	Page 1
1	Staten Island Public Input Session - Housing and Land
2	Use - New York City Charter Revision Commission
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	Moderated by Richard Buery
8	Monday, June 23, 2025
9	5:27 p.m.
10	
11	
12	Remote Proceeding
13	Snug Harbor Cultural Center - The Main Hall
14	1000 Richmond Terrace, Building P Lobby
15	Staten Island, NY 10301
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Reported by: Lindsey Diego
22	JOB NO: 7363246
23	
24	
25	

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	List of Attendees:
3	Richard Buery, Chairperson
4	Leila Bozorg, Secretary
5	Shams DaBaron, Commission Member
6	Anita Laremont, Commission Member
7	Dr. Lisette Nieves, Commission Member (by
8	videoconference)
9	Julie Samuels, Commission Member (by videoconference)
10	Diane Savino, Commission Member
11	Carl Weisbrod, Commission Member (by videoconference)
12	Valerie White, Commission Member
13	Kathryn Wylde, Commission Member
14	Frank Morano, New York City Council Member
15	Sean Campion, Director of Housing and Economic
16	Development, Citizens Budget Commission
17	Cliff Hagen
18	Jen Gaboury, Vice President, Professional Staff
19	Congress
20	Diane Stiles, Director, All Stars Project of New York
21	Cathy Stewart, National Organizing Director, Open
22	Primaries
23	Susan Lerner, Executive Director, Common Cause New
24	York
25	

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	List of Attendees:
3	Vincent Albanese, Executive Director, New York State
4	Laborers' Political Action Committee (by
5	videoconference)
6	Richard Barton, Assistant Teaching Professor, Syracuse
7	University (by videoconference)
8	Melanie La Rocca (by videoconference)
9	Jesse Lang
10	Nicole Campo, Senior Advisor for Land Use Planning,
11	Langan Engineering
12	Bob Kelly, Political Action Representative, Building
13	Industry Association of New York City
14	L. Joy Williams, President, NAACP New York State
15	Conference
16	Rachael Fauss, Senior Policy Advisor, Reinvent Albany
17	(by videoconference)
18	Grace Rauh, Executive Director, Citizens Union (by
19	videoconference)
20	Seth Masket, Professor of Political Science,
21	University of Denver (by videoconference)
22	Valerie De La Rosa, Chair, Manhattan Community Board 2
23	(by videoconference)
24	Celia Iervasi (by videoconference)
25	

	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	List of Attendees:
3	Charles Moerdler, Chair, Land Use Committee, Community
4	Board 8 (by videoconference)
5	Don Hulbert (by videoconference)
6	Cynthia Terrell, Founder and Director, Represent Women
7	(by videoconference)
8	David Cherry, President, Leaders Network (by
9	videoconference)
10	Deborah Green (by videoconference)
11	Alex Rabb, General Counsel, Working Families Party (by
12	videoconference)
13	Rob Richie, President, Expand Democracy (by
14	videoconference)
15	Natalia Aristizabal, Deputy Director, Make the Road
16	New York (by videoconference)
17	Eric Bronner, Founder and COO, Veterans for All Voters
18	(by videoconference)
19	Robert Anglin, Panelist (by videoconference)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

June 23, 2025

	5 till 25, 2025	
		Page 5
1	CONTENTS	
2		PAGE
3	Mr. Morano	11
4	Mr. Campion	19
5	Mr. Hagen	23
6	Ms. Gaboury	29
7	Ms. Stiles	32
8	Ms. Stewart	39
9	Ms. Lerner	42
10	Mr. Albanese	56
11	Mr. Barton	58
12	Ms. La Rocca	64
13	Ms. Lang	69
14	Ms. Campo	72
15	Mr. Kelly	76
16	Ms. Williams	83
17	Ms. Fauss	101
18	Ms. Rauh	104
19	Mr. Masket	108
20	Ms. De La Rosa	111
21	Ms. Iervasi	115
22	Mr. Moerdler	116
23	Mr. Hulbert	119
24	Ms. Terrell	121
25	Mr. Cherry	124

June 23, 2025

		Page 6
1	CONTENTS (Cont'd)	
2		PAGE
3	Ms. Green	127
4	Mr. Rabb	130
5	Mr. Richie	133
6	Ms. Aristizabal	137
7	Mr. Bronner	140
8	Mr. Anglin	143
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

MR. BUERY: Good evening. Good evening. I'm sorry we're getting to a late start, but I want to welcome you all to this public hearing of the New York City Charter Revision Commission. My name is Richard Buery. I am deeply honored to be able to serve as the chair of this commission.

Our mission is to look at the ways to make the city government more transparent and responsive with a particular focus on the city's housing crisis. It is our responsibility to review the entire charter and suggest changes for voters' consideration.

Importantly, only if voters agree to those changes at an election will any changes to the charter go into effect. I know that I speak for my fellow commissioners when I say that we are deeply committed to hearing from a broad spectrum of New Yorkers and to pursuing the best ideas we can find.

This hearing is just one of many public hearings across every borough to hear ideas from experts, from community leaders, from elected officials, and indeed from any member of the public who wishes to testify. So greatly appreciate for those of you who would take your time on this

Page	8
------	---

beautiful, beautiful weather, this beautiful temperate weather to join us this evening.

Very importantly, I think it's important to remember that this is an independent commission. Although appointed by the mayor, we are not bound by any elected officials' opinions. In making our recommendations to the city's voters, we are bound only by our judgment and by our values. We'll pursue any idea regardless of who proposes them and regardless of who supports them.

Joining me in this task are 12 other commissioners, some of whom I believe are remote, and others I know are in transit: Vice Chair Sharon Greenberger, Secretary Leila Bozorg, Grace Bonilla, Shams DaBaron, Anita -- virtual connectivity interruption -- want to name one thing because there's been lots of reports recently about that this charter is intending to reduce the role of community boards.

And one thing I can say is that there's nothing in our recommendations, nothing that our -- that we're considering that reflects reducing the role of community boards or the time in which they have to consider a proposal. So I do want to name that as it may be something on people's minds, because I know it's something that has been coming up in -- in news

reports about the commission's work.

I will say today, although I named some of the things that we are focusing on, testimony on any topic is welcome in today's hearing. So do not feel limited by the three subjects that I happened to mention at the top of my remarks.

I want to say a few words about how the hearing will unfold. And the general matter, we want to focus on making sure we hear from those who are present before turning to virtual testimony. We may have a couple of exceptions to that, but we're going to try to make sure that the people who made the time to come up here can testify first.

I'm going to ask that members of the public testify for no longer than three minutes.

We're going to call two people at a time for public testimony. We'll hear from them both, and then ask for any questions from the panelists.

I'll ask commissioners to hold their questions until each panel has completed their testimony, and -- and I will try to actually hold people to their three minutes. I hope no one takes offense at that. We want to make sure that everybody had the chance to talk and that we can get home in time to see our families, particularly those of us who

do :	not	live	on the	island.
------	-----	------	--------	---------

We will also hear from testimony online, presuming that we have time. We're -- we're scheduled to go till 8 p.m., but we will try to endeavor to go later if we need to. We're going to try our best to hear from everyone who signed up, but we do officially end at eight.

If you wish to testify virtually, you can sign up online. You can go to, again, nyc.gov/charter. There'll be a meeting page for the Staten Island Hearing. If you click on the meetings tab, click on the tab for -- click on the link for the hearing. We'll drop a link in the chat as well. But that's where you can go to just sign up to -- to testify virtually.

But if for some reason we can't go late, as late as we hope and we can't hear from everyone past eight, you can still submit testimony in writing again at nyc.gov -- nyc.gov/charter. You can also attend another public hearing. I think we have at least one more currently scheduled.

You can also any time submit written testimony at the following email address: chartertestimony@citycharter.nyc.gov, charter testimony@citycharter.nyc.gov. And someone will have

Page 11 1 read and will continue to read every piece of written testimony that gets submitted. 2 3 Of course, if you can never not attend 4 a live hearing, all of our hearings are public and 5 live streamed, and are also available to be read for 6 archival purposes. 7 I want to hold off on taking minutes because I think we're still a person short of -- of a 8 quorum, although we will hopefully have one soon. 10 with that, we will begin our testimony. 11 And first up, I'm going to invite 12 Councilmember Frank Moreno to join. 13 Welcome, Councilman, and good to see 14 you again. 15 MR. MORANO: Great to see you, 16 especially on Staten Island, which is I'm sure 17 Commissioner Savino can attest not only has the 18 smartest people testifying, but the best food. 19 actually am here today to speak about an issue that I 20 brought to your attention a couple of months back 21 before I was elected to the city council. 22 Although now I am submitting testimony 23 on behalf of 11 other of my colleagues and myself. 24 But I am going to not assume that that means I get to testify three minutes times twelve, and I'm going to 25

try	and	limit	it	to	а	reasonable	length.
-----	-----	-------	----	----	---	------------	---------

So speaking on behalf of the council members, who I'll -- I'll name, we write to strongly urge the commission to amend the city charter to grant city council members binding appointment authority over a portion of community board members in their districts.

As council members, we're on the ground in our communities every day. We attend civic meetings, hear directly from our constituents, and engage with the very stakeholders who serve or seek to serve on community boards. We believe it is past time that this direct democratic connection be given real weight in the appointment process.

Under the current charter, city council members may submit recommendations for community board appointments, but the decision ultimately rests with the borough presidents. While we recognize the borough presidents' citywide coordination role and value their contributions to borough wide planning, this structure creates a total disconnect between representation and authority.

It has too often led to situations where well qualified individuals deeply embedded in and trusted by their communities are denied

appointments or reappointments for reasons unrelated to performance or community feedback.

This is not a theoretical concern. It's a lived reality for many of us. We've all encountered cases where our informed thoughtful recommendations were disregarded. This practice undercuts the legitimacy of community boards and frustrates constituents who rightly expect their elected councilmembers' input to carry meaningful weight.

So we propose chapter 70, section 2,800A of the New York City Charter be amended as follows, or with similar language to allow each council members binding authority over a specified portion of appointments to the community boards that serve their district.

"For each community district created pursuant to chapter 69, there shall be a community board which shall consist of not more than 50 persons, half of which would be appointed by the borough president, and half appointed by the council members elected from council districts, which include any portion of the community district."

And additionally amended to read "Members shall serve until their successors are

appointed, but no member may serve for more than 60 days after the expiration of his or her original term unless reappointed by the borough president or the respective council member who appointed them."

Under this provision, for example, if a community board has 50 members, and 25 positions are open in a given cycle, the council member whose district covers the majority of the board's geography could be authorized to directly appoint a fixed number, say 5 to 7 of those members.

Furthermore, the council member should be given the same binding authority as a borough president to reappoint or remove community board members he or she has appointed. This would require amending chapter 70, section 2,800B of the city charter. I'm not going to read the specific language in the interest of time, but I will submit this testimony to you.

This approach would enhance accountability. Council members are directly elected by the communities served by the community boards, giving us the authority to appoint some members, ensures there's a direct line of democratic responsibility if boards become dysfunctional or out of touch. It would diversify representation.

Borough presidents often rely on centralized networks and legacy affiliations. Council members, by contrast, are more likely to know and elevate emerging voices, especially those from underrepresented or newer community segments. This promotes responsiveness.

When residents bring issues to our attention about the performance or composition of their community boards, they rightly expect that we have the power to make change. Currently, we can't. This reform would give communities a stronger say through their elected representative.

This would strengthen intergovernmental balance. Just as mayoral appointees to city agencies are balanced by council oversight, so too should a borough President's authority over boards be balanced by council appointment powers. This is a matter of simple checks and balances.

This is a nonpartisan issue of good governments. This proposal is not about political advantage or partisan power. It's about fairness, accountability, and making local government more responsive and more representative.

Members of the -- of this -- who signed this letter represent a wide range of political

	Page 16
1	perspectives, but we're united in our belief that this
2	committee the communities we serve, deserve a more
3	meaningful say in the boards that shape neighborhood
4	development, land use, and city services.
5	So we're asking the commission to give
6	this proposal serious consideration and welcome any
7	opportunity to engage further as you complete your
8	final recommendations. And it's signed by members
9	from all five boroughs in both political parties
10	representing conservatives, moderates, progressives.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank you so
12	much, Councilman.
13	MR. MORANO: Thank you.
14	MR. BUERY: Any questions?
15	MR. MORANO: Ms. Wylde?
16	MS. WYLDE: I I'm just curious as to
17	why only 11? Was it a logistical issue of just
18	getting the more people, or are some people opposed to
19	it?
20	MR. MORANO: Oh, I I think part of
21	it I think it could have been a little bit bit
22	of both. In candor, some members said to me
23	privately, "We agree with exactly what you're trying
24	to do, but if, you know, if I go publicly on the
25	board, we don't want it to be perceived that we're

	Page 17
1	taking a shot politically at our borough president."
2	But so far, nobody on the merits has
3	privately or publicly suggested any reason that they
4	wouldn't like this. And I think just some haven't
5	gotten around to it 'cause we're in the middle of
6	budget season and the rest.
7	You're loud, we can hear you.
8	MS. SAVINO: I know, but still, they
9	have to get it for the recording. So good to see you
10	as always, Frank.
11	MR. MORANO: Likewise.
12	MS. SAVINO: So the I just have more
13	of a logistical question. So let's assume we adopt
14	this, we put it on the ballot, the voters adopt it.
15	How do you envision dividing up the community board
16	appointments amongst community boards that cross more
17	than one council district, which happens here on
18	Staten Island, I think in all three of them.
19	MR. MORANO: Right. Yeah, I mean, I
20	I've talked about the the need for co-terminality
21	between community districts and council districts for
22	a long time, but I realize there are some logistical
23	hurdles in making that happen.
24	So I I think as it stands now that
25	the nomination process is already divided by council

	Page 18
1	member. For instance, Council Member Carr gets to
2	nominate non-binding one member to Community Board 3,
3	I get to nominate one member to Community Board 2. So
4	I believe under the current community district
5	allocation formula, that's already been figured out.
6	MS. SAVINO: Yeah, but that's one and
7	one. You you're suggesting that the council get 50
8	percent of the community board appointments, which is
9	a significant number
10	MR. MORANO: Right. So it would the
11	only thing it really does in practical purposes is
12	take the situation now, which is advisory for half the
13	members, and makes it binding. Because right now, the
14	borough president gets to make all the picks, but half
15	of them are supposed to be made based on our
16	recommendation or nomination. This just makes it
17	binding rather than advisory.
18	MS. SAVINO: I'm just saying at some
19	point you'll have to figure out the calculation.
20	Councilman Carr gets 12, Councilman Morano gets 6, and
21	Councilwoman Hanks gets, you know, the rest of them,
22	depending on where the crossover is. I don't know how
23	you figure that out.
24	MR. MORANO: Right. Well, so I I
25	think it's exactly what the standards are when it

	Page 19
1	comes to nominations. So for Community Board 3 for
2	instance, Carr gets 1, Morano gets 24.
3	I don't know the numbers for Community
4	Board 1, but in Community Board 2, it's the exact
5	opposite. Morano gets 1, Carr gets 24. Although
6	there are a lot of vacancies in both of those boards
7	as it is. Thank you.
8	MR. BUERY: Any further questions?
9	MR. MORANO: Thank you very much.
10	Leave this to you, boss.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Appreciate it.
12	All right. Our first panel public
13	testimony is, and please forgive me if I mispronounce
14	your name, Sean Campion and Cliff Hagen. And just so
15	that you're ready, as Sean and Cliff are coming to the
16	panel, the next next folks to testify will be Jen
17	Gaboury and Diane Stiles.
18	All right. So Mr. Campion and Mr.
19	Hagen.
20	MR. CAMPION: Good evening. Thank you
21	for the opportunity to testify. Again, I'm Sean
22	Campion, Director of Housing and Economic Development
23	Studies at the Citizens Budget Commission. In March,
24	so we testified about our three charter revision
25	recommendations to improve the HIJDD process

And we want to thank the commission and staff for considering two of those in full in the preliminary report, combining BP and Community Board Advisory reviews to shorten the process and establishing a ULURP appeals board.

Today, we wanted to offer a -- a refined version of our third recommendation, which is streamlined ULURP by fast tracking modestly sized projects and removing some non-zoning actions from ULURP.

So first on fast tracking, we continue to recommend the fast track review ending with the City Planning Commission based on project size. We had recommended exempting projects that are currently exempt from environmental review, which is 250 units or fewer in moderate to high density districts, and 175 units or fewer and low density districts.

Broad streamlining, we think it's better land use and housing policy than fast tracking only a small subset of subsidized projects or only a subset of projects and neighborhoods that fail to meet fair housing goals. Fixing the process for the widest scope of projects is needed to meaningfully increase production.

And then a threshold based on project

size would benefit all types of residential development, including home ownership, mixed income, 100 percent affordable in all areas of the city where these types of modestly sized projects are not currently allowed as of right.

And it would also benefit -- the -- the applications are most likely to be returned by the cost and uncertainty of ULURP, the modestly sized project that staff analyzed in the preliminary report.

The second aspect is removing some of the non-zoning actions from ULURP. We recommend that all non-zoning actions be exempt from ULURP instead of subject to administrative reviews. But if the CRC were interested in prioritizing specific actions to streamline, we recommend three areas.

First would be exempting a minor revocable consents and franchise agreements. City Planning could define those similar to way that they define distinguish major and minor revocable consents -- or sorry, concessions, which would allow modest projects requiring consents and franchise agreements to move more quickly while reserving full ULURP for those that require major land use or fiscal impacts.

The second is exempting otherwise as of

right public projects, exempting all public actions that don't require zoning changes from ULURP as preferable, but especially critical for those below a certain size.

For example, we think the city should be able to acquire land for a small park or public library without requiring a full review process.

While even though many -- and this wouldn't diminish the council's role either.

They would still weigh in through projects through the city's budget process and for large projects, which requiring multiple approvals and zoning changes, would still go through the full ULURP review.

And third would be to exempt special permits, which are administrative, not legislative actions. They've already been enacted by the city council, and the City Planning Commission is administering them according to conditions placed already in the zoning resolution.

Many of these permits apply to otherwise as of right public projects, and there may be alternative ways to categorize these permits. We can -- we can provide additional recommendations to the commission on specifically how to streamline

tŀ	nose.	Thank	you	for	the	opport	tunit	y to	testify,	and
I	look	forward	to	any	ques	stions	you !	have.		

MR. HAGEN: Good evening. My name is Cliff Hagan. I am a candidate for District 51 city council running as Democrat against Councilman Morano. And I echo and strongly support the recommendations he shared here with you today. But I'm here to speak about something else.

So welcome to the island. When announced just six months ago, this iteration of Charter Revision Commission was tasked with identifying prudent and purposeful amendments to ULURP, the uniform land use review process, which would allow for increased development to address the city's housing crisis.

The effort to build more housing is informed by the assertion that more affordable housing will drive down the cost of rentals and ownership. By weakening the strength of ULURP, it is expected that even more housing will be built.

According to Thomas P. DiNapoli's office, the New York State Comptroller's Housing Production in New York City, 2024/25, a report issued just in March 2025, and I quote: "Over the last 14 years, housing supply growth in New York City outpaced

that of the state. The gross was driven in part by more recent housing production between 2020 and 2023, and net housing production subtracting units lost from alterations in the demolitions.

"Citywide, it grew 40 percent. As 2023 saw the largest annual growth since 2018. In 2024, the city's housing production hit another record growing a further 25 percent over the year to reach nearly 38,000 net units."

The comptroller's report goes on to say, again, I quote: "While most of the historical growth during this period was in Brooklyn and Manhattan, more recent growth has been in the Bronx, particularly of new buildings with 100 or more housing units. Those buildings also made up the largest share of new building construction citywide."

Bravo. The current administration has been breaking records on growth of available housing even prior to the implementation of the City of Yes, the administration's keystone initiative to spur growth in the housing market.

Considering that New York City is currently experiencing record setting construction, it seems disingenuous to argue that now is an appropriate time to minimize the voice of our citizens as defined

by	ULURP	to	further	spark	increased	housing.
----	-------	----	---------	-------	-----------	----------

ULURP is an essential tool. ULURP gives voice to the community and allows citizens to play a role in determining the future of the community. ULURP must not be minimized.

Currently, ULURP offers a short window of opportunity for neighborhood watchdogs and advocates, most often volunteers, to receive a notification, share the news of impending development research, and gather historic and current information on a property, on a developer, on the seller of the property.

That volunteer effort, an effort which brings concerned citizens to task, often requires visits to the public library, agency offices, and government computer portals, none of which are easily accessible to user friendly.

Within just 60 days, citizens who wish to address community concerns must gather and decipher amazing amounts of research while well-financed developers set forth plans, seek allowances, and continue to amend their original submittals.

After just two months, the proposal being considered is moved from community board to an inaccessible borough hall and borough board. At this

Page 26 1 juncture, the community's voice is muted, diffused. Lastly, any further consideration takes 2 3 place in a city council member's office. Within just 4 150 days, just 5 months, a proposal is moved through 5 ULURP and most often finds approval. 6 MR. BUERY: I ask if you can wrap up, 7 Mr. Hagen. I apologize. 8 MR. HAGEN: Sure. 9 Staten Island accounts for just 2.5 10 percent of the population of New York City. 11 growth of new housing in the borough has far outpaced growth in each of the other boroughs. This incredible 12 13 growth in housing belies the argument that city 14 planning department's application process is too 15 stringent. 16 Staten Island's history of housing growth stands as testament to the effectiveness of 17 18 ULURP. The Charter Revision Commission must not 19 minimize the effectiveness of the current version of 20 ULURP. 21 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. 22 MR. HAGEN: Thank you. 23 MR. BUERY: Are there any questions 24 from the commissioners for the panel? 25 MS. SAVINO: Thank -- thank you, Cliff.

And I know how passionate you are about this. You've been involved in Staten Island longer than I've been around. But do you -- do you not think there's some flexibility that could be found in the ULURP process? That a 60-story building and a 2-story home should not be treated the same way?

Let's say a five-story building? No.

They all -- if they're subject to ULURP, it's the same process. I mean is there -- do -- in your mind, to your way of thinking, you don't have to answer it now, but I mean, I would suggest think about it.

Is there some possibility that for particular types of projects, you could streamline the process so we could get more housing built? And again, Staten Island is not Manhattan. It's not Brooklyn. We're not building 100-story buildings. You know, it's never going to be that way.

We don't -- either we don't have the land, number one, and number two, we wouldn't have the support from -- from the community. But there's, there's no doubt that the Staten Island that I moved to 20 some odd years ago, where you could buy a house and it would be relatively affordable, no longer exists for thousands of Staten Islanders.

People who came here, built a life, and

	Page 28
1	a family, and owned a home, their kids are not going
2	to be able to stay here because there's nowhere for
3	them to go. How do we how do we square that circle
4	so we can have responsible development, expedite the
5	development of quality housing so that young Staten
6	Islanders can stay here and have that same experience
7	that you and I had?
8	MR. HAGEN: Yes. What I did not
9	read
10	MR. CAMPION: Go ahead.
11	MR. HAGEN: What I did not read: "Over
12	the past 40 years, from 1970 to 2010, Staten
13	Island" let's see. "Our borough was borne a heavy
14	burden, increased housing in New York City. During
15	those 40 years, Staten Island saw 87,000 new housing
16	units. Queens: 127,000, Manhattan: 132,000, Brooklyn:
17	98,000 in the Bronx, just 3,000."
18	Right. So I think the focus should be
19	elsewhere. Staten Island, with only two and a half
20	percent of the the population of New York City has
21	already borne its fair share of development on the
22	island. And and thankfully, according to the state
23	comptroller, the Bronx is now on pace to catch up with
24	the rest of the city.
25	MS. SAVINO: I don't want to argue with

Page	29
------	----

you, Cliff. I just -- I just -- I'm going to remind us all that there is a -- there is a future for the kids who grew up on this island that have nowhere to go.

So that we're either going to figure out how to solve that problem and create the kind of quality affordable housing that everybody can grow into, or we're going to become an older community. You know, I'm on the verge of being old, okay. An older community where people are house rich and cash poor. And that's not good for Staten Island either.

MR. HAGEN: Sure. I -- I would only respond that when I purchased my home 25 years ago, I had a fabulous union job, right. And -- and those jobs are not quite as available now. It's -- it's a larger -- a lot more variables involved in affordable housing than just more housing.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Thank you both for your testimony. I appreciate it. Thank you.

Next I'd like to call Jen Gaboury and Diane Stiles, following just that they're ready will be Kathy Stewart and Susan Lerner.

MS. GABOURY: Hi, my name is Jen Gaboury. I've come here today to speak to you with

three different hats on. I'm the vice president of the Professional Staff Congress, the union that represents the 30,000 workers of CUNY. I'm here as a political scientist who teaches at Hunter College.

And I'm also here -- well, I have lived here in New York City since 1994. My family is from California. And California has made changes to its primary system. And part of what I'm here to tell you is that that has not gone well.

And I say that both as someone with, like, family who is politically engaged in California and as someone who has studied politics for a very long time as my profession. I'm also speaking then as a unionist who is looking to organize people and looking to organize people at CUNY.

Parties matter. They matter as histories of ideas. They matter as ideology. They matter as organizing. They matter as forms of identification. And it's a little frustrating to be here on the eve of the primary election when I would rather be handing out and talking to people about getting out the vote.

But I made an effort to come here because I think this is a really significant issue. I am a political scientist and I did not know that there

was a hearing that happened at Medgar Evers College on this same subject, like, a month ago. And when I asked about 70 other political scientists in the CUNY system whether or not they knew about this, only one person said, "Yes."

And we're political scientists in the city. Part of what that tells me is that this is not a process that is getting, like, a rich and full discussion about changing the primary system, which would be a massive change in how we're organized and how we vote. And that really robs people.

Parties at best matter because they are forms of organization and mobilization. And what the California system and other open primary reforms have -- or reforms have showed us is that it is a process that favors money over grassroots organization.

And that is partly why I believe, many of us believe, that this charter revision has been in fact proposed in the first place. The data in political science does not show you, and some of this is sited in the very report that is circulating about this charter revision, that in fact organize -- that in fact this change would produce the -- the thing that it it purports to do, which is more turnout.

In the California system, what it has shown is in that system is a highly polarized -- highly polarized system where people are disincentivized from coming out to vote. Because in fact the system is very, very lopsided depending on whatever is the dominant party within a particular region.

And that then depresses engagement, and people do not then come to engage. If we were to make this change, I would implore you to -- to have more time for real study and political education on this issue so we can have an actual debate. Thank you very much.

MS. STILES: Good evening. My name is Diane Stiles. I'm the director of the All Stars Project of New York, a national nonprofit that creates developmental opportunities for young people from some of our poorest communities. I'm a native Staten Islander who now lives in Chelsea, and I've been an independent voter since I began voting in 1976.

So I'm here tonight in support of an open primary system. I find it somewhat incomprehensible that I and over 1,000,000 other New Yorkers can't vote in taxpayer funded primaries by virtue of being an independent.

We're not able to fully participate in our electoral process, but instead have to choose between candidates in the general election that we have had no hand in getting there.

Over 43 percent of the national electorate are independents not aligned with either of the two major parties. Many others register in one party or another simply to have the opportunity to vote in primaries.

So I hope the commission will grapple with and address the inequity built into our current process, and instead create a more inclusive one in line with the changing nature of voters and our interests. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. I have just a quick question for Professor Gaboury. Gaboury, sorry. I just want to clarify -- I just want to see if you can clarify something for me.

I think part of the premise -- one of the arguments for having a different primary system is the one that Ms. Stiles just articulated that, you know, currently, there are 20 percent of voters who are not registered to a party, if I have my math right, and therefore cannot currently participate in a primary as currently organized.

Pa	aq	e	3	4

So how is it that allowing those 20 percent of -- of registered but non-party affiliated voters to vote, how could that reduce? It seems very counterintuitive in opening up the primary system to 1,000,000 new voters would depress turn out. I'm not sure I understand.

MS. GABOURY: It depresses turn out because in fact it skews, like, races from one side to another depending on the population. If independent voters -- like, I'm a disaffected Democrat, and I try to skew -- try to push within my party to organize for the party to go in a particular direction, and there's various vehicles to do that.

I'm a pretty unhappy Democrat. But I do that work. I do that organizing work. Andrew Cuomo has shown us several things. One of them is that it's really easy to put together a party. So one of the things I would say to independent voters is you should put together a party in a system that is dominated by in fact parties through systems of organization.

I think that if we are going to have parties and the parties are -- like, this is not a proposal to abolish political parties. If you were -- so you either have to, like, work through political

parties, right, as things that are meaningful in -- as forms of representation or not.

Opening up a system to say, like, that independents can vote in this way means that other people then skew the race. That is -- that is a form of, like, membership and selection. I -- like, I have stayed a Democrat, right, because that is meaningful to me, and I want to choose someone to represent a group of people.

MR. BUERY: Go ahead. Sure.

MS. SAVINO: Yeah. So thank you,
Professor. So just want to get this straight in my
head. So your concern is that if we open up the
primary process to non-Democrats -- by the way, I'm a
disaffected -- I'm an angry Democrat myself. Join the
club.

MS. GABOURY: Yeah.

MS. SAVINO: But what's the argument for disenfranchising, just in New York City alone, 1.1 million voters like -- like the woman sitting next -- let me finish -- sitting next to you, who if what you're saying is that political parties are important because they're like a club that we join, and we participate in that club, but it's a club that then makes decisions that affect all the voters of the city

Page 36 1 of New York, independent of their ability to 2 participate in that club? Do you not see that as a 3 problem? 4 MS. GABOURY: No, people can choose to 5 join the club or not join the club. And there's no 6 limit on the number of clubs that can be created. 7 for example, I yesterday was canvassing with people who are Working Families Party members as registered 9 voters. 10 They are not participating in the 11 Democratic primary because they are WFP voters, and they are door knocking, right. 12 13 MS. SAVINO: I know. 14 MS. GABOURY: And they are doing that 15 precisely to pull, right, and -- and precisely because 16 they are participating, right, in that way. and then if they get enough people, then they will 17 18 have their own primary. 19 They -- I -- I was at the MS. SAVINO: 20 founding convention of the Working Families Party. 21 They have no intention of running their own 22 That's just -- it's never been their candidates. 23 intention. It's always been to pull the Democratic 24 party to the left. 25 MS. GABOURY: Here in New York.

MS. SAVINO: That was the whole goal behind it. That being said, there's -- I still have not heard a rationale as to why we should disenfranchise millions.

And I think Susan Lerner is here from Common Cause. She will tell you we have, as far as extensive study on this, it has been done year over year. This is the single biggest issue we've heard at the charter commission this year is on open primaries, or nonpartisan elections, or expanding the franchise, which is our responsibility to try and figure out how to do that.

What we haven't heard though is that that it reduces turnout. In fact it increases turnout. But more importantly, the one thing that -- that Susan will talk about I'm sure when she gets up here is people who don't enroll in a party do it because they don't want to belong to a party.

It would be very easy right now for a person to enroll in a party early enough so that they could participate in that primary and then disenroll. They don't want to do that.

They don't want to feel forced that they have to engage in partisan politics. And I'll finally -- at the -- at the -- the last thing I'll

say, 'cause I -- it's hot and we all want to go home early, is the partisan primary process is producing a really bad product.

In the past 50 years, turnout in New York City has plummeted in spite of campaign finance reform, one to one, two to one, four to one, eight to one match, term limits, not -- it's got worse and worse and worse.

And we're down to now 20 percent of voters are making a decision about who should run this city. And we're leaving behind millions of people.

There's something wrong with that process.

MS. GABOURY: I would -- I would say in fact that is because of poor parties, and I would say that about the Brooklyn County party. But that then is about fixing parties. That is not -- it is going the wrong direction rather than to say we should have no parties.

MR. BUERY: Near the -- but --

MS. GABOURY: No, but -- but opening up -- okay, so I live in southern Brooklyn, right.

And so the city council race -- the city council race in my district, we -- we won -- like, the last two city council cycles, we won by 1,300 votes, right.

Open that up, there's no Democrat who wins, right.

	Page 39
1	MR. BUERY: Any other
2	MS. GABOURY: I mean, but that is
3	that then is part of, like, the fact that there is no
4	contest, no exchange of ideas. No there's not
5	the it reduces the it reduces that opportunity.
6	If if in fact disaffection should in fact
7	could in fact lead to a party of independents.
8	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank thank
9	you.
10	So any other questions for the panel?
11	Okay.
12	MS. WHITE: You mentioned some negative
13	impact in California. If you had a specific study or
14	research on that, if you could submit that?
15	MS. GABOURY: I'd be more than happy to
16	do that. The library is stocked with those virtual
17	connectivity interruption.
18	MS. STEWART: As Diane knows, my late
19	husband, Harry Kresky, served on the 2002 Charter
20	Revision Commission that considered the issue. And in
21	2003, I played a leadership role in the unsuccessful
22	campaign to pass nonpartisan elections question 3.
23	I actually want to take a moment to
24	share a personal story that I actually think addresses
25	a number of the things we've been grappling with. As

Page	40
------	----

an independent voter who lived in New York City for 33 years as an -- in 2021, after decades of being unable to cast a meaningful ballot for my local representatives, there was a nonpartisan special election for city council in my neighborhood.

I lived in the Bronx. I got phone calls. I got mailings from multiple campaigns. It was shocking and very refreshing. I actually got a phone call from a candidate himself, and we had a very engaged and thoughtful conversation about this very issue. He told me no one had ever asked him to address the issue of primary structure.

When I went into the voting booth, my vote mattered. It made a difference. I was a full participant in selecting my council member, and I got to use ranked choice voting for the first time. I lived in New York City for 33 years. That was the first and only time I played a role in selecting my most local elected official.

It should not, and it cannot be the case, that the independent voters cannot fully participate on the same terrain as party members in a special election only. Every election should be special and magical.

I want a system where every voter has

the right to participate fully as they do in 85 percent of cities across the country. And those cities, by the way, have very strong party structures. It has not hurt the party structure.

I commend the commission for your responsiveness to this issue and to hearing from scores of New Yorkers who've asked you to consider this profound crisis: a primary system that deliberately excludes 1.1 million independents from elections that they pay for that determine the leadership of the city.

I know you're looking at various forms of open primaries, various models. At Open Primaries, my organization, we're less focused on the specific model, and more focused on the tremendous opportunity we have this year, and the importance of taking a step forward on this critical and growing voting rights issue in the city.

I want to urge the commission to take a path forward. You don't have to solve every issue, but you have a chance this year to advance a proposal that would give the franchise to over 1,000,000 people. Hope you'll ask me some questions on the turnout.

MR. BUERY: Thank you, Ms. Stewart. I

have to say I never heard anyone be excited about receiving campaign mailers or phone calls before.

I'm -- I'm sort of fascinated by that.

Susan, please continue.

MS. LERNER: Hi, thank you. I'm Susan Lerner. I'm the executive director of Common Cause New York. And I think it's very telling that the -- my companion here does not have a preference, but likes the concept of open primaries.

Our elections are very complicated.

And as we have seen, there is absolutely no consensus as to what would be the appropriate form of primary reform in our city. Citizens Union has one model.

Reinvent Albany has another. Common Cause has talked about the semi-open primary. And actually last hearing, Gwen Mandell from the Independent Voting organization said, "Keep it simple."

So what we have seen is a lack of consensus. And in fact this -- today, a letter was released from 13 unions and 27 organizations who actually talked to voters day in and day out. And they've said, "Why are you surprising us with this?" What has happened as a consequence is actually not a thorough discussion, because a thorough discussion would review the actual research.

Page	43
------	----

For instance, the desire for greater electoral participation may be an admirable goal, but little evidence suggests the top two primary is a successful method for achieving it. A report by Professor Patterson of the Southern Oregon University in Electoral Study 60.

He goes on to say: "Estimating the unintended" -- let's see. "General elections featuring two members of the same party, the arrangement reformist contends would increase turnout, actually decreases voter participation.

"I find that approximately 7 -- 7
percent of voters roll off the ballot in the absence
of party competition, while overall turnout is
unaffected. These results suggest the top two
primaries are likely to exacerbate rather than
ameliorate trends in participation."

And then there's a very interesting piece by Seth Masket of the University of Denver, which is entitled What Is and Isn't Causing Polarization in Modern State Legislatures. He says "There is little relationship between the openness of a primary system and the ideological extremism of the elected officials it produces."

So the question really is if we are

looking to involve the unaffected 1.1 million, which as Ms. Savino pointed out, we have studied, then I think we need to get beyond the concept of open primaries, and we need to have a community-wide discussion of what form.

And I am concerned that instead of having a broad-based discussion, we are now facing a situation where some substantial portion of those who are politically engaged have been forced into an automatic no position. Because what they're really concerned about is more of the jungle primary, but now they're lumping in open primaries.

And we are not having a detailed discussion about what -- what we're trying to achieve, and we're not bringing in a larger, broader selection of people to support the concept and the specific type of open primary that we think will work in New York City.

So there is no rush. We are not going to have another municipal primary for four years. Give us an opportunity to build a consensus and come back to the next Charter Revision Commission with a consensus at least 70 to 80 percent of those who are engaged what form of open primary rather than having a top-down decision made.

Page	45
------	----

MR. BUERY: Thank you. I did have a quick question, which may not be easy to answer, but I'm -- I'm sort of struggling with the paradigm. One about the top-down decision making process that is actually up for referendum. So ultimately it depend on the will of the voters.

So I -- I would love to -- and I ask this because I -- I do trust your -- your judgment.

So I -- I ask this honestly, I'm just trying to balance that.

And the second thing I'm trying to balance is a perspective that we need more time. But as we also know, this issue has been considered by numerous charter revision commissions over years. Has actually been put on the ballot before. Tons of organizations and research.

It seems to me that there is a fairly strong evidence base. I mean, we can disagree, people can reasonably disagree, but it's hard for me to understand how more time after decades of consideration. So I -- I do really want to sort of test.

MS. LERNER: So first of all, I am concerned that we now have a fairly sizable opposition that at the beginning of your discussion we did not

have, that we have polarized the issue, and as you point out, if it goes on the ballot and fails, we're going to wait for another 20 years to try and solve what is a significant issue, which is a significant number of people who are outside of the primary.

In terms of more time, I think because of the number of people who have become -- and organizations who have become concerned about a decision being made without a broader base of discussion, that again, we are polarizing the issue.

And we have not had an opportunity to really build the base of support for open -- for some form of open primaries that we were able to build for ranked choice voting.

Now why organizations don't pay attention to this issue earlier, I don't have an explanation. We certainly did a study two years ago. But now the organizations that talk most frequently to voters are focused on it.

And I think the very diverse communities and organizations that talk day in and day out to voters should have an opportunity to weigh the different types of open primaries, and come back with a consensus. And then we won't have to worry about it's failing in the ballot, and then we don't have a

Page 47 1 solution for another 20 years. MS. WYLDE: Richard, I'd like to hear 2 3 the response from the other panelist, please. 4 MS. STEWART: Well, let me start by 5 saying, and Susan knows this, I supported ranked 6 choice voting, even though as someone who's organized 7 in the independent voter community, none of those voters who voted for it could use it. So -- and -and again, I think if we miss the opportunity this 10 year, it's gone for 20 years again. I've been there, 11 done it. And I want to point out, there's just a 12 13 lot of work to do to understand this claim that's 14 being made by some that it doesn't increase turnout. 15 You've got to look at the way they've done the 16 statistics. 17 In California, when you allow -- when 18 you increase the pool of voters by 4,000,000, well, 19 you got to think about the denominator and the --20 that's changed when you look at those turnout figures. 21 That's one thing I would say. 22 I think it's worth looking at the 23 Bipartisan Center's studies on this. They've looked 24 They see that there is an increase in turnout. They looked at Colorado's change. They've looked at 25

	<u> </u>
	Page 48
1	Oklahoma locally.
2	And I would say that we have to look at
3	the fact that there's 1.1 million New Yorkers who pay
4	for these elections. I just I just think we can't
5	wait. That's why in part what we are saying is,
6	"Look, maybe there's a step this year, and another
7	commission can take another step."
8	But let's not miss an opportunity that
9	this commission open the door for because you listen
10	to people come to you. It's remarkable. I I
11	can't when I say I I really commend you, I do,
12	because that is a remarkable thing that happened. And
13	I can tell you in the independent voter community
14	across the city and the country, people are very
15	heartened by this.
16	So I think we have to relook at the
17	stats. I think we have to relook at why is the
18	opposition opposing it. Surely they're not telling
19	voters like me that we are going to hurt union members
20	or communities of color. I resent that.
21	Especially since 53 percent of
22	independent voters in this city are Black, Latino, and
23	Asian. I resent that. That's got to be examined
24	under a microscope. I hope that addresses.

MS. WYLDE:

Thank you.

	Page 49
1	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Any other
2	questions?
3	MS. BOZORG: Can I ask one question?
4	Ms. Lerner, I'm curious your thoughts on do you think
5	with more time we actually could get to consensus?
6	We've heard a lot of testimony on
7	different viewpoints of different types of open
8	primaries, and there has been a lot of research about
9	the different types that we've had the opportunity to
10	read and assess. So I'm curious what makes you
11	believe we actually could get to consensus with more
12	time?
13	MS. LERNER: Because nobody has
14	actually tried to build a consensus. We do have the
15	experience of doing that with ranked choice voting.
16	We know it takes time. We know it requires engaging
17	to begin with the 27 organizations that now are on
18	record as being against the concept of open primary.
19	MS. WYLDE: Those organizations have
20	been on record against open primaries for 20 years
21	plus. This is nothing new. You know that, Susan, so
22	it's a little disingenuous to testify otherwise.
23	MS. LERNER: So so among the
24	organizations that we work with, over 50 organizations
25	that are way beyond the 27 that represent communities

Page 5	60
--------	----

across the city, all of them have come to us and said,
"What is going on, why did we not know about this, and
what are we supposed to make of it, because none of
our people have come to us about open primaries and we
need some time to figure out what this is about?"

So it's not a question of opposing open primaries, although we now are seeing a more polarized situation. But again, it's going into the details of figuring out what form of open primaries would work here. And I have to say that the research is pretty overwhelming in terms of the California system not doing very much of anything other than rearranging the furniture.

MS. SAVINO: I have a -- I have a question, Susan, 'cause I know you're concerned about the organizations that, you know, sent a -- an anonymous letter with their -- the listing of their organizations. But not a single -- not a single signatory on that letter, by the way. That's persuasive to me.

But moving that aside, your organization works on this issue day in and day out.

It's what you do. So what -- to what extent do you see Common Cause and the other good government groups as part of the reason of responsible for educating,

whether it's organizations that you work with or others?

This is not a new concept. It's been -- it's been dealt with here before, you know, when we rejected it in 2003. And I -- I think for then for the right reason, but it was a very different time.

But now, the work that you've done, you've come to talk to me about it, whether I was -- I was up in Albany or here at city hall, about how do we expand the franchise to include more voters who have specifically told your organization they do not want to belong to a party.

So how do we just say, "Well, we need more time to talk to people who, one, don't want to hear it"? There are some people who will never listen to this.

MS. LERNER: So -- well, but what I'm hearing from are the people who are actually eager to learn more about it, but feel overwhelmed by the fact that the primary, right, the ranked choice voting primary, is tomorrow, that they have spent the last four months trying to educate their voters in Mandarin, in Korean, in Cantonese, in Urdu, in various languages, and they basically feel overburdened.

Page 32	P	age	е	52	2
---------	---	-----	---	----	---

It's not that they don't want to focus on it. It's that they actually have to deal with what's directly in front of their voters. And I have to say that there is a certain amount of disrespect to those who are politically active to hold this hearing on the night before the primary. It shows that you do not want to hear from those who are politically engaged. I was genuinely surprised.

MS. SAVINO: We've had -- I -- track of how many hearings we've had.

MS. LERNER: But my response -- my response is -- is what it has been from the beginning, which is if you feel you have to go forward with something that will be in effect in four years, then I would agree with the advocate who testified last time and say, "Keep it simple."

Make it as easy as possible, and that is a semi-open primary. If what you are concerned about is that it is unfair for 1.1 million not to be able to vote in a primary, then allow them to vote in a primary.

It's the simplest, easiest thing to explain, it has the least disruptive factor, and it isn't just rearranging the furniture for what academics tell us gains us nothing.

Page !	5	3
--------	---	---

MR. BUERY: Well, thank you. I -- I just -- and I just want to take one point. You know, we've had, as you know, I think nearly a dozen public hearings. They're not all tonight. So I -- I just think fairly we have had and will just continue to have public hearings.

And so I -- I don't think it's completely fair to say that somehow it's disrespectful to folks that have a hearing tonight. We're trying to accommodate a lot of people in a lot of schedules across a large city. And certainly no intent is made by that.

But I -- I don't think it's fair to sort of use tonight's schedule as somehow excluding other voices. And the only -- other thing I would say, and again, I ask the question because I do take the perspective seriously.

I -- I think the only thing I would encourage you and your partners to consider is that there is a risk that with less time, there is less time to configure. There's also a risk that you could take more time and never have a commission that's willing to put this on the ballot again.

I think there are -- there are risks in every process. I do think that this -- as you know,

Page 5	4
--------	---

this is on our agenda, not because -- not by design, but because we heard tons of people who want it on our agenda. It -- it would seem to be disrespectful not to consider those voters as well.

So I -- I just want to say that because I just want to be clear that we are trying to accommodate the voices that we're hearing. And we're of course always open to hearing additional voices and there is still time to do so.

MS. STEWART: I just, if I could, I wanted to address one thing, Susan, about what you were saying about all of the organizations. And I commend them for all the work they're doing to educate and activate people in the primary.

They're independent voters who are getting ready to picket some of those polls tomorrow because they're sick and tired of paying for primaries that are essentially private.

And I would point out that the reason that the exact thing you're saying that all these organizations who are doing good work within the party structure had no idea that this was an issue of concern to thousands and thousands of voters. That's the disconnect that we have to solve.

And this is not radical. Most cities

Page 55 1 in the country use it. And also by the way, you heard testimony from USC that shows the impact. 2 The more 3 closed the system is, the lower the turnout in 4 communities of color. It's really time to take a step 5 forward. 6 And it's been studied, and I would say, 7 Susan, Common Cause is in a great position to play a leadership role with all those organizations. 8 you did a remarkable study, so I think you're well 10 positioned to help move the needle on the education 11 front. You and I have talked about that over the 12 years too, so. 13 MS. LERNER: Certainly not. 14 MR. BUERY: Right. 15 Right. Well, 1.1 million MS. STEWART: 16 voters can't keep waiting. 17 MS. LERNER: Again. 18 MR. BUERY: Yeah. 19 MS. LERNER: Now you've heard -- you've 20 heard from one academic there. I will be sending you 21 a large number of studies which contest that position. 22 MR. BUERY: Thank you both so much, and 23 thank you for engaging with us. I appreciate it. 24 Next we're going to switch to Zoom 25 before coming back in person. We're joined by

Commissioner DaBaron. Thank you.

From Zoom, we're going to hear Vincent Albanese and Richard Barton. Vincent Albanese first, and then Richard Barton.

MR. ALBANESE: There we go. Sorry, I was waiting to be unmuted. Thank you. Thank you. My name is Vincent Albanese, and I'm the executive director of the New York State Laborers' Political Action Committee.

Our union is comprised of 21 local LiUNA chapters across the state representing over 40,000 members, primarily employed in construction, with over 16,000 of those members living in New York City alone.

I'm here to express our union's interest in seeing changes to our current election system to address a number of issues which we believe are detrimental to our current electoral process, resulting in important outcomes of our subsequent governing system.

In our current system with closed primaries, the closed primary elections determine the eventual outcome of most elections the vast majority of the time. And in doing so, it limits the voices of over 1,000,000 New Yorkers, many of whom are our

members.

As you've heard in prior hearings, nearly 1,000,000 independent voters are prohibited from participating in the primary. And as such, electoral process and results in elected officials who do not reflect the full diversity of our city and our membership.

Adopting a version of open primaries, which -- which better fits our electorate here in New York City ensures that all New Yorkers, regardless of party affiliate affiliation, have a meaningful voice in selecting political leaders and the policies that they focus on.

Open primaries would encourage greater participation from many of our members who are unaffiliated as they don't recognize their place in either of our mainstream political parties, as they once did. For our union, allowing all voters to have a say in who advances to the general election is a positive.

This simple yet crucial reform would foster a government that is more reflective of New York City, its true diversity, especially on issues affecting union members and their families. The currently debated charter revisions are a step in the

1	right	dire	ction.
---	-------	------	--------

While I can't say unequivocally that the proposed changes are perfect, for us and the laborers, they represent a system that would be much more inclusive of many of our members who are registered as independents or with a specific party.

We applaud the commission for dedicating time and thought to finding a better way forward. Thank you all for your time.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Thank you so much.

Richard Barton.

MR. BARTON: Going to be on mute. Oh, there we go. Thank you so much for having me. My name's Richard Barton. I am an assistant teaching professor at Syracuse University and a senior research fellow at United America. And my research focuses on primary elections and alternative systems.

So I want to kind of weigh in on a few of the -- the conversations that have already been going on here. So the evidence on turnout on -- on open, all candidate primaries, including the top two and top four models under debate now, the evidence on that and turnout is that it -- as -- as the -- the commission is alluding to, significantly increases

turnout in the primary election, which in most cases is the most consequential election.

And this is based on numerous studies from the Bipartisan Policy Center, from scholars Robert Boatright, who's a leader on primary research, and Caroline Tolbert, research by Andrew Sinclair.

Now in general elections, as one of the advocates against the reform mentioned, in general elections, there's these competing impacts, which is that all-candidate primaries produce more competitive general elections, and that competition tends to drive up turnout in the general election.

But there is also roll off from same party general elections. When you have, like, two Ds running against each other in a blue district, you have a significant percentage of Republicans who are not going to turn out there. And so on net, we see I would say a modest increase, but basically a draw in general election turnout.

And research on the competitiveness has been done by myself and others. The studies on the impact of these reforms and polarization find -- the -- the more recent studies that use the same kinds of data in the same method as earlier studies find a quite consistent impact at reducing polarization. And

this is work that's been done by myself, by Christian Grose at USC, by Jesse Crosson at the University of Purdue.

And there were earlier studies including studies -- and one of the authors, Seth Masket, has been a reference, and is here, and is a -- a friend and colleague of mine. But I will say that -- that his earlier work on this was the, the data ended in 2014 really had sort of a quite limited sample of all candidate primaries that had occurred at that point that found really sort of no real impact on polarization.

So the more recent studies using the same kind of data find a significant mitigating effect. Of course, California still looks polarized, but California was by the -- the common metrics, the most polarized state by a long measure before the reform was passed.

Two last things in my final seconds here are research that's been done by me collaboratively with other scholars. We find that all-candidate primaries do not undercut political parties, specifically their influence in the nomination process.

And they also do undercut the impact of

	Page 61
1	ideological donors and political action committees.
2	And I'm happy to describe my data and methods a little
3	more fully.
4	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Let me
5	start, we have a question from Commissioner Weisbrod.
6	MR. WEISBROD: This question to Mr.
7	Barton. The California system as it exists now has an
8	open primary without ranked choice voting. What
9	what do you see as the impact of the combination of
10	ranked choice voting in a primary and in an open
11	primary and its effect on turnout in the general
12	election thereafter? Or is there any evidence on this
13	at all?
14	MR. BARTON: Of having ranked choice
15	voting in the primary.
16	MR. WEISBROD: In the open primary,
17	correct.
18	MR. BARTON: The evidence on this is
19	there's pretty limited research on this. So most of
20	the research has been done at the the federal or
21	state level.
22	And of course there's a lot of
23	variation that we could be looking at including the
24	kinds of systems that you're talking about at the
25	local level But studies that have been sort of

	Page 62
1	like, rigorous studies across many municipalities on
2	this are are pretty limited.
3	MR. WEISBROD: Thank you.
4	MR. BUERY: Any other questions for the
5	panel?
6	Thank you. I just have a quick
7	question for you as well, Mr. Barton, just to clarify
8	something. You described open primaries increasing
9	turnout in the primary election, potentially a neutral
10	effect in the general election, or a modest increase
11	if the primary leads to two Democratic candidates in
12	the blue district because then Republicans don't
13	aren't motivated to vote.
14	How should we think about that in terms
15	of voter engagement? Did that still, in your opinion,
16	reflect increased voter engagement because the two
17	general candidates more reflect the majority of
18	electorate?
19	How - how should we think about that as
20	we sort of balance we're trying to aim for
21	increased voter participation and engagement?
22	MR. BARTON: So I was very good about
23	following my initial three minutes, but I have a lot
24	to say on this. So I'm going to you're going to
25	have to cut me off here.

So the I think the way that we
should think about this is first, in a typical
partisan primary system, as other others have
mentioned, most of the time it is in very low turnout
partisan primary elections where the winner is
ultimately decided because general elections are
entirely uncompetitive.

And so the meaningfulness of participation, both in the primary and the general in all-candidate primary is much greater. Now even in a top -- so in a -- in a top two, when you have two Ds say in a blue district in California, you see roll off among Republican voters there.

Now, like, counterintuitively, it is in those very elections when those Republican voters who are turning out a lower rate actually have the biggest impact, because they are often the pivotal voting block, Republicans and independents, between those two Democrats.

I've made this argument many times to voters who are boxed out of a general election, and I will say they -- they might find the logic persuasive, but emotionally, they're not interested in that.

So I -- I would also say that in a top four system, you don't have the same kind of problem.

	Page 64
1	And and the the studies that I'm referencing
2	with the with the roll off are based on the top
3	two.
4	So in a top four system, which is
5	the I understand the commission is also
6	considering, this is not the same kind of problem
7	because you're you're likely to get a D and an R
8	advancing to the general election.
9	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. I
10	appreciate it. That wasn't too long.
11	MR. BARTON: Right, thank you.
12	MR. BUERY: Thank you. All right.
13	What's that? All right. Yeah, very interesting. All
14	right. Thank you so much, and thank the panelists for
15	participating.
16	Next up we have Melanie La Rocca on
17	Zoom.
18	MS. LA ROCCA: Hey, good evening. My
19	name is Melanie La Rocca. Thank you for allowing me
20	the opportunity to address you this evening. And I'm
21	sorry I couldn't be there in person tonight.
22	I want to start by acknowledging the
23	work done by the Charter Revision Commission staff,
24	and specifically for their production of a thoughtful
25	and well-researched preliminary report

As has been undoubtedly said many times before, the process to develop in New York City, whether an as of right project or an action requiring ULURP, is filled with costly process and paperwork where the insertion and addition of new steps, agency workflows, and legislative mandates have gone unchecked and largely unnoticed.

with housing production continues to be a drain on the city's ability to compete with other municipalities and provide our residents with adequate housing as well as housing mobility. It's reasonable to say that the cost associated with bringing forward a project that requires a ULURP action is in the range of \$1.5 million.

Those dollars are largely being spent to satisfy the laborious environmental review process. While the cost to engage the various consultants for a ULURP action is significant, the uncertainty in the process is the ultimate deterrent.

In a system that treats all projects as equal, it's hard to unlock opportunities for growth that aligns with our city's needs. It also works to block a significant population of individuals from participating in the creation of housing by

establishing such a high bar for entry, one where it's far too cost intensive, time intensive, and, most critically, risk intensive for people to endeavor upon.

The opportunity cost to the city is tremendous. Therefore, CRC's efforts to -- to streamline the development process is strongly supported and in great need. The proposed fast track as outlined in the preliminary report should continue to be explored as it correctly identifies an area of vulnerability in the city.

When ULURP actions are as fraught as they are, it's clear that a fast track specifically for affordable housing would serve as an important step in aligning city priorities and processes, and would narrow the gap between ULURP action sought today and the missing middle as the report notes, but lose out because of the barriers to entry.

However, it's critical that
well-intended goals are not thwarted by new processes
that supplant existing broken systems. For developers
who work with the city to create affordable housing,
it's helpful to remember that pipeline constraints
exist beyond land use and permitting, and only add to
the uncertainty of the overall timeline for a

<pre>project's completion</pre>

The time it can take to get through the pipeline can add another five -- five plus years on the total development timeline. And that's after ULURP. The CRC's review of public land and leveraging the population to, again, align public needs with process is critically important. Failure to do so is just adding unnecessary costs and time to a process that should otherwise be straightforward.

Two other points. I -- the identification of street map changes is an area that is correctly being targeted for inefficiencies in the system. Having each borough president maintain disparate teams responsible for the same things is inefficient.

While city planning seems best suited to unify this work, I want to ensure that the nuances of the totality of the work are not lost, and that the commission particularly notes the interactions between the Department of City Planning, Department of Finance, and the Department of Buildings in the creation of new addresses, as well as both temporary building identification numbers and permanent building identification numbers.

And lastly, while the report notes the

Page 68 1 challenges faced by nonprofits for correct -- for contracting issues, the commission fails to address 2 the longstanding issues in our city's permitting 3 4 process. And I believe it's an issue worthy of your 5 action. 6 The work -- this workstream would have 7 the widest impact touching all projects. As you know, the city's multi-agency permitting process is 8 antiquated and suffers from agency by agency bespoke 10 systems and rules. I do not believe it's an 11 exaggeration to say that permitting in New York City ultimately causes delays similar to those related to 12 13 ULURP actions. 14 Every developer faces issues stemming 15 from our siloed review system where agencies have no 16 incentive to work together to solve problems to get a project to yes. I believe the commission should 17 18 consider interventions that would correct this. Thank 19 you for your time. 20 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Thank 21 Any questions for Melanie? you so much. No? 22 All right. Thank you so much for your 23 testimony, deeply appreciate it. 24 Next step, we're moving to in-person 25 testimony from Jesse Lang and Nicole Campo.

	Page 69
1	And just, Bob Kelly, you'll be next.
2	MS. LANG: On or is this on?
3	MR. BUERY: Uh-huh.
4	MS. LANG: And I should go first. I'm
5	Jesse, right?
6	MR. BUERY: I'm sorry?
7	MS. LANG: Should I go first? I'm
8	Jesse.
9	MR. BUERY: Please.
10	MS. LANG: Okay, great.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
12	MS. LANG: Hi, my name is Jesse Lang.
13	My job is in housing policy, and I'm a longtime
14	housing advocate. But tonight I just want to be clear
15	that I'm testifying on my own behalf as somebody who
16	wants to see this city that I really love be a better
17	place to live.
18	I'm glad that the city that the
19	Charter Revision Commission and staff have really
20	emphasized housing to date. I know I don't need to
21	repeat the statistics about how bad our city's housing
22	shortages and how broken the process is to build new
23	housing.
24	I've been a renter for the ten years
25	that I've lived in New York City, and I've bounced

around five different neighborhoods in the struggle to be able to continue to live in an apartment I afford, and I consider myself lucky because I can still afford housing here.

Over the years, I've seen how member deference is an enormous barrier to getting new housing built. I've shown up to advocate in support of housing projects that I worry may never end up being built because the local council member doesn't support them.

From Just Home in the Bronx to today
Haven Green looking like it's going to be canceled,
it's hard to maintain hope that we can alleviate the
housing crisis for New Yorkers who are really
struggling and in some cases literally dying before
they can access housing because housing delayed is
housing denied.

We do have a real opportunity to address this right now. I strongly support many of the housing reforms outlined in the CRC preliminary staff report, but want to emphasize two in particular. One to replace the current unilateral mayoral veto of ULURPs with a three-person body consisting of the borough president, mayor, and city council speaker who could overturn a city council vote against a rezoning.

I would also urge the CRC to consider extending this process to other city council land use approvals such as for dispositions of public land, as in the case of Just Home. I also strongly support an enforcement mechanism to accompany Speaker Adams's fair housing framework to ensure that neighborhoods that aren't contributing their fair share have a fast track process to catch up to housing production targets.

I also want to take a moment to comment on the election reform proposals that the CRC is considering to move the city to even year elections and to move to a non-partisan primary system. I do support both of these proposals, especially starting the process to move to even year elections, which I really think would be transformative, but I have no noticed is not getting as much attention as nonpartisan primaries this evening.

I know that the CRC has brought up the concern that because this would also need state approval, that the change would not be immediate. It wouldn't be felt by voters right away. But I really feel strongly that that's not a good reason to delay the necessary charter change until after the state legislature approves it.

I think that we really need to send a strong signal to Albany to act. I think that they are too slow to act, and -- and would not do this on their own. And after working in policy for many years, I really think that the only way to do that is through first passing the charter revision, and then encouraging the state to follow suit. Thank you for the opportunity to testify this evening.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

MS. CAMPO: Hi, good evening, and thank you to all for spending your time serving the city in this way and listening to everyone. My name is Nicole Campo. I'm a senior advisor for land use planning for Langan Engineering. So I guess I'm representing my company, but I'm also representing sort of the practitioners in my area.

I'm a born and raised Staten Islander now Brooklynite. I worked on street mapping issues since I was a baby planner in the agencies well over 20 years ago now, which is crazy.

But I in part have gained, you know, for those who have worked with me, some people know me as a New York City streets expert, and that is not a thing one should even need to be to get through processes in New York City. But it speaks to some of

Pa	αe	73

the previous comments about some of the difficulties with permitting and -- and other approvals that could use reform.

So, you know, as -- as others referred to, but I will explain, the official city map is actually a collection of physical paper maps that, you know, are, like, what you do architectural kind of sketches on. You pull them out of a drawer, and they each sit in five different boroughs, because each borough president is in charge of their borough's portions of the city map.

And until only a few years ago, if you needed to find out the width of that street at that, you know, particular corner, or whether or not it was officially mapped, or just a record street, or the -- I mean, you had to physically go to the office, get somebody to help you pull the maps out of the drawer, find the map, and then continue on with your research.

Since then, the Department of City

Planning went through an amazing effort to digitize as

many of those paper maps as they could possibly get

their hands on. It's on their website. It's, you

know, NYC Streets, and it's -- it's pretty cool, and

it also saves a ton of time.

But unfortunately legally, it is not

	Page 74
1	the official city map because it they cannot claim
2	that they have every single map scanned there. So
3	you're still left with questions and, you know, you
4	it's not fully defensible, and you may still have to
5	go searching for this thing.
6	And so besides the fact that, you know,
7	these maps are officially still on paper in five
8	different boroughs and drawers, you know, just getting
9	different city agencies to get on the same page about
10	streets is difficult, and nevermind, you know, when
11	there's five different boroughs kind of working
12	separately. And I can answer more questions, but
13	that's the item I think needs reform.
14	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank you so
15	much.
16	Any questions for the panelists?
17	MR. DABARON: What exactly
18	MR. BUERY: Can you use a microphone,
19	Shams?
20	MR. DABARON: I'm sorry.
21	MS. CAMPO: You said what am I looking
22	to reform?
23	MR. DABARON: Yeah.
24	MS. CAMPO: I I think that we need
25	to move to a more central location for the city map,

and that the -- the keepers of the map should no longer be separated into five, but that there should be a centralized keeper and location.

It is 2025, so arguably, it should be digitally accessible. And whatever maps are not yet digitized should be found and digitized. And arguably that should be, you know, kind of researched, and there should be, you know, a group of people who have the technical awareness of how these things work.

I do think that there needs to be sort of, like, a -- a group from different city agencies who regularly come together to negotiate street issues, because I have been involved when I worked for the city and projects where I had to, like, with city hall's help, get, like, six or seven different city agencies in the room to agree on different aspects of how we treat, you know, grade changes or roller coasters over map streets I've researched for half a year. You know, just minutia that unfortunately comes up often enough that it causes major delays in projects.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

Any other questions? All right.

Thank you so much. I appreciate it.

Next I'd like to invite Bob Kelly in

Page 76 1 person, and we'll move after Mr. Kelly testifies in person, L. Joy Williams and Rachael Fauss, you'll be 2 3 up next on Zoom. Thank you. 4 MR. KELLY: Okay. To leave this here 5 or you? You, can you hear me okay? 6 MR. BUERY: I don't think people on 7 Zoom can hear. I can't promise I'm not 8 MR. KELLY: 9 going to break it into song, but I'll do my -- do my 10 best. Well, guess we'll find that. 11 Good evening. I wanted to thank the 12 mayor's office, Diane Savino, Alec, and Casey, as well 13 as the local city planning office for inviting me to 14 talk about in -- in specific terms the -- this new 15 mapping process. 16 But in -- in general terms, I am the 17 political action representative for the Building 18 Industry Association of New York City, representing 19 builders mainly in Staten Island and in Brooklyn. 20 Born and raised on Staten Island, I've been in the 21 building industry for 40 years. 22 And again, I just wanted to thank Diane 23 and -- and the other members for taking the 24 initiative -- virtual connectivity interruption -- and 25 the only way to do that would be to go into the

Dasement of CICV nat.	basement	of	citv	hall
-----------------------	----------	----	------	------

And as Nicole mentioned prior, these books look like something out of a -- a Tolstoy movie. They're -- they're 3 feet wide, 4 feet high. And I'll elaborate a little more on Nicole's point. As you open them, all you saw was tissue paper over tissue paper over post-it note over somebody's comments and you -- you could not really understand it.

And the only way we got through the process up until recently was that there were two people down there, Mike Nahee [ph] and Ted Wajinski [ph], who both have retired. They're a little older than me.

But if you didn't know one of those guys personally, you got nothing done. And I'm talking up into the 2000s when there was an internet and there was computer information. If you didn't know those guys, you couldn't move forward.

And I think it's important to state that, that the idea of having five of those books or multiple books throughout the city is just absolutely insane. And it always amused me that they kept these precious books in a basement below grade, and you were 150 feet from the -- I'm sorry, from -- from the -- the Narrows.

And at any given time, we could've been all out of business, including the city workers because without those maps, nothing -- nothing could happen. So I -- I just want to put that in perspective 'cause anything that this administration, this city planning commission and this city -- local city planning office along with the mayor's office can do to move my business forward and make it more tech savvy, I'm all for it.

And -- and I -- I like the fact that, again, with city workers, again, not trying to be disparaging, it's very easy when you're a civil servant to just say, "I'm just going to do my job.

I'm not going to think out of the box. I'm just going to, you know, trudge away." And these people are really thinking forward. They were able to get some changes at -- at South Richmond last year that were critical to my business.

So I'll just leave by saying this.

I -- I grew up on Staten Island. My dad bought a house on a policeman's wage for three times his income. The house next to my dad's house closed two days ago, was also purchased by a cop and a fireman. And they paid -- if you took one income out of the process, they paid 9 times their income for a

Page 79 1 65-year-old house. And I've talked to Diane about this at 2 3 My dad did it at 3.5 times his income. 4 mother stayed home. These two civil servants will be 5 doing overtime, and I don't know who's going to take 6 care of their kids when they -- when they have them 7 hopefully. But they paid nine times their income to get the same house my -- my dad bought in 1963. 8 9 He bought it brand new, they bought it 10 64 years old. And I think that's a very compelling 11 example, and it's true, and it's happening every day. 12 Not just on Staten Island, but throughout the city. 13 Thank you. 14 MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank you so 15 much. 16 MR. KELLY: Any -- yes, 17 Thank you, Bob, for your, MS. SAVINO: 18 the description of the -- I know. 19 MR. KELLY: Minutes, like a record. 20 MS. SAVINO: I know. The -- the 21 Thank you for the -- for your mapping issue. 22 testimony. But I wanted to ask you your, as a builder 23 and the head of the building industry associates, 24 the -- the issue about performing expediting the ULURP 25 process for certain projects.

Have -- have you guys taken a look at that potential for the -- be able to move forward?

Because we hear all the time, the permitting process, the ULURP process, it slows down, and a lot of builders just say, "You know what? I'm not even going to bother."

MR. KELLY: Correct. And -- and I'm glad that Nicole brought it up as well from -- from again, another part of the industry. But there are projects on Staten Island that would be built today were it not for ULURP. Because if you're -- virtual connectivity interruption -- larger developer in -- in Brooklyn.

If I bring him anything under 150 units, he says, "I'm not interested," because the time, the effort, the sweat equity, and -- and the risk. And -- and that's the other thing that obviously Nicole doesn't really get that part of it. I shouldn't say that. She gets it, but it's not her job.

You can't buy something today knowing that you won't build for five years. You have no idea where the -- where the market will be. I mean, today's a great example. We saw the stock market like a pinball machine today.

Page 81	Pac	1e	81
---------	-----	----	----

And as a developer who's using his own money along with bank money, there's no way to really sink your teeth into a project that's five years away without complete support from the city.

And I'm not talking about expediting support. I'm talking about financial support. And that's why a lot of projects just get passed over because you just can't do that work without scale.

MS. SAVINO: Right. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you. All right,

MR. KELLY: That one -- one, Shams.

MR. BUERY: Oh, all right, Shams. One

more question. I'm sorry.

MR. DABARON: Sorry. So -- that's right. That's right. Hopefully he's good. So I just want to ask you real quickly for the commission and for the charter, do you have any specific things that could help? 'Cause what you said is things that we're seeing across the city.

And do you have any particular things that we could do to help address that? There's proposals that have been put forth and stuff like that, but what do you think specifically we can do as a charter to help make -- mitigate those -- those things that you just described?

MR. KELLY: That's a great question, and I -- I won't -- I know there's a lot of people who want to talk. But -- so one of the greatest thing that could -- could have -- things that could happen is if more of what my filing process is could be done concurrently instead of consecutively.

So to give you an example, these maps that we spoke of -- I'm sorry. So these maps that we're speaking of. So when we buy a piece of property, we subdivide it, we wait for house numbers, we wait for lot numbers, and then we move on to city planning. We move on to DOB, Department of Buildings, and a lot of it is done consecutively.

So I'm waiting for my subdivision, okay, two months. Then I'm waiting for my house numbers, two months. I'm waiting for my lot numbers, two months. So that's six months. And that has nothing to do with the building process.

But to -- to put it in perspective,

I -- if I bought a small piece of property for

\$1,000,000, and I borrow \$800,000, my debt service is

\$64,000 a year on a two or three house job. By taking

six months just to get these pieces of paper that

allowed me to file with DOB, I've spent \$31,000 or

\$32,000, and have nothing to show for it.

1	The property didn't go up in value, my
2	cost of construction did not come down, but I had to
3	wait for these consecutive approvals through
4	Department of Finance, DOT, and DOB, where if if
5	they could just say, "Look, Bob, we know you're going
6	to get these subdivisions. We know you're going to
7	get house numbers. We know you're get a lot numbers.
8	Let's get you into DOB. Let's start looking at your
9	plans. If you got to go to City Planning, let's do
10	that now."
11	And that would be more of a concurrent
12	environment. And and even just cutting six months
13	out of the process would save \$32,000 a house and
14	right. But it's it's really more of of the city
15	I think thinking like a business person and not a an
16	an administration.
17	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
18	Appreciate it. Yes, please. Thank you so much.
19	Next we're going back to Zoom, L. Joy
20	Williams, and then Rachael Fauss.
21	Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. My mistake.
22	Well then, Ms. Williams, come testify now, and then
23	we'll go back to Zoom. I apologize. We appreciate
24	it.
25	MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening. I will

Page 84 1 try my best to be quick. 2 MR. BUERY: If you -- please use the 3 microphone, okay. 4 MS. WILLIAMS: No problem. I'll try my 5 best to be quick in -- tomorrow's election day, and 6 spending my day trying to get water for voters for 7 election day tomorrow. So doing our best here. name is L. Joy Williams. I'm the president of the NAACP New York State Conference. 9 10 The Charter Revision Commission offers 11 New Yorkers a meaningful opportunity to weigh in. I 12 have lots of opinions, not only on the voting process, 13 but also on the land use piece, which I'm not going to 14 be able to -- be able to dive in today. 15 But I urge the commission to slow down 16 on the electoral reform pieces on open primaries specifically and putting on the November ballot, not 17 18 because it's not a question worth asking, not because 19 I individually may be opposed or supportive of it, but 20 because this process has not honored the full weight 21 of what the question demands. And that has been that there has not 22 23 been rigorous or independent study on how open primary 24 systems would impact Black voters of New York City. Not that there isn't research on how open primaries 25

have	imp	pacte	ed ot	ner	places	which	engaged	it,	but	that
there	e's	not	been	dee	p city	wide c	ommunity	enga	ageme	ent.

In addition to this, while the commission certainly has had hearings, and discussions, and heard from folks, as a community organizer, there is a difference between having public hearings and having deep community engagement on a question.

So analysis without community interpretation is incomplete. And showing data that may show that there is no harm is not the same as showing benefit or addressing the root causes of disengagement. I respect the research and the experts that have been here, but New York City is not Chicago, it's not Louisiana, and our political structures, our party dynamics, and our racial history are different.

Reforms must be evaluated in context.

And if the system is as promising as some suggest, why not build public buy-in first? Democratic reforms succeed when people feel invited into the process, not when they're supervised by it.

Open primaries are not just a procedural tweak. This is not just an upgrade. They change how power operates in elections, and that deserves more than our few months of discussion here

Page 86 1 and the impending ballot deadline of November. I also want to challenge, and this is a 2 3 huge point for me, the assumption that a robust voter 4 education plan will follow if this is added to the 5 ballot and we indeed march towards that -- that goal. 6 Because I don't oppose education 7 efforts, obviously I lead them, but the city's record shows that the civic education is often underfunded. 8 It is rushed and reliant on volunteer-led 9 10 organizations like mine. 11 And so I look forward to questions any further or talking about why we are engaged in this 12 13 process and what some of our hesitation may be. 14 MR. BUERY: Thank you. 15 Shams. 16 MR. DABARON: Yeah. I got it. Sorry. Welcome to Staten Island. So I have a 17 18 question. So -- and you know I'm not -- I'm not the 19 expert. But we looked at some of, like, the 20 previous -- the previous campaigns to do open 21 elections and stuff, right, and this comes up all the 22 time. 23 What I'm seeing in the new, in, like, 24 recent times is that there's a significant amount of 25 voters who -- they're not subscribing to either party

Page 87	/
---------	---

for	whatever	reason,	especially	young	voters;	right?
		MS W	TT.T.TAMS: Y	ah		

MR. DABARON: And it's a significant amount of that population who are left out of the primary elections, et cetera. And it's not -- it's not -- many of them are Black and brown people as well. In fact, my children have six of them, and I think four of them don't subscribe to a party. They can't vote in the primary. These are Black kids.

How do we sort of, like, reconcile that there's a significant amount of Black and brown people who cannot vote -- can't vote in these primaries simply because we have sort of, like, just narrowed it down to the two parties? How do -- how do we reconcile that?

MS. WILLIAMS: Well, you should have not invited a civics enthusiast to have that conversation before you, because the -- the issue of two major parties, right, there are a number of things and laws on the books that actually support us maintaining that system, right. I often argue we should make it easier in the state of New York for independent -- independent candidates and third parties to gain ballot access.

Part of the reason we don't have that

Page 88 is because it is significantly harder for independent candidates and third parties to actually get ballot access, right. And so if -- if you want to address that, right, then there are other things that we need to address for ballot access in that regard. The other thing, because I represent a lot of -- as NAACP, I build, you know, a nonpartisan but very political membership that some, yes, who are Democrats, but others in various different parties. 'Cause quite contrary, we're not all a monolith, right. And that them being independent voters is more also about disillusionment with the process and the candidates that are being presented, and not necessarily that I need to, you know, vote in this particular primary or this particular political affiliation. And I think there are additional things in terms of whether unaffiliated voters can participate or not, but whether they feel represented and invested in as voters and as civic participants in our overall structure. MR. BUERY: Anita? Thank you for your MS. LAREMONT:

testimony. I -- I have a question about what you are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

positing in terms of saying that we should wait.

Given the fact that we've heard such an overwhelming amount of testimony from people who are disenfranchised and would like to participate, and what you envision happening in the interim.

And I can't even say when we think the next time that there would be an opportunity for this to happen. So it's sort of, you know, following up on Shams's question, balancing that sort of fact that there are a lot of people who really can't participate.

And a lot of them are young, and we want them in our process, against this notion that we need to wait and what you think would happen in that waiting period.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah. How much time I got? So one is the -- the issue of waiting. And really I'm bringing that up because while I commend the commission for the hearings and, you know, crisscrossing the city, and having this conversation, quite often our view of engagement is we set a date and set a place and a location and say people come to us.

Rather than from those of us who do this community engagement on a regular basis is going

to people and having conversations with them about what they see and how to engage. So yes, and far be it from me, right, to say that someone who feels disengaged or feel disempowered that they need to wait.

I mean that's my whole job, right, is to focus on those who have that voice, and particularly, as you mentioned, the young people who feel that disillusionment. But the -- to put others before others, right, is sort of competing, right.

Where is the conversation with -- in -in senior centers? Where are the conversations with
young people? Because if you look at how many people
have come to testify and weighing that against the
population of the city of New York, right, has there
been actual engagement with young voters of color,
right, about how they feel that their system should be
set up for their investment?

The same thing can be said in terms of housing. Even as we're talking, I've served as chair of land use on a community board, right. Having a voice and having your power be included in the process and being helped -- helped to shape what the process should be is something significant.

And, you know, as one of the

Pa	qe	9	1

organizations who are often tasked with that education after the fact, that is what we hear a lot from people. This was thrust upon us, and that there was not time for my voice in the process of how this should be shaped.

Immediately for -- in -- in terms of that is ranked choice voting, right. I'm still educating voters about this process and people are asking, "Well, where did this come from? Where -- you know, why is this?"

And so we take for granted how engaged or the information flow that happens between what happens in the rooms that we are in even that I am in to how it actually boils out into the community and into potential voters overall. You're welcome.

MS. WHITE: Hi. Thank you for your perspective and testimony, and I've heard you talk about your Adelphi experience before. So good to see you again. I -- you know, it's -- it's -- I'm -- in my viewpoint or -- or the statistics that I would really like to see is that it seems like there's a trend -- more of a trend.

And that's more concerning to me that this trend is rapidly moving toward the unaffiliated population. So I -- I wanted to hear more about --

or -- or your thoughts, right. Because this -we're -- we're just put -- if this passes a vote
amongst us, that's a big if, right, because we want to
consider all the perspectives and get as much data as
possible.

But there's still an opportunity to do that education and getting the opinion of the community because it's going to go to a vote, and it's going to be voted either yes or no if it happens.

So I'd be interested to hear your thought about the, if it gets on the, you know, ballot at all, what would be the best way to ensure that everyone understands the ramifications and then can make a clear decision when they do vote in November?

MS. WILLIAMS: I have two points to that. I think one, the suggestion that it may be 20 years before we have a Charter Revision Commission, I would just point to the fact that how many Charter Revision Commissions have we had in the most recent five years, right?

And so it's to say that there wouldn't be a, another opportunity that it would be 20 years or 30 years from now, I do think is not a point, you know, that is valid because we have had just in 5 years the conversations in -- in order to do that.

City council, the mayor, right. So there can be another opportunity. That's number one.

Number two, in terms of the community education, we have also had in the state of New York valid questions the way they -- which they were phrased, the structure in which they were presented where people have had to mobilize quickly and say, "Vote no," because of the way it is phrased, because of the structure where in which is presented.

Here in New York where we were part of the lead effort to help pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Act of the State of New York, right, this will also have to go before the attorney general for a review on how this would impact Black voters and voters of color in this city as well, right.

So I don't think there is a harm in really setting forth a rigorous process of community engagement and setting up a structure for more people to be involved in -- in the process.

Now that being said, if it does move forward, if y'all go behind closed doors and y'all decide, you know, "We just can't wait and we must move this forward," making it as simple as I know my partner in, you know, others would say in crime, but I would say in democracy, Susan Lerner, has mentioned,

and making it as simple and be -- people being able to choose, right, like, in terms of participating in a democracy, that would be our process.

I can tell you still though, y'all are going -- because y'all will be done after this gets on the ballot, right. It will be organizations and -- like ours who will have to be in the streets, who will be in the senior centers, who will, you know, be gathering the community meetings in order to inform, and educate, and tweet, and text.

And the city will say, "Here's a little \$2,000, here's a little 5,000 to do it." And they'll put up a bus shelter and put, you know, do one mailing and they'll be like, "Education," when that is not what voter education or civic education is in that process.

MR. BUERY: Yeah. Thank you very much. It was very helpful. I -- I think just one thing I want to maybe clarify and explore. I -- I think the question of not wanting to wait, it's not a question of whether there'll be another Charter Revision Commission.

I think the question is of course we, and I know it's been a wonderful experience, truly, I'm not sure I'm doing another Charter Revision

-	_			
1		mıe	21	an a
_		1111エコ	2 _	UII ,

MS. WILLIAMS: You're not addicted?

MR. BUERY: I think the -- I -- I love

it. It's been great. Truly been great. But what I

don't know is whether another commission will put this

to the voters again. So I will say to you, I feel a

great deal of responsibility as the person sitting

here now to advance the thing that makes sense to me

now.

And we're, and this within, this is the structure that we have. So I -- I definitely appreciate the challenge of education, but I -- I do want to balance that against the need and the opportunity to put things that seem important and that matter to voters when we can.

And I guess part of my concern, and I'm not sure there's a real answer to this question, but I guess my concern is that these questions, the nature of life in New York City is that these questions are never urgent until they're urgent.

So I guess my -- what I -- I continue to struggle with is similar to the question I asked Ms. Lerner is I'm still struggling to think about if we say, "Okay, let's hold. Let's pause. Let's wait to have education," we risk that the one that the

future commission will never put the question to the voters again.

But then again, I still worry that what is the motivation to build the kind of grassroots conversation until it's actually ripe. Yeah. And I -- I ask that question honestly, 'cause I'm still struggling with how to manage the -- the -- I think the reasonable push.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah. Yeah. So I started my career doing voting rights, you know, '22 or what have you, positioning towards legislators at the time about same day voter registration, right. And I remember folks' eyes glazing over in the room saying, "Yeah, we like knowing where our voters come from. You know, we don't want to proceed down this path." And it was halted, right.

And so there are a number of different reforms, not just in how you bring independent voters and -- or I would say unaffiliated voters into a primary process. There are many reforms from a civic engagement and increasing participation overall that we need to engage in that are on the table waiting, like, in the wings, right.

So in terms of the urgency similar, like us having a voting rights act, right. Being able

to strike down the law, it took, you know, me as president of Brooklyn NAACP to strike down the law to be able to provide something as simple as water to voters who will be waiting in line tomorrow in order to vote when the temperatures are 102 degrees.

So that doesn't mean, however, that we can't stop and see how something will impact and will there be unintended consequences based upon our actions. And New York is unique. We have a -- a unique -- a voting population. As you say, we have growing young people. And the trend is not just here in New York City, but across the nation of people being unaffiliated.

And parties will have their -- are having their own reckoning in terms of how they are growing their individual parties and how they are looking to engage people, right. But there's no shortage of New Yorkers being engaged in the civic fabric of our city.

You could see that in community boards.

You can see that in mutual aid societies that have,

you know, that have continued -- populated through the

city. People are civically engaged, right.

And so to put the question to them and say that we want your voice in how we should

Page	98
------	----

structure, how we change our election process in order to increase participation, that we can get better candidates that will more represent our -- our ideals, I don't think it's haphazard to stop and actually pose the question.

And to, Ms. Anita, your question of what we do in that pause, I do think that, which is something we continue to advocate for, there needs to be increased resources into the city agencies that are responsible for the civic engagement process to bring people into that process. And it can't just be us having the meeting and expecting people to come in.

MR. BUERY: I -- I definitely appreciate the push and the being careful about making sure that we give education it's due. I guess the -- and we don't have to, I mean, it's not something that we can resolve, but -- but I appreciate the conversation.

I -- I guess where I'm stuck is you say that don't we need a process to bring this to community? And it strikes me that that's what an election is.

Because anything that we propose, you know, we don't determine by fiat. It then becomes an issue for voters five months from now -- I can't

	Page 99
1	count. Four: July, August I mean November, I can't
2	count. July well, no, July, August, September,
3	four months.
4	November; right? Right, I'm not crazy.
5	I'm like election's in November?
6	MS. WYLDE: Right.
7	MR. BUERY: So and so I agree that
8	making sure that people have the resources to have
9	that conversation appropriately. I guess I just
10	struggle with why isn't enough time to have a
11	robust
12	MS. WILLIAMS: Of how the question is
13	presented to them. Because there have been times when
14	the question as presented to them makes it yes.
15	MR. BUERY: Yes. That's absolutely
16	part of our task. This has to our our job is to
17	present questions that are clear, and and if we
18	don't do that, then we haven't done our job, whatever
19	we recommend.
20	MS. WILLIAMS: And I don't think and
21	and to that point, will voters have an opportunity to
22	have input on what type of open primary system they
23	will have, right? Like, that is still the question.
24	Because to say the question won't be
25	or should or, you know, as you deliberate, will we

	Page 100
1	have open primaries such to be determined that fits
2	New York, right? You're you're trying to you're
3	questioning what type of system will we have and then
4	be putting that out on the ballot.
5	MR. BUERY: Yeah. Yup. Will we have
6	specific proposals that voters will have to vote yes
7	or no?
8	MS. WILLIAMS: Exactly. Exactly.
9	MS. WYLDE: There aren't that many
10	choices. I mean, but what we do have is more hearings
11	coming up where people can come in and say what kind
12	of system they'd like.
13	The other point I wanted to make is I
14	think that you're absolutely right that we should be
15	coupling this with thinking about the voter access and
16	the other issues. Unfortunately, those are all in
17	Albany.
18	MR. BUERY: Yeah, those are not.
19	MS. WYLDE: So I mean we certainly
20	should be working with you on thinking through that as
21	well.
22	MR. BUERY: Absolutely. And thank you
23	for taking so much time with us. I really appreciate
24	it.
25	MS. WILLIAMS: No problem.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

We're going to move to Zoom, Rachael Fauss and Grace Rauh. Rachael first.

MS. FAUSS: Hi, good evening. My name is Rachael Fauss. I'm the senior policy advisor for Reinvent Albany. We advocate for transparent, accountable New York government and fact-based public policy.

Today, we are testifying in favor of major changes to the New York City voting process that take full advantage of ranked choice voting, RCV, and recognize the clear trend toward New York City voters registering unaffiliated with a party, a trend that will accelerate if New York's long delayed automatic voter registration is finally implemented.

Specifically, we support moving New York City elections to even years. And I would echo what a previous speaker said and say that putting it on the ballot and having New York City voters approve it would send a very strong message to Albany.

And we also support a top four general election and open primary using ranked choice voting. Reinvent Albany strongly supports RCV and its basic goal of reducing vote splitting and spoilers, increasing voter choice, and ensuring that the

selection of candidates with broad bases of support.

Tomorrow, June 24th, is primary day, and so far ranked choice voting is working as intended in the Democratic Party primary for mayor. There's a broad field of candidates, and they're cross endorsing each other, and forming informal alliances. And that we believe that's a positive dynamic encouraged by many of the candidates being endorsed by the same minor party.

Much as we are happy to have it, New York City's adoption of ranked choice voting in 2019 was more a triumph of political compromise and negotiation than in election logic. Though we would note there was an obvious financial logic to ending costly low turnout runoff elections.

Of the dozens of local governments across the U.S. using RCV, New York City is the only one to use it solely in the primary and then switch to a first-pass-the-post voting system in the general election. The overwhelming share of local governments using RCV have one single election.

So we have previously testified in favor of a number of different ways to improve New York City election process, including semi-open primaries. We still support that as an incremental

improvement, especially if it includes a sore loser provision.

However, our clear favorite is an open primary with -- whose top four vote getters advance to the general election. We note that over the last five general elections, New York City has averaged just under ten candidates for mayor on the general election ballot.

Thus, top four would, on average, cut the number of candidates on the general election ballot in half. Because all four candidates on the general election ballot are emerging from an open primary using ranked race voting, it's highly likely all would have a substantial body of public support and be able to engage in substantive policy debate.

The city's leading election law authorities confirmed that New York City may move to a top four system without changes to state law. And similarly, it would be legal for the city to cancel primaries in any contest where four or fewer candidates file.

I see I'm running out of time, but I'll be happy to answer any questions you have, and you'll have our written testimony as well.

MR. BUERY: Thank you. You can hold

	Page 104
1	for a minute in case there are questions.
2	Next is Grace Rauh.
3	MS. RAUH: Okay, I'm unmuted. Sorry
4	about that.
5	MR. BUERY: Yeah, we can hear you.
6	MS. RAUH: Good evening, commissioners.
7	Thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight. My
8	name is Grace Rauh. I'm the executive director of
9	Citizens Union. We work to ensure honest and
10	effective government, fair and open elections, and a
11	civically engaged public.
12	And I'm struck that this hearing today
13	falls just one day before the primary election, which
14	has shaped up to be one of the most competitive and
15	dynamic municipal contests that we've seen in decades.
16	Election reform may not be flashy, but
17	it is foundational to a healthy democracy. And we are
18	seeing in real time how benefits from election reforms
19	can grow over time. I'm here to urge you to advance
20	two election reform proposals under consideration for
21	the November ballot: even year elections and open
22	primaries.
23	When early voting was first
24	implemented, critics were focused on how few people
25	used it. But as we are seeing right now, more than

340,000 New Yorkers have voted early in this election, more than double the number from our last citywide primary. And that reform has given people more of an opportunity to have a say in this important race.

On ranked choice voting, when that was adopted, some critics said it wouldn't matter. It wouldn't change campaign dynamics or voter behavior. And now, six years later, we are watching as New Yorkers actively strategize to maximize the impact of their ranked choice ballots, campaigns are cross endorsing, and, most importantly, we know that voters will have a greater say in the outcome of this election as a result of ranked choice voting.

Even our widely respected public matching funds program, which took decades, but has become the backbone of our elections. And today candidates without ties to big money are able to break fundraising records through small donations from everyday New Yorkers.

And the two reforms that this commission is considering putting on the ballot in November are similarly transformative. First, opening up our closed primary system would give over 1,000,000 voters who are currently shut out of the process, a chance to vote in this hugely consequential election.

As others have noted, unaffiliated voters are disproportionately younger, more than a quarter in the city are under the age of 30, and we would likely see even more New Yorkers be eligible to join an open primary given the rapid growth that we've seen of unaffiliated voters, especially among younger New Yorkers.

I also want to note that whether you put forward a top two or a top four model for open primaries, Citizens Union would support either approach. We feel very strongly that we should no longer exclude this many voters from meaningful participation in our primary elections. It isn't democratic.

Second, by moving away from the city's off-cycle election calendar onto the higher turnout even year cycle, we would ensure that the most important elections for city voters take place when turnout is at its highest. Instead of city politics being an insider's game, we would draw in a younger, more diverse, and more representative electorate to vote on local issues.

We know that these reforms will take time to implement, and that is okay. Democracy takes time. Elections are serious. Reforms must be

	Page 107
1	thoughtful. And that's why we're so grateful to have
2	charter commissions like yours, independent bodies
3	conducting robust public engagement with a mandate to
4	think long term about what's best for New York.
5	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank you so
6	much.
7	Do you have any questions for Rachael
8	or Grace?
9	MR. DABARON: So so there's
10	there's been concern about the Black African American
11	vote voters. How do you address the concerns that
12	the African American vote or Black vote will be
13	diminished if we do the open primaries and and
14	stuff like that? Do you have any thoughts on that,
15	and is that a something that we should consider or
16	not?
17	MS. RAUH: I think that when we look at
18	the data in terms of the 1,000,000 plus unaffiliated
19	voters that are currently disenfranchised and can't
20	participate in the primary process, we know that they
21	are younger, and that it is a diverse group of New
22	Yorkers who are registering to vote but are choosing
23	not to participate in a party.
24	So so the open primary reform simply
25	would allow more voters to participate. So it has

	Page 108
1	the the real potential to grow the universe of
2	of all voters, including Black voters in New York in
3	terms of their ability to shape the outcome of these
4	really consequential elections.
5	MR. BUERY: Any other questions?
6	Thank you both so much, and, Grace,
7	again, congratulations again on your new role.
8	All right. Next testimony from also on
9	Zoom, Seth Masket and Valerie De La Rosa.
10	MR. MASKET: Hello. Am I coming
11	through okay?
12	MR. BUERY: Yeah, you're good. We can
13	hear you.
14	MR. MASKET: Okay, great. Thank you
15	very much for your time today. My name is Seth
16	Masket. I'm a professor of political science at the
17	University of Denver. I don't live in New York City,
18	but I was born there. My son is a resident.
19	I wish to speak on the topic of the all
20	party top two election system reform that's being
21	proposed. Several states have experimented with this
22	and similar reforms in recent years, and several
23	speakers have mentioned this tonight. I I wanted
24	to weigh in with a few comments.
25	Typically, proponents of such a top two

system offer two significant benefits. One is that it would reduce polarization allowing the election of more moderate candidates. The second is that it would increase voter turnout in primaries.

One of the best -- the highest profile examples we have of this is the top two election system in California, which was enacted in 2012. Two important things happened after that.

First of all, in 2014, turnout in primaries actually dropped, although the next primary, you know, after that it sort of evened out. It wasn't a large drop, but it didn't seem to change it very much in the long run and it did not go up.

Second, polarization did actually ebb somewhat over the next decade, and this is something previous witness, Richard -- Richard Barton, mentioned. Polarization actually declined a bit largely where there were two candidates in the same party going to the runoff election together. In those cases, the more moderate candidate tended to win. This has slightly reduced polarization in the California legislature.

We've seen other states attempt similar source of reforms, so they're generally without much detectable effect, either on turnout or polarization.

Washington State enacted such a reform in 2008, didn't seem to change very much. Alaska has a similar style top four system with ranked choice voting that they've used since 2022.

One of the interesting outcomes of that was that there was -- that the state elected a Democrat to Congress, Mary Peltola, in what is usually a very Republican leaning state. That was largely result of Republicans failing to coordinate prior to the first election, and -- and the Republicans ended up splitting their vote.

Now the turnout question is an interesting one. In New York and many other places with partisan primaries, people not registered in a political party can't vote in its primary elections. This is something Dr. Gaboury mentioned earlier this evening of, you know, the people who are not members of the party generally can't participate in its decisions, although there are a number of groups that advocate for such reforms to allow non-party members to participate.

If anyone can vote in a primary regardless of their own party membership, then theoretically that increases the number of people who can participate. Yet it turns out that for the most

Page 111 1 part, people who want to participate in the primary already do, either by registering what -- sometimes 2 just by registering with the party beforehand. 3 4 In states with closed systems, we often 5 see voters registering with a party to join primaries. 6 If it's a state where independents can participate in 7 the primaries, they often remain independents. Overall, it generally doesn't change 8 9 the sort of people who actually show up for the 10 primary. Thank you for your time. I hopefully --11 happy to answer questions. Thank you. 12 MR. BUERY: Thank you. I'm -- thank 13 you so much. Thank you. If you can hold on for a 14 second in case there are questions. 15 But first we'll hear from Valerie De La 16 Rosa. MS. DE LA ROSA: 17 Hello. Hi. 18 MR. BUERY: Hi. We can hear you well. 19 Thank you. 20 MS. DE LA ROSA: Okay, wonderful. 21 can turn my camera on in a second, but while we're on, 22 hello. My name is Valerie De La Rosa, and I am the 23 chair of Manhattan Community Board 2, and I'm speaking 24 on behalf of the board. I'm also an economist by 25 practice.

		Oh,	let me see if	I can turn my ca	mera
on	with	my notes.	Okay, great.	Thank you so muc	h.
And	d I'm	speaking or	n behalf of Mar	nhattan Community	ı
Воа	ard 2	today.			

So we advise that the commission's focus on ULURP timelines completely ignores the importance and impact of the precertification phase where developers can direct -- confer directly and repeatedly over a course of months or years with members of the staff of the Department of City Planning, and also engage in various aspects of environmental review, all without the involvement of the community, the community board, or local electeds, all while recognizing the importance of that input investing time and effort to engage the community in order to produce a better outcome.

We oppose a reduction in the ULURP review process from 90 to 60 days, which would diminish the time for the public to weigh in.

And I apologize for the uproar. I'm actually giving this testimony from Elizabeth Street Garden in Manhattan, which had a big land use announcement today.

Additionally, we fail to see the benefit of running concurrent public reviews at the

community board and borough president's level when reviews should roll up to the borough president from the community board level.

We find it difficult to support the recommendation of a streamlined New York for small projects and categorically beneficial projects, given that these terms are not sufficiently defined, but support a local review process for categorically beneficial projects.

We strongly oppose the creation of a three member panel that could override the decisions of a democratically elected city council with just two votes, and do not support the changes in the roles of the borough president, city council speaker, members of the city council, and community boards that would diminish local community input.

We disagree with efforts to weaken member deference, particularly when member deference is not even codified in the city council. The role of a local city council member is to be an expert on local issues, and still must win the support of the full council.

We find the mayor's commission suggestions for comprehensive planning inadequate. As an example, when rezonings occur, there should be a

	Page 114
1	requirement for much newer investment in impacted
2	infrastructure and local services.
3	We find that the recommendation of
4	adding a zoning administrator requires the additional
5	definition along with specifics on how community input
6	would be preserved for processes decided by such an
7	administrator.
8	We agree with we agree with the
9	recommendation of another commission to increase the
10	number of votes on the city planning commission
11	required to disprove a land use action if the
12	community board, borough president and borough board
13	all recommend approval of a land use action. We
14	oppose rules that would weaken public input
15	MR. BUERY: I I apologize. I'm
16	sorry we're
17	MS. DE LA ROSA: I've gone over my
18	three minutes. Thank you so much.
19	MR. BUERY: Yeah, thank you so much.
20	MS. DE LA ROSA: Sure.
21	MR. BUERY: Are there any questions for
22	Seth or Valerie? Nope. I want to thank you so much
23	for your time and your testimony. We appreciate it.
24	Next we'll hear from Celia Iervasi and
25	Charles Moerdler.

1	MS. IERVASI: Good evening, everyone.
2	I want to thank this commission for giving me the
3	opportunity to speak tonight. I'm very appreciative.
4	Mine is more of a personal and a
5	community issue. I am in favor of the council members
6	being able to appoint members half of the members
7	to the community board. I was on Community Board 3 I
8	would say from right after Sandy till I would say
9	Friday.
10	I didn't I didn't get an email or
11	anything. I received a phone call that I was no
12	longer on the board, even though I had good
13	attendance, I felt it was very valuable to the
14	community board. I'm on very quite a few community
15	organizations that I'm involved in.
16	Just give me a minute, I apologize.
17	I've been on I was the chairperson for the YMCA
18	counseling centers for three years. I was the
19	honoree, past president of Arizona Kiwanis,
20	chairperson for Northwell Pediatric Cancer Center.
21	Currently I am a president of the
22	Richmond Recovery and Wellness Center, YMC Counseling
23	Services of America, Carl Bini Foundation, Vice
24	President Sansone Foundation, Committee of DaVinci
25	Society, and a few others.

	Page 116
1	I didn't get a email. I didn't get a
2	reason. I was I I was told that to give
3	opportunity for more people to join, even though we're
4	17 open seats, which I am in favor of getting more
5	people, more blood involved.
6	But this is a community. When you're
7	involved with a community, you want to be a part of
8	it. So therefore, I really feel that if the charter
9	revision would try to change what's happening and give
10	the council members 50 percent of the vote who they
11	appoint on the community boards would be very, very
12	important and necessary for the committee for the
13	community. Any questions?
14	MR. BUERY: Well, we're going to
15	where were we? Okay, I'm sorry. If you can hold on
16	for a second. We're going to have Charles Moldler
17	testify first, and we'll see if there are any
18	questions for either of you.
19	MS. IERVASI: Thank you.
20	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
21	MR. MOERDLER: Can you hear me?
22	MR. BUERY: Yeah, thank you.
23	MR. MOERDLER: Good evening
24	commissioners and Mr. Chairman. My name is Charles

Moerdler. I speak on behalf of Community Board number

8 in Bronx County, of which I'm chair of the land use committee and a former board chairman of boards 8 and 14 previously.

Let me make it clear that the board unanimously opposes any diminution of the role of the community boards, the city council, or the borough presidents in the ULURP process. And I will give you experience as to why that would be a foolhardy mistake.

Let me note that my own experiences on all three sides of that issue: governmentally, as a developer oriented council, and community oversight. That experience accumulated over 50 years includes service today and since Mario Cuomo recommended my appointment decades ago as a member -- the gubernatorial member of the New York City Housing Development Corporation.

I served as Commissioner of Buildings of the City of New York, and in that role helped formulate the building code, the housing maintenance code and the zoning ordinance. And in addition to that, until recently, I served as a member of the MTA. In all of those instances, by governors of different parties.

Let me make it very clear that as

counsel to various of those developers who get involved in this, there is very clear evidence that should you take this step, you will further decline the city of New York. And I say further decline.

affordability has increasingly become a convenient though hollow political slogan, centralization has ignored the reality of what is affordable to some. For example, mid-Manhattan or even select segments of my own Riverdale and Spuyten Duyvil neighborhoods, it is not -- it is not realistically affordable to most in the South Bronx and elsewhere.

Indeed, not even in our own areas and communities. Communities and board members know the reality of their neighborhood. They know that the AMI, which is a standard that is used for determining qualification, is rigged. It's based on the income of people in places like New Rochelle, and Scarsdale, and Great Neck.

They know as well that when you do the housing programs that now are done, they do not fit the needs of affordability. It is not a matter of quantity, it is a matter of quality. It is a matter of having housing fit for people, and fit for living, and fit for their pocketbooks. That balance has not

	Page 119
1	been struck in decades in this city and state. Let me
2	make
3	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much, Mr.
4	Moerdler. We're I apologize, we're at time.
5	Are there questions for Ms. Iervasi or
6	Mr. Moerdler? No?
7	I want to thank you so much for your
8	testimony and and your service, both of you. We
9	deeply appreciate it. Thank you so much.
10	Next, we'll here from Cynthia Terrell
11	and Don Hulbert. I'm sorry. Okay. All right. So
12	Don Hulbert and David Cherry.
13	MR. HULBERT: Okay.
14	MR. BUERY: But Don but Don, you
15	can you can't see who that yeah. So Don, you
16	can begin please. Thank you.
17	MR. HULBERT: Okay, thank you very
18	much. I appreciate the opportunity to speak, and I'll
19	try to do this as quickly as possible. My name is Don
20	Hulbert. I've resided in the five boroughs for 47
21	years.
22	I came here to study music, have had a
23	modestly successful career as a freelance musician,
24	and I've also worked as a legal document specialist.
25	In addition I've been an independent voter and

activist since 1981, and I urged the commission to put a measure to open the primaries on the November ballot.

I guess part of my story would be I also came to New York to have a full and open life as a gay man. While doing that, I contracted HIV. So while I enjoyed my work as a document specialist, it wasn't my first choice. I had to keep that job to keep health insurance and access to healthcare.

I'm talking about this because I beg you to not make it the case that I need to have a party affiliation that I don't want in order to participate in this situation -- in the governance of the city in that same way.

I also believe that there is adequate evidence that having an open primary system will open up elections to greater participation, will help create more voice for ordinary New Yorkers, the 1.1 million that I'm part of, and would in general help the quality of life in New York and allow people to have a voice.

You know, I'm fine with parties. I think people should be able to associate for whatever reasons and however they would like. That said, those parties are not empowered by our constitution to

completely limit all elections and electoral participation.

So I think these two issues can be divorced, that opening primaries doesn't particularly weaken parties in general, even as it loosens some of the lockstep in terms of electoral process and who actually gets to run. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

And now we will hear from Cynthia

Terrell.

MS. TERRELL: Thank you for this opportunity to share my perspectives on women's representation and the ranked choice voting system used in New York City that was adopted by 74 percent of city voters in 2019.

I believe this perspective is relevant to whether you propose a top two system that puts women's representation at risk, or whether you propose a top four system that could further enhance women's representation.

My name is Cynthia Terrell, and I'm the founder and director of Represent Women, a nonpartisan organization that works nationally, but also partners with allies in New York City. We research the barriers women face in politics and the data-driven

policies to reduce those barriers.

One of the barriers is the rules for elections. In a vote for one system, many women are told to wait their turn, parties make calculations about who is electable, and candidates are rewarded for negative campaigning rather than for finding common ground.

After starting to use ranked choice voting in 2021, women on the New York City Council went from 13 seats to 31 seats. Nationally, women hold 52 percent of council seats in cities using RCV as compared to barely a third on the councils without RCV in our nation's 100 largest cities.

Organizations and leaders in New York
City who work to advance women in office fully
appreciate this fact, and will evaluate any proposed
charter reform through this lens. Just today, I
coauthored an article with Ebonie Simpson, executive
director of the New Majority in New York City,
entitled With Ranked Choice Voting in New York City,
Women Win.

Here's an excerpt: "Research finds that women have better opportunities to run and win ranked choice voting elections. More women can jump into the race without fear of splitting the vote with one

D	123	`
Page	123	3

another and without being told to 'wait their	notner	'wait their tur	n.
---	--------	-----------------	----

"Whether in red Utah and Alaska, blue California, or purple Minnesota, the results were uniform: as cities introduced ranked choice voting, more women ran and won, and states and localities that had never come close to gender equity now approached it or surpassed it.

"What we see in New York is that these election rules encourage candidates to campaign differently. When you can't win with just your base, you need to talk to everyone throughout the city.

Instead of attacking your opponents, you work to be their supporters' second choice. Multiple candidates with similar perspective ask ranked -- asked voters to rank all of them."

Abandoning the ranked choice voting system that helps to elect more women with a top two system where the decisive election would no longer allow for RCV will raise major red flags among the women's organizations I work with in New York City.

A top four proposal with RCV in November would allow you to open up elections to more voters without putting women's electoral success at risk.

In the appendix to my testimony are

	Page 124
1	more resources in support of our research on choice
2	voting and a policy document that represent women
3	released with other experts on the best practices for
4	statutory provisions when following Alaska's top four
5	ranked choice voting system.
6	Thank you for your time, and I'd be
7	pleased to answer any questions you may have.
8	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
9	Are there any questions for Ms. Terrell
10	or Mr. Hulbert? She said yeah.
11	You said you submitted your testimony
12	in writing; correct?
13	MS. TERRELL: I did, yes.
14	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
15	MS. TERRELL: Thank you.
16	MR. BUERY: All right. I don't see any
17	questions, so I want to thank you both for your time
18	and your your testimony. Deeply appreciate it.
19	Next step we have David Cherry and
20	Deborah Green.
21	MR. CHERRY: Thank you. Good evening,
22	everyone. My name is David Cherry. I'm the president
23	of an organization of faith and community leaders in
24	Chicago called the Leaders Network and cofounder of
25	the National Faith Leaders Collaborative.

I was born in New York City where I spent the first 31 years of my life. My parents were independent activists in Harlem, and I proudly followed in their footsteps becoming independent voter and activist.

An important lesson I learned from them was about the goals of the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s and the 1960s. The goal was not to become big shots or operatives for any political party. The goal was to end racism and poverty and to win the fights for quality education, affordable housing, access to quality healthcare, equal employment, voting rights, and safer communities.

As an independent, my loyalty has never belonged to political parties. My loyalty and love has always been for the people in all the boroughs and the communities in New York City. It is the main reason why, as a native New Yorker, I detest partisan primaries.

It is outrageous to tell me and other independent voters that we have to join a political party to exercise our hard fought right to vote. As a free American, I don't have to join any group if I choose not to.

After moving to Chicago, I started

participating in nonpartisan primaries where you simply vote for your preferred candidate without being forced into a political party, which is how it should be.

Now this system doesn't automatically solve all of our problems. We still have to fight and advocate for the issues we care about. But the important thing it does is it -- it allows for new opportunities to create new coalitions with new people.

Individuals who self-identify as progressives, or moderates, or conservatives can freely rally around the same candidates without the handcuffs, and restrictions, and limitations created by partisan political parties.

And for those who are concerned, and I've heard a number of people who expressed concern about the impact on Black communities, I do want to say that the two most recent Chicago mayors were Black candidates elected through this nonpartisan system. And not only that, but the 50 members of the city council has become the most diverse in Chicago's history through the open nonpartisan system.

Younger voters are also increasingly declaring their independence. The closed party

	Page 127
1	primary is a relic from the past. It's time for New
2	York City to move into the 21st century by adopting an
3	open primary system for all New Yorkers. Thank you.
4	MR. BUERY: Thank thank you so much.
5	Perfect timing.
6	Deborah Green, please. You are mute,
7	Deborah. I don't know if it's on our end or yours,
8	but okay. You're good now.
9	MS. GREEN: Thank you. My name's
10	Deborah Green. I live in Queens. I moved here 55
11	years ago as a student to go to college in New York.
12	I'm testifying in favor of open primaries.
13	I've been an independent activist
14	political activist for many, many years. I was a
15	lobbyist in Washington who worked for the rights of
16	independent voters and independent parties to have
17	access to our democracy.
18	However, about ten years ago, I
19	switched to my registration to the Democratic Party
20	and I for the sole reason that I wanted to have
21	some voice in who was going to run in November. And
22	I I came across an interesting poll that was
23	conducted by the Manhattan Institute.
24	It was a poll of likely voters in the
25	2025 New York City mayoral election. And they found

out that in polling -- that 23 percent of the Democrats that they polled and asked this question to said that they had changed their registration to Democratic Party solely to be able to vote in this primary.

So it seems very clear that these partisan elections are a big part of decreasing the participation of the broadest possible electorate in our -- in the selection of our candidates. Any system that excludes so many people, I heard tonight someone say over 1,000,000 New York City voters, it cannot really be called a democratic system.

With regard to the issue of polarization, it seems self-evident that closed primaries force candidates to narrow their message to appeal only to those that they think are most likely to vote in the primary. Usually they're partisans that they rally every year to come out. I mean, this depresses turnout, it favors special interests, and it degrades representation.

More than 20 years ago, a referendum on open primaries was placed on the New York City ballot. I worked very hard to get it elected. And it lost after fierce opposition from major party establishment, which was clearly not disturbed by

	Page 129
1	voter disenfranchisement.
2	Two decades later, the portion of
3	independent voters nationwide has increased from 35
4	percent to 50 percent. Fifty percent of voters do not
5	want to belong to a party. This is larger than the
6	proportion enjoyed by the two major parties together.
7	We must not lose the chance to allow all registered
8	New York City voters to
9	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank you so
10	much. We're at time. I apologize.
11	Any questions for David Cherry or
12	Deborah Green? No.
13	Thank you so much. I'm sorry.
14	Shams, do you have a question?
15	MR. DABARON: I just wanted to thank
16	you both for your testimony. I think you added some
17	great perspective. And I I just want to highlight
18	one thing that David Cherry said, which made a note
19	of, is that the idea of new coalitions with new
20	people. That really stands out to me, and just thank
21	you both for your testimony.
22	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank you both,
23	we appreciate it.
24	Next step is Alexander Rabb I'm
25	sorry, Alexander Rabb and Rob Richie.

MR. RABB: Thank you. Good evening, commissioners, and thank you for the opportunity to appear on behalf of the Working Families Party, which I serve as general counsel.

I hope to direct your attention to the fact that a jungle primary would violate the New York State Constitution by preventing parties from nominating the same candidates to separate party lines in the primary election, and excluding fusion parties from having their own lines, or even appearing at all in the general election.

Unlike all of the other states with top
two or top four elections, under New York's fusion
voting system, multiple parties may nominate the same
candidates. These cross endorsed candidates appear
multiple times on a general election ballot on each
separate line of every party that nominated them.

New Yorkers can vote on the line of the party they feel best represents their interests, knowing that their votes will be tallied together in their candidates final count.

This system fights polarization by allowing parties with different priorities to form coalitions around the same mutually agreeable candidates. It allows voters who may not identify

with a major party to cast a meaningful vote for a candidate who can actually win as opposed to a protest or spoiler vote for a nonviable candidate.

Now the court of appeals has found repeatedly and unequivocally that the Constitution of New York State protects the rights of voters, party members, and political parties to nominate their own candidates and for their nominees to appear separately and under their lines.

As far back as 1911 in the matter of Callahan, the court of appeals in a case brought by Citizens Union to protect fusion voting found that restrictions on fusion voting would be as arbitrary as prohibiting a party from nominating redheaded candidates.

The next year, in Hopper vs. Britt, court of appeals went on to strike down a Tammany Hall inspired state law limiting candidates to only one party line.

In 1973, in Devane vs. Touhey, the court of appeals reaffirmed that no law may prevent a qualified elector from exercising his constitutional right to vote for a candidate and party of their choice.

And with the words "and party," Devane

suggests that the Constitution would prohibit the city from excluding any party that duly designated a candidate from the general election ballot, especially given that the court of appeals has taken steps to remedy technical ballot access failures by ordering a write-in primary, ensuring a place on the general election ballot for a party whose members have made the requisite showing of support to designated candidate.

Now finally, I've been surprised to learn this evening that the commission is considering potentially opening party primaries to non-party members. This proposed change would clearly violate party members associational rights under the state constitution to choose their own candidates.

I urge the commission to consider that the answer for self-identifying independent voters is not to allow them to vote in other parties' primaries, but rather to nominate independent candidates to appear on the general election ballot.

And note that those independent bodies that dominate candidates can become political parties and even as the -- as the result of litigation brought by the Independence Party to adopt party rules opening -- primaries.

	Page 133
1	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your
2	time. I apologize. Thank you. We're at time.
3	MR. RABB: Thank you. I just wanted to
4	finish the sentence.
5	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Thank you.
6	Before we continue, our ASL
7	interpreters are are normally staying till 8 p.m.,
8	but I want to know if anybody continues to need ASL
9	interpretation, in which case they will stay with.
10	But if not, we will relieve them at 8 p.m. Okay. I'm
11	not, I'm not seeing any all right. Thank you.
12	All right. So next is Rob Richie.
13	MR. RICHIE: Hey, hello. My name's Rob
L 4	Richie. I cofounded FairVote and led it for 31 years.
15	I'm now president of Expand Democracy, a nonprofit
16	seeking to catalyze conversation about pro-democracy
17	ideas. Thanks for this additional opportunity to
18	testify as a follow up to my in-person testimony a
19	couple weeks ago.
20	I will zero in on a few a key policy
21	choice if you propose an all candidate primary model.
22	Top two with a lower turnout primary followed by a
23	five month runoff, or a top four primary where the
24	larger, more diverse November electorate can choose a

more and more candidates with ranked choice voting.

As a starting point, RCV is making a powerful difference in your politics. Because of RCV, candidates are reaching out to far more voters and winning with far more votes than in the old choose one system.

Washington Post yesterday did a pro-RCV editorial with this excerpt: "This is how ranked choice voting is supposed to work. It's meant to encourage candidates to broaden their appeal and achieve consensus rather than going negative.

"It allows people to vote for their preferred candidate without worrying that they're voting for a spoiler. The absurdity about New York's approach to ranked choice voting is that the city uses it in primaries but not general elections. It should be used for both.

Given your city's investment to bring RCV to New York, I would embrace this suggestion, expand RCV to November rather than move away from it.

Let me now directly compare top two with top four. First, a more representative electorate when it matters. Under top two, nearly all candidates are eliminated in the primary, yet typically about half as many voters participate in that primary as in November, and are older, whiter,

and	wea	1	+h	i	er	
and	wea	_		_	$=$ \mathbf{r}	•

Top four would ensure that primaries would not eliminate serious candidates that more representative November voters may support. On voter choice, when only two candidates advance, voters have limited choice. Under top two, most races feature only a Democrat and a Republican, and usually are noncompetitive.

When a November race is competitive, it often means a narrower choice where only one major party has candidates and independents and third parties pretty much never advance a candidate in top two.

In contrast, top four would be a win-win for voter choice, more likely to have competition with more than one candidate from a district's majority party while still more often having candidates from major party -- from other major parties in representing independents and third parties.

Gaming the vote. Given how much easier it is for a district's majority party candidate to defeat a candidate not part of that party, you see blatant gaming in top two elections.

Last year, allies of front runner Adam

Page 136 1 Schiff in California's U.S. Senate race spent more than \$10,000,000 lifting up Republican Steve Garvey in 2 the primary, thereby successfully choosing his 3 4 opponent, who was then easy to defeat in November. 5 That kind of big money politics is common in top two 6 as more money is needed both for the primary and for 7 runoffs where negative ads are incentivized. Given such realities, it's no accident 8 9 that the two states were top two. California and 10 Washington have relatively few competitive elections 11 and their state legislatures are two of the four most polarized state legislatures in the country. 12 13 Yet after just two elections with top 14 four, Alaska has general elections that matter, 15 majority women house, and bipartisan coalitions 16 running both chambers and ways focused on getting 17 things done for voters. 18 Top four brings more voters in and I 19 believe it's likely that a top four campaign would allow for a broader reform coalition because New York 20 21 has the readiness -- okay. 22 MR. BUERY: Thank you. 23 MR. RICHIE: Thanks. 24 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your

time.

I apologize.

	Page 137
1	Are there any questions for Alexander
2	or Rob? No?
3	I want to thank you so much for your
4	testimony. Deeply appreciate it.
5	We will hear next from Natalia
6	Aristizabal and Billy.
7	MS. ARISTIZABAL: First of all, thank
8	you so much for the opportunity to testify. My name
9	is Natalia Aristizabal. I am here because you and
10	I'm with Make the Road New York and Make the Road
11	Action. We have an office in Staten Island.
12	I'm here because you're considering
13	implemented the so-called final four or top four
L 4	jungle primary system in New York City. At first
15	glance, the system where all candidates appear on a
16	single primary ballot at the top four advanced to a
17	ranked choice general election seems to improve the
18	top two primaries.
19	However, the evidence shows that the
20	final four suffer many of the same problems as
21	California top two, and in some cases, it introduced
22	new ones. I wanted to quickly take a look at Alaska.
23	In 2022, Alaska held its first election
24	using the final four system. Despite the claims that

it would increase participation, the Alaska Division

of Elections reported that primary voter turnout just -- was just 27.5 percent lower than Alaska's 2014 39 percent and 2018 35.5 percent midterm primaries under the old system.

Worse, it was the worst voter confusion was -- and a 2022 study by Alaska Survey Research found that only 48 percent of voters fully understood how the new voting system worked heading into that election, even after extensive public education efforts.

In diverse, multilingual, and highly density cities like New York, that kind of confusion could disenfranchise hundreds of thousands of voters, especially low income immigrant like myself and elderly communities. This potential for disenfranchisement should be cause for concern to all New Yorkers.

If we really -- the final four also risk amplifying the role of big money and name recognition. Name -- candidates must first campaign in wide open, nonpartisan fields, and then again in a ranked choice general election.

That means double the fundraising, double the advertisement, double the areas for grassroots and -- people of color candidates facing

a -- a structural disadvantage. Only those with deep pockets will be able to compete effectively.

If you want to increase voter turnout, focus on systems that have proven track records. Move local elections to align with state and federal elections, implement automatic voter registration, work to pass same date registration, and, more importantly, improve civic engagement across the city.

By focusing on these proven reforms, we can build a stronger and more inclusive democracy.

Why would we throw away to chase a trendy but unproven reform?

Final four is still an experiment. It has not been tested in any city remotely as large, diverse and complex as New York -- as New York, and it comes with real risks: voter confusions, suppressed turnout, and a greater advantage for wealthy and connected candidates. Why is this even being considered?

You must reject this final four jungle primary proposal and focus instead on strengthening the reforms New Yorkers have already voted and for a legislation that has already been passed. Strengthen reforms that are really delivering real democratic results. Thank you.

	Page 140
1	MR. BUERY: Thank you. If you can hold
2	in case there are questions.
3	Next up is Lloyd Feng. No Lloyd.
4	Okay, next up is Eric Bronner.
5	MR. BRONNER: Hello, good evening. Can
6	you hear me okay?
7	MR. BUERY: Yes.
8	MR. BRONNER: Great. Thank you so
9	much. Thank you for your time. Thank you for your
10	public service. My name is Eric Bronner. I'm a Naval
11	Academy graduate, and proud Navy veteran, and a
12	lifelong independent voter.
13	I'm also the founder and COO of
14	Veterans for All Voters. We're a national nonprofit
15	community of over 5,000 veterans and supporters from
16	across the political spectrum. We advocate for more
17	open and inclusive election systems. We've worked on
18	reform campaigns from Maine, to Alaska, to my hometown
19	and state of St. Louis, Missouri.
20	I'm here tonight to urge this
21	commission to refer a fully open and unified primary
22	system to New York City voters this November. You
23	have the chance to make a dramatic improvement in New
24	York City's democracy.
25	As one of 55 percent of post-9/11

veterans who identify as independent, I'm here on behalf of over 65,000 independent New York City veterans who have no voice in the primary elections their taxes pay for and which they fought to defend. The commission has the power to give these independent veterans a voice.

It's come to my attention that some of our opponents for more open and inclusive election systems talk about the potential to dilute minority votes. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, my experience here in St. Louis, Missouri, is just the opposite.

In 2020, I had the privilege of working on a citizen led reform campaign in St. Louis City to get rid of our antiquated partisan primary election system. We were addressing the problem of vote splitting, low turnout, and plurality winners.

Proposition D passed with 68 percent support in November of 2020.

We implemented a new open and unified primary system with approval voting and a top two runoff. This system delivered on its promises for a more diverse and representative government in St. Louis.

Under this unified primary system, we

	Page 142	
1	elected our first Black woman mayor of St. Louis, the	
2	first female president of the Board of Alderman, and	
3	we elected the first all female Board of Estimate and	
4	Apportionment.	
5	Party elites and power brokers love to	
6	to spread disingenuous fear about open primary	
7	election systems. This is a feeble attempt to protect	
8	their own power and control at the expense of millions	
9	of diverse independent voters who are locked out of	
10	closed primaries.	
11	There is no justification for treating	
12	independent voters like second class citizens	
13	anywhere, and especially not independent veterans who	
14	not only fought for this country, but fought for the	
15	system and the right to vote in their own democracy.	
16	So please keep us in mind when you make this	
17	recommendation for the November ballot. Thank you	
18	very much.	
19	MR. BUERY: Thank you both so much.	
20	Are there any questions for Natalia or	
21	Eric?	
22	You have a question?	
23	MR. DABARON: Real quickly. I was just	
24	trying to find out, are you still a resident of New	
25	York, please?	

	Page 143
1	MR. BRONNER: Is that is that for
2	me?
3	MR. DABARON: Yes, Eric.
4	MR. BRONNER: No, I'm I'm a resident
5	of St. Louis, Missouri, and I'm here on behalf of
6	Veterans for All Voters. We do have many members in
7	New York City, some of whom have testified in front of
8	this commission earlier.
9	MR. DABARON: Okay. So I thought the
10	numbers that you raised, I think it was 65K of New
11	York veteran voters was a important number to to
12	highlight. Thank you for your testimony.
13	MR. BRONNER: Thank you very much.
14	Thank You. Thanks for your time.
15	MR. BUERY: Eric, thank you so much for
16	your service to our nation. It's deeply appreciated.
17	Thank you and Natalia for your testimony. Grateful.
18	Next up, the final two panelists are
19	Robert Anglin and Mimi Mitchell.
20	MR. ANGLIN: Hi, can you guys hear me?
21	MS. SAVINO: Yep.
22	MR. ANGLIN: Okay, great. Good
23	evening, commissioners. My name is Rob Anglin. I'm
24	just an ordinary citizen. This is my first time
25	testifying, but I'm moved to do so because I'm opposed

D	. 111
rage	<u>. 144</u>

to the final four top four jungle primaries for our New York City local elections.

I want to focus on a popular claim often made in support of the system: that it leads to the election of more moderate, less polarized candidates. That claim is widely repeated, but not supported by the data.

Let's start with the theory. Under a top four or two -- or a top two system, all candidates appear on a single primary ballot regardless of party. And the top finishers advance to the general election, supposedly encouraging candidates to appeal to the middle. But in practice, this is not -- this has not happened.

In California, a state that I -- that I've once lived, it was -- you know, which implemented a top two primary system in 2010 with the same sort of theoretical goal. Multiple peer reviewed studies have found no evidence of increased moderation.

A landmark 2016 study by the political scientist Douglas Ahler, and was it Jack, I think, Citrin, and Gabriel Lenz concluded that California's top two primary has not had a substantial effect on the ideological positions of elected officials.

Likewise in 2020, a report by the

Page 145

Public Policy Institute of California found that legislators elected under the top two were no more moderate than their predecessors. And the system had done -- has done little to reduce party polarization in practice.

The same is true in Alaska where final four voting was introduced in 2022. While some point to Senator Lisa Murkowski's reelection is proof of moderation, the reality is that Murkowski is a long-term incumbent with enormous name recognition, a unique brand, and deep financial backing. Not the product of final four mechanics.

There's no consistent trend in Alaska showing that the election of more centrist candidates in either state legislative or congressional races, you know, has occurred. And one cycle of data in a state as politically and demographically distinct as Alaska should not be used to justify sweeping reform in New York City.

In fact, some research suggests that final four and top two systems may reduce ideological clarity for voters and lead to strategic gaming by well-funded candidates who can afford to court multiple blocks. This undermines transparency and makes it harder, not easier for voters to hold

	Page 146
1	officials accountable.
2	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. I
3	apologize. We're at time. We can hold a second in
4	case there are questions.
5	Next up is Mimi Mitchell. Okay, going
6	once. Going twice.
7	Are there any questions for Mr. Anglin?
8	Any questions for Mr. Anglin? No. All right.
9	Thank you so much, Mr. Anglin. Before
10	we thank you so much for your testimony. I
11	appreciate it.
12	Before we wrap, can I have a motion to
13	approve the minutes from our June 10th hearing? A
14	second? Any discussion? All in favor. Thank you so
15	much.
16	And now I just want to confirm that our
17	next hearing will be in Harlem on July 7th at 5 p.m.
18	at the Schomburg Center at 515 Malcolm X Boulevard.
19	I will now entertain a motion to
20	adjourn. A second? All in favor? Any opposed?
21	We are adjourned. Thank you so much.
22	(Whereupon, at 8:16 p.m., the
23	proceeding was concluded.)
24	
25	

Page 147

•	1		
_	ı	L	
•		_	

CERTIFICATE

I, LINDSEY DIEGO, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.



LINDSEY DIEGO
Notary Public in and for the
State of New York

Page 148

BRETT STREISAND

1		
1	•	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, BRETT STREISAND, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from the digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

M

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com [1 - 32,000] Page 1

1	124 5:25	2,800a 13:12	2024/25 23:23
1 19:2,4,5	127 6:3	2,800b 14:15	2025 1:8 23:24
1,000,000 32:23	127,000 28:16	2.5 26:9	75:4 127:25
34:5 41:22	13 42:20	20 27:22 33:22	21 56:10
56:25 57:3	122:10	34:1 38:9 46:3	21st 127:2
82:21 105:23	130 6:4	47:1,10 49:20	22 96:10
107:18 128:11	132,000 28:16	72:20 92:16,22	23 1:8 5:5
1,300 38:24	133 6:5	128:21	128:1
1.1 35:19 41:9	137 6:6	2000s 77:16	24 19:2,5
44:1 48:3	14 23:24 117:3	2002 39:19	24th 102:2
52:19 55:15	140 6:7	2003 39:21	25 14:6 24:8
120:18	143 6:8	51:5	29:13
1.5 65:14	150 26:4 77:24	2008 110:1	250 20:15
10,000,000	80:14	2010 28:12	25538 147:18
136:2	16,000 56:13	144:17	27 42:20 49:17
100 21:3 24:14	17 116:4	2012 109:7	49:25
27:16 122:13	175 20:17	2014 60:9	27.5 138:2
1000 1:14	19 5:4	109:9 138:2	29 5:6
101 5:17	1911 131:10	2016 144:20	3
102 97:5	1950s 125:8	2018 24:6	3 18:2 19:1
10301 1:15	1960s 125:8	138:3	39:22 77:4
104 5:18	1963 79:8	2019 102:11	115:7
108 5:19	1970 28:12	121:15	3,000 28:17
10th 146:13	1973 131:20	2020 24:2	3.5 79:3
11 5:3 11:23	1976 32:20	141:13,19	30 92:23 106:3
16:17	1981 120:1	144:25	30,000 30:3
111 5:20	1994 30:6	2021 40:2	30686 148:14
115 5:21	2	122:9	31 122:10
116 5:22	2 3:22 18:3	2022 110:4	125:2 133:14
119 5:23	19:4 27:5	137:23 138:6	31,000 82:24
12 8:11 18:20	111:23 112:4	145:7	32 5:7
121 5:24	2,000 94:12	2023 24:2,5	32,000 82:25
		2024 24:6	83:13

[33 - acknowledging]

33 40:1,17	56 5:10	83 5:16	academic 55:20
340,000 105:1	58 5:11	85 41:1	academics
35 129:3	5:27 1:9	87,000 28:15	52:25
35.5 138:3	6	8:16 146:22	academy
38,000 24:9	6 18:20	9	140:11
39 5:8 138:3	60 14:1 25:18	9 78:25	accelerate
4	27:5 43:6	9/11 140:25	101:14
4 77:4	112:18	90 112:18	access 70:16
4,000,000 47:18	64 5:12 79:10	98,000 28:17	87:24 88:3,5
40 24:5 28:12	64,000 82:22	a	100:15 120:9
28:15 76:21	65 79:1		125:12 127:17
40,000 56:12	65,000 141:2	abandoning 123:16	132:5
42 5:9	65k 143:10		accessible
43 33:5	68 141:18	ability 36:1 65:10 108:3	25:17 75:5
47 119:20	69 5:13 13:18	147:10 148:7	accident 136:8
48 138:7	7	able 7:6 22:6	accommodate
5	7 14:10 43:12	28:2 33:1	53:10 54:7
5 14:10 26:4	43:12	46:13 52:20	accompany 71:5
92:24 146:17	70 13:11 14:15	70:2 78:16	
5,000 94:12	31:3 44:23	80:2 84:14,14	accountability 14:20 15:22
140:15	72 5:14	94:1 96:25	accountable
50 13:19 14:6	7363246 1:22	97:3 103:15	101:7 146:1
18:7 38:4	74 121:14	105:17 115:6	accounts 26:9
49:24 116:10	76 5:15	120:23 128:4	accumulated
117:13 126:21	7th 146:17	139:2	117:13
129:4	8	abolish 34:24	accurate 147:9
51 23:4	8 4:4 10:4	absence 43:13	148:5
515 146:18	117:1,2 133:7	absolutely	achieve 44:14
52 122:11	133:10	42:11 77:21	134:10
53 48:21	80 44:23	99:15 100:14	achieving 43:4
55 127:10	800,000 82:21	100:22	acknowledging
140:25	000,000 02.21	absurdity	64:22
		134:13	

acquire 22:6	109:10,14,17	adequate 65:11	advances 57:19
act 72:2,3	111:9 112:21	120:15	advancing 64:8
93:12 96:25	121:7 131:2	adjourn 146:20	advantage
action 3:4,12	adam 135:25	adjourned	15:21 101:11
56:9 61:1 65:3	adams's 71:5	146:21	139:17
65:14,19 66:16	add 66:24 67:3	administering	advertisement
68:5 76:17	added 86:4	22:19	138:24
114:11,13	129:16	administration	advise 112:5
137:11 147:12	addicted 95:2	24:17 78:5	advisor 3:10,16
147:16 148:8	adding 67:8	83:16	72:13 101:5
148:12	114:4	administratio	advisory 18:12
actions 20:9	addition 65:5	24:20	18:17 20:4
21:11,12,14	85:3 117:21	administrative	advocate 52:15
22:1,17 66:12	119:25	21:13 22:16	69:14 70:7
68:13 97:9	additional	administrator	98:8 101:6
activate 54:14	22:24 54:8	114:4,7	110:20 126:7
active 52:5	88:18 114:4	admirable 43:2	140:16
actively 105:9	133:17	adopt 17:13,14	advocates 25:8
activist 120:1	additionally	132:24	59:8
125:5 127:13	13:24 112:24	adopted 105:6	affect 35:25
127:14	address 10:23	121:14	affecting 57:24
activists 125:3	23:14 25:19	adopting 57:8	affiliate 57:11
actual 32:12	33:11 40:12	127:2	affiliated 34:2
42:25 90:16	54:11 56:17	adoption	affiliation
actually 9:21	64:20 68:2	102:11	57:11 88:17
11:19 39:23,24	70:19 81:21	ads 136:7	120:12
40:8 42:15,21	88:3,5 107:11	advance 41:21	affiliations
42:23 43:11	addresses	95:8 103:4	15:2
45:5,15 49:5	39:24 48:24	104:19 122:15	afford 70:2,3
49:11,14 51:19	67:22	135:5,12	145:23
52:2 63:16	addressing	144:11	affordability
73:6 87:20	85:12 141:16	advanced	118:6,22
88:2 91:14	adelphi 91:18	137:16	affordable 21:3
96:5 98:4			23:17 27:23

	T	I	I
29:7,16 66:14	alaska 110:2	120:20 123:19	125:23
66:22 118:8,11	123:2 136:14	123:22 129:7	ami 118:16
125:11	137:22,23,25	132:18 136:20	amount 52:4
african 107:10	138:6 140:18	allowances	86:24 87:4,11
107:12	145:6,13,18	25:21	89:3
age 106:3	alaska's 124:4	allowed 21:5	amounts 25:20
agencies 15:14	138:2	82:24	amplifying
68:15 72:19	albanese 3:3	allowing 34:1	138:19
74:9 75:11,16	5:10 56:3,3,5,7	57:18 64:19	amused 77:22
98:9	albany 3:16	109:2 130:23	analysis 85:9
agency 25:15	42:14 51:10	allows 25:3	analyzed 21:9
65:5 68:8,9,9	72:2 100:17	126:8 130:25	andrew 34:15
agenda 54:1,3	101:6,20,23	134:11	59:6
ago 23:10	alderman	alluding 58:25	anglin 4:19 6:8
27:22 29:13	142:2	alterations	143:19,20,22
31:2 46:17	alec 76:12	24:4	143:23 146:7,8
72:20 73:12	alex 4:11	alternative	146:9
78:23 117:15	alexander	22:23 58:18	angry 35:15
127:11,18	129:24,25	amazing 25:20	anita 2:6 8:15
128:21 133:19	137:1	73:20	88:23 98:6
agree 7:14	align 67:6	ameliorate	announced
16:23 52:15	139:5	43:17	23:10
75:16 99:7	aligned 33:6	amend 12:4	announcement
114:8,8	aligning 66:15	25:22	112:23
agreeable	aligns 65:23	amended 13:12	annual 24:6
130:24	alleviate 70:13	13:24	anonymous
agreements	alliances 102:6	amending	50:17
21:17,22	allies 121:24	14:15	answer 27:10
ahead 28:10	135:25	amendments	45:2 74:12
35:10	allocation 18:5	23:12	95:17 103:23
ahler 144:21	allow 13:13	america 58:17	111:11 124:7
aid 97:21	21:20 23:14	115:23	132:17
aim 62:20	47:17 52:20	american	antiquated
	107:25 110:20	107:10,12	68:9 141:15

anybody 133:8	appointees	approval 26:5	article 122:18
apartment 70:2	15:14	71:21 114:13	articulated
apologize 26:7	appointment	141:21	33:21
83:23 112:20	12:5,14 15:17	approvals	asian 48:23
114:15 115:16	117:15	22:12 71:3	aside 50:21
119:4 129:10	appointments	73:2 83:3	asked 31:3
133:2 136:25	12:17 13:1,15	approve 101:19	40:11 41:7
146:3	17:16 18:8	146:13	95:22 123:14
appeal 128:16	apportionment	approves 71:25	128:2
134:9 144:12	142:4	approximately	asking 16:5
appeals 20:5	appreciate 7:24	43:12	84:18 91:9
131:4,11,17,21	19:11 29:19	arbitrary	asl 133:6,8
132:4	55:23 64:10	131:13	aspect 21:10
appear 130:3	68:23 75:24	architectural	aspects 75:16
130:15 131:8	83:18,23 95:12	73:7	112:11
132:20 137:15	98:14,17	archival 11:6	assertion 23:17
144:10	100:23 114:23	area 66:10	assess 49:10
appearing	119:9,18	67:11 72:16	assistant 3:6
130:10	122:16 124:18	areas 21:3,15	58:15
appendix	129:23 137:4	118:13 138:24	associate
123:25	146:11	arguably 75:4	120:23
applaud 58:7	appreciated	75:6	associated 65:8
application	143:16	argue 24:24	65:13
26:14	appreciative	28:25 87:21	associates
applications	115:3	argument	79:23
21:7	approach	26:13 35:18	association
apply 22:21	14:19 106:11	63:20	3:13 76:18
appoint 14:9	134:14	arguments	associational
14:22 115:6	approached	33:20	132:14
116:11	123:6	aristizabal 4:15	assume 11:24
appointed 8:5	appropriate	6:6 137:6,7,9	17:13
13:20,21 14:1	24:24 42:12	arizona 115:19	assumption
14:4,14	appropriately	arrangement	86:3
	99:9	43:10	

	I		
attacking	available 11:5	130:16 132:3,5	beg 120:10
123:12	24:18 29:15	132:7,20	began 32:20
attempt 109:23	average 103:9	137:16 142:17	beginning
142:7	averaged 103:6	144:10	45:25 52:12
attend 10:20	awareness 75:9	ballots 105:10	behalf 11:23
11:3 12:9	b	bank 81:2	12:2 69:15
attendance	baby 72:19	bar 66:1	111:24 112:3
115:13	back 11:20	barely 122:12	116:25 130:3
attendees 2:2	44:22 46:23	barrier 70:6	141:2 143:5
3:2 4:2	55:25 83:19,23	barriers 66:18	behavior 105:7
attention 11:20	131:10	121:25 122:1,2	belief 16:1
15:8 46:16	backbone	barton 3:6 5:11	belies 26:13
71:17 130:5	105:16	56:3,4 58:12	believe 8:12
141:7	backing 145:11	58:13,15 61:7	12:12 18:4
attest 11:17	bad 38:3 69:21	61:14,18 62:7	31:18,19 49:11
attorney 93:13	balance 15:14	62:22 64:11	56:17 68:4,10
147:14 148:10		109:16	68:17 102:7
audio 147:8	45:10,12 62:20	base 45:18 46:9	120:15 121:16
148:3	95:13 118:25	46:12 123:10	136:19
august 99:1,2	balanced 15:15	based 18:15	belong 37:18
authorities	15:16	20:13,25 44:7	51:13 129:5
103:17	balances 15:18	59:3 64:2 97:8	belonged
authority 12:5	balancing 89:9	101:7 118:17	125:15
12:22 13:14	ballot 17:14	basement 77:1	beneficial
14:12,22 15:16	40:3 43:13	77:23	113:6,9
authorized	45:15 46:2,25	bases 102:1	benefit 21:1,6
14:9	53:23 84:17	basic 101:23	85:12 112:25
authors 60:5	86:1,5 87:24	basically 51:25	benefits 104:18
automatic	88:2,5 92:11	59:18	109:1
44:10 101:14	94:6 100:4	basis 89:25	bespoke 68:9
139:6	101:19 103:8	beautiful 8:1,1	best 7:19 10:6
automatically	103:11,12	8:1	11:18 31:12
126:5	104:21 105:21	becoming	67:16 76:10
	120:3 128:22	125:4	84:1,5,7 92:12

[best - bronner] Page 7

107:4 109:5	blocks 145:24	boils 91:14	bound 8:6,8
124:3 130:19	blood 116:5	bonilla 8:14	box 78:14
147:10 148:6	blue 59:15	books 77:3,20	boxed 63:21
better 20:19	62:12 63:12	77:21,23 87:20	bozorg 2:4 8:14
57:9 58:8	123:2	booth 40:13	49:3
69:16 98:2	board 3:22 4:4	born 72:17	bp 20:3
112:16 122:23	12:6,16 13:19	76:20 108:18	brand 79:9
beyond 44:3	14:6,13 16:25	125:1	145:11
49:25 66:24	17:15 18:2,3,8	borne 28:13,21	bravo 24:17
big 92:3 105:17	19:1,4,4 20:3,5	borough 7:21	break 76:9
112:22 125:9	25:24,25 90:21	12:18,19,20	105:17
128:7 136:5	111:23,24	13:20 14:3,12	breaking 24:18
138:19	112:4,13 113:1	15:1,16 17:1	brett 148:2,15
biggest 37:8	113:3 114:12	18:14 25:25,25	bring 15:7
63:16	114:12 115:7,7	26:11 28:13	80:14 96:18
billy 137:6	115:12,14	67:13 70:24	98:10,20
binding 12:5	116:25 117:2,4	73:10 113:1,2	134:17
13:14 14:12	118:14 142:2,3	113:14 114:12	bringing 44:15
18:2,13,17	board's 14:8	114:12 117:6	65:13 89:18
bini 115:23	boards 8:18,22	borough's	brings 25:14
bipartisan	12:12 13:7,15	73:10	136:18
47:23 59:4	14:21,24 15:9	boroughs 16:9	britt 131:16
136:15	15:16 16:3	26:12 73:9	broad 7:18
bit 16:21,21	17:16 19:6	74:8,11 119:20	20:18 44:7
109:17	97:20 113:15	125:16	102:1,5
black 48:22	116:11 117:2,6	borrow 82:21	broaden 134:9
84:24 87:6,9	boatright 59:5	boss 19:10	broader 44:15
87:11 93:14	bob 3:12 69:1	bother 80:6	46:9 136:20
107:10,12	75:25 79:17	bought 78:20	broadest 128:8
108:2 126:18	83:5	79:8,9,9 82:20	broken 66:21
126:19 142:1	bodies 107:2	boulevard	69:22
blatant 135:24	132:21	146:18	brokers 142:5
block 63:18	body 70:23	bounced 69:25	bronner 4:17
65:24	103:14		6:7 140:4,5,8

140:10 143:1,4	81:10,12 83:17	buildings 24:14	california's
143:13	84:2 86:14	24:15 27:16	136:1 144:22
bronx 24:13	88:23 94:17	67:21 82:12	call 9:16 29:21
28:17,23 40:6	95:3 98:13	117:18	40:9 115:11
70:11 117:1	99:7,15 100:5	built 23:20	callahan
118:12	100:18,22	27:14,25 33:11	131:11
brooklyn 24:12	101:1 103:25	70:7,9 80:10	called 124:24
27:16 28:16	104:5 107:5	burden 28:14	128:12 137:13
38:15,21 76:19	104.5 107.5	bus 94:13	calls 40:7 42:2
80:13 97:2	111:12,18	business 78:2,8	camera 111:21
brooklynite	114:15,19,21	78:18 83:15	112:1
72:18	116:14,20,22	buy 27:22	campaign 38:5
brought 11:20	119:3,14 121:8	80:21 82:9	39:22 42:2
71:19 80:8	124:8,14,16	85:19	105:7 123:9
131:11 132:23	127:4 129:9,22	c	136:19 138:20
brown 87:6,11	133:1,5 136:22		141:14
budget 2:16	136:24 140:1,7	c 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	campaigning
17:6 19:23	142:19 143:15	6:1 7:1	122:6
22:11	146:2	calculation	campaigns
buery 1:7 2:3	build 23:16	18:19	40:7 86:20
7:2,6 16:11,14	44:21 46:12,13	calculations	105:10 140:18
19:8,11 26:6	49:14 69:22	122:4	campion 2:15
26:21,23 29:18	80:22 85:19	calendar	5:4 19:14,18
33:15 35:10	88:7 96:4	106:16	19:20,22 28:10
38:19 39:1,8	139:10	california 30:7	campo 3:10
41:25 45:1	builder 79:22	30:7,11 31:14	5:14 68:25
49:1 53:1	builders 76:19	32:1 39:13	72:10,13 74:21
55:14,18,22	80:5	47:17 50:11	74:24
58:10 61:4	building 1:14	60:15,16 61:7	cancel 103:19
62:4 64:9,12	3:12 24:16	63:12 109:7,22 123:3 136:9	canceled 70:12
68:20 69:3,6,9	27:5,7,16	137:21 144:15	cancer 115:20
69:11 72:9	67:23,23 76:17		candidate 23:4
74:14,18 75:22	76:21 79:23	145:1	40:9 58:22
76:6 79:14	82:18 117:20		59:10 60:10,22

63:10 109:20	care 79:6 126:7	96:6 138:16	chairperson
126:2 131:2,3	career 96:10	causes 68:12	2:3 115:17,20
131:23 132:3,9	119:23	75:20 85:12	challenge 86:2
133:21 134:12	careful 98:14	causing 43:20	95:12
135:12,16,22	carl 2:11	celia 3:24	challenges 68:1
135:23	115:23	114:24	chambers
candidates	caroline 59:6	center 1:13	136:16
33:3 36:22	carr 18:1,20	59:4 115:20,22	chance 9:24
62:11,17 87:23	19:2,5	146:18	41:21 105:25
88:2,14 98:3	carry 13:9	center's 47:23	129:7 140:23
102:1,5,8	case 40:21 71:4	centers 90:12	change 15:10
103:7,10,11,21	104:1 111:14	94:8 115:18	31:10,24 32:10
105:17 109:3	120:11 131:11	central 74:25	47:25 71:21,24
109:18 122:5	133:9 140:2	centralization	85:24 98:1
123:9,13	146:4	118:7	105:7 109:12
126:13,20	cases 13:5 59:1	centralized	110:2 111:8
128:9,15 130:8	70:15 109:20	15:2 75:3	116:9 132:13
130:15,15,21	137:21	centrist 145:14	changed 47:20
130:25 131:8	casey 76:12	century 127:2	128:3
131:15,18	cash 29:10	certain 22:4	changes 7:12
132:15,19,22	cast 40:3 131:1	52:4 79:25	7:15,15 22:2
133:25 134:3,9	catalyze 133:16	certainly 46:17	22:13 30:7
134:23 135:3,5	catch 28:23	53:11 55:13	56:16 58:3
135:11,18	71:8	85:4 100:19	67:11 75:17
137:15 138:20	categorically	certificate	78:17 101:10
138:25 139:18	113:6,8	147:1 148:1	103:18 113:13
144:6,9,12	categorize	certify 147:4	changing 31:9
145:14,23	22:23	148:2	33:13
candor 16:22	cathy 2:21	cetera 87:5	chapter 13:11
cantonese	cause 2:23 17:5	chair 3:22 4:3	13:18 14:15
51:24	37:6 38:1 42:6	7:7 8:13 90:20	chapters 56:11
canvassing	42:14 50:15,24	111:23 117:1	charge 73:10
36:7	55:7 78:5	chairman	charles 4:3
	81:18 88:10	116:24 117:2	114:25 116:16

[charles - city] Page 10

11604	40 15 51 21	04.05.05.0.14	75 14 15 76 10
116:24	49:15 51:21	24:25 25:3,14	75:14,15 76:13
charter 1:2 7:5	61:8,10,14	25:18 42:13	76:18 77:1,21
7:12,16 8:17	91:7 101:11,22	104:9 106:10	78:2,6,6,7,11
10:10,19,24	101:25 102:3	131:12 142:12	79:12 81:4,19
12:4,15 13:12	102:11 105:5	citrin 144:22	82:11 83:9,14
14:16 19:24	105:10,13	city 1:2 2:14	84:24 85:14
23:11 26:18	110:3 120:8	3:13 7:5,9	89:20 90:15
31:19,23 37:9	121:13 122:8	11:21 12:4,5	93:1,15 94:11
39:19 44:22	122:20,24	12:15 13:12	95:19 97:12,19
45:14 57:25	123:4,13,16	14:15 15:14	97:23 98:9
64:23 69:19	124:1,5 131:24	16:4 20:13	101:10,12,17
71:24 72:6	133:21,25	21:3,17 22:5	101:19 102:17
81:17,24 84:10	134:8,14 135:5	22:17,18 23:4	102:24 103:6
92:17,18 94:21	135:6,10,15	23:23,25 24:19	103:17,19
94:25 107:2	137:17 138:22	24:22 26:3,10	106:3,18,19
116:8 122:17	choices 100:10	26:13 28:14,20	108:17 112:10
chartertestim	choose 33:2	28:24 30:6	113:12,14,15
10:24	35:8 36:4 94:2	31:7 35:19,25	113:19,20
chase 139:11	125:24 132:15	38:5,11,22,22	114:10 117:6
chat 10:13	133:24 134:4	38:24 40:1,5	117:16,19
checks 15:18	choosing	40:17 41:11,18	118:4 119:1
chelsea 32:19	107:22 136:3	42:13 44:18	120:14 121:14
cherry 4:8 5:25	christian 60:1	48:14,22 50:1	121:15,24
119:12 124:19	circle 28:3	51:10 53:11	122:9,15,19,20
124:21,22	circulating	56:14 57:6,10	123:11,20
129:11,18	31:22	57:23 65:2	125:1,17
chicago 85:14	cities 41:2,3	66:5,11,15,22	126:21 127:2
124:24 125:25	54:25 122:11	67:16,20 68:11	127:25 128:11
126:19	122:13 123:4	69:16,18,25	128:22 129:8
chicago's	138:12	70:24,25 71:2	132:1 134:14
126:22	citizen 141:14	71:12 72:11,23	137:14 139:8
children 87:7	143:24	72:25 73:5,11	139:14 140:22
choice 40:16	citizens 2:16	73:19 74:1,9	141:2,14 143:7
46:14 47:6	3:18 19:23	74:25 75:11,14	144:2 145:19

oityla 7.10 9.7	117.4 25 110.2	aallahawatira	55.25 100.11
city's 7:10 8:7	117:4,25 118:2	collaborative	55:25 100:11
22:11 23:15	128:6	124:25	108:10
24:7 65:10,23	clearly 128:25	collaboratively	commend 41:5
68:3,8 69:21	132:13	60:21	48:11 54:13
86:7 102:11	click 10:11,12	colleague 60:7	89:18
103:16 106:15	10:12	colleagues	comment 71:10
134:17 140:24	cliff 2:17 19:14	11:23	comments 73:1
citycharter.n	19:15 23:4	collection 73:6	77:7 108:24
10:24	26:25 29:1	college 30:4	commission 1:2
citycharter.n	close 123:6	31:1 127:11	2:5,6,7,9,10,11
10:25	closed 55:3	color 48:20	2:12,13,16 7:5
citywide 12:19	56:21,22 78:22	55:4 90:16	7:7 8:5 12:4
24:5,16 85:2	93:21 105:23	93:15 138:25	16:5 19:23
105:2	111:4 126:25	colorado's	20:1,13 22:18
civic 12:9 86:8	128:14 142:10	47:25	22:25 23:11
88:21 94:15	club 35:16,23	combination	26:18 33:10
96:20 97:18	35:24,24 36:2	61:9	37:9 39:20
98:10 139:8	36:5,5	combining 20:3	41:5,19 44:22
civically 97:23	clubs 36:6	come 9:13	48:7,9 53:22
104:11	coalition	29:25 30:23	58:7,25 64:5
civics 87:17	136:20	32:9 44:21	64:23 67:19
civil 78:12 79:4	coalitions	46:23 48:10	68:2,17 69:19
125:7	126:9 129:19	50:1,4 51:9	78:6 81:16
claim 47:13	130:24 136:15	75:12 83:2,22	84:10,15 85:4
74:1 144:3,6	coasters 75:18	89:22 90:14	89:19 92:17
claims 137:24	coauthored	91:9 96:14	94:22 95:1,5
clarify 33:17,18	122:18	98:12 100:11	96:1 105:21
62:7 94:19	code 117:20,21	123:6 128:18	113:23 114:9
clarity 145:22	codified 113:19	141:7	114:10 115:2
class 142:12	cofounded	comes 19:1	120:1 132:11
clear 54:6	133:14	75:19 86:21	132:16 140:21
66:13 69:14	cofounder	139:16	141:5 143:8
92:14 99:17	124:24	coming 8:25	commission's
101:12 103:3		19:15 32:4	9:1 112:5

	101011100		
commissioner	12:12,16 13:2	compelling	comptroller
11:17 56:1	13:7,15,17,18	79:10	28:23
61:5 117:18	13:23 14:6,13	compete 65:10	comptroller's
commissioners	14:21 15:5,9	139:2	23:22 24:10
7:17 8:12 9:19	17:15,16,21	competing 59:9	computer
26:24 104:6	18:2,3,4,8 19:1	90:10	25:16 77:17
116:24 130:2	19:3,4 20:3	competition	concept 42:9
143:23	25:3,5,19,24	43:14 59:11	44:3,16 49:18
commissions	27:20 29:8,10	135:16	51:3
45:14 92:19	44:4 47:7	competitive	concern 13:3
107:2	48:13 85:2,5,7	59:10 104:14	35:13 54:23
committed 7:18	85:9 89:25	135:9 136:10	71:20 95:16,18
committee 3:4	90:21 91:14	competitiven	107:10 126:17
4:3 16:2 56:9	92:8 93:3,17	59:20	138:16
115:24 116:12	94:9 97:20	complete 16:7	concerned
117:2	98:21 111:23	81:4	25:14 44:6,11
committees	112:3,13,13,15	completed 9:20	45:24 46:8
61:1	113:1,3,15,16	completely	50:15 52:18
common 2:23	114:5,12 115:5	53:8 112:6	126:16
37:6 42:6,14	115:7,7,14,14	121:1	concerning
50:24 55:7	116:6,7,11,13	completion	91:23
60:16 122:7	116:25 117:6	67:1	concerns 25:19
136:5	117:12 124:23	complex	107:11
communities	140:15	139:15	concessions
12:9,25 14:21	community's	complicated	21:20
15:11 16:2	26:1	42:10	concluded
32:18 46:21	companion	composition	144:22 146:23
48:20 49:25	42:8	15:8	concurrent
55:4 118:14,14	company 72:15	comprehensive	83:11 112:25
125:13,17	compare	113:24	concurrently
126:18 138:15	134:20	comprised	82:6
community	compared	56:10	conditions
3:22 4:3 7:22	122:12	compromise	22:19
8:18,22 12:6		102:12	

conducted	consensus	consistent	continues 65:9
127:23	42:11,19 44:21	59:25 145:13	133:8
conducting	44:23 46:24	consisting	contracted
107:3	49:5,11,14	70:23	120:6
confer 112:8	134:10	constituents	contracting
conference	consents 21:17	12:10 13:8	68:2
3:15 84:9	21:20,21	constitution	contrary 88:10
configure	consequence	120:25 130:7	contrast 15:3
53:21	42:23	131:5 132:1,15	135:14
confirm 146:16	consequences	constitutional	contributing
confirmed	97:8	131:22	71:7
103:17	consequential	constraints	contributions
confusion	59:2 105:25	66:23	12:20
138:5,12	108:4	construction	control 142:8
confusions	conservatives	24:16,23 56:12	convenient
139:16	16:10 126:12	83:2	118:6
congratulations	consider 8:23	consultants	convention
108:7	41:7 53:19	65:18	36:20
congress 2:19	54:4 68:18	cont'd 3:1 4:1	conversation
30:2 110:7	70:3 71:1 92:4	6:1	40:10 87:18
congressional	107:15 132:16	contends 43:10	89:20 90:11
145:15	consideration	contest 39:4	96:5 98:18
connected	7:13 16:6 26:2	55:21 103:20	99:9 133:16
139:18	45:21 104:20	contests 104:15	conversations
connection	considered	context 85:17	58:20 90:1,12
12:13	25:24 39:20	continue 11:1	92:25
connectivity	45:13 139:19	20:11 25:22	coo 4:17 140:13
8:15 39:17	considering	42:4 53:5 66:9	cool 73:23
76:24 80:12	8:21 20:2	70:2 73:18	coordinate
consecutive	24:22 64:6	95:21 98:8	110:9
83:3	71:12 105:21	133:6	coordination
consecutively	132:11 137:12	continued	12:19
82:6,13	consist 13:19	97:22	cop 78:23

corner 73:14	council's 22:9	61:22 94:23	cross 17:16
corporation	councilman	112:9	102:5 105:10
117:17	11:13 16:12	court 131:4,11	130:15
correct 61:17	18:20,20 23:5	131:17,21	crosson 60:2
	councilmember	131.17,21	
68:1,18 80:7			crossover
124:12	11:12	covers 14:8	18:22
correctly 66:10	councilmemb	crazy 72:20	crucial 57:21
67:12	13:9	99:4	cultural 1:13
cost 21:8 23:18	councils 122:12	crc 21:13 70:20	cuny 30:3,15
65:8,13,18	councilwoman	71:1,11,19	31:3
66:2,5 83:2	18:21	crc's 66:6 67:5	cuomo 34:16
costly 65:4	counsel 4:11	create 29:6	117:14
102:15	118:1 130:4	33:12 66:22	curious 16:16
costs 67:8	147:11,14	120:18 126:9	49:4,10
could've 78:1	148:7,10	created 13:17	current 12:15
council 2:14	counseling	36:6 126:14	18:4 24:17
11:21 12:2,5,8	115:18,22	creates 12:21	25:10 26:19
12:15 13:14,21	count 99:1,2	32:16	33:11 56:16,18
13:22 14:4,7	130:21	creation 65:25	56:21 70:22
14:11,20 15:2	counterintuiti	67:22 113:10	currently 10:21
15:15,17 17:17	34:4	crime 93:24	15:10 20:14
17:21,25 18:1	counterintuiti	crisis 7:11	21:5 24:23
18:7 22:18	63:14	23:15 41:8	25:6 33:22,24
23:5 26:3	country 41:2	70:14	33:25 57:25
38:22,22,24	48:14 55:1	crisscrossing	105:24 107:19
40:5,15 70:9	136:12 142:14	89:20	115:21
70:24,25 71:2	county 38:15	critical 22:3	cut 62:25 103:9
93:1 113:12,14	117:1	41:17 66:19	cutting 83:12
113:15,19,20	couple 9:11	78:18	cycle 14:7
113:22 115:5	11:20 133:19	critically 66:3	106:16,17
116:10 117:6	coupling	67:7	145:16
117:12 122:9	100:15	critics 104:24	cycles 38:24
122:11 126:22	course 11:3	105:6	cynthia 4:6
	54:8 60:15		119:10 121:9

121:21	days 14:2 25:18	declaring	delayed 70:16
d	26:4 78:23	126:25	101:14
d 7:1 64:7	112:18	decline 118:3,4	delays 68:12
141:18	de 3:22 5:20	declined	75:20
dabaron 2:5	108:9 111:15	109:17	deliberate
	111:17,20,22	decreases	99:25
8:15 56:1	114:17,20	43:11	deliberately
74:17,20,23 81:14 86:16	deadline 86:1	decreasing	41:9
	deal 52:2 95:7	128:7	delivered
87:3 107:9	dealt 51:4	dedicating 58:8	141:22
129:15 142:23	debate 32:12	deep 85:2,7	delivering
143:3,9 dad 78:20 79:3	58:23 103:15	139:1 145:11	139:24
79:8	debated 57:25	deeply 7:6,17	demands 84:21
dad's 78:22	deborah 4:10	12:24 68:23	democracy
data 31:20	124:20 127:6,7	119:9 124:18	4:13 93:25
59:24 60:9,14	127:10 129:12	137:4 143:16	94:3 104:17
61:2 85:10	debt 82:21	defeat 135:23	106:24 127:17
92:4 107:18	decade 109:15	136:4	133:15,16
121:25 144:7	decades 40:2	defend 141:4	139:10 140:24
145:16	45:20 104:15	defensible 74:4	142:15
date 69:20	105:15 117:15	deference 70:6	democrat 23:5
89:21 139:7	119:1 129:2	113:18,18	34:10,14 35:7
david 4:8	decide 93:22	define 21:18,19	35:15 38:25
119:12 124:19	decided 63:6	defined 24:25	110:7 135:7
124:22 129:11	114:6	113:7	democratic
	decipher 25:19	definitely 95:11	12:13 14:23
129:18 davinci 115:24	decision 12:17	98:13	36:11,23 62:11
day 12:9 42:21	38:10 44:25	definition	85:19 102:4
	45:4 46:9	114:5	106:14 127:19
42:21 46:21,21	92:14	degrades	128:4,12
50:22,22 79:11	decisions 35:25	128:20	139:24
84:5,6,7 96:12	110:19 113:11	degrees 97:5	democratically
102:2 104:13	decisive 123:18	delay 71:23	113:12

democrats	deserve 16:2	19:22 21:2	digitize 73:20
35:14 63:19	deserves 85:25	23:14 25:9	digitized 75:6,6
88:9 128:2	design 54:1	28:4,5,21 66:7	dilute 141:9
demographic	designated	67:4 117:17	diminish 22:8
145:17	132:2,8	developmental	112:19 113:16
demolitions	desire 43:1	32:17	diminished
24:4	despite 137:24	diane 2:10,20	107:13
denied 12:25	detailed 44:13	19:17 29:22	diminution
70:17	details 50:8	32:15 39:18	117:5
denominator	detectable	76:12,22 79:2	dinapoli's
47:19	109:25	diego 1:21	23:21
density 20:16	determine	147:2,19	direct 12:13
20:17 138:12	41:10 56:22	difference	14:23 112:8
denver 3:21	98:24	40:14 85:6	130:5
43:19 108:17	determined	134:2	direction 34:12
department	100:1	different 30:1	38:17 58:1
67:20,20,21	determining	33:20 46:23	directly 12:10
73:19 82:12	25:4 118:16	49:7,7,9 51:6	14:9,20 52:3
83:4 112:10	deterrent 65:20	70:1 73:9 74:8	112:8 134:20
department's	detest 125:18	74:9,11 75:11	director 2:15
26:14	detrimental	75:15,16 85:16	2:20,21,23 3:3
depend 45:5	56:18	88:9 96:17	3:18 4:6,15
depending	devane 131:20	102:23 117:23	19:22 32:15
18:22 32:5	131:25	130:23	42:6 56:8
34:9	develop 65:2	differently	104:8 121:22
depress 34:5	developer	123:10	122:19
depresses 32:8	25:11 68:14	difficult 74:10	disadvantage
34:7 128:19	80:12 81:1	113:4	139:1
deputy 4:15	117:12	difficulties 73:1	disaffected
describe 61:2	developers	diffused 26:1	34:10 35:15
described 62:8	25:21 66:21	digital 147:8	disaffection
81:25	112:8 118:1	148:3	39:6
description	development	digitally 75:5	disagree 45:18
79:18	2:16 16:4		45:19 113:17

disconnect	disparate 67:14	138:11 139:15	doors 93:21
12:21 54:24	dispositions	141:23 142:9	dot 83:4
discussion 31:9	71:3	diversify 14:25	double 105:2
42:24,24 44:5	disproportion	diversity 57:6	138:23,24,24
44:7,14 45:25	106:2	57:23	doubt 27:21
46:10 85:25	disprove	divided 17:25	doubt 27.21 douglas 144:21
146:14	114:11	divided 17.23	douglas 144.21 dozen 53:3
discussions	disregarded	division 137:25	dozens 33.3 dozens 102:16
85:5	13:6	divorced 121:4	dr 2:7 110:16
disempowered	disrespect 52:4	dob 82:12,24	drain 65:9
90:4	disrespectful	83:4,8	dramatic
disenfranchise	53:8 54:3	document	140:23
37:4 138:13	disruptive	119:24 120:7	draw 59:18
disenfranchis	52:23	124:2	106:20
89:4 107:19	distinct 145:17	doing 36:14	drawer 73:8,17
disenfranchis	distinguish	49:15 50:12	drawer 73.8,17 drawers 74:8
129:1 138:16	21:19	54:13,21 56:24	drive 23:18
disenfranchis	district 13:16	79:5 84:7	59:11
35:19	13:17,23 14:8	94:25 96:10	driven 24:1
	17:17 18:4	120:6	121:25
disengaged 90:4	23:4 38:23	dollars 65:16	drop 10:13
	59:15 62:12	dominant 32:6	109:12
disengagement 85:13	63:12	dominate 32.0	dropped
disenroll 37:21	district's	132:22	109:10
disillusionment	135:17,22	dominated	ds 59:14 63:11
88:13 90:9	districts 12:7	34:20	due 98:15
disincentivized		don 4:5 119:11	
	13:22 17:21,21		duly 132:2
32:4	20:16,17 disturbed	119:12,14,14	147:5
disingenuous		119:15,19	duyvil 118:10
24:24 49:22	128:25 dive 84:14	donations	dying 70:15
142:6		105:18	dynamic 102:7
disparaging	diverse 46:20	donors 61:1	104:15
78:12	106:21 107:21	door 36:12	dynamics
	126:22 133:24	48:9	85:16 105:7

dysfunctional	educating	116:18 145:15	132:3,7,20
14:24	50:25 91:8	elaborate 77:5	137:17,23
e	education	elderly 138:15	138:9,22
	32:11 55:10	elect 123:17	140:17 141:8
e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1	86:4,6,8 91:1	electable 122:5	141:15 142:7
4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1	92:7 93:4	elected 7:22 8:6	144:5,11
7:1	94:14,15,15	11:21 13:9,22	145:14
eager 51:19 earlier 46:16	95:12,25 98:15	14:20 15:12	election's 99:5
59:24 60:4,8	125:11 138:9	40:19 43:24	elections 37:10
110:16 143:8	effect 7:16	57:5 110:6	39:22 41:10
early 37:20	52:14 60:15	113:12 126:20	42:10 43:8
38:2 104:23	61:11 62:10	128:23 142:1,3	48:4 56:22,23
105:1	109:25 144:23	144:24 145:2	58:18 59:7,9
easier 87:22	effective	electeds 112:13	59:11,14 63:5
135:21 145:25	104:10	election 7:15	63:6,15 71:12
easiest 52:22	effectively	30:20 33:3	71:15 85:24
easily 25:16	139:2	40:5,23,23	86:21 87:5
easy 34:17	effectiveness	56:16 57:19	101:17 102:15
37:19 45:2	26:17,19	59:1,2,12,19	103:6 104:10
52:17 78:12	effort 23:16	61:12 62:9,10	104:21 105:16
136:4	25:13,13 30:23	63:21 64:8	106:13,18,25
ebb 109:14	73:20 80:16	71:11 84:5,7	108:4 110:15
ebonie 122:18	93:11 112:15	98:1,22 101:22	120:17 121:1
echo 23:6	efforts 66:6	102:13,20,21	122:3,24
101:17	86:7 113:17	102:24 103:5,7	123:22 128:7
economic 2:15	138:10	103:10,12,16	130:13 134:15
19:22	eight 10:7,18	104:13,16,18	135:24 136:10
economist	38:6	104:20 105:1	136:13,14
111:24	either 22:9	105:13,25	138:1 139:5,6
editorial 134:7	27:18 29:5,11	106:16 108:20	141:3 144:2
educate 51:23	33:6 34:25	109:2,6,19	elector 131:22
54:13 94:10	57:17 86:25	110:10 123:9	electoral 33:2
	92:9 106:10	123:18 127:25	43:2,6 56:18
	109:25 111:2	130:9,11,16	57:5 84:16

	_		
121:1,6 123:23	employment	86:12 91:11	entire 7:12
electorate 33:6	125:12	97:18,23	entirely 63:7
57:9 62:18	empowered	104:11	entitled 43:20
106:21 128:8	120:25	engagement	122:20
133:24 134:22	enacted 22:17	32:8 62:15,16	entry 66:1,18
elevate 15:4	109:7 110:1	62:21 85:2,7	environment
eligible 106:4	encountered	89:21,25 90:16	83:12
eliminate 135:3	13:5	93:18 96:21	environmental
eliminated	encourage	98:10 107:3	20:15 65:17
134:23	53:19 57:14	139:8	112:12
elites 142:5	123:9 134:9	engaging 49:16	envision 17:15
elizabeth	encouraged	55:23	89:5
112:21	102:7	engineering	equal 65:22
email 10:23	encouraging	3:11 72:14	125:12
115:10 116:1	72:7 144:12	enhance 14:19	equity 80:16
embedded	endeavor 10:5	121:19	123:6
12:24	66:3	enjoyed 120:7	eric 4:17 140:4
embrace	ended 60:9	129:6	140:10 142:21
134:18	110:10	enormous 70:6	143:3,15
emerging 15:4	endorsed 102:8	145:10	es 147:4
103:12	130:15	enroll 37:17,20	especially
emotionally	endorsing	ensure 67:17	11:16 15:4
63:23	102:5 105:11	71:6 92:12	22:3 48:21
emphasize	enforcement	104:9 106:17	57:23 71:14
70:21	71:5	135:2	87:1 103:1
emphasized	engage 12:11	ensures 14:23	106:6 132:3
69:20	16:7 32:9	57:10	138:14 142:13
employed	37:24 65:18	ensuring	essential 25:2
56:12 147:11	90:2 96:22	101:25 132:6	essentially
147:14 148:8	97:17 103:15	entertain	54:18
148:11	112:11,15	146:19	establishing
employee	engaged 30:11	enthusiast	20:5 66:1
147:13 148:10	40:10 44:9,24	87:17	establishment
	52:8 85:1		128:25

[estimate - fact] Page 20

estimate 142:3	exact 19:4	22:1	expert 72:23
estimate 142.3 estimating 43:7	54:20	exercise 125:22	86:19 113:20
et 87:5			
	exactly 16:23	exercising	experts 7:22
evaluate	18:25 74:17	131:22	85:13 124:3
122:16	100:8,8	exist 66:24	expiration 14:2
evaluated	exaggeration	existing 66:21	explain 52:23
85:17	68:11	exists 27:24	73:5
eve 30:20	examined	61:7	explanation
evened 109:11	48:23	expand 4:13	46:17
evening 7:2,3	example 14:5	51:11 133:15	explore 94:19
8:2 19:20 23:3	22:5 36:7	134:19	explored 66:10
32:14 64:18,20	79:11 80:24	expanding	express 56:15
71:18 72:8,10	82:7 113:25	37:10	expressed
76:11 83:25	118:9	expect 13:8	126:17
101:4 104:6	examples 109:6	15:9	extending 71:2
110:17 115:1	exceptions 9:11	expected 23:19	extensive 37:7
116:23 124:21	excerpt 122:22	expecting	138:9
130:1 132:11	134:7	98:12	extent 50:23
140:5 143:23	exchange 39:4	expedite 28:4	extremism
eventual 56:23	excited 42:1	expediting	43:23
evers 31:1	exclude 106:12	79:24 81:5	eyes 96:13
everybody 9:23	excludes 41:9	expense 142:8	f
29:7	128:10	experience 28:6	fabric 97:19
everyday	excluding	49:15 91:18	fabulous 29:14
105:19	53:14 130:9	94:24 117:8,13	face 121:25
evidence 43:3	132:2	141:11	faced 68:1
45:18 58:21,23	executive 2:23	experiences	faces 68:14
61:12,18 118:2	3:3,18 42:6	117:10	
120:16 137:19	56:7 104:8	experiencing	facing 44:7
144:19	122:18	24:23	138:25
evident 128:14	exempt 20:15	experiment	fact 31:20,23
exacerbate	21:12 22:15	139:13	31:24 32:5
43:16	exempting	experimented	34:8,20 37:14
	20:14 21:16,25	108:21	38:14 39:3,6,6

[fact - first] Page 21

	T	1	1
39:7 42:19	farther 141:10	felt 71:22	finance 38:5
48:3 51:20	fascinated 42:3	115:13	67:21 83:4
74:6 78:10	fast 20:8,11,12	female 142:2,3	financed 25:20
87:7 89:2,9	20:19 66:8,13	feng 140:3	financial 81:6
91:2 92:18	71:7	fewer 20:16,17	102:14 145:11
101:7 122:16	fauss 3:16 5:17	103:20	financially
130:6 141:11	76:2 83:20	fiat 98:24	147:15 148:11
145:20	101:3,4,5	field 102:5	find 7:19 32:22
factor 52:23	favor 101:9	fields 138:21	43:12 59:22,24
fail 20:21	102:23 115:5	fierce 128:24	60:14,21 63:22
112:24	116:4 127:12	fifty 129:4	73:13,18 76:10
failing 46:25	146:14,20	fight 126:6	113:4,23 114:3
110:9	favorite 103:3	fights 125:11	142:24
fails 46:2 68:2	favors 31:16	130:22	finding 58:8
failure 67:7	128:19	figure 18:19,23	122:6
failures 132:5	fear 122:25	29:5 37:11	finds 26:5
fair 20:22	142:6	50:5	122:22
28:21 53:8,13	feature 135:6	figured 18:5	fine 120:22
71:6,7 104:10	featuring 43:9	figures 47:20	finish 35:21
fairly 45:17,24	federal 61:20	figuring 50:9	133:4
53:5	139:5	file 82:24	finishers
fairness 15:21	feeble 142:7	103:21	144:11
fairvote 133:14	feedback 13:2	filing 82:5	fireman 78:23
faith 124:23,25	feel 9:5 37:23	filled 65:4	first 9:13 11:11
falls 104:13	51:20,25 52:13	final 16:8 60:19	19:12 20:11
families 4:11	71:23 85:20	130:21 137:13	21:16 31:20
9:25 36:8,20	88:20 90:4,9	137:20,24	40:16,18 45:23
57:24 130:3	90:17 95:6	138:18 139:13	56:3 63:2 69:4
family 28:1	106:11 116:8	139:20 143:18	69:7 72:6
30:6,11	130:19	144:1 145:6,12	85:19 101:3
far 17:2 26:11	feels 90:3	145:21	102:19 104:23
37:6 66:2 90:2	feet 77:4,4,24	finally 37:25	105:22 109:9
102:3 131:10	fellow 7:17	101:15 132:10	110:10 111:15
134:3,4	58:17		116:17 120:8

			T
125:2 134:21	folks 19:16	forth 25:21	130:13 133:23
137:7,14,23	53:9 85:5	81:22 93:17	134:21 135:2
138:20 142:1,2	96:13	forward 23:2	135:14 136:11
142:3 143:24	follow 72:7	41:17,20 52:13	136:14,18,19
fiscal 21:23	86:4 133:18	55:5 58:9	137:13,13,16
fit 118:21,24,24	followed 125:4	65:13 77:18	137:20,24
118:25	133:22	78:8,16 80:2	138:18 139:13
fits 57:9 100:1	following 10:23	86:11 93:21,23	139:20 144:1,1
five 16:9 27:7	29:22 62:23	106:9	144:9 145:7,12
67:3,3 70:1	89:8 124:4	foster 57:22	145:21
73:9 74:7,11	follows 13:13	fought 125:22	framework
75:2 77:20	food 11:18	141:4 142:14	71:6
80:22 81:3	foolhardy	142:14	franchise 21:17
92:20 98:25	117:8	found 27:4	21:21 37:10
103:5 119:20	footsteps 125:4	60:11 75:6	41:22 51:11
133:23	force 128:15	127:25 131:4	frank 2:14
fixed 14:9	forced 37:23	131:12 138:7	11:12 17:10
fixing 20:22	44:9 126:3	144:19 145:1	fraught 66:12
38:16	foregoing	foundation	free 125:23
flags 123:19	147:3,4 148:4	115:23,24	freelance
flashy 104:16	forgive 19:13	foundational	119:23
flexibility 27:4	form 35:5	104:17	freely 126:13
flow 91:12	42:12 44:5,24	founder 4:6,17	frequently
focus 7:10 9:9	46:13 50:9	121:22 140:13	46:18
28:18 52:1	130:23	founding 36:20	friday 115:9
57:13 90:7	former 117:2	four 38:6 44:20	friend 60:7
112:6 139:4,21	forming 102:6	51:23 52:14	friendly 25:17
144:3	forms 30:18	58:23 63:25	front 52:3
focused 41:14	31:13 35:2	64:4 87:8 99:1	55:11 135:25
41:15 46:19	41:12	99:3 101:21	143:7
104:24 136:16	formula 18:5	103:4,9,11,18	frustrates 13:8
focuses 58:17	formulate	103:20 106:9	frustrating
focusing 9:3	117:20	110:3 121:19	30:19
139:9		123:21 124:4	

[full - going] Page 23

full 20:2 21:22	35:17 36:4,14	111:8	38:1 52:13
22:7,13 31:8	36:25 38:13,20	genuinely 52:8	56:5 58:14
40:14 57:6	39:2,15 110:16	geography 14:8	69:4,7 73:16
84:20 101:11	gabriel 144:22	getters 103:4	74:5 76:25
113:22 120:5	gain 87:24	getting 7:3	83:1,9,23 92:8
fully 33:1 40:21	gained 72:21	16:18 30:22	93:13,21
41:1 61:3 74:4	gains 52:25	31:8 33:4	109:13 127:11
122:15 138:7	game 106:20	54:16 70:6	goal 37:1 43:2
140:21	gaming 135:21	71:17 74:8	86:5 101:24
funded 32:24	135:24 145:22	92:7 116:4	125:8,10
145:23	gap 66:16	136:16	144:18
fundraising	garden 112:22	give 15:11 16:5	goals 20:22
105:18 138:23	garvey 136:2	41:22 44:21	66:20 125:7
funds 105:15	gather 25:10,19	82:7 98:15	goes 24:10 43:7
furniture 50:13	gathering 94:9	105:23 115:16	46:2
52:24	gay 120:6	116:2,9 117:7	going 9:11,14
further 16:7	gender 123:6	141:5	9:16 10:5
19:8 24:8 25:1	general 4:11	given 12:13	11:11,24,25
26:2 86:12	9:8 33:3 43:8	14:7,12 78:1	14:16 27:17
118:3,4 121:19	57:19 59:7,8	89:2 105:3	28:1 29:1,5,8
147:13 148:9	59:11,12,14,19	106:5 113:6	34:22 38:16
furthermore	61:11 62:10,17	132:4 134:17	44:19 46:3
14:11	63:6,9,21 64:8	135:21 136:8	48:19 50:2,8
fusion 130:9,13	76:16 93:13	gives 25:3	55:24 56:2
131:12,13	101:21 102:19	giving 14:22	58:13,21 59:17
future 25:4	103:5,6,7,10,12	112:21 115:2	62:24,24 70:12
29:2 96:1	120:19 121:5	glad 69:18 80:8	76:9 78:13,14
g	130:4,11,16	glance 137:15	78:14 79:5
	132:3,6,20	glazing 96:13	80:5 83:5,6,19
0	134:15 136:14	go 7:16 10:4,5	84:13 89:25
gaboury 2:18 5:6 19:17	137:17 138:22	10:9,14,16	92:8,9 94:5
	144:11	16:24 22:13	101:2 109:19
29:21,24,25	generally	28:3,10 29:4	116:14,16
33:16,16 34:7	109:24 110:18	34:12 35:10	127:21 134:10
		<u> </u>	

146:5,6	grace 3:18 8:14	greenberger	h
good 7:2,2	101:3 104:2,8	8:14	hagan 23:4
11:13 15:19	107:8 108:6	grew 24:5 29:3	hagen 2:17 5:5
17:9 19:20	grade 75:17	78:20	19:14,19 23:3
23:3 29:11	77:23	grose 60:2	26:7,8,22 28:8
32:14 50:24	graduate	gross 24:1	28:11 29:12
54:21 62:22	140:11	ground 12:8	half 13:20,21
64:18 71:23	grant 12:4	122:7	18:12,14 28:19
72:10 76:11	granted 91:11	group 35:9	75:18 103:11
81:15 83:25	grapple 33:10	75:8,11 107:21	115:6 134:24
91:18 101:4	grappling	125:23	hall 1:13 25:25
104:6 108:12	39:25	groups 50:24	51:10 77:1
115:1,12	grassroots	110:19	131:17
116:23 124:21	31:16 96:4	grow 29:7	hall's 75:15
127:8 130:1	138:25	104:19 108:1	halted 96:16
140:5 143:22	grateful 107:1	growing 24:8	hand 33:4
gotten 17:5	143:17	41:17 97:11,16	handcuffs
governance	great 11:15	growth 23:25	126:14
120:13	55:7 66:8	24:6,12,13,18	handing 30:21
governing	69:10 80:24	24:21 26:11,12	hands 73:22
56:20	82:1 95:4,4,7	26:13,17 65:22	hanks 18:21
government	108:14 112:2	106:5	haphazard
7:9 15:22	118:19 129:17	gubernatorial	98:4
25:16 50:24	140:8 143:22	117:16	happen 17:23
57:22 101:7	greater 43:1	guess 72:14	78:4 82:4 89:8
104:10 141:23	57:14 63:10	76:10 95:16,18	89:14
governmenta	105:12 120:17	95:21 98:15,19	happened 9:5
117:11	139:17	99:9 120:4	31:1 42:23
governments	greatest 82:3	guys 77:15,18	48:12 109:8
15:20 102:16	greatly 7:24	80:1 143:20	144:14
102:20	green 4:10 6:3	gwen 42:16	happening
governors	70:12 124:20		79:11 89:5
117:23	127:6,9,10		116:9
	129:12		

	I	I	
happens 17:17	114:24 116:21	helped 90:23	95:24 103:25
91:12,13 92:9	121:9 137:5	90:23 117:19	111:13 116:15
happy 39:15	140:6 143:20	helpful 66:23	122:11 140:1
61:2 102:10	heard 37:3,8,13	94:18	145:25 146:3
103:23 111:11	42:1 49:6 54:2	helps 123:17	hollow 118:7
harbor 1:13	55:1,19,20	hereto 147:15	home 9:24 21:2
hard 45:19	57:2 85:5 89:2	148:11	27:5 28:1
65:22 70:13	91:17 126:17	hesitation	29:13 38:1
125:22 128:23	128:10	86:13	70:11 71:4
harder 88:1	hearing 7:4,18	hey 64:18	79:4
145:25	7:20 9:4,8	133:13	hometown
harlem 125:3	10:11,13,20	hi 29:24 42:5	140:18
146:17	11:4 31:1 41:6	69:12 72:10	honest 104:9
harm 85:11	42:16 51:19	91:16 101:4	honestly 45:9
93:16	52:5 53:9 54:7	111:17,18	96:6
harry 39:19	54:8 104:12	143:20	honored 7:6
hats 30:1	146:13,17	high 20:16 66:1	84:20
haven 70:12	hearings 7:21	77:4	honoree 115:19
head 35:13	11:4 52:10	higher 106:16	hope 9:22
79:23	53:4,6 57:2	highest 106:19	10:17 33:10
heading 138:8	85:4,7 89:19	109:5	41:23 48:24
health 120:9	100:10	highlight	70:13 130:5
healthcare	heartened	129:17 143:12	hopefully 11:9
120:9 125:12	48:15	highly 32:2,3	79:7 81:15
healthy 104:17	heavy 28:13	103:13 138:11	111:10
hear 7:21 9:9	held 137:23	historic 25:10	hopper 131:16
9:17 10:2,6,17	hello 108:10	historical 24:11	hot 38:1
12:10 17:7	111:17,22	histories 30:17	house 27:22
47:2 51:16	133:13 140:5	history 26:16	29:10 78:21,22
52:7 56:2 76:5	help 55:10	85:16 126:23	78:22 79:1,8
76:7 80:3 91:2	73:17 75:15	hit 24:7	82:10,15,22
91:25 92:10	81:18,21,24	hiv 120:6	83:7,13 136:15
104:5 108:13	93:11 120:17	hold 9:19,21	housing 1:1
111:15,18	120:19	11:7 52:5	2:15 7:11

10.00.00.10.00	100 10	0.1.0.0.1.1	
19:22 20:19,22	129:19	84:24 93:14	improvement
23:15,16,17,20	ideals 98:3	97:7 105:9	103:1 140:23
23:22,25 24:2	ideas 7:19,21	112:7 126:18	inaccessible
24:3,7,14,18,21	30:17 39:4	impacted 85:1	25:25
25:1 26:11,13	133:17	114:1	inadequate
26:16 27:14	identification	impacts 21:24	113:24
28:5,14,15	30:19 67:11,23	59:9	incentive 68:16
29:7,17,17	67:24	impending	incentivized
65:9,11,12,25	identifies 66:10	25:9 86:1	136:7
66:14,22 69:13	identify 126:11	implement	include 13:22
69:14,20,21,23	130:25 141:1	106:24 139:6	51:11
70:4,7,8,14,16	identifying	implementati	included 90:22
70:16,17,20	23:12 132:17	24:19	includes 103:1
71:6,8 90:20	ideological	implemented	117:13
117:16,20	43:23 61:1	101:15 104:24	including 21:2
118:5,21,24	144:24 145:21	137:13 141:20	58:22 60:5
125:11	ideology 30:17	144:16	61:23 78:2
huge 86:3	iervasi 3:24	implore 32:10	102:24 108:2
hugely 105:25	5:21 114:24	importance	inclusive 33:12
huh 69:3	115:1 116:19	41:16 112:7,14	58:5 139:10
hulbert 4:5	119:5	important 8:4	140:17 141:8
5:23 119:11,12	ignored 118:8	35:22 56:19	income 21:2
119:13,17,20	ignores 112:6	66:14 67:7	78:22,24,25
124:10	illustrate 118:5	77:19 95:14	79:3,7 118:17
hundreds	immediate	105:4 106:18	138:14
138:13	71:21	109:8 116:12	incomplete
hunter 30:4	immediately	125:6 126:8	85:10
hurdles 17:23	91:6	143:11	incomprehen
hurt 41:4 48:19	immigrant	importantly	32:23
husband 39:19	138:14	7:14 8:3 37:15	increase 20:23
i	impact 39:13	105:11 139:8	43:10 47:14,18
idea 8:9 54:22	55:2 59:22,25	improve 19:25	47:24 59:18
77:20 80:22	60:11,25 61:9	102:23 137:17	62:10 98:2
11.20 00.22	63:17 68:7	139:8	109:4 114:9

137:25 139:3	141:5 142:9,12	initiative 24:20	147:15 148:12
increased	142:13	76:24	interesting
23:14 25:1	independents	input 1:1 13:9	43:18 64:13
28:14 62:16,21	33:6 35:4 39:7	99:22 112:14	110:5,13
98:9 129:3	41:9 58:6	113:16 114:5	127:22
144:19	63:18 111:6,7	114:14	interests 33:14
increases 37:14	135:11,19	insane 77:22	128:19 130:19
58:25 110:24	individual	insertion 65:5	intergovernm
increasing 62:8	97:16	insider's	15:13
96:21 101:25	individually	106:20	interim 89:5
increasingly	84:19	inspired 131:18	internet 77:16
118:6 126:24	individuals	instance 18:1	interpretation
incredible	12:24 65:24	19:2 43:1	85:10 133:9
26:12	126:11	instances	interpreters
incremental	industry 3:13	117:23	133:7
102:25	76:18,21 79:23	institute 127:23	interruption
incumbent	80:9	145:1	8:16 39:17
145:10	inefficiencies	insurance	76:24 80:12
independence	67:12	120:9	interventions
126:25 132:24	inefficient	intended 66:20	68:18
independent	67:15	102:3	introduced
8:4 32:20,25	inequity 33:11	intending 8:18	123:4 137:21
34:9,18 36:1	influence 60:23	intensive 66:2,2	145:7
40:1,21 42:16	inform 94:9	66:3	invested 88:21
47:7 48:13,22	informal 102:6	intent 53:11	investing
54:15 57:3	information	intention 36:21	112:15
84:23 87:23,23	25:10 77:17	36:23	investment
88:1,12 96:18	91:12	interactions	90:18 114:1
107:2 119:25	informed 13:5	67:19	134:17
125:3,4,14,21	23:17	interest 14:17	invite 11:11
127:13,16,16	infrastructure	56:16	75:25
129:3 132:17	114:2	interested	invited 85:20
132:19,21	initial 62:23	21:14 63:23	87:17
140:12 141:1,2		80:15 92:10	

inviting 76:13	117:11 128:13	joy 3:14 76:2	keystone 24:20
involve 44:1	issued 23:23	83:19 84:8	kids 28:1 29:3
involved 27:2	issues 15:7	judgment 8:8	79:6 87:9
29:16 75:13	56:17 57:23	45:8	kind 29:6 58:19
93:19 115:15	68:2,3,14	julie 2:9	60:14 63:25
116:5,7 118:2	72:18 75:13	july 99:1,2,2	64:6 73:7
involvement	100:16 106:22	146:17	74:11 75:7
112:12	113:21 121:3	jump 122:24	96:4 100:11
island 1:1,15	126:7	juncture 26:1	136:5 138:12
10:1,11 11:16	item 74:13	june 1:8 102:2	kinds 59:23
17:18 23:9	iteration 23:10	146:13	61:24
26:9 27:2,15	j	jungle 44:11	kiwanis 115:19
27:21 28:13,15	jack 144:21	130:6 137:14	knew 31:4
28:19,22 29:3	jen 2:18 19:16	139:20 144:1	knocking 36:12
29:11 76:19,20	29:21,24	justification	know 7:16 8:13
78:20 79:12	jesse 3:9 60:2	142:11	8:24 15:3
80:10 86:17	68:25 69:5,8	justify 145:18	16:24 17:8
137:11	69:12	k	18:21,22 19:3
island's 26:16	job 1:22 29:14	kathryn 2:13	27:1,17 29:9
islander 32:19	69:13 78:13	kathy 29:23	30:25 33:22
72:17	80:20 82:22	keep 42:17	36:13 41:12
islanders 27:24	90:6 99:16,18	52:16 55:16	45:13 49:16,16
28:6	120:8	120:8,9 142:16	49:21 50:2,15
issue 11:19	jobs 29:15	keeper 75:3	50:16 51:4
15:19 16:17	john 93:11	keepers 75:1	53:2,3,25 68:7
30:24 32:12	join 8:2 11:12	kelly 3:12 5:15	69:20 71:19
37:8 39:20	35:15,23 36:5	69:1 75:25	72:21,22 73:4
40:11,12 41:6 41:18,20 45:13	36:5 106:5	76:1,4,8 79:16	73:7,14,23 74:3,6,8,10
46:1,4,10,16	111:5 116:3	79:19 80:7	75:7,8,17,19
50:22 54:22	125:21,23	81:11 82:1	77:14,18 78:15
68:4 79:21,24	joined 55:25	kept 77:22	79:5,18,20
87:18 89:17	joining 8:11	key 133:20	80:5 82:2 83:5
98:25 115:5			83:6,7 86:18
JU.4J 11J.J			05.0,7 00.10

[know - letter] Page 29

1-1	1 4 24.6 15	1-64 26.24.74.2
		left 36:24 74:3
		87:4
		legacy 15:2
		legal 103:19
		119:24
		legally 73:25
		legislation
	,	139:23
	, and the second	legislative
•	·	22:16 65:6
	laws 87:20	145:15
112:22 114:11	lead 39:7 86:7	legislators
114:13 117:1	93:11 145:22	96:11 145:2
landmark	leader 59:5	legislature
144:20	leaders 4:8	71:25 109:22
lang 3:9 5:13	7:22 57:12	legislatures
68:25 69:2,4,7	122:14 124:23	43:21 136:11
69:10,12,12	124:24,25	136:12
langan 3:11	leadership	legitimacy 13:7
72:14	39:21 41:11	leila 2:4 8:14
language 13:13	55:8	length 12:1
14:16	leading 103:16	79:3
languages	leads 62:11	lens 122:17
51:25	144:4	lenz 144:22
laremont 2:6	leaning 110:8	lerner 2:23 5:9
88:24	learn 51:20	29:23 37:5
large 22:12	132:11	42:5,6 45:23
53:11 55:21	learned 125:6	49:4,13,23
109:12 139:14	leave 19:10	51:18 52:11
largely 65:7,16	76:4 78:19	55:13,17,19
109:18 110:8	leaving 38:11	93:25 95:23
larger 29:16	led 12:23 86:9	lesson 125:6
44:15 80:12	133:14 141:14	letter 15:25
129:5 133:24		42:19 50:17,19
	114:13 117:1 landmark 144:20 lang 3:9 5:13 68:25 69:2,4,7 69:10,12,12 langan 3:11 72:14 language 13:13 14:16 languages 51:25 laremont 2:6 88:24 large 22:12 53:11 55:21 109:12 139:14 largely 65:7,16 109:18 110:8 larger 29:16 44:15 80:12	122:13 13tly 26:2 67:25 13tly 26:2 10:17 39:18 13tly 26:2 10:17 39:18 13tly 26:2 13tly 26:2 13tly 26:2 13tly 26:2 13tly 10:17 39:18 13tly 10:17 39:18 13tly 13tly

[level - love] Page 30

lored 61.01.05	Lin og 120.0 10	61.25.70.0	127.22
level 61:21,25	lines 130:8,10	61:25 70:9	137:22
113:1,3	131:9	76:13 78:6	looked 47:23
leveraging 67:5	link 10:12,13	102:16,20	47:25,25 86:19
lewis 93:11	lisa 145:8	106:22 112:13	looking 30:14
library 22:7	lisette 2:7	113:8,16,20,21	30:15 41:12
25:15 39:16	list 2:2 3:2 4:2	114:2 139:5	44:1 47:22
life 27:25 95:19	listen 48:9	144:2	61:23 70:12
120:5,20 125:2	51:16	localities 123:5	74:21 83:8
lifelong 140:12	listening 72:12	locally 48:1	97:17
lifting 136:2	listing 50:17	location 74:25	looks 60:15
likely 15:3 21:7	literally 70:15	75:3 89:22	loosens 121:5
43:16 64:7	litigation	locked 142:9	lopsided 32:5
103:13 106:4	132:23	lockstep 121:6	lose 66:17
127:24 128:16	little 16:21	logic 63:22	129:7
135:15 136:19	30:19 43:3,22	102:13,14	loser 103:1
likes 42:9	49:22 61:2	logistical 16:17	lost 24:3 67:18
likewise 17:11	77:5,12 94:11	17:13,22	128:23
144:25	94:12 145:4	long 17:22	lot 19:6 29:16
limit 12:1 36:6	liuna 56:11	30:13 60:17	47:13 49:6,8
121:1	live 10:1 11:4,5	64:10 101:14	53:10,10 61:22
limitations	38:21 69:17	107:4 109:13	62:23 80:4
126:14	70:2 108:17	145:10	81:7 82:2,11
limited 9:5 60:9	127:10	longer 9:15	82:13,16 83:7
61:19 62:2	lived 13:4 30:5	27:2,23 75:2	88:7 89:10,12
135:6	40:1,6,17	106:12 115:12	91:2
limiting 131:18	69:25 144:16	123:18	lots 8:17 84:12
limits 38:7	lives 32:19	longstanding	loud 17:7
56:24	living 56:13	68:3	louis 140:19
lindsey 1:21	118:24	longtime 69:13	141:11,14,24
147:2,19	lloyd 140:3,3	look 7:8 23:2	142:1 143:5
line 14:23	lobby 1:14	47:15,20 48:2	louisiana 85:15
33:13 97:4	lobbyist 127:15	48:6 77:3 80:1	love 45:7 69:16
130:17,18	local 15:22	83:5 86:11	95:3 125:15
131:19	40:3,19 56:10	90:13 107:17	142:5

[low - mean] Page 31

low 20:17 63:4	maintenance	malcolm	60:6 108:9,10
102:15 138:14	117:20	146:18	108:14,16
141:17	major 21:19,23	man 120:6	massive 31:10
lower 55:3	33:7 75:20	manage 96:7	match 38:7
63:16 133:22	87:19 101:10	mandarin	matching
138:2	123:19 128:24	51:24	105:15
loyalty 125:14	129:6 131:1	mandate 107:3	math 33:23
125:15	135:10,18,18	mandates 65:6	matter 9:8
lucky 70:3	majority 14:8	mandell 42:16	15:17 30:16,16
lumping 44:12	56:23 62:17	manhattan	30:17,18,18
m	122:19 135:17	3:22 24:13	31:12 95:15
machine 80:25	135:22 136:15	27:15 28:16	105:6 118:22
made 9:12	make 4:15 7:9	111:23 112:3	118:23,23
18:15 24:15	9:12,23 15:10	112:22 118:9	131:10 136:14
30:7,23 40:14	18:14 32:9	127:23	mattered 40:14
44:25 46:9	50:3 52:17	map 67:11 73:5	matters 134:22
47:14 53:11	78:8 81:24	73:11,18 74:1	maximize
63:20 129:18	87:22 92:14	74:2,25 75:1	105:9
132:7 144:4	100:13 117:4	75:18	mayor 8:5
magical 40:24	117:25 119:2	mapped 73:15	70:24 93:1
mailers 42:2	120:11 122:4	mapping 72:18	102:4 103:7
mailing 94:13	137:10,10	76:15 79:21	142:1
mailings 40:7	140:23 142:16	maps 73:6,17	mayor's 76:12
main 1:13	makes 18:13,16	73:21 74:7	78:7 113:23
125:17	35:25 49:10	75:5 78:3 82:7	mayoral 15:14
maine 140:18	95:8 99:14	82:8	70:22 127:25
mainstream	145:25	march 19:23	mayors 126:19
57:17	making 8:7 9:9	23:24 86:5	mean 17:19
maintain 67:13	15:22 17:23	mario 117:14	27:9,11 39:2
70:13	38:10 45:4	market 24:21	45:18 55:8
maintaining	93:23 94:1	80:23,24	73:16 80:23
87:21	98:14 99:8	mary 110:7	90:6 97:6
	134:1	masket 3:20	98:16 99:1
		5:19 43:19	100:10,19

120.10	440 40 40 00		•
128:18	113:18,18,20	methods 61:2	minutes 9:15
meaningful	117:15,16,22	metrics 60:16	9:22 11:7,25
13:9 16:3 35:1	member's 26:3	microphone	62:23 79:19
35:7 40:3	members 9:14	74:18 84:3	114:18 146:13
57:11 84:11	12:3,5,6,8,16	microscope	minutia 75:19
106:12 131:1	13:14,21,25	48:24	mispronounce
meaningfully	14:6,10,14,20	mid 118:9	19:13
20:23	14:22 15:3,24	middle 17:5	missing 66:17
meaningfuln	16:8,22 18:13	66:17 144:13	mission 7:8
63:8	36:8 40:22	midterm 138:3	missouri
means 11:24	43:9 48:19	mike 77:11	140:19 141:11
35:4 135:10	56:12,13 57:1	million 35:20	143:5
138:23	57:15,24 58:5	41:9 44:1 48:3	mistake 83:21
meant 134:8	76:23 110:17	52:19 55:15	117:9
measure 60:17	110:20 112:10	65:15 120:19	mitchell 143:19
120:2	113:14 115:5,6	millions 37:4	146:5
mechanics	115:6 116:10	38:11 142:8	mitigate 81:24
145:12	118:14 126:21	mimi 143:19	mitigating
mechanism	131:7 132:7,13	146:5	60:14
71:5	132:14 143:6	mind 27:9	mixed 21:2
medgar 31:1	membership	142:16	mobility 65:12
meet 20:21	35:6 57:7 88:8	minds 8:24	mobilization
meeting 10:10	110:23	mine 60:7	31:13
98:12	mention 9:6	86:10 115:4	mobilize 93:7
meetings 10:11	mentioned	minimize 24:25	model 41:15
12:10 94:9	39:12 59:8	26:19	42:13 106:9
melanie 3:8	63:4 77:2 90:8	minimized 25:5	133:21
64:16,19 68:21	93:25 108:23	minnesota	models 41:13
member 2:5,6,7	109:17 110:16	123:3	58:23
2:9,10,11,12,13	merits 17:2	minor 21:16,19	moderate 20:16
2:14 7:23 14:1	message 101:20	102:9	109:3,20 144:5
14:4,7,11 18:1	128:15	minority 141:9	145:3
18:1,2,3 40:15	method 43:4	minute 104:1	moderated 1:7
70:5,9 113:11	59:24	115:16	

	1	1	
moderates	18:20,24 19:2	multiple 22:12	69:12 72:12
16:10 126:12	19:5,9 23:5	40:7 77:21	84:8 101:4
moderation	moreno 11:12	123:13 130:14	104:8 108:15
144:19 145:9	mother 79:4	130:16 144:18	111:22 116:24
modern 43:21	motion 146:12	145:24	119:19 121:21
modest 21:21	146:19	municipal	124:22 137:8
59:18 62:10	motivated	44:20 104:15	138:19,20
modestly 20:8	62:13	municipalities	140:10 143:23
21:4,8 119:23	motivation	62:1 65:10	145:10
moerdler 4:3	96:4	murkowski	name's 58:15
5:22 114:25	move 21:22	145:9	127:9 133:13
116:21,23,25	55:10 71:12,13	murkowski's	named 9:2
119:4,6	71:15 74:25	145:8	narrow 66:16
moldler 116:16	76:1 77:18	music 119:22	128:15
moment 39:23	78:8 80:2	musician	narrowed
71:10	82:11,12 93:20	119:23	87:13
monday 1:8	93:22 101:2	mute 58:13	narrower
money 31:16	103:17 127:2	127:6	135:10
81:2,2 105:17	134:19 139:4	muted 26:1	narrows 77:25
136:5,6 138:19	moved 25:24	mutual 97:21	natalia 4:15
monolith 88:10	26:4 27:21	mutually	137:5,9 142:20
month 31:2	127:10 143:25	130:24	143:17
133:23	movement	n	nation 97:12
months 11:20	125:7	n 2:1 3:1 4:1	143:16
23:10 25:23	movie 77:3	5:1,1 6:1,1 7:1	nation's 122:13
26:4 51:23	moving 50:21	naacp 3:14	national 2:21
82:15,16,17,17	68:24 91:24	84:9 88:7 97:2	32:16 33:5
82:23 83:12	101:16 106:15	nahee 77:11	124:25 140:14
85:25 98:25	125:25	name 7:6 8:16	nationally
99:3 112:9	mta 117:22	8:23 12:3	121:23 122:10
morano 2:14	multi 68:8	19:14 23:3	nationwide
5:3 11:15	multilingual	29:24 32:14	129:3
16:13,15,20	138:11	56:7 64:19	native 32:18
17:11,19 18:10		20., 01.17	125:18

4 22.12	4-4- 75.10	24.5.25.10	105.17.10
nature 33:13	negotiate 75:12	34:5 35:19	125:17,18
95:18	negotiation	36:1,25 38:4	126:8,9,9
naval 140:10	102:13	40:1,17 41:7	127:1,3,11,25
navy 140:11	neighborhood	42:7 44:17	128:11,22
near 38:19	16:3 25:7 40:5	48:3 49:21	129:8,19,19
nearly 24:9	118:15	51:3 56:8,13	130:6,13,18
53:3 57:3	neighborhoods	56:25 57:9,10	131:6 134:13
134:22	20:21 70:1	57:22 65:2,5	134:18 136:20
necessarily	71:6 118:10	66:20 67:22	137:10,14,22
88:15	neither 147:11	68:11 69:22,25	138:8,12,17
necessary	148:7	70:6,14 72:23	139:15,15,22
71:24 116:12	net 24:3,9	72:25 76:14,18	140:22,23
neck 118:19	59:17	79:9 84:9,11	141:2,20
need 10:5 17:20	network 4:8	84:24 85:14	142:24 143:7
44:3,4 45:12	124:24	86:23 87:22	143:10 144:2
50:5 51:14	networks 15:2	90:15 93:4,10	145:19 147:21
66:8 69:20	neutral 62:9	93:12 95:19	newer 15:5
71:20 72:1,24	never 11:3	97:9,12,18	114:1
74:24 88:4,15	27:17 36:22	100:2 101:7,10	news 8:25 25:9
89:14 90:4	42:1 51:16	101:12,14,16	nicole 3:10
95:13 96:22	53:22 70:8	101:19 102:10	68:25 72:12
98:20 120:11	95:20 96:1	102:17,23	77:2 80:8,18
123:11 133:8	123:6 125:14	103:6,17 105:1	nicole's 77:5
needed 20:23	135:12	105:8,19 106:4	nieves 2:7
73:13 136:6	nevermind	106:7 107:4,21	night 52:6
needle 55:10	74:10	108:2,7,17	nine 79:7
needs 65:23	new 1:2 2:14,20	110:13 113:5	nominate 18:2
67:6 74:13	2:23 3:3,13,14	117:16,19	18:3 130:14
75:10 98:8	4:16 7:5,18	118:4,18 120:5	131:7 132:19
118:22	13:12 23:22,23	120:18,20	nominated
negative 39:12	23:25 24:14,16	121:14,24	130:17
122:6 134:10	24:22 26:10,11	122:9,14,19,19	nominating
136:7	28:14,15,20	122:20 123:8	130:8 131:14
	30:6 32:16,23	123:20 125:1	

nomination	noted 106:1	numerous	144:24 146:1
17:25 18:16	notes 66:17	45:14 59:3	oh 16:20 58:13
60:24	67:19,25 112:2	ny 1:15	81:12 83:21
nominations	noticed 71:17	nyc 73:23	112:1
19:1	notification	nyc.gov 10:10	okay 29:9
nominees 131:8	25:9	10:19,19	38:21 39:11
non 18:2 20:9	notion 89:13	0	69:10 76:4,5
21:11,12 34:2	november		82:15 83:21
35:14 71:13	84:17 86:1	o 5:1 6:1 7:1	84:3 95:24
110:20 132:12	92:14 99:1,4,5	obvious 102:14	104:3 106:24
noncompetiti	104:21 105:22	obviously	108:11,14
135:8	120:2 123:22	80:18 86:7	111:20 112:2
nonpartisan	127:21 133:24	occur 113:25	116:15 119:11
15:19 37:10	134:19,25	occurred 60:10	119:13,17
39:22 40:4	135:4,9 136:4	145:16	127:8 133:10
71:18 88:7	140:22 141:19	odd 27:22	136:21 140:4,6
121:22 126:1	142:17	offense 9:23	143:9,22 146:5
126:20,23	nuances 67:17	offer 20:6 109:1	oklahoma 48:1
138:21	number 14:10	offers 25:6	old 29:9 79:1
nonprofit	18:9 27:19,19	84:10	79:10 134:4
32:16 133:15	36:6 39:25	office 23:22	138:4
140:14	46:5,7 55:21	26:3 73:16	older 29:8,10
nonprofits 68:1	56:17 87:19	76:12,13 78:7	77:12 134:25
nonviable	93:2,3 96:17	78:7 122:15	once 57:18
131:3	102:23 103:10	137:11	144:16 146:6
nope 114:22	105:2 110:19	officer 147:2	ones 137:22
normally 133:7	110:24 114:10	offices 25:15	online 10:3,9
northwell	116:25 126:17	official 40:19	open 2:21 14:7
115:20	143:11	73:5 74:1	31:14 32:22
notary 147:20	numbers 19:3	officially 10:7	35:13 37:9
note 77:7	67:23,24 82:10	73:15 74:7	38:25 41:13,13
102:14 103:5	82:11,16,16	officials 7:23	42:9,15 44:3
106:8 117:10	83:7,7 143:10	8:6 43:24 57:5	44:12,17,24
129:18 132:21			46:12,13,23

			_
48:9 49:7,18	opponents	128:24	oriented
49:20 50:4,6,9	123:12 141:8	order 92:25	117:12
52:18 54:8	opportunities	94:9 97:4 98:1	original 14:2
57:8,14 58:22	32:17 65:22	112:16 120:12	25:22
61:8,10,16	122:23 126:9	ordering 132:5	outcome 56:23
62:8 77:6	opportunity	ordinance	105:12 108:3
84:16,23,25	16:7 19:21	117:21	112:16 147:16
85:22 86:20	23:1 25:7 33:8	ordinary	148:12
99:22 100:1	39:5 41:15	120:18 143:24	outcomes 56:19
101:22 102:24	44:21 46:11,22	oregon 43:5	110:5
103:3,12	47:9 48:8 49:9	organization	outlined 66:9
104:10,21	64:20 66:5	31:13,17 34:21	70:20
106:5,9 107:13	70:18 72:8	41:14 42:17	outpaced 23:25
107:24 116:4	84:11 89:7	50:22 51:12	26:11
120:2,5,16,16	92:6,22 93:2	121:23 124:23	outrageous
123:22 126:23	95:14 99:21	organizations	125:20
127:3,12	104:7 105:4	42:20 45:16	outside 46:5
128:22 138:21	115:3 116:3	46:8,15,18,21	overall 43:14
140:17,21	119:18 121:12	49:17,19,24,24	65:8 66:25
141:8,20 142:6	130:2 133:17	50:16,18 51:1	88:22 91:15
opening 34:4	137:8	54:12,21 55:8	96:21 111:8
35:3 38:20	oppose 86:6	86:10 91:1	overburdened
105:22 121:4	112:17 113:10	94:6 115:15	51:25
132:12,25	114:14	122:14 123:20	override
openness 43:22	opposed 16:18	organize 30:14	113:11
operates 85:24	84:19 131:2	30:15 31:23	oversight 15:15
operatives	143:25 146:20	34:11	117:12
125:9	opposes 117:5	organized	overtime 79:5
opinion 62:15	opposing 48:18	31:10 33:25	overturn 70:25
92:7	50:6	47:6	overwhelmed
opinions 8:6	opposite 19:5	organizer 85:6	51:20
84:12	141:12	organizing	overwhelming
opponent 136:4	opposition	2:21 30:18	50:11 89:2
	45:24 48:18	34:15	102:20

[own - party] Page 37

26:19.21	72.C 21	04.2 126.1	125.10.20
own 36:18,21	paper 73:6,21	94:2 126:1	135:19,20
69:15 72:4	74:7 77:6,7	participation	147:12,14
81:1 97:15	82:23	43:2,11,17	148:8,11
110:23 117:10	paperwork	57:15 62:21	partisan 15:21
118:10,13	65:4	63:9 96:21	37:24 38:2
130:10 131:7	paradigm 45:3	98:2 106:13	63:3,5 71:13
132:15 142:8	parents 125:2	120:17 121:2	110:14 125:18
142:15	park 22:6	128:8 137:25	126:15 128:7
owned 28:1	part 16:20 24:1	particular 7:10	141:15
ownership 21:2	30:8 31:7	27:13 32:6	partisans
23:18	33:19 39:3	34:12 70:21	128:17
p	48:5 50:25	73:14 81:20	partly 31:18
p 1:14 2:1,1 3:1	72:21 80:9,18	88:16,16	partner 93:24
3:1 4:1,1 7:1	87:25 93:10	particularly	partners 53:19
23:21	95:16 99:16	9:25 24:14	121:23
	111:1 116:7	67:19 90:8	party 4:11 32:6
p.m. 1:9 10:4 133:7,10	120:4,19 128:7	113:18 121:4	33:8,23 34:2
,	135:23	parties 16:9	34:11,12,17,19
146:17,22 pace 28:23	participant	30:16 31:12	36:8,20,24
_	40:15	33:7 34:20,23	37:17,18,20
page 5:2 6:2 10:10 74:9	participants	34:23,24 35:1	38:15 39:7
	88:21	35:22 38:14,16	40:22 41:3,4
paid 78:24,25	participate	38:18 57:17	43:9,14 51:13
79:7	33:1,24 35:24	60:23 87:14,19	54:21 57:11
panel 9:20	36:2 37:21	87:24 88:2,9	58:6 59:14
19:12,16 26:24	40:22 41:1	97:14,16	85:16 86:25
39:10 62:5	88:20 89:4,11	117:24 120:22	87:8 101:13
113:11	107:20,23,25	120:25 121:5	102:4,9 107:23
panelist 4:19	110:18,21,25	122:4 125:15	108:20 109:19
47:3	111:1,6 120:13	126:15 127:16	110:15,18,20
panelists 9:18	134:24	129:6 130:7,9	110:23 111:3,5
64:14 74:16	participating	130:14,23	120:12 125:9
143:18	36:10,16 57:4	131:7 132:18	125:22 126:3
	64:15 65:25	132:22 135:12	126:25 127:19
	30.20		

[party - piece] Page 38

128:4,24 129:5	peer 144:18	128:10 129:20	80:3
130:3,8,17,19	peltola 110:7	134:11 138:25	person 11:8
131:1,6,14,19	people 9:12,16	people's 8:24	31:5 37:20
131:23,25	9:22 11:18	perceived	55:25 64:21
131.23,23	16:18,18 27:25	16:25	68:24 70:23
132:14,24,24	29:10 30:14,15	percent 18:8	76:1,2 83:15
135:11,17,18	30:21 31:11	21:3 24:5,8	95:7 133:18
135:22,23	32:3,9,17 35:5	26:10 28:20	personal 39:24
142:5 144:10	35:9 36:4,7,17	33:5,22 34:2	115:4
145:4	37:17 38:11	38:9 41:2	
			personally 77:15
pass 39:22	41:23 44:16	43:13 44:23	
93:11 102:19	45:18 46:5,7	48:21 116:10	persons 13:19
139:7	48:10,14 50:4	121:14 122:11	perspective
passed 60:18	51:15,16,19	128:1 129:4,4	45:12 53:17
81:7 139:23	53:10 54:2,14	129:4 138:2,3	78:5 82:19
141:18	66:3 72:22	138:3,7 140:25	91:17 121:16
passes 92:2	75:8 76:6	141:18	123:14 129:17
passing 72:6	77:11 78:15	percentage	perspectives
passionate 27:1	82:2 85:20	59:16	16:1 92:4
past 10:18	87:6,11 89:3	perfect 58:3	121:12
12:12 28:12	89:10,22 90:1	127:5	persuasive
38:4 115:19	90:8,13,13	performance	50:20 63:22
127:1	91:3,8 93:7,18	13:2 15:8	ph 77:11,12
path 41:20	94:1 97:11,12	performing	phase 112:7
96:16	97:17,23 98:11	79:24	phone 40:6,9
patterson 43:5	98:12 99:8	period 24:12	42:2 115:11
pause 95:24	100:11 104:24	89:15	phrased 93:6,8
98:7	105:3 110:14	permanent	physical 73:6
pay 41:10	110:17,24	67:23	physically
46:15 48:3	111:1,9 116:3	permits 22:16	73:16
141:4	116:5 118:18	22:21,23	picket 54:16
	118:24 120:20	normitting	picks 18:14
paying 54:17	118.24 120.20	permitting	picks 10.14
paying 54:17 pediatric	120:23 125:16	66:24 68:3,8	piece 11:1

0.4.10	110 16 100 6	T	II. 107.00.04
84:13	119:16 127:6	policeman's	poll 127:22,24
pieces 82:23	142:16,25	78:21	polled 128:2
84:16	pleased 124:7	policies 57:12	polling 128:1
pinball 80:25	plummeted	122:1	polls 54:16
pipeline 66:23	38:5	policy 3:16	pool 47:18
67:3	plurality	20:19 59:4	poor 29:11
pivotal 63:17	141:17	69:13 72:4	38:14
place 26:3	plus 49:21 67:3	101:5,8 103:15	poorest 32:18
31:20 57:16	107:18	124:2 133:20	popular 144:3
69:17 89:22	pocketbooks	145:1	populated
106:18 132:6	118:25	political 3:4,12	97:22
placed 22:19	pockets 139:2	3:20 15:20,25	population
128:22	point 18:19	16:9 30:4,25	26:10 28:20
places 85:1	46:2 47:12	31:3,6,21	34:9 65:24
110:13 118:18	53:2 54:19	32:11 34:24,25	67:6 87:4
plan 86:4	60:11 77:5	35:22 56:8	90:15 91:25
planner 72:19	86:3 92:18,23	57:12,17 60:22	97:10
planning 3:10	99:21 100:13	61:1 76:17	portals 25:16
12:20 20:13	134:1 145:7	85:15 88:8,16	portion 12:6
21:18 22:18	pointed 44:2	102:12 108:16	13:15,23 44:8
26:14 67:16,20	points 67:10	110:15 118:7	129:2
72:13 73:20	92:15	125:9,15,21	portions 73:11
76:13 78:6,7	polarization	126:3,15	pose 98:4
82:12 83:9	43:21 59:22,25	127:14 131:7	positing 89:1
112:11 113:24	60:12 109:2,14	132:22 140:16	position 44:10
114:10	109:17,21,25	144:20	55:7,21
plans 25:21	128:14 130:22	politically 17:1	positioned
83:9	145:4	30:11 44:9	55:10
play 25:4 55:7	polarized 32:2	52:5,7 145:17	positioning
played 39:21	32:3 46:1 50:7	politics 30:12	96:11
40:18	60:15,17	37:24 106:19	positions 14:6
please 19:13	136:12 144:5	121:25 134:2	144:24
42:4 47:3 69:9	polarizing	136:5	positive 57:20
83:18 84:2	46:10		102:7

•1 •1•4	6 11 22 2	•	100 00 100 10
possibility	preferable 22:3	presuming	128:22 132:12
27:12	preference 42:8	10:3	132:18,25
possible 52:17	preferred	pretty 34:14	134:15 135:2
92:5 119:19	126:2 134:12	50:10 61:19	137:18 138:3
128:8	preliminary	62:2 73:23	142:10 144:1
possibly 73:21	20:3 21:9	135:12	primarily
post 77:7	64:25 66:9	prevent 131:21	56:12
102:19 134:6	70:20	preventing	primary 30:8
140:25	premise 33:19	130:7	30:20 31:9,14
potential 80:2	prepared 148:3	previous 73:1	32:22 33:20,25
91:15 108:1	present 9:10	86:20,20	34:4 35:14
138:15 141:9	99:17	101:18 109:16	36:11,18 37:21
potentially	presented	previously	38:2 40:12
62:9 132:12	88:14 93:6,9	102:22 117:3	41:8 42:12,15
poverty 125:10	99:13,14	primaries 2:22	43:3,23 44:11
power 15:10,21	preserved	32:24 33:9	44:17,20,24
85:24 90:22	114:6	37:9 41:13,13	46:5 49:18
141:5 142:5,8	president 2:18	42:9 43:16	51:21,22 52:6
powerful 134:2	3:14 4:8,13	44:4,12 46:13	52:18,20,21
powers 15:17	13:21 14:3,13	46:23 49:8,20	54:14 56:22
practical 18:11	17:1 18:14	50:4,7,9 54:17	57:4 58:18
practice 13:6	30:1 67:13	56:22 57:8,14	59:1,5 61:8,10
111:25 144:13	70:24 73:10	58:22 59:10	61:11,15,16
145:5	84:8 97:2	60:10,22 62:8	62:9,11 63:3,5
practices 124:3	113:2,14	71:18 84:16,25	63:9,10 71:13
practitioners	114:12 115:19	85:22 87:12	84:23 87:5,9
72:16	115:21,24	100:1 102:25	88:16 96:20
precertification	124:22 133:15	103:20 104:22	99:22 101:22
112:7	142:2	106:10 107:13	102:2,4,18
precious 77:23	president's	109:4,10	103:4,13
precisely 36:15	15:16 113:1	110:14 111:5,7	104:13 105:3
36:15	presidents	120:2 121:4	105:23 106:5
predecessors	12:18,19 15:1	125:19 126:1	106:13 107:20
145:3	117:7	127:12 128:15	107:24 109:10

110.15.22	1	105.04.107.00	
110:15,22	procedural	105:24 107:20	prohibited 57:3
111:1,10	85:23	112:18 113:8	prohibiting
120:16 127:1,3	proceed 96:15	117:7 121:6	131:14
128:5,17 130:6	proceeding	processes 66:15	project 2:20
130:9 132:6	1:12 146:23	66:20 72:25	20:13,25 21:9
133:21,22,23	148:4	114:6	32:16 65:3,13
134:23,25	proceedings	produce 31:24	68:17 81:3
136:3,6 137:14	147:3,5,6,9	59:10 112:16	project's 67:1
137:16 138:1	148:6	produces 43:24	projects 20:9
139:21 140:21	process 12:14	producing 38:2	20:14,20,21,23
141:3,15,21,25	17:25 19:25	product 38:3	21:4,21 22:1
142:6 144:10	20:4,22 22:7	145:12	22:11,12,22
144:17,23	22:11 23:13	production	27:13 65:21
prior 24:19	26:14 27:4,9	20:24 23:23	68:7 70:8
57:2 77:2	27:14 31:8,16	24:2,3,7 64:24	75:14,21 79:25
110:9 147:5	33:2,12 35:14	65:9 71:8	80:10 81:7
priorities 66:15	38:2,12 45:4	profession	113:6,6,9
130:23	53:25 56:18	30:13	promise 76:8
prioritizing	57:5 60:24	professional	promises
21:14	65:2,4,17,20	2:18 30:2	141:22
private 54:18	66:7 67:7,8	professor 3:6	promising
privately 16:23	68:4,8 69:22	3:20 33:16	85:18
17:3	71:2,8,15	35:12 43:5	promotes 15:6
privilege	76:15 77:10	58:16 108:16	proof 145:8
141:13	78:25 79:25	profile 109:5	property 25:11
pro 133:16	80:3,4 82:5,18	profound 41:8	25:12 82:10,20
134:6	83:13 84:12,20	program	83:1
problem 29:6	85:20 86:13	105:15	proponents
36:3 63:25	88:13 89:13	programs	108:25
64:6 84:4	90:22,23 91:4	118:21	proportion
100:25 141:16	91:8 93:17,19	progressives	129:6
problems 68:16	94:3,16 96:20	16:10 126:12	proposal 8:23
126:6 137:20	98:1,10,11,20	prohibit 132:1	15:20 16:6
	101:10 102:24		25:23 26:4

34:24 41:21	25:15 53:3,6	97:24 106:9	99:14,23,24
123:21 139:21	67:5,6 71:3	120:1	110:12 128:2
proposals	85:6,19 101:7	puts 121:17	129:14 142:22
71:11,14 81:22	103:14 104:11	putting 84:17	questioning
100:6 104:20	105:14 107:3	100:4 101:18	100:3
propose 13:11	112:19,25	105:21 123:23	questions 9:18
98:23 121:17	114:14 138:9	q	9:20 16:14
121:18 133:21	140:10 145:1	qualification	19:8 23:2
proposed 31:20	147:20	118:17	26:23 39:10
58:3 66:8	publicly 16:24	qualified 12:24	41:23 49:2
108:21 122:16	17:3	131:22 147:7	62:4 68:21
132:13	pull 36:15,23	quality 28:5	74:3,12,16
proposes 8:9	73:8,17	29:7 118:23	75:23 86:11
proposition	purchased	120:20 125:11	93:5 95:18,19
141:18	29:13 78:23	125:12	99:17 103:23
protect 131:12	purdue 60:3	quantity	104:1 107:7
142:7	purple 123:3	118:23	108:5 111:11
protects 131:6	purports 31:25	quarter 106:3	111:14 114:21
protest 131:2	purposeful	queens 28:16	116:13,18
proud 140:11	23:12	127:10	119:5 124:7,9
proudly 125:3	purposes 11:6	question 17:13	124:17 129:11
proven 139:4,9	18:11	33:16 39:22	137:1 140:2
provide 22:24	pursuant 13:18	43:25 45:2	142:20 146:4,7
65:11 97:3	pursue 8:9	49:3 50:6,15	146:8
provision 14:5	pursuing 7:19	53:16 61:5,6	quick 33:16
103:2	push 34:11	62:7 81:13	45:2 62:6 84:1
provisions	96:8 98:14	82:1 84:18,21	84:5
124:4	put 17:14 34:17	85:8 86:18	quickly 21:22
prudent 23:12	34:19 45:15	88:25 89:9	81:16 93:7
public 1:1 7:4	53:23 78:4	94:20,20,23	119:19 137:22
7:20,23 9:15	81:22 82:19	95:17,22 96:1	142:23
9:16 10:20	90:9 92:2	96:6 97:24	quite 29:15
11:4 19:12	94:13,13 95:5	98:5,6 99:12	59:25 60:9
22:1,1,6,22	95:14 96:1	70.0,0 77.12	88:10 89:21

[quite - recent] Page 43

115:14	rank 123:15	reach 24:8	81:2 83:14
quorum 11:9	ranked 40:16	reaching 134:3	89:10,18 91:21
quote 23:24	46:14 47:5	read 11:1,1,5	93:17 100:23
24:11	49:15 51:21	13:24 14:16	108:4 116:8
r	61:8,10,14	28:9,11 49:10	128:12 129:20
r 2:1 3:1 4:1 7:1	91:7 101:11,22	readiness	138:18 139:24
64:7	102:3,11	136:21	reappoint
rabb 4:11 6:4	103:13 105:5	ready 19:15	14:13
129:24,25	105:10,13	29:22 54:16	reappointed
130:1 133:3	110:3 121:13	reaffirmed	14:3
race 35:5 38:22	122:8,20,23	131:21	reappointments
38:22 103:13	123:4,14,16	real 12:13	13:1
105:4 122:25	124:5 133:25	32:11 60:11	rearranging
135:9 136:1	134:7,14	70:18 81:16	50:12 52:24
races 34:8	137:17 138:22	95:17 104:18	reason 10:16
135:6 145:15	rapid 106:5	108:1 139:16	17:3 50:25
rachael 3:16	rapidly 91:24	139:24 142:23	51:6 54:19
76:2 83:20	rate 63:16	realistically	71:23 87:1,25
101:2,3,5	rather 18:17	118:11	116:2 125:18
107:7	30:21 38:17	realities 136:8	127:20
racial 85:16	43:16 44:24	reality 13:4	reasonable
racism 125:10	89:24 122:6	118:8,15 145:9	12:1 65:12
radical 54:25	132:19 134:10	realize 17:22	96:8
raise 123:19	134:19	really 18:11	reasonably
raised 72:17	rationale 37:3	30:24 31:11	45:19
76:20 143:10	rauh 3:18 5:18	34:17 38:3	reasons 13:1
rally 126:13	101:3 104:2,3	43:25 44:10	120:24
128:18	104:6,8 107:17	45:21 46:12	receive 25:8
ramifications	rcv 101:11,23	48:11 55:4	received
92:13	102:17,21	60:9,11 69:16	115:11
ran 123:5	122:11,13	69:19 70:14	receiving 42:2
range 15:25	123:19,21	71:16,22 72:1	recent 24:2,13
65:14	134:1,2,6,18,19	72:5 77:8	59:23 60:13
		78:16 80:18	86:24 92:19

108:22 126:19	recording 17:9	reflects 8:21	110:14 129:7
recently 8:17	147:8 148:4	reform 15:11	registering
77:10 117:22	records 24:18	38:6 42:13	101:13 107:22
reckoning	105:18 139:4	57:21 59:8	111:2,3,5
97:15	recovery	60:18 71:11	registration
recognition	115:22	73:3 74:13,22	96:12 101:15
138:20 145:10	red 123:2,19	84:16 104:16	127:19 128:3
recognize	redheaded	104:20 105:3	139:6,7
12:18 57:16	131:14	107:24 108:20	regular 89:25
101:12	reduce 8:18	110:1 122:17	regularly 75:12
recognizing	34:3 109:2	136:20 139:12	reinvent 3:16
112:14	122:1 145:4,21	140:18 141:14	42:14 101:6,23
recommend	reduced 109:21	145:18	reject 139:20
20:12 21:11,15	147:7	reformist 43:10	rejected 51:5
99:19 114:13	reduces 37:14	reforms 31:14	related 68:12
recommendat	39:5,5	31:15 59:22	147:11 148:7
18:16 20:7	reducing 8:21	70:20 85:17,19	relationship
113:5 114:3,9	59:25 101:24	96:18,20	43:22
142:17	reduction	104:18 105:20	relative 147:13
recommendat	112:17	106:23,25	148:10
8:7,20 12:16	reelection	108:22 109:24	relatively 27:23
13:6 16:8	145:8	110:20 139:9	136:10
19:25 22:24	refer 140:21	139:22,24	released 42:20
23:6	reference 60:6	refreshing 40:8	124:3
recommended	referencing	regard 88:5	relevant 121:16
20:14 117:14	64:1	128:13	reliant 86:9
reconcile 87:10	referendum	regardless 8:9	relic 127:1
87:15	45:5 128:21	8:10 57:10	relieve 133:10
record 24:7,23	referred 73:4	110:23 144:10	relook 48:16,17
49:18,20 73:15	refined 20:7	region 32:7	rely 15:1
79:19 86:7	reflect 57:6	register 33:7	remain 111:7
147:9 148:5	62:16,17	registered	remarkable
recorded 147:6	reflective 57:22	33:23 34:2	48:10,12 55:9
		36:8 58:6	

remarks 9:6	representation	requiring	respective 14:4
remedy 132:5	12:22 14:25	21:21 22:7,12	respond 29:13
remember 8:4	35:2 121:13,18	65:3	response 47:3
66:23 96:13	121:20 128:20	requisite 132:8	52:11,12
remind 29:1	representative	research 25:10	responsibility
remote 1:12	3:12 15:12,23	25:20 39:14	7:11 14:24
8:12	76:17 106:21	42:25 45:16	37:11 95:7
remotely	134:21 135:4	49:8 50:10	responsible
139:14	141:23	58:16,17 59:5	28:4 50:25
remove 14:13	representatives	59:6,20 60:20	67:14 98:10
removing 20:9	40:4	61:19,20 73:18	responsive 7:10
21:10	represented	84:25 85:13	15:23
rentals 23:18	88:20	121:24 122:22	responsiveness
renter 69:24	representing	124:1 138:6	15:6 41:6
repeat 69:21	16:10 56:11	145:20	rest 17:6 18:21
repeated 144:6	72:14,15 76:18	researched	28:24
repeatedly	135:19	64:25 75:7,18	restrictions
112:9 131:5	represents 30:3	resent 48:20,23	126:14 131:13
replace 70:22	130:19	reserving 21:22	rests 12:17
report 20:3	republican	resided 119:20	result 105:13
21:9 23:23	63:13,15 110:8	resident 108:18	110:9 132:23
24:10 31:22	135:7 136:2	142:24 143:4	resulting 56:19
43:4 64:25	republicans	residential 21:1	results 43:15
66:9,17 67:25	59:16 62:12	residents 15:7	57:5 123:3
70:21 144:25	63:18 110:9,10	65:11	139:25
reported 1:21	require 14:14	resolution	retired 77:12
138:1	21:23 22:2	22:20	returned 21:7
reports 8:17	required	resolve 98:17	review 7:11
9:1	114:11	resources 98:9	20:12,15 22:7
represent 4:6	requirement	99:8 124:1	22:14 23:13
15:25 35:8	114:1	respect 85:13	42:25 65:17
49:25 58:4	requires 25:14	respected	67:5 68:15
88:6 98:3	49:16 65:14	105:14	93:14 112:12
121:22 124:2	114:4		112:18 113:8

		146.0	la 0.10.21
reviewed	rid 141:15	146:8	role 8:18,21
144:18	rigged 118:17	rightly 13:8	12:19 22:9
reviews 20:4	right 17:19	15:9	25:4 39:21
21:13 112:25	18:10,13,24	rights 41:17	40:18 55:8
113:2	19:12,18 21:5	93:12 96:10,25	108:7 113:19
revision 1:2 7:5	22:1,22 28:18	125:7,13	117:5,19
19:24 23:11	29:14 33:24	127:15 131:6	138:19
26:18 31:19,23	35:1,7 36:12	132:14	roles 113:13
39:20 44:22	36:15,16 37:19	rigorous 62:1	roll 43:13
45:14 64:23	38:21,24,25	84:23 93:17	59:13 63:12
69:19 72:6	41:1 51:6,21	ripe 96:5	64:2 113:2
84:10 92:17,19	55:14,15 58:1	risk 53:20,21	roller 75:17
94:21,25 116:9	64:11,12,13,14	66:3 80:17	room 75:16
revisions 57:25	65:3 68:22	95:25 121:18	96:13
revocable	69:5 70:19	123:24 138:19	rooms 91:13
21:17,19	71:22 75:23	risks 53:24	root 85:12
rewarded	81:9,10,12,15	139:16	rosa 3:22 5:20
122:5	81:15 83:14	riverdale	108:9 111:16
rezoning 70:25	86:21 87:1,19	118:10	111:17,20,22
rezonings	87:21 88:3,4	road 4:15	114:17,20
113:25	88:11 90:3,6	137:10,10	rules 68:10
rich 29:10 31:8	90:10,10,15,17	rob 4:13	114:14 122:2
richard 1:7 2:3	90:21 91:7	129:25 133:12	123:9 132:24
3:6 7:6 47:2	92:1,3,20 93:1	133:13 137:2	run 38:10
56:3,4 58:12	93:12,15 94:2	143:23	109:13 121:7
58:15 109:16	94:6 96:12,16	robert 4:19	122:23 127:21
109:16	96:23,25 97:17	59:5 143:19	runner 135:25
richie 4:13 6:5	97:23 99:4,4,6	robs 31:11	running 23:5
129:25 133:12	99:23 100:2,14	robust 86:3	36:21 59:15
133:13,14	104:25 108:8	99:11 107:3	103:22 112:25
136:23	115:8 119:11	rocca 3:8 5:12	136:16
richmond 1:14	124:16 125:22	64:16,18,19	runoff 102:15
78:17 115:22	131:23 133:11	rochelle 118:18	109:19 133:23
	133:12 142:15		141:22

	I. 01.0	146.2 14 20	127.17
runoffs 136:7	scale 81:8	146:3,14,20	137:17
rush 44:19	scanned 74:2	seconds 60:19	seen 42:11,18
rushed 86:9	scarsdale	secretary 2:4	70:5 104:15
S	118:18	8:14	106:6 109:23
s 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	schedule 53:14	section 13:11	segments 15:5
6:1 7:1	scheduled 10:4	14:15	118:9
safer 125:13	10:21	see 9:25 11:13	select 118:9
sample 60:10	schedules	11:15 17:9	selecting 40:15
sample 00.10 samuels 2:9	53:10	28:13 33:17	40:18 57:12
	schiff 136:1	36:2 43:8	selection 35:6
sandy 115:8	scholars 59:4	47:24 50:24	44:15 102:1
sansone 115:24	60:21	59:17 61:9	128:9
satisfy 65:17	schomburg	63:12 69:16	self 126:11
save 83:13	146:18	90:2 91:18,21	128:14 132:17
saves 73:24	science 3:20	97:7,20,21	seller 25:11
savino 2:10	31:21 108:16	103:22 106:4	semi 42:15
11:17 17:8,12	scientist 30:4	111:5 112:1,24	52:18 102:24
18:6,18 26:25	30:25 144:21	116:17 119:15	senate 136:1
28:25 35:11,18	scientists 31:3	123:8 124:16	senator 145:8
36:13,19 37:1	31:6	135:23	send 72:1
44:2 50:14	scope 20:23	seeing 50:7	101:20
52:9 76:12	scores 41:7	56:16 81:19	sending 55:20
79:17,20 81:9	sean 2:15 19:14	86:23 104:18	senior 3:10,16
143:21	19:15,21	104:25 133:11	58:16 72:13
savvy 78:9	searching 74:5	seek 12:11	90:10 72:13
saw 24:6 28:15	season 17:6	25:21	101:5
77:6 80:24	seats 116:4	seeking 133:16	sense 95:8
saying 18:18	122:10,10,11	seem 54:3	sent 50:16
35:22 47:5	second 21:10	95:14 109:12	sentence 133:4
48:5 54:12,20	21:25 45:11	110:2	separate 130:8
78:19 89:1	106:15 109:3	seems 24:24	130:17
96:14	100.13 109.3	34:3 45:17	
says 43:21	111:21 116:16	67:16 91:21	separated 75:2
80:15			separately
	123:13 142:12	128:6,14	74:12 131:8

september 99:2	shams's 89:9	sick 54:17	simpson 122:18
serious 16:6	shape 16:3	side 34:8	sinclair 59:6
106:25 135:3	90:23 108:3	sides 117:11	single 37:8
seriously 53:17	shaped 91:5	sign 10:9,14	50:18,18 74:2
servant 78:13	104:14	signal 72:2	102:21 137:16
servants 79:4	share 24:15	signatory 50:19	144:10
serve 7:7 12:11	25:9 28:21	signature	sink 81:3
12:12 13:16,25	39:24 71:7	147:18 148:14	sit 73:9
14:1 16:2	102:20 121:12	signed 10:6	sited 31:22
66:14 130:4	shared 23:7	15:24 16:8	sitting 35:20,21
served 14:21	sharon 8:13	significant 18:9	95:7
39:19 90:20	shelter 94:13	30:24 46:4,4	situation 18:12
117:18,22	shocking 40:8	59:16 60:14	44:8 50:8
service 82:21	short 11:8 25:6	65:19,24 86:24	120:13
117:14 119:8	shortage 97:18	87:3,11 90:24	situations
140:10 143:16	shortages	109:1	12:23
services 16:4	69:22	significantly	six 23:10 75:15
114:2 115:23	shorten 20:4	58:25 88:1	82:17,23 83:12
serving 72:11	shot 17:1	siloed 68:15	87:7 105:8
session 1:1	shots 125:9	similar 13:13	sizable 45:24
set 25:21 89:21	show 31:21	21:18 68:12	size 20:13 21:1
89:22 90:18	82:25 85:11	95:22 96:24	22:4
seth 3:20 43:19	111:9	108:22 109:23	sized 20:8 21:4
60:5 108:9,15	showed 31:15	110:2 123:14	21:8
114:22	showing 85:10	similarly	sketches 73:8
setting 24:23	85:12 132:8	103:19 105:22	skew 34:11
93:17,18	145:14	simple 15:18	35:5
seven 75:15	shown 32:2	42:17 52:16	skews 34:8
several 34:16	34:16 70:7	57:21 93:23	skills 147:10
108:21,22	shows 52:6	94:1 97:3	148:6
shams 2:5 8:15	55:2 86:8	simplest 52:22	slightly 109:21
74:19 81:11,12	137:19	simply 33:8	slogan 118:7
86:15 129:14	shut 105:24	87:13 107:24	slow 72:3 84:15
		126:2	

[slows - state] Page 49

slows 80:4	120.12.25	specialist	st 140:19
snows 80.4 small 20:20	129:13,25 sort 42:3 45:3	119:24 120:7	
	45:21 53:14		141:11,14,23 142:1 143:5
22:6 82:20		specific 14:16	
105:18 113:5	60:9,11 61:25	21:14 39:13	staff 2:18 20:2
smartest 11:18	62:20 72:15	41:14 44:16	21:9 30:2
snug 1:13	75:10 87:10,13	58:6 76:14	64:23 69:19
societies 97:21	89:8,9 90:10	81:17 100:6	70:21 112:10
society 115:25	109:11 111:9	specifically	stakeholders
sole 127:20	144:17	22:25 51:12	12:11
solely 102:18	sought 66:16	60:23 64:24	standard
128:4	source 109:24	66:13 81:23	118:16
solution 47:1	south 78:17	84:17 101:16	standards
solve 29:6	118:12	specifics 114:5	18:25
41:20 46:3	southern 38:21	specified 13:14	stands 17:24
54:24 68:16	43:5	spectrum 7:18	26:17 129:20
126:6	spark 25:1	140:16	stars 2:20
somebody	speak 7:16	spending 72:11	32:15
69:15 73:17	11:19 23:7	84:6	start 7:3 47:4
somebody's	29:25 108:19	spent 51:22	61:5 64:22
77:7	115:3 116:25	65:16 82:24	83:8 144:8
somewhat	119:18	125:2 136:1	started 96:10
32:22 109:15	speaker 70:24	spite 38:5	125:25
son 108:18	71:5 101:18	splitting 101:24	starting 71:14
song 76:9	113:14	110:11 122:25	122:8 134:1
soon 11:9	speakers	141:17	state 3:3,14
sore 103:1	108:23	spoiler 131:3	23:22 24:1
sorry 7:3 21:20	speaking 12:2	134:13	28:22 43:21
33:17 56:5	30:13 82:9	spoilers 101:24	56:8,11 60:17
64:21 69:6	111:23 112:3	spoke 82:8	61:21 71:20,24
74:20 77:24	speaks 72:25	spread 142:6	72:7 77:19
81:13,14 82:8	special 22:15	spur 24:20	84:9 87:22
83:21 86:17	40:4,23,24	spuyten 118:10	93:4,12 103:18
104:3 114:16	128:19	square 28:3	110:1,6,8
116:15 119:11		_	111:6 119:1

100 5 101 6 10	60.24.110.2		00.00.10
130:7 131:6,18	68:24 118:3	street 67:11	93:6,9,18
132:14 136:11	124:19 129:24	72:18 73:13,15	95:11 98:1
136:12 139:5	steps 65:5	75:12 112:21	structures 41:3
140:19 144:15	132:4	streets 72:23	85:15
145:15,17	steve 136:2	73:23 74:10	struggle 70:1
147:21	stewart 2:21	75:18 94:7	95:22 99:10
staten 1:1,15	5:8 29:23	streisand 148:2	struggling 45:3
10:11 11:16	39:18 41:25	148:15	70:15 95:23
17:18 26:9,16	47:4 54:10	strength 23:19	96:7
27:2,15,21,24	55:15	strengthen	stuck 98:19
28:5,12,15,19	stiles 2:20 5:7	15:13 139:23	student 127:11
29:11 32:18	19:17 29:22	strengthening	studied 30:12
72:17 76:19,20	32:14,15 33:21	139:21	44:2 55:6
78:20 79:12	stock 80:24	strike 97:1,2	studies 19:23
80:10 86:17	stocked 39:16	131:17	47:23 55:21
137:11	stop 97:7 98:4	strikes 98:21	59:3,21,23,24
states 108:21	story 27:5,5,7	stringent 26:15	60:4,5,13
109:23 111:4	27:16 39:24	strong 41:3	61:25 62:1
123:5 130:12	120:4	45:18 72:2	64:1 144:18
136:9	straight 35:12	101:20	study 32:11
statistics 47:16	straightforward	stronger 15:11	37:7 39:13
69:21 91:20	67:9	139:10	43:6 46:17
stats 48:17	strategic	strongly 12:3	55:9 84:23
statutory 124:4	145:22	23:6 66:7	119:22 138:6
stay 28:2,6	strategize	70:19 71:4,23	144:20
133:9	105:9	101:23 106:11	stuff 81:22
stayed 35:7	streamed 11:5	113:10	86:21 107:14
79:4	streamline	struck 104:12	style 110:2
staying 133:7	21:15 22:25	119:1	subdivide
stemming	27:13 66:7	structural	82:10
68:14	streamlined	139:1	subdivision
step 41:16 48:6	20:8 113:5	structure 12:21	82:14
48:7 55:4	streamlining	40:12 41:4	subdivisions
57:25 66:15	20:18	54:22 88:22	83:6

	1	1	
subject 21:13	successors	135:4 141:18	49:21 50:15
27:8 31:2	13:25	144:4	54:11 55:7
subjects 9:5	suffer 137:20	supported 47:5	93:25
submit 10:18	suffers 68:9	66:8 144:7	sweat 80:16
10:22 12:16	sufficiently	supporters	sweeping
14:17 39:14	113:7	123:13 140:15	145:18
submittals	suggest 7:12	supportive	switch 55:24
25:22	27:11 43:15	84:19	102:18
submitted 11:2	85:18	supports 8:10	switched
124:11	suggested 17:3	101:23	127:19
submitting	suggesting 18:7	supposed 18:15	sworn 147:5
11:22	suggestion	50:3 134:8	syracuse 3:6
subscribe 87:8	92:16 134:18	supposedly	58:16
subscribing	suggestions	144:12	system 30:8
86:25	113:24	suppressed	31:4,9,14 32:1
subsequent	suggests 43:3	139:16	32:2,3,5,22
56:19	132:1 145:20	sure 9:9,12,23	33:20 34:4,19
subset 20:20,21	suit 72:7	11:16 26:8	35:3 40:25
subsidized	suited 67:16	29:12 34:6	41:8 43:23
20:20	supervised	35:10 37:16	50:11 55:3
substantial	85:21	94:25 95:17	56:17,20,21
44:8 103:14	supplant 66:21	98:15 99:8	58:4 61:7 63:3
144:23	supply 23:25	114:20	63:25 64:4
substantive	support 23:6	surely 48:18	65:21 67:13
103:15	27:20 32:21	surpassed	68:15 71:13
subtracting	44:16 46:12	123:7	85:18 87:21
24:3	70:7,10,19	surprised 52:8	90:17 99:22
succeed 85:20	71:4,14 81:4,6	132:10	100:3,12
success 123:23	81:6 87:20	surprising	102:19 103:18
successful 43:4	101:16,21	42:22	105:23 108:20
119:23	102:1,25	survey 138:6	109:1,7 110:3
successfully	103:14 106:10	susan 2:23	120:16 121:13
136:3	113:4,8,13,21	29:23 37:5,16	121:17,19
	124:1 132:8	42:4,5 47:5	122:3 123:17

102.10 104.5	140.0	4. J. 77.11	124.0 12 15
123:18 124:5	148:9	ted 77:11	124:9,13,15
126:5,20,23	takes 9:22 26:2	teeth 81:3	test 45:22
127:3 128:9,12	49:16 106:24	tell 30:8 37:6	testament
130:14,22	talk 9:24 37:16	48:13 52:25	26:17
134:5 137:14	46:18,21 51:9	94:4 125:20	tested 139:14
137:15,24	51:15 76:14	telling 42:7	testified 19:24
138:4,8 140:22	82:3 91:17	48:18	52:15 102:22
141:16,21,22	123:11 141:9	tells 31:7	143:7
141:25 142:15	talked 17:20	temperate 8:1	testifies 76:1
144:4,9,17	42:14,21 55:11	temperatures	testify 7:24
145:3	79:2	97:5	9:13,15 10:8
systems 34:20	talking 30:21	temporary	10:15 11:25
58:18 61:24	61:24 77:16	67:22	19:16,21 23:1
66:21 68:10	81:5,6 86:12	ten 69:24 103:7	49:22 72:8
84:24 111:4	90:20 120:10	127:18	83:22 90:14
139:4 140:17	tallied 130:20	tended 109:20	104:7 116:17
141:9 142:7	tammany	tends 59:11	133:18 137:8
145:21	131:17	term 14:2 38:7	testifying 11:18
t	targeted 67:12	107:4 145:10	69:15 101:9
t 5:1,1 6:1,1	targets 71:9	terminality	127:12 143:25
tab 10:12,12	task 8:11 25:14	17:20	147:5
table 96:22	99:16	terms 46:6	testimony 9:3
take 7:25 18:12	tasked 23:11	50:11 62:14	9:10,17,21
39:23 41:19	91:1	76:14,16 88:19	10:2,18,23,25
48:7 53:2,16	taxes 141:4	89:1 90:19	11:2,10,22
53:22 55:4	taxpayer 32:24	91:6 93:3 94:2	14:18 19:13
67:2 71:10	teaches 30:4	96:24 97:15	29:19 49:6
79:5 91:11	teaching 3:6	107:18 108:3	55:2 68:23,25
101:11 106:18	58:15	113:7 121:6	79:22 88:25
106:23 118:3	teams 67:14	terrace 1:14	89:3 91:17
137:22	tech 78:8	terrain 40:22	103:24 108:8
taken 80:1	technical 75:9	terrell 4:6 5:24	112:21 114:23
	132:5	119:10 121:10	119:8 123:25
132:4 147:3,12		101.11.01	104.11.10
· ·		121:11,21	124:11,18

129:16,21	111:10,11,12	37:15,25 45:11	74:24 75:10
133:18 137:4	111:12,13,19	47:21 48:12	76:6 77:19
143:12,17	112:2 114:18	52:22 53:15,18	78:14 79:10
146:10	114:19,22	54:11,20 72:24	81:23 83:15
text 94:10	115:2 116:19	74:5 80:17	87:8 88:18
thank 16:11,11	116:20,22	82:3 88:6	89:6,14 92:16
16:13 19:7,9	119:3,7,9,16,17	90:19 94:18	92:23 93:16
19:11,20 20:1	121:7,8,11	95:8 126:8	94:18,19,23
23:1 26:21,22	124:6,8,14,15	129:18	95:3,23 96:7
26:25,25 29:18	124:17,21	things 9:3	98:4,7 99:20
29:18,19 32:12	127:3,4,4,9	34:16,18 35:1	100:14 107:4
33:14,15 35:11	129:9,9,13,15	39:25 60:19	107:17 120:23
39:8,8,8 41:25	129:20,22,22	67:14 75:9	121:3 128:16
42:5 45:1	130:1,2 133:1	81:17,18,20,25	129:16 143:10
48:25 49:1	133:2,3,5,5,11	82:4 87:19	144:21
53:1 55:22,23	136:22,24	88:4,18 95:14	thinking 27:10
56:1,6,6 58:9	137:3,7 139:25	109:8 136:17	78:16 83:15
58:10,10,14	140:1,8,9,9	think 8:3 10:20	100:15,20
61:4 62:3,6	142:17,19	11:8 16:20,21	third 20:7
64:9,11,12,14	143:12,13,14	17:4,18,24	22:15 87:23
64:14,19 68:18	143:15,17	18:25 20:18	88:2 122:12
68:20,20,22	146:2,9,10,14	22:5 27:3,11	135:11,19
69:11 72:7,9	146:21	28:18 30:24	thomas 23:21
72:10 74:14,14	thankfully	33:19 34:22	thorough 42:24
75:22,24 76:3	28:22	37:5 39:24	42:24
76:11,22 79:13	thanks 133:17	42:7 44:3,17	thought 58:8
79:14,14,17,21	136:23 143:14	46:6,20 47:9	92:11 143:9
81:9,10 83:17	theoretical	47:19,22 48:4	thoughtful 13:5
83:18 86:14	13:3 144:18	48:16,17 49:4	40:10 64:24
88:24 91:16	theoretically	51:5 53:3,5,7	107:1
94:17 100:22	110:24	53:13,18,24,25	thoughts 49:4
101:1 103:25	theory 144:8	55:9 62:14,19	92:1 107:14
104:7 107:5,5	thing 8:16,19	63:1,2 71:16	thousands
108:6,14	18:11 31:24	72:1,2,5 74:13	27:24 54:23,23

138:13	86:22 89:7,16	today's 9:4	106:9,9 108:20
three 9:5,15,22	91:4 96:12	80:24	108:25 109:6
11:25 17:18	99:10 100:23	together 34:17	110:3 121:17
19:24 21:15	103:22 104:18	34:19 68:16	121:19 123:17
30:1 62:23	104:19 106:24	75:12 109:19	123:21 124:4
70:23 78:21	106:25 108:15	129:6 130:20	130:12,13
82:22 113:11	111:10 112:15	tolbert 59:6	133:22,23
114:18 115:18	112:19 114:23	told 40:11	134:20,21,22
117:11	119:4 124:6,17	51:12 116:2	135:2,6,12,14
threshold	127:1 129:10	122:4 123:1	135:24 136:5,9
20:25	133:2,2 136:25	tolstoy 77:3	136:13,18,19
throw 139:11	140:9 143:14	tomorrow	137:13,16,18
thrust 91:3	143:24 146:3	51:22 54:16	137:21 141:21
thwarted 66:20	timeline 66:25	84:7 97:4	144:1,9,9,11,17
ties 105:17	67:4	102:2	144:23 145:2
till 10:4 115:8	timelines 112:6	tomorrow's	145:21
133:7	times 11:25	84:5	topic 9:4
time 7:25 8:22	63:20 65:1	ton 73:24	108:19
9:12,16,25	78:21,25 79:3	tonight 32:21	total 12:21 67:4
10:3,22 12:12	79:7 86:24	53:4,9 64:21	totality 67:18
14:17 17:22	99:13 130:16	69:14 104:7	touch 14:25
24:25 30:13	timing 127:5	108:23 115:3	touching 68:7
32:11 40:16,18	tired 54:17	128:10 140:20	touhey 131:20
45:12,20 46:6	tissue 77:6,6	tonight's 53:14	toward 91:24
49:5,12,16	today 9:2 11:19	tons 45:15 54:2	101:12
50:5 51:7,15	20:6 23:7	took 78:24 97:1	towards 86:5
52:15 53:20,21	29:25 42:19	105:15	96:11
53:22 54:9	66:16 70:11	tool 25:2	track 20:12
55:4 56:24	80:10,21,25	top 9:6 43:3,15	52:9 66:8,13
58:8,9 63:4	84:14 101:9	44:25 45:4	71:8 139:4
65:8 66:2 67:2	104:12 105:16	58:22,23 63:11	tracking 20:8
67:8 68:19	108:15 112:4	63:11,24 64:2	20:11,19
72:11 73:24	112:23 117:14	64:4 101:21	transcriber
78:1 80:3,16	122:17	103:4,9,18	148:1

transcript	trusted 12:25	turns 110:25	type 44:16
148:3,5	truth 141:10	tweak 85:23	99:22 100:3
transcriptionist	try 9:12,21	tweet 94:10	types 21:1,4
147:8	10:4,6 12:1	twelve 11:25	27:13 46:23
transformative	34:10,11 37:11	twice 146:6	49:7,9
71:16 105:22	46:3 84:1,4	two 9:16 20:2	typewriting
transit 8:13	116:9 119:19	25:23 27:19	147:7
transparency	trying 16:23	28:19 33:7	typical 63:2
145:24	44:14 45:9,11	38:6,23 43:3,9	typically
transparent	51:23 53:9	43:15 46:17	108:25 134:24
7:9 101:6	54:6 62:20	58:22 59:14	u
treat 75:17	78:11 84:6	60:19 62:11,16	u.s. 102:17
treated 27:6	100:2 142:24	63:11,11,18	136:1
treating 142:11	turn 34:5,7	64:3 67:10	uh 69:3
treats 65:21	59:17 111:21	70:21 77:10	ultimate 65:20
tremendous	112:1 122:4	78:22 79:4	ultimately
41:15 66:6	123:1	82:15,16,17,22	12:17 45:5
trend 91:22,22	turning 9:10	87:14,19 92:15	63:6 68:12
91:24 97:11	63:16	93:3 104:20	ulurp 19:25
101:12,13	turnout 31:25	105:20 106:9	20:5,8,10 21:8
145:13	37:14,15 38:4	108:20,25	21:11,12,23
trends 43:17	41:24 43:10,14	109:1,6,7,18	22:2,13 23:13
trendy 139:11	47:14,20,24	113:12 121:3	23:19 25:1,2,2
tried 49:14	55:3 58:21,24	121:17 123:17	25:5,6 26:5,18
triumph	59:1,12,19	126:19 129:2,6	26:20 27:4,8
102:12	61:11 62:9	130:13 133:22	65:4,14,19
trudge 78:15	63:4 102:15	134:20,22	66:12,16 67:5
true 57:23	106:16,19	135:5,6,13,24	68:13 79:24
79:11 145:6	109:4,9,25	136:5,9,9,11,13	80:4,11 112:6
147:9 148:5	110:12 128:19	137:18,21	112:17 117:7
truly 94:24	133:22 138:1	141:21 143:18	ulurps 70:23
95:4	139:3,17	144:9,9,17,23	unable 40:2
trust 45:8	141:17	145:2,21	

unaffected	understand	union's 56:15	urged 120:1
43:15 44:1	34:6 45:20	unionist 30:14	urgency 96:24
unaffiliated	47:13 64:5	unions 42:20	urgent 95:20
57:16 88:19	77:8	unique 97:9,10	95:20
91:24 96:19	understands	145:11	usc 55:2 60:2
97:13 101:13	92:13	united 16:1	use 1:2 3:10 4:3
106:1,6 107:18	understood	58:17	16:4 20:19
unanimously	138:7	units 20:15,17	21:23 23:13
117:5	undoubtedly	24:3,9,15	40:16 47:8
uncertainty	65:1	28:16 80:15	53:14 55:1
21:8 65:19	unequivocally	universe 108:1	59:23 66:24
66:25	58:2 131:5	university 3:7	71:2 72:13
unchecked 65:7	unfair 52:19	3:21 43:5,19	73:3 74:18
uncompetitive	unfold 9:8	58:16 60:2	84:2,13 90:21
63:7	unfortunately	108:17	102:18 112:22
under 12:15	73:25 75:19	unlock 65:22	114:11,13
14:5 18:4	100:16	unmuted 56:6	117:1 122:8
48:24 58:23	unhappy 34:14	104:3	used 104:25
80:14 103:7	unified 140:21	unnecessary	110:4 118:16
104:20 106:3	141:20,25	67:8	121:14 134:16
130:13 131:9	uniform 23:13	unnoticed 65:7	145:18
132:14 134:22	123:4	unproven	user 25:17
135:6 138:4	unify 67:17	139:11	uses 134:14
141:25 144:8	unilateral	unrelated 13:1	using 60:13
145:2	70:22	unsuccessful	81:1 101:22
undercut 60:22	unintended	39:21	102:17,21
60:25	43:8 97:8	upgrade 85:23	103:13 122:11
undercuts 13:7	union 3:18	uproar 112:20	137:24
underfunded	29:14 30:2	urdu 51:24	usually 110:7
86:8	42:13 48:19	urge 12:4 41:19	128:17 135:7
undermines	56:10 57:18,24	71:1 84:15	utah 123:2
145:24	104:9 106:10	104:19 132:16	
underreprese	131:12	140:20	
15:5			

v	videoconfere	volunteers 25:8	138:1,5 139:3
vacancies 19:6	2:8,9,11 3:5,7,8	vote 30:22	139:6,16
valerie 2:12	3:17,19,21,23	31:11 32:4,24	140:12
3:22 108:9	3:24 4:4,5,7,9	33:9 34:3 35:4	voters 4:17
111:15,22	4:10,12,14,16	40:14 52:20,20	7:12,14 8:7
114:22	4:18,19	62:13 70:25	17:14 33:13,22
valid 92:24	view 89:21	87:9,12,12	34:3,5,10,18
93:5	viewpoint	88:15 92:2,8	35:20,25 36:9
valuable	91:20	92:14 93:8	36:11 38:10
115:13	viewpoints	97:5 100:6	40:21 42:21
value 12:20	49:7	101:24 103:4	43:13 45:6
83:1	vincent 3:3	105:25 106:22	46:19,22 47:8
values 8:8	56:2,3,7	107:11,12,12	47:18 48:19,22
variables 29:16	violate 130:6	107:22 110:11	51:11,23 52:3
variation 61:23	132:13	110:15,22	54:4,15,23
various 34:13	virtual 8:15	116:10 122:3	55:16 57:3,18
41:12,13 51:24	9:10 39:16	122:25 125:22	63:13,15,21
65:18 88:9	76:24 80:11	126:2 128:4,17	71:22 84:6,24
112:11 118:1	virtually 10:8	130:18 131:1,3	86:25 87:1
vast 56:23	10:15	131:23 132:18	88:12,19,21
vehicles 34:13	virtue 32:25	134:11 135:21	90:16 91:8,15
verge 29:9	visits 25:15	141:16 142:15	93:14,15 95:6
version 20:7	voice 24:25	voted 47:8 92:9	95:15 96:2,14
26:19 57:8	25:3 26:1	105:1 139:22	96:18,19 97:4
veteran 140:11	57:11 90:7,22	voter 32:20	98:25 99:21
143:11	91:4 97:25	40:1,25 43:11	100:6 101:12
veterans 4:17	120:18,21	47:7 48:13	101:19 105:11
140:14,15	127:21 141:3,6	62:15,16,21	105:24 106:2,6
141:1,3,6	voices 15:4	86:3 94:15	106:12,18
142:13 143:6	53:15 54:7,8	96:12 100:15	107:11,19,25
veto 70:22	56:24	101:15,25	108:2,2 111:5
vice 2:18 8:13	volunteer	105:7 109:4	121:15 123:14
30:1 115:23	25:13 86:9	119:25 125:4	123:23 125:21
		129:1 135:4,15	126:24 127:16

127:24 128:11	134:8,13,14	71:10 78:4	72:5,12 76:25
129:3,4,8	138:8 141:21	81:16 82:3	77:9 81:2
130:25 131:6	145:7	86:2 88:3	92:12 93:5,8
132:17 134:3	vs 131:16,20	89:13 92:3	120:14
134:24 135:4,5	vulnerability	94:19 95:13	ways 7:8 22:23
136:17,18	66:11	96:15 97:25	102:23 136:16
138:7,13	W	106:8 111:1	we've 13:4 37:8
140:14,22	wage 78:21	114:22 115:2	39:25 49:6,9
142:9,12 143:6	wait 46:3 48:5	116:7 119:7	52:9,10 53:3
143:11 145:22	82:10,11 83:3	120:12 124:17	89:2 104:15
145:25	89:1,14 90:5	126:18 129:5	106:5 109:23
votes 38:24	93:22 94:20	129:17 133:8	140:17
113:13 114:10	95:24 122:4	137:3 139:3	weaken 113:17
130:20 134:4	123:1	144:3 146:16	114:14 121:5
141:10	waiting 55:16	wanted 20:6	weakening
voting 32:20	56:6 82:14,15	54:11 76:11,22	23:19
40:13,16 41:17	82:16 89:15,17	79:22 91:25	wealthier 135:1
42:16 46:14	96:22 97:4	100:13 108:23	wealthy 139:17
47:6 49:15	wajinski 77:11	127:20 129:15	weather 8:1,2
51:21 61:8,10	want 7:4 8:16	133:3 137:22	website 73:22
61:15 63:17	8:23 9:7,8,23	wanting 94:20	weeks 133:19
84:12 91:7	11:7 16:25	wants 69:16	weigh 22:10
93:11 96:10,25	20:1 28:25	washington	46:22 58:19
97:10 101:10	33:17,17 35:8	110:1 127:15	84:11 108:24
101:11,22	35:12 37:18,22	134:6 136:10	112:19
102:3,11,19	37:23 38:1	watchdogs 25:7	weighing 90:14
103:13 104:23	39:23 40:25	watching 105:8	weight 12:14
105:5,13 110:3	41:19 45:21	water 84:6 97:3	13:10 84:20
121:13 122:9	47:12 51:12,15	way 21:18 27:6	weisbrod 2:11
122:20,24	52:1,7 53:2	27:10,17 35:4	61:5,6,16 62:3
123:4,16 124:2	54:2,5,6 58:19	35:14 36:16	welcome 7:4
124:5 125:12	64:22 67:17	41:3 47:15	9:4 11:13 16:6
130:14 131:12	69:14 70:21	49:25 50:19	23:9 86:17
131:13 133:25		55:1 58:8 63:1	91:15

wellness 115:22	winner 63:5	81:8 104:9	write 12:3
went 40:13	winners 141:17	120:7 122:15	132:6
73:20 122:10	winning 134:4	123:12,20	writing 10:19
131:17	wins 38:25	134:8 139:7	124:12
wfp 36:11	wish 10:8 25:18	worked 72:18	written 10:22
white 2:12	108:19	72:22 75:13	11:1 103:24
39:12 91:16	wishes 7:24	119:24 127:15	wrong 38:12,17
whiter 134:25	witness 109:16	128:23 138:8	wylde 2:13
who've 41:7	147:4	140:17	16:15,16 47:2
wide 12:20	woman 35:20	workers 30:3	48:25 49:19
15:25 44:4	142:1	78:2,11	99:6 100:9,19
77:4 138:21	women 4:6	workflows 65:6	X
widely 105:14	121:22,25	working 4:11	x 146:18
144:6	122:3,9,10,15	36:8,20 72:4	
widest 20:22	122:21,23,24	74:11 100:20	y
68:7	123:5,17 124:2	102:3 130:3	y'all 93:21,21
width 73:13	136:15	141:13	94:4,5
williams 3:14	women's	works 50:22	yeah 17:19
5:16 76:2	121:12,18,19	65:23 121:23	18:6 35:11,17
83:20,22,25	123:20,23	workstream	55:18 64:13
84:4,8 87:2,16	won 38:23,24	68:6	74:23 86:16
89:16 92:15	123:5	worry 46:24	87:2 89:16
95:2 96:9	wonderful	70:8 96:3	94:17 96:5,9,9
99:12,20 100:8	94:24 111:20	worrying	96:14 100:5,18
100:25	words 9:7	134:12	104:5 108:12
willing 53:23	131:25	worse 38:7,8,8	114:19 116:22
win 109:20	work 9:1 34:15	138:5	119:15 124:10
113:21 122:21	34:15,25 44:17	worst 138:5	year 24:8 37:7
122:23 123:10	47:13 49:24	worth 47:22	37:8,9 41:16
125:10 131:2	50:9 51:1,8	84:18	41:21 47:10
135:15,15	54:13,21 60:1	worthy 68:4	48:6 71:12,15
window 25:6	60:8 64:23	wrap 26:6	75:19 78:17
wings 96:23	66:22 67:17,18	146:12	79:1 82:22
	68:6,16 75:9		104:21 106:17

[year - zoom] Page 60

128:18 131:16	38:5 40:1,17	york's 101:14
135:25	42:7 44:17	130:13 134:13
years 23:25	56:8,13 57:10	yorker 125:18
27:22 28:12,15	57:23 65:2	yorkers 7:19
29:13 38:4	68:11 69:25	32:24 41:7
40:2,17 44:20	72:23,25 76:18	48:3 56:25
45:14 46:3,17	84:9,24 85:14	57:10 70:14
47:1,10 49:20	87:22 90:15	84:11 97:18
52:14 55:12	93:4,10,12	105:1,9,19
67:3 69:24	95:19 97:9,12	106:4,7 107:22
70:5 72:4,20	100:2 101:7,10	120:18 127:3
73:12 76:21	101:12,17,19	130:18 138:17
79:10 80:22	102:11,17,24	139:22
81:3 92:17,20	103:6,17 107:4	young 28:5
92:22,23,25	108:2,17	32:17 87:1
101:17 105:8	110:13 113:5	89:12 90:8,13
108:22 112:9	117:16,19	90:16 97:11
115:18 117:13	118:4 120:5,20	younger 106:2
119:21 125:2	121:14,24	106:6,20
127:11,14,18	122:9,14,19,20	107:21 126:24
128:21 133:14	123:8,20 125:1	yup 100:5
yep 143:21	125:17 127:2	Z
yesterday 36:7	127:11,25	zero 133:20
134:6	128:11,22	zoning 20:9
ymc 115:22	129:8 130:6	21:11,12 22:2
ymca 115:17	131:6 134:18	22:13,20 114:4
york 1:2 2:14	136:20 137:10	117:21
2:20,24 3:3,13	137:14 138:12	zoom 55:24
3:14 4:16 7:5	139:15,15	56:2 64:17
13:12 23:22,23	140:22,24	76:3,7 83:19
23:25 24:22	141:2 142:25	83:23 101:2
26:10 28:14,20	143:7,11 144:2	108:9
30:6 32:16	145:19 147:21	
35:19 36:1,25		