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10:33 a.m.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Hello, everybody. Good morning. Hopefully you can hear me okay. I'll try to keep my voice up. My name is Gary Thompson, the Chair of the Board of Elections. With us today are my fellow board members, Karyn Greenfield and J.C. Boggs. All three of us are here, so we have a quorum.

We have a pretty simple agenda today. It's a special session to discuss the adoption of a short title and the summary statement and the legislative form for voter initiative measure number 83. I would move the agenda. Is there a second?

MS. GREENFIELD: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor say, aye.
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. That's our whole agenda. We'll commence. Just to set the table a little bit, as I think everybody here
probably knows, but just in case you don't, our board already considered and ruled upon the issue of whether the proposed voter initiative is a proper subject matter under D.C. law. We ruled in the affirmative that it is a proper subject matter for voter's initiative and gave the green light for ballot access. We issued a written ruling as well, and that's, of course, all been made public. Once again, as I said last time, our board has not and does not and does not mean to comment on the merits of the voter's initiative. We're not ever meaning to say the voters should vote yes or should vote not, that's going to be for the voters to decide. And that's really at the core of our job today, which is to discuss and confirm a short title and summary statement. Something that's obviously as neutral and independent as it can be, informative enough to let the voters understand what they're voting on but not overly wordy. And we, of course, are well aware of our statutory and regulatory guidance
in that regard, especially DC Code Section 11001.16, sub C, that our job is to, quote, prepare a true and impartial summary statement written in plain language, et cetera. Such statements shall not intentionally create prejudice for or against the measure. So that's our job.

So what we issued in connection with the notice for this meeting (audio interference) draft, short title, and summary statement. There's been an opportunity for members of the public to submit written comments in advance. We've received some very thoughtful and detailed suggestions from the proposer, Ms. Lisa Rice, with Make All Votes Count, D.C. We've received one email. What we'll do is, well, first, I'll ask General Counsel Terri Stroud to comment. But then we'll hear from the proposer. We'll make note of the email comment. Later we'll open the floor to comment from everybody that's here. With that, I would ask Terri Stroud to
to work using the draft that was prepared by the Office of the General Counsel as a baseline from which to work. So we'll do that in real time during the meeting. After adoption we will notify the proposer of the measure via email and, of course, the proposer is here today, as I can see on the Zoom, of the formulations, and they will be published in at least one newspaper of general circulation, on the Board's website, and in the D.C. Register. The publication in the D.C. Register, which will take place on Friday, September 1, will launch a 10 day period during which any registered voter who objects to the formulations may seek review in the Superior Court of D.C. stating objections and requesting appropriate changes. The voters may also file objections regarding the initiative with the court on other grounds during this period including the Board's determination that the proposed measure presents a proper subject for initiative. That 10 day period will end on

September 11. So I just wanted to put that on the record so that people can be aware of that 10 day period, which will commence on Friday, September 1 because that is when the formulations will be published in the D.C. Register.

With that, we're going to share the screen so that everyone can see the formulations that were proposed, or drafted, and these formulations are what was published in the D.C. Register, and that is what we're working with today.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you very much. I think with that I think we would commence with the proposer, Lisa Rice, or her counsel, Joseph Sandler. I don't know who wants to speak and lead us through their suggestions.

MS. RICE: Hi, good morning. I just had to unmute myself. Thank you for this time this morning. As you mentioned, I submitted written comments, and I just want to highlight
a few, I'm not going to read the entire note that I sent, about the short title.

The main concern that I have is the use of that phrase, semi-closed. It's not really well understood by the general public and doesn't reflect the intent of the ballot measure. The term for unaffiliated voters that's most recognized and understood by the general public is independent voters. And so we're recommending that the short title be amended to Ranked Choice Voting and Open the Primary Elections to Independent Voters Act of 2024. I'll repeat that. Ranked Choice Voting and Open the Primary Elections to Independent Voters Act of 2024. I do have an alternative suggestion and that would be Ranked Choice Voting and Expanding Primary Election Access to Independent Voters Act of 2024.

We're providing these two short titles because we just don't feel use of the term semi-closed accurately reflects the intent of the ballot measure, nor does it make sure
that the general public understands what the measure does in order to make an informed choice. Semi-closed, closed just does not sound welcoming and it's not what we're doing. We're not closing anything, we're opening.

Also, about the summary statement. We just have some concern about the order of the bullet points as presented. We'd like to suggest moving the funding clause to the very beginning, and that way voters understand that this is about two things that need to happen. Number one, the ballot measure needs to be enacted by voters. Number two, the ballot measure needs to be funded by the D.C. Council. So we suggest reversing the order of the two bullet points.

Finally, we think the voters would benefit from understanding the ballot measure doesn't permit unlimited ranking of candidates, rather it's up to five rankings. So we think that ranking in order of preference is not wording that's necessarily clear to everyday
voters who usually think in terms of enumerating their choices. First choice, second choice, et cetera. So we want to add that crucial piece of information to the summary statement.

So, combined, what we'd end up with is, if enacted and projected costs are funded by the D.C. Council the initiative would, and the first bullet point is, Implement ranked choice voting to allow voters to rank their preferred candidates (up to five choices) in each contest for any office (other than political party offices) with three or more qualified candidates; and second bullet point, Permit voters who are not registered with a political party to choose to participate in the primary election of their choosing for all offices (other than political party offices). And that's it for me at this point. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Rice. Those are very thoughtful
comments. When I sat down myself to go through this I spotted almost all the same issues. So when I saw your memo it really overlapped with what drew my attention.

Mr. Sandler, would you like to supplement that?

MR. SANDLER: Just to say, thank you, Mr. Chairman, that the terms open primary, semi-closed, closed primary are used by lawyers and political scientists. I've litigated these cases myself in the National Democratic Party. But even the justices of the U.S. Supreme Court don't agree among themselves on what these terms mean and not using them consistently. So just to emphasize that sort of as a matter of plain, you know, the average voter just understanding what this is about, we would respectfully urge the use of the term either open the primary elections or expand the primary elections to independent voters just to state it in plain English. Thank you. CHAIR THOMPSON: Just a quick
question on that. Maybe something that might work that isn't weighted in any way would be to call it the Ranked Choice Voting and Partially Open Primaries Act of 2024. I suggest that because I think in common discussion people generally talk about open primaries. In Virginia they have open primaries, and that's a commonly used phrase that isn't, I think, wedded to a technical definition. And then modifying it with the word partially is maybe a neutral description that is then given more detail when you get down to the summary statement and it's then described. Do you think that would be sufficient? I say that also because maybe it's a little too wordy to have that longer phrase, Open the Primary Elections to Independent Voters Act. MR. SANDLER: Well, again, the term partial is also somewhat opaque for somebody just looking at this. If there was a way to just say what it means may be worth the extra words in terms of that it is opening the
primary to independent voters we think would be more precise, accurate, and easily understandable.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. In fact

MS. GREENFIELD: Mr. Chairman, this is Karyn, can I say?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Please, yeah.
MS. GREENFIELD: The concern I have with the independent voters is independent is a party and is this going to read to people that we've now opened it to only independents? That's my concern. That was my concern with the use of the term independent voter. That will cause another level of confusion, so I would not like use of the word independent voters only because people could read it as Open the Primary Election to Independents and not mean unaffiliated voters but mean those affiliated with the Independent party. That's my concern.

MR. SANDLER: Maybe unaffiliated is
better.
MR. STREGE: I have a comment if I may, if everyone can hear me.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, I was going to call on you, Commissioner, from your email comment. Why don't you chime in there? Thank you.

MR. STREGE: Yeah, I would weight in and just say that I think it's probably best to avoid terms such as semi-closed, semi-open, and partially open altogether, simply because if you say something like partially open, if a voter isn't informed, they may think that we currently have fully open, and it may imply that we're restricting it in some way, which is why I was encouraging a title that would be directionally correct. Expanding primary access is pretty unarguable, that's what this does, it's increasing the franchise, it's bringing more people into the franchise, and the summary statement would be what defines who it's being expanded to. But if you get into
the nuances of semi-closed, things like that, the definitions are not well understood, and they're not really well defined depending on who you ask. I would just encourage avoiding using any of those terms altogether.

If you did want to use the word open, I would encourage the word opening for the same reason, it speaks to the direction of the initiative. It's opening the franchise rather than restricting it, which is why the title that I suggested was Expanding Primary Access and left it at that.

MR. BOGGS: Thanks for that. A couple comments. One, I think the Office of General Counsel did a great job at putting this together. It reads well, it's fairly simple. But, Gary, I shared some of your, as I read through it, some questions in my mind. The easy one I'll take, I think it makes a lot of sense to reverse A and B and start with Ranked Choice Voting in the title. Why not start with A on that and the second part is Semi-Closed

Primaries Act. So just switch those around, again, it just makes sense.

I liked the idea of a simple title.
It seems very verbose. Some of the ways we're going I get the closed versus open, so I like the idea of opening or expanding in there, if we can tweak that a little bit but try to keep it short. I wondered almost if I were, well, I am in the public, but resubmit it as two separate initiatives instead of one combined it might be simpler. But it is what it is, and think there are some tweaks here that folks have brought up and makes some sense.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Yeah, thanks. Why don't we cover the easy stuff first? I agree that we should switch the order of $A$ and $B$ to track the order of the title, the short title. Karyn, are you okay with that as well?

MS. GREENFIELD: Yes. Yeah, I agree with that. That lines up.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Also, I think it
was suggested that we use bullet points instead of $A$ and $B$, but $I$ think $A$ and $B$ are appropriate because they clearly delineate between what really are two separate things that could be two different initiatives but are packaged together here. I favor the way it's drafted is both $A$ and $B$ just switching the order of $A$ and $B$ as we have it. J.C., are you good with that? MR. BOGGS: Yes. MS. GREENFIELD: Mm-hmm.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. That covers the easy stuff. Before we dive in a little bit deeper, let me ask for comment from anybody else that's there. Just raise your hand and just let us know you'd like to comment. Okay. I don't see any hands coming up. There's Nikolas Schiller, if he could be unmuted. Let us know your thoughts. Hello. MR. SCHILLER: Hello. Good to see you. Thank you everyone for having a special meeting today. Going back, I think A and B, this wasn't addressed. With respect to what

Lisa suggested, having the concluding clause being neither $A$ or $B$, being incorporated into the opening clause. If enacted and projected cost funded by the D.C. Council, this initiative would both, is that any discussion on that point about combining this -- A and B makes it read as if they're two independent pieces of legislation, but when routed, there are two reforms in one law, not two laws with one reform. So making bullet points as two separate and combining the concluding clause to the first, because it really says that there are two things that need to be done, first it needs to be enacted, which means the voters pass it. B, the Council has to take action to fund it. Once those two are done, then the two bullet points would then be able to manifest. So it seems more straightforward to the voter that you take out the $A$ and the $B$ because having them independent clauses almost implies that they're two independent things but in reality one law will be transferred to Congress
if it's enacted by voters, not two different laws. That's my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thanks. We'll get to those two things. Any other comment out there before we deliberate live?

MS. GREENFIELD: This is Karyn, I have one more. More of a question than a comment just for clarity for the voters. When we say implement Ranked Choice Voting to allow voters to rank candidates. When I read that, me as a voter would think I don't have to. I can just vote one candidate for each of the races, and my vote will count, I don't have to rank anybody else if I don't want to, but those who want to can rank, and then when you go through the ranked voting their additional rankings will count. Is that correct? Because if it's not we're not allowing voters to rank candidates.

MS. RICE: It's correct, Ms.
Greenfield. That's correct. As a voter you make your choice of how many candidates you
want to rank, and if it's just one, that's your choice.

CHAIR THOMPSON: And I, related to that, I favor this edit that Ms. Rice suggested, in that exact language, to add the parenthetical up to five choices. That helps clarify there could be one, there could be five, or something in between.

MS. RICE: Yes, yeah.
MR. GREENBERG: I think that's inserted right after preferred candidates.

MR. STREGE: Yeah, I would echo that adding up to five is important. It's pretty standard, but there are some jurisdictions that do six. Maine is one of them, for example.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Well, actually I guess the suggested edit is, implement ranked choice voting to allow voters to rank their preferred candidates, up to five choices, it's a little, well, sorry, I'm kind of doing this in real time. It's kind of completely reworded. Maybe the way it is, is fine --
according to their preference in each contest for any office. It's just re-written to say.

MR. STREGE: You could just put, up to five between rank and candidates. So implement ranked choice voting to allow voters to rank up to five candidates.

MR. BOGGS: Instead of the paren.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, that works for me.

MS. GREENFIELD: Okay. So.
MR. STREGE: So, yeah, I guess remove the parenthetical and put it between rank and candidate, up to five candidates. One is still up to five if you choose to rank one.

CHAIR THOMPSON: To rank up to five candidates according to their preference in each contest for any office other than political party offices.

MR. STREGE: Yeah, that seems to make sense.

MS. RICE: So I'd like to -- are we still working on this? Because I do want to go
back to the independent language.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, so there's that language in $A$ that we just addressed. I still favor using A and B. I don't think that implies there is two separate laws. It's one voters' initiative, one law that does two very distinct things. I mean, I heard the concern, but I still favor saying both A and B.

MS. RICE: I think adding and does what we need.

MS. GREENFIELD: Mm-hmm.
CHAIR THOMPSON: And then, in terms of the modifier, which we've talked about, at the very end we say neither A nor B would be implemented unless the D.C. Council separately chooses to appropriate funds for the projected cost. I kind of lean towards keeping it at the end, but $I$ don't feel strongly about that. Karyn and J.C., what do you think?

MR. BOGGS: I like it where it is.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. BOGGS: -- what the bill --
sorry, the initiative does, $A$ and $B$, and then secondarily, doesn't happen unless it gets funded.

Karyn, I'm sorry.
MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah, I'm trying to think because it is true that for it to be implemented it needs to be enacted and funded. I mean, once it gets voted on it then needs to be funded. I'm trying to think. I kind of like the one up front because it tells them right up front, if enacted and if the money is funded, then what the initiative would both do. If they vote it through does it get enacted? It's just an unfunded initiative basically or and unfunded law, or does it not get enacted at all. Is it not enacted until funded? I know we can implement it until it is, but it's still in there saying that's what we could do, it's just waiting for money.

MR. BOGGS: How would that read? If enacted and incorporated by the D.C. Council -(Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. GREENFIELD: They both say, because they both explain the same thing, it just puts it more up front when they're looking at what it does.

Yeah, both says it. To me, both explains that it has to be funded.

Yeah, I would agree with you. I would just leave it as neither $A$ nor $B$ would be implemented.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, I think it's good the way it is. Because if it's enacted, the voters vote yes, then it's enacted, but it's not implemented unless the D.C. Council separately chooses to appropriate funds for the projected cost which, I think you kind of need all those words to really get across the point that this is not in any way requiring the D.C. Council to fund this, which is important to it being a proper subject matter. The necessary sort of shortening of the phrase to put it at the outset instead of at the end kind of loses some of that description. So I think I like it
better at the end the way it is.
MR. BOGGS: Let me go back to paragraph A. It still seems like -- I like what we did, it still seems like a long sentence.

MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. BOGGS: -- each contest for any office other than political party offices with three or more qualified candidates. Do we need the with three or more qualified candidates? What happens when you have two?

MR. SCHILLER: I mean, technically two is just one round of ranked choice voting. I mean, it's mathematically the same.

MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah. If there's two, if you only vote for one you definitely put the other one as second.

MR. SCHILLER: Yeah.
MR. BOGGS: Is it necessary to even,
it just seems like up to five and then with three or more. Kind of simplify it but make it
accurate.
MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah.
MR. SCHILLER: Yeah. What you're going to have to do anyway when you go to rule making is you're going to have to restrict the number of ranked choice bubbles to the number of candidates minus one. So if you had three candidates you wouldn't be having five bubbles for first, second, third, fourth, fifth. So in the case where there's two candidates you're only going to have one bubble anyway because it's two minus one. So I think you can probably remove that.

MR. BOGGS: So other than political party offices, end paren, period. Or semicolon and.

CHAIR THOMPSON: I agree it's implied, it's necessarily the case.

MS. GREENFIELD: And do we, yeah.
CHAIR THOMPSON: It's confusing with the five and the three because, what if there's four, you know.

MR. SCHILLER: Yeah.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Up to five tells you this is going to be something that will be utilized if there are three or more.

MS. GREENFIELD: Mm-hmm.
MR. STREGE: You can't rank five if there aren't five candidates.

MS. GREENFIELD: And do we need to say up to five qualified candidates? Do we need that word qualified in or not? We had it below, I didn't know if we needed it above. We had it when we said three or more.

MS. RICE: Do we assume if they're on the ballot that they're qualified?

MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah.
CHAIR THOMPSON: I guess you could write in a candidate for ranked choice voting too, can't you?

MR. SCHILLER: It allows for one, yeah.

MS. GREENFIELD: Okay.
MR. BOGGS: After and there will be
a comma, not a period?
MS. GREENFIELD: Mm-mmm. Oh, yeah, it would not be a period.

MS. STROUD: That should be deleted, it shows up as deleted on my screen.

MS. GREENFIELD: Okay.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah.
MR. BOGGS: I see. Okay.
MR. SCHILLER: I just wanted to bring up that the neither A nor B part, that to me still has a little bit of bias. It's a negative component as opposed to a positive. I just have a problem with neither A nor B. It sounds like there's two separate laws here when there's one law. I just have to reiterate that. You could say this initiative would not be implemented unless the D.C. Council chooses to appropriate funds. I think the neither A nor B, to me, it's confusing as a voter. But what it's essentially saying it, this initiative would not be implemented unless. You're going to go down that path.
would be to accept what Ms. Rice suggested with a slight modification and call it the Ranked Choice Voting and Open the Primary Elections to Unaffiliated Voters Act of 2024 to address Karyn's point that independent is not the right word. So what are your --

MR. BOGGS: The two other things I heard out there was to replace semi-closed with either expanding or opening primaries act of 2024.

MR. STREGE: Can you all see the text in Zoom? I could just cut and paste the two that we seem to be talking about.

MS. RICE: I would like the Chairman to go back because we're talking about two things. One is inserting that verb or the gerund, either open or opening. But the other thing is, and I'd like to talk about, Ms. Greenfield, an independent. An independent is not a recognized party in D.C. So do you feel that people are going to infer that independent is actually a recognized party in D.C.?

MS. GREENFIELD: That's my concern.
MS. RICE: Would having independent followed in parenthesis by unaffiliated help?

MR. STREGE: Or a slash, maybe.
MS. RICE: Who was that?
MR. STREGE: That was me. Sorry.
MS. RICE: Brian, please let me have this conversation.

MR. STREGE: Sure, sure.
MS. RICE: Thank you. So that's what I was saying, Ms. Greenfield. So would independent followed by unaffiliated in parens help with that clarification, do you think?

MS. GREENFIELD: If we put it in parents, then we're defining independent as unaffiliated, so then why wouldn't we just say unaffiliated.

MS. RICE: Not sure if you would just say independent.

MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah.
MR. BOGGS: Well, it's called a short title for a reason. I just -- I'd like
to keep it simple and then elaborate $A$ or $B$ below.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. If it's saying partially-open that's really short, and if that's all you ever saw I agree it would be a head scratcher. But because the summary statement then described exactly what that means to permit any voter who is not registered with a political party to vote in the primary election of that voter's choosing for all offices. I mean, that describes what that means to say partially-open.

MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah. I'm not sure, one thing I do kind of agree with Brian on is I don't think it describes what we're moving from and to.

MR. SANDLER: Right.
MS. GREENFIELD: So if I'm a voter, I agree semi-closed is not clear. Partiallyopen, I may not know if that means now they're going from open to partially-open, because I may not know what the definitions are. That
was the only thing $I$ was thinking. I kind of like the expanding access, and maybe we say expanding primary access.

MR. BOGGS: Yeah, expending primary access or opening primary, more active tense.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Somebody put in the comments a good point. The voters registration form itself says that no party is a, quote, independent voter.

MR. SANDLER: Yeah.
CHAIR THOMPSON: And that's a pretty commonly used word, independent. Almost has the ability to start sounding kind of technical.

MR. SANDLER: Yeah.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Was it too many words to say Open the Primary Elections to Independent Voters Act?

MS. RICE: No. I think that, though it looks like the Ranked Choice Voting and Open the Primary Elections to Independent Voters Act of 2024, I think that's 14, yeah, that's 14
letters. The first suggested title. So what was your exact language, Gary?

CHAIR THOMPSON: I don't know if we're all okay with this, but go ahead and type it in. Open the Primary Elections to Independent Voters Act, instead of semi-closed primaries. Yeah.

MS. GREENFIELD: That's 14.
CHAIR THOMPSON: That is literally correct. It would open the primary elections to independent voters.

MS. GREENFIELD: And I think that open is neutral because right now I think that everyone would agree that the status quo is that the primaries are closed, and then open suggests that change is occurring, and with the B clause that sort of describes how we're changing. So I think that's probably better than expanding.

MR. BOGGS: I'm good with that.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Let's try this. Why don't I just make a motion just so it's

CHAIR THOMPSON: Will is a better, yeah, you're right, that's the right tense.

MS. GREENFIELD: Mm-hmm.
CHAIR THOMPSON: I think I like that. I think I'm okay with that. I think it's fair, it's balanced.

MS. GREENFIELD: I will acquiesce to be independent. You have convinced me.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Well, before I make a final motion.

MS. STROUD: And open, can we just say --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Anybody that's been a part of this feel free to make a suggestion.

MS. STROUD: Do we need this, the?
MR. STREGE: I you move the the, I think you should make it opening. The aforementioned conversation about not saying open primary.

MS. STROUD: Yeah.
CHAIR THOMPSON: I think you leave the the. I think opening, expanding, starts to
tip a little bit to the positive type of description.

MS. GREENFIELD: Yeah. Leave the the.

MR. BOGGS: I think Terri already raised this, maybe we shouldn't get into it, but if the D.C. Council decides, okay, we're going to fund the open primary part but not the ranked choice voting part, is it all, under this language, does it all go down or do they have to fund both to make it happen?

MR. SANDLER: Under the language of the thing itself. Under the language of the initiative itself, both have to be funded to make it happen.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, that's what
it says in the text. What section is that?
MS. STROUD: What section is what?
CHAIR THOMPSON: Legislative text on
funding.
MR. SANDLER: Section five, Mr. Chair.

I'll read it into the record once you're done.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Going once, going twice. I would move that we adopt the short title and summary statement that we see on our screen here, if the general counsel could please read that into the record.

MS. STROUD: Sure. Initiative Measure 83, the short title reads as follows, Ranked Choice Voting and Open the Primary Elections to Independent Voters Act of 2024. The summary statement reads as follows, If enacted, the initiative will both A, implement ranked choice voting to allow voters to rank up to five candidates according to their preference in each contest for any office (other than political party offices); and B, permit any voter who is not registered with a political party to vote in the primary election of that voter's choosing for all offices (other than political party offices). This initiative will not be implemented unless the D.C. Council separately chooses to appropriate funds for the
projected costs.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Second?
MR. BOGGS: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor. (Chorus of aye.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: The motion carries unanimously. Thank you, everybody, for your input, that was really helpful. I think we struck the right balance. As the general counsel explained, this will now be published in the D.C. Register on September 1, which will commence a 10 day period for appeals, including regarding whether this is a proper subject matter at all for a voters initiative. So that's the next phase ahead of us before we get to issuing petitions for signature and all those other details. So that concludes our business here in our special session. We will be returning for a regular meeting on September 16.

MS. STROUD: Yes. Well, September 13.

CHAIR THOMPSON: 13, sorry, September 13, 10:30, where I'm sure we'll have a lot of progress to report about the election itself and many, many details, and maybe some additional developments regarding this voter's initiative. With that, I would move we adjourn.

MS. GREENFIELD: Second. CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor.
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: Everybody have a great rest of the summer.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled
matter went off the record at 11:22 a.m.)
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