

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION
(Ariz. Const. Art. IV, Part 2 § 1)
1700 West Washington Street, 7th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
and via Conference Call
FINAL COPY
Meeting Minutes of January 14, 2021

I. Call to order, Secretary of State Katie Hobbs

Secretary of State Katie Hobbs called the meeting to order at 11:15 a.m.

II. Welcome & roll call

Commission Members Present:

David Mehl, Commissioner
Shereen Lerner, Commissioner
Derrick Watchman, Commissioner
Douglas York, Commissioner
Vacant, Commissioner

Commission Staff Present:

Chris Rhode – Elections Analyst & Staff
Christine Dyster – Election Services Manager & Staff
Tanner Robinson – Elections Specialist & Staff
Caroline Guerrero – Assistant Attorney General
Kyle Cummings – Assistant Attorney General

Commission Members Absent:

None

Commission Staff Absent:

None

Secretary Hobbs stated she would be holding the role of Active Commission Chair until one was selected for the current commission. She went over the significance of the commission's purpose, and its origins in 2000, following a previous process for redistricting handled by the state legislature.

III. Oath of office administered to the appointed members, Secretary of State Katie Hobbs

Secretary Hobbs led the commissioners in taking their oath of office. The oaths were then notarized.

IV. Election of Interim Chair to conduct remainder of meeting

Secretary Hobbs opened up the floor for nominations of Interim Commission Chair.

Commissioner Derrick Watchman motioned for the nomination of Commissioner Shereen Lerner as Interim Commission Chair. Commissioner Lerner seconded the motion.

Commissioner Douglas York motioned to nominate Commissioner David Mehl as Interim Commission Chair. Commissioner Mehl seconded the motion.

Secretary Hobbs described the voting and a 3 vote majority requirement.

Votes:

For Commissioner Lerner to become acting chair:

Commissioner Mehl: No
Commissioner Lerner: Yes
Commissioner Watchman: Yes
Commissioner York: No
Secretary Hobbs: Abstained

Ayes: 2

Nays: 2

Abstained: 1

For Commissioner Mehl to become acting chair:

Commissioner Mehl: Yes
Commissioner Lerner: No
Commissioner Watchman: No
Commissioner York: Yes
Secretary Hobbs: Abstained

Ayes: 2

Nays: 2

Abstained: 1

Secretary Hobbs opened the floor for comments from the Interim Commission Chair nominees.

Commissioner Lerner said she felt she was capable of guiding the commission through the agenda, having served on other commissions previously.

Commissioner Mehl said he served on several boards as well, saying he would be very open during his leadership. Commissioner Mehl further stated that since Republicans are the majority party in Arizona a Republican should be chair.

The votes were re-opened.

For Commissioner Lerner to become acting chair:

Commissioner Mehl: No
Commissioner Lerner: Yes
Commissioner Watchman: Yes
Commissioner York: No
Secretary Hobbs: Abstained

Ayes: 2
Nays: 2
Abstained: 1

For Commissioner Mehl to become acting chair:

Commissioner Mehl: Yes
Commissioner Lerner: Yes
Commissioner Watchman: Yes
Commissioner York: Yes
Secretary Hobbs: Abstained

Ayes: 4
Nays: 0
Abstained: 1

Commissioner Mehl was successfully nominated as Interim Commission Chair until the fifth commissioner is selected. Secretary Hobbs excused herself until the selection of the fifth member is completed.

V. Pre-interview discussion

The Commission discussed the process of the selection of Commission Chair amongst themselves, determining how they would go about approaching it with the set of questions they compiled. There was a general consensus of having each individual introduce themselves and describe themselves, and receive questions from each Commissioner.

Commissioner Watchman motioned that the committee go into executive session to consult legal counsel. Commissioner York seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

The Commission exited regular session and went into executive session at 11:41 a.m.

The Commission reconvened from executive session back into regular session at 11:59 a.m.

VI. Interview of nominees (virtual) and opening of public comment

12:05 P.M. – 12:35 P.M.	Robert Wilson
12:40 P.M. – 01:10 P.M.	Thomas Loquvam
01:15 P.M. – 01:45 P.M.	Gregory Teesdale
01:50 P.M. – 02:20 P.M.	Erika Schupak Neuberg
02:25 P.M. – 02:55 P.M.	Megan Carollo

Robert Wilson:

The Interim Chairman Mehl thanked him for his interest and asked him to describe himself and why he thought he would be a good Commission Chair.

Mr. Robert Wilson stated he was pursuing the position due to its importance. He said his understanding of the importance of the job makes him suitable for the role of the Commission Chair.

Commissioner Lerner asked what skills Mr. Wilson possessed for reaching out to the community. Mr. Wilson said the community connection was the most important part of the commission's function. The more public input, the better, he said. Paying attention to root causes of issues is key, he continued.

Commissioner York asked Mr. Wilson's name appearing in the press. He wanted to know how Mr. Wilson would overcome perceived conflicts. Mr. Wilson said none of the materials compiled in opposition to him or four of the five other candidates were linked to event hosting specifically. He said they did not find any endorsement for a candidate, and went on to say that he is all about voter education. His management of the Commission would respect the will of the people via this process.

Commissioner Watchman asked how the perspectives of the community would be balanced by Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson said listening to Arizonans is critical for the commission. The ability for people to be included, especially for those who are not as internet or Zoom savvy, will present for a unique challenge, saying he is familiar with technology, noting there is a lot to do for how each Arizonan's voice can be heard.

Interim Chairman Mehl referred to the Constitutional guidelines of the Commission, wanting to know which ones Mr. Wilson thought were key. Mr. Wilson said complying by the Voting Rights Act and equal representation is non-negotiable. He stated that working towards the "pre-clearance" agreement, even though no longer required, would be a goal for him, and went on to note that it all comes back to the importance of public input regarding the additional four Constitutional requirements.

Commissioner Lerner followed up on Commissioner York's inquiry, wanting to know if Mr. Wilson had hosted Democratic party events. Mr. Wilson said he had not, but invitations were extended from him. He stated that the reasoning was possibly because Democrats had a different view on the Second Amendment. He said while events were designed around voter education, he has not endorsed or condemned a candidate.

Commissioner Watchman asked how he would handle the political environment, and Mr. Wilson responded that the party divide is the reason he is an independent. How we successfully conduct redistricting is by remaining transparent about the process. Things like executive sessions should be minimized, and done when only absolutely necessary. He said the 2010 redistricting could have been done more effectively to increase confidence in the process, going on to note that frontloading administrative tasks would be a first goal of his.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked if Mr. Wilson had spoken to any of the current Commissioners. Mr. Wilson said he had sent each Commissioner an email regarding the controversy surrounding the Trump event at his business. Each Commissioner had received the same email from them and he only responded to individual emails after that.

Interim Chairman Mehl continued, asking how Mr. Wilson would define success. Mr. Wilson answered that 100% buy-in is impossible. The rules and regulations in the Constitution and compliance is an absolute success, noting there is room for improvement for Arizona state districts and equal population. He added that a super majority vote could be workable and a possible idea to explore.

Commissioner Lerner asked Mr. Wilson to speak to his strengths and weaknesses. Mr. Wilson said that he is a strong leader, has thick skin, and he's not detoured by roadblocks, adding that that if decisions are based on facts and are open and transparent, this is the best way. He said he can sometimes be overly optimistic. He gave the example of obtaining a conditional use permit when opening up a Flagstaff gun range. He said that by the time he approached the county commission, unanimous approval was obtained.

Commissioner Watchman asked for Mr. Wilson's plans for community outreach. Mr. Wilson said that the number and variety of meetings in 2010 are a good reference point. He was concerned about the citizenry's familiarity with commission requirements and processes, going on to say that since so many are Zoom friendly, more participation and more meetings could be possible.

Commissioner Lerner asked if Mr. Wilson had been in touch with any political parties or if others have encouraged him to apply. He said he received no encouragement but has spoken to previous Commissioners.

The Commission thanked Mr. Wilson for his time.

The Commission recessed for a break at 12:30 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 12:36 p.m.

Thomas Loquvam:

The Interim Chairman Mehl thanked him for his interest and asked him to describe himself and why he thought he would be a good Commission Chair.

Mr. Thomas Loquvam stated that redistricting has not been a clear process, but it is instrumental in the political environment and process. The process of determining or creating a significant influence on finding the right cast of characters is important. If all Arizonans interests are not represented the processes

will not be followed effectively. A lot of people feel their voices have not been heard, he said. The work for Arizona could start here. He went on to say he considers Tucson to be home, and he is an Arizonan for life. He would love to make a better Arizona.

Commissioner Lerner asked what skills Mr. Loquvam possesses to reach out to the community effectively. Mr. Loquvam said he does not believe he has the right answer, only the little piece of the truth. He said that how he conveys the truth is important as well. He said he grew up abroad. He spent time in Honduras, and many of his friends were Honduran, but it did not cross his mind that there was anything wrong or different about it.

Commissioner York asked what Mr. Loquvam and his selection of lines would look like from now and 2010. Mr. Loquvam said that this is the type of Commission where the legal counsel and the type of selection is important regarding being thoughtful about advice for all sides of an issue. He said that this is his approach in his legal background. Communities of interest, and competitive districts are some of the requirements that are not as clear or easily defined. Agreement on generating analysis is important and allows for examining or considering legal risk regarding policy decisions. Lawsuits may not come from decisions that were wrong, but could be inevitable, he continued.

Commissioner Watchman asked for Mr. Loquvam to describe his leadership skills. He answered, describing managing complex litigation, referring to experts compiling reports that would be difficult to understand, but noted that guiding experts back to English language is important, as well as stakeholder engagement. These are aspects of litigation that he has done. Ensuring everyone understands where the facts are originating and being generated is key. A healthy skepticism for previous past decisions is a good approach, he went on.

Commissioner Mehl asked about the other two provisions of the Commission requirements. Mr. Loquvam said the Constitution doesn't really weight the requirements. He does not see one that stands above the other requirements for redistricting, going on to note that once data is available, lines can be effectively drawn.

Commissioner Lerner asked if he had reached out to any political parties, or who encouraged him to apply. Mr. Loquvam said his daughter encouraged him. He said that as a parent, he wanted to "walk the talk". He said he spoke to friends from all political party backgrounds for their perspective, Republican, Independent and Democratic parties.

Commissioner York asked him to speak to his lobbying experience. Mr. Loquvam said that 18 years ago the Corporation Commission created a code of ethics stating that lobbyist registration was required regarding Commission communication. He said that from an ACC perspective, he does talk to them under their code of ethics requirements. Even though attorneys are not required to, he chose to register under their requirements. He referred to the distinction of the ACC lobbying requirements and the broader lobbying requirements in Arizona, stating he has not made efforts to impact the passage of legislation or rulemaking changes. Even if he was considered a lobbyist, he has not lobbied under the state definition of lobbying.

Commissioner Watchman asked how management of the political process would be conducted by him. Mr. Loquvam said that the work the Commission does is an important opportunity. He said that a fix for

Arizona could begin today regarding demonstrating unity for Arizonans to observe, going on to note that the Commission process and outreach can allow for a method for everyone to be heard.

Commissioner Mehl asked if Mr. Loquvam had spoken to the Commissioners since his application was submitted. He said no.

Commissioner Mehl then questioned how he would define success. Mr. Loquvam noted that he would define success as an outcome where everyone saw an avenue to be heard, detailing that a setting where everyone saw their own input, as well as the input of others, would be important. He said a unanimous vote would be a great goal to achieve and the best thing for our state.

Commissioner Lerner asked about his firm's involvement in political activity and his impartiality potential. Mr. Loquvam said that he briefly had his own law firm from April to September of 2019. He said his current involvement in Water services delivery is not politically involved. He went on to say that his law firm did have connections to the political realm, going on to say he did not know much about election law, but in terms of day-to-day compliance with involvement in the Governor's political committees, he said that it was a function of him needing to pay his bills. He said he had to find clients in order to make money.

Commissioner Lerner asked him to speak to his strengths and skills he needs to work on. Mr. Loquvam said that curiosity is important. His interest in policy and the beliefs of others in terms of their goals. He said that a little bit of the truth lies in everyone, noting that he could work on something being good enough. At some point, something needs to be finalized regarding concluding a report or litigation, he continued.

The Commission thanked him for his time. He asked what success would look like from the Commissioners. Interim Chairman Mehl said they may not have time for that, noting That the immediate success would be to find a Chair.

Gregory Teesdale:

The Interim Chairman Mehl thanked him for his interest and asked him to describe himself and why he thought he would be a good Commission Chair.

Mr. Teesdale said he did not watch his previous fellow applicants' interviews, as a point of him not wanting to be influenced. He apologized if his answers mirrored his fellow applicants. He said that he grew up on the East Coast. He said he interned at the Pentagon, and has served his country, and sees this as a great other opportunity to serve. He said he has lived in Arizona for 35 years, both in Phoenix and Tucson. Between his accounting, finance, and global supply chain experience, he is pretty good with numbers. He noted that he is not a Democrat or Republican, but he does not want that to influence the Commission's thought process in his selection. He said he has a large background in technology, working with companies such as those involved with Motorola mobile phone and Apple thumbprint scanning technology development. Representing the company, he was at in board meetings was something he did often. He has spoken for highly notable characters with impressive backgrounds in these boards. To operate in a tense and high energy setting is just a part of his background.

Commissioner Lerner asked him to speak to his experience with effective communication regarding connecting to the community during commission outreach. He said that district lines have the potential to impact the influence of a person's vote. The margin of victory plays a role. He said he would stand on the basis of the Constitution. Keeping to commission guidelines is critical, he went on.

Commissioner York asked him to describe his thoughts on communities of interest and competitive districts. He said he has not found clear definitions of communities of interest, but he does link it to commonality, or almost a default setting. He said he does not want to define it too strictly, saying that setting an overall understanding of communities of interest would be a good Commission goal. Competitive districts are similarly gray. He said that looking at a congressional macro level, we do have competitive districts based on the margins of victory. At the macro level, the term would hold true, but not on the micro level. He said this is a big data issue that is important to try and understand.

Commissioner Watchman asked about his leadership skills. Mr. Teesdale said that setting a vision is critical for any leader. Following the constitution is a big part of his vision. Focusing on listening to the community is also a part of it. He stated that tolerance in hearing things you may not like to hear is important, citing working with his family through an often high-energy and tense environment as an example.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked about the additional requirements and their importance. Mr. Teesdale said he knows the previous Commissioners did not just simply draw a district without proper consideration. He said district drawing is done like a jigsaw puzzle, from the outside working inward, noting he has a much better appreciation for the process after studying it. He added he has a tough time saying there is a better way to start the drawing process, adding that it is our challenge to do the process in a steady and fair manner once maps are received from mapping companies.

Commissioner Lerner asked if he has been in touch with any political party regarding his application or done any political donating. Mr. Teesdale said that he has contributed on both sides, but that he is embarrassed to say he has not contributed much. He says he believes the money he has contributed has leaned more Republican, because he knows more Republican connections. He said he does think of himself exactly as an independent.

Commissioner York asked how Mr. Teesdale's skills could speak to this role. Mr. Teesdale said that he loves change. If something isn't working, he is not averse to change in any regard. He said that working with the companies he has a pivot is a common occurrence. The nature of change involves challenging yourself, he went on.

Commissioner Watchman asked him to speak to the political process component of the commission. He said the Commission's task is happening because we are honoring the Constitution. He does think he's the right person to do this. Just because something is challenging, does not mean it can't be accomplished.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked if Mr. Teesdale reached out to any of the current Commissioners during his application process. He said that he had tried to but was not successful. He said that having more time with each Commissioner would have been helpful. He said he is comfortable with each Commissioners background.

The Commission thanked him for his time.

Erika Schupak Neuberg:

The Commission thanked her for her application. Interim Chairman Mehl asked her after her background and why she would be suitable as Chair.

Ms. Schupak Neuberg said she felt that she could do more regarding the mistrust in our current environment across the country. She began exploring how she could make a difference. She said that she promises her motives are pure. She is intent on advancing individual freedoms.

Commissioner Lerner asked about her skills for effective communicating during the Commission's outreach process. Ms. Schupak Neuberg said that as a psychologist, she has studied people. She said that mastery of listening skills is what she does, stating she wants to know the people of Arizona.

Commissioner York asked about her experience with the press regarding political donations. She said that everything she has done is for advancing relationships with perspective and sitting members of Congress via bipartisanship. She said one of the best methods to connect with members is via donations in order to have time to teach them about foreign policy.

Commissioner Watchman asked after her leadership qualities. She said she can have many different leadership styles. She has run many different psychological groups requiring different leadership styles, as well as Jewish and orthodox religious community leadership positions. She prefers to empower the team. She would try to maximize the strengths of each team member, seeing the Commission as a working team. Mutual respect and trust are key for the Commission to establish early on in its mission. She was excited to see the words used in the Commissioners interviews and thinks she would work well with the team.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked how she would prioritize the statutory requirements of the Commission. She said she believes there is a reason for the order of the six guiding principles. She said she would argue that the third principle is related to the fourth, while the first two are obvious in their spot on the list in terms of importance. The top four are the essence of representation in the country. Minorities must have representation. The next two follow the four in their importance, since "to the extent practicable" comes first in their language, she explained. She thought the previous Commission prioritized competitive districts at the possible cost of less emphasis on the other principles. Before moving, an understanding of the Commission's mission is important.

Commissioner Lerner asked about her donations to the Governor and whether she has been communicating with political parties about this opportunity or been encouraged in her application process. She said she made sure the organization she worked with would connect with anyone in a position of power, and the Governor fits that category. She said her donations are equal across the aisle, contrary to media reports. She said she has already disentangled herself from pro-Israel politics because she wants to make a difference, acknowledging this is her path. She said a lot of her friends are politically involved and values their opinion. She said she promises the Commission that her representation in politics and her application was equally known and was equally encouraged from both parties.

Commissioner York asked about her experience with conflict. She said she was not new to conflict, saying her first strategy is to return to a common denominator, or a common vision. She said that

sometimes the fear of failure can be helpful. Understanding Commission responsibilities and of meeting its goals can cut through any resistance.

Commissioner Watchman asked how she would approach the process with the current political environment in mind. She answered, stating that this country has so many different factions and individual freedoms any country can afford. In thinking about our country, compassion and understanding is important. She helped create a Jewish-based organization recently to combat Xenophobia in order to break through mistrust. She would approach this process with a similar goal.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked if she has talked to any of the Commissioners since she has been approached for this opportunity, and she said she had not. She said that if she is chosen, she would want to know each Commissioner and build trust.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked what success is to her. She said a fair map that adheres to the Constitution and the mission, noting that After that, she hopes things do not get litigious. She said that Danny Seiden's idea of picking the right five people in a way that doesn't require litigation really spoke to her vision for the Commission. Finally, she would love for the five individuals to say they did our best and that they can feel good about themselves and the process.

Commissioner Lerner asked after her skills that she may need to work on. Ms. Schupak Neuberg said she can be impatient. She needs to learn to go through the process and work towards understanding by all across the board, noting that one descriptor that she cannot help is that she is a white woman in Maricopa County. She said she does not know much about the surrounding populations and parts of the state, adding that She would need to do an active listening tour. She said she listened to some of the interviews and said that the Commissioners were chosen well.

Commissioner York asked Ms. Schupak Neuberg to speak to her strengths. She said she is resilient, dedicated, hard-working, principled, and she likes to have fun. She said she is a positive psychologist now. She added that she has a certain amount of influence skills from her academic background.

The Commission thanked her for her time.

Megan Carollo:

Interim Chairman Mehl asked her to speak to her background and why she would be suitable for the role as Chair. She started by saying hello to Commissioner York as she is connected through him via a relative of his. She described her experience in the small business community in Arizona. She went on to say that she has not been involved politically and wanted to change that. She described herself as a numbers nerd, even though she has worked as a florist and wedding organizer.

Commissioner Lerner asked about her skills for effective communication during the Commission's outreach process. Ms. Carollo said that she has a background in working through organizing meetings during her MBA. She said that maintaining order during these meetings required a delicate balance, noting that this experience would be very beneficial. Commissioner York wanted to ask about conflict management experience. She said that conflict and stress go hand in hand. Being involved in the wedding industry can be a tense and stressful environment, adding that the one-shot of a wedding can also apply to the Commission's mission.

Commissioner Watchman asked after her leadership qualifications. Ms. Carollo said that acknowledging that she does not know everything is important, stating she is not worried about asking questions, listening, or seeking out resources for help. As a strong leader, knowing when to ask for help and carefully considering advice is important, she went on.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked what her opinion was on the different factors about the Constitutional guidelines for the commission. She said that some of them may be more highly criticized, but they serve as a guide. She does not think one is more important than the other. A delicate balance must be achieved.

Commissioner Lerner asked if she has been in touch with anyone in a political party or been in touch with anyone encouraging her to apply. She said she had not and was not in Arizona when she applied. She said she did it because she wanted to do something about her lack of involvement.

Commissioner York asked about her insight on communities of interest and competitive districts. She described her understanding of the terms.

Commissioner Watchman asked about her approach to conflict. She said the most important focus would be transparency. This would help alleviate this to some degree. It provides for the opportunity to improve the process for the benefit of the next Commission, and any mistrust surrounding it.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked if she has talked to any of the Commissioners since her application was submitted. She said she had not. He went on to ask how she views success for the results of the Commission. Ms. Carollo said that success would be that a better example be set, the process be less contentious, and that well-received decisions be received in the present and future, noting that success would not necessarily be visible immediately. Patience in building an example for the future and creation of fair representation is important, she continued.

Commissioner Lerner asked after her skills and what she could apply towards the position, speaking to her strengths and weaknesses. Ms. Carollo said she definitely uses the left and right side of her brain. Cooperation in drawing these districts together is key, and something she is capable of. Her love of data is also a strength she would submit. She said that she can be nice as a fault, and this could be a weakness. She said that this does not equate to weakness, however.

The Commission thanked her for her time.

VII. Scheduled recess from approximately 2:55 until 3:30 P.M. to coincide with the close of the Public Comment period

Commissioner York motioned that the commission recess. Commissioner Lerner seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

The Commission recessed at 2:44 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 3:32 p.m.

VIII. Overview of commission timing requirements, Attorney General's Office

Mr. Kyle Cummings, Assistant Attorney General, Attorney General's Office, described the timeline for the fifth and final member determination. The Commission has 15 days to decide, which is up until Jan. 29. If they do not decide, the Commission on Appellate Court Appointments will do so. Under the Constitution, they will need to post notice 48 hours prior to the 15-day requirement if they do decide to select the Chair at a later date.

If they decide to go into executive session at a later date to discuss applicants, they will need to provide notice to the applicants within 24 hours of executive session, he continued.

Interim Chairman Mehl asked what the notice contains. Notice is given to those candidate's discussed in executive session. If the applicant objects, it would result in public session, Mr. Cummings said. He went on to say this was done by an individual applicant basis depending on the number of applicants who reject an executive session notice, in answering Interim Chairman Mehl's questions regarding rejection protocols.

Mr. Cummings advised the commission to move forward with all speed. Commissioner Lerner asked if there was a reason for calendar days. Mr. Cummings believed this was just how Arizona law noted it.

Interim Chairman Mehl questioned if they do not decide on an applicant, they would need to reschedule another agenda item with not much time remaining. Mr. Cummings confirmed this.

IX. Election of the fifth member of the Commission (Ariz. Const., Art. IV. Part 2, § 1(8))

- a. Review public comments. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.**

Interim Chairman Mehl noted that the public comment period ended with over 300 comments submitted.

He opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner York thanked the candidates for their involvement. The rest of the Commission echoed his thanks. Commissioner Watchman said he would examine the public comments as soon as they were provided to him.

Interim Chairman Mehl said that Item 9 would be tabled for discussion at a forthcoming meeting, as well as Items 10 and 11.

X. Oath of office administered to the fifth member of the Commission, Secretary of State Katie Hobbs

Tabled for forthcoming meeting.

XI. Selection of Vice-Chair

Tabled for forthcoming meeting.

XII. Discussion of upcoming meetings

Interim Chairman Mehl proposed that the Commission meet again for the purpose of selecting a fifth member, giving them time to consider the candidates with the submitted public comments in mind, covering agenda Items 9(A), 10 and 11 at that time. He proposed a date and time of Thursday, January 21, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. The rest of the Commission was agreeable to this.

Commissioner Watchman asked if the meeting would be done in-person. Interim Chairman Mehl said that it would be a good idea to conduct the next meeting in the same fashion as the current meeting, with the Commission appearing in-person and public interaction taking place via Zoom once again. The other members of the Commission were agreeable to this.

XIII. Adjournment

Commissioner Watchman motioned that the Commission adjourn. Commissioner York seconded the motion, and the motion was carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.