

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

Phoenix, Arizona

June 19, 2008

9:34 a.m.

Reported By:

Angela Furniss Miller, RPR  
Certified Reporter (AZ 50127)

Miller Certified Reporting

2

1 A PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE CITIZENS CLEAN  
 2 ELECTIONS COMMISSION, convened at 9:34 a.m. on June 19,  
 3 2008, at the State of Arizona, Clean Elections  
 Commission, 1616 W. Adams, Conference Room, Phoenix,  
 Arizona, in the presence of the following Board members:

4 Mr. Gary Scaramazzo, Chairperson  
 Ms. Royann Parker (Telephonically)  
 5 Mr. Donald Lindholm  
 Ms. Lori Daniels

6 OTHERS PRESENT:

7 Todd Lang, Executive Director  
 8 Colleen McGee, Deputy Director  
 Rita Azcona, Administrative Assistant III  
 9 Michael Becker, Voter Education Manager  
 Daniel Ruiz II, Campaign Finance Manager  
 10 Tanja Shipman, Attorney General's Office  
 Kevin Maniak, Legal Intern  
 11 Rhonda Barnes, Perkins Coie Brown & Bain PA  
 Eric Ehst, Clean Elections Institute

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Miller Certified Reporting

3

P R O C E E D I N G

1  
2  
3 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: I'd like to call to  
 4 order this meeting of the Citizens Clean Election  
 5 Commission.  
 6 It is Thursday, June 19th, 2008. It is 9:34  
 7 a.m.  
 8 Welcome to everyone.  
 9 (Chorus of good morning's.)  
 10 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Appreciate everyone  
 11 being here. Jeff is on assignment in Las Vegas with his  
 12 company and couldn't be here, so he apologizes for that.  
 13 And Royann, she is on speakerphone from Tucson. We  
 14 appreciate that, Royann.  
 15 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.  
 16 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Let's move on. One --  
 17 one note, we'd like to pull number five from the agenda  
 18 today, the consideration of possible action on the  
 19 officeholder expense rules. And we'll bring that back  
 20 next time. Okay?  
 21 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Okay. Sounds good.  
 22 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: And, otherwise, we  
 23 will go ahead then and seek approval of the May 22nd,  
 24 2008, Commission meeting minutes.  
 25 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: I move we approve them.

Miller Certified Reporting

4

1 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Second.  
 2 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: It's been moved by  
 3 Commissioner Lindholm, seconded by Commissioner Daniels  
 4 to approve the May 22nd, 2008, Commission meeting  
 5 minutes.  
 6 Any discussion on this item? Todd?  
 7 MR. LANG: I'd note on -- on page six where we  
 8 mention the "Green Party." Green Party should be  
 9 capitalized. It's -- it -- I see on line nine, 10 --  
 10 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Anywhere where it's --  
 11 MR. LANG: Yeah, eight, nine, and 10. Thank  
 12 you -- thank you, Commissioner.  
 13 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay. We'll make  
 14 those corrections.  
 15 Anything else?  
 16 All right. Okay with the maker and second?  
 17 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Yes.  
 18 All those in favor say "aye."  
 19 (Chorus of ayes.)  
 20 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Opposed? Motion  
 21 carries.  
 22 Todd, turn it over to you for the Executive  
 23 Director report.  
 24 MR. LANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning,  
 25 Commissioners. Good morning, Commissioner Parker.

Miller Certified Reporting

5

1 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Good morning.  
 2 MR. LANG: I want to introduce our summer legal  
 3 intern, Kevin Maniak. Please stand up and say, "hi."  
 4 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Good morning, Kevin.  
 5 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Good morning.  
 6 MR. LANG: Kevin is a -- just finished his  
 7 first year at University of Arizona and we have him hard  
 8 at work and he's doing good stuff. So we're really  
 9 happy with him.  
 10 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Royann, maybe you guys  
 11 can carpool?  
 12 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yeah, there we go.  
 13 MR. LANG: I -- I -- felt like we needed some  
 14 Tucson representation, Commissioner Parker, so that's  
 15 why I...  
 16 COMMISSIONER PARKER: I appreciate that.  
 17 MR. LANG: Last night was the second-to-last  
 18 candidate education event with Michael and Daniel  
 19 providing their usual excellent instruction.  
 20 Everything's been going well. The last one will be held  
 21 on Friday, June 27th, so get your tickets now.  
 22 The 200-word statement primary candidate --  
 23 200-word primary candidate statement pamphlet is almost  
 24 finished. Mike and McGee have been working very hard on  
 25 it, and they're nearly done with the edits. So it will

Miller Certified Reporting

6

1 be going out soon.

2 So we had to -- it's funny, the -- we've been

3 more proactive than in past years in making sure that

4 people get their statements in and their pictures in,

5 because they were so unhappy when they were left out.

6 So Mike sent in letters, sent letters reminding folks

7 of -- of the due date months ago. It's been in all our

8 publications. He sent out letters again, e-mails again,

9 and then this past week with the deadline this past

10 week, he made phone calls and more e-mails to those who

11 hadn't done it. And, yet, still, a couple folks didn't

12 get their statements in and complained, which is -- is

13 just stunning.

14 So, I really appreciate all Mike's good

15 efforts, but I want you to know, we -- we had a really

16 good percentage of folks who -- who did get them in, and

17 those last-minute folks who did because of our reminders

18 were especially appreciative. But I -- I -- if you do

19 hear anything, I want you to know that we went -- that

20 staff went all out to make sure we got everyone in

21 there.

22 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay.

23 MR. LANG: And then we've also started doing

24 Frequently Asked Questions on the Website, FAQs. If you

25 click on "Information For Candidates" on the left side

Miller Certified Reporting

8

1 consideration and decision whether there is reason to

2 believe a violation occurred in MUR 08-0002, John

3 Huppenthal.

4 MR. LANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 Commissioners, this is our second complaint of the year

6 and this is in regard to some autodial calls made by

7 Senator John Huppenthal. You have in your packet the

8 complaint filed by the Democratic Party, the response by

9 the Senator, a transcript of the autodial communication

10 made by the Democratic Party, but that I believe is --

11 and which is accurate.

12 And then we also have, it's not in your packet,

13 but we have an audio file of the original Democratic

14 card party call that Senator Huppenthal states that he

15 was responding to. Because I think it helps provide

16 some context, at least for the phone -- the initial

17 phone calls. There are two phone calls at issue here.

18 And so I want to make sure you have all of those

19 documents.

20 Would you like me to go through my analysis or

21 would you like to hear the phone call first?

22 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Let's hear the phone

23 call first.

24

25 (Whereupon an audio recording is played in open

Miller Certified Reporting

7

1 of the Website main page, you'll see an option to look

2 at FAQs. There's only six now -- is that right, Daniel?

3 MR. RUIZ: We actually have -- today we have

4 seven.

5 MR. LANG: Seven. And we have several more

6 that we're working on and we'll continue to post those.

7 The one today that we just posted is good news

8 for our candidates, and I'll let you know in case you

9 get asked about this. If the budget is not passed and

10 the State shuts down, we are still permitted to function

11 because we're not appropriated and we have our own

12 funding sources. And there is an AG opinion that says

13 that we are permitted to continue to function. So,

14 there's no worries for any participating candidates that

15 they'll have any sort of funding crisis.

16 Unless you have any other questions, that

17 concludes my report.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Anything for Todd?

19 Lori, I know you're missing the budget

20 discussion.

21 MR. LANG: Oh.

22 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: No, I'm grateful and

23 thankful I am not there.

24 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Thank you, Todd.

25 We'll move on then to Item No. IV,

Miller Certified Reporting

9

1 session.)

2

3 MR. LANG: Okay. Commissioner Parker, were you

4 able to hear that?

5 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes, and that's the same

6 one that's on the paper that was provided us.

7 MR. LANG: Oh, you do have a transcript of

8 that, okay.

9 Well, it sounds better.

10 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Up close and personal.

11 MR. LANG: And a -- a thank you to the

12 Democratic Party for pro- -- for providing me the audio

13 on that.

14 So, what we have here are -- are a couple of

15 issues. One is there's a whole Secretary of State

16 Article One issue regarding the paid-for language, which

17 we don't care about or need to get into. Our issue is

18 whether or not it constitutes expressed advocacy and

19 whether or not it was a constituent communication done

20 after the deadline under our rules. As you know,

21 candidates are permitted to raise money -- I mean,

22 officeholders are permitted to raise money in order to

23 communicate with constituents so long as that

24 communication doesn't contain expressed advocacy and is

25 done before April 30th of an election year.

Miller Certified Reporting

10

1 The reason that rule exists, as a matter of  
 2 background, is because there's a definition in the  
 3 statutes at 16-901. The definition of contribution  
 4 includes money raised for purposes of communic- --  
 5 communicating with constituents. Which obviously raises  
 6 a Clean Election's problem, because, in that case, real  
 7 constituent communication, real newsletters that are  
 8 completely not expressed advocacy would -- would trigger  
 9 matching funds for -- in the case of non-participating  
 10 candidates and would get participating candidates into  
 11 big trouble, or potentially could.

12 So, the Commission passed the rule basically  
 13 exempting this sort of thing from the definitions of  
 14 expressed advocacy -- I mean from -- of com- -- of  
 15 contributions, so that officeholders could communicate  
 16 without running into funding for Clean Election's  
 17 problems. So that's the background on the rule, which  
 18 we initially we're going to discuss today, but we're  
 19 going to postpone that for a month.

20 And so you have here a communication which  
 21 occurred which the Democratic Party believes is  
 22 expressed advocacy; and, therefore, would trigger  
 23 matching funds, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

24 So the first thing we want to look at is  
 25 whether or not it constitutes expressed advocacy. Of

Miller Certified Reporting

12

1 the response calls were in regard to a legislative  
 2 issue. Especially when you hear the -- the phone call  
 3 by the Democrats. It -- it clearly paints it as a  
 4 legislative issue, urges you to take action regarding  
 5 the legislative issue, and then he responds.

6 So I think that's an easy question that that  
 7 was not expressed advocacy.

8 The second phone call regarding the disabled  
 9 child who received help is a tougher one because there  
 10 it's not a clear legislative issue. The same sort of --  
 11 the same sort of analysis applies that it's targeted to  
 12 the electorate, that it -- it -- it puts the --  
 13 obviously puts the candidate in a favorable light. I  
 14 mean, the "Senator Huppenthal rocks," I think that's the  
 15 language used. That's positive.

16 And so there -- there's a tougher, closer issue  
 17 there under 16-901.01 whether that's expressed advocacy.  
 18 You see in -- in his response it explains that: No,  
 19 we're letting people know that we do great constituent  
 20 services, which could be a campaign point, but it's also  
 21 a legitimate point regarding constituent services,  
 22 especially given -- and we can look at context, so  
 23 especially given that this happened well -- during the  
 24 legislative session, well before the election cycle got  
 25 real hot.

Miller Certified Reporting

11

1 course, we look to our statute, 16-901.01. And the key  
 2 issues there are targeted to the electorate, no other  
 3 reasonable meaning, favorable -- and you can look at  
 4 context, is the candidate in favorable or unfavorable  
 5 light, that sort of thing.

6 Our analysis is that, one, it was targeted to  
 7 his electorate, it did go to his district. It's a  
 8 general public communication, so it meets those  
 9 definitions. And it paints the respondent in a  
 10 favorable light. Both of them do.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: You're talking about  
 12 the representative's response calls, right?

13 MR. LANG: That's right.

14 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay.

15 MR. LANG: That's right.

16 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Just to make --

17 MR. LANG: But it was regard- -- regarding a  
 18 legislative issue at Del Sol.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Right.

20 MR. LANG: Legislature was still in that  
 21 session. It was clearly a legislative issue. And  
 22 the -- the key part of the test is: No other reasonable  
 23 meaning. And while this could have been an election  
 24 call or could have been interpreted in that fashion, I  
 25 think that it's completely reasonable to determine that

Miller Certified Reporting

13

1 And so, ultimately, we determined that it -- or  
 2 we recommend that you find that it's not expressed  
 3 advocacy. It's a close call. It's a problem with  
 4 the -- with the constituent communication rule, is that  
 5 some of these -- these constituent communications will  
 6 go close to the line.

7 If you look at the Section 5, which we're not  
 8 going to discuss today. But if you look at it, there's  
 9 an attachment there regarding some ads done by the  
 10 Democratic Party, which also come very close to the  
 11 line.

12 So we ultimately determined that the phone  
 13 calls were not expressed advocacy because there was  
 14 another reasonable meaning. And, again, that's the key.  
 15 There has to be no other reasonable meaning. And here  
 16 basically advertising availability of constituent  
 17 services we felt was a legitimate, nonpolitical purpose.

18 Now, were the Democrats unreasonable in finding  
 19 that that was a political move? No. I -- I can  
 20 understand why they viewed it that way. But ultimately  
 21 we think there's another reasonable interpretation which  
 22 is that it's a non -- for nonpolitical purpose, so we  
 23 ask that you find no reason to believe on either of the  
 24 phone calls.

25 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Lori?

Miller Certified Reporting

14

1 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Chairman, would you  
 2 have felt differently it would have been made later in  
 3 the year?  
 4 MR. LANG: Quite possibly.  
 5 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Just curious.  
 6 MR. LANG: When -- when the -- we are permitted  
 7 to look at context and so the timing is really  
 8 important. But because this happened in May and not in  
 9 August or July, we think it's an easier case. Had it  
 10 happened in August or July, we probably would have  
 11 recommended the other way depending on the exact  
 12 language and the context and what have you.  
 13 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Would you have also then  
 14 recommended that the Democratic Party have to make known  
 15 what they spent on their phone calls?  
 16 MR. LANG: Their phone calls to us weren't  
 17 expressed advocacy because it was still a legislative  
 18 issue that was still being debated. It was -- and so  
 19 that one probably wouldn't have been expressed advocacy  
 20 regardless of when it was done. Had it been done after  
 21 the session was over and there was no longer a  
 22 legislative issue, then quite possibly it would have  
 23 been considered expressed advocacy and we would have  
 24 wanted to know the cost.  
 25 COMMISSIONER PARKER: So I noticed in your --  
 Miller Certified Reporting

16

1 I think what we would placed it at. Because of course,  
 2 for him there was no real cost. But what we would  
 3 include is the value of having the -- whatever the  
 4 machine is that he used to do the robo calls on his  
 5 computer. So that's not an issue for the Commission to  
 6 decide today, but I think it's relevant to your  
 7 understanding the full -- full package of what we're  
 8 considering.  
 9 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Will we be asking him to  
 10 tell us the number of calls he made after April 30th?  
 11 MR. LANG: We have asked him and we will  
 12 continue to ask him. He's not certain when the calls  
 13 were placed. My hope and expectation is that he will be  
 14 able to find that out.  
 15 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Lori.  
 16 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Chairman, Todd, okay  
 17 did I lose it -- let me -- okay. In this instance, you  
 18 were going to ask him what the machine would cost and  
 19 that would place a value on it and you would pay for it  
 20 in that respect. How do we handle it when you have  
 21 constituent -- when you have incumbents who bought a  
 22 machine in the Clean Election cycle the very first time,  
 23 put that in their expenses, but the machine isn't  
 24 obsolete for the next -- how -- how do we determine a  
 25 factor? Do we give them a -- do we give them a price  
 Miller Certified Reporting

15

1 your document you say that the value of any robo calls  
 2 made after April 30th would be treated as a  
 3 contribution. Do we know if any of his calls were made  
 4 after April 30?  
 5 MR. LANG: No, and that's the last point I  
 6 wanted to mention to you, Commissioner Parker.  
 7 Assuming you agree with our recommend- --  
 8 staff's recommendation, we still have a -- an issue  
 9 which doesn't require enforcement, but that I -- you  
 10 need to know about, which is, any calls made after April  
 11 30th are not in compliance with the constituent  
 12 communication rule and must be reported and would be  
 13 subject to triggering matching funds. Or in if -- if  
 14 the Senator decided to be a participating candidate  
 15 would count towards his personal money contributions.  
 16 So that issue remains out there. Basically  
 17 what it means is we need to find out how much -- what  
 18 calls were done after April 30th and the -- and how much  
 19 they were worth. You can see in the analysis, there's  
 20 an AG opinion that basically says -- this is the AG  
 21 opinion, if anyone wants to read it. It basically says  
 22 any money raised by the candidate for constituent  
 23 communication also counts.  
 24 And so, Mr. -- I mean, Senator Huppenthal's  
 25 estimate of the value of these calls is much lower than  
 Miller Certified Reporting

17

1 cost new every single election?  
 2 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: No, we have a rule --  
 3 Chair, Commissioners, we have a rule that requires them,  
 4 when a candidate reuses yard signs, or machines, or  
 5 computers, they have to pay their old campaign the value  
 6 of that -- that sign. They get to determine what that  
 7 value is, but we recently passed a rule that says it has  
 8 to be one-fifth -- one-fifth of the initial purchase  
 9 price.  
 10 Which is a little tricky when you -- when you  
 11 are talking about signs because they bought 5,000 signs  
 12 and they now are reusing 200 of them? Do you just  
 13 divide or how does that work? So there is a rule that  
 14 a- -- applies. It's frustrating for some that they  
 15 think it's too much. And then we have a recent  
 16 complaint from someone because they don't think it's  
 17 enough. So -- and -- and of course, that's the nature  
 18 of the beast. Everyone is going to disagree. But we do  
 19 have a rule that applies to that situation.  
 20 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Thank you.  
 21 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Todd, what were to happen  
 22 if the -- if the Democratic Party calls have gone out,  
 23 say, April 29th, and then not leaving Mr. Huppenthal any  
 24 time basically to -- to put his calls out, and they  
 25 would have gone out after April 30th, would we still  
 Miller Certified Reporting

18

1 have charged him?

2 MR. LANG: Commissioner Parker, we -- that --

3 in my view, that wouldn't change the analysis --

4 analysis at all because the rule is straightforward. If

5 you do it, it has to be done by April 30th. And

6 remember, the rule's an exception that was done as a --

7 an accommodation for officeholders so that they could do

8 constituent communications.

9 The policy set by the State in the statute,

10 aside from Clean Elections, is clear. They view

11 constituent communications as something that should

12 count as a contribution. And whether you agree with

13 that policy or disagree with it, that is the policy of

14 the State. And so the default is, yeah, you can do it

15 after April 30th, but it's going to trigger treatment as

16 a contribution.

17 And so if the -- if anybody, the Democratic

18 Party, the Republican Party, or the Green Party wants to

19 play games and do the phone call right at the last

20 minute, that's just part of the political process.

21 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Sounds like we could be

22 opening a huge can of worms.

23 MR. LANG: We didn't open it.

24 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: No. But this is an

25 ongoing problem also. We've been dealing with this for

Miller Certified Reporting

20

1 in 16- -- what is --

2 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: 16-901.

3 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: In --

4 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: In MUR number 08- --

5 COMMISSIONER PARKER: 08-0002.

6 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: -- 002, that's the

7 one.

8 Okay. Any discussion on this item?

9 MR. LANG: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Todd.

11 MR. LANG: I -- I think Ms. Barnes is here on

12 behalf of the Democratic Party.

13 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Yes, ma'am. Please

14 come forward.

15 MS. BARNES: Thank you. My name is Rhonda

16 Barnes and I'm an attorney for the Arizona Democratic

17 Party.

18 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Welcome.

19 MS. BARNES: Thank you. And my comments might

20 be more appropriate for when we discuss the rule next

21 month and changes. The concern isn't so much about

22 whether or not this particular piece is expressed

23 advocacy because I -- I know there is the context of the

24 legislative session and -- and certainly we've explained

25 in our letter that we think because it was just a

Miller Certified Reporting

19

1 a number of years. And wasn't there -- there was a

2 committee formed?

3 MR. LANG: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Yeah. A couple of

5 years ago trying to address these issues. To no avail,

6 I might add. So, it's like trying --

7 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Is the Chair --

8 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: -- to get our arms

9 around butter.

10 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Is the Chair ready for

11 a motion?

12 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Certainly. Whenever

13 you are.

14 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: I move that the --

15 based -- based upon how broad the definition of

16 expressed advocacy is in A.R.S. 16-901.01, and based

17 upon the recommendations and on the -- the analysis of

18 the Executive Director, that the Commission adopt the

19 recommendation of the Executive Director.

20 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I second the motion.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay. It's been moved

22 by Commissioner Lindholm, seconded by Commissioner

23 Daniels to accept the recommendations of the Dir- -- of

24 the Executive Director and find no reason to believe

25 violations of the Act or the Commission rules occurred

Miller Certified Reporting

21

1 general call about what a great guy Senator Huppenthal

2 is, is -- we would err on the side of expressed

3 advocacy.

4 But my concern is almost more of a

5 clarification in the Executive Director's report. And

6 it sounds like something you guys are struggling with is

7 the pre-April 30th deadline. I -- I guess what I didn't

8 get out of here and I just want to raise as a concern is

9 that a- -- any of the calls that are determined to be

10 before April 30th should then be reported out of Senator

11 Huppenthal's officeholder expense account. And --

12 and -- and I just didn't see any of that in here.

13 And I just wanted to make sure, especially for

14 our incumbents who are in the legislature now, that they

15 understand what needs to be reported out of what

16 account, and then anything that is done that could be

17 considered constituent services, after April 30th would

18 be reported out of their general campaign account. So

19 that there is nothing that would fall between the cracks

20 so that people don't know where the money is coming from

21 in -- both into that officeholder expense account or

22 into the campaign and then they know who is paying for

23 it.

24 And obviously the disclaimer issue will be

25 addressed in the Secretary of State's office. But when

Miller Certified Reporting

1 these calls went out, we didn't know if they were  
 2 Senator Huppenthal's, an independent expenditure, the  
 3 woman who had the -- the child who had these issues. So  
 4 I don't know if it's really something that the  
 5 Commission can address right now, but I just wanted  
 6 clarification for our sitting legislatures about how  
 7 they report their money at different times.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay. Todd?  
 9 MR. LANG: Ms. Barnes raises a good point and  
 10 I'm glad she did.

11 Daniel Ruiz is working with Senator Huppenthal,  
 12 and, the Senator, because it was his own machine, was  
 13 under the view that he really didn't need to report  
 14 anything because there was no expense. And so we're  
 15 going to be working with him on that issue and I think  
 16 it will address Ms. Barnes' concern.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay.  
 18 MS. BARNES: A- -- a -- Mr. Chairman and  
 19 Commissioners, and Todd, is that something then that  
 20 might come up on next's month agenda so we have a  
 21 another written report or something that will give  
 22 guidance to current officeholders; do you know?

23 MR. LANG: I don't know at this time.

24 MS. BARNES: Okay. Well, and -- and next month  
 25 I'll probably try and to come back, and -- and --

Miller Certified Reporting

1 assuming that the rule changes are on the agenda,  
 2 perhaps we can discuss some of the -- the concerns of  
 3 the legislatures at that time. But that was mostly  
 4 my -- my concern.

5 And if anybody has questions about sitting  
 6 legislatures or their concerns, I'm happy to help  
 7 address them.

8 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Great. Any questions?  
 9 MS. BARNES: Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: We appreciate it.  
 11 Thanks for the input.

12 All right. I think we need to vote on it,  
 13 don't we?

14 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Uh-huh.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay. With the motion  
 16 on the table, all those in favor say "aye."

17 (Chorus of ayes.)

18 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Aye, Royann?

20 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay. Great.

22 All those opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

23 That will bring us to Item No. VI, discussion

24 and possible action on Representative Steve Farley's

25 request for a no-action letter regarding the use of

Miller Certified Reporting

1 personal e-mail lists. Todd?

2 MR. LANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Commissioners.  
 3 Representative Farley has asked for a no-action letter  
 4 pursuant to Commission Rule 703(B) which permits  
 5 candidates to explain -- to ask for guidance on proposed  
 6 expenditures.

7 Clean Election -- he is a participating  
 8 candidate, and Clean Election's candidates cannot use  
 9 their funds to support, endorse, or contribute to other  
 10 campaigns, so generally the rule is no.

11 In this case though, he's using a personal  
 12 e-mail list of no monetary value and simply endorsing  
 13 candidates or encouraging people to get out to vote or  
 14 register to vote with the use of that list. Because  
 15 it's of no mon- -- monetary value, no Clean Election's  
 16 money is expended, no personal money is expended, in  
 17 this very limited circumstance, I would recommend the  
 18 Commission issue is no-action letter.

19 But I would suggest that the letter make it  
 20 very clear that it's in this limited circumstance for a  
 21 limited personal e-mail list of -- in -- in -- of small  
 22 proportions, and that any sort of attempt to expand the  
 23 e-mail list, to buy e-mails or to get e-mails from a  
 24 party or what have you, would not -- would not be viewed  
 25 as something that's appropriate.

Miller Certified Reporting

1 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: How do you track that?

2 MR. LANG: We -- fortunately, we don't have to  
 3 track it, Mr. Chair, because in the case of Mr. Farley,  
 4 his opponents will track it for us. And in the case of  
 5 any other candidate, the same would happen. But we  
 6 could track it because we could simply just keep in  
 7 touch with him. But gen- -- I'm not worried about what  
 8 Mr. Farley is doing, I'm worried about the next person  
 9 to come along and push the envelope. It's that --  
 10 that's how -- that's the nature of the business.

11 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Right. As far as  
 12 being able to acquire a list and all of a sudden you  
 13 have 10,000 --

14 MR. LANG: That's right.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: -- instead of a 100.

16 MR. LANG: That's right.

17 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Lori?

18 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Chair, Todd, do we  
 19 know what the numbers is on his e-mail list?

20 MR. LANG: I don't. I don't.

21 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: And the only reason I  
 22 ask it is because I'm sure that personal e-mail list  
 23 would include a number of constituents that have  
 24 e-mailed him throughout the session, and at any given  
 25 time a legislature can get four to 500 e-mails in -- on

Miller Certified Reporting

1 one issue in the session. So I'm just -- I mean, we say  
2 it's no monetary value, Im -- I'm curious where his  
3 personal e-mails came from. Did it come from  
4 constituents contacting him at the legislature, which  
5 then it would be actually property of the State because  
6 you're in a legislative office with a computer that  
7 belongs to the State. Or is it something he does at  
8 home?

9 I mean, I -- I'm just curious. And how do we  
10 determine that it is worth no monetary value?

11 MR. LANG: E-mail lists are -- are a bugaboo  
12 for us in all their forms, Commissioner, as you probably  
13 know. In this case it's my understanding that it's --  
14 it's not his work computer.

15 I don't want to be in the business of  
16 regulating whether something is owned by the State or a  
17 the candidate. But in this case with -- with the  
18 understanding, and we would be quite specific in the  
19 no-action letter, that it's a personal e-mail list with  
20 his home computer, that it's not State names -- names he  
21 obtained through the State, his State e-mail address,  
22 and that it's under a 1,000 people, that we would issue  
23 a no-action letter given those -- those restrictions.

24 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Mr. Chairman?

25 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Don't

Miller Certified Reporting

1 That -- that would be my concern.

2 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Todd?

3 MR. LANG: Commissioners, you obviously raise  
4 valid concerns. The solution might be to repeal 703(B)  
5 which is the rule in question. What it says is: "Upon  
6 written request from the candidate, the Commission shall  
7 determine whether a planned campaign expenditure or  
8 fundraising activity is permissible under the Act."

9 Now, I can could provide you with more  
10 information or we could set parameters to what is  
11 permitted. But right now I think Representative Farley  
12 is entitled to a yes or no. Frankly, my initial take on  
13 this, because I share the same concerns you have, was to  
14 not issue the no-action letter. Not because what I  
15 thought he did was inappropriate, because we know that  
16 people would push the envelope, and I don't want to give  
17 anybody safe harbor.

18 Although, the rule specifically says that it  
19 applies only if the candidate requests it. But when I  
20 considered the matter and reread the rule, I realized  
21 that really the rule pretty much puts the obligation on  
22 the Commission to issue one.

23 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: And Mr. Chairman,  
24 Todd --

25 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Royann, go ahead.

Miller Certified Reporting

1 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Todd, I -- I have  
2 reservations about a letter going out from the  
3 Commission to somebody involved in the election process  
4 and that letter seems to be an approval of action that's  
5 yet to be taken. I mean, I'm reluctant to -- to approve  
6 disseminating a letter from the Commission without  
7 actually seeing the letter. That's my first  
8 reservation.

9 My second reservation is actually founded on  
10 what Lori has to say there. If we issue this no-action  
11 letter, and then later, in the political process,  
12 there's a complaint based upon this e-mail list and we  
13 made a commitment to it, well, I'm don't -- I'm not very  
14 fond of that.

15 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Lori?

16 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Chairman, and -- and  
17 Todd, I guess my -- I don't know that I -- I wouldn't  
18 like us to not -- I think it's good to have guidelines,  
19 you don't want to catch people after the fact. We're  
20 not there to -- to try to trap candidates.

21 But I think if we're going to make a statement  
22 to this effect, it should go out to all the  
23 participating candidates, to all the candidates so that  
24 they know this is a -- a new guideline by the Commission  
25 that everybody understands completely what it is.

Miller Certified Reporting

1 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Well, I have a concern  
2 about this too, because I -- I'm kind of thinking we  
3 need to know how extensive his e-mail list is. And he  
4 tells us right up front he's going to send these people  
5 a -- a message for an appeal to volunteer for campaign  
6 for Democratic legislative candidates in districts other  
7 than his own because he's unopposed. So we know it's  
8 going to be an expressed advocacy mailer.

9 MR. LANG: Oh, sure.

10 COMMISSIONER PARKER: And even if it's on his  
11 personal computer, it could very easily have been  
12 e-mails that came to his office for other things, and --  
13 and e-mails because he -- and I guess my question is, is  
14 this an e-mail list that he regularly sends constituent  
15 newsletters, you know, once a month: This is what I've  
16 done at the legislature for you, type of a thing, or,  
17 you know, how often does his database access to do  
18 things for him. And I think we need to get a handle on  
19 how large it is and how the -- how the names were --  
20 were generated.

21 And if it -- it's his buddies, that's one  
22 thing. But if it's people that have contacted him for,  
23 you know, legislative assistance or wrote him about, you  
24 know, about an item of concern, they want to make him  
25 aware of it or whatever, I have a problem with that

Miller Certified Reporting

30

1 being considered, you know, his personal e-mail.  
 2 Also, unless I'm misunderstanding, we were  
 3 in -- in -- in a prior action, we were talking about use  
 4 of his home computer to generate calls. Well, he's  
 5 using his home computer to generate e-mails. And would  
 6 that not come under 16-901.18 which talks about personal  
 7 access to which the candidate has a legal right of  
 8 access or control, and that's considered personal money  
 9 that would have to be reported. That's why I'm not  
 10 understanding that whole section.  
 11 MR. LANG: I think she understands it.  
 12 The -- the -- there are a couple of answers to  
 13 your questions, Commissioner Parker. This is a weekly  
 14 list from his home e-mail, and I had the impression,  
 15 though frankly I should verify it, that this was his  
 16 personal e-mail and not work related. He makes a point  
 17 that he's not using the State e-mail, that these aren't  
 18 folks addressed in that fashion, and it is a weekly  
 19 e-mail.  
 20 So -- and I -- I'm on a couple of those lists,  
 21 and, you know, it's just updates. I'm not on his  
 22 particular one, but it's just updates on what's going  
 23 on. Here he's very straightforward, which obviously I  
 24 appreciate that. It is going to definitely be expressed  
 25 advocacy. And the -- the concern you raise,  
 Miller Certified Reporting

32

1 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Lori?  
 2 COMMISSIONER PARKER: I -- I personally don't  
 3 feel comfortable giving a letter of -- of no action,  
 4 mainly because it's going to be -- you know, if -- even  
 5 if it's just going to be the people that have  
 6 contributed to him in the past, you know, it's still of  
 7 value and it's -- it's a piece of the field that the  
 8 other guys that he's running -- that are running against  
 9 these other candidates won't have.  
 10 So it's really not a level playing field, if  
 11 that's indeed what we're trying to go for. And, you  
 12 know, I'm not trying to play czar of the e-mails either,  
 13 you know, the right of speech is imperious, but I guess  
 14 I just have a problem saying: Yeah, go ahead and do it  
 15 and it's just --  
 16 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Chairman, Todd, I  
 17 would -- I would love a clarification. So you're  
 18 telling me though that we're required to -- to respond  
 19 to him because he -- it's says the Commission shall, but  
 20 we can't -- but we only can do it to the one particular  
 21 candidate. So I kind of feel like we're the IRS and  
 22 we're making a rule that doesn't apply to everybody.  
 23 This one tax payor for this one circumstance is  
 24 clarified for it, but nobody else gets to benefit from  
 25 that. And is that correct? Is that what we have to do?  
 Miller Certified Reporting

31

1 Commissioner Parker, is a valid one, which is what's the  
 2 value of these e-mails given that we think Senator  
 3 Huppenthal's phone calls are of value.  
 4 Frankly, personal e-mails have always been  
 5 exempted from Clean Elections in terms of enforcement  
 6 matters, and we've been able to keep that line viable  
 7 because no one has abused it by, you know, paying for  
 8 10,000 e-mail addresses and downloading to personal  
 9 e-mail. And as long as that continues, it will continue  
 10 to work, because, frankly, we don't want to be in the  
 11 business of regulating personal e-mails.  
 12 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Right. I agree with  
 13 that.  
 14 MR. LANG: And -- and so this seemed to be  
 15 appropriate for an exception from the general rule which  
 16 is sub- -- that Senator Huppenthal is subject to, which  
 17 is when you send personal e-mails endorsing someone of  
 18 no value, that you didn't pay for, that it might be  
 19 okay.  
 20 But I certainly understand all the  
 21 Commissioners' concerns and -- and -- and to some extent  
 22 share them.  
 23 COMMISSIONER PARKER: I -- I just don't think  
 24 we know enough about it to give him a blanket letter.  
 25 MR. LANG: Okay.  
 Miller Certified Reporting

33

1 We have to respond to this one but we can't make a -- a  
 2 blanket?  
 3 MR. LANG: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Daniels,  
 4 we -- we can respond to this person. We can say -- and  
 5 the Commission certainly can decline to issue the  
 6 no-action letter. That's completely a reasonable  
 7 option.  
 8 But the Commission, we're doing the FAQs that I  
 9 just mentioned, if the Commission liked, if we said that  
 10 this is okay, we could write up an FAQ that's just like  
 11 it, that would apply to everyone.  
 12 COMMISSIONER PARKER: I think we're going to  
 13 have to be so specific of what constitutes personal  
 14 e-mail lists --  
 15 MR. LANG: Right. Right.  
 16 COMMISSIONER PARKER: -- and that kind of  
 17 thing.  
 18 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Don?  
 19 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Mr. Chairman, Todd,  
 20 the -- the rule that's -- that's creating the issue for  
 21 us, reads specifically: "Upon written request from a  
 22 candidate, the Commission shall determine whether a  
 23 planned campaign expenditure or fundraising activity is  
 24 permissible under the Act."  
 25 It seems to me that, number one, that doesn't  
 Miller Certified Reporting

34

1 prohibit the Commission from requiring additional  
 2 information to support the action of the Commission.  
 3 And, number two, unless there's some other rule  
 4 relative, it also doesn't prohibit the Commission from  
 5 expanding upon the response like Commissioner Daniels is  
 6 inquiring about.  
 7       So it would seem that in light of the  
 8 reservations of everybody here on the Commission's  
 9 expressing, that, number one, we probably need more  
 10 information from the person making this inquiry; and,  
 11 number two, we may want to consider at another meeting  
 12 whether we're going to expand on the response.  
 13       MR. LANG: Thank you, Commissioner Lindholm.  
 14 I'd -- I'd point out also that, frankly, the Commission  
 15 is not required to respond. I felt like it was only  
 16 fair that they respond, but it's regarding campaign  
 17 expenses, the rule, and this is not a campaign expense  
 18 by his own assertion. This is a simple constituent  
 19 communication. So the rule doesn't directly apply. So,  
 20 you're not obligated to respond. And I think the  
 21 purpose of the applies only to this person language in  
 22 the rule is simply to protect the Commission from others  
 23 who would try to exploit the no-action letter.  
 24       And basically what the rule says is, if you  
 25 want to do something, you better get a no-action letter

Miller Certified Reporting

36

1 rates has always been a conundrum for -- for us, but we  
 2 permitted it because it was the practice long before  
 3 Clean Elections. And similarly e-mails, personal  
 4 e-mails has always been permitted. But I share --  
 5 all -- all your observations are correct. It is a  
 6 challenge.  
 7       COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Chairman, do we need  
 8 a motion to hold this until next week -- till next  
 9 meeting?  
 10       CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: To table it.  
 11       COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I will make a motion  
 12 that we would table this item until we get further  
 13 information.  
 14       COMMISSIONER PARKER: I'll second that.  
 15       CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: It's been moved by  
 16 Commissioner Daniels, seconded by Commissioner Parker to  
 17 table the consideration of possible action on the  
 18 Commission Rule R2-20-104(F) -- or, excuse me, Steve  
 19 Farley's request for no-action letter -- scratch that  
 20 one off -- regarding personal e-mail lists.  
 21       There is no discussion on the table. So, all  
 22 those in favor say "aye."  
 23       (Chorus of ayes.)  
 24       CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Opposed? Motion  
 25 carries.

Miller Certified Reporting

35

1 because if Charlie has it, it doesn't mean you're safe.  
 2       COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: But we don't want to  
 3 ignore him though.  
 4       MR. LANG: Yeah, so I will -- we will gather  
 5 more information and bring it back for you.  
 6       THE WITNESS: Royann?  
 7       COMMISSIONER PARKER: Yeah, I -- I had a  
 8 question following up to the -- the language that Don  
 9 read. It seemed to me that this will be an in-kind  
 10 contribution from his campaign to these other campaigns,  
 11 would it not?  
 12       MR. LANG: Arguably, it could be. The response  
 13 you have from him and from his advocates would be that,  
 14 well, it's of zero value. And, again --  
 15       COMMISSIONER PARKER: If it's of zero value,  
 16 why is he doing it? Obviously, they're hoping they  
 17 would have some value --  
 18       MR. LANG: I didn't say zero political value.  
 19 I meant zero financial value.  
 20       And -- and that's the problem with e-mail lists  
 21 and e-mails. And -- and sort of the slippery slope we  
 22 get on when we start regulating personal e-mails,  
 23 because they cost nothing, and yet they have value.  
 24       I mean, the -- the fact that the party gives  
 25 out e-mail lists for candidates for well below market

Miller Certified Reporting

37

1       Item No. VII, discussion and possible action on  
 2 monthly legislative status report. Todd?  
 3       MR. LANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
 4 Commissioners, two things to point out. The primary  
 5 concern we have is in regard to HCR 2044, which would  
 6 allow our legislature to raid our fund, the voter  
 7 protected funds in times of financial crisis. We're  
 8 opposed to that bill because, obviously, as you know,  
 9 we -- we give as much money as we can to the legislature  
 10 already, to the General Fund already, so it's not  
 11 necessary in regard to Clean Elections.  
 12       The good news is that so far it's not moving  
 13 any further and we're cautiously optimistic -- our  
 14 lobbyist is cautiously optimistic that it will not move  
 15 further, but that remains to be seen. But we are  
 16 certainly keeping tabs on it and will let you know if  
 17 there's any action needed or anything changes.  
 18       The other bill I wanted to point out is House  
 19 Bill 2105, which is not a bill we have monitored  
 20 closely. This is the one on the first page. Basically  
 21 it's -- it's the -- the revenue folks want to change it  
 22 so all the check-offs are on the back of the form rather  
 23 than the front page of the form. We like being on the  
 24 front page of the form, but they wanted to uni- -- make  
 25 everything uniform and wanted to move it and clean it

Miller Certified Reporting

38

1 up. So we didn't oppose it. We took no position.  
 2 It passed, but the latest news this week is  
 3 that the Clean Elections' check-off box did not pass.  
 4 It passed but because it was voter protected, they  
 5 needed more votes. And so they're going to -- it's  
 6 still rattling around over in the legislature. I -- I'm  
 7 sure they will address it and fix it. But I just  
 8 thought you would find it interesting to know that,  
 9 despite the lack of opposition by anyone, that portion  
 10 of it -- so we might be all by ourselves on the front of  
 11 the page, that will be -- that will be kind -- kind of  
 12 nice.  
 13 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Lori -- Lori, do you  
 14 like Todd's description of the legislative process?  
 15 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I do. Very appropriate.  
 16 I was just going to say seeing that it's June  
 17 17th, you would think that nothing would be passing and  
 18 it would all be gone.  
 19 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: That's it?  
 20 MR. LANG: That's it. Unless you have any  
 21 questions.  
 22 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay. Any questions  
 23 for Todd?  
 24 All right then. Hearing none, we'll move on to  
 25 Item No. VIII, discussion on write-in candidates  
 Miller Certified Reporting

40

1 MR. LANG: -- they would be eligible for Clean  
 2 Election funding for the general. And -- and it's  
 3 complicated because they have to abide by all the Clean  
 4 Election restrictions, which means they only can spend  
 5 their early money and seed money, and they have to spend  
 6 it all by the end of the primary period which is August  
 7 21st. So after August 21, they can't spend any more  
 8 money.  
 9 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Even in the general?  
 10 MR. LANG: Well, once in the general, then they  
 11 can.  
 12 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Oh.  
 13 MR. LANG: So, anyway, that's how it works. I  
 14 wanted to make sure you understood that that, yes, you  
 15 can qualify for Clean Election's funding as a write-in,  
 16 but only if you get on your party's ballot and only for  
 17 that general period and you have to abide by our  
 18 restrictions, so it's a bit cumbersome. But that's not  
 19 our concern, that's -- that's just how the statutes  
 20 work.  
 21 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay. Any questions  
 22 for Todd on this?  
 23 All right. Then we'll move on to Item No. IX,  
 24 a consideration and possible action on Laurin Hendrix's  
 25 request for exemption from participating in a primary  
 Miller Certified Reporting

39

1 qualifications to receive Clean Election funding.  
 2 MR. LANG: Mr. Chair, Commissioners,  
 3 Participating Candidate Laurin Hendrix would like to be  
 4 exempted from the legislative district --  
 5 Oh, I'm sorry, which one are we on?  
 6 MS. SHIPMAN: Write-in candidate.  
 7 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: No. VIII, write-in  
 8 candidate qualification.  
 9 MR. LANG: Oh, okay. I moved right on to IX  
 10 because there's no VIII tab in my book.  
 11 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Right.  
 12 MR. LANG: This I put on the agenda for your  
 13 discussion and information. There's nothing really  
 14 controversial here. I just wanted to make sure you  
 15 know, because we've received several questions this  
 16 week. It's in our FAQs, because of that. Our FAQs, not  
 17 F-A-X. But, basically, the way it works is -- and I  
 18 think this came up because of Senator Flake's untimely  
 19 passing -- but the way it works is, we do not fund  
 20 write-in candidates, not because we're mean-spirited or  
 21 something like that, it's because the statute doesn't  
 22 permit us to fund write-in candidates. But if a  
 23 write-in candidate wins their primary -- and,  
 24 Commissioner, you know about that --  
 25 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: I know about that.  
 Miller Certified Reporting

41

1 election debate for District 22.  
 2 MR. LANG: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, this is  
 3 fairly straightforward. Ms. Hendrix would like to be  
 4 exempted from the debate scheduled for July 17 because  
 5 she is going to be in California for reasons related to  
 6 her employment. We didn't inquire further into what  
 7 those reasons were, but we took her at her word. So we  
 8 recommend that you excuse her from that debate.  
 9 MS. AZCONA: Him. Him.  
 10 MR. LANG: Him? Oh, thank you. Daniel --  
 11 Daniel -- was it Daniel or Mike? Who was --  
 12 MR. RUIZ: Mike.  
 13 MR. LANG: Mike was working with Mr. Hendrix.  
 14 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay.  
 15 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Mr. Chairman, I would  
 16 make a motion that we -- we allow Mr. Hendrix to not be  
 17 at the debate.  
 18 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Okay.  
 19 COMMISSIONER PARKER: Second.  
 20 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: It's been moved by  
 21 Commissioner Daniels, second by Commissioner Parker to,  
 22 I guess, exempt or excuse Mr. Hendrix from the primary  
 23 election debate scheduled for District 22.  
 24 Any discussion on that item?  
 25 All those in favor say "aye."  
 Miller Certified Reporting

1 (Chorus of ayes.)  
 2 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Opposed? Motion  
 3 carries.  
 4 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Probably should have  
 5 spelled his name right in his letter.  
 6 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: Yeah.  
 7 MR. LANG: I would have his gender right if he  
 8 had done that.  
 9 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: No. X, call for public  
 10 comment. Eric?  
 11 MR. EHST: Nothing no- -- this month, Mr.  
 12 Chairman.  
 13 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Nothing this month?  
 14 Okay. Good enough.  
 15 Then that will leave us with Item No. XI which  
 16 is adjournment.  
 17 COMMISSIONER DANIELS: So moved.  
 18 COMMISSIONER LINDHOLM: Second.  
 19 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Moved and seconded.  
 20 All those in favor say "aye."  
 21 (Chorus of ayes.)  
 22 CHAIRPERSON SCARAMAZZO: Opposed? Motion  
 23 carries.  
 24  
 25 (Whereupon the proceeding concludes at 10:22  
 Miller Certified Reporting

1 a.m.)  
 2  
 3 \* \* \* \* \*  
 4  
 5 C E R T I F I C A T E  
 6  
 7 I, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter,  
 8 do hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1  
 9 through 42, inclusive, constitute a full and accurate  
 10 printed record of my stenographic notes taken at said  
 11 time and place, all done to the best of my skill and  
 12 ability.  
 13 DATED, at Phoenix, this 23rd day of June,  
 14 2008.  
 15  
 16  
 17 \_\_\_\_\_  
 18 Angela Furniss Miller, RPR  
 19 Certified Reporter (AZ50127)  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 Miller Certified Reporting