 11	matters. So, we so we the solution is to simplify	10 11	recommendation is we passed these amendments; we make the
	the certification to re-emphasize that the IE reports that		currently outstanding corporations, LLC's, and Unions
12 13	Clean Elections calls for do not determine political	12 13	aware of the amendments. We've already done a little bit
	committee status.		of informal outreach to the attorneys for those
14 15	We want to hold harmless the folks who are	14	corporations to see if we can move them through the
	already certified. In other words, we had really good	15	certification process. I would also have to modify the
16	success. I would say we had I can't remember the final	16	form itself, which is something the rules delegate to my
17	number of how many people we have currently certified. I	17	authority, and then come back to the Commission.
18	think we only have three outstanding groups that aren't	18	And then and then we look at the Free Ent
19	certified. Or well, two that are yeah, two	19 20	continue to monitor the Free Enterprise Club enforcement
20 21	outstanding groups that are are not certified.	20	matter; and then whether it's a rulemaking or we get into
21	So, there's no we don't know, frankly, whether	21	a position where we make a more comprehensive statutory
	or not the the this would this change actually	22	suggestion going after the election, you know, we can
23 24	substantially affects those groups that are already	23	do that.
24	certified, but there's no harm in just leaving them be.	24	So, the goal here is to, again, decouple the rule. It's extended to the extent it is coupled at all
25	And then and then there's some cleanup and	25	
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC 44		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC 45
1		1	
1	from the political committee issue to and and	1	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for
2	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed	2	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I
2 3	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can	2 3	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the
2 3 4	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or	2 3 4	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the
2 3 4 5	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified	2 3 4 5	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow.
2 3 4 5 6	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process.	2 3 4 5 6	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would
2 3 4 5 6 7	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. I I agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of candidates and committees.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process.</li> <li>So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of candidates and committees.</li> <li>And and that's that's kind of that's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of candidates and committees.</li> <li>And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, 1 would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of candidates and committees. And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process.</li> <li>So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of candidates and committees.</li> <li>And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have.</li> <li>Mary O'Grady is here also on this because this is related to our other representation. So, if you have</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of candidates and committees. And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have.</li> <li>Mary O'Grady is here also on this because this is related to our other representation. So, if you have legal questions, you can you can direct those to her, I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, 1 would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of candidates and committees.</li> <li>And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to be accomplished here and look forward to the time when he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process.</li> <li>So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of candidates and committees.</li> <li>And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have.</li> <li>Mary O'Grady is here also on this because this is related to our other representation. So, if you have legal questions, you can you can direct those to her, I believe, and that's all I have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to be accomplished here and look forward to the time when he reaches the point where he is able to revise the form.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of candidates and committees.</li> <li>And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to be accomplished here and look forward to the time when he</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of candidates and committees. And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have. Mary O'Grady is here also on this because this is related to our other representation. So, if you have legal questions, you can you can direct those to her, I believe, and that's all I have. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you, Mr. Collins. Is there anyone here who would like to comment among the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow. So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry. MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to be accomplished here and look forward to the time when he reaches the point where he is able to revise the form. And I expect we'll be able to wrap thing things up with</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of candidates and committees. And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have. Mary O'Grady is here also on this because this is related to our other representation. So, if you have legal questions, you can you can direct those to her, I believe, and that's all I have. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you, Mr. Collins. Is there anyone here who would like to comment among the public on the proposed change?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow.</li> <li>So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful.</li> <li>MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus</li> <li>Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to be accomplished here and look forward to the time when he reaches the point where he is able to revise the form.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of candidates and committees. And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have. Mary O'Grady is here also on this because this is related to our other representation. So, if you have legal questions, you can you can direct those to her, I believe, and that's all I have. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you, Mr. Collins. Is there anyone here who would like to comment among the public on the proposed change? Mr. Liburdi, please.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow.</li> <li>So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful.</li> <li>MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to be accomplished here and look forward to the time when he reaches the point where he is able to revise the form.</li> <li>And I expect we'll be able to wrap thing things up with respect to an exemption for 60 Plus at that time. So, thank you.</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	<ul> <li> from the political committee issue to and and make that immediate, and then and then we will proceed step-wise in consultation with as many folks as we can consult with to provide an appropriate regulatory and/or statutory response to the issues that have been identified over the course of the last few months in the process. So, with that, and that's a long preface, and I</li> <li> and I and I, you know, we wanted to do this quickly because it we think that this is a necessary thing to do. We can revisit these rules at subsequent meetings but we think that this change needs to be made immediately effective and based on the actions of of of candidates and committees. And and that's that's kind of that's kind of all I have. Mary O'Grady is here also on this because this is related to our other representation. So, if you have legal questions, you can you can direct those to her, I believe, and that's all I have. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you, Mr. Collins. Is there anyone here who would like to comment among the public on the proposed change? Mr. Liburdi, please. MR. LIBURDI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and</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	<ul> <li>want to commend Mr. Collins and the Commission for reacting to the situation as it has developed. 1 1 agree with Mr. Collins, it has been confusing. And the Secretary of State's office has not provided with the regulated community with any guidelines to follow.</li> <li>So, with that expression of gratitude, I would just like to add by saying I look forward to working with Mr. Collins on the revised form.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Wonderful.</li> <li>MR. LIBURDI: Thank you.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Oh. Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry.</li> <li>MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Hauser from Gammage &amp; Burnham, and I represent the 60 Plus Association. I had a good conversation with Mr. Collins yesterday to better understand exactly what was trying to be accomplished here and look forward to the time when he reaches the point where he is able to revise the form.</li> <li>And I expect we'll be able to wrap thing things up with respect to an exemption for 60 Plus at that time. So, thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: So, just real quickly,</li> </ul>

		1	
	46		47
1	favorably disposed to what is being what what the	1	think unanimous means everybody who is here.
2	Commission is going to try to do here? What Mr. Collins	2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair?
3	is suggesting the Commission do here with these rules?	3	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, sir.
4	MS. HAUSER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.	4	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I would like to move we go
5	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you.	5	into executive session to address that issue. But before
6	Ms. O'Grady, did you want to say anything to the	6	we do, I wanted to ask a question of whether we whether
7	Commission?	7	we I'm sorry. I have lost my train of thought here.
8	MS. O'GRADY: It's okay.	8	What would the procedure be if we're comfortable
9	MR. COLLINS: Well, I think	9	with proceeding on an emergency basis? Does that mean
10	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Go ahead, Mr. Collins.	10	that we have does it is it a requirement that it be
11	MR. COLLINS: We have a well, we have a we	11	put out for public comment or does the emergency eliminate
12	have a question about whether or not in the absence of	12	that step?
13	Mr. Laird, the need for a unanimous we've my	13	MR. COLLINS: Well, that we could do one of
14	position when I was your counsel, which I am not	14	two things. We could we could we could we could
15	currently, was that "unanimous" meant everybody here.	15	file it for public comment and make it an emergency. In
16	That means, that is to say, of the people who are here.	16	other words, we can do both. We can take public comment
17	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Of the	17	and have it effective. There's nothing in the statute
18	MR. COLLINS: There is a question the Commission	18	that prevent that requires you to select a path between
19	needs to decide, I guess, how it wants to proceed in terms	19	those two. So, one you know, I don't at least I
20	of being above above any question. The Commission can	20	don't think there's anything in the statute that I
21	put this off. That will or well, that's really the	21	mean, at this point I mean
22	question that the Commission would have to decide to put	22	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay.
23	it off. There's nothing we can do to resolve the question	23	MR. COLLINS: My reading of the statute is there
24	today because the statute says what it says. Either you	24	is no is that there is you know, there is no reason
25	think unanimous means everybody's got to be here or you	25	you have to pick between those two. So, if you move if
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	Miller Contined Reporting, 220		Miller Cortanea (toporting, EEC
	48		49
1	48	1	49 MR_COLLINS: Lithink Ms_O'Grady is available
1	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would	1	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available.
2	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd	2	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General?
2 3	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are.	2 3	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think
2 3 4	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear	2 3 4	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so
2 3 4 5	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the	2 3 4 5	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a
2 3 4 5 6	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded to go into executive session. All in favor?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session from 10:39 a.m. until 10:53 a.m.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded to go into executive session. All in favor? (Chorus of ayes.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session from 10: 39 a.m. until 10: 53 a.m.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded to go into executive session. All in favor? (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All opposed?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session from 10: 39 a.m. until 10: 53 a.m.) ***** (Whereupon all members of the public are present
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded to go into executive session. All in favor? (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All opposed? Okay. I was an "aye" vote. I'm sorry.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session from 10: 39 a.m. until 10: 53 a.m.) ***** (Whereupon all members of the public are present and the Commission resumes in general session.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded to go into executive session. All in favor? (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All opposed? Okay. I was an "aye" vote. I'm sorry. Okay. We'll go into executive session. I hope</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. COLLINS: 1 think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: 1 think that Ms 1 don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. 1 think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: 1 agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session from 10: 39 a.m. until 10: 53 a.m.) $\star \star \star \star$ (Whereupon all members of the public are present and the Commission resumes in general session.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: We're back in public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded to go into executive session. All in favor? (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All opposed? Okay. I was an "aye" vote. I'm sorry. Okay. We'll go into executive session. I hope to be brief, so.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. COLLINS: I think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: I think that Ms I don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. I think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: I agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session from 10: 39 a.m. until 10: 53 a.m.) $\star \star \star \star \star$ (Whereupon all members of the public are present and the Commission resumes in general session.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: We're back in public session. Is there Mr. Collins has has briefly gone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>you open for public comment, then 60 days hence you would vote to finalize this rule and you could do that and we'd be where we are. As a practical matter, I think it's pretty clear what my direction will be in terms of trying to manage the enforcement of this rule. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Now MR. COLLINS: I don't maybe I'm not understanding the question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So no, you've answered my question to the extent possible in open meeting. I would like to move we go into executive session to discuss the issue. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Moved and seconded to go into executive session. All in favor? (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All opposed? Okay. I was an "aye" vote. I'm sorry. Okay. We'll go into executive session. I hope</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. COLLINS: 1 think Ms. O'Grady is available. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Not the Attorney General? MR. COLLINS: 1 think that Ms 1 don't think we well, the Attorney General's boss is in the room so they can figure that out. 1 think it's Ms. O'Grady, for a lack of a better way of proceeding. MR. ELLMAN: 1 agree. MR. COLLINS: If you guys want to come in. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you for the invitation, though. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. (Whereupon the public retires from the meeting room.) (Whereupon the Commission is in executive session from 10: 39 a.m. until 10: 53 a.m.) $\star \star \star \star$ (Whereupon all members of the public are present and the Commission resumes in general session.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: We're back in public

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

	50		51
1		1	סו MR. COLLINS: No, and we did get questions about
1	with regard to why language is deleted or why language is		
2	added?	2	that after we circulated the the the the rule
	I think it's fairly clear on its face what we're	4	the draft, and I do want to make that clear that that is
4 5	trying to accomplish with it, so I have none. But I'll	4 5	cleanup, because of a, you know because, you know, it's
	invite any Commissioner.	_	cleanup. Period.
6	Mr. Hoffman?	6	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Got it. Cleanup.
7	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yes. Mr. Chair, I have	7	May I proceed to the second question
8	two minor matters with regard to the language. First of	8	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please.
9	all, in R2-20-109(F)(3)(C), there's some matter underlined	9	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair?
10	and part (D) entirely is underlined. I thought those	10	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Please.
11	that's the way it was. Is is is that an an	11	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to -109(F)(1),
12	error?	12	it says that: "Any person making independent expenditures
13	MR. COLLINS: That is an error. That is an error	13	cumulatively exceeding the amount prescribed
14	we're trying to correct. The language should track the	14	shall file campaign finance reports."
15	statutes, was intended to track the statute. You were	15	That is intended, however, to be anyone other
16	informed it would track the statute when the rule passed,	16	than somebody who gets the exemption, correct?
17	but it doesn't actually track the statute. That is when I	17	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Yes. We think that that's
18	said cleanup, that is cleanup.	18	we think that that's correct. We think that we we
19	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I see. So, the purpose of	19	think that we can still yes. We think that's true.
20	the underlining was to put in stuff that we thought was	20	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So I had a suggestion for
21	there, but in the administrative code is doesn't show	21	some language to make that more explicit so that it
22	up?	22	doesn't appear to be in conflict I believe asked you to
23	MR. COLLINS: That is correct.	23	type up yeah.
24	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Ah. Thank you for	24	MR. COLLINS: So, yeah. Mr. Chairman,
25	explaining that. I was very confused at that.	25	Mr. Hoffman, I did get a chance to very briefly do this
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	52		53
1	52 this morning.	1	53 MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are
1 2		1 2	
	this morning.		MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are
2	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it.	2	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political
2 3	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in	2 3	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct.
2 3 4	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah.	2 3 4	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah.
2 3 4 5	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the	2 3 4 5	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again,
2 3 4 5 6	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this	2 3 4 5 6	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could
2 3 4 5 6 7	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<pre>this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that was the other comment that I had, Mr. Chair.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we immediately change rule R2-20-109 and that we, therefore,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that was the other comment that I had, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we immediately change rule R2-20-109 and that we, therefore, adopt R-20-109 [sic], the amendments thereto as indicated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that was the other comment that I had, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. And just since we're going over some of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we immediately change rule R2-20-109 and that we, therefore, adopt R-20-109 [sic], the amendments thereto as indicated by the paper entitled "Hoffman Amended Version" that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that was the other comment that I had, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. And just since we're going over some of the particulars. In -109(F)(4), the addition of "a" is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we immediately change rule R2-20-109 and that we, therefore, adopt R-20-109 [sic], the amendments thereto as indicated by the paper entitled "Hoffman Amended Version" that was just passed around.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that was the other comment that I had, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. And just since we're going over some of the particulars. In -109(F)(4), the addition of "a" is really because you could be a political committee that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we immediately change rule R2-20-109 and that we, therefore, adopt R-20-109 [sic], the amendments thereto as indicated by the paper entitled "Hoffman Amended Version" that was just passed around. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that was the other comment that I had, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. And just since we're going over some of the particulars. In -109(F)(4), the addition of "a" is really because you could be a political committee that complies with 16-920(A)(6) or 16-914, but you still should	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we immediately change rule R2-20-109 and that we, therefore, adopt R-20-109 [sic], the amendments thereto as indicated by the paper entitled "Hoffman Amended Version" that was just passed around. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this morning. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it. MR. COLLINS: This is one sentence that is in addition to everything that yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So this would insert the language "unless an exemption is obtained pursuant to this Subsection (F)" at the very beginning. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I can't remember. That was the only change, was it? MR. COLLINS: What's that? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That was the only change, right? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That was the only change in this from the document you already had. And that's and that's I mean, that's up to you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. Okay. So, that was the other comment that I had, Mr. Chair. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman. And just since we're going over some of the particulars. In -109(F)(4), the addition of "a" is really because you could be a political committee that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. COLLINS: It's yeah. The folks who are who are contemplated here are folks who are not political committees, that's that is correct. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. MR. COLLINS: So, we're talking about again, we're talking about going from a model that implies could not possibly be a political committee, to a model that says: Are not political committees, but if you are in fact a political committee and have so declared, there this is not something that you need to be concerned about. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Or not available to, yeah. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Okay. With that, I'll entertain a motion. Mr. Hoffman. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I'd like to move that we conclude that the actions of the committees described by Mr. Collins require that we immediately change rule R2-20-109 and that we, therefore, adopt R-20-109 [sic], the amendments thereto as indicated by the paper entitled "Hoffman Amended Version" that was just passed around. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second?

	54		55
1	Mr. Hoffman, thank you. Any further discussion?	1	us that if they bear out as they are presented to us, that
2	There being none, I'll call for a vote. All	2	there would be a violation that we conclude at this point
3	those in favor, please indicate by saying "aye."	3	to believe that one has occurred and ask for a further
4	(Chorus of ayes.)	4	investigation.
5		5	It is not a finding on the factual matters, no
6	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Passes unanimously. Thank	6	conclusions of laws, there are no fines being assessed by
7	you.	7	this action whatsoever.
8	All righty. Item VI on the agenda. Discussion	8	In reading Mr. Horne's I've been through all
9	and possible action regarding MUR 14-006, Tom Horne and	9	the papers that Executive Director put together, which is
10	campaign committees. And we'll deal with (A), first item;	10	quite an effort, and I read Mr. Horne's letter last night.
11	I don't know if there's anything to talk about (B) at this	11	And I had a sense I I'm not here to debate it, but I
12	point.	12	had a sense there was a misapprehension of what this
13	I realized that late last night we received a	13	action is today. It is not a final action. It's not an
14	letter from Mr. Horne, whether or not that should be	14	action for which any amendment will be I mean, any
15	considered in terms of being procedurally correct, I am	15	appeal can be taken with regard to we are looking to do an
16	not going to comment on; although, the question is there	16	administrative investigation.
17	whether it should be considered by the Commission at this	17	And so, I just advise the Commissioners of that.
18	late point.	18	That, you know, when we get to a point where we have to
19	I would like to frame it, however take the	19	take action in terms of determining whether definitively a
20	prerogative to frame the whole issue. Is what we're	20	violation has occurred, there need to be a a good
21	dealing with here is, again, a statement of reasons that	21	vetting of the facts and a set of finding of facts and
22	there is there is a reason to believe that a violation	22	application of law for those purposes. This is not that
23	has occurred. And, again, it's a, in my view, a fairly	23	action.
24	low standard. We are looking at facts or matters that has	24	So, with that, I'll ask Mr. Collins to introduce
25	been evaluated by the Executive Director that suggest to	25	the well, the follow-up.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	56		57
1	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman,	1	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained
2	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield	2	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those
2 3	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related	2 3	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an
2 3 4	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process.	2 3 4	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation.
2 3 4 5	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the	2 3 4 5	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments
2 3 4 5 6	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that	2 3 4 5 6	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is	2 3 4 5 6 7	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think the I think the I think the the the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject to a compliance order and we've incorporated the numbers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think the I think the I think the the the analysis I think speaks for itself. I think that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject to a compliance order and we've incorporated the numbers that could would go on that compliance order, those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think the I think the I think the the the analysis I think speaks for itself. I think that the response to the extent that you consider it at this point	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject to a compliance order and we've incorporated the numbers that could would go on that compliance order, those numbers are subject to revision as we move forward, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think the I think the I think the the the analysis I think speaks for itself. I think that the response to the extent that you consider it at this point does, you know, demonstrate that that there there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject to a compliance order and we've incorporated the numbers that could would go on that compliance order, those numbers are subject to revision as we move forward, and that's I think that's explicit in the document you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think the I think the I think the the the analysis I think speaks for itself. I think that the response to the extent that you consider it at this point does, you know, demonstrate that that there there are steps that are in addition to be taken. I think that,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject to a compliance order and we've incorporated the numbers that could would go on that compliance order, those numbers are subject to revision as we move forward, and that's I think that's explicit in the document you have in front of you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think the I think the I think the the the analysis I think speaks for itself. I think that the response to the extent that you consider it at this point does, you know, demonstrate that that there there are steps that are in addition to be taken. I think that, you know, the fact of the matter is that we we will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject to a compliance order and we've incorporated the numbers that could would go on that compliance order, those numbers are subject to revision as we move forward, and that's I think that's explicit in the document you have in front of you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Two questions, at least on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and just briefly, you know, Mr. Kanefield is here if you have legal or procedural questions related to this process. I think that, Mr. Chairman, you laid out the procedural posture that we're in correctly. I think that the the the recommendation here is that there is that we is that we move forward and that you find reason to believe a violation may have occurred. The purpose of this vote is to permit me to move forward. And and I'll be and I think I'll I think I want to be clear here that this will involve the authorization to subpoena documents, to put people under oath, and I would recommend that any motion make that specific so we're clear. Just to highlight a couple of points. I think the I think the I think the the the analysis I think speaks for itself. I think that the response to the extent that you consider it at this point does, you know, demonstrate that that there there are steps that are in addition to be taken. I think that, you know, the fact of the matter is that we we will need those tools subpoena, and and putting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	do, quote, unquote, "interviews" until you have obtained all of the documents you would need to frame those interviews properly. That's not how you do an investigation. And so I think to the extent that the arguments that are in the response you received last night and and, frankly, the the original response themselves, seem to say that you have to have the evidence, all of the evidence to in order to investigate that you would obtain through the investigation. Well, that's simply not how the Clean Elections Act and rules are structured. The question is whether or not there's reason to believe a violation may have occurred and then subsequent to that we will be able to obtain all the information necessary. And so, for example, although you operate subject to a compliance order and we've incorporated the numbers that could would go on that compliance order, those numbers are subject to revision as we move forward, and that's I think that's explicit in the document you have in front of you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Two questions, at least on my part. One is, is laying out the timing of things at

	58		59
1	could lay that out a little more specifically, because I,	1	emphatic letter from me asking for that information.
2	in looking at this, I think a 14-day time period to	2	So, you know, we've done everything we can within
3	complete an investigation is inappropriate and is	3	the structure of this of the of the prior to reason
4	insufficient. And I think the law the rules allow us	4	to believe to to be efficient, to be effective, subject
5	to extend for whatever we may need. That 14-day period is	5	to those those events. And we'll and we'll continue
6	not an absolute.	6	to do that, but 14 days is not the is not the deadline.
7	MR. COLLINS: I I believe that that is	7	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Great. Thank you.
8	correct. And we would we would certainly I think we	8	I'll I'll hold my other comment for later.
9	want to continue to move with expe expeditiously.	9	Questions from the Commissioners for Mr. Collins?
10	But that that 14 days is is is that's correct.	10	No. Okay.
11	It is it is essentially 14 days, but we're in the midst	11	I understand Mr. Wilenchik, are are you
12	of the investigation and there will be an explanation	12	here? Okay. Sir, please, if you'd like to say something,
13	that 14 days is going to is going to move,	13	you're you have the podium.
14	inherently.	14	MR. WILENCHIK: I thank you for that. I
15	The most important thing I think is that that	15	understand the the low threshold that you're dealing
16	the Commissioners understand that we have taken every step	16	with, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I just
17	we can to move it as expeditious and Mr. Horne,	17	want to make it clear that I got involved in this actually
18	frankly, as well we've taken every step we can to move	18	late yesterday, so don't hold it against me. But, because
19	as expeditiously as possible within the confines of the	19	of that
20	reason to believe itself, subject to his own decision to	20	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: The practice of law is
21	file a lawsuit to enjoin, and subject to the fact that the	21	wonderful, isn't it?
22	Attorney General's office for example has not been able to	22	MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. It's always it's always
23	provide to us documents quickly; was not able to confirm,	23	a joy, but and an honor to be here.
24	for example, the salaries of these employees for	24	But what I was just wanting to make clear is I
25	essentially a month and a half, subject to a pretty	25	think what happened was is that the counsel, Mr. LaSota,
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	60		
			01
1		1	61 everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you
1	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this	1	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you
2	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And	2	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an
_	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that		everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example.
2 3	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication,	2 3	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think,
2 3 4 5	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially.	2 3 4	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's
2 3 4	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the	2 3 4	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm
2 3 4 5 6	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And	2 3 4 5 6 7	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to	2 3 4 5 6 7	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I won't belabor it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you know, issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I won't belabor it. But I do want to say that the time sheet issue, which is something that's noted I believe in a footnote	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you know, issues. I do want to say two things as before I sit down, though, as to why I don't think you should proceed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I won't belabor it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you know, issues. I do want to say two things as before I sit down, though, as to why I don't think you should proceed to continue this investigation, which is why we do have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I won't belabor it. But I do want to say that the time sheet issue, which is something that's noted I believe in a footnote and I think you were just referring to in part. It's my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you know, issues. I do want to say two things as before I sit down, though, as to why I don't think you should proceed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I won't belabor it. But I do want to say that the time sheet issue, which is something that's noted I believe in a footnote and I think you were just referring to in part. It's my understanding, because I've checked into that quickly, are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you know, issues. I do want to say two things as before I sit down, though, as to why I don't think you should proceed to continue this investigation, which is why we do have the witness statements in front of you. Basically what I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I won't belabor it. But I do want to say that the time sheet issue, which is something that's noted I believe in a footnote and I think you were just referring to in part. It's my understanding, because I've checked into that quickly, are at the DOA. It's in the State system. So Mr. Horne	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you know, issues. I do want to say two things as before I sit down, though, as to why I don't think you should proceed to continue this investigation, which is why we do have the witness statements in front of you. Basically what I see here, and I'll try to sum this up in the interest of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	as you probably saw from some e-mails, thought that this was going to be an actual hearing for some reason. And I'm not sure as I looked at it briefly why he thought that and looked at the rules, but that's the communication, essentially. So, I think that is what resulted in the preparation of the document you received last night. And so, I didn't mean to because I got involved late, I didn't mean to put you all to the trouble of having to read all that, and and and I apologize honestly for that. Because I think there was some misunderstanding, which has been clarified through discussions I've had with not only Mr. Collins but with your counsel who you are represented well by. Let me just say a couple quick things and I'll sit down. In light of the fact that I sorry. In light of the fact that I acknowledged your comments earlier so I won't belabor it. But I do want to say that the time sheet issue, which is something that's noted I believe in a footnote and I think you were just referring to in part. It's my understanding, because I've checked into that quickly, are at the DOA. It's in the State system. So Mr. Horne doesn't have any control over some of these documents,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	everything. I think you can see he's trying to get you all information. We have 11 witness statements, as an example. So, it would be unfair to characterize, I think, with all due respect to Mr. Collins, that Mr. Horne's office is somehow stalling you or stonewalling. And I'm not suggesting he said those words. But if there was any inference of that, I want to make clear that's not our intent. We would like to get this done as soon as possible. That's why you have all those witness statements. If you want to put those people under oath, we're happy to do that. We may have some disagreement as things go with certain documents. For example, I'm not sure how important it is to know what people earn. But, you know, if that's something you're interested in and you think is important, I'm sure we'll get through those kinds of, you know, issues. I do want to say two things as before I sit down, though, as to why I don't think you should proceed to continue this investigation, which is why we do have the witness statements in front of you. Basically what I see here, and I'll try to sum this up in the interest of time, is one witness who has stated things as to that

	63		63
	62		63
1	And, in fairness, I don't believe and, again,	1	people are stating the truth or not. And that's why we
2	I haven't had all the time in the world as I just said to	2	submitted additional statements yesterday from Ms. Dugan,
3	go through this. But what I have gone through quickly and	3	as an example.
4	stayed up late last night reading, I can I can say with	4	So, on the one hand I think it's a little
5	conviction, does not appear that she either alleged or is	5	overbroad with respect to everybody else who has given you
6	even producing any evidence of what everybody else in the	6	statements. And it's almost assuming that all those
7	office was doing. And I think it's presumptuous, to say	7	people are not telling the truth, which I also think is an
8	the least, in fairness to her. And in fairness to Mr.	8	unfair thing to do, and that one person is.
9	Horne, though, that it's a little presumptuous for her to	9	Furthermore, the second thing that I said I would
10	extrapolate, and and basically if that's what she	10	want to raise here before I sit down in terms of whether
11	was doing. And I'm, frankly, not even clear if she was	11	you proceed further is this quid pro quo issue. Those of
12	doing it, because I couldn't even find last night an	12	you that don't speak Latin, like me, but learned this in
13	allegation, in effect, about the others specifically.	13	law school a long time ago, I can't even tell you exactly
14	So, I think on the one issue it's a little	14	what that means, but someone here I'm sure can tell me.
15	overbroad. If the investigation proceeded as to this one	15	But but
16	woman, Ms. Beattie, I could appreciate that and I wouldn't	16	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: This for that.
17	even argue it. We'll deal with that and hopefully we can	17	MR. WILENCHIK: What?
18	have a hearing. And that's another issue I want to	18	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: This for that.
19	address before I sit down, because I do wish to have a	19	MR. WILENCHIK: This for that. Yes. Okay. Very
20		20	
	hearing here not necessarily at the OAH, but we could	20	well. I didn't pass my Latin course, obviously.
21	do that, too.		But I understand the concept and I understand
22	But before this thing gets further, because of	22	what's being alleged. And all I can say on that is, is
23	the nature of it, I think in fairness a hearing is	23	that I looked at that carefully, too, last night. I do
24	appropriate, so that you can assess the witnesses and you	24	want to point out a couple of quick things as I say on
25	can speak to them and determine whether or not these	25	that, first of all, I think are just wrong.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	64		65
1	If you look at page 12 and 13 of of	1	hours a day for the campaign. Because we certainly
2	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any	2	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any
2 3	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to	2 3	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what
2 3 4	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement.	2 3 4	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all
2 3	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various,	2 3 4 5	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months.
2 3 4 5 6	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering,	2 3 4 5 6	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are.	2 3 4 5 6 7	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not. So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement.</li> <li>Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not.</li> <li>So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read this thing, it makes Mr. Horne the policeman of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important and and stated to you: This is what I know;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement.</li> <li>Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not.</li> <li>So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read this thing, it makes Mr. Horne the policeman of the office; he's supposed to go around and check everybody's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important and and stated to you: This is what I know; this is what I saw; this is what I saw about Ms. Beattie.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not. So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read this thing, it makes Mr. Horne the policeman of the office; he's supposed to go around and check everybody's time sheets.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important and and stated to you: This is what I know; this is what I saw; this is what I saw about Ms. Beattie. You have to consider that strongly in terms of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement. Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not. So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read this thing, it makes Mr. Horne the policeman of the office; he's supposed to go around and check everybody's time sheets. And the final thing is, if in fact these time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important and and stated to you: This is what I know; this is what I saw; this is what I saw about Ms. Beattie. You have to consider that strongly in terms of what we're talking about here when you're going after a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement.</li> <li>Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not.</li> <li>So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read this thing, it makes Mr. Horne the policeman of the office; he's supposed to go around and check everybody's time sheets.</li> <li>And the final thing is, if in fact these time sheets were altered by Ms. Beattie, there's no evidence</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important and and and stated to you: This is what I know; this is what I saw; this is what I saw about Ms. Beattie. You have to consider that strongly in terms of what we're talking about here when you're going after a sitting Attorney General, albeit one that won't be sitting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement.</li> <li>Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not.</li> <li>So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read this thing, it makes Mr. Horne the policeman of the office; he's supposed to go around and check everybody's time sheets.</li> <li>And the final thing is, if in fact these time sheets were altered by Ms. Beattie, there's no evidence anybody else altered them. But if Ms. Beattie altered</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important and and stated to you: This is what I know; this is what I saw; this is what I saw about Ms. Beattie. You have to consider that strongly in terms of what we're talking about here when you're going after a sitting Attorney General, albeit one that won't be sitting long, but one that is sitting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Mr. Collins' report, there really is nothing by way of any reason to believe that any position was expressly tied to campaign work or campaign work requirement.</li> <li>Page 8, which purports to set forth the various, quote, unquote, "evidence" excuse me, I'm suffering, Commissioner, from the same thing you are.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. Yeah.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: So apologize. But, anyway CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I'm off purgatory.</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Page 8, which purports to list out some of the alleged evidence, actually has nothing to do with anything to do with <i>quid pro quo</i> that I can understand, and it has to do with whether people are volunteering or not.</li> <li>So, the bottom line is, you know, the way I read this thing, it makes Mr. Horne the policeman of the office; he's supposed to go around and check everybody's time sheets.</li> <li>And the final thing is, if in fact these time sheets were altered by Ms. Beattie, there's no evidence anybody else altered them. But if Ms. Beattie altered time sheets at the time and I know this may not be a</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	haven't received anything by way of allegations or any documents that I could find last night that indicate what she was doing six hours a day for all these days for all of these months. We have some little snippets of things she said she was doing, such as an invitation, but that invitation takes you about five minutes from prior invitations that you just stick in different names. So, these are issues that again, I don't want to belabor this because I know, you know, time time is of the essence and I know that you don't want to take a whole bunch of time today. But I do think you should seriously question this, because you've got 11 witnesses that are very clear that will go under oath if you want them to, but have given statements which are important and and stated to you: This is what I know; this is what I saw; this is what I saw about Ms. Beattie. You have to consider that strongly in terms of what we're talking about here when you're going after a sitting Attorney General, albeit one that won't be sitting long, but one that is sitting. (Coughing.)

	66		67
1	allegations and and they need to be dealt with, I	1	prove a negative.
2		2	I would think this Commission has some burden of
3	understand. We're happy to do that based on what I know	3	
	of this case.		its own to establish the allegations and the evidence to
4	I think if you push this case forward based on	4	suggest that he did something inappropriate. Instead,
5	the allegations here as broadly as they were stated, it's	5	what I saw was allegations by this Commission through
6	a mistake. I think and I'm not trying to tell you guys	6	Mr. Collins that were not substantiated in the allegations
7	what to do, but I think that what would be appropriate	7	of Ms. Beattie, and they aren't substantiated by any
8	here would be to say we'll reasonably investigate	8	actual evidence at all. And every reasonable inference is
9	Ms. Beattie's allegations in terms of what she knows, what	9	taken against Mr. Horne, as if all these statements are
10	she stated about herself; and if in that course of that	10	false, everything he said is false.
11	investigation, it turns out that there's any evidence to	11	And I think that's a very unfortunate state, if
12	reasonably suggest or believe under the same standard that	12	that's where are in the State of Arizona, that our sitting
13	she does have evidence about other people other than an	13	Attorney General is is considered in some way his word
14	anecdotal evidence, but real evidence that she can present	14	doesn't mean anything, but someone who left the office and
15	or even allege because I haven't even seen it	15	is disgruntled, her word means something. And even if you
16	alleged then maybe there's a reason to investigate the	16	find that it does for purposes of today's hearing, I have
17	entire office there. I would even agree with that. But	17	no problem with that, we'll deal with Ms. Beattie's
18	that hasn't happened.	18	allegations, but why is this Commission even considering
19	And so, my suggestion to you, and of course	19	this widespread dragnet investigation?
20	you'll do what you want, but I think in fairness to	20	And I don't mean that to disparage you, but
21	Mr. Horne, based on the fact that he has gone out and	21	that's what it is. Where Mr. Collins intends to go off on
22	given you a full response. And and and to question	22	this sweeping investigation based on an allegation that
23	that response by saying he hasn't proven his case in the	23	Mr. Horne's office somehow was his campaign headquarters
24	response, which is how I read some of the comments made,	24	when, in fact, he had campaign headquarters. That to me
25	is is very unfair. It's putting the burden on him to	25	is not fair to him and it's not fair to anybody who would
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	68		69
1	68 be in his situation.	1	69 guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their
1	be in his situation.	1	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their
2	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously	2	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their
2 3	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one	2 3	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time.
2 3 4	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to	2 3 4	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after
2 3 4 5	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't	2 3 4 5	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and
2 3 4 5 6	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own	2 3 4 5 6	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you
2 3 4 5 6 7	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you	2 3 4 5 6 7	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that there's reason to suggest that other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in charge of daily looking at people's sheets and and that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the Commissioners? None?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in charge of daily looking at people's sheets and and that kind of thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the Commissioners? None? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. I got lots.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in charge of daily looking at people's sheets and and that kind of thing. Now, if he is aware of campaign activity being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the Commissioners? None? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. I got lots. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in charge of daily looking at people's sheets and and that kind of thing. Now, if he is aware of campaign activity being rub out of that office, I understand fully that that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the Commissioners? None? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. I got lots. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, Commissioner Titla.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in charge of daily looking at people's sheets and and that kind of thing. Now, if he is aware of campaign activity being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the Commissioners? None? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. I got lots. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in charge of daily looking at people's sheets and and that kind of thing. Now, if he is aware of campaign activity being rub out of that office, I understand fully that that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the Commissioners? None? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. I got lots. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, Commissioner Titla.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	be in his situation. And that's all I ask you to do is to seriously consider the scope of where you proceed and to take it one step at a time. And if there is some credible evidence to support Mr. Collins' allegations, which right now I don't believe there is, when you go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations, specific allegations of her activity, and you find in that that there's reason to suggest that other people have misstated things in their statements or have lied or have done inappropriate things that are in violation of the law, I have no problem at that point with expanding this investigation further. And I will tell you that I will assist, because we've given you statements, in any information that he wants. But I think this investigation needs some lid on it, because right now it's very ambiguous as to what exactly you you are going after Mr. Horne for in terms of everybody else's activity in an office. He is not in charge of daily looking at people's sheets and and that kind of thing. Now, if he is aware of campaign activity being rub out of that office, I understand fully that that's something he's going to have to be responsible for and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	guarantor of what everybody's doing every day of their every minute of their life. They've said they used their own time. If he has any reason to believe otherwise after he starts conducting Ms. Beattie's allegations and investigation into those, that's fine. But right now you don't have that; you don't really even have an allegation from her on that; and you don't even have an allegation on this <i>quid pro quo</i> issue; and you don't have any evidence to support it. So, that's the only thing I would ask the Commission today, with due respect to sorry to take a look at and to and to seriously consider. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you for your time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you very much, Mr. Wilenchik. Are there any comments or questions of the Commissioners? None? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. I got lots. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, Commissioner Titla. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Are you Dennis Wilenchik?

	70		71
1	on yesterday afternoon?	1	Mr. Kanefield, who I have great respect for. And and I
2	MR. WILENCHIK: Well, I was advised yesterday	2	think we can probably work all of those out. I will try
3	earlier, but I was unavailable personally, that our office	3	to get whatever he needs if you do go forward on anything.
4	would be involved, so I had some other people working on	4	I will tell you, just on or off the record or
5	it; but then I personally was able to focus on it toward	5	otherwise, that we'll we want this investigation to
6	the end of the day.	6	proceed. I do. I I think, you know, he's either right
7	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Okay. I'm glad you are on	7	or he's wrong and we'll soon enough find out. But I've
8	now. I was looking at the material and the Mr. Collins	8	seen enough thus far based on the statements that I think
9	and Sara Larsen, our staff, wrote letters to the Attorney	9	are pretty clear, and the evidence that I have seen, to
10	General's office requesting for information	10	suggest it should not. And I am not suggesting here that
11	MR. WILENCHIK: Right.	11	you shouldn't go forward on Ms. Beattie's own allegations.
12	COMMISSIONER TITLA: and I was concerned	12	I do think that's probably if I were in your position,
13	because there was a lack of response from the office. And	13	I would vote to do that. I'm not going to lie to you on
14	it seems like it took them a long time to respond until	14	that.
15	Mr. Collins had to write them a letter. So, since you're	15	But I do think if you look carefully at her
16	on now, if this goes further, will you try to ensure from	16	allegations, I do, with all due respect to to to
17	your client that the request for information is done, you	17	your Director, I do believe that they've gone a little bit
18	know?	18	awry and afar from even what she alleges in terms of what
19	MR. WILENCHIK: Yes, sir. Absolutely. And I	19	is being looked into.
20	just want to apologize if that was the case. I again,	20	And that's the only criticism I have at this
21	I had nothing to do with that.	21	point, okay? I understand your criticism. It 's well
22	I intend, if you do go forward, to fully	22	taken. And and I'll to do what I can to to try to
23	cooperate a hundred percent. As I said, there there	23	rectify that. But I would ask you to sincerely listen to
24	could be good faith issues, you know, on certain items,	24	what I am saying on the scope of the investigation, only
25	which, as I said, you are well represented by	25	because I do think that the allegations don't even amount
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	72		70
4		4	73
1	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her	1	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else
2	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is	2	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office.
2 3	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no	2 3	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything
2 3 4	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> .	2 3 4	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he
2 3 4 5	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements,	2 3 4 5	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I
2 3 4 5 6	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I	2 3 4 5 6	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where
2 3 4 5 6 7	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And	2 3 4 5 6 7	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press,
2 3 4 5 6	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I	2 3 4 5 6	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I haven't seen any evidence where he told anyone to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Anyway, I'm sorry to take the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I haven't seen any evidence where he told anyone to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Anyway, I'm sorry to take the time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I haven't seen any evidence where he told anyone to do anything other than follow the law. So, I think these allegations have gone overboard. I think they've gotten a lot of unfortunate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Anyway, I'm sorry to take the time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Mr. Hoffman were you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I haven't seen any evidence where he told anyone to do anything other than follow the law. So, I think these allegations have gone overboard. I think they've gotten a lot of unfortunate publicity that's hurt him. That's why I think at this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Anyway, I'm sorry to take the time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Mr. Hoffman were you done, Mr. Titla?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I haven't seen any evidence where he told anyone to do anything other than follow the law. So, I think these allegations have gone overboard. I think they've gotten a lot of unfortunate publicity that's hurt him. That's why I think at this point he wants to clear his name of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Anyway, I'm sorry to take the time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Mr. Hoffman were you done, Mr. Titla? COMMISSIONER TITLA: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I haven't seen any evidence where he told anyone to do anything other than follow the law. So, I think these allegations have gone overboard. I think they've gotten a lot of unfortunate publicity that's hurt him. That's why I think at this point he wants to clear his name of this. But I will tell you, there's not going to be,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Anyway, I'm sorry to take the time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Mr. Hoffman were you done, Mr. Titla? COMMISSIONER TITLA: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Mr. Koester, do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to statements that can be reasonably construed to her having any evidence of what anybody else in that office is doing other than herself. And further that there's no issue on the <i>quid pro quo</i> . I can't even find it in the in the statements, and if I'm missing that, I apologize, but but I couldn't find it under page 8, and page 12 and 13. And based on, again, what I know of the case at this point, I don't understand the <i>quid pro quo</i> argument at all. There's never anyone that has said that Mr. Horne conditioned a job based upon having to in fact, to the contrary we know, there's policy issue that's very clear that Ms. Dugan again reaffirmed last night that she she enforced that it's very clear that it's against company policy State policy and that and that Attorney General Horne made it a point when that came up to be very hard on that. That's the only evidence that I've seen. I haven't seen any evidence where he told anyone to do anything other than follow the law. So, I think these allegations have gone overboard. I think they've gotten a lot of unfortunate publicity that's hurt him. That's why I think at this point he wants to clear his name of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ever told anyone, implied, winked his eye or anything else to hire anybody to to do campaign work at the office. If he when he when and if he learned about anything that was even close to being even a minor infraction, he was always very clear on his position on that. And I think it's just been an unfortunate series of events where everybody has just sort of assumed, including the press, that he's guilty of something. And and I'm not suggesting you guys have done that. But I'm just saying the press, with all due respect to them, take things I think that's one of the reasons why, frankly, now that I have the opportunity to elaborate, I think it's one of the reasons why there was some confusion actually as to what today's hearing was about because of some of the things the press had had had written. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Anyway, I'm sorry to take the time. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No. COMMISSIONER TITLA: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Mr. Hoffman were you done, Mr. Titla? COMMISSIONER TITLA: Yeah.

	74		75
1	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I think Mr. Hoffman was	1	But there's a little more to it, at least in my
2	first	2	mind
3	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay.	3	MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.
4	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: but I do have couple	4	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: besides who said this
5	comments though.	5	and who said that. And one thing is it's kind of out
6	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty.	6	there is the fact that he's running a statewide
7	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Go ahead.	7	campaign
8	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. Mr. Hoffman.	8	MR. WILENCHIK: Yes.
9	MR. WILENCHIK: If you don't have any other	9	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: normally you would
10	questions, though	10	think that he'd have full-time volunteers or at least
11	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: No, you can	11	volunteers apart from the Attorney General's office
12	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah.	12	itself.
13	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: If you had something,	13	MR. WILENCHIK: Right.
14	please go.	14	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I remember one comment
15	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Well, just in general I	15	that someone said: Who are the volunteers? Like, we're
16		16	
17	know with you didn't have much time, and this is more or less my read of what you presented is that Sarah	17	all working on this campaign, where is everybody else at? And it's like, yeah, that's true.
18	Beattie made certain statements about time and time on the	18	-
19	campaign and time in the office, and these other employees	19	Same way with the campaign headquarters, apparently there's Rock Corporation is out there a few
20		20	
20	said more or less the opposite. And it's sort of like	20	blocks away, but as far as the money spent on using the
	you're saying she said/he said/whoever said, and if it was		office and the telephone calls made, you don't see too
22	just this alone, it would be very hard for us to come to	22	much of that, at least I didn't.
23	any conclusions other than to bring your people in and	23	MR. WILENCHIK: You mean from Rock Products?
24	have them say again what what they made statements	24	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Rock Products, yeah.
25	about.	25	Whatever the company is called.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	76		77
4	And exceptions there is out there too is one	4	was daing a had ich. I think if I recall he had a
1	And another thing that is out there, too, is she	1	was doing a bad job. I think if I recall, he had a
2	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about	2	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing
2 3	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie	2 3	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her.
2 3 4	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right.	2 3 4	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests
2 3 4 5	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.	2 3 4 5	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's
2 3 4 5 6	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good	2 3 4 5 6	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she
2 3 4 5 6 7	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or	2 3 4 5 6 7	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about</li> <li>Ms Ms. Beattie</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Right.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.</li> <li>And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good</li> <li>job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or</li> <li>three months after or four months after, and she becomes</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about</li> <li>Ms Ms. Beattie</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Right.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.</li> <li>And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good</li> <li>job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or</li> <li>three months after or four months after, and she becomes</li> <li>employed or watched over by someone else other than I</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about</li> <li>Ms Ms. Beattie</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Right.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.</li> <li>And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good</li> <li>job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or</li> <li>three months after or four months after, and she becomes</li> <li>employed or watched over by someone else other than I</li> <li>think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about</li> <li>Ms Ms. Beattie</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Right.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.</li> <li>And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good</li> <li>job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or</li> <li>three months after or four months after, and she becomes</li> <li>employed or watched over by someone else other than I</li> <li>think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right.</li> <li>So, there's a lot of questions out there</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about</li> <li>Ms Ms. Beattie</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Right.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.</li> <li>And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good</li> <li>job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or</li> <li>three months after or four months after, and she becomes</li> <li>employed or watched over by someone else other than I</li> <li>think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right.</li> <li>So, there's a lot of questions out there</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about</li> <li>Ms Ms. Beattie</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Right.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.</li> <li>And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good</li> <li>job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or</li> <li>three months after or four months after, and she becomes</li> <li>employed or watched over by someone else other than I</li> <li>think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right.</li> <li>So, there's a lot of questions out there</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about</li> <li>Ms Ms. Beattie</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Right.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment.</li> <li>And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good</li> <li>job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or</li> <li>three months after or four months after, and she becomes</li> <li>employed or watched over by someone else other than I</li> <li>think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right.</li> <li>So, there's a lot of questions out there</li> <li>MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go</li> <li>ahead.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if everybody was doing what she claims they were doing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility. The issue is, did Mr. Horne approve that, did he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if everybody was doing what she claims they were doing without any evidence of it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility. The issue is, did Mr. Horne approve that, did he encourage it, and did he sustain it? That's where,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if everybody was doing what she claims they were doing without any evidence of it. I think he did respond and the original response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility. The issue is, did Mr. Horne approve that, did he encourage it, and did he sustain it? That's where, Commissioner, I I have to say that there's just no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if everybody was doing what she claims they were doing without any evidence of it. I think he did respond and the original response as I read it yesterday that explained that that raise,</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility. The issue is, did Mr. Horne approve that, did he encourage it, and did he sustain it? That's where, Commissioner, I I have to say that there's just no evidence of that and it's just not true.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if everybody was doing what she claims they were doing without any evidence of it. I think he did respond and the original response as I read it yesterday that explained that that raise, of course, had nothing to do with anything other than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility. The issue is, did Mr. Horne approve that, did he encourage it, and did he sustain it? That's where, Commissioner, I I have to say that there's just no evidence of that and it's just not true. So, that's where we have this issue. There was a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if everybody was doing what she claims they were doing without any evidence of it. I think he did respond and the original response as I read it yesterday that explained that that raise, of course, had nothing to do with anything other than the fact that she had a low-paid position, she was put in a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility. The issue is, did Mr. Horne approve that, did he encourage it, and did he sustain it? That's where, Commissioner, I I have to say that there's just no evidence of that and it's just not true. So, that's where we have this issue. There was a policy and, yet, when we say there was a policy, your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	was given a rather substantial raise. I'm talking about Ms Ms. Beattie MR. WILENCHIK: Right. COMMISSIONER KOESTER: during her employment. And all of a sudden, it's like if she's not doing a good job, why such a huge raise in salary halfway through or three months after or four months after, and she becomes employed or watched over by someone else other than I think it was Ms. Dugan or if my memory is right. So, there's a lot of questions out there MR. WILENCHIK: Can I respond to that one? COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Besides yeah. Go ahead. MR. WILENCHIK: Oh. Thanks. Well, there's there's a lot of response but let me keep it brief. You'd have to almost assume just logically that everybody then would have been large raises in the same scenario if everybody was doing what she claims they were doing without any evidence of it. I think he did respond and the original response as I read it yesterday that explained that that raise, of course, had nothing to do with anything other than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	meeting with her in which they discussed her doing something that was more interesting for her. There's nothing in that meeting that suggests that she indicated that she was going I mean, there's just no evidence of it, no objective evidence, that she indicated that: Now I need more money to do full-time campaign work. And then what is that work? That's the part that I'm at a loss at. No one has ever even begun to allege, let alone explain, what she's doing for six hours a day for all those months; there's no product to show for it. And so, what I'm saying is it is possible that you have a rogue employee in any organization that decides to do what they want to do every day and that is possible, or decides to do volunteer work on company time, if you will, and not on her own time. I I recognize that's always a possibility. The issue is, did Mr. Horne approve that, did he encourage it, and did he sustain it? That's where, Commissioner, I I have to say that there's just no evidence of that and it's just not true. So, that's where we have this issue. There was a

	78		79
1	but he didn't do anything to enforce it. Well, that's	1	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yeah. And and and,
2	what policies are. You you have them so that they will	2	again, what we're looking at here is a very low standard
3	be enforced. And where there was an infraction known, it	3	of of, you know, reason to believe that a violation has
4	was enforced.	4	occurred. We're not making any conclusions regarding
5	The problem here is Sarah Beattie left and then	5	it
6	made these allegations. So, that's the issue we have	6	MR. WILENCHIK: I understand.
7	here. There's nothing contemporaneous with her working	7	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: but there's enough dust
8	where it was indicated that she complained to somebody and	8	in the air as a result of the messiness. And given her
9	somebody did said, you know what, forget it, we're not	9	allegations that it it suggests to me that wherever the
10	going to enforce those policies. That wasn't in the	10	factual determinations may come out, it sill suggests to
11	facts. So that's why I say it's a little more complicated	11	me that an investigation needs to go forward.
12	than it appears.	12	You have a fair point on the scope of it, but I
13	And I I recognize your point, finally. I do	13	think that's something that we can deliberate on a little
14	recognize your point that there are a lot of people	14	bit more on.
15	working up there that are working on this campaign as	15	But I think to to piggyback on Mr. Koester's
16	well. I get that point. I acknowledge that point, it's	16	comment, I I think that here is what brings me to
17	obvious. But I don't know that that means that anything	17	decide and I'm telegraphing my vote here. Brings me to
18	was violated when they use their own time to do it.	18	decide that we probably need to go ahead with an
19	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Let me just jump in real	19	investigation or we do need to go ahead with an
20	quick before I turn it over to Mr. Hoffman. To follow on	20	investigation.
21	Mr. Koester's point that it's just it's messy. The	21	Okay. Mr. Hoffman?
22	fact that you had four senior members of the office or,	22	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yes. Mr. Wilenchik, you
23	prominent members of the office also being senior members	23	represent Mr. Horne?
24	of the campaign, it's just messy.	24	MR. WILENCHIK: Uh-huh.
25	MR. WILENCHIK: We can agree on that.	25	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Do you represent him in
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	80		81
			01
1	both his personal and official capacities?	1	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may
1 2		1 2	
	both his personal and official capacities?		MR. WILENCHIK: If I may
2	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah.	2	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be
2 3	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful	2 3	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the
2 3 4	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that	2 3 4	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day,
2 3 4 5 6 7	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the	2 3 4 5	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work
2 3 4 5 6	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. 1 understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. 1 1 may have that slightly wrong	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattle, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. 1 understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. 1 1 may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a sort of attack on Mr. Collins for daring to, you know,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattle, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner, that some of that may be subject to DOA, so I'll look into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a sort of attack on Mr. Collins for daring to, you know, raise the issue that things had been delayed. And I, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner, that some of that may be subject to DOA, so I'll look into that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a sort of attack on Mr. Collins for daring to, you know, raise the issue that things had been delayed. And I, you know, would encourage if, in fact, your client does want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner, that some of that may be subject to DOA, so I'll look into that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Well, I mean, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. 1 understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. 1 1 may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a sort of attack on Mr. Collins for daring to, you know, raise the issue that things had been delayed. And I, you know, would encourage if, in fact, your client does want to, you know, get everything, as you've said and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner, that some of that may be subject to DOA, so I'll look into that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Well, I mean, I I think I'm not sure what you mean by "subject to DOA."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a sort of attack on Mr. Collins for daring to, you know, raise the issue that things had been delayed. And I, you know, would encourage if, in fact, your client does want to, you know, get everything, as you've said and invest and, you know, allow an investigation to go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner, that some of that may be subject to DOA, so I'll look into that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Well, I mean, I I think I'm not sure what you mean by "subject to DOA." MR. WILENCHIK: Well, my understanding was I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. 1 understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a sort of attack on Mr. Collins for daring to, you know, raise the issue that things had been delayed. And I, you know, would encourage if, in fact, your client does want to, you know, get everything, as you've said and invest and, you know, allow an investigation to go forward in in a meaningful way, that perhaps we can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner, that some of that may be subject to DOA, so I'll look into that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Well, I mean, I I think I'm not sure what you mean by "subject to DOA." MR. WILENCHIK: Well, my understanding was I got a message actually, because my question was very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	both his personal and official capacities? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So, that's helpful because of the issue that MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. I understand. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Commissioner Titla raised with regard to responding to the subpoena the public records request. Just picking starting with that, and I'd like to take these in sort of little cabined positions. MR. WILENCHIK: Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It disturbed me that also that there's been two months since the public records request was made on July 3rd, and by my count four pieces of paper produced. I I may have that slightly wrong and maybe there's pieces that I don't know about it. But it is at least a partial response and it seemed very partial to me, and that was accompanied with a sort of attack on Mr. Collins for daring to, you know, raise the issue that things had been delayed. And I, you know, would encourage if, in fact, your client does want to, you know, get everything, as you've said and invest and, you know, allow an investigation to go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WILENCHIK: If I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me ask let me be more specific on what I have in mind. You've raised the question of if, you know, she worked six hours a day, Ms. Beattie, on campaign business, where's the work product? Well, wouldn't that be all all of her e-mails and all of her documents that she did on her computer would tell us the answer to that, what she was doing every day, right? MR. WILENCHIK: Which she has and she's produced. And if you added all of that up COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I assume that what's on the State computers is going to be far more than what she happened to take with her and print out or whatever, too. So so MR. WILENCHIK: As I indicated earlier, I think some of that may be the problem may be, Commissioner, that some of that may be subject to DOA, so I'll look into that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Well, I mean, I I think I'm not sure what you mean by "subject to DOA." MR. WILENCHIK: Well, my understanding was I

	82	1	83
1	produced and so forth? Because I'm in agreement with you.	1	Mr. Horne and his staff.
2	I'm not I'm not fighting and arguing about it, I think	2	MR. WILENCHIK: Let me just answer that as
3	you should have whatever you need.	3	quickly as I can.
4	The time sheets in particular, which would be	4	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm sorry. Mr. Collins
5	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I'm not talking	5	and his staff.
6	about time sheets. I almost don't care about I mean	6	MR. WILENCHIK: Part of the problem, I have to be
7	well, I shouldn't say I don't care about them. I don't	7	very candid with you and the reason why I suggested the
8	know if I care about the time sheets.	8	scope issue is, let let's just assume for the sake of
9	What I'm interested in is there is allegations	9	the argument that that's true
10	that this collection of employees was doing a lot of	10	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm going to talk about
11	campaign work on on not only State time, meaning their	11	the scope issue later with you, I'd like to do that,
12	salaries, but also on State facilities. And, you know, so	12	but
13	it seems like and and the response from Mr. Horne	13	MR. WILENCHIK: But let me just answer.
14	seems to be: Well, they put in full eight hours days and	14	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want you to repeat
15	did a lot of work on various tasks for the State and in	15	it, but whether it's Ms Ms. Beattie herself only or
16	addition to the campaign materials. And, you know, and on	16	all of them, you know, the issue is, you know, let's look
17	the other hand, there's Mr. Horne says, the response is	17	at their computers and let's look at the quantity of work,
18	that there's no evidence of lots of work being done on	18	right? Relative quantity of work.
19	campaign-related activities.	19	MR. WILENCHIK: The issue, I think and this is
20	Well, that's testable, right? I mean, the	20	why I brought it up. And that's why this is not an easy
21	entirety of the e-mails and the entirety of the documents	21	issue; it is messy. The issue is, is Mr. Horne being
22	that are produced on the computers on State computers	22	charged or potentially being charged with something
23	at the State offices during the entire period ought to	23	relating to what an individual does on
24	tell us the answer to that question if it were produced or	24	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, that's another
25	made available for inspection to to, you know,	25	question.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	84		85
1		-	
•	MR. WILENCHIK: Well, that's a big question here.	1	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't have a problem with that,
2	MR. WILENCHIK: Well, that's a big question here. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you	1 2	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't have a problem with that, I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm
2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you	2	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm
2 3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised	2 3	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy
2 3 4	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question.	2 3 4	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point
2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business.	2 3 4 5 6 7	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full eight-hour day on State business.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: it's been two months.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full eight-hour day on State business. MR. WILENCHIK: That's right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: it's been two months. Mr. Horne has now lost the election, so, you know, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full eight-hour day on State business. MR. WILENCHIK: That's right. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, let's let's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: it's been two months. Mr. Horne has now lost the election, so, you know, the issue of stalling doesn't come into it. Whether he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full eight-hour day on State business. MR. WILENCHIK: That's right. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, let's let's let's check that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: it's been two months. Mr. Horne has now lost the election, so, you know, the issue of stalling doesn't come into it. Whether he stalled or not, doesn't matter. You know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full eight-hour day on State business. MR. WILENCHIK: That's right. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, let's let's let's check that. MR. WILENCHIK: That's what they represented.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: it's been two months. Mr. Horne has now lost the election, so, you know, the issue of stalling doesn't come into it. Whether he stalled or not, doesn't matter. You know MR. WILENCHIK: May I comment?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full eight-hour day on State business. MR. WILENCHIK: That's right. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, let's let's let's check that. MR. WILENCHIK: That's what they represented. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let's check that. Right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: it's been two months. Mr. Horne has now lost the election, so, you know, the issue of stalling doesn't come into it. Whether he stalled or not, doesn't matter. You know MR. WILENCHIK: May I comment? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: let's get it done,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. But but you raised MR. WILENCHIK: question. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Horne has raised the question of whether these employees actually were doing lots of campaign business. MR. WILENCHIK: Mr. Horne isn't raising it, Mr. Horne is trying to respond to it. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But Mr. Horne's response says that, you know, that people MR. WILENCHIK: Their response says. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: No. Mr. Horne's response says that these people put in well, okay. He's supported by affidavits, yes, but or, statements. MR. WILENCHIK: Statements. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Statements. They all say, if I understand correctly, that these guys put in full eight-hour day on State business. MR. WILENCHIK: That's right. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, let's let's let's check that. MR. WILENCHIK: That's what they represented.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I'm not sure you'll get a great answer to it, but I'm happy COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So so, my my point with regard to the documentation is that, you know, it's, you know, I think it's important that there is a willingness to promptly, you know, disclose the documents of employees, whichever set we talk about, from the State computers, including e-mail and including work product, and appropriate confidentiality provisions MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: can be negotiated, I'm sure. And, you know, I I wanted to say I appreciated your comment earlier that said, you know, we want to get everything out there and want to make sure that that information is provided. It has not to date MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: it's been two months. Mr. Horne has now lost the election, so, you know, the issue of stalling doesn't come into it. Whether he stalled or not, doesn't matter. You know MR. WILENCHIK: May I comment?

	86	1	87
1	MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah.	1	we're raising there is Ms. Beattie did have to fill out
2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay.	2	time sheets and certify them.
3	MR. WILENCHIK: No. Look, I don't disagree with	3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah.
4	a lot of what you just said, okay?	4	MR. WILENCHIK: I think the only point that I
5	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Good. Well, I'm	5	know of in which that came up was saying and you may
6	glad we're on the same overall page.	6	not like it, but that's the reality of it either she
7	MR. WILENCHIK: We are.	7	was telling the truth when she was filling out those time
8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Let me turn to the	8	sheets or she wasn't; if she and it can only be one or
9	well, while we're on the subject there's in Mr. Horne's	9	the other.
10	responses there are a lot of personal attacks on Ms.	10	And so, today if she's saying: Well, when I
11	Beattie and on our Executive Director. I wanted to	11	filled them out, I wasn't telling the truth on those
12	express	12	certifications. That the only issue that I know of.
13	MR. WILENCHIK: He would consider there were a	13	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I hear you, but
14	lot of personal attacks on him, but I I understand your	14	MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree it's irrelevant
15	point.	15	in some ways.
16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I agree with that,	16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, I'm not saying
17	too. But in terms of saying people are a liar, you know,	17	it's it's irrelevant. What I'd like to to
18	Mr. Horne has said Ms Ms. Beattie is a liar and also	18	do is that to the extent during the investigation I'd
19	said our Executive Director is biased.	19	like to ask this. To me, personally, and I'm speaking for
20	MR. WILENCHIK: Can I make that clear?	20	myself, not the Commission.
21	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah.	21	MR. WILENCHIK: I understand.
22	MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Thank you for that. What	22	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: It's relevant if, you
22	I think Mr. Horne is saying and what I what I would	22	know, if you have a point. If you challenging
23	say I can't say everything he said, but what I what	23	someone's credibility is fine if you tie it to a statement
25	I would say is this in response: The only point that	25	that the person made that you believe is untrue. So if
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC	20	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	88		89
1	88 you say: She's lying about "X" because she's	1	89 COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might
1	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's	1	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might
2	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that	2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're
2 3	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely.	2 3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says
2 3 4	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject.	2 3 4	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct.
2 3 4 5	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point.	2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if
2 3 4 5 6	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure.	2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make	2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<pre>you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<pre>you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think you would have. But but I wanted to</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the relationship; you have to have trust in him. I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think you would have. But but I wanted to MR. WILENCHIK: But I agree with you.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the relationship; you have to have trust in him. I don't think he's out in a vendetta or anything like that, so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think you would have. But but I wanted to MR. WILENCHIK: But I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I wanted to just express	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the relationship; you have to have trust in him. I don't think he's out in a vendetta or anything like that, so. There is none of that coming from me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think you would have. But but I wanted to MR. WILENCHIK: But I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I wanted to just express some comments going forward that as to what the, you</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the relationship; you have to have trust in him. I don't think he's out in a vendetta or anything like that, so. There is none of that coming from me. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm glad you said that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think you would have. But but I wanted to MR. WILENCHIK: But I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I wanted to just express some comments going forward that as to what the, you know</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the relationship; you have to have trust in him. I don't think he's out in a vendetta or anything like that, so. There is none of that coming from me. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm glad you said that. MR. WILENCHIK: And I absolutely. And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think you would have. But but I wanted to MR. WILENCHIK: But I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I wanted to just express some comments going forward that as to what the, you know MR. WILENCHIK: Appreciate.</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the relationship; you have to have trust in him. I don't think he's out in a vendetta or anything like that, so. There is none of that coming from me. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm glad you said that. MR. WILENCHIK: And I absolutely. And I believe also your counsel is somebody of the highest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>you say: She's lying about "X" because she's MR. WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: not credible about that subject. MR. WILENCHIK: That's a good point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Then, you know, sure. You're free to make MR. WILENCHIK: That's wrong. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: any argument you want. But MR. WILENCHIK: Ad hominem attacks are not welcome and I agree. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. But, you know MR. WILENCHIK: And by the way, I didn't write just so you know COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I get that. I don't think you would have. But but I wanted to MR. WILENCHIK: But I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I wanted to just express some comments going forward that as to what the, you know MR. WILENCHIK: Appreciate. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: what the stuff I care</pre>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: And and and I might care if it's relevant to a particular fact that you're disputing of what she says MR. WILENCHIK: Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: and but and if the attack is is somehow tied to it. MR. WILENCHIK: Otherwise I agree with you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I I know Mr. Collins well enough to say that I doubt personal attacks are going to be productive regardless. MR. WILENCHIK: And, listen, I I want to say very clearly before you even go on. I'm glad I have the opportunity, actually. This is not about Mr. Collins to me. I have nothing against Mr. Collins. I'm sure he does a great job for you. I've sat on boards myself, I understand the relationship; you have to have trust in him. I don't think he's out in a vendetta or anything like that, so. There is none of that coming from me. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm glad you said that. MR. WILENCHIK: And I absolutely. And I believe also your counsel is somebody of the highest integrity. So, as far as I'm concerned on my watch, that

	90		91
1	thank you for saying those comments. If, in fact, there	1	right? Independent.
2	are any problems with the way your side feels treated	2	MR. WILENCHIK: I will say this. I agree with
3	or or or the other side if if, you know, assuming	3	99 percent of what you just said except I will say this.
4	people or representatives are here, you know, please bring	4	I think it's reality, that in any office, if we were to go
5	it to attention of the Chair, and and I'd be	5	in and audit any political office today of anyone
6	certainly interested in that.	6	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Minus trivia.
7	MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.	7	MR. WILENCHIK: Huh?
8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But but if there's	8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Minus trivia. I'll agree
9	not	9	with you on that.
10	MR. WILENCHIK: I hear you.	10	MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Yeah. I think you'd find
11	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: let's let's let's	11	that people do talk about things, that's all.
12	tone it appropriately.	12	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Sure.
13	The all right. So, the the other thing I	13	MR. WILENCHIK: Or may send a quick e-mail or
14	wanted to say is with regard to what we're looking at, as	14	something.
15	I understand it, and and I'd like your comments if you	15	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Sure. And I I.
16	agree or disagree on that. There's even if somebody	16	MR. WILENCHIK: That's all I'm saying. But I
17	works 40 hours a day a week on State business, so one	17	agree with your comment.
18	issue is if they're not getting the full services a	18	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But and I accept your
19	particular person, whatever that is, an employee, if	19	qualification.
20	they're not providing their full services to the State	20	But but those are two issues. And then the
21	because they're off volunteering, that's a problem,	21	third issue which you raised is Mr. Horne's own activity
22	problem number one.	22	and whether he has the duty to supervise and whether he
23	Problem number two, even if they're providing	23	set up these issues and whether he did it himself,
24	40 hours a week of State service, if they're using State	24	correct?
25	facilities for campaign purposes, that's a problem too,	25	So those those are the three issues with
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
1	92	1	93
1	respect	1	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any
2	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be	2	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation.
2 3	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may	2 3	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the
2 3 4	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah.	2 3 4	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that.
2 3 4 5	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he	2 3 4 5	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those	2 3 4 5 6	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to
2 3 4 5 6 7	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her specifically to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response, allegation and response is the form of the document. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattle is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her specifically to do MR WILENCHIK: Absolutely.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response, allegation and response is the form of the document. And they talk about allegations with respect to Ms. Dugan
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her specifically to do MR WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: campaign business	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response, allegation and response is the form of the document. And they talk about allegations with respect to Ms. Dugan well, I'm not sure if they're if they're "Mrs." or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her specifically to do MR WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: campaign business MR. WILENCHIK: Then that's <i>quid pro quo</i> .	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response, allegation and response is the form of the document. And they talk about allegations with respect to Ms. Dugan well, I'm not sure if they're if they're "Mrs." or "Ms."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattle is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her specifically to do MR WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: campaign business MR. WILENCHIK: Then that's quid pro quo. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: you know, and pays her	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response, allegation and response is the form of the document. And they talk about allegations with respect to Ms. Dugan well, I'm not sure if they're if they're "Mrs." or "Ms." MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her specifically to do MR WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: campaign business MR. WILENCHIK: Then that's quid pro quo. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: you know, and pays her a State salary, then that's what you're talking about.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response, allegation and response is the form of the document. And they talk about allegations with respect to Ms. Dugan well, I'm not sure if they're if they're "Mrs." or "Ms." MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, let me just say:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	respect MR. WILENCHIK: Well, what I'm saying, just to be clear if I may COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: is he set up policies and he made it clear to Ms. Dugan who ran the office that those policies would be enforced. My only point was I think anyone here can appreciate that as a high-ranking government COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Policies. MR. WILENCHIK: official, he can't be running around making sure Ms. Beattie is filling out her time sheets correctly. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. MR. WILENCHIK: That's all. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But if he hires her specifically to do MR WILENCHIK: Absolutely. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: campaign business MR. WILENCHIK: Then that's quid pro quo. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: you know, and pays her a State salary, then that's what you're talking about. MR. WILENCHIK: That's quid pro quo. And what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WILENCHIK: I don't read here any allegation. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm not getting into the merits yet of whether I agree with that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I'm just trying to identify three categories of concern. MR. WILENCHIK: Yes. Correct. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: With regard to your issue about other other employees, I'm looking at the while you were talking, I was looking at the Secretary of State's reasonable cause notice. And from page 5 through the end of the document. The first four pages are talking about Ms. Beattie and her own work schedule, but page around the middle of page 5, there's discussions of allegations and response, allegation and response, allegation and response is the form of the document. And they talk about allegations with respect to Ms. Dugan well, I'm not sure if they're if they're "Mrs." or "Ms." MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Sure. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: So, let me just say: Dugan, Beattie, Winn I know that's a Ms Scordato,

|--|

	94		95
1	finding and that there were allegations that each of	1	people here today, by the way, but but I'm glad we
2	those people did proscribed things with regard to working	2	didn't when last late last night I kind of figured out
3	on campaigns; and many of those responses were sort of	3	what the scope of this was. But they're they're happy
4	admit that the or not deny the allegation but merely	4	to come here and talk to you, put their hand on a Bible
5	provide an explanation of some sort.	5	and and tell you under oath everything they told you in
6	You're asking us to make a a finding of	6	the statement.
7	reasonable cause that is a narrower scope than the	7	The fact of the matter is we made very clear, we
8	MR. WILENCHIK: Yes.	8	tried before this hearing to make it very clear, that
9	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: than than this, and	9	those people have said there is nothing that was done
10	and am I right?	10	inappropriately. Ms. Beattie has no evidence of that.
11	MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah yes. Thank you. What	11	What Ms. Beattle has as to herself, we can deal
12		12	
13	I'm saying is this: If you actually look at all the	13	with. But there is no evidence that she has substantiated
14	allegations that Secretary of State made, I don't know	14	anything to give you even the lowest probable cause
14	that Ms. Beattie actually made them but that can be	14	standard that Mr. Horne has done anything inappropriate in
16	debated, but I don't read it that way. But taking a look	16	his office with respect to any of these people:
17	at what you just looked at, there is nothing that I could	17	Encouraging them to do campaign work there; hiring them to
	find at least and I'm not, you know, when I say		do campaign work as a condition; or even condoning any
18	nothing, there's always something that can come up and	18	campaign work. When it came to his attention, he was
19 20	and and surprise me.	19 20	always resolute that it shouldn't be. And Ms. Dugan has
20 21	But there's nothing that I saw of any substance	20	now reaffirmed that as of late last or yesterday in a
21 22	that would support that Mr. Horne, first of all, should be		separate statement, even making it even clearer.
22 22	responsible for any of that; secondly, that they did	22	So, what I'm saying is when you are looking at a
23 24	anything inappropriate that was specific; and third, the	23 24	reasonable cause standard, I think you even you know, I
	reason why Mr. Horne gave you the 11 statements of these	24 25	was a prosecutor many, many moons ago and we had probable
25	people, which by the way we were going to have those	25	cause hearings and I, you know, was on the other side of a
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	96		97
4		4	Mar Hanna and Gradhe and Brazer that were heared in the
1	lot of these arguments arguing that the standard was very	1	Mr. Horne specifically and it says that, you know, just
2	low. I get that.	2	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie
2 3	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem	2 3	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to
2 3 4	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her	2 3 4	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser.
2 3 4 5	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the	2 3 4 5	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour.
2 3 4 5 6	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against	2 3 4 5 6	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your
2 3 4 5 6 7	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was	2 3 4 5 6 7	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy  MR. RYAN: Garret Archer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy  MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling. MR. WILENCHIK: And Ms. Grisham would attest to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer. Thank you. And I believe he affirmed, in fact, this very point	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling. MR. WILENCHIK: And Ms. Grisham would attest to that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer. Thank you. And I believe he affirmed, in fact, this very point COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, listen. I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling. MR. WILENCHIK: And Ms. Grisham would attest to that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Again, you know, Mr. Horne
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer. Thank you. And I believe he affirmed, in fact, this very point COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, listen. I don't mean to say that you don't have any evidence or that these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling. MR. WILENCHIK: And Ms. Grisham would attest to that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Again, you know, Mr. Horne discussed a proposed robocall during work hours; Mr. Horne
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer. Thank you. And I believe he affirmed, in fact, this very point COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, listen. I don't mean to say that you don't have any evidence or that these issues are made up in my mind, they are not, but by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling. MR. WILENCHIK: And Ms. Grisham would attest to that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Again, you know, Mr. Horne discussed a proposed robocall during work hours; Mr. Horne
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer. Thank you. And I believe he affirmed, in fact, this very point COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, listen. I don't mean to say that you don't have any evidence or that these issues are made up in my mind, they are not, but by the way, I should have said starting with page 4.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling. MR. WILENCHIK: And Ms. Grisham would attest to that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Again, you know, Mr. Horne discussed a proposed robocall during work hours; Mr. Horne discussed a negative of Rotellini memo; Mr. Horne e-mailed a memo about his achievements to two other employees.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	low. I get that. But what I'm saying is it may not be a problem with Beattie's allegations. I repeat. But her allegations do not establish probable cause in the slightest degree for you to proceed right now against Mr. Horne that somehow everybody else in that wing was somehow doing something illegally at his instance, at his knowledge, his condoning it, and or his wanting it done. And that you have no evidence at any time any infraction was brought to his attention he didn't absolutely say it's inappropriate. He did. In fact, there's a statement, as I recall, from gosh, the names are a little hard on me right now, but the technical guy MR. RYAN: Garret Archer. MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. Thanks. Garret Archer. Thank you. And I believe he affirmed, in fact, this very point COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, listen. I don't mean to say that you don't have any evidence or that these issues are made up in my mind, they are not, but by the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	some of the allegations, that Mr. Horne asked Ms. Beattie to meet at Molina Fine Jewelry during work hours to discuss a fundraiser. MR. WILENCHIK: That was at a lunch hour. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I don't want to hear your responses. I'm just the question is whether we have enough to investigate Mr. Horne, his personal activities as well, his as what he did himself as opposed it says here that Ms. Beattie alleged Mr. Horne routinely discussed the campaigns of opponents with executive office staff during regular office hours or not lunch or breaks; and Mr. Horne admits to that but refers to them as water cooler. There's the allegation that Horne that there were weekly meetings held for business and including cam- review of campaign events and he says they're just scheduling. MR. WILENCHIK: And Ms. Grisham would attest to that. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Again, you know, Mr. Horne discussed a proposed robocall during work hours; Mr. Horne

	98		99
1	the secretary, but responds that there is water cooler	1	at the on the of the worst order.
2	political gossip.	2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: But some of them can be
3	MR. WILENCHIK: No, that's just	3	checked with documents, right?
4	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: My point is my point is	4	MR. WILENCHIK: Not necessarily, no. That's the
5	just that not that you don't have answers to all these	5	problem.
6	things, but it seems like there's enough allegations there	6	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay.
7	to make our our investigation to investigate all of	7	MR. WILENCHIK: Some of them depend on
8	these and see whether how much, you know, how much was	8	credibility of 11 people versus 1.
9	done.	9	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, if that turns out to
10	There is also I believe the allegation, which I	10	be the case, then, you know, that may not be specific
11	can't find right now, that that he actually made calls	11	pieces that pass the muster.
12	from his office using that mislabeled binder. So, you	12	MR. WILENCHIK: How do you put documentation when
13	know	13	somebody says that there's water cooler talk about Mr.
14	MR. WILENCHIK: May I just say this?	14	Horne saying I'm going to a campaign event or something?
15	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. Please.	15	I mean, what is that? How do you defeat the negative?
16	MR. WILENCHIK: There are a lot of allegations,	16	That's my point.
17	which is what made it messy when Chairman brought that up	17	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: There's an there's an
18	and I didn't disagree. However, what we have done not	18	see, I don't think that's the burden. But, you know,
19	me personally, but what has been done, is you have been	19	if there's an allegation that Mr. Horne e-mailed a memo
20	given before this determination an opportunity of	20	about his achievements during work hours via e-mail to
21	statements from every one of those people, to have	21	employees, then we can look at their employee those
22	explanations if you read them correctly	22	e-mails.
23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Sure.	23	MR. WILENCHIK: We have.
24	MR. WILENCHIK: about every one of those	24	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: We can look at the
25	supposed hearsay allegations, which would only be hearsay	25	MR. WILENCHIK: But we have.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	100		101
			101
1	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay.	1	be another term that you use.
1		1	
	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay.		be another term that you use.
2	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that	2	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in
2 3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly?	2 3	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have
2 3 4	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah.	2 3 4	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they
2 3 4 5	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am	2 3 4 5	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those
2 3 4 5 6	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it,	2 3 4 5 6	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're
2 3 4 5 6 7	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse	2 3 4 5 6 7	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But, you know, in fairness that's what they do. That's what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I I hear all of what you're saying it. I truly believe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But, you know, in fairness that's what they do. That's what anybody does in political office is go out and talk to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I I hear all of what you're saying it. I truly believe you're going to have a chance to make that argument
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But, you know, in fairness that's what they do. That's what anybody does in political office is go out and talk to people and tell them what they've done.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I I hear all of what you're saying it. I truly believe you're going to have a chance to make that argument COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But, you know, in fairness that's what they do. That's what anybody does in political office is go out and talk to people and tell them what they've done. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That may be permissible is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I I hear all of what you're saying it. I truly believe you're going to have a chance to make that argument COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: to us at some point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But, you know, in fairness that's what they do. That's what anybody does in political office is go out and talk to people and tell them what they've done. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That may be permissible is what you're saying?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I I hear all of what you're saying it. I truly believe you're going to have a chance to make that argument COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: to us at some point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I haven't concluded that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But, you know, in fairness that's what they do. That's what anybody does in political office is go out and talk to people and tell them what they've done. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That may be permissible is what you're saying? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. So, what I'm saying is you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I I hear all of what you're saying it. I truly believe you're going to have a chance to make that argument COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: to us at some point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I haven't concluded that anybody's statement is is false.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Well, okay. MR. WILENCHIK: If I can just answer that quickly? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yeah. MR. WILENCHIK: We have. And the point I am getting to is simply this. I don't want to belabor it, but the point I'm getting to is a memo was or, excuse me, achievements was prepared in the office. I believe if I recall correctly, Ms. Winn and somebody else don't hold me to that, I think it was Ms. Winn primarily who was in charge at the time of being in charge of Ms. Beattie did I think state in one of those statements that I saw that it was prepared. But that's what they did, they were a community outreach and they had to go out and tell people the accomplishments of the office. You can argue, I suppose, that's political. But, you know, in fairness that's what they do. That's what anybody does in political office is go out and talk to people and tell them what they've done. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: That may be permissible is what you're saying? MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. So, what I'm saying is you have to look at that and say: Is there evidence here	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	be another term that you use. To get over that hump based on what you have in front of you, not what's hypothetical, but you have statements of these people who have stated what they stated. Now, if you're going to conclude that those statements are just irrelevant, they're false, or we're just not going to take them into consideration because we don't believe them, I suppose you have the power to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And just let me jump in. We're not here, again, weighing the 11 versus the 1. We're deciding whether there's a reason to believe based on what has been said. I understand that there is a he said/she said element. I think Tom said that earlier. That's what we've got to get into. You know, we're not hear to resolve merits. I I hear all of what you're saying it. I truly believe you're going to have a chance to make that argument COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Right. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: to us at some point. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I haven't concluded that anybody's statement is is false. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. I guess I just wonder

	102		103
1	MR. WILENCHIK: How do we	1	Collins came out in terms of what his assessments are
2	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It's just that we've	2	before I'm comfortable agreeing that those are what's
3	we've I think, you know, at least the disposition from	3	happened.
4	what I'm hearing is there's not been a vote, is that we	4	MR. WILENCHIK: Understood.
5	believe we need to go in and find more out, okay? And	5	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: There's a you know,
6	that's what we're going to do. I think one of the	6	there's a long way to go.
7	questions I want to have executive session over is what is	7	MR. WILENCHIK: Can I ask one question before I
8	the scope of that because I think you raise a decent	8	sit down, if you don't mind?
9	point. And we also have some other stuff related to	9	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Sure.
10	client privilege.	10	MR. WILENCHIK: I'm okay, honestly, with that
11	MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.	11	approach. I don't know how anybody stops a reasonable
12	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But I I mean and	12	cause finding, but then when I was a prosecutor I never
13	just and not to cut in on Commissioner Hoffman's	13	did either. So, I'm not being critical.
14	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I was substantially done.	14	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Right. You can indict a
15	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. But I I think we	15	ham sandwich on a warm summer day, and that's
16	aren't I I appreciate all you're saying and and	16	MR. WILENCHIK: Yeah. I'm not being critical
17	there is a lot to be said when 11 people come and they	17	because I understand that it's almost impossible. But let
18	they say: This ain't the case	18	me just say this all I'm asking for, the only thing I
19	MR. WILENCHIK: Right.	19	would ask and you don't have to grant it but the
20	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: and that's something we	20	only thing I would ask for is this other than what I've
21	will weigh, I guess, as part of, I guess, the finder of	21	asked already I would like an opportunity before we
22	fact, if you will, at some point here as to what is the	22	even get to an OAH stage to convince you all of what I
23	truth and what happened.	23	just I'm saying. And if I'm wrong on that, then you'll
24	And, you know, there's in my mind, just so you	24	find me wrong.
25	know, there's a long way to go before we get to where Mr.	25	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Before we get to a what
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	104		105
			105
1	stage?	1	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's
2	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of	2	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and
2 3	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you	2 3	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of
2 3 4	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going	2 3 4	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen.
2 3 4 5	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would	2 3 4 5	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious
2 3 4 5 6	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I	2 3 4 5 6	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the
2 3 4 5 6 7	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I mean, I've gotten I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do is I need to find out those facts, and that's why I want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I mean, I've gotten I've been through a lot of papers, but there's a lot more work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do is I need to find out those facts, and that's why I want to go ahead with this so I can find them out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I mean, I've gotten I've been through a lot of papers, but there's a lot more work to do here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do is I need to find out those facts, and that's why I want to go ahead with this so I can find them out. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. I appreciate that. I do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I mean, I've gotten I've been through a lot of papers, but there's a lot more work to do here. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do is I need to find out those facts, and that's why I want to go ahead with this so I can find them out. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. I appreciate that. I do. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I mean, I've gotten I've been through a lot of papers, but there's a lot more work to do here. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do is I need to find out those facts, and that's why I want to go ahead with this so I can find them out. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. I appreciate that. I do. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All right. MR. WILENCHIK: Thanks so much.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I mean, I've gotten I've been through a lot of papers, but there's a lot more work to do here. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: And I think Mr. Collins recognizes that. I mean, for my speaking for myself only, I I can't make a decision based on what's before me right now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do is I need to find out those facts, and that's why I want to go ahead with this so I can find them out. MR. WILENCHIK: Thanks so much. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All right. MR. WILENCHIK: Thanks for the opportunity. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, thank you very much,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	stage? MR. WILENCHIK: The the Office of Administrative Hearing stage. In other words, if you conduct an investigation, which sounds like you're going to do and that's fine and we'll cooperate, and I would appreciate a more in-depth discussion and, you know, I feel like I'm almost taking your time here and I don't want to do that. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and I let me from my own standpoint in terms of my own heart and conscience, I want that. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. Great. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I can't make a decision on this. There's enough messiness here that I can't make a decision until I get my head into this a lot more. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. That's all I ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I mean, I've gotten I've been through a lot of papers, but there's a lot more work to do here. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things because it gives me an opportunity to know what's on your mind and to respond to it during this process, and I will. Whether I convince you of it or not, that's of course, remains to be seen. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, and these are serious things. And and and I'm not having been on the other side in some of these things in my own capacity representing clients, I I don't like things not being taken very seriously because of what they can do to people's lives. So, you you have that from me personally. MR. WILENCHIK: Thank you. That's all I can ask. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: But, yeah. And the thing is, we just you know, we have to go through process. MR. WILENCHIK: I understand. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Part of what I need to do is I need to find out those facts, and that's why I want to go ahead with this so I can find them out. MR. WILENCHIK: Okay. I appreciate that. I do. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All right. MR. WILENCHIK: Thanks so much. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Thank you. MR. WILENCHIK: Thanks for the opportunity.

	400		407
	106		107
1	Mr. Ryan, you you are here and I recall that	1	it does apply in this case, even though you aren't the
2	you are Ms. Beattie's attorney. Did you have something	2	State Bar. He does have that obligation of oversight.
3	you wanted to say?	3	There's no basis upon which this Commission I
4	MR. RYAN: Only briefly. I wanted to address the	4	apologize should in any way limit the scope other than
5	issue of the working on the 17 points of achievement as	5	what is suggested by Mr. Collins.
6	community outreach. Those also turned out to be the very	6	Those are my only comments. And if anybody has
7	same things that he put on his campaign website and all of	7	any questions.
8	his campaign literature, but that's for you to weigh down	8	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Other than suggested by
9	the road.	9	Mr. Collins in what respect?
10	With respect to the argument now made about the	10	MR. RYAN: The the scope of the investigation
11	concept of scope of the investigation and that, you know,	11	that is suggested by or, recommended by your Executive
12	you can't really expect Tom Horne to supervise his whole	12	Director Tom Collins.
13	staff, I would bring this to the attention of the	13	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I see.
14	Commission. Mr. Horne is not a manager in a widget shop;	14	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman?
15	he's a lawyer. He is monitored by the State Bar and under	15	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, Mr. Titla.
16	the duties of the State Bar of Arizona, and that means	16	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Sir, what was the ER again?
17	he's subject to the provisions of ER 5.3, which mandates	17	5.3?
18	that lawyers in an office and it includes the Attorney	18	MR. RYAN: It's ER 5.3. It's under
19	General of the State of Arizona have an obligation of	19	COMMISSIONER TITLA: What is the title?
20	oversight and supervision of anybody in that office that	20	MR. RYAN: It is under Arizona Rules of Supreme
21	is assigned duties in that office, and it's very specific.	21	Court, it is Rule 42 or -3. It is ER 5.3. And,
22	And I would point out specifically Comment 2,	22	specifically, the information you'll find is under
23	which requires someone like the Attorney General to	23	Comment 2.
24	specifically speak to somebody about when they're	24	COMMISSIONER TITLA: And what was the subject
25	violating the law and violating their ethical duties and	25	matter of that?
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	108		
			1119
1		1	109 MR RYAN: Thank you
1	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a	1	MR. RYAN: Thank you.
2	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's	2	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else?
2 3	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So,	2 3	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you.
2 3 4	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an	2 3 4	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you.
2 3 4 5	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor	2 3 4 5	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot
2 3 4 5 6	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential	2 3 4 5 6	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>MR. RYAN: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else?</li> <li>MR. RYAN: Thank you.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you.</li> <li>Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot</li> <li>here. So, you'll have your chance, I think.</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me, I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me, I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause notice, that he should have supervised all these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me, I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla. So, all those in favor to go into executive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me, I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause notice, that he should have supervised all these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me, I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla. So, all those in favor to go into executive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause notice, that he should have supervised all these activities going on?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla. So, all those in favor to go into executive session, please say "aye."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause notice, that he should have supervised all these activities going on?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla. So, all those in favor to go into executive session, please say "aye."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause notice, that he should have supervised all these activities going on? MR. RYAN: Yes. Yes, Commissioner. You have correctly stated the obligation under ER 5.3. And it does	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me, I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla. So, all those in favor to go into executive session, please say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. RYAN: The subject matter is the duty of a lawyer to supervise non-lawyers within that lawyer's office, and it includes even independent contractors. So, whether it's a paralegal or a legal secretary or even an independent contractor, because the independent contractor and the non-lawyers are not subject to potential discipline with the State Bar, it is incumbent upon that lawyer which includes the Attorney General of the State of Arizona to ensure that the law is fully complied with. That is a very serious violation that somewhere down the line the State Bar is also going to have to deal with in this case, but it does apply in this case based upon the argument that Mr. Wilenchik is advancing here. COMMISSIONER TITLA: So, you're saying that because of the the rule here, these rules, ER 5.3 and Rule 42, that Mr. Horne had the obligation to supervise his office so that with respect to all these allegations here on Exhibit D in our material on the reasonable cause notice, that he should have supervised all these activities going on? MR. RYAN: Yes. Yes, Commissioner. You have correctly stated the obligation under ER 5.3. And it does apply to these these things. It's not just the Rules	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Anything else? MR. RYAN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Thank you. Mr. Collins, anything in response? There's a lot here. So, you'll have your chance, I think. MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I yeah. I mean, if you you had an interest in getting some advice from Joe. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: I would like to propose I would like to move that we go into executive session. I I have some questions here on a couple things I want to get resolved in my head that require advice of counsel. So, if I could COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I move for executive session. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: if you would indulge me, I'd I would make that motion if I can get someone to second. Thank you, Mr. Titla. So, all those in favor to go into executive session, please say "aye." (Chorus of ayes.) CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Three?

	110		111
1	the reference. All right, we're in executive session.	1	Mr. Collins to conduct an investigation Mr. Collins and
2	(Whereupon the public retires from the meeting	2	his staff and to subpoena to issue subpoenas to find
3	room.)	3	out more facts concerning the allegations, and to conduct
4	(Whereupon the Commission is in executive session	4	sworn interviews to support that investigation.
5	from 11:57 a.m. until 12:19 p.m.)	5	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Do I have a second
6		6	for that motion?
7	* * * *	7	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: I second.
8		8	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Koester has
9	(Whereupon all members of the public are present	9	seconded. Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.
10	and the Commission resumes in general session.)	10	Is there any further discussion?
11	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: We're back in public	11	Okay. All those in favor, please indicate by
12	session. Thank you for everyone's patience. We've gotten	12	saying "aye."
13	Mr. Kanefield's advice on some things.	13	(Chorus of ayes.)
14	All righty. I I think we have exhausted our	14	· • • •
15	desire to discuss this and would entertain any motions in	15	
16	regard to item agenda No. VI agenda item number. Said	16	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It passes unanimously.
17	that backwards, Agenda Item No. VI.	17	Thank you very much.
18	Mr. Hoffman?	18	Okay. Item No. VII, discussion and possible
19	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Mr. Chair, I'll	19	action regarding procedural status, Commission interest,
20	Mr. Chair, thank you. I I'd like to move to find	20	and related legal actions in Arizona Secretary of
21	reason to believe that Mr. Horne and his campaign have	21	State's office in the case <u>Arizona Secretary of State's</u>
22	violated the Act with regard to failure to report certain	22	office versus CJF, Commission For Jus Committee For
23	in-kind contributions, and that there's reason to believe	23	Justice and Fairness.
24	that there's a violation of statutes over with over	24	We may again, as before, go into executive
25	which the Commission has jurisdiction, to authorize	25	session to consult with our attorney regarding matters of
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	112		
			113
1		1	113 brief due around October 29th, pending on when the
1	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).	1	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the
2	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins?	2	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.
2 3	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,	2 3	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really
2 3 4	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the	2 3 4	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?
2 3 4 5	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.	2 3 4 5	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.
2 3 4 5 6	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just	2 3 4 5 6	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well,
2 3 4 5 6 7	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as	2 3 4 5 6 7	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.) I don't know if I did that. As I recall the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.)</li> <li>I don't know if I did that. As I recall the MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well,</li> <li>let's let's move this along because I want to get back</li> <li>home. So is there are there any questions for him?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is</li> <li>I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am</li> <li>appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the</li> <li>previous (beeping.)</li> <li>I don't know if I did that. As I recall the</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it,</li> <li>I don't know.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option? MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well,</li> <li>let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is</li> <li>I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.)</li> <li>I don't know if I did that. As I recall the</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it,</li> <li>I don't know.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option?</li> <li>MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.) I don't know if I did that. As I recall the MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option?</li> <li>MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well,</li> <li>let's let's move this along because I want to get back</li> <li>home. So is there are there any questions for him?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is</li> <li>I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.)</li> <li>I don't know if I did that. As I recall the</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it,</li> <li>I don't know.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much.</li> <li>As as I was as I recall, there was the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option?</li> <li>MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Commission when the case was</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well,</li> <li>let's let's move this along because I want to get back</li> <li>home. So is there are there any questions for him?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is</li> <li>I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am</li> <li>appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the</li> <li>previous (beeping.)</li> <li>I don't know if I did that. As I recall the</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it,</li> <li>I don't know.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling</li> <li>me I'm talking too much.</li> <li>As as I was as I recall, there was the</li> <li>issue of whether this was whether this was actually</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option?</li> <li>MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Commission when the case was at the Court of Appeals, which we think was helpful to the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.) I don't know if I did that. As I recall the MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much. As as I was as I recall, there was the issue of whether this was whether this was actually do you know what that is?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option?</li> <li>MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Commission when the case was at the Court of Appeals, which we think was helpful to the Court.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.) I don't know if I did that. As I recall the MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much. As as I was as I recall, there was the issue of whether this was whether this was actually do you know what that is? MS. THOMAS: I know. Somebody is trying to call
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4).</li> <li>Mr. Collins?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart,</li> <li>Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late.</li> <li>When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so</li> <li>We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option?</li> <li>MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Commission when the case was at the Court of Appeals, which we think was helpful to the court.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well,</li> <li>let's let's move this along because I want to get back</li> <li>home. So is there are there any questions for him?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is</li> <li>I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.)</li> <li>I don't know if I did that. As I recall the</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it,</li> <li>I don't know.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much.</li> <li>As as I was as I recall, there was the issue of whether this was whether this was actually</li> <li>do you know what that is?</li> <li>MS. THOMAS: I know. Somebody is trying to call this line.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option? MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Commission when the case was at the Court of Appeals, which we think was helpful to the court. We'd also like to weigh in. This is an important issue for the Commission at the Supreme Court, urging the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.) I don't know if I did that. As I recall the MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much. As as I was as I recall, there was the issue of whether this was whether this was actually do you know what that is? MS. THOMAS: I know. Somebody is trying to call this line. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I see. At least it's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option? MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Commission when the case was at the Court of Appeals, which we think was helpful to the court. We'd also like to weigh in. This is an important issue for the Commission at the Supreme Court, urging the court to deny review. And if I am correct with the	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>brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item?</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it.</li> <li>CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well,</li> <li>let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him?</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is</li> <li>I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall the previous (beeping.)</li> <li>I don't know if I did that. As I recall the</li> <li>MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it,</li> <li>I don't know.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much.</li> <li>As as I was as I recall, there was the issue of whether this was whether this was actually</li> <li>do you know what that is?</li> <li>MS. THOMAS: I know. Somebody is trying to call this line.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I see. At least it's not me.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	legal advice pursuant to 38-431.03(A)(4). Mr. Collins? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Chairman Reckart, Commissioners, really briefly, this is was added at the very last minute, and I apologize for it coming late. When the Petition for Review was filed, I think Joe just wanted to make sure that we could file an amicus brief as we have in the past in this case. If Joe had anything else he wanted to ask, he's not here. He has stepped outside for the moment, so We we under I understand, Mr. Kanefield, you would like us to authorize you would like to ask the Commission if they would authorize you to to file an amicus brief at in in response to the Petition for Review in the <u>CJF</u> case or to have that option? MR. KANEFIELD: Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, yeah, if that if you wouldn't mind, I would appreciate that authorization. As you know, we filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Commission when the case was at the Court of Appeals, which we think was helpful to the court. We'd also like to weigh in. This is an important issue for the Commission at the Supreme Court, urging the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	brief due around October 29th, pending on when the response is filed to the Petition to Review. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All righty. And really that's the scope of this agenda item? MR. COLLINS: Yeah. That's it. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. All righty. Well, let's let's move this along because I want to get back home. So is there are there any questions for him? COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I have a question. Is I I just got handed the Petition earlier which I am appreciative of having. But the as I recall, the previous (beeping.) I don't know if I did that. As I recall the MR. COLLINS: There's nothing we can do about it, I don't know. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Maybe it's telling me I'm talking too much. As as I was as I recall, there was the issue of whether this was whether this was actually do you know what that is? MS. THOMAS: I know. Somebody is trying to call this line. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I see. At least it's not

	114		115
1	was actually express advocacy, this particular ad, and	1	Okay. Well, we've come to the fun part oh. I'm sorry.
2	and the legal standards relating to whether the statute	2	MR. COLLINS: Almost.
3	was constitutional in effect. Are both of those issues	3	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Yes, we have.
4	raised by the Petition?	4	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: We said one more thing. I
5	MR. KANEFIELD: Yes.	5	got yeah, those kind people over there have been so
6		6	
_	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. That's all I needed	7	patient.
7	to know. Thank you.		Item No. VIII, discussion and possible action on
8	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Chairman, I make a motion.	8	Attorney General's office representation of Commission
9	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Yes, sir.	9	Interagency Services Agreement between the Commission and
10	COMMISSIONER TITLA: To approve the filing of the	10	Attorney General's office. Mr. Collins and then I think
11	amicus by Mr. Kanefield.	11	we the Solicitor General is here.
12	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you,	12	MR. COLLINS: He is. And Chairman Reckart,
13	Mr. Titla. Commissioner Titla has so moved. Is there a	13	Commissioners, really briefly, we've had this sort of
14	second?	14	discussion about what we do going forward for the next
15	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I second.	15	year. Mr. Ellman has a proposal for at least the short
16	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Thank you,	16	term, which I think is is reasonable. I don't want to
17	Mr. Hoffman. We've moved and seconded to authorize	17	get in the way of it. I want you guys to have the
18	Mr. Kanefield to prepare an amicus brief in connection	18	opportunity to discuss that with him.
19	with the Petition for Review with the Arizona in the	19	The agenda item is set up for you to ask him
20	case Arizona Secretary of State's office versus CJF.	20	other questions. I think he and Ms. Bickett are here,
21	All those in favor, please indicate by saying	21	they're comfortable and Mr. Munns together they will
22	"aye."	22	decide whether to recommend you go into executive session
23	(Chorus of ayes.)	23	I think based on your questions.
24		24	And I have nothing else to add other than to turn
25	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It passes unanimously.	25	it over to Rob, with your permission.
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	116		
	116		117
1	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I	1	117 sometimes privileged.
1 2		1 2	
_	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I		sometimes privileged.
2	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI,	2	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just
2 3	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not	2 3	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns.
2 3 4	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover	2 3 4	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of
2 3 4 5	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you.	2 3 4 5	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client
2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information.
2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is	2 3 4 5 6 7	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart, members of the Commission. Actually, I think we you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved. Thank you, sir.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart, members of the Commission. Actually, I think we you may want to go into executive session for this. And before I say anything more, I just wanted to know if if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved. Thank you, sir. I'll second. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart, members of the Commission. Actually, I think we you may want to go into executive session for this. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved. Thank you, sir. I'll second. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Is there discussion on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart, members of the Commission. Actually, I think we you may want to go into executive session for this. And before I say anything more, I just wanted to know if if that's what you wanted to do. Otherwise, I'll I'll just proceed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved. Thank you, sir. I'll second. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Is there discussion on the motion? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart, members of the Commission. Actually, I think we you may want to go into executive session for this. And before I say anything more, I just wanted to know if if that's what you wanted to do. Otherwise, I'll I'll just proceed. I don't I'm not going to go into the substance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved. Thank you, sir. I'll second. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Is there discussion on the motion? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, no. All those in favor?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart, members of the Commission. Actually, I think we you may want to go into executive session for this. And before I say anything more, I just wanted to know if if that's what you wanted to do. Otherwise, I'lI I'lI just proceed. I don't I'm not going to go into the substance of the merits of any pending case, of course, but it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved. Thank you, sir. I'll second. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Is there discussion on the motion? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. And one thing I wanted to point out is during agenda Item No. VI, Mr. Munns was not he was in the public domain, not not up here in capacity as counsel. So, just to cover you. All right. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: One question. When is fiscal year '15 be, please? MR. COLLINS: Fiscal '15? We're in fiscal '15. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. So mid year to mid year? MR. COLLINS: Yes. That's right. The State calendar is mid year to mid year; our our budget calendar runs January to January. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Please, sir. MR. ELLMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Reckart, members of the Commission. Actually, I think we you may want to go into executive session for this. And before I say anything more, I just wanted to know if if that's what you wanted to do. Otherwise, I'll I'll just proceed. I don't I'm not going to go into the substance	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	sometimes privileged. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Well, is it let me just ask go ahead, Mr. Munns. MR. MUNNS: All right. And Mr. Chair, members of the Commission, if it does involve attorney/client privileged information. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. MR. MUNNS: So if the Commission would like to and would like to be able to speak fully and frankly about confidential issues, that's available to you, but CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Yeah, that was my question, is this purpose of receiving legal advice and matters that may be privileged or subject to work product. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to go into public I mean, into executive session. COMMISSIONER TITLA: I motion, Chairman. CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Mr. Titla has moved. Thank you, sir. I'll second. Okay. COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: Is there discussion on the motion? CHAIRPERSON RECKART: No, no. All those in favor?

	118		119
1	COMMISSIONER HOFFMAN: I vote nay.	1	p.m.)
2	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. Passes three/one.	2	
3	We're in executive session. Thank you.	3	* * * *
4	(Whereupon the public retires from the meeting	4	
5	room.)	5	<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>
6	(Whereupon the Commission is in executive session	6	
7	from 12:28 p.m. until 12:37 p.m.)	7	I, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter, do
8		8	hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through
9	* * * *	9	118, inclusive, constitute a full and accurate printed
10		10	record of my stenographic notes taken at said time and
11	(Whereupon all members of the public are present	11	place, all done to the best of my skill and ability.
12	and the Commission resumes in general session.)	12	DATED, at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 16th day
13	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: Okay. We're back in public	13	of September, 2014.
14	session. Now's the time for public comment. I don't	14 15	
15	think there's anybody here who wants to do it, so I'll	16	
16	entertain a motion to adjourn.		Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR
17	COMMISSIONER TITLA: Motion.	17	Certified Reporter (AZ50127)
18	COMMISSIONER KOESTER: Second.	18	
19	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: All right. Moved and	19	
20	seconded to adjourn the meeting. All those in favor?	20	
21	(Chorus of ayes.)	21	
22		22	
23	CHAIRPERSON RECKART: It passed unanimously.	23	
24	We're done. Thank you.	24	
25	(Whereupon the proceeding concludes at 12:38	25	
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
	120		
	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	7		
	8		
	9		
	10		
	11 12		
	13		
	14		
	15		
	16		
	17 18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		
	23 24		
	25		
	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC		
1		1	